Gut Microbiome–Wide Search for Bacterial Azoreductases Reveals Potentially Uncharacterized Azoreductases Encoded in the Human Gut Microbiome^S

Domenick J. Braccia, Glory Minabou Ndjite, Ashley Weiss, Sophia Levy, Stephenie Abeysinghe, Xiaofang Jiang, Mihai Pop, and Brantley Hall

Center for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology (D.B., M.P., B.H.) and Departments of Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics (G.M.N., A.W., S.L., S.A., B.H.) and Computer Science (M.P.), University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland; and National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland (X.J.)

Received March 14, 2022; accepted August 18, 2022

ABSTRACT

The human gut is home to trillions of microorganisms that are responsible for the modification of many orally administered drugs, leading to a wide range of therapeutic outcomes. Prodrugs bearing an azo bond are designed to treat inflammatory bowel disease and colorectal cancer via microbial azo reduction, allowing for topical application of therapeutic moieties to the diseased tissue in the intestines. Despite the inextricable link between microbial azo reduction and the efficacy of azo prodrugs, the prevalence, abundance, and distribution of azoreductases have not been systematically examined across the gut microbiome. Here, we curated and clustered amino acid sequences of experimentally confirmed bacterial azoreductases and conducted a hidden Markov model-driven homolog search for these enzymes across 4644 genome sequences present in the representative Unified Human Gastrointestinal Genomes collection. We identified 1958 putative azo-reducing species, corroborating previous findings that azo reduction appears to be a ubiquitous function of the gut microbiome. However, through a systematic

Introduction

Orally administered drugs are an attractive, noninvasive mode of delivery of pharmaceuticals to the intestines. The human gut microbiome plays an important role in drug metabolism (Spanogiannopoulos et al., 2016) and is capable of activating (Peppercorn and Goldman, 1972; Morrison et al., 2012; Sousa et al., 2014), inactivating (Peters, 1978;

D.B. was supported in part by the National Science Foundation [DGE-1632976] and in part by B.H. startup funding from the University of Maryland. X.J. was supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of National Institutes of Health National Library of Medicine. M.P. was supported by National Institutes of Health [Grant R01-AI-100947]. B.H., G.M.N., A.W., S.L., and S.A. were supported by startup funding from the University of Maryland.

No author has an actual or perceived conflict of interest with the contents of this article.

dx.doi.org/10.1124/dmd.122.000898.

S This article has supplemental material available at dmd.aspetjournals.org.

comparison of predicted and confirmed azo-reducing strains, we hypothesize the presence of uncharacterized azoreductases in 25 prominent strains of the human gut microbiome. Finally, we confirmed the azo reduction of Acid Orange 7 by multiple strains of *Fusobacterium nucleatum*, *Bacteroides fragilis*, and *Clostridium clostridioforme*. Together, these results suggest the presence and activity of many uncharacterized azoreductases in the human gut microbiome and motivate future studies aimed at characterizing azoreductase genes in prominent members of the human gut microbiome.

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

This work systematically examined the prevalence, abundance, and distribution of azoreductases across the healthy and inflammatory bowel disease human gut microbiome, revealing potentially uncharacterized azoreductase genes. It also confirmed the reduction of Acid Orange 7 by strains of *Fusobacterium nucleatum*, *Bacteroides fragilis*, and *Clostridium clostridioforme*.

Saha et al., 1983; Haiser et al., 2013), and even toxifying (Wallace et al., 2010) pharmaceutical drugs. Prodrugs containing an azo bond actually require bacterial azoreductase activity to release biologically active compounds (Peppercorn and Goldman, 1972). For conditions such as inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) and colorectal cancer (CRC), bacterial azoreductases have been used to deliver therapeutics such as 5-aminosalicylic acid (5-ASA), prednisolone (Ruiz et al., 2011), and celecoxib (Ruiz et al., 2011) topically to diseased intestinal tissues (Fig. 1). Following oral administration of sulfasalazine, bacterial azoreductases in the gut reduce azo bonds, liberating 5-ASA and allowing it to confer its anti-inflammatory properties (Mahida et al., 1991; Rachmilewitz et al., 1992; Weber et al., 2000) topically on inflamed intestinal tissue. Direct oral administration of 5-ASA is nonoptimal because the majority of the drug is absorbed in the small intestine and is sent through systemic circulation (Peppercorn and Goldman, 1973; Tozaki et al., 2002; Friend, 2005; Perrotta et al., 2015; Foppoli et al., 2019). Other examples of azo-bonded prodrugs are OPN501 and celecoxib-5-ASA. OPN501 is made of up prednisolone, 5-ASA, and an inert cyclization product, dihydroquinolone

ABBREVIATIONS: 5-ASA, 5-aminosalicylic acid; BHI, Brain Heart Infusion; CD, Crohn disease; CRC, colorectal cancer; DHQ, dihydroquinolone; EFI-EST, Enzyme Function Initiative-Enzyme Similarity Tool; FDR, false discover rate; FMN, flavin mononucleotide; FN, false negative; FP, false positive; HMM, hidden Markov model; HMP2, Integrative Human Microbiome Project; HPFS, Health Professionals Follow-Up Study; IBD, inflammatory bowel disease; PR, predicted reducer; PRISM, Prospective Registry of IBD Patients at MGH; SR, sulfasalazine reducing; TN, true negative; TP, true positive; UC, ulcerative colitis; UHGG, Unified Human Gastrointestinal Genomes; YCFA, Yeast Casitone Fatty Acid.



Fig. 1. Azo reduction by gut microbiota. (A) Pathways of azo-bonded drug activation by bacterial azoreductase activity. DHQ is produced via cyclization of an intermediate of OPN501 and celecoxib-5-ASA prodrug following intramolecular lactamization (Ruiz et al., 2011). (B) Description of downstream metabolites of bacterial azo reduction and the mechanisms of action in IBD and CRC. References for each molecular function described in this subfigure: 5-ASA (Mahida et al., 1991; Cominelli et al., 1992; Rachmilewitz et al., 1992), prednisolone (Cohen et al., 2000), celecoxib (Wu et al., 2003, ; Wu et al., 2010; Gustafsson et al., 2010), sulfapyridine (Nielsen, 1982), and DHQ (Ruiz et al., 2011). (C) Presence of azoreductase-containing bacteria is required for prodrug activation in the IBD gut and CRC gut (left). Many azo-reducting bacteria have been characterized; however, some species have shown experimental evidence of azo-reduction without the full characterization of the genes responsible for azo reduction (right).

(DHQ). Upon azo reduction, 5-ASA is released and is able to act topically upon the target tissue. Following a spontaneous cyclization reaction, prednisolone and DHQ are released where prednisolone can act upon the target tissue (Ruiz et al., 2011). Celecoxib-5-ASA is made up of celecoxib, 5-ASA, and DHQ, which are all released upon azo reduction and cyclization in a similar mechanistic fashion to OPN501 (Ruiz et al., 2011).

A recent review article by Suzuki (2019) collected and curated experimentally confirmed azoreductases and described their preferred flavin cofactors and electron donors. They found that bacterial azoreductases qualitatively cluster into four main clades, which harbor a preference for either flavin mononucleotide (FMN) or flavin adenine dinucleotide as the flavin cofactor and either NADH or NADPH as the preferred electron donor. Clades I, II, and III are flavoproteins, whereas clade IV proteins are flavin free. Clade I azoreductases prefer NADPH as the electron donor, clade II prefers NADH as its electron donor, and clades III and IV generally use both. Of the 37 enzymes examined by Suzuki (2019), eight enzymes formed no distinct phylogenetic clade and featured differences in primary sequence length, flavin cofactor, and preferred electron donor. In addition to their relevance in drug delivery and efficacy, azoreductases are involved in nitroreduction (Brown 1981; Rafii et al., 1990; Rafii and Cerniglia, 1995; Liu et al., 2007; Mercier et al., 2013; Chalansonnet et al., 2017), quinone oxidoreduction (Liu et al., 2008; Leelakriangsak et al., 2008; Ryan et al., 2010a; Ryan et al., 2010b; Ryan et al., 2014), and azo dye reduction. Azo dyes such as Allura

Red and Brilliant Black are commonly used in the food and textile industries, and waste from their production and usage pollutes the environment. This has led to a plethora of manuscripts characterizing the activity of azoreductases across the bacterial kingdom (Cerniglia et al., 1982; Zimmermann et al., 1982; Nakanishi et al., 2001; Suzuki et al., 2001; Blümel et al., 2002; Blümel and Stolz, 2003; Chen et al., 2004; Chen et al., 2005; Nachiyar and

Rajakumar, 2005; Ooi et al., 2007; Matsumoto et al., 2010; Misal et al., 2011; Feng et al., 2012; Gonçalves et al., 2013; Lang et al., 2013; Misal et al., 2014; Eslami et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016), many of which exhibit nonnegligible sequence similarity to gut microbial azoreductases (Suzuki 2019).

There is a growing body of literature suggesting that azo reduction is a ubiquitous function of the human gut microbiome (Javdan et al., 2020), with many prominent bacterial strains showing significant reduction of sulfasalazine in vitro (Zimmermann et al., 2019). Javdan et al. (2020) showed that among 20 different individuals, sulfasalazine reduction was one of the only ubiquitous functions of the gut microbiome. Zimmermann et al. (2019) tested the reduction of sulfasalazine by 76 prominent strains of the gut microbiome and reported a significant [false discover rate (FDR) adjusted P value < 0.05] reduction of sulfasalazine by 62 of these strains. Interestingly, some of these experimentally confirmed azo-reducing strains reported by Zimmermann et al. (2019) have no prior evidence of azo-reduction and, thus, may encode novel or uncharacterized azoreductase genes (Fig. 1C). Identification of known azoreductases in newly reported sulfasalazine-reducing species can help narrow down strains to target for identification of uncharacterized azoreductases.

The prevalence, abundance, expression, and distribution of azoreductase enzymes in the human gut microbiome have implications for the efficacy of existing prodrugs mentioned above, as well as for the development of future azo prodrugs. Although azoreductases have been identified and characterized in many gut bacteria (Supplemental Table 1), the distribution of azoreductases has not been systematically explored across current gut bacterial reference genomes. To address this gap, we conducted a homolog search of known azoreductases across the Unified Human Gastrointestinal Genomes (UHGG) collection (Almeida et al., 2020) to identify putative azoreductases and azo-reducing species in the human gut microbiome. We then assessed the relative abundance and expression of known azoreductases in healthy, ulcerative colitis (UC), and Crohn disease (CD) participants of the Integrative Human Microbiome Project (HMP2) (Proctor and Huttenhower, 2019), the Prospective Registry of IBD Patients at MGH (PRISM) (Franzosa et al., 2019), and the Health Professionals Follow-Up Study (HPFS) (Abu-Ali et al., 2018). Finally, we tested the in vitro azo reduction of Acid Orange 7 by three strains of Fusobacterium nucleatum along with two strains of Bacteroides fragilis and two strains of Clostridium clostridioforme.

Materials and Methods

Description of Publicly Available Shotgun Metagenomic Sequencing Data. Shotgun metagenomic sequencing data obtained from the HMP2 [N (samples) = 703, N (individuals) = 103] (Proctor and Huttenhower, 2019), the PRISM [N (samples) = 218, N (individuals) = 218] (Franzosa et al., 2019), and the HPFS [N (samples) = 220, N (individuals) = 220] (Abu-Ali et al., 2018) are used throughout this work. Note that all samples referred to throughout this work are human stool samples.

Curation of Hidden Markov Models Representing Azoreductase Enzymes. We searched the literature for known and experimentally validated species of bacteria that have azoreductase activity. The list of gene sequences collected, along with the relevant metadata (organism, functional annotation, length, etc.) is available in Supplemental Table 1. Preliminary evidence for azoreductase gene sequence clustering is shown in Suzuki (2019), where sequences were aligned and phylogenetically compared. Next, after collecting 40 sequences of experimentally validated azoreductases, we generated a sequence similarity network using the Enzyme Function Initiative-Enzyme Similarity Tool (EFI-EST) (Gerlt et al., 2015) at a 35% amino acid sequence identity threshold for identifying similar clusters of azoreductase genes. This threshold corroborates the preliminary evidence for a diversity of azoreductase sequences put forth by Suzuki (2019). With the exception of clade IVb sequences, which reached 31% sequence identity, all other clusters of genes had at least 35% sequence identity. The groups shown in Fig. 2 were pressed into profile hidden Markov models (HMMs) using HMMER v[N/A][N/A]ersion 3.1b2 (Finn et al., 2015). Other genes that did not fall into the clade I-clade IV clusters (*arsH*, *yieF*, *mdaB*, *azo1*, *azoR*, etc.) were pressed into singular HMMs and included in the homolog search.

Search for Azoreductase Genes across Human Gut Microbial Genomes. We searched HMMs of known, experimentally validated azoreductases across 4644 nonredundant genomes contained in the UHGG collection (Almeida et al., 2020) using HMMER v3.1b2 (Finn et al., 2015). Alignments to queried HMMs with E-value $< 1 \times 10^{-10}$ and 60% coverage of the query sequence were labeled as putative azoreductase gene sequences. Putative azoreducing bacterial species with experimentally confirmed azoreductase activity (Supplemental Table 2) were then labeled as "known" azo-reducing species and classified separately from the putative azo-reducing species. Putative azoreducing species across the bacterial taxonomy were visualized using the iTOL web interface (Letunic and Bork, 2019), and prominent phyla of the gut microbiome were subsetted and presented in Fig. 3.

