

The Microbial Planet

QTC-024 · From Quarks to Consciousness

The Universe, Life, and How We Found Out

Author: Juan Segurolo

Version: v1.0 EN · 2 September 2026

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge

License: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Earth looks like a planet of forests and animals because those organisms meet the eye. By duration, abundance, metabolic range and planetary work, however, its history is overwhelmingly microbial. Ribosomal RNA revealed Bacteria and Archaea as deep lineages; microscopy, drilling and molecular surveys exposed vast populations that cultivation had missed. The numbers remain model-based: plants dominate standing biomass carbon, while updated estimates lowered counts in major subsurface compartments. Microbes nevertheless operate carbon, nitrogen, sulfur, methane and oxygen cycles through coupled communities, not isolated cells. Some deep populations turn over extraordinarily slowly; extremophiles establish possibility under specific conditions, not direct ancestry or extraterrestrial life. Calling Earth a microbial planet is therefore a measured synthesis about time, diversity and biogeochemical function—not a claim that microbes weigh more than plants or that every cell has been counted.

In 60 Seconds

Most life that ever inhabited Earth was microbial, but microbe is not a branch on one tree. It is a practical category spanning Bacteria, Archaea and many microscopic eukaryotes. A 1998 census estimated $4\text{--}6 \times 10^{30}$ prokaryotic cells; later syntheses reduced important compartments, including seafloor sediment and the continental subsurface. That revision is a strength: planetary totals are constructed from samples, habitat volumes and conversion factors. Plants still dominate standing biomass carbon. Microbial dominance instead lies in long history, cell numbers, metabolic variety and repeated flux. Microbes harvest light in several ways and couple inorganic donors to electron acceptors; methanogens, methane oxidizers and syntrophic partners make reactions possible together. Deep communities may persist near energetic limits with population-average turnover measured in years to millennia. Biofilms create gradients, viruses redirect matter and genes, and horizontal transfer makes functional history a network. Cultivation sees only selected organisms, so ribosomal probes, metagenomes and single-cell genomes expanded the known tree. Extremophiles show what living systems can tolerate under stated conditions. They are modern specialists, not fossils of life's origin. The conclusion is robust while exact global counts, rates and ancient transitions remain revisable.

Why This Question Matters

The phrase microbial planet can sound like rhetoric unless its dimensions are separated. Cell number is not biomass; biomass is not activity; a gene is not a measured rate; survival in a laboratory is not

ecological dominance. Keeping those distinctions visible explains how scientists infer a biosphere too small, deep and dispersed to census directly. It also shows why corrected estimates do not diminish microbial importance. The point is not one spectacular total. It is the convergence of phylogeny, microscopy, chemistry, genomics and flux measurements on a planet whose habitability and atmospheric history were built largely by organisms we rarely see.

1. The Visible World Is a Thin Layer

The Question

Forests, animals and flowers dominate human attention because size makes them visible. But what becomes of that picture when life's history is measured by duration, lineages, biochemical possibilities and work done rather than by what a person can see?

For most of Earth's inhabited history, life was microbial. Animals and land plants arrived late in a biosphere already altered by cells for billions of years.[29,30] The ancient record is uneven: fossils preserve shapes selectively, and geochemical signals identify processes more readily than organisms. Yet no plausible chronology makes macroscopic life the default condition of the living planet.

Microbial did not mean one undifferentiated prokaryotic kingdom. Comparisons of ribosomal RNA led Carl Woese and George Fox to recognize Bacteria and Archaea as deeply distinct cellular lineages.[1,2] That reorganization came from molecules, not appearance. Domain names and the position of life's deepest root remain separate questions, but the bacterial–archaeal distinction transformed the map that any census must count.

Microbe is therefore a working category, not a formal clade. It covers bacteria, archaea and many eukaryotes whose small size or unicellular lives conceal radically different ancestries.[1,2,24] Viruses belong in microbial ecology because they infect cells and redirect communities, but they are not cellular microorganisms. One convenient word crosses several branches of evolution.

