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ABSTRACT

It is assumed that the sequencing of ribosomes better reflects the active microbial community than the sequencing of the ribosomal RNA encoding genes. Yet, many studies exploring microbial communities in various environments, ranging from the human gut to deep oceans, questioned the validity of this paradigm due to the discrepancies between the DNA and RNA based communities. Here we focus on an often neglected key step in the analysis, the reverse transcription (RT) reaction. Previous studies showed that RT may introduce biases when expressed genes and ribosomal RNA are quantified, yet its effect on microbial diversity and community composition was never tested. High throughput sequencing of ribosomal RNA is a valuable tool to understand microbial communities as it better describes the active population than DNA analysis. However, the necessary step of RT may introduce biases that have so far been poorly described. In this manuscript, we compare three RT enzymes, commonly used in soil microbiology, in two temperature modes to determine a potential source of bias due to non-standardized RT conditions. In our comparisons, we have observed up to 6 fold differences in bacterial class abundance. A temperature induced bias can be partially explained by G-C content of the affected bacterial groups, thus pointing towards a need for higher reaction temperatures. However, another source of bias was due to enzyme processivity differences. This bias is potentially hard to overcome and thus mitigating it might require the use of one enzyme for the sake of cross-study comparison.

INTRODUCTION

Massively parallel amplicon sequencing revolutionized our view of microbial world: by sequencing a taxonomic tag such as 16S rRNA encoding gene, it allows taxonomic description of the microbial communities (Quammen, 2018). However, the existing approaches introduce caveats: the DNA amplicon sequencing may capture ‘relic DNA’, which is a recalcitrant genetic material from dead cells or naked DNA (Carini et al., 2016) in addition, amplicon sequencing carries technical biases due to sample preparation, DNA extraction methods (Pan et al., 2010), amplification reaction (Pfeiffer et al., 2014) and analysis (Pollock et al., 2018). Moreover, DNA-based microbiome information can describe the total community, but it cannot report which members are metabolically active (Blazewicz et al., 2013). In contrast to DNA based tools, analysis of ribosomes can describe the metabolically active members of a given community. The combination of data generated from rRNA encoding genes and ribosomes led to a wide range of ecological insights, including the response to climatic changes (Angel et al., 2013), pH and water availability (Romanowicz et al., 2016), and biogeochemical processes (Freedman et al., 2015).

Ribosomal analysis studies are based on an assumption that ribosomes are more abundant in active cells compared to dormant ones (Blazewicz et al., 2013; Lennon and Jones, 2011). However, this assumption may not always be correct. Dormant bacteria may be misclassified as active, when ribosomes are present in cells and spores that are inactive (Segev et al., 2013; Blagodatskaya and Kuzyakov, 2013). In contrast,
active bacteria with low metabolic turnover and low ribosomal count could be labeled as dormant when sequencing depth is insufficient (Steven et al., 2017; Joergensen and Wichern, 2018). In spite of various biases that introduce discrepancies in the community structure (Forney et al., 2004), ribosomal analysis can capture the biological variability highlighting large differences between samples. However, if more subtle differences are of interest, technical biases could confound biological interpretations (Lever et al., 2015; McCarthy et al., 2015). This is due to specific challenges introduced RNA based analysis (Bustin and Nolan, 2004, 2017). Therefore, to confidently compare results across ribosome-based amplicon sequencing studies, we must determine which component of the analysis: RNA extraction, processing or data analysis may influence the outcome and introduce biases.