Relative Abundance and Azoreductase Gene Abundance and Expression Estimation. Raw sequencing reads for samples from HMP2 (Proctor and Huttenhower, 2019), PRISM (Franzosa et al., 2019), and HPFS (Abu-Ali et al., 2018) were downloaded and extracted with the National Center for Biotechnology Information's SRA toolkit v2.10.9 (http://ncbi.github.io/sra-tools/). Quality control and adapter trimming of the fastq sequence files were done with the Trim Galore wrapper v0.6.6 (https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/ trim_galore/). To remove potential human contaminants, quality trimmed reads were screened against the human genome (hg19) with Bowtie2 v2.4.2 (Langmead and Salzberg, 2012). Putative azoreductase sequences were extracted from UHGG genomes via custom shell and python scripts. Putative azoreductase gene sequences (HMP2, PRISM) and expression levels (HPFS) were quantified using salmon v1.4.0 (Patro et al., 2017) and were normalized and aggregated in R v4.1.1 and were subsequently visualized using the R package ggplot2 (Wickham, 2011) (Fig. 4). Taxonomy profiling of the cleaned metagenomic reads from HMP2 samples was performed using Kraken 2 v2.0.8-beta (Wood et al., 2019) to estimate the relative abundance of bacterial species present in each dataset. These relative abundances were then processed in R v4.1.1 and plotted using ggplot2 (Fig. 5). All computational and bioinformatic procedures are open source and are provided at https://github.com/dombraccia/Azoreductases.

Statistical Analysis of Relative Metagenomic Sequence Data from HMP2 and PRISM Datasets. Statistical analyses described in Fig. 4 were performed in R 4.1.1 with the Wilcoxon test method using default parameterization. Next, we compared the relative abundances of known and putative azo-reducing species for HMP2 subjects with 20 or more stool samples taken over the course of the study (Fig. 5). A linear mixed-effects model ANOVA was performed on this subset of HMP2 data to determine any statistically significant differences in relative abundance values across non-IBD, UC, and CD subjects. The R package lme4 (Bates et al., 2014) was used to fit the model to the data, and the package lmerTest (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) was used to perform the ANOVA on the model. All statistical analyses were performed in R version 4.1.1 and are provided at https://github.com/dombraccia/Azoreductases.

Acid Orange 7 Azo Reduction Assay. Biologic triplicates were grown in a 10 ml tube containing 10 ml of Yeast Casitone Fatty Acids (YCFA) broth for *B. fragilis* and *C. clostridioforme* strains and 10 ml of Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) broth for *F. nucleatum* strains. Each tube was inoculated with 10 μ L of bacteria from glycerol stocks. The final concentrations of each substrate in the bacterial cultures were 50 μ g/ml of FMN, 50 μ g/ml of NADH, and 50 μ mol/ml of Acid Orange 7. The bacterial cultures were left to grow in an anaerobic chamber for 72 hours, and Acid Orange 7 decolorization was measured once every 24 hours since inoculation. The decolorization of Acid Orange 7 was measured by aliquoting triplicates of 200 μ L media aliquants to a 96-well plate for each bacterial culture, and absorbance of 550 nm light was measured using a spectrophotometer.



Fig. 2. Bacterial azoreductases cluster by cofactor and electron donor preferences. Following an extensive literature search for experimentally confirmed bacterial azoreductases, amino acid sequences of 40 azoreductase enzymes were collected and clustered with EFI-EST (Gerlt et al., 2015) at 35% sequence identity. Each node in the figure above is a single azoreductase gene, and the edges between nodes indicate at least 35% sequence identity between the two amino acid sequences. The colored clusters, clade I through clade IVa and IVb, are groups of azoreductases previously described by Suzuki (2019) as mechanistically similar groups based on cofactor and electron donor preferences. Clusters labeled with gene names (*mdaB*, *yieF*, etc.) represent homologous gene sequences found in two or more organisms. Each mechanistically characterized group of azoreductases were subsequently pressed into profile HMMs using HMMER v3.1b2 (Finn et al., 2015), which formed the basis of the homolog search. The group labeled "other azoreductases" contains sequences that did not fall into any cluster at the 35% identity threshold and were pressed into singular HMMs prior to the homolog search.

The raw absorbance values for each biologic and technical replicate are reported in Supplemental Table 5.

Results

Primary Amino Acid Sequences of Bacterial Azoreductases Group by Mechanistic Preferences. To begin identifying putative azo-reducing species of the gut microbiome, we searched the literature for experimentally verified azoreductase enzymes, collected amino acid sequences, and metadata for these azoreductases (Supplemental Table 1) and compared their primary sequences using the EFI-EST (Gerlt et al., 2015). The resulting sequence similarity network captured mechanistic preferences such as flavin dependence and electron donor preference for each azoreductase reported by Suzuki (2019). We saw near-complete concordance between the clade I-IV azoreductases and the sequence similarity clusters at a 35% amino acid identity edge threshold, with the exception of clade IV, which was split into two separate clusters (Fig. 2). The gene families labeled arsH, mdaB, yieF, and azo1 clustered separately from clade I-IV azoreductases, and we consider each of these clusters as separate subfamilies of azoreductases. Multiple sequence alignments were generated for each cluster shown in Fig. 2 (with the exception of the "Other Azoreductases" group) using MUSCLE v3.8.425 (Edgar, 2004). HMMs were then trained on the multiple sequence alignments from the previous

step using the HMMER v3.1b2 method hmmpress (Finn et al., 2015) and were queried against the UHGG collection (Almeida et al., 2020).

Homolog Search for Azoreductases Supports Evidence for Ubiquity of Azo Reduction by the Human Gut Microbiome. We searched for homologs of azoreductases across 4644 representative genomes in the UHGG collection (Almeida et al., 2020) using HMMs generated from sequences of experimentally validated azoreductase enzymes (Fig. 3). This collection contains 204,938 genome sequences of bacteria known to inhabit the human gut, of which 4644 are included in the representative collection (Supplemental Table 4). For the remainder of this work, we refer to species receiving statistically significant (E-value $< 1 \times 10^{-10}$) hits to azoreductase genes as "putative azo-reducing species" or "putative azo-reducing bacteria." Of the 4644 genomes in the UHGG collection, there are 1443 (31.1%) with one putative azoreductase gene, 343 (7.4%) with two or more putative azoreductases, and 372 (8.0%) with three or more putative azoreductases, indicating the extensive potential of the gut microbiome to reduce azo bonds. Most notably, 364 genomes contain hits to the clade I profile, 452 contain hits to the clade II profile, 793 genomes contain hits to the clade III profile, 568 contain hits to the clade IVa profile, 410 contain hits to the clade IVb profile, 285 contain hits to the *mdaB* profile, and 477 contain hits to the *yieF* profile. Prominent phyla of the gut microbiome, such as Proteobacteria and Firmicutes, appear particularly rich with clade I, clade II, clade III, clade



Fig. 3. Azoreductases are widely distributed across gut bacterial taxonomy. Presence/absence of azoreductases across prominent phyla of the human gut microbiome. The taxonomic tree is obtained from the UHGG (Almeida et al., 2020) which is built on the Genome Taxonomy Database (Chaumeil et al., 2019). Phyla names are annotated on the left side. Phyla names followed by a capital letter, e.g., Firmicutes (A), indicate a novel phylum classified by the Genome Taxonomy Database tool-kit. The bar chart in the center indicates the number of species contained in each genus shown in the tree. The size of the circles indicates the number of species that contain hits to the azoreductase genes specified. The color of the circles indicates the cofactor and preferred electron (e^{-}) donor of the enzyme.

IVab, and flavin adenine dinucleotide utilizing azoreductases (purple columns in Fig. 3).

Systematic Evaluation of Predicted Azo-Reducing Species. We next sought to evaluate the results of our azoreductase homolog search with recent findings by Zimmermann et al. (2019) regarding sulfasalazine reduction. Zimmermann et al. (2019) tested the degradation of sulfasalazine by 76 prominent gut bacterial strains, 67 of which had corresponding reference genomes present in the UHGG collection. This provided an excellent source of data to compare our bioinformatic predictions against. We determined the sulfasalazine-reducing status as either sulfasalazine reducing (SR) or non–sulfasalazine reducing for each of the 67 strains based on the significant (FDR adjusted P value < 0.05) reduction of sulfasalazine in vitro reported by Zimmermann et al. (2019) (Table 1). We also determined the predicted reducing status as either a predicted reducer (PR) or a non-predicted reducer (Non-PR) for each strain based on the presence of a putative azoreductase identified from the homolog search step. For each strain, the sulfasalazine-reducing status and predicted reducing status were systematically compared to validate the results of the azoreductase homolog search (Table 1, columns 7–9). We correctly predicted the sulfasalazine-reducing status for 47.8% (32/67) of strains and we incorrectly predicted the sulfasalazine reducing status for 52.2% (35/67) of strains (Table 2). The vast majority (77.1%, 27/35) of incorrectly predicted strains are false negatives, meaning the strain does reduce sulfasalazine in vitro, but we did not identify an azoreductase in

146



Fig. 4. Abundance and expression of azoreductase genes by human gut microbiota. (A and B) Visualization of shotgun metagenomic sequencing data from the Human Microbiome Project 2, also known as the HMP2 and the PRISM. We used salmon 1.4.0 (Patro et al., 2017) to quantify the abundance of azoreductase genes from hundreds of stool samples across healthy controls (non-IBD), UC, and CD participant cohorts. Raw DNA read alignment counts were normalized to counts per million (CPM), analogous to transcripts-per-million (TPM) normalization. Asterisks above each boxplot indicate statistical significance (*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001, Wilcoxon rank sum test, all FDR adjusted using Benjamini-Hochberg method). (C) Visualization of high-throughput metatranscriptomic data obtained from the HPFS. We quantified the expression of bacterial azoreductases using salmon v1.4.1 (Patro et al., 2017) and normalized the raw read alignment statistics to transcripts per million (TPM). Please see *Materials and Methods* for a more detailed description of the computational and statistical methods employed.

the homolog search step (Table 2). Interestingly, the majority of false positives (75%, 6/8) are members of the Proteobacteria phylum, which we previously noted to be particularly rich in azoreductase gene sequences (Fig. 3).

Exploratory Analysis of Azoreductase Abundance and Expression Levels in the Human Gut Microbiome. After identifying putative azo-reducing species of the human gut microbiome, we next sought to examine the abundance and expression of putative azoreductases using publicly available metagenomic and metatranscriptomic datasets. We used shotgun metagenomic sequence data from the HMP2 (Proctor and Huttenhower, 2019) and the PRISM (Franzosa et al., 2019) to quantify azoreductase gene abundance. We also used high-throughput metatranscriptomic sequence data from the HPFS (Abu-Ali et al., 2018) to quantify the expression of azoreductases by the human gut microbiota (Fig. 4, A–C). Briefly, raw genomic and transcriptomic reads were filtered and processed using fastp (Chen et al., 2018), and

azoreductases were quantified using salmon v1.4.0 (Patro et al., 2017). Please see *Materials and Methods* for more details on the computational and statistical procedures used.

Significant differences in azoreductase gene abundances between disease conditions are displayed in Fig. 4, A and B with asterisks. We find that clade I, clade II, clade III, clade IVa, clade IVb, mdaB, and yieF genes are considerably higher in abundance than ferB, azoR1_cperf, arsH, azoR_ropacus, azo1, and azoR1_llentus within all three disease conditions for both HMP2 (all FDR adjusted $P < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$) and PRISM (all FDR adjusted $P < 2.6 \times 10^{-7}$) (Fig. 4, A and B). Clade IVa is higher in abundance than all other azoreductases across healthy, UC, and CD cohorts from HMP2 (Fig. 4A), but the same statistically significant difference was not observed in the PRISM study (Fig. 4B).

The expression of clade I, clade II, clade III, clade IVa, mdaB, and yieF azoreductases are significantly higher than those of clade IVb, ferB, azoR1_cperf, arsH, azoR_ropacus, azo1, and azoR1_llentus azoreductases



Fig. 5. Known and putative azo-reducing species are more abundant in the IBD gut. Relative abundance of known and putative azo-reducing species in HMP2 subjects with more than 20 total stool collections. (A) Relative abundance of known and putative azo-reducing species for qualifying participants across non-IBD, UC, and CD populations. Subjects with CD have significantly higher relative abundances of known+putative azo-reducing species than healthy subjects (non-IBD) per linear mixed-effects model AN-OVA, F(1,10) = 17.09, P < 0.003. (B) Relative abundance of putative azo-reducing species over time for healthy (non-IBD), UC, and CD participants. Each line represents a single participant, and each point is the summed relative abundance of known+putative azo-reducing species at that collection point. The key on the right links relative abundance data point shown over collection numbers. Collections were taken approximately every 14 days.

in healthy individuals (minimum FDR adjusted *P* value < 1×10^{-7} between mdaB and azoR1_cperf) (Fig. 4C). Although clade IVb abundance levels are comparable to those of clades I, II, III, and IVa, the expression levels of clade IVb azoreductases are significantly lower in vivo than the expression clade I, II, III, and IVa azoreductases (all FDR adjusted *P* < 2.2×10^{-16}).

The Relative Abundance of Putative Azo-Reducing Species Fluctuates over Time. We next sought to examine whether relative abundance levels of combined known and putative azo-reducing species are stable or fluctuate over time. The HMP2 dataset provides a unique opportunity to examine the stability of individuals' gut microbiomes over time as there are 18 individuals across healthy, UC, and CD cohorts, with at least 20 stool samples taken once every 2 weeks over a 6-month period. To examine the stability of azo reduction in the human gut, we compared the relative abundance of known and putative azo-reducing species from these participants (Fig. 5). The median relative abundance of combined azo-reducing species ranges from $20.3 \pm 3.58\%$ to $33.9 \pm 19.2\%$ for non-IBD, $21.7 \pm 7.6\%$ to $49.0 \pm 15.0\%$ for UC, and 34.9 ± 6.39 to 62.3 ± 18.8 for CD subjects. Using linear mixed-effects model ANOVA, we found that combined azo-reducing species are significantly more abundant in CD subjects than in non-IBD subjects (P = 0.002) and are not significantly more abundant in UC subjects than in non-IBD subjects (P = 0.064) (Fig. 5A). Note that Fig. 5B shows the same relative abundance values displayed in Fig. 5A but over the course of the study, from collection 1 to collection 24.