Small does not mean chemically simple. Microbial genomes encode oxygenic and anoxygenic phototrophy, fermentation, methanogenesis and many ways of using inorganic donors or acceptors that animals and plants do not possess.[10,23,24] A genome shows potential rather than activity, yet the range of potential already overturns the equation between visible complexity and biochemical versatility.

The animal-centred picture is understandable but ecologically incomplete. Microorganisms sustain decomposition, food webs and elemental transformations in soils, oceans, sediments and rocks. [3,10,34] That claim needs one immediate restraint: plants dominate global standing biomass carbon in the best-known synthesis. A microbial planet is not simply a planet on which microbes weigh the most.

Where That Leaves Us

Visibility was the wrong denominator. Microbes dominate life's duration, much of its abundance and most of its metabolic repertoire without dominating every measure. That conclusion cannot rest on impression, however. It requires turning scattered samples into planetary estimates and explaining why later, lower numbers represent improved knowledge rather than retreat.

2. Counting the Invisible

The Question

No one counted every microbial cell. Global totals are models assembled from samples, mapped habitat volumes and conversion factors. Their revisions reveal how inference improves—and why cell count, carbon stock and biological activity must never be treated as interchangeable numbers.

In 1998, William Whitman, David Coleman and William Wiebe estimated roughly $4\text{--}6 \times 10^{30}$ prokaryotic cells on Earth.[3] The number became famous because it made the unseen majority quantitative. It was not a literal headcount. The authors combined measurements from soils, water, sediments and subsurface habitats, then extrapolated across volumes that were sampled with radically unequal density.

Later work revised crucial compartments. A 2018 synthesis estimated $2\text{--}6 \times 10^{29}$ cells in the continental subsurface and, after combining available inventories, about 23–31 petagrams of carbon in global prokaryotic biomass.[5] Heat flow, depth, lithology and sparse geographic coverage entered the model. The printed range describes uncertainty within that framework, not every possible structural error.

Subseafloor sediment changed even more. A 2012 reassessment estimated 2.9×10^{29} cells and 4.1 petagrams of carbon there, far below an earlier compartment estimate.[6] It used improved cores and correlations with sedimentation rate and distance from land. The result applies to sediment, not all oceanic crust, and it illustrates why a global total must retain its habitat definitions.

Carbon gives another denominator. Yinon Bar-On, Rob Phillips and Ron Milo estimated that plants dominate Earth's standing biomass carbon, despite enormous microbial abundance.[4,5] That does not demote microbes. A small stock can support a large flux when material cycles repeatedly. The proper comparison depends on the question: cells for abundance, carbon for stock, production for turnover and reaction rates for geochemical work.

Every census carries shared conversions. Microscopy may count intact and dead cells; gene copies differ among genomes; lipids persist; carbon per cell varies with size and starvation.[3,5,6] Deep communities also separate presence from activity.[7–9] A defensible number therefore names what was measured, how habitat volume was inferred and which conversions produced the planetary estimate.

Where That Leaves Us

A census is strongest when its denominator and extrapolations remain visible. Revised totals do not erase microbial scale; they replace one map with a better constrained one. Counts still say little about what cells can do. The next dimension is metabolic: sunlight is only one source of usable disequilibrium available to cells.

3. Sunlight Is Only One Energy Source

Photosynthesis itself is plural. Microbes perform oxygenic photosynthesis and several anoxygenic forms using different pigments, electron donors and reaction-centre architectures.[10,33] Water is not the only possible donor, and oxygen is not the inevitable product of harvesting light. The

distribution of those systems records both ancient divergence and later gene transfer, which QTC-025 will meet again in the atmosphere.

Other microbes harvest chemical disequilibria. Chemolithotrophs oxidize hydrogen, reduced sulfur, iron or ammonia by coupling the reaction to an available electron acceptor.[5,10,12] Calling this chemical energy can mislead: a donor molecule is not a battery by itself. The acceptor, concentrations, products, temperature and pressure together determine whether energy is available.

Thermodynamic possibility is not biological use. A reaction must yield enough free energy under local conditions, proceed at an accessible rate and be coupled by cellular machinery.[8,10,15] Many nominally sunless ecosystems still depend indirectly on photosynthesis because oxygen, nitrate or buried organic matter arrived from the surface. Independence is a reaction budget, not a label attached to darkness.

