Extracellular enzymes Foraging strategy for free-living marine bacteria

Sachia J Traving^{1,2}, Uffe H Thygesen², Lasse Riemann¹, Colin A Stedmon² ¹Marinebiological section, University of Copenhagen, 3000 Helsingør. ²DTU Aqua, Denmarks Technical University, 2920 Charlottenlund.

Introduction

Dissolved organic matter (DOM) in the oceans is one of the largest reservoirs of carbon in the biosphere. The entire ecosystem contributes to the DOM pool, but the DOM is almost exclusively exploited by the bacterioplankton through the microbial loop and this represents a major trophic pathway. Up to 50% of marine carbon fixation is processed through the bacterioplankton (Cole et al. 1988) and play an important role in biogeochemical fluxes, marine productivity and food web structure.

Enzyme Model

There are two main extracellular enzyme strategies: surface-associated; and dissolved (freely released). Here we present the results of a model study on the efficiency of the two strategies, for single free-living bacteria under open ocean conditions.

We ask 1) do extracellular enzymes (as in freely released) have a role in the foraging strategy of free-living bacteria in the open ocean? and 2) is it possible to deduce a threshold concentration of a substrate, below which enzymatic activity ceases to be an advantage to the cell?

(max 800 Da) **Surface Attatched** Bacterial Enzyme Challenges **Dissolved enzyme**

Uptake Site

Метноря

Mathematical analysis: We determine the spatial distribution of substrate and enzymes by solving governing PDEs, and from this find the uptake by the bacterium. We score the efficiency by comparing with an idealized cell which absorbs substrate directly. The threshold concentration of substrate is where the

resulting carbon uptake equals the carbon used in enzyme production.



Figure 1

The efficiency decrease with enzyme diffusivity ($D_{\rm F}$) and increase with the lifetime of the enzyme (decrease in decay rate). For a lifetime of 1 week, with the reference parameters listed in table 1, an enzyme would have an efficiency of 1.5 % (diamond).

Figure 2

efficient strategy.

The efficiency increase with production rate (Q) but decrease with diffusivities. That means for a diffusivity corresponding to an enzyme of approximately 100 kDa, with the reference parameters listed in table 1, the efficiency is 1.5 % (diamond), far from saturation. This and figure 1 point towards surface associated enzymes as the most

Figure 3

The efficiency increases with decreasing diffusivity. For a dissolved (freely released) enzyme, the majority of the products (monomers) never reach the cell (-). However, the plot also show the potential for "social foraging" under the right conditions; such as high cell density, where the efficiency of dissolved enzymes would yield a monomer production high enough to support mutualistic efforts of a consortium.

Threshold concentration

eq. $P_{IIIII} = n_E / n_M^* \alpha / \beta$

result in a threshold value of:

 $P_{lim} = 0.4 \text{ nM}$

The currency is based on carbon atoms, deriving a price for the enzyme (N_{F}) relative to a monomer (N_{M}) . At substrate concentrations below P_{lim}, production of enzymes does not pay off. DOM concentrations in the open oceans are relatively stable, around 40-60 µmol C kg-1 (Carlson et al.

2011), when considering the complexity of the many thousands of compounds that make up the DOM pool, and the specificity of enzymes, the threshold concentration may explain the persistence of "old" fractions of DOM; not as refractory but persisting at concentrations so low that there is no energetic gain for producing the specific enzymes needed.

Table 1

| Symbols | Description | Values | Units |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Μ | (monomer) substrate | < 800 | Dalton |
| Р | substrate | ~100,000 | Dalton |
| а | radius of cell | 0.3e ^{-3*} | mm |
| D _E | diffusivity enzyme | 1e ^{-5*} | mm² s⁻¹ |
| D _P | diffusivity substrate | 1e ^{-5*} | mm² s⁻¹ |
| Q | enzyme production in C | 1e ^{-24a} | mol s ⁻¹ |
| α | enzyme decay rate | 1 day, 1 week, 1 month | |
| β | reaction rate | 4.1 ^{b*} | s ⁻¹ µM ⁻¹ |
| *reference parameters. | | | |

^aenzyme production equal to the cell's own weight in a week. ^baverage of bacterial α -amylases (Chessa et al. 1999).

Carlson C.A., Hansell D.A. & Tamburini C. (2011). DOC persistance and its fate after export within the ocean interior. Science, SCOR, 3.

Chessa J.-P., Feller G. & Gerday C. (1999). Purification and characterization of the heat-labile a-amylase secreted by the psychrophilic bacterium TAC 240B. Canadian Journal of Microbiology, 45, 452-457.

Cole J.J., Findlay S. & Pace M.L. (1988). Bacterial production in fresh and saltwater ecosystems: a cross-system overview. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 43, 10.

SJTraving@bio.ku.dk



OceanLife

Centre for Ocean Life

VKR Centre of Excellence