Prior studies focused on biases in the steps of RNA extraction, amplification and sequencing, but disregard any biases that may occur during RT (Creer et al., 2016). At the crucial step of RT, most researches simply ‘follow the manufacture instructions’ (Table 1). However, RT kits typically detail a wide range of temperatures, primer, template and reaction options, which may lead to different results. The reverse transcriptase (RT) enzyme requires sequence priming to initiate a reaction. Primers could be poly-A complementary, random or sequence specific. Poly-A priming is limited to eukaryotic mRNA which makes it unsuitable for use with ribosomal taxonomic tags. Opinions vary about the usefulness of random and sequence-specific priming for the analysis of microbiomes: Random priming may produce higher yield of cDNA and improve the detection limit (Zhang and Byrne, 2015; Ståhlberg et al., 2004a), but may decrease the reproducibility and introduce bias (Bustin and Nolan, 2004; Hansen et al., 2010). Sequence specific primes require fine tuning of the reaction conditions and higher template concentration than random priming (Ståhlberg et al., 2004b). Moreover, the results of the RT reaction is determined not only by the type of the RT enzyme used, but also by the reaction conditions (Curry et al., 2002; Ståhlberg et al., 2004a,b; Bustin and Nolan, 2004; Sieber et al., 2010).

Ideally RT efficiency is near 100 %, but in practice it varies dramatically: 90 % efficiency was reported for SuperScript III (mutated MMLV RT) (Ståhlberg et al., 2004a), 20 % for Murine Leukemia Virus (M-MLV) RT (Curry et al., 2002), and as low as 2 % for Avian Myeloblastosis Virus (AMV) RT (Ståhlberg et al., 2004a). Moreover almost two order of magnitude difference were reported between mutated and wild-type AMV RT (Ståhlberg et al., 2004a).

To the best of our knowledge no study has yet compared the RT reaction conditions for environmental microbiome profile. We hypothesize that during RT reactions, varying RT enzyme types and temperature conditions will yield different results in microbial diversity and community composition. We further predict that variations in communities will be G-C dependent. To test our prediction, we present a comparative study of commonly used RT enzymes in the field of environmental microbiology as well as a comparison of two different reaction temperatures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>RT Enzyme</th>
<th>RT origin</th>
<th>Temperature [°C] Suggested Used</th>
<th>RNA type</th>
<th>Primer type</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promega</td>
<td>MMLV</td>
<td>MMLV</td>
<td>37–42</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>rRNA</td>
<td>926R Carson et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>rRNA</td>
<td>Random hexamers</td>
<td>Pratscher et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ImProm-II</td>
<td>AMV</td>
<td>37–55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>rRNA &amp; mRNA</td>
<td>Random hexamers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiagen</td>
<td>Quantitect</td>
<td>Quantiscript</td>
<td>42–50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>rRNA</td>
<td>Unique RT Primer Mix Barnard et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omniscrypt</td>
<td>Quantiscript</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>mRNA</td>
<td>Random hexamers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takara</td>
<td>PrimeScript II</td>
<td>AMV</td>
<td>42–50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>mRNA</td>
<td>Random hexamers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roche</td>
<td>Roche reverse transcription kit</td>
<td>AMV</td>
<td>42–60</td>
<td>42 &amp; 50</td>
<td>rRNA</td>
<td>Random hexamers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermo Fisher</td>
<td>MMLV</td>
<td>MMLV</td>
<td>37–42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>rRNA</td>
<td>900R Lillies et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SuperScript-II</td>
<td>MMLV</td>
<td>42–55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>mRNA</td>
<td>1492R Baldrian et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Literature overview of RT conditions applied in soil microbiological studies.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study site and sample collection scheme
Soil samples were collected at the central Negev Desert highlands, Israel (Zin Plateau, 30°58'N, 34°20'0'E) at an established ecological research site. The mean annual precipitation at the sampling site is 90 mm and the mean annual temperature is 30°C (LTER data). Samples were collected under the canopy of perennial shrub Hammada scoparia in October 2015 at the end of the dry season as previously described (Baubin et al., 2019). Briefly, sampling was conducted in seven random blocks, each providing two technical replicates resulting in 14 samples. Samples were collected from the top 5 cm of the soil, following the removal of crust and debris. The soil samples were processed within 24 h of collection. Samples were homogenized using 2 mm sieve and the duplicates from each block were composited. This resulted in seven final replicates.