Methanogenic archaea show several architectures for conserving energy while producing biological methane.[13] Their pathways use carbon dioxide, methyl compounds or acetate in different ecological settings. Methane alone is not a biosignature: geological reactions also make it. Isotopes, co-products, genes, context and measured rates must converge before a source is assigned.

Sometimes the metabolic unit is a partnership. Anaerobic oxidation of methane is often performed by archaeal and bacterial consortia, with methane oxidation linked to partner processes such as sulfate reduction.[14,15] Keeping intermediates low can make a coupled reaction favourable when neither partner can sustain its side alone. Community organization becomes part of the energy calculation.

Where That Leaves Us

Microbial metabolism expands wherever compatible donors, acceptors and catalysts meet, but no pathway escapes energy accounting. That rule makes the deep biosphere especially revealing. Far below abundant fresh substrates, cells persist at powers and turnover rates unlike laboratory growth, forcing measured abundance and biological activity apart once again in practice.

4. The Deep Biosphere Lives Slowly

The Question

A cell detected hundreds of metres below the seafloor is not automatically alive, active or indigenous. Deep-biosphere science must separate contamination, preserved remains, maintenance and reproduction while measuring systems whose natural timescales can exceed an experimenter's entire career.

Cells and microbial activities occur widely in deeply buried marine sediments, including samples hundreds of metres below the seafloor.[6,9,32] Drilling turns that observation into an adversarial measurement problem. Fluids and organisms from the surface can enter a core, while old molecules may remain after activity stops. Tracers, sterile handling and spatial patterns are therefore part of the evidence, not housekeeping details.

The continental subsurface is also populous and heterogeneous. Its estimated cells occupy fractures, pores and waters constrained by temperature, liquid availability, porosity and rock

chemistry.[5] A global total cannot specify one universal deep ecosystem. Boreholes preferentially reach accessible geology, and local fluid connections can couple apparent isolation to surface recharge or buried organic matter.

In marine sediment, measured activities generally diminish with depth and available energy.[9] Even a sunless cell may depend ultimately on photosynthetic carbon buried from above or on oxidants delivered by ocean circulation. Other settings use rock–water reactions or radiolytically generated substrates. The degree of surface independence has to be demonstrated for each reaction network.

Low supply changes tempo. Reviews of deep life infer extraordinarily low power use and turnover from geochemical gradients, cell inventories and reaction rates.[7,8,32] Those are population averages over heterogeneous communities, not movies of one cell dividing after a thousand years. Cells may invest in repair, maintenance, replacement or intermittent growth, and the partition remains difficult to observe.

Generation-time estimates extending from years toward millennia are therefore current interpretations rather than direct cell-cycle measurements.[7,8] Divide an inferred production rate by a standing population and assumptions immediately enter: how many cells are alive, whether biomass is steady and whether all cells share activity. The deep biosphere is real; its biological clock is reconstructed.

Where That Leaves Us

Deep life is established, but its tempo is inferred by joining contamination control, inventories and chemical rates. The distinction between stock and flux has become unavoidable. It matters at planetary scale too, because microbes need not hold the largest biomass to process the same elements repeatedly and reshape oceans and atmosphere.

5. Microbes Run Planetary Cycles

Microbial carbon metabolism links atmosphere, ocean, soil, biomass, sediment and rock. Photosynthesis and chemosynthesis fix carbon; respiration and fermentation return products; other cells consume the intermediates.[10,34] A pathway in a genome is only potential, so global budgets depend on rate measurements, chemical gradients and inventories. The cycle is an accounting system built from many habitats.

Nitrogen is equally transformed. Nitrogen fixation makes atmospheric nitrogen biologically available, while nitrification, denitrification and anammox move it among reduced, oxidized and gaseous forms.[11,12] Plants and animals participate in the biological cycle, but key chemical conversions are microbial. Fertilizer and combustion now perturb those networks without replacing their cellular machinery.

Sulfur connects rocks, waters and cells through oxidation and reduction of multiple compounds.[10,14] In anoxic sediments, sulfate reduction can be coupled to organic matter or methane consumption. At vents and other interfaces, steep gradients bring reduced substrates near oxidants. The visible deposit is often the product of invisible reaction zones organized at millimetre scales.