Multiple Strains of F. Nucleatum, B. Fragilis, and C. Clostridioforme Reduce Acid Orange 7 in Vitro. Finally, we sought to test the azo reduction of Acid Orange 7 by three strains of the health-relevant (Castellarin et al., 2012; Kostic et al., 2012; Bashir et al., 2015; Abed et al., 2016) microbe F. nucleatum. As well, we tested the azo reduction of Acid Orange 7 by two positive control species, B. fragilis and C. clostridioforme. Acid Orange 7 is an azo-bonded dye commonly used in the food and textile industries (Bay et al., 2014), and the decolorization of azo-bonded dyes is commonly used to test azo reduction by bacteria in vitro (Feng et al., 2012). F. nucleatum CTI-06, F. nucleatum subsp. animalis D11, and F. nucleatum subsp. polymorphum were grown in BHI media, and Acid Orange 7 was added to the culture after 4 days of growth (Materials and Methods). We also tested the azo reduction of Acid Orange 7 by the known azo-reducing species B. fragilis and Clostridium clostridiforme. B. fragilis strains 3_1_12 and CL07T00C01 and C. clostridioforme strains 2_1_49_FAA and WAL-7855 were grown in YCFA broth and served as positive controls. We found that all strains examined in this assay significantly decolorized Acid Orange 7 in vitro (Fig. 6). To our knowledge, this is the first reporting of azo reduction by F. nucleatum CTI-06, F. nucleatum subsp. animalis D11, and F. nucleatum subsp. polymorphum.

Discussion

The presence of azo-reducing bacteria in the human gut is necessary for the effective delivery and activation of azo-bonded prodrugs.

Prediction of Uncharacterized Azo Reduction by the Gut Microbiome

TABLE 1

Systematic comparison with Zimmermann et al. (2019) sulfasalazine consumption results

Complete results from the systematic comparison of predicted sulfasalazine-reducing bacteria to actual sulfasalazine-reducing bacteria. The columns labeled FC (fold change), FC_STD (standard deviation in fold change), P_FDR (FDR adjusted P value), Pct_Consumed (percent consumed), and Pct_Consumed_STD (standard deviation of the percent consumed) were all obtained directly from Zimmermann et al. (2019) (Supplemental Table 3). The SR_Status column contains values SR and non-SR, which were determined based on significant ($p_FDR < 0.05$) or nonsignificant ($p_FDR \ge 0.05$) sulfasalazine reduction. The PR_Status column contains the values PR and non-PR, which were determined based on the presence or absence of one or more azoreductase homologs determined from the homolog search step. The final column, Result, contains the values TP (true negative), FP (false positive), and FN (false negative). Correctly predicted SR strains have a result of TP and correctly predicted Non-SR strains have a result of TN whereas incorrectly predicted SR strains have a result of FP and incorrectly predicted Non-SR strains have a result of FN.