RNA preparation
Total RNA was extracted from each of the seven samples using a phenol-chlorophorm extraction previously described by Angel (2012). The reaction buffer pH was adjusted to 5. The total RNA was subsequently purified with the MagListo™ Total RNA Extraction Kit (Bioneer, Daejeon, Republic of Korea). Contaminant DNA was removed using a DNase I from the MasterPure RNA Purification Kit (Epicenter, Madison, WI, USA) with two successive treatments of 30 min according to manufacturer’s instructions. The reaction mixture was purified using the MagListo™ Total RNA Extraction Kit (Bioneer). The absence of contaminant DNA was verified using total bacterial primers 341F (5’ CCTACGGAGGCAGCAG 3’) and 515R (5’ TTACCGCGCTGTGACGC 3’) (Klindworth et al., 2013) and DreamTaq DNA polymerase (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) under the following conditions: 95°C for 5 min, followed by 26 cycles of 95°C for 15 s, 60°C for 30 s and 72°C for 30 s for extension followed by 72°C for 5 min for final extension. If amplification was detected the sample was discarded, re-extracted, purified and tested. Only DNA-free samples were used in this study.

Reverse transcription reaction conditions
RT kits used in this experiment were chosen to represent the most commonly used enzymes in the field (Figure 1). All seven samples were reverse transcribed by the same kit to reduce batch effects. Each RT kit used in this study originated from a different source: (I.) ImProm-II Reverse Transcription System enzyme (Promega, Madison, WI, USA) originates from AMV RT. (II.) SuperScript IV Reverse Transcriptase Kit enzyme (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) originates from MMLV RT and (III.) TGIRT originates from the mobile group II introns reverse transcriptase (Mohr et al., 2013) TGIRT™, III Enzyme (InGex, St. Louis, MO, USA). Each reaction consisted of 50 ng of total RNA template, measured by Quanti-iT™ RNA Assay Kit (ThermoFisher), and random hexamer primers (0.5 µg/reaction). Template and primer mix were heated to 70°C (ImProm-II) or 65°C (SuperScript IV). Each reaction was subsequently cooled to 4°C for 5 min and incubated at 42°C (ImProm-II), 55°C (ImProm-II and Superscript) or 57°C (TGIRT) for 60 min (ImProm-II), 120 min (TGIRT) or 10 min (SuperScript IV). All reactions were terminated and DNA was removed by alkaline lysis using 2 µl of 1 M NaOH, incubating for 12 min at 70°C. After which the reaction was neutralized using 4 µl of 0.5 M acetic acid (Table 2).

Illumina sequence preparation
The V3 and V4 regions of the resulting cDNA were amplified using 341F (5’ CCTACGGAGGCAGCAG 3’) and 806R (5’ GTTCTGGACTACHVGGGTWTCTAAT 3’) (Klindworth et al., 2013) primers. Each reaction was performed in triplicate and consisted of 1 mM bovine serum albumin (Takara, Kusatsu, Japan), 2.5 µl of 10x standard buffer, 5 µM primers, 0.8 mM dNTPs, 0.4 µl DreamTaq DNA polymerase (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA), and 4 µl of template cDNA. The reaction mixtures were subsequently amplified using the following PCR conditions: 95°C for 30 s, 27 cycles of 95°C for 15 s, 50°C for 30 s, 68°C for 30 s and 68°C for 5 min. Resulting amplicon presence was verified using 1.5 % agarose gel electrophoresis. Resulting technical triplicates were combined, and the sequencing libraries were constructed using the TruSeq® DNA Sample Preparation Kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) following the manufacturer’s recommendations. The amplicon libraries were sequenced (250x2 base pairs, pair-end) on the Illumina MiSeq System platform at the Research Resources Centre at the University of Illinois.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>RT kit</th>
<th>Primers</th>
<th>Thermo cycling</th>
<th>Reaction mix</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promega</td>
<td>Im-Prom II</td>
<td>Random Hexamers</td>
<td>(500 ng/reaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>DTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Tris-HCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>KCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42°C</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>MgCl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70°C</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>dNTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNAse inhibitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promega</td>
<td>Im-Prom II</td>
<td>Random Hexamers</td>
<td>(500 ng/reaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>DTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Tris-HCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>KCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55°C</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>MgCl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70°C</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>dNTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNAse inhibitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThermoFisher</td>
<td>SuperScriptIV</td>
<td>Random Hexamers</td>
<td>(2.5 µM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>DTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0°C</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Tris-HCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23°C</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>KCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55°C</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>MgCl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80°C</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>dNTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNAse inhibitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIRT</td>
<td>TGIRT-III</td>
<td>Random Hexamers</td>
<td>(500 ng/reaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65°C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>DTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0°C</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Tris-HCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23°C</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>EDTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58°C</td>
<td>120 min</td>
<td>MgCl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80°C</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>dNTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNAse inhibitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. A summary of conditions applied to the different reaction conditions.