Methanogenesis and microbial methane oxidation regulate major biological sources and sinks.[13–15] Neither side belongs to one universal organism or habitat. The net atmospheric consequence is the difference among production, consumption, transport and oxidation, each with uncertainty. Detecting methane without that budget cannot establish the process that made or preserved it.

Oxygen supplies the largest historical example. Oxygenic photosynthesis evolved in microbial lineages and ultimately changed surface redox conditions, while microbial metabolisms still govern carbon and nutrient feedbacks.[4,10,11,30,33] A modest microbial stock can execute a large flux through rapid reuse. QTC-025 will ask how rocks retain the timing and structure of that atmospheric transformation.

Where That Leaves Us

Planetary cycles are networks of coupled reactions, not trophies assigned to one species. Their scale emerges from repeated turnover and from interfaces where one organism's product becomes another's substrate. To understand that organization, the next step is to stop treating isolated cells as the natural unit of microbial work entirely.

6. Communities Are Metabolic Machines

A biofilm is not a crowd suspended in uniform liquid. Cells build matrices that retain water and molecules, resist disturbance and create steep chemical gradients across microscopic distances.[16] Oxygen may vanish near the surface while anaerobic processes continue beneath it. Community architecture thus creates adjacent niches that a well-mixed flask deliberately removes.

Syntrophy makes dependence even stronger. Partners can keep hydrogen, formate or other intermediates at concentrations that make a coupled set of reactions energetically favourable.[15] Neither population may grow alone under the same bulk conditions. The metabolically meaningful unit is the closed exchange network, and disrupting one member changes the thermodynamics experienced by the rest.

Genes also cross population boundaries. Horizontal transfer distributes functions among microbial lineages, so histories of resistance, metabolism or ecological adaptation often form networks even where vertical descent remains recoverable for conserved markers.[24,25] A gene tree and a species framework answer related but non-identical questions. QTC-027 will follow that distinction into inheritance and viruses.

Viruses are participants in these systems without being cells. Infection kills hosts, releases organic matter, redirects metabolism and sometimes moves genes.[17,18] Ocean surveys find enormous viral abundance and diversity, but a sequence or particle does not by itself prove active infection. Global estimates depend on sampling, classification and models of particles that lack one universal marker.

Metagenomes likewise reveal collective potential rather than a finished ecology. Environmental sequencing can recover genes without cultivation, but abundance of a sequence is not abundance of cells, assignment to a genome, expression or reaction rate.[17,18,21–23] Transcript, protein, metabolite, spatial and flux measurements provide different links from potential to activity. Communities become machines only when those links close.

Where That Leaves Us

Microbial communities manufacture their own gradients, exchange metabolites, move genes and redirect matter through infection. Their collective behaviour cannot be reconstructed from one isolate or one sequence layer. Yet some organisms also live near striking physical limits, raising a different danger: mistaking modern adaptation for a window onto early life.

7. Extremes Reveal Adaptation, Not Ancestry

The Question

A microbe growing at a record temperature demonstrates that life can function there under the stated experiment. It does not show that most natural cells thrive there, that early life resembled it or that life exists on another world.

Laboratory cultures have demonstrated microbial cell proliferation at 121 °C and 122 °C under high pressure.[27,28] Those results extended the measured upper range for growth, but the experimental clauses matter. Pressure prevented boiling, medium supplied particular substrates and growth was judged by specified cellular and chemical evidence. A record is a bounded observation, not a universal line drawn through every habitat.

Other extremophiles tolerate high salinity, strong acidity or alkalinity, cold, desiccation and radiation through different molecular and physiological adaptations.[26] The word extreme is human-centred: an acidophile's optimum may damage a neutral organism, while oxygen itself is toxic to strict anaerobes. Several stresses combined can be harder than any one tested separately.

Modern extremophiles are evolved lineages, not living fossils. Their present genomes contain ancient inheritance, later innovations, losses and transfers like those of other organisms.[24,26] A thermophile can help test whether a protein architecture functions at high temperature, but its habitat does not identify the environment of LUCA or the first cells.