Akkermatic mucinphile ATCCBAA-833 -0419 0.61 0.19 22.222 18.707 Non-SR Non-PR TN Ausernorcask hydrogendia DSM1254 -8.826 0.198 0.018 99.78 0.013 SR Non-PR FN Ausernorcask hydrogendia DSM1254 -8.826 0.198 0.016 96.633 0.013 SR Non-PR FN Bacteriolize carcer ATCCS1358 -0.572 0.328 0.010 96.691 7.532 SR PG FN Bacteriolize carcer DSM1755 -0.61 0.014 0.012 99.87 0.099 SR Non-PR FN Bacteriolize carcer DSM1755 -0.77 0.296 0.012 9.87 0.099 SR Non-PR FN Bacteriolize carcer IDSM1755 -0.77 0.296 0.014 0.062 SR PR TP Bacteriolize fragendii DSM1755 -0.73 0.256 0.013 99.956 0.013 SR PR TP Bacteriolize fragendii	Strain_Name	FC	FC_STD	p_FDR	Pct_Consumed	Pct_Consumed_STD	SR_Status	PR_Status	Result
Atatiges industance DSM 22520 0.11 0.013 99.806 0.015 SR PR TP Auterevences toriblematin DSM17241 8.488 1.57 0.016 99.833 0.0401 SR Non-PR FN Auterevences toriblematin DSM17241 9.488 1.57 0.016 99.835 0.0401 SR Non-PR FN Auterevences toriblematin DSM17825 0.016 0.210 0.991 1.356 1.4918 Non-SR Non-PR FN Bacterioles eggerPhit DSM17825 0.029 0.044 0.012 99.87 1.0609 SR Non-PR FN Bacterioles reggerPhit DSM17855 0.97 0.290 0.044 0.022 SR PR TP B registio XVIC1839 10.572 0.157 0.006 9.9942 0.007 SR PR TP B registio TNVIS10 10.522 0.159 0.006 9.9421 0.007 SR PR TP B registio TNVIS10 10.522 0.158 0.0016	Akkermansia muciniphila ATCCBAA-835	-0.419	0.361	0.19	25.222	18.707	Non-SR	Non-PR	TN
Auaceronescs hydrogenabis IDSM1754	Alistipes indistinctus DSM 22520	-9.01	0.11	0.003	99.806	0.015	SR	PR	TP
Aueneratures: colibonitis ISMIT241 -8.088 1.57 0.016 99.633 0.401 SR NumPR FN Bacteriolis: coccus ATCC31BS -1.502 0.035 0.002 64.691 7.312 SR PF FT Bacteriolis: coccus ATCC31BS -1.502 0.035 0.002 64.691 7.312 NM NM PF FT Bacteriolis: coccus ATCC31BS -0.74 0.044 0.002 99.87 0.009 SR Num-PR FN Bacteriolis: coccus ATSC31BS -0.074 0.348 0.002 99.87 0.004 SR PR FP B riggin SDS-NO -10.57 0.048 0.005 99.932 0.007 SR PR FP	Anaerococcus hydrogenalis DSM7454	-8.826	0.198	0.008	99.78	0.03	SR	Non-PR	FN
Intervention Output State PH TP Intervention Construction <	Anaerotruncus colihominis DSM17241	-8.088	1.575	0.016	99.633	0.401	SR	Non-PR	FN
Dectorelate cellalositylics DSMI438 -1.502 0.308 0.002 64.691 7.532 SR PR Th Bacteriolic corpolitie DSMI735 -0.431 0.744 0.013 9.596 2.001 SR Non-FR FN Bacteriolic corpolitie DSMI755 -4.631 0.744 0.013 9.596 2.001 SR Non-FR FN B fragilis ATCR355 -0.074 0.348 0.004 9.844 0.062 SR PR TP B fragilis DS 208 -0.576 0.088 0.039 9.926 0.007 SR PR TP B fragilis INW610 -0.1039 0.256 0.013 SR PR TP B fragilis INW613 -0.258 0.037 9.9267 0.11246 SR PR TP B fragilis INTCV343 -0.258 0.0473 0.054 1.5822 1.1246 SR Non-FR Non-FR B fragilis ATCC3423 -0.248 0.005 9.843 0.6153 Non-SR Non-FR TN	Bacteroides caccae ATCC43185	-9.247	0.262	0.008	99.835	0.03	SR	PR	TP
Bacteriolde corpuplials ISM1822 -0.006 0.216 0.991 0.386 14.918 Non-FR TN Bacteriolde corputin ISM17855 -4.613 0.7148 0.013 99.955 0.019 SR Non-FR FN Bacteriolde corputin ISM17855 -0.075 0.088 0.009 49.184 1.222 SR Non-FR FN B, rigglis JATCC43859 -10.576 0.088 0.003 99.934 0.004 SR PR TP B, rigglis IMW610 -10.522 0.159 0.004 99.922 0.007 SR PR TP B, rigglis IMW610 -10.522 0.159 0.004 99.922 0.007 SR PR TP B, rigglis VCITS343 -0.248 0.256 0.013 99.267 1.126 SR PR TP B, rigglis VCITS343 -0.248 0.241 0.048 10.522 1.126 SR PR TP B, rigglis VCITS343 -0.249 0.241 0.045 9.0461 6.	Bacteroides cellulosilyticus DSM14838	-1.502	0.308	0.002	64.691	7.532	SR	PR	TP
Bacteriolite doriel DSM17855 -4.63 0.748 0.013 95.965 2.091 SR Non-PR FN Bacteriolite aggindii DSM17565 -0.79 0.259 0.104 0.002 94.87 0.1092 SR Non-PR FN Parghiti DTCV13559 -10.576 0.083 99.934 0.004 SR PR TT R progitis DTCV13559 -10.576 0.088 0.99.34 0.004 SR PR TT R progitis DTV041 -10.589 0.256 0.013 99.926 0.013 SR PR TT R progitis TTCV343 -6.144 0.035 0.059 5.201 1.134 SR PR TT Bacteriolitis interiolitis 0.0248 0.0251 1.134 SR SR PR TT Brogitis TTCV313 -0.248 0.0251 0.134 0.0381 0.0351 0.346 0.0351 0.346 0.0351	Bacteroides coprophilus DSM18228	-0.006	0.216	0.991	0.386	14.918	Non-SR	Non-PR	TN
Bacteriodie signerhiu DSN20697 -9.59 0.104 0.002 99.87 0.009 SR Non-PR FN B /ngilis N207 T10 -0.974 0.384 0.009 45.044 12.282 SR PR TP B /ngilis N207 T10 -0.974 0.384 0.009 45.0444 12.282 SR PR TP B /ngilis N1CC383 -10.522 0.159 0.004 99.932 0.0013 SR PR TP B /ngilis N1CV0343 -1.0340 0.035 90.038 SR PR TP B /ngilis N1CV0343 -0.225 0.144 0.005 99.856 0.016 SR PR TP B nearroids instrainal/CC483 -0.228 0.471 0.346 17.951 Non-SR Non-SR PR TP B nearroids instrainamicron 7130 -1.032 0.247 0.038 1.042 Non-SR PR TP Bacteroids instrainamicron 7130 -1.032 0.247 0.038 5.0461 1.542 Non-PR	Bacteroides dorei DSM17855	-4.631	0.748	0.013	95.965	2.091	SR	Non-PR	FN
Bacteroide juegoldi DSM1765 -0.79 0.266 0.094 42.176 11.877 SR Non-PR PR B /ragili artCC43859 -10.376 0.088 0.003 99.944 0.044 SR PR TP B /ragili nartCC43859 -10.376 0.088 0.003 99.944 0.044 SR PR TP B /ragili NTW060 -0.328 0.013 99.926 0.013 SR PR TP B /ragili NTW060 -0.322 0.144 0.005 99.325 0.0766 SR PR TP B /ragili NTP1793 -1.266 0.388 0.005 99.267 1.246 SR PR TP Bacteroide rotatis AttC4343 -0.285 0.241 0.268 1.822 1.042 Non-SR Non-FR TN Bacteroide induitomotiron TP1423 -0.231 0.255 0.060 54.642 0.31 SR RT TP Bacteroide induitomotiron TP1423 -0.237	Bacteroides eggerthii DSM20697	-9.59	0.104	0.002	99.87	0.009	SR	Non-PR	FN
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Bacteroides finegoldii DSM17565	-0.79	0.296	0.042	42.176	11.877	SR	Non-PR	FN
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	B. fragilis 3397 T10	-0.974	0.348	0.009	49.084	12.282	SR	PR	TP
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	B. fragilis ATCC43859	-10.576	0.088	0.003	99.934	0.004	SR	PR	TP
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	B. fragilis DS-208	-9.327	0.57	0.006	99.844	0.062	SR	PR	TP
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	B. fragilis HMW610	-10.522	0.159	0.004	99.932	0.007	SR	PR	TP
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	B. Jraguis HNIW015 B. fracilia NCTC0242	-10.398	0.236	0.013	99.920	0.015	SK	PR	
b. Jugupt 10P 2.266 0.38 0.005 55.267 0.106 SR FR FP Bacteroide mention ATCC34243 -0.249 0.241 0.258 1.532 1.6402 Non-SR Non-PR TN Bacteroide streationsmics at CC34243 -0.249 0.241 0.258 1.532 1.6402 Non-SR Non-PR TN Bacteroide streationsmics at CC34243 -0.249 0.024 0.005 59.461 6.961 SR PR TP Bacteroide sthetiotomicron 7330 -1.032 0.227 0.003 51.082 8.044 SR PR TP Bacteroide streatiots motion 7300 -1.032 0.271 0.014 38.442 1.584 SR Non-PR FN Bacteroide streationsmicen 7915-542 -1.252 0.155 0.002 99.877 0.01 SR PR FP Bifadotecrim andolescent 3.74C15703 -9.244 0.155 0.002 99.835 0.021 SR Non-PR FN Bijadota crimin andolescent 3.74C15704 <td>B. fragilis NC1C9343</td> <td>-0.184</td> <td>0.855</td> <td>0.006</td> <td>98.023</td> <td>0.796</td> <td>SK</td> <td>PR</td> <td></td>	B. fragilis NC1C9343	-0.184	0.855	0.006	98.023	0.796	SK	PR	
Indervoids roman ATT 0.546 17.951 22.015 Nom-SR PR FP Bacteroids periodits increaris ATT 0.249 0.241 0.288 15.832 14.042 Nom-SR	B. Juguis 1(B)9 Bacteroides intestinalis DSM17303	-9.232	0.144	0.005	50 267	11 246	SR		TP
Backerovide: pecimically includes ATCC43243 -0.249 0.241 0.268 15.832 14.042 Non-SR Non-SR <td>Bacteroides ovatus ATCC8483</td> <td>-0.285</td> <td>0.398</td> <td>0.546</td> <td>17 951</td> <td>26.015</td> <td>Non-SP</td> <td>PP</td> <td>FP</td>	Bacteroides ovatus ATCC8483	-0.285	0.398	0.546	17 951	26.015	Non-SP	PP	FP
materonick streerick strerick Biladiotacerinm	Bacteroides pectinophilus ATCC43243	-0.285 -0.249	0.475	0.268	15.832	14 042	Non-SR	Non-PR	TN
Bacternides thetaiatanaireran 3731 -1.33 0.248 0.005 59.461 6.961 SR PR PP Bacternides thetaiatanaireran VPI-542 -1.32 0.37 0.003 \$1.082 8.044 SR PR PP Bacternides uniformis ATCS492 -2.055 0.006 \$8.006 4.511 SR PR PP Bidebacterium adotsscents ATCCL5703 -0.7 0.011 38.442 10.58 Non-PR PN Bidebacterium breve DSM10213 -0.214 0.182 0.008 99.835 0.021 SR Non-PR PN Bidebacterium breve DSM10213 -0.224 0.135 0.006 99.835 0.021 SR Non-PR PN Broardia binder DSM11469 -0.722 0.432 0.113 39.359 18.171 Non-SR PR PF Clostridum agragregione DSM1581 -0.184 0.003 0.013 99.477 0.306 SR Non-PR PN Clostridum agragregione DSM1402 -0.064 0.169 0.	Bacteroides stercoris ATCC43183	-0.588	0.326	0.053	33.46	15.033	Non-SR	Non-PR	TN
Tacternides thetaiotancirum 7330 -1032 0.237 0.003 \$1 082 8.044 SR PR TP Bacternides theintoincorum 70 VP5482 -2.655 0.389 0.001 83.558 4.435 SR Non-PR FN Bacternides xigninschent DSM03083 -9.653 0.155 0.000 83.558 4.435 SR Non-PR FN Bifdohosterium adolescentit ATCC15703 -0.7 0.271 0.014 38.442 1.584 SR Non-PR FN Bifdohosterium adolescentit ATCC15703 -0.241 0.152 0.005 99.834 0.018 SR Non-PR FN Bifdohosterium adolescentit ATCC16703 -0.722 0.422 0.011 39.359 0.817 Non-SR PR FP Cloritidium garragiform DSM1402 -0.039 0.011 99.277 0.306 SR Non-PR FN Cloritidium scheeta ATCC18704 -9.046 0.649 9.811 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Cloritidium sproforme DSM1522 <	Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron 3731	-1.303	0.248	0.005	59 461	6 961	SR	PR	TP
Tacteroides theraiotaomicron VPI-5482 -1.232 0.155 0.006 \$\$8.066 4.511 SR PR T Bacteroides unformis ATCC15703 0.663 0.115 0.001 83.558 4.436 SR Non-PR PN Bifdobacterium doeleccenit ATCC15703 -0.71 0.011 38.442 1.154 SR Non-PR PN Bidatio tansemit DS0033 -9.234 0.152 0.008 99.835 0.021 SR Non-PR PN Byrantia formaticities DSM1469 -0.722 0.432 0.113 39.339 18.171 Non-SR PR PF Clostridium baraneit/forme DSM15981 -9.184 0.203 0.013 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprange/forme DSM1402 -9.046 0.169 0.004 99.811 0.022 SR PR TP Clostridium sprange/forme DSM1402 -9.064 0.24 0.004 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprange/forme DSM1402 -9	Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron 7330	-1.032	0.237	0.003	51.082	8.044	SR	PR	TP
Tacterides uniformis ATCC8492 -2.605 0.389 0.001 \$3.558 4.436 SR Non-PR FN Bacterides yunisolvens DSM18836 -9.603 0.115 0.002 99.877 0.01 SR PR TP Bijdohacterium adolescentis ATCC15703 -0.7 0.271 0.014 38.442 1.584 SR Non-PR FN Blantia hansenii DSM2083 -9.244 0.155 0.006 99.835 0.018 SR Non-PR FN Bryndia formeterigen: DSM1469 -0.722 0.432 0.013 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Cloarridium difficit 120 -6.039 0.013 99.813 0.042 SR PR TP Cloarridium scindens ATCC3704 -9.046 0.169 0.006 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Cloarridium scindens ATCC15704 -9.046 0.224 0.004 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Cloarridium sprogrome DSM1502 -2.478	Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron VPI-5482	-1.252	0.155	0.006	58.006	4.511	SR	PR	TP
Bacteroides xylanisolvens DSM18836 -9.663 0.115 0.002 99.877 0.01 SR PR TP Bijdobacterium advescenti ATCC15703 -9.234 0.182 0.008 99.835 0.021 SR Non-PR FN Bijdobacterium advescenti DSM10831 -9.234 0.113 39.359 18.171 Non-SR PR FP Brutin baneward DSM10811 -0.184 0.001 99.827 0.036 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium dificile 120 -6.039 0.703 0.013 99.811 0.022 SR PR TP Clostridium anosum DSM1402 -9.046 0.522 0.014 89.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprogenes ATCC15709 -9.072 0.158 0.004 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprogenes ATCC15709 -9.072 0.158 0.006 99.814 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprogenes ATCC25508 -6.629 0.628 <t< td=""><td>Bacteroides uniformis ATCC8492</td><td>-2.605</td><td>0.389</td><td>0.001</td><td>83.558</td><td>4.436</td><td>SR</td><td>Non-PR</td><td>FN</td></t<>	Bacteroides uniformis ATCC8492	-2.605	0.389	0.001	83.558	4.436	SR	Non-PR	FN
Bifdohacterium adolescentis ATCC15703 -0.7 0.211 0.014 38.442 11.584 SR Non-PR FN Bidath anasenii DSM02033 -9.234 0.185 0.006 99.835 0.021 SR Non-PR FN Branta hansenii DSM14469 -0.722 0.432 0.113 39.359 18.171 Non-SR PR FP Clostridium aparagiforme DSM15981 -9.184 0.203 0.01 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium difficiel 120 -6.039 0.703 0.013 99.479 0.741 SR PR FP Clostridium scienders ATCC3704 -9.064 0.324 0.004 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprogreens ATCC15579 -9.072 0.188 0.006 99.814 0.02 SR PR TP Collinstella arceriacitics MTC2596 0.290 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Colinstella metrolicitics MTC21596 -0.61	Bacteroides xylanisolvens DSM18836	-9.663	0.115	0.002	99.877	0.01	SR	PR	TP
Bifdohacterium breve DSM20213 -9.244 0.182 0.008 99.835 0.021 SR Non-PR FN Blautia harsaverii DSM2083 -9.234 0.155 0.005 99.834 0.018 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium digree DSM1460 -0.722 0.432 0.113 39.359 18.171 Non-SR PR FP Clostridium digree DSM15981 -9.184 0.203 0.01 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium comosum DSM1402 -9.046 0.169 0.006 99.811 0.022 SR PR TP Clostridium spriograme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.018 2.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spriograme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.018 2.002 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spriograme DSM1525 -1.19 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spriograme DSM1525 -0.107 0.218 0.024 SR Non-PR FN	Bifidobacterium adolescentis ATCC15703	-0.7	0.271	0.014	38.442	11.584	SR	Non-PR	FN
Blautia hamsenii DSM20583 -9.234 0.155 0.005 99.834 0.018 SR Non-PR FN Prynatia Gromatexigens DSM14469 -0.722 0.432 0.011 99.835 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium bolicae ATCCBAA-613 -71.113 0.611 0.005 99.277 0.306 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium folicae ATCCBAA-613 -71.113 0.611 0.005 99.277 0.306 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium scinders ATCC35704 -9.064 0.524 0.004 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprorogenes ATCC15579 -9.072 0.118 0.006 99.814 0.022 SR PR TP Clostridium sprorogenes ATCC15579 -9.072 0.118 0.006 99.814 0.022 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sprorogenes ATCC15759 -6.629 0.428 SR Non-PR FN Collinselia aerofaciens ATCC27755 -4.071 0.57 0.019 </td <td>Bifidobacterium breve DSM20213</td> <td>-9.241</td> <td>0.182</td> <td>0.008</td> <td>99.835</td> <td>0.021</td> <td>SR</td> <td>Non-PR</td> <td>FN</td>	Bifidobacterium breve DSM20213	-9.241	0.182	0.008	99.835	0.021	SR	Non-PR	FN
Bryania formatexigens DSM14469 -0.722 0.432 0.113 39.359 18.171 Non-SR PR FP Clostridium sograngform DSM15981 -9.184 0.203 0.01 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium difficile 120 -6.039 0.703 0.013 98.479 0.741 SR PR TP Clostridium scindens ATCC25704 -9.046 0.169 0.006 99.811 0.022 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1520 -9.072 0.158 0.006 99.816 0.022 SR PR TP Clostridium spiroforme DSM15280 -6.629 0.628 0.044 SR PR TP Coltinselia instrainalis DSM13280 -8.916 0.118 0.003 99.793 0.017 SR Non-PR FN Coltinselia instrainalis DSM13280 -8.916 0.118 0.003 <td< td=""><td>Blautia hansenii DSM20583</td><td>-9.234</td><td>0.155</td><td>0.005</td><td>99.834</td><td>0.018</td><td>SR</td><td>Non-PR</td><td>FN</td></td<>	Blautia hansenii DSM20583	-9.234	0.155	0.005	99.834	0.018	SR	Non-PR	FN
Clostridium osparagiforme DSM15981 -9.184 0.203 0.01 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium bioleae ATCCBAA-613 -7.113 0.611 0.005 99.277 0.306 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sindens ATCC35704 -9.064 0.169 0.006 99.811 0.022 SR PR TP Clostridium scindens ATCC35704 -9.064 0.324 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium synbiosum ATCC14940 -9.256 0.209 0.009 99.836 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Collinselia arengiocins ATCC25786 -6.629 0.628 0.046 98.99 0.44 SR Non-PR FN Collinselia arengiocins ATCC25756 -4.071 0.57 0.015 94.051 2.351 SR Non-PR FN Edwardiella tarda ATCC23655	Bryantia formatexigens DSM14469	-0.722	0.432	0.113	39.359	18.171	Non-SR	PR	FP
Clostridium bolteae ATCCBAA-613 -7.113 0.611 0.005 99.277 0.306 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium afficile 120 -6.039 0.703 0.013 98.479 0.741 SR PR TP Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM13260 -9.072 0.158 0.009 99.836 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Coltinselia intestinatis DSM131280 -8.916 0.118 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Cobristidium spiroforme DSM13280	Clostridium asparagiforme DSM15981	-9.184	0.203	0.01	99.828	0.024	SR	Non-PR	FN
Clostridium difficiel 120 -6.039 0.703 0.013 98.479 0.741 SR PR TP Clostridium scindens ATCC35704 -9.064 0.324 0.004 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sporogenes ATCC15579 -9.072 0.158 0.006 99.814 0.02 SR PR TP Clostridium sporogenes ATCC25986 -6.629 0.628 0.046 98.99 0.44 SR Non-PR FN Collinsella acrefaciens ATCC25986 -6.629 0.628 0.040 98.99 0.044 SR Non-PR FN Collinsella acrefaciens ATCC27758 -9.182 0.199 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Dorea formicigenerms ATCC27755 -4.071 0.57 0.015 94.051 2.351 SR Non-PR FP Eggerthella lenta ATCC3655 -0.107 0.287 0.722 1.107 SR PR TP	Clostridium bolteae ATCCBAA-613	-7.113	0.611	0.005	99.277	0.306	SR	Non-PR	FN
Clostridium ramosum DSM1402 -9.046 0.169 0.006 99.811 0.022 SR PR TP Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.006 99.814 0.02 SR PR TP Clostridium spiroforme DSM1582 -2.478 0.526 0.209 0.009 99.836 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Coltinselia aerofaciens ATCC23986 -6.629 0.628 0.046 98.99 0.44 SR Non-PR FN Coltinselia intestinatis DSM13280 -8.9182 0.199 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Dorea formicigeneruns ATCC23553 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Edwardsiela tarda ATCC23685 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC23536 -0.853 0.579 0.074 4.621 2.214 Non-SR	Clostridium difficile 120	-6.039	0.703	0.013	98.479	0.741	SR	PR	TP
Clostridium scindens ATCC35704 -9.064 0.324 0.004 99.813 0.042 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.010 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552 -9.072 0.158 0.006 99.836 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Coltinsella carefaciens ATCC25986 -6.629 0.628 0.046 98.99 0.44 SR Non-PR FN Collinsella carefaciens ATCC25758 -9.182 0.199 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Dorea formicigenerans ATCC27755 -4.071 0.57 0.015 94.051 2.351 SR Non-SR PR FP Edwardsiella tarda ATCC23685 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Enterooccus faecalis V583 -8.61 0.228 0.01 99.744 0.04 SR PR FP Excherichia coli K-12 -0.714 0.331 0.038 39.057 13.995 SR PR </td <td>Clostridium ramosum DSM1402</td> <td>-9.046</td> <td>0.169</td> <td>0.006</td> <td>99.811</td> <td>0.022</td> <td>SR</td> <td>PR</td> <td>TP</td>	Clostridium ramosum DSM1402	-9.046	0.169	0.006	99.811	0.022	SR	PR	TP
Clostridium spirojome DSM1552 -2.478 0.572 0.001 82.055 7.119 SR Non-PR FN Clostridium sporogenes ATCC15579 -9.072 0.158 0.006 99.814 0.02 SR PR PP Collinsella anergiaciens ATCC25986 -6.629 0.628 0.046 98.99 0.44 SR PR PP Collinsella intestinalis DSM13280 -8.916 0.118 0.003 99.793 0.017 SR Non-PR FN Coprococcus comes ATCC27758 -9.182 0.199 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Edwardsiella tarda ATCC23685 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Eggerthella lenta ATCC23516 -0.853 0.579 0.076 44.621 22.14 Non-SR PR FP Escherichia coli K-12 -0.714 0.331 0.038 39.057 1.395 SR PR FP Eutacterium biforme DSM3989 -8.27 0.098 0.008 99.795 0.014 SR Non-PR FN	Clostridium scindens ATCC35704	-9.064	0.324	0.004	99.813	0.042	SR	Non-PR	FN