Sequence analysis
Resulting paired end sequences were merged using the CASPER program (Kwon et al., 2014), and the resulting merged reads were clustered using the UPARSE pipeline according to the recommended settings (Edgar, 2013). The resulting OTU representative sequences were taxonomically assigned with the SINA incremental aligner using a lowest common ancestor algorithm (Pruesse et al., 2007) and the SILVA database version 132 (Quast et al., 2013). All sequences retrieved in this study were uploaded to European Nucleotide Archive (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena) submission number PRJEB32237.

Class enrichment plot data preparation
To explore whether G-C content contributed to differences in relative abundances of different taxa, we ran the following analysis: for each reaction condition we calculated pairwise comparisons at the class level: we normalized the proportional enrichment in each respective reaction conditions following Equation 1 (Figure 2 and Supplementary Figure S2), where the A and B represent a class at the different conditions.

\[ Class_{normalized} = \frac{A - B}{A + B} \] (1)

The error bars represent a standard deviation, which have been calculated as a standard deviation of each category and normalized according to the Equation 2. The \( \delta A \) and \( \delta B \) represent the standard deviation of class A and B. Details of deriving this equations are specified in Supplementary Equation S1.

\[ \delta Class_{normalized} = \frac{2}{(A + B)^2} \sqrt{B^2 \delta A^2 + A^2 \delta B^2} \] (2)

Statistical analysis
All data analysis was performed in R v3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2018). The dataset was sub-sampled (rarified) to an even depth of 9000 sequences per sample using python numpy package v1.15.4 (Van Der Walt et al., 2011). The subsampling removed five samples from the dataset. Additionally, three more samples were removed as outliers (“https://gitlab.com/stovicek/rt˙article/blob/master/data˙preparation.ipynb). In order to equalize the number of replicates, two random samples were removed from the TGIRT dataset. This reduced the number of replicates to four samples per experimental category. The sample diversity was analyzed using the vegan package v2.5-2 (Oksanen et al., 2018). The data was visualized using the R package ggplot2 package v2.2.1 (Wickham, 2016) and python package matplotlib (Hunter, 2007).
RESULTS

Sample preparation and diversity analysis

After removing obvious outliers, four samples from each condition were analyzed. The summary of
the analysis and all the code used to produce each figure is included in the Supplementary File S1
and S2. The changes in bacterial diversity among the tested conditions were expressed using species
count, Pielou’s evenness index (Pielou, 1967) and Shannon diversity index (Shannon and Weaver, 1949).
Despite observed trends in the diversity indices, no statistically significant differences were detected
(Supplementary Figure S1, Supplementary diversity_statistics.ipynb).

Relative abundance plot

A relative abundance of major taxonomic classes is depicted in the Figure 1. Each column is an av-
erage of four biological replicates. OTUs (operational taxonomic units) that were not taxonomically
assigned at this level are summarized as “Unclassified” (≈ 2 %). Various patterns (detailed below)
were detected among the experimental conditions: some patterns could be attributed to differences in
reaction temperature (which ranged from 42 °C to 55 °C and 57 °C). Other patterns could be linked to
enzyme type. RT reactions with SupeScript IV and TGIRT RTs yielded no significant differences in
class relative abundances. However, transcription with ImProm-II RT at a similar temperature (≈ 55 °C)
yielded different abundances: specifically, the abundances of Alphaproteobacteria, Bacteroidia, Deltapro-
teobacteria, Oxyphotobacteria, Rubrobacteria and Verrucomicrobidae decreased. However, Chloflexia,
Gammaproteobacteria and Thermoleophilia abundances increased when their ribosomes were transcribed
with ImProm-II RT (Figure 1, Supplementary Table S1). When transcription occurred at lower temperature
(42 °C), relative abundances of Bacilli, Deltaproteobacteria and Oxyphotobacteria were enriched, while
Actinobacteria, Chloroflexia and Acidimicrobia were depleted under the same conditions (Figure 1 and
Supplementary Table S1).