Tolerance also differs from ecological importance. Growth at a boundary establishes possibility under a recipe; it does not establish large natural populations, high rates or persistence when temperature, pressure, pH and energy limitation act together.[26–28] Contamination control is decisive near records, because a few faster-growing cells from a cooler interval can imitate weak growth.

The exact upper-temperature ceiling therefore remains an experimental inference tied to pressure, medium, growth criteria and sterility controls.[27,28] A new record may move it, while theory about macromolecular stability constrains why it cannot rise without limit. Extremophiles expand plausible habitability; they do not supply evidence that an inhabited extraterrestrial environment has been found.

Where That Leaves Us

Extremes teach possibility only when experimental conditions travel with the record. They neither resurrect ancestral cells nor populate another planet by analogy. The same evidential discipline governs the larger microbial portrait: because most organisms were never cultured, the planet had to be reconstructed by combining methods with different blind spots.

8. A Microbial Planet Is Reconstructed

Cultivation once defined the accessible microbial world. The great plate count anomaly named the gap between cells seen microscopically and colonies formed on any one laboratory recipe.[19,20] The fraction is environment- and method-dependent, not one fixed percentage. A dish selects organisms that tolerate its nutrients, surfaces, temperature, atmosphere and partnerships; failure to grow is not absence from nature.

Ribosomal RNA probes and sequencing loosened that filter. Researchers could identify lineages in place and compare conserved molecules without cultivating every organism first.[1,2,20]

Molecular detection introduced its own questions about extraction, copy number, contamination and inactive material. It changed which organisms were visible, not the obligation to prove what a signal represents.

Environmental shotgun sequencing extended the view from markers to collective genes and pathways.[21,22,34] Metagenomes reveal biochemical potential at community scale, while assembly and binning try to associate fragments with populations. A pathway assembled in a sample may span partners, and relative read abundance is not automatically cell abundance or reaction rate.

Single-cell genomes, metagenome-assembled genomes and targeted cultivation have added deep lineages to the tree of life.[23–25,31] Each route compensates for a different obstruction: mixed communities, uncultivated cells or missing physiological context. Each also carries characteristic errors—amplification bias, incomplete bins, contamination or laboratory selection—that independent data must expose.

The planetary conclusion comes from triangulation. Microscopy constrains cells; molecular surveys map lineages and potential; chemistry measures inventories and gradients; rates connect communities to cycles; geological context extends the story through time.[3–6,10,24,30] These methods establish a microbial planet while leaving totals, turnover and ancient transitions open to revision. QTC-025 follows one such transition into the rock record of atmosphere.

Where That Leaves Us

Earth is microbial by converging measures, not by one unrepeatably number. The portrait survives revised censuses because its foundations include deep time, phylogenetic breadth, metabolic range and planetary flux. Microbes also altered the atmosphere. The next article asks how rocks can preserve that invisible history without becoming simple photographs of ancient air.

What We Know, and How

- Bacteria and Archaea are deeply distinct cellular lineages revealed by comparative molecular evidence.[1,2]
- Planetary microbial cell and biomass estimates are explicit extrapolations that have been revised as major habitats were resampled.[3–6]
- Microorganisms perform core transformations in carbon, nitrogen, sulfur, methane and oxygen cycling.[10–14,30,33,34]
- Deep sediment and continental subsurface habitats contain large microbial populations under severe energy limitation.[5–9,32]

- Molecular and genome-resolved methods reveal lineages and metabolic potential without requiring prior cultivation.[20–25,31]

What We Still Don't Know

- The exact number, biomass and active fraction of microbial cells across poorly sampled deep habitats.
- How maintenance, repair, dormancy and reproduction divide the minute energy budgets of the deepest communities.
- The full taxonomic and functional diversity carried by uncultivated lineages and viruses.
- The natural upper limits of life when temperature, pressure, water activity, pH and energy limitation act together.
- The precise sequence and ecological structure of microbial innovations that transformed the ancient atmosphere.