Clostridium sporiogenes AICC13579 -9.072 0.138 0.006 99.814 0.022 SR PR IP Clostridium symbiosum ATCC14940 -9.256 0.209 0.009 99.836 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Collinsella aerofaciens ATCC25986 -6.629 0.628 0.046 98.99 0.44 SR PR TP Collinsella aerofaciens ATCC27758 -9.182 0.199 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Correcoccus comes ATCC27758 -9.182 0.199 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Edwardsiella tarda ATCC23685 -0.017 0.27 7.125 1.8.483 Non-SR PR FP Enterococcus facalis VS33 -8.61 0.228 0.01 99.744 0.04 SR PR TP Eubacterium haliii DSM3353 -9.031 0.381 0.028 99.809 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Eubacterium ventrioum ATCC3560 -4.633 0.827 0.051 96.024 2.278 Non-SR Non-PR FN <td>Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552</td> <td>-2.478</td> <td>0.572</td> <td>0.001</td> <td>82.055</td> <td>7.119</td> <td>SR</td> <td>Non-PR</td> <td>FN</td>	Clostridium spiroforme DSM1552	-2.478	0.572	0.001	82.055	7.119	SR	Non-PR	FN
Clossifialum symptosium AICC1940 -9.250 0.209 0.009 99.850 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Collinsella aterofaciens ATCC25986 -6.629 0.628 0.046 98.99 0.44 SR Non-PR FN Collinsella aterofaciens ATCC27758 -9.182 0.199 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-PR FN Comococcus comes ATCC27755 -4.071 0.57 0.015 94.051 2.351 SR Non-PR FN Edwardsiella tarda ATCC23685 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Eggerthella lenta ATCC23559 -0.435 0.217 0.038 26.042 11.107 SR PR TP Eatretrobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316 -0.853 0.579 0.076 44.621 22.14 Non-SR PR TP Excherichia coli K-12 -0.714 0.331 0.038 39.057 13.995 SR Non-PR FN Eubacterium halfii DSM13253	Clostriaium sporogenes ATCC15579	-9.072	0.158	0.006	99.814	0.02	SK	PK	
Collinsella latelogiatelis AFC23950 -0.029 0.028 0.040 98.99 0.44 SR FR FP Collinsella intestinalis DSM13280 -8.916 0.118 0.003 99.793 0.017 SR Non-PR FN Dorea formicigeneras ATCC27755 -4.071 0.57 0.015 94.051 2.351 SR Non-PR FN Edwardsiella tarda ATCC25559 -0.435 0.217 0.038 26.042 11.107 SR PR FP Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC3516 -0.853 0.279 0.076 44.621 22.214 Non-SR PR FP Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316 -0.853 0.579 0.076 44.621 22.214 Non-SR PR FP Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316 -0.853 0.279 0.076 44.621 22.214 Non-SR PR FP Eubacterium biform DSM3989 -8.927 0.098 0.008 99.795 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Eubacterium hallii DSM3535 <td>Collingella agrafaciana ATCC14940</td> <td>-9.256</td> <td>0.209</td> <td>0.009</td> <td>99.830</td> <td>0.024</td> <td>SK</td> <td>NON-PK</td> <td>FN TD</td>	Collingella agrafaciana ATCC14940	-9.256	0.209	0.009	99.830	0.024	SK	NON-PK	FN TD
Continistical intestidints D5M113200 -6.510 0.118 0.003 99.793 0.017 SR Non-FR FN Coprococcus comes ATCC27758 -9.182 0.009 99.828 0.024 SR Non-FR FN Edwardsiella tarda ATCC23685 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Eggerthella lenta ATCC23559 -0.435 0.217 0.038 26.042 11.107 SR PR FP Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316 -0.853 0.579 0.076 44.621 22.214 Non-SR PR FP Excherichia coli K-12 -0.714 0.381 0.038 39.057 13.995 SR PR FP Eubacterium biforme DSM3989 -8.927 0.098 0.002 99.809 0.05 SR Non-PR FN Eubacterium retaile ATCC33656 -9.002 0.322 0.022 99.805 0.044 SR PR TP Parabacterium ventriosum ATCC25503 -1.007 0.298<	Collinsella intestinalis DSM12280	-0.029	0.028	0.040	96.99	0.44	SR	FK Non PP	I F EN
Coprotocuts formes ATCC23755 -2.162 0.179 0.005 94.051 2.351 SR Non-PR FN Edwardsiella tarda ATCC23585 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Eggerthella lenta ATCC23585 -0.107 0.287 0.722 7.125 18.483 Non-SR PR FP Eggerthella lenta ATCC23599 -0.435 0.217 0.038 26.042 11.107 SR PR FP Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316 -0.853 0.279 0.076 44.621 22.214 Non-SR PR FP Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316 -0.853 0.228 0.01 99.744 0.04 SR PR TP Eubacterium biforme DSM3989 -8.927 0.098 0.008 99.795 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Eubacterium ventious mATCC3565 -9.002 0.322 0.022 99.805 0.044 SR PR TP Parabacteroides idistasonis ATCC87560 <td< td=""><td>Contracoccus comas ATCC27758</td><td>-0.910</td><td>0.118</td><td>0.003</td><td>00 828</td><td>0.017</td><td>SR</td><td>Non-PR</td><td>EN</td></td<>	Contracoccus comas ATCC27758	-0.910	0.118	0.003	00 828	0.017	SR	Non-PR	EN
Dotter Journary Jouravy Journary Journary Journary Journary Journary J	Dorea formicigenerans ATCC27755	-4.071	0.199	0.009	94.051	2 351	SR	Non-PR	FN
Landbalkuk internetLink	Edwardsiella tarda ATCC23685	-0.107	0.287	0.722	7 125	18 483	Non-SR	PR	FP
Bission and the construction of the constru	Eggerthella lenta ATCC25559	-0.435	0.217	0.038	26.042	11.107	SR	PR	TP
Enterococcus faecalis V583-8.610.2280.0199.7440.04SRPRTPEscherichia coli K-12-0.7140.3310.03839.05713.995SRPRTPEubacterium biforme DSM3989-8.9270.0980.00899.7950.014SRNon-PRFNEubacterium hallii DSM353-9.0310.3810.02299.8090.05SRNon-PRFNEubacterium rectale ATCC33656-9.0020.3220.02299.8050.044SRPRTPEubacterium vertiosum ATCC27560-4.6530.8270.05196.0242.278Non-SRNon-PRTNOdoribacter splanchnius-7.8920.7440.00499.5790.217SRPRTPParabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503-1.0070.2980.02250.25310.272SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides merdae ATCC43184-0.7490.2080.00640.5088.593SRNon-PRFNPretovella copri DSM18205-8.6930.410.01599.7580.069SRNon-PRFNProvidencia alcalifaciens DSM30120-0.3790.2470.10823.09413.183Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25827-0.0720.2460.8074.85416.212Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC2519-8.6390.450.99.7490.008SRNon-PRFNRuminococcus lactariis ATCC29176 <t< td=""><td>Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316</td><td>-0.853</td><td>0.579</td><td>0.076</td><td>44.621</td><td>22.214</td><td>Non-SR</td><td>PR</td><td>FP</td></t<>	Enterobacter cancerogenus ATCC35316	-0.853	0.579	0.076	44.621	22.214	Non-SR	PR	FP
Escherichia coli K-12 -0.714 0.331 0.038 39.057 13.995 SR PR TP Eubacterium biforme DSM3989 -8.927 0.098 0.008 99.795 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Eubacterium hallii DSM3533 -9.031 0.381 0.022 99.809 0.05 SR Non-PR FN Eubacterium rectale ATCC33656 -9.002 0.322 0.022 99.805 0.044 SR PR TP Eubacterium ventriosum ATCC27560 -4.653 0.827 0.051 96.024 2.278 Non-SR Non-PR TN Odoribacter splanchnius -7.892 0.744 0.004 99.579 0.217 SR PR TP Parabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503 -1.007 0.298 0.022 50.253 10.272 SR Non-PR TN Parabacteroides merdae ATCC43184 -0.749 0.208 0.006 40.508 8.593 SR Non-PR FN Protelus penneri ATCC35198 -1.657	Enterococcus faecalis V583	-8.61	0.228	0.01	99.744	0.04	SR	PR	TP
Eubacterium biforme DSM3989-8.9270.0980.00899.7950.014SRNon-PRFNEubacterium neutilii DSM3533-9.0310.3810.02899.8090.05SRNon-PRFNEubacterium rectale ATCC33656-9.0020.3220.02299.8050.044SRPRTPEubacterium ventriosum ATCC27560-4.6530.8270.05196.0242.278Non-SRNon-PRTNOdoribacter splanchnius-7.8920.7440.00499.5790.217SRPRTPParabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503-1.0070.2980.02250.25310.272SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503-0.5290.2810.12330.70213.51Non-SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides merdae ATCC43184-0.7490.2080.00640.5088.593SRNon-PRFNPretovella copri DSM18205-8.6930.410.01599.7580.069SRNon-SRPRFPProvidencia alcalifaciens DSM30120-0.3790.2470.10823.09413.183Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25827-0.0720.2460.8074.85416.212Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25149-8.6390.045099.7870.023SRNon-PRFNRuminococcus lactaris ATCC29176-9.5220.1450.00599.8640.014SRNon-PRF	Escherichia coli K-12	-0.714	0.331	0.038	39.057	13.995	SR	PR	TP
Eubacterium hallii DSM3353-9.0310.3810.02899.8090.05SRNon-PRFNEubacterium rectale ATCC33656-9.0020.3220.02299.8050.044SRPRTPEubacterium ventriosum ATCC27560-4.6530.8270.05196.0242.278Non-SRNon-PRTNOdoribacter splanchnius-7.8920.7440.00499.5790.217SRPRTPParabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503-1.0070.2980.02250.25310.272SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides ipinnsonii DSM18315-0.5290.2810.12330.70213.51Non-SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides merdae ATCC43184-0.7490.2080.00640.5088.593SRNon-PRFNProtvella copri DSM18205-8.6930.410.01599.7580.069SRNon-PRFNProvidencia alcalifaciens DSM30120-0.3790.2470.10823.09413.183Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25827-0.0720.2460.8074.85416.212Non-SRPRFPRuminococcus gavus ATCC29149-8.6390.045099.7870.023SRNon-PRFNRuminococcus torques ATCC2756-2.3840.2980.01680.8413.961SRPRFPSubdoligranulum variabile DSM15176-8.8540.1890.00899.7840.028SRNon-PRFN <tr<< td=""><td>Eubacterium biforme DSM3989</td><td>-8.927</td><td>0.098</td><td>0.008</td><td>99.795</td><td>0.014</td><td>SR</td><td>Non-PR</td><td>FN</td></tr<<>	Eubacterium biforme DSM3989	-8.927	0.098	0.008	99.795	0.014	SR	Non-PR	FN
Eubacterium rectale ATCC33656-9.0020.3220.02299.8050.044SRPRTPEubacterium ventriosum ATCC27560-4.6530.8270.05196.0242.278Non-SRNon-PRTNOdoribacter splanchnius-7.8920.7440.00499.5790.217SRPRTPParabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503-1.0070.2980.02250.25310.272SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides distasonis ATCC43184-0.5290.2810.12330.70213.51Non-SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides merdae ATCC43184-0.7490.2080.00640.5088.593SRNon-PRFNPretovella copri DSM18205-8.6930.410.01599.7580.069SRNon-PRFNProvidencia alcalifaciens DSM30120-0.3790.2470.10823.09413.183Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25827-0.0720.2460.8074.85416.212Non-SRPRFPRuminococcus gnavus ATCC29149-8.6390.045099.7490.008SRNon-PRFNRuminococcus lactaris ATCC27756-2.3840.2920.01680.8413.961SRPRFPSalmonella Typhimurum LT2-0.6730.7120.25237.28730.936Non-SRPRFPSubdoligranulum variabile DSM15176-8.8540.1890.00899.7840.028SRNon-PRFN <td>Eubacterium hallii DSM3353</td> <td>-9.031</td> <td>0.381</td> <td>0.028</td> <td>99.809</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>SR</td> <td>Non-PR</td> <td>FN</td>	Eubacterium hallii DSM3353	-9.031	0.381	0.028	99.809	0.05	SR	Non-PR	FN
Eubacterium ventriosum ATCC27560-4.6530.8270.05196.0242.278Non-SRNon-PRTNOdoribacter splanchnius-7.8920.7440.00499.5790.217SRPRTPParabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503-1.0070.2980.02250.25310.272SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides johnsonii DSM18315-0.5290.2810.12330.70213.51Non-SRNon-PRFNParabacteroides merdae ATCC43184-0.7490.2080.00640.5088.593SRNon-PRFNPretovella copri DSM18205-8.6930.410.01599.7580.069SRNon-PRFNProteus penneri ATCC35198-1.6570.3130.00968.2896.884SRPRTPProvidencia atcalifaciens DSM30120-0.3790.2470.10823.09413.183Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25827-0.0720.2460.8074.85416.212Non-SRPRFPRuminococcus gnavus ATCC29149-8.6390.045099.7870.023SRNon-PRFNRuminococcus torques ATCC2756-2.3840.2980.01680.8413.961SRPRFPSalmonella Typhimurium LT2-0.6730.7120.25237.28730.936Non-SRPRFPSubdoligranuluw variabile DSM15176-8.8540.1890.00899.7840.028SRNon-PRFN<	Eubacterium rectale ATCC33656	-9.002	0.322	0.022	99.805	0.044	SR	PR	TP
Odoribacter splanchnius -7.892 0.744 0.004 99.579 0.217 SR PR TP Parabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503 -1.007 0.298 0.022 50.253 10.272 SR Non-PR FN Parabacteroides johnsonii DSM18315 -0.529 0.281 0.123 30.702 13.51 Non-SR Non-PR FN Parabacteroides merdae ATCC43184 -0.749 0.208 0.006 40.508 8.593 SR Non-PR FN Pretovella copri DSM18205 -8.693 0.41 0.015 99.758 0.069 SR Non-PR FN Proteus penneri ATCC35198 -1.657 0.313 0.009 68.289 6.884 SR PR TP Providencia alcalifaciens DSM30120 -0.379 0.247 0.108 23.094 13.183 Non-SR PR FP Providencia stuartii ATCC25827 -0.072 0.246 0.807 4.854 16.212 Non-SR PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 <	Eubacterium ventriosum ATCC27560	-4.653	0.827	0.051	96.024	2.278	Non-SR	Non-PR	TN
Parabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503 -1.007 0.298 0.022 50.253 10.272 SR Non-PR FN Parabacteroides johnsonii DSM18315 -0.529 0.281 0.123 30.702 13.51 Non-SR Non-PR TN Parabacteroides merdae ATCC43184 -0.749 0.208 0.006 40.508 8.593 SR Non-PR FN Pretovella copri DSM18205 -8.693 0.41 0.015 99.758 0.069 SR Non-PR FN Proteus penneri ATCC35198 -1.657 0.313 0.009 68.289 6.884 SR PR TP Providencia alcalifaciens DSM30120 -0.379 0.247 0.108 23.094 13.183 Non-SR PR FP Providencia stuartii ATCC25827 -0.072 0.246 0.807 4.854 16.212 Non-SR PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.787 0.0023 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29176 <td>Odoribacter splanchnius</td> <td>-7.892</td> <td>0.744</td> <td>0.004</td> <td>99.579</td> <td>0.217</td> <td>SR</td> <td>PR</td> <td>TP</td>	Odoribacter splanchnius	-7.892	0.744	0.004	99.579	0.217	SR	PR	TP
Parabacteroides johnsonii DSM18315 -0.529 0.281 0.123 30.702 13.51 Non-SR Non-PR TN Parabacteroides merdae ATCC43184 -0.749 0.208 0.006 40.508 8.593 SR Non-PR FN Pretovella copri DSM18205 -8.693 0.41 0.015 99.758 0.069 SR Non-PR FN Proteus penneri ATCC35198 -1.657 0.313 0.009 68.289 6.884 SR PR TP Providencia alcalifaciens DSM30120 -0.379 0.247 0.108 23.094 13.183 Non-SR PR FP Providencia stuartii ATCC25827 -0.072 0.246 0.807 4.854 16.212 Non-SR PR FP Roseburia intestinalis L1-82 -8.876 0.156 0.006 99.787 0.023 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.749 0.008 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC27176 <	Parabacteroides distasonis ATCC8503	-1.007	0.298	0.022	50.253	10.272	SR	Non-PR	FN
Parabacteroides merdae ATCCC43184-0.7490.2080.00640.5088.593SRNon-PRFNPretovella copri DSM18205-8.6930.410.01599.7580.069SRNon-PRFNProteus penneri ATCC35198-1.6570.3130.00968.2896.884SRPRTPProvidencia alcalifaciens DSM30120-0.3790.2470.10823.09413.183Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25827-0.0720.2460.8074.85416.212Non-SRPRFPProvidencia stuartii ATCC25827-0.0720.2460.8074.85416.212Non-SRPRFPRoseburia intestinalis L1-82-8.8760.1560.00699.7870.023SRNon-PRFNRuminococcus gnavus ATCC29149-8.6390.045099.7490.008SRNon-PRFNRuminococcus lactaris ATCC29176-9.5220.1450.00599.8640.014SRNon-PRFNSalmonella Typhimurium LT2-0.6730.7120.25237.28730.936Non-SRPRFPSubdoligranulum variabile DSM15176-8.8540.1890.00899.7840.028SRNon-PRFNVictivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548-1.8440.3920.00472.1467.574SRNon-PRFN	Parabacteroides johnsonii DSM18315	-0.529	0.281	0.123	30.702	13.51	Non-SR	Non-PR	TN
Pretovella copri DSM118205 -8.693 0.41 0.015 99.758 0.069 SR Non-PR FN Proteus penneri ATCC35198 -1.657 0.313 0.009 68.289 6.884 SR PR TP Providencia alcalifaciens DSM30120 -0.379 0.247 0.108 23.094 13.183 Non-SR PR FP Providencia rettgeri DSM1131 -0.205 0.204 0.25 13.245 12.273 Non-SR PR FP Providencia stuartii ATCC25827 -0.072 0.246 0.807 4.854 16.212 Non-SR PR FP Roseburia intestinalis L1-82 -8.876 0.156 0.006 99.787 0.023 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.749 0.008 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29176 -9.522 0.145 0.005 99.864 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus torques ATCC27756 -2.384 0.298 0.016 80.841 3.961 SR PR FP<	Parabacteroides merdae ATCC43184	-0.749	0.208	0.006	40.508	8.593	SR	Non-PR	FN
Proteus penneri AICC35198 -1.657 0.313 0.009 68.289 6.884 SR PR IP Providencia alcalifaciens DSM30120 -0.379 0.247 0.108 23.094 13.183 Non-SR PR FP Providencia rettgeri DSM1131 -0.205 0.204 0.25 13.245 12.273 Non-SR PR FP Providencia stuartii ATCC25827 -0.072 0.246 0.807 4.854 16.212 Non-SR PR FP Roseburia intestinalis L1-82 -8.876 0.156 0.006 99.787 0.023 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.749 0.008 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29176 -9.522 0.145 0.005 99.864 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Salmonella Typhimurium LT2 -0.673 0.712 0.252 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR	Pretovella copri DSM18205	-8.693	0.41	0.015	99.758	0.069	SR	Non-PR	FN
Providencia actalijacien's DSM15020 -0.579 0.247 0.108 23.094 15.185 IN01-SR PR FP Providencia rettgeri DSM1131 -0.205 0.204 0.25 13.245 12.273 Non-SR PR FP Providencia stuartii ATCC25827 -0.072 0.246 0.807 4.854 16.212 Non-SR PR FP Roseburia intestinalis L1-82 -8.876 0.156 0.006 99.787 0.023 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.749 0.008 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus torques ATCC29176 -9.522 0.145 0.005 99.864 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Salmonella Typhimurium LT2 -0.673 0.712 0.252 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR FN Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR No	Proteus penneri AICC35198	-1.65/	0.313	0.009	68.289	6.884	SK Nan SD	PR	
Providencia religen DSM1151 -0.203 0.244 0.23 13.243 12.275 INdi-SK PK PF Providencia stuartii ATCC25827 -0.072 0.246 0.807 4.854 16.212 Non-SR PR FP Roseburia intestinalis L1-82 -8.876 0.156 0.006 99.787 0.023 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.749 0.008 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29176 -9.522 0.145 0.005 99.864 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus torques ATCC27756 -2.384 0.298 0.016 80.841 3.961 SR PR FP Salmonella Typhimurium LT2 -0.673 0.712 0.252 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Providencia aicaujaciens DSM50120 Providencia netto ari DSM1121	-0.379	0.247	0.108	23.094	13.183	Non-SR	PR	FP ED
Providencia situariti ATCC23827 -0.072 0.240 0.807 4.634 10.212 IN01-SK FK FF Roseburia intestinalis L1-82 -8.876 0.156 0.006 99.787 0.023 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.749 0.008 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29176 -9.522 0.145 0.005 99.864 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus torques ATCC27756 -2.384 0.298 0.016 80.841 3.961 SR PR TP Salmonella Typhimurium LT2 -0.673 0.712 0.252 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR FN Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Providencia religen DSM1151	-0.203	0.204	0.23	15.245	12.275	Non SD		FF ED
Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29149 -8.639 0.045 0 99.749 0.008 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus gnavus ATCC29176 -9.522 0.145 0.005 99.864 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29176 -9.522 0.145 0.005 99.864 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Salmonella Typhimurium LT2 -0.673 0.712 0.252 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR FN Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Providencia stuartil ATCC25627 Poseburia intestinalis L1 82	-0.072	0.240	0.807	4.634	0.023	NUII-SK	IN Non DD	FF EN
Ruminococcus juntus Interceptity 0.007 0.008 0.014 SR Non-PR FN Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -0.673 0.712 0.252 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR FN Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Ruminococcus ongrus ATCC20140	-8.639	0.045	0.000	99.767	0.025	SR	Non-PR	FN
Ruminococcus torques ATCC27756 -2.384 0.298 0.016 80.841 3.961 SR PR TP Salmonella Typhimurium LT2 -0.673 0.712 0.225 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR FN Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Ruminococcus lactaris ATCC29179	-9 522	0 145	0.005	99 864	0.014	SR	Non-PR	FN
Salmonella Typhimurum LT2 -0.673 0.712 0.252 37.287 30.936 Non-SR PR FP Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 -8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR FN Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Ruminococcus torques ATCC27756	-2384	0.298	0.016	80,841	3.961	SR	PR	TP
Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176 8.854 0.189 0.008 99.784 0.028 SR Non-PR FN Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Salmonella Typhimurium LT2	-0.673	0.712	0.252	37,287	30,936	Non-SR	PR	FP
Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548 -1.844 0.392 0.004 72.146 7.574 SR Non-PR FN	Subdoligranulum variabile DSM15176	-8.854	0.189	0.008	99.784	0.028	SR	Non-PR	FN
	Victivallis vadensis ATCC BAA-548	-1.844	0.392	0.004	72.146	7.574	SR	Non-PR	FN