Class enrichment plot

The Figure 2 also depicts the weighted average of the G-C content in each class. The proportional
comparison is interpreted as follows: A value of zero in the proportional comparison represents the
taxonomic class count that is exactly equal between the two compared groups (Figure 2). A value of 1
or -1 is assigned when a given taxonomic class is only present in one category and absent in another,
respectively. In general, there was a tendency towards lower G-C content lower temperature of ImProm-
II (Figure 2,a, and Supplementary Figure S2, a and b). No statistically significant differences were
detected between the profiles resulting from RT of SuprScript-IV or TGIRT (Supplementary Figure S2,
d). The taxa Gemmatimonadetes, Fibrobacteria and Thermoanaerobaculalia were relatively insensitive
to the RT conditions. However the majority of the classes were enriched in some conditions. (I.) the
rate of RT was only sensitive to temperature for the classes Alphaproteobacteria, Gemmatimonadetes,
Fibrobacteria, Thermoanaerobaculalia, TK10, and Blastocatellia (Figure 2, a). These groups tend to have
extreme GC content (both high and low). (II.) Gammaproteobacteria, Planctomycetacia and Phycisphaerae
are relatively insensitive to the reaction temperature (Figure 2, a), but their abundances vary with different
RT enzymes (Figure 2, b, Supplementary figure S2).

Class enrichment statistics

We calculated a linear regression, where the response variable was the relative proportion of each class
between two tested categories, and the explanatory variable was the G-C content (the assumptions tests
and plots can be found in the Supplementary file S2). The linear regression assumptions were tested:
in case of two condition pairs (I mProm-II at 42 °C & SuperScript-IV as well as ImProm-II at 55 °C &
SuperScript-IV), the assumption conditions were not met (Supplementary file S2). Since we cannot
confidently discard the null hypothesis in these cases, we do not consider these two tests significant.
Therefore, we are considering only the ImProm-II 42 °C & ImProm-II 55 °C as well as ImProm-II 42 °C &
TGIRT as a significant outcome. Differences in the remaining cases cannot be explained by the weighted
G-C content alone (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

As high throughput sequencing has become increasingly accessible in recent years, researchers urgently
call for method standardization to allow for accurate cross-study comparisons (Pan et al., 2010; Blago-
Figure 1. Relative abundance of main classes across each tested condition. Only top 15% of the most abundant classes are represented and the rest is summarized in the ‘Low abundance’ category. The x axis show different enzymes and conditions. The y axis shows an average relative abundance. Each category is an average of 4 samples.
Figure 2. A proportional comparison of most abundant classes between the ImProm-II at 42 °C and 55 °C (a) and the ImProm-II at 55 °C and SuperScriptIV at 55 °C (b). Enrichment is expressed such that a class that is equally proportional in both conditions, has a value of 0. If the class shows in one condition but is absent from another, its value would be equal to 1 or -1 respectively. Furthermore, a weighted average of the GC content of each class is expressed as the bar color. Each value is an average of 4 biological replicates.