What Could Change Our Minds

- Standardized global sampling that substantially changes major habitat volumes, cell densities or carbon conversions.
- Long-term single-cell measurements that directly separate repair, maintenance and division under deep-biosphere energy supply.
- Cultures and closed genomes that confirm or reorganize major lineages reconstructed from environmental sequence fragments.
- Reproducible growth beyond present physicochemical records with contamination controls and a complete energy budget.
- Rock records that reorder the timing of oxygenic photosynthesis or other globally important microbial metabolisms.

If You Remember Only One Thing

Earth is microbial by history, abundance, metabolism and planetary flux—not biomass alone. Its global numbers are model-based, while communities, deep life and extremophiles reveal distinct, testable dimensions of dominance.

Related Articles

- QTC-023 — LUCA: The Ancestor We Reconstructed
- QTC-025 — How to Read an Atmosphere from a Rock

References

- [1] Carl R. Woese; George E. Fox. Phylogenetic structure of the prokaryotic domain: The primary kingdoms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 74, 5088–5090 (1977). DOI 10.1073/pnas.74.11.5088. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.74.11.5088>
- [2] Norman R. Pace. A molecular view of microbial diversity and the biosphere. *Science* 276, 734–740 (1997). DOI 10.1126/science.276.5313.734. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.276.5313.734>

- [3] William B. Whitman; David C. Coleman; William J. Wiebe. Prokaryotes: The unseen majority. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 95, 6578–6583 (1998). DOI 10.1073/pnas.95.12.6578. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.12.6578>
- [4] Yinon M. Bar-On; Rob Phillips; Ron Milo. The biomass distribution on Earth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, 6506–6511 (2018). DOI 10.1073/pnas.1711842115. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1711842115>
- [5] C. Magnabosco; L.-H. Lin; H. Dong; M. Bomberg; W. Ghiorse; H. Stan-Lotter; K. Pedersen; T. L. Kieft; E. van Heerden; T. C. Onstott. The biomass and biodiversity of the continental subsurface. *Nature Geoscience* 11, 707–717 (2018). DOI 10.1038/s41561-018-0221-6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-018-0221-6>
- [6] Jens Kallmeyer; Robert Pockalny; Rishi Ram Adhikari; David C. Smith; Steven D’Hondt. Global distribution of microbial abundance and biomass in seafloor sediment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109, 16213–16216 (2012). DOI 10.1073/pnas.1203849109. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1203849109>
- [7] Bo Barker Jørgensen; Antje Boetius. Feast and famine—microbial life in the deep-sea bed. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 5, 770–781 (2007). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro1745. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1745>
- [8] Tori M. Hoehler; Bo Barker Jørgensen. Microbial life under extreme energy limitation. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 11, 83–94 (2013). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro2939. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2939>
- [9] Steven D’Hondt; Bo Barker Jørgensen; D. Jay Miller; Anja Batzke; Ruth Blake; Barry A. Cragg; Heribert Cypionka; Gerald R. Dickens; Timothy Ferdelman; Kai-Uwe Hinrichs; Nils G. Holm; Richard Mitterer; Arthur Spivack; Guizhi Wang; Barbara Bekins; Bert Engelen; Kathryn Ford; Glen Gettemy; Scott D. Rutherford; Henrik Sass; C. Gregory Skilbeck; Ivano W. Aiello; Gilles Guérin; Christopher H. House; Fumio Inagaki; Patrick Meister; Thomas Naehr; Sachiko Niitsuma; R. John Parkes; Axel Schippers; David C. Smith; Andreas Teske; Juergen Wiegel; Christian Naranjo Padilla; Juana Luz Solis Acosta. Distributions of microbial activities in deep seafloor sediments. *Science* 306, 2216–2221 (2004). DOI 10.1126/science.1101155. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1101155>
- [10] Paul G. Falkowski; Tom Fenchel; Edward F. Delong. The microbial engines that drive Earth’s biogeochemical cycles. *Science* 320, 1034–1039 (2008). DOI 10.1126/science.1153213. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1153213>
- [11] Donald E. Canfield; Alexander N. Glazer; Paul G. Falkowski. The evolution and future of Earth’s nitrogen cycle. *Science* 330, 192–196 (2010). DOI 10.1126/science.1186120. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1186120>
- [12] Marcel M. M. Kuypers; Hannah K. Marchant; Boran Kartal. The microbial nitrogen-cycling network. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 16, 263–276 (2018). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro.2018.9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro.2018.9>
- [13] Rudolf K. Thauer; Anne-Kristin Kaster; Henning Seedorf; Wolfgang Buckel; Reiner Hedderich. Methanogenic archaea: ecologically relevant differences in energy conservation. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 6, 579–591 (2008). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro1931. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1931>