Summarized results of systematic Zimmermann et al. (2019) comparison This table displays the summarized results of the systematic comparison of predicted sulfasalazine reducers to experimentally confirmed sulfasalazine reducers reported by Zimmermann et al. (2019).

	PR	Non-PR
SR Non-SR	38.8% (26/67) ^a 11.9% (8/67) ^c	$\begin{array}{c} 40.3\% \left(27/67 \right)^b \\ 9.0\% \left(6/67 \right)^d \end{array}$

^aThe number of true positives.

^bThe number of false negatives.

^cThe number of true false positives.

^dThe number of true negatives.

Although azoreductase activity has been identified in several prominent phyla of the human gut microbiota (Zimmermann et al., 2019) and appears to be ubiquitous across healthy individuals (Javdan et al., 2020), the prevalence, abundance, and distribution of azoreductases have not been systematically examined in the human gut microbiome of healthy individuals nor in individuals living with IBD. In this work, we curated and compiled known azoreductase genes (Fig. 2), searched for azoreductase gene families across a nonredundant set of 4644 human gut bacterial genomes (Almeida et al., 2020), and identified 1958 putative azo-reducing species (Fig. 3). The systematic comparison of our search results to recent experimental evidence of sulfasalazine reduction by

prominent gut bacteria (Table 1, Table 2) indicates a disconnect between the current state of azoreductase annotation and experimental evidence of sulfasalazine reduction. Interestingly, the majority (77.1%, 27/35) of incorrectly predicted sulfasalazine-reducing strains are false negatives, meaning these strains did not return a significant hit to an azoreductase gene from the homolog search step but do, in fact, reduce sulfasalazine in vitro. This inconsistency between annotated azoreductases and experimental evidence of azo reduction suggests that many prominent bacterial strains of the human gut microbiome may encode and express previously uncharacterized azoreductase genes. These genes likely serve other endogenous roles such as nitro reduction (Liu et al., 2007; Chalansonnet et al., 2017) and quinone oxidoreduction (Leelakriangsak et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2008; Ryan et al., 2010a; Ryan et al. 2010b; Ryan et al., 2014), with the azo reduction being a side mechanism that these

enzymes crossfunctionally participate in.

We next sought to report the relative abundance and expression of azoreductases in the human gut microbiome for healthy controls and IBD patients. Our analysis of 1558 metagenomic samples from 326 individuals across healthy, UC, and CD patient cohorts showed that clade I, II, III, IVa, IVb, mdaB, and yieF azoreductases are significantly more abundant in the gut microbiome compared with the other azoreductases examined in this study (Fig. 4, A and B). We also examined the



Fig. 6. Three putative azo-reducing strains of *F. nucleatum* degrade Acid Orange 7 in vitro. The absorbance of light at 550 nm (corresponding to the absorbance spectra of Acid Orange 7) was measured in cultures of *F. nucleatum*, *B. fragilis*, and *C. clostridiforme* isolate cultures. *F. nucleatum* strains were grown in BHI media and were compared with BHI-blank control mixture, whereas *B. fragilis* and *C. clostridiforme* strains were grown in YCFA media and were thus compared with a YCFA-blank. Each strain was grown and tested in biologic and technical triplicates. Each data point on the plot above is the average of three technical replicates from a single biologic replicate per strain. Please see *Materials and Methods* for more details regarding our experimental methodology. Asterisks indicate statistical significance calculated via two-sided *t* tests (*P < 0.05; **P < 0.001).

expression of azoreductases by the human gut microbiota and found that, with the exception of clade IVb, expression levels of azoreductases roughly match with their corresponding genomic abundance (Fig. 4C). The incongruence of clade IVb abundance and expression levels suggests that, when feasible, shotgun metagenomic sequencing of stool samples should be performed in parallel with metatranscriptomic sequencing to better understand the functional landscape of the gut microbiome and the relative contributions of different azoreductases to overall azo reduction. We also sought to examine the relative abundance of known and putative azo-reducing bacteria in healthy, UC, and CD patients over time. We found that the relative abundance of known and putative azo-reducing bacteria is significantly (P = 0.002) higher in individuals with CD and is modestly (P = 0.06) higher in individuals with UC compared with healthy controls (Fig. 5). This bodes well for the future of azo-bonded prodrug development because these therapies are intended to treat individuals afflicted with UC and CD. However, the cumulative relative abundance of known and putative azo-reducing bacteria fluctuates over time (Fig. 5B), and future studies should explore whether there exists some minimum necessary abundance of azo-reducing species for adequate prodrug metabolism and activation.