Table 3. The linear regression statistics.
We used a GC content as an explanatory variable of a the class enrichment. The rows marked with a • do not fulfill all test assumptions (see supplementary diversity_statistics.ipynb).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition 1</th>
<th>Condition 2</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ImProm-II 42 °C</td>
<td>ImProm-II 55 °C</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>5.366</td>
<td>4.89E-06</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImProm-II 42 °C</td>
<td>SuperScript IV</td>
<td>0.1373</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImProm-II 42 °C</td>
<td>TGIRT</td>
<td>0.2032</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>0.00264</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImProm-II 55 °C</td>
<td>SuperScript IV</td>
<td>0.0841</td>
<td>-2.097</td>
<td>0.0431</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImProm-II 55 °C</td>
<td>TGIRT</td>
<td>0.03624</td>
<td>-1.546</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuperScript IV</td>
<td>TGIRT</td>
<td>0.03634</td>
<td>1.548</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

microbiology (Table 1) at two distinct temperature modes (42 °C and 55 °C–57 °C). Then we analyzed
temperature and RT enzyme-related effects on the resulting community profiles (Table 2).

Under different reaction conditions, we detected differences in the relative abundance of bacterial
classes portrayed by different reaction conditions (Figure 1). Some observed differences can be attributed
to the combined effect of reaction temperature and average template G-C content (Figure 2 and Supplementary Figure S2). As expected, this effect is clearest when we applied the same enzyme (ImProm-II) at two reaction temperatures (42 °C and 55 °C), then the G-C content had the highest prediction power (t = 5.366, p = 4.8 × 10⁻⁵, Table 3). Likewise, in every comparison of RT enzymes at low and high temperature, G-C content affected the relative abundance of taxonomic classes with statistical significance. Although the RT reactions are commonly performed at 42 °C (Table 1), our results indicate that this reaction temperature is too low to allow successful RT of some soil community taxa, in particular species with higher G-C content.

When transcription was performed with different enzymes under similar reaction temperatures, relative
abundances of taxa differed notably (Figure 1 and 2). Although the RTs of SuperScript-IV and TGIRT
originate from different organisms, they yielded similar taxa abundances. Reactions with ImProm-II yielded different profiles. These differences cannot be explained by the G-C content (Table 3), but could be attributed to ribosome properties and the efficiency of RT. The ribosomes extracted from the soil environment were diverse and perhaps differ in their secondary and tertiary structures (Yilmaz et al., 2006) post-transcriptional modifications (Schwartz and Motorin, 2017). Thus RT’s kinetics would differ.

The discrepancies reported in this study raise further questions: how would one decide which enzymes
or temperatures best reflect the active community composition? It has been suggested that the total
community could be used as a reference to accurately deduce the diversity. Furthermore, this study was performed on desert soil samples and the effects in other environments remain to be determined.

We previously demonstrated that the total and active communities in the Negev soil used in this study differ in both abundance profiles and community composition during the dry season, while during the wet season, no differences were detected (Baubin et al., 2019). During the dry season, a "phantom taxa" (Klein et al., 2016), Deinococcus-Thermus, comprised ≈ 30% of the total soil community (Baubin et al., 2019) but was undetected in the active community of the dry season by any of the methods used here. These results suggest that the DNA-based total community may differ from the RNA-based community and thus cannot be used as a reliable reference for diversity. Furthermore, our results underline a need to standardize and specify the RT conditions that allow cross-study comparisons. The scale of the effect of RT conditions on the RNA-based community might vary with a studied biome. Depending on obvious factors such as GC content (discussed above), as well as poorly studied factors such as ribosomal post-transcriptional modifications. Therefore, we recommend verifying each case separately before attempting a cross-study comparison.

CONCLUSION

We have tested commonly utilized RT enzymes at assorted temperatures and observed marked differences in the output community structure. These differences were attributed to RT type and reaction conditions. We suggest that RT reaction conditions may dictate the diversity of a given community and therefore the exact conditions should be detailed in full [i.e., the common notation, "according to manufacturer instructions" does not provide sufficient information (Table 1)]. Furthermore, RT should be performed at a sufficiently high temperature to minimize the G-C bias, preferably at 55°C. Lastly, we suggest that the same RT enzyme should be used across comparable studies, since we detected discrepancies between RT enzymes performing at equivalent conditions (Figure 2, b). Here, we highlight, for the first time, the need for standardisation and careful consideration of RT reaction conditions in studies describing ribosome-based diversity and community composition.
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