- [14] Katrin Knittel; Antje Boetius. Anaerobic oxidation of methane: progress with an unknown process. *Annual Review of Microbiology* 63, 311–334 (2009). DOI 10.1146/annurev.micro.61.080706.093130. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.micro.61.080706.093130>
- [15] Alfons J. M. Stams; Caroline M. Plugge. Electron transfer in syntrophic communities of anaerobic bacteria and archaea. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 7, 568–577 (2009). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro2166. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2166>
- [16] Hans-Curt Flemming; Jost Wingender; Ulrich Szewzyk; Peter Steinberg; Scott A. Rice; Staffan Kjelleberg. Biofilms: an emergent form of bacterial life. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 14, 563–575 (2016). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro.2016.94. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro.2016.94>
- [17] Curtis A. Suttle. Marine viruses—major players in the global ecosystem. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 5, 801–812 (2007). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro1750. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1750>
- [18] Jennifer R. Brum; J. Cesar Ignacio-Espinoza; Simon Roux; Guilhem Doulier; Silvia G. Acinas; Adriana Alberti; Samuel Chaffron; Corinne Cruaud; Colomban de Vargas; Josep M. Gasol; Gabriel Gorsky; Ann C. Gregory; Lionel Guidi; Pascal Hingamp; Daniele Iudicone; Fabrice Not; Hiroyuki Ogata; Stéphane Pesant; Bonnie T. Poulos; Sarah M. Schwenck; Sabrina Speich; Celine Dimier; Stefanie Kandels-Lewis; Marc Picheral; Sarah Searson; Tara Oceans Coordinators; Peer Bork; Chris Bowler; Shinichi Sunagawa; Patrick Wincker; Eric Karsenti; Matthew B. Sullivan. Patterns and ecological drivers of ocean viral communities. *Science* 348, 1261498 (2015). DOI 10.1126/science.1261498. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1261498>
- [19] James T. Staley; Allan Konopka. Measurement of in situ activities of nonphotosynthetic microorganisms in aquatic and terrestrial habitats. *Annual Review of Microbiology* 39, 321–346 (1985). DOI 10.1146/annurev.mi.39.100185.001541. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.mi.39.100185.001541>
- [20] R I Amann; W Ludwig; K H Schleifer. Phylogenetic identification and in situ detection of individual microbial cells without cultivation. *Microbiological Reviews* 59, 143–169 (1995). DOI 10.1128/mr.59.1.143-169.1995. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mr.59.1.143-169.1995>
- [21] Jo Handelsman. Metagenomics: application of genomics to uncultured microorganisms. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* 68, 669–685 (2004). DOI 10.1128/MMBR.68.4.669-685.2004. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.68.4.669-685.2004>
- [22] J. Craig Venter; Karin Remington; John F. Heidelberg; Aaron L. Halpern; Doug Rusch; Jonathan A. Eisen; Dongying Wu; Ian Paulsen; Karen E. Nelson; William Nelson; Derrick E. Fouts; Samuel Levy; Anthony H. Knap; Michael W. Lomas; Ken Nealson; Owen White; Jeremy Peterson; Jeff Hoffman; Rachel Parsons; Holly Baden-Tillson; Cynthia Pfannkoch; Yu-Hui Rogers; Hamilton O. Smith. Environmental genome shotgun sequencing of the Sargasso Sea. *Science* 304, 66–74 (2004). DOI 10.1126/science.1093857. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1093857>
- [23] Christian Rinke; Patrick Schwientek; Alexander Sczyrba; Natalia N. Ivanova; Iain J. Anderson; Jan-Fang Cheng; Aaron Darling; Stephanie Malfatti; Brandon K. Swan; Esther A. Gies; Jeremy A. Dodsworth; Brian P. Hedlund; George Tsiamis; Stefan M. Sievert; Wen-Tso Liu; Jonathan A. Eisen; Steven J. Hallam; Nikos C. Kyrpides; Ramunas Stepanauskas; Edward M. Rubin; Philip Hugenholtz; Tanja Woyke. Insights into the phylogeny and coding potential of microbial dark matter. *Nature* 499, 431–437 (2013). DOI 10.1038/nature12352. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12352>