Finally, we tested the reduction of the azo-bonded dye Acid Orange 7 by three strains of F. nucleatum alongside positive control strains of B. fragilis and C. clostridioforme (Fig. 6). F. nucleatum is positively correlated with colorectal cancer (Marchesi et al., 2011; Kostic et al., 2012), is present in and on cancerous tissue (Castellarin et al., 2012), and possibly contributes to the etiology of the disease (McCoy et al., 2013; Rubinstein et al., 2013; Han, 2015). We found that F. nucleatum CTI-06, F. nucleatum subsp. animalis D11, and F. nucleatum subsp. polymorphum all significantly reduce Acid Orange 7 in vitro, indicating the encoding and activity of azoreductases in these strains of F. nucleatum. The F. nucleatum reference strain present in UHGG received significant hits to the mdaB (E-value = 4.20×10^{-13}) and yieF (E-value = 1.40×10^{-13}) 10^{-23}) HMMs and, thus, represents an accurately predicted azo-reducing bacteria (Supplemental Table 3). The identification and characterization of these, and possibly other, F. nucleatum azoreductases could lead to the eventual development of an azo-bonded colorectal cancer therapeutic designed specifically to activate in the presence of F. nucleatum on the surface of colonic tumors.

B. fragilis is a known reducer of azo dyes including Acid Orange 7 (this study), Amaranth, Orange II, and Tartrazine (Bragger et al., 1997), as well as of the quinone menadione (Ito et al., 2020). Additionally, many B. fragilis strains have been shown to be potent reducers of sulfasalazine in vitro (Zimmermann et al., 2019). Although we did identify a significant (E-value $< 1 \times 10^{-45}$) hit to the clade IVa HMM in the two B. fragilis reference strains present in UHGG (Supplemental Table 3), there may be other B. fragilis genes or operons that exhibit azoreductase activity. Ito et al. (2020) described two NADH:quinone oxidoreductase operons, NQR and NUO, and one NADH:quinone oxidoreductase gene, ndh2, capable of reducing the quinone menadione. Recall that bacterial quinone oxidoreductases are often crossreactive with azo compounds and have even been proposed to be a part of the same FMNdependent superfamily of NAD(P)H utilizing oxidoreductase enzymes (Ryan et al., 2014). Future studies are required to confirm or deny that NQR, NUO, and ndh2 are hitherto uncharacterized azoreductases contributing to the complete azo reduction of sulfasalazine by B. fragilis shown in Zimmerman et al. (2019).

Of the seven bacterial strains tested for reduction of Acid Orange 7, the two *C. clostridioforme* strains exhibited by far the most effective reduction of Acid Orange 7 (Fig. 6). Although *C. clostridioforme* is a known azo dye reducer (Raffi and Cerniglia, 1990; Nakamura et al., 2002; Xu et al., 2010), neither of the two reference strains present in UHGG recruited significant alignments to known azoreductase gene

families curated in the homolog search step of this work (Supplemental Table 3). This could be the result of either 1) strain-level variation between the reference strains and those tested with Acid Orange 7 in this study or 2) the presence and activity of one or more uncharacterized azoreductases in *C. clostridioforme*. In either case, further research including a comparative genomics analysis and gene knockout experiment on various strains of *C. clostridioforme* could lead to an improved understanding of gut microbial azo reduction.

This study has two primary limitations. 1) The E-value and percent of alignment thresholds for determining a putative azoreductase in the homolog search step are not absolute but rather are designed to strike a balance between identifying spurious homologs and missing the identification of true azoreductase homologs. This is an inherent limitation of studies requiring hard cutoffs for homolog classification and, thus, is very difficult to avoid. 2) Bacterial azoreductases exhibit different substrate specificities (Bin et al., 2004; Deller et al., 2006; Sugiura et al., 2006; Joshi et al., 2008; Ryan et al., 2010a, ; Mendes et al., 2011; Lang et al., 2013) and, thus, have varying affinities for different azo prodrugs as well as azo dyes. Though we show a significant reduction of Acid Orange 7 by three strains of *F. nucleatum* in this work, future experiments showing the reduction of azo drugs such as sulfasalazine would further bolster the hypothesis that *F. nucleatum* encodes and expresses one or more uncharacterized azoreductases.

In conclusion, we show that known azoreductases are widely distributed in the human gut microbiome and that there are likely many more uncharacterized azoreductases encoded and expressed in the human gut microbiome. These results both 1) bolster previous findings suggesting the ubiquity of azo-reduction in the gut microbiome (Javdan et al., 2020) and 2) suggest the presence and activity of many hitherto uncharacterized azoreductases in the human gut microbiome. The list of false negative strains identified in our systematic comparison analysis can serve as a resource for future studies focused on identifying azoreductases encoded by the human gut microbiome (Table 1). Overall, this work describes the abundance and distribution of known azoreductases in the human gut microbiome and motivates the need for future studies focused on annotating hitherto uncharacterized azoreductases encoded in the human gut microbiome. Further validation and annotation of putative azoreductases encoded by prominent members of the gut flora such as B. fragilis, F. nucleatum, and C. clostridioforme, are important for functional characterization of azo reduction by the human gut microbiome and for the future of azo prodrug development.

Authorship Contributions

Participated in research design: Braccia, Minabou Ndjite, Jiang, Pop, Hall. Conducted experiments: Minabou Ndjite, Weiss, Levy, Abeysinghe.

Performed data analysis: Braccia, Minabou Ndjite.

Wrote or contributed to the writing of the manuscript: Braccia, Minabou Ndjite, Weiss, Levy, Abeysinghe, Jiang, Pop, Hall.

References

- Abed J, Emgård JEM, Zamir G, Faroja M, Almogy G, Grenov A, Sol A, Naor R, Pikarsky E, Atlan KA, et al. (2016) Fap2 Mediates Fusobacterium nucleatum Colorectal Adenocarcinoma Enrichment by Binding to Tumor-Expressed Gal-GalNAc. *Cell Host Microbe* 20:215–225.
- Abu-Ali GS, Mehta RS, Lloyd-Price J, Mallick H, Branck T, Ivey KL, Drew DA, DuLong C, Rimm E, Izard J, et al. (2018) Metatranscriptome of human faecal microbial communities in a cohort of adult men. *Nat Microbiol* 3:356–366.
- Almeida A, Nayfach S, Boland M, Strozzi F, Beracochea M, Shi ZJ, Pollard KS, Sakharova E, Parks DH, Hugenholtz P, et al. (2021) A unified catalog of 204,938 reference genomes from the human gut microbiome. *Nat Biotechnol* 39:105–114.
- Bashir A, Miskeen AY, Bhat A, Fazili KM, and Ganai BA (2015) Fusobacterium nucleatum: an emerging bug in colorectal tumorigenesis. Eur J Cancer Prev 24:373–385.
- Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, and Walker S (2014) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using Lme4. J Stat Softw 67:1–48. DOI: http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.5823.
- Bay HH, Lim CK, Kee TC, Ware I, Chan GF, Shahir S, and Ibrahim Z (2014) Decolourisation of Acid Orange 7 recalcitrant auto-oxidation coloured by-products using an acclimatised mixed bacterial culture. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* 21:3891–3906.

Bin Y, Jiti Z, Jing W, Cuihong D, Hongman H, Zhiyong S, and Yongming B (2004) Expression and characteristics of the gene encoding azoreductase from Rhodobacter sphaeroides AS1.1737. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 236:129–136.

- Blümel S and Stolz A (2003) Cloning and characterization of the gene coding for the aerobic azoreductase from Pigmentiphaga kullae K24. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 62:186–190.
- Blümel S, Knackmuss H-J, and Stolz A (2002) Molecular cloning and characterization of the gene coding for the aerobic azoreductase from Xenophilus azovorans KF46F. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 68:3948–3955.
- Bragger JL, Lloyd AW, Soozandehfar SH, Bloomfield SF, Marriott C, and Martin GP (1997) Investigations into the Azo Reducing Activity of a Common Colonic Microorganism. *Int J Pharm* 157:61–71 DOI: 10.1016/S0378-5173(97)00214-7.
- Brown JP (1981) Reduction of polymeric azo and nitro dyes by intestinal bacteria. Appl Environ Microbiol 41:1283–1286.
- Castellarin M, Waren RL, Freeman JD, Dreolini L, Krzywinski M, Strauss J, Barnes R, Watson P, Allen-Vercoe E, Moore RA, et al. (2012) Fusobacterium nucleatum infection is prevalent in human colorectal carcinoma. *Genome Res* 22:299–306.
- Cerniglia CE, Freeman JP, Franklin W, and Pack LD (1982) Metabolism of azo dyes derived from benzidine, 3,3'-dimethyl-benzidine and 3,3'-dimethoxybenzidine to potentially carcinogenic aromatic amines by intestinal bacteria. *Carcinogenesis* **3**:1255–1260.
- Chalansonnet V, Mercier C, Orenga S, and Gilbert C (2017) Identification of Enterococcus faecalis enzymes with azoreductases and/or nitroreductase activity. *BMC Microbiol* 17:126.
- Chaumeil PA, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P, and Parks DH (2019) GTDB-Tk: a toolkit to classify genomes with the Genome Taxonomy Database. *Bioinformatics* **36**:1925–1927.
- Chen H, Hopper SL, and Cerniglia CE (2005) Biochemical and molecular characterization of an azoreductase from Staphylococcus aureus, a tetrameric NADPH-dependent flavoprotein. *Microbiology (Reading)* 151:1433–1441.
- Chen H, Wang RF, and Cerniglia CE (2004) Molecular cloning, overexpression, purification, and characterization of an aerobic FMN-dependent azoreductase from Enterococcus faecalis. *Protein Expr Purif* 34:302–310.
- Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, and Gu J (2018) fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor. Bioinformatics 34:1884–1890.
- Cohen RD, Woseth DM, Thisted RA, and Hanauer SB (2000) A meta-analysis and overview of the literature on treatment options for left-sided ulcerative colitis and ulcerative proctitis. Am J Gastroenterol 95:1263–1276.
- Cominelli F, Nast CC, Duchini A, and Lee M (1992) Recombinant interleukin-1 receptor antagonist blocks the proinflammatory activity of endogenous interleukin-1 in rabbit immune colitis. *Gastroenterology* 103:65–71.
- Deller S, Sollner S, Trenker-El-Toukhy R, Jelesarov I, Gübitz GM, and Macheroux P (2006) Characterization of a thermostable NADPH:FMN oxidoreductase from the mesophilic bacterium Bacillus subtilis. *Biochemistry* 45:7083–7091.
- Saha JR, Butler Jr VP, Neu HC, and Lindenbaum J (1983) Digoxin-inactivating bacteria: identification in human gut flora. Science 220:325–327.
- Edgar RC (2004) MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput. Nucleic Acids Res 32:1792–1797.
- Eslami M, Amoozegar MA, and Asad S (2016) Isolation, cloning and characterization of an azoreductase from the halophilic bacterium Halomonas elongata. *Int J Biol Macromol* 85:111–116.

Feng J, Cerniglia CE, and Chen H (2012) Toxicological significance of azo dye metabolism by human intestinal microbiota. Front Biosci (Elite Ed) 4:568–586.

- Finn RD, Clements J, Arndt W, Miller BL, Wheeler TJ, Schreiber F, Bateman A, and Eddy SR (2015) HMMER web server: 2015 update. *Nucleic Acids Res* 43 (W1):W30–W38.
- Foppoli A, Maroni A, Moutaharrik S, Melocchi A, Zema L, Palugan L, Cerea M, and Gazzaniga A (2019) In vitro and human pharmacoscintigraphic evaluation of an oral 5-ASA delivery system for colonic release. *Int J Pharm* 572:118723.
- Franzosa EA, Sirota-Madi A, Avila-Pacheco J, Fornelos N, Haiser HJ, Reinker S, Vatanen T, Hall AB, Mallick H, McIver LJ, et al. (2019) Gut microbiome structure and metabolic activity in inflammatory bowel disease. *Nat Microbiol* 4:293–305.
- Friend DR (2005) New oral delivery systems for treatment of inflammatory bowel disease. Adv Drug Deliv Rev 57:247–265.
- Gerlt JA, Bouvier JT, Davidson DB, Imker HJ, Sadkhin B, Slater DR, and Whalen KL (2015) Enzyme Function Initiative-Enzyme Similarity Tool (EFI-EST): A web tool for generating protein sequence similarity networks. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1854:1019–1037.
- Gonçalves AMD, Mendes S, de Sanctis D, Martins LO, and Bento I (2013) The crystal structure of Pseudomonas putida azoreductase - the active site revisited. *FEBS J* 280:6643–6657.
- Gustafsson A, Andersson M, Lagerstedt K, Lönnroth C, Nordgren S, and Lundholm K (2010) Receptor and enzyme expression for prostanoid metabolism in colorectal cancer related to tumor tissue PGE2. Int J Oncol 36:469–478.
- Haiser HJ, Gootenberg DB, Chatman K, Sirasani G, Balskus EP, and Turnbaugh PJ (2013) Predicting and manipulating cardiac drug inactivation by the human gut bacterium Eggerthella lenta. *Science* 341:295–298.
- Han, YW (2015) Fusobacterium nucleatum: a commensal-turned pathogen. Curr Opin Microbiol 23:141–147. DOI: 10.1016/j.mib.2014.11.013.
- Ito T, Gallegos R, Matano LM, Butler NL, Hantman N, Kaili M, Coyne MJ, Comstock LE, Malamy MH, and Barquera B (2020) Genetic and Biochemical Analysis of Anaerobic Respiration in Bacteroides Fragilis and Its Importance In Vivo. *mBio* 11:e03238–19. DOI: 10.1128/ mBio.03238-19.
- Javdan B, Lopez JG, Chankhamjon P, Lee YJ, Hull R, Wu Q, Wang X, Chatterjee S, and Donia MS (2020) Personalized Mapping of Drug Metabolism by the Human Gut Microbiome. *Cell* 181:1661–1679.e22.
- Joshi T, Iyengar L, Singh K, and Garg S (2008) Isolation, identification and application of novel bacterial consortium TJ-1 for the decolourization of structurally different azo dyes. *Bioresour Technol* 99:7115–7121.
- Peters U, Falk LC, and Kalman SM (1978) Digoxin metabolism in patients. Arch Intern Med 137:1074–1076.
- Kostic AD, Gevers D, Pedamallu CS, Michaud M, Duke F, Earl AM, Ojesina AI, Jung J, Bass AJ, Tabernero J, et al. (2012) Genomic analysis identifies association of Fusobacterium with colorectal carcinoma. *Genome Res* 22:292–298.
- Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, and Christensen RHB (2017) LmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. J Stat Softw 82:1–26 DOI: 10.18637/jss.v082.i13.
- Lang W, Sirisansaneeyakul S, Ngiwsara L, Mendes S, Martins LO, Okuyama M, and Kimura A (2013) Characterization of a new oxygen-insensitive azoreductase from Brevibacillus

laterosporus TISTR1911: toward dye decolorization using a packed-bed metal affinity reactor. *Bioresour Technol* 150:298–306.

- Langmead B and Salzberg SL (2012) Fast gapped-read alignment with bowtie 2. Nat Methods 9:357–359. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.1923.
- Leelakriangsak M, Huyen NT, Töwe S, van Duy N, Becher D, Hecker M, Antelmann H, and Zuber P (2008) Regulation of quinone detoxification by the thiol stress sensing DUF24/MarRlike repressor, YodB in Bacillus subtilis. *Mol Microbiol* 67:1108–1124.
- Letunic I and Bork P (2019) Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v4: recent updates and new developments. Nucleic Acids Res 47 (W1):W256–W259.
- Liu G, Zhou J, Jin R, Zhou M, Wang J, Lu H, and Qu Y (2008) Enhancing survival of Escherichia coli by expression of azoreductase AZR possessing quinone reductase activity. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 80:409–416.
- Liu G, Zhou J, Lv H, Xiang X, Wang J, Zhou M, and Qv Y (2007) Azoreductase from Rhodobacter sphaeroides AS1.1737 is a flavodoxin that also functions as nitroreductase and flavin mononucleotide reductase. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 76:1271–1279.
- Mahida YR, Lamming CE, Gallagher A, Hawthorne AB, and Hawkey CJ (1991) 5-Aminosalicylic acid is a potent inhibitor of interleukin 1 beta production in organ culture of colonic biopsy specimens from patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *Gut* 32:50–54.
- Marchesi JR, Dutilh BE, Hall N, Peters WHM, Roelofs R, Boleij A, and Tjalsma H (2011) Towards the human colorectal cancer microbiome. *PLoS One* 6:e20447.
- Ruiz JFM, Kedziora K, Keogh B, Maguire J, Reilly M, Windle H, Kelleher DP, and Gilmer JF (2011) A double prodrug system for colon targeting of benzenesulfonamide COX-2 inhibitors. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 21:6636–6640.
- Matsumoto K, Mukai Y, Ogata D, Shozui F, Nduko JM, Taguchi S, and Ooi T (2010) Characterization of thermostable FMN-dependent NADH azoreductase from the moderate thermophile Geobacillus stearothermophilus. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 86:1431–1438. DOI: 10.1007/ s00253-009-2351-7.
- McCoy AN, Araújo-Pérez F, Azcárate-Peril A, Yeh JJ, Sandler RS, and Keku TO (2013) Fusobacterium is associated with colorectal adenomas. *PLoS One* 8:e53653.
- Mendes S, Pereira L, Batista C, and Martins LO (2011) Molecular determinants of azo reduction activity in the strain Pseudomonas putida MET94. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 92:393–405.
- Mercier C, Chalansonnet V, Orenga S, and Gilbert C (2013) Characteristics of major Escherichia coli reductases involved in aerobic nitro and azo reduction. J Appl Microbiol 115:1012–1022.
- Misal SA, Lingojwar DP, Lokhande MN, Lokhande PD, and Gawai KR (2014) Enzymatic transformation of nitro-aromatic compounds by a flavin-free NADH azoreductase from Lysinibacillus sphaericus. *Biotechnol Lett* 36:127–131.
- Misal SA, Lingojwar DP, Shinde RM, and Gawai KR (2011) Purification and characterization of azoreductase from alkaliphilic strain Bacillus badius. *Process Biochem* 46:1264–1269. DOI: 10.1016/j.procbio.2011.02.013.
- Morrison JM, Wright CM, and John GH (2012) Identification, Isolation and Characterization of a Novel Azoreductase from Clostridium Perfringens. *Anaerobe* 18:229–234. DOI: 10.1016/j. anaerobe.2011.12.006.
- Nachiyar CV and Rajakumar GS (2005) Purification and Characterization of an Oxygen Insensitive Azoreductase from Pseudomonas Aeruginosa. *Enzyme Microb Technol* 36:503–509 DOI: 10.1016/j.enzmictec.2004.11.015.
- Nakamura J, Kubota Y, Miyaoka M, Saitoh T, Mizuno F, and Benno Y (2002) Comparison of four microbial enzymes in Clostridia and Bacteroides isolated from human feces. *Microbiol Immunol* 46:487–490.
- Nakanishi M, Yatome C, Ishida N, and Kitade Y (2001) Putative ACP phosphodiesterase gene (acpD) encodes an azoreductase. J Biol Chem 276:46394–46399.
- Nielsen OH (1982) Sulfasalazine intolerance. A retrospective survey of the reasons for discontinuing treatment with sulfasalazine in patients with chronic inflammatory bowel disease. Scand J Gastroenterol 17:389–393.
- Ooi T, Shibata T, Sato R, Ohno H, Kinoshita S, Thuoc TL, and Taguchi S (2007) An azoreductase, aerobic NADH-dependent flavoprotein discovered from Bacillus sp.: functional expression and enzymatic characterization. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 75:377–386.
- Patro R, Duggal G, Love MI, Irizarry RA, and Kingsford C (2017) Salmon provides fast and biasaware quantification of transcript expression. *Nat Methods* 14:417–419.
- Peppercorn MA and Goldman P (1972) The role of intestinal bacteria in the metabolism of salicylazosulfapyridine. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 181:555–562.
- Peppercorn MA and Goldman P (1973) Distribution studies of salicylazosulfapyridine and its metabolites. Gastroenterology 64:240–245.
- Perrotta C, Pellegrino P, Moroni E, De Palma C, Cervia D, Danelli P, and Clementi E (2015) Five-aminosalicylic Acid: an update for the reappraisal of an old drug. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2015:456895.
- Proctor L and Huttenhower C; Integrative HMP (iHMP) Research Network Consortium (2019) The Integrative Human Microbiome Project. *Nature* 569:641–648.
- Rachmilewitz D, Karmeli F, Schwartz LW, and Simon PL (1992) Effect of aminophenols (5-ASA and 4-ASA) on colonic interleukin-1 generation. *Gut* 33:929–932.
- Raffi F and Cerniglia CE (1990) An Anaerobic Nondenaturing Gel Assay for the Detection of Azoreductase from Anaerobic Bacteria. J Microbiol Methods 12:139–148. DOI: 10.1016/ 0167-7012(90)90024-Z.
- Rafii F and Cerniglia CE (1995) Reduction of azo dyes and nitroaromatic compounds by bacterial enzymes from the human intestinal tract. *Environ Health Perspect* **103** (Suppl 5):17–19.
- Rafii F, Franklin W, and Cemiglia CE (1990) Azoreductase activity of anaerobic bacteria isolated from human intestinal microflora. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 56:2146–2151.
- Rubinstein MR, Wang X, Liu W, Hao Y, Cai G, and Han YW (2013) Fusobacterium nucleatum promotes colorectal carcinogenesis by modulating E-cadherin/β-catenin signaling via its FadA adhesin. Cell Host Microbe 14:195–206.
- Ruiz JFM, Kedziora K, Windle H, Kelleher DP, and Gilmer JF (2011) Investigation into drug release from colon-specific azoreductase-activated steroid prodrugs using in-vitro models. J Pharm Pharmacol 63:806–816. DOI: 10.1111/j.2042-7158.2011.01289.x.
- Ryan A, Kaplan E, Nebel J-C, Polycarpou E, Crescente V, Lowe E, Preston GM, and Sim E (2014) Identification of NAD(P)H quinone oxidoreductase activity in azoreductases from P. aeruginosa: azoreductases and NAD(P)H quinone oxidoreductases belong to the same FMN-dependent superfamily of enzymes. *PLoS One* 9:e98551.
- Ryan A, Laurieri N, Westwood I, Wang C-J, Lowe E, and Sim E (2010a) A novel mechanism for azoreduction. J Mol Biol 400:24–37.
- Ryan A, Wang C-J, Laurieri N, Westwood I, and Sim E (2010b) Reaction mechanism of azoreductases suggests convergent evolution with quinone oxidoreductases. *Protein Cell* 1:780–790.

Sousa T, Yadav V, Zann V, Borde A, Abrahamsson B, and Basit AW (2014) On the colonic bacterial metabolism of azo-bonded prodrugsof 5-aminosalicylic acid. J Pharm Sci 103:3171–3175. Spanogiannopoulos P, Bess EN, Carmody RN, and Turnbaugh PJ (2016) The microbial pharma-

- cists within us: a metagenomic view of xenobiotic metabolism. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 14:273–287. Sugiura W, Yoda T, Matsuba T, Tanaka Y, and Suzuki Y (2006) Expression and characterization of the genes encoding azoreductases from Bacillus subtilis and Geobacillus stearothermophilus.
- Biosci Biotechnol Biochem 70:1655–1665. Suzuki H (2019) Remarkable diversification of bacterial azoreductases: primary sequences, struc-
- tures, substrates, physiological roles, and biotechnological applications. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* **103**:3965–3978. Suzuki Y, Yoda T, Ruhul A, and Sugiura W (2001) Molecular cloning and characterization of the gene
- coding for azoreductase from Bacillus sp. OY1-2 isolated from soil. J Biol Chem 276:9059–9065. Tozaki H, Odoriba T, Okada N, Fujita T, Terabe A, Suzuki T, Okabe S, Muranishi S, and Yama-
- Tozaki H, Odorho T, Okada N, Fujita T, Terabe A, Suzuki T, Okabe S, Muransini S, and Fantamoto A (2002) Chitosan capsules for colon-specific drug delivery: enhanced localization of 5aminosalicylic acid in the large intestine accelerates healing of TNBS-induced colitis in rats. J Control Release 82:51–61.
- Wallace BD, Wang H, Lane KT, Scott JE, Orans J, Koo JS, Venkatesh M, et al. (2010) Alleviating cancer drug toxicity by inhibiting a bacterial enzyme. *Science* 330:831–835. DOI: 10.1126/ science.1191175.
- Weber CK, Liptay S, Wirth T, Adler G, and Schmid RM (2000) Suppression of NF-kappaB activity by sulfasalazine is mediated by direct inhibition of IkappaB kinases α and β . Gastroenterology **119**:1209–1218.

Wickham H (2011) Ggplot2. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Stat 3:180-185 DOI: 10.1002/wics.147.

- Wood DE, Lu J, and Langmead B (2019) Improved metagenomic analysis with Kraken 2. Genome Biol 20:257.
- Wu A-W, Gu J, Ji J-F, Li Z-F, and Xu G-W (2003) Role of COX-2 in carcinogenesis of colorectal cancer and its relationship with tumor biological characteristics and patients' prognosis. World J Gastroenterol 9:1990–1994.
- Wu WKK, Sung JJ, Lee CW, Yu J, and Cho CH (2010) Cyclooxygenase-2 in tumorigenesis of gastrointestinal cancers: an update on the molecular mechanisms. *Cancer Lett* 295:7–16. Xu H, Heinze TM, Paine DD, Cerniglia CE, and Chen H (2010) Sudan azo dyes and Para Red
- degradation by prevalent bacteria of the human gastrointestinal tract. Anaerobe **16**:114–119.
- Zhang X, Ng IS, and Chang JS (2016) Cloning and characterization of a robust recombinant azoreductase from Shewanella xiamenensis BC01. J Taiwan Inst Chem Eng 61:97–105. DOI: 10.1016/j.jtice.2016.01.002.
- Zimmermann M, Zimmermann-Kogadeeva M, Wegmann R, and Goodman AL (2019) Mapping human microbiome drug metabolism by gut bacteria and their genes. *Nature* 570:462–467.
- Zimmermann T, Kulla HG, and Leisinger T (1982) Properties of purified Orange II azoreductase, the enzyme initiating azo dye degradation by Pseudomonas KF46. Eur J Biochem 129:197–203.

Address correspondence to: Dr. Brantley Hall, Bioscience Research Building, Room 3219, 3126 Campus Drive, College Park, MD 20742. E-mail: brantley@ umd.edu