- [24] Laura A. Hug; Brett J. Baker; Karthik Anantharaman; Christopher T. Brown; Alexander J. Probst; Cindy J. Castelle; Cristina N. Butterfield; Alex W. Hernsdorf; Yuki Amano; Kotaro Ise; Yohey Suzuki; Natasha Dudek; David A. Relman; Kari M. Finstad; Ronald Amundson; Brian C. Thomas; Jillian F. Banfield. A new view of the tree of life. *Nature Microbiology* 1, 16048 (2016). DOI 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.48. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.48>
- [25] Donovan H. Parks; Christian Rinke; Maria Chuvochina; Pierre-Alain Chaumeil; Ben J. Woodcroft; Paul N. Evans; Philip Hugenholtz; Gene W. Tyson. Recovery of nearly 8,000 metagenome-assembled genomes substantially expands the tree of life. *Nature Microbiology* 2, 1533–1542 (2017). DOI 10.1038/s41564-017-0012-7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-017-0012-7>
- [26] Lynn J. Rothschild; Rocco L. Mancinelli. Life in extreme environments. *Nature* 409, 1092–1101 (2001). DOI 10.1038/35059215. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35059215>
- [27] Kazem Kashefi; Derek R. Lovley. Extending the upper temperature limit for life. *Science* 301, 934 (2003). DOI 10.1126/science.1086823. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1086823>
- [28] Ken Takai; Kentaro Nakamura; Tomohiro Toki; Urumu Tsunogai; Masayuki Miyazaki; Junichi Miyazaki; Hisako Hirayama; Satoshi Nakagawa; Takuro Nunoura; Koki Horikoshi. Cell proliferation at 122 °C and isotopically heavy CH₄ production by a hyperthermophilic methanogen under high-pressure cultivation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105, 10949–10954 (2008). DOI 10.1073/pnas.0712334105. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0712334105>
- [29] Abigail C. Allwood; Malcolm R. Walter; Balz S. Kamber; Craig P. Marshall; Ian W. Burch. Stromatolite reef from the Early Archaean era of Australia. *Nature* 441, 714–718 (2006). DOI 10.1038/nature04764. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04764>
- [30] Timothy W. Lyons; Christopher T. Reinhard; Noah J. Planavsky. The rise of oxygen in Earth's early ocean and atmosphere. *Nature* 506, 307–315 (2014). DOI 10.1038/nature13068. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13068>
- [31] Hiroyuki Imachi; Masaru K. Nobu; Nozomi Nakahara; Yuki Morono; Miyuki Ogawara; Yoshihiro Takaki; Yoshinori Takano; Katsuyuki Uematsu; Tetsuro Ikuta; Motoo Ito; Yohei Matsui; Masayuki Miyazaki; Kazuyoshi Murata; Yumi Saito; Sanae Sakai; Chihong Song; Eiji Tasumi; Yuko Yamanaka; Takashi Yamaguchi; Yoichi Kamagata; Hideyuki Tamaki; Ken Takai. Isolation of an archaeon at the prokaryote–eukaryote interface. *Nature* 577, 519–525 (2020). DOI 10.1038/s41586-019-1916-6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1916-6>
- [32] William D. Orsi. Ecology and evolution of seafloor and subseafloor microbial communities. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 16, 671–683 (2018). DOI 10.1038/s41579-018-0046-8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-018-0046-8>
- [33] Donald A. Bryant; Niels-Ulrik Frigaard. Prokaryotic photosynthesis and phototrophy illuminated. *Trends in Microbiology* 14, 488–496 (2006). DOI 10.1016/j.tim.2006.09.001. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2006.09.001>
- [34] Mary Ann Moran. The global ocean microbiome. *Science* 350, aac8455 (2015). DOI 10.1126/science.aac8455. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac8455>

