

STREAMS guidelines: standards for technical reporting in environmental and host-associated microbiome studies

Received: 28 March 2025

Accepted: 14 October 2025

Published online: 1 December 2025

 Check for updates

A list of authors and their affiliations appears at the end of the paper

The interdisciplinary nature of microbiome research, coupled with the generation of complex multi-omics data, makes knowledge sharing challenging. The Strengthening the Organization and Reporting of Microbiome Studies (STORMS) guidelines provide a checklist for the reporting of study information, experimental design and analytical methods within a scientific manuscript on human microbiome research. Here, in this Consensus Statement, we present the standards for technical reporting in environmental and host-associated microbiome studies (STREAMS) guidelines. The guidelines expand on STORMS and include 67 items to support the reporting and review of environmental (for example, terrestrial, aquatic, atmospheric and engineered), synthetic and non-human host-associated microbiome studies in a standardized and machine-actionable manner. Based on input from 248 researchers spanning 28 countries, we provide detailed guidance, including comparisons with STORMS, and case studies that demonstrate the usage of the STREAMS guidelines. STREAMS, like STORMS, will be a living community resource updated by the Consortium with consensus-building input of the broader community.

Microbiome research is inherently interdisciplinary, spanning hosts (humans, animals or plants) and environments and capturing impacts ranging from health and disease to ecosystem function, agriculture and food security^{1–4}. While human microbiome research has flourished due to heavy investment in research infrastructure and broad public recognition, resourcing for microbiome science outside human health has lagged⁵. Environmental microbiome research necessitates unique considerations, as it combines cross-disciplinary techniques, field sampling campaigns and insights from microbiology, data science, bioinformatics and ecology, among other areas. The data and metadata associated with microbiome studies continue to be difficult to capture and report, especially as the utilization of multi-omics methodologies has advanced, generating large, complex datasets⁶. Furthermore, ensuring data are deposited and available for reuse according to the Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable (FAIR) principles presents challenges for many researchers when navigating data repository

submissions and when working with incomplete metadata⁷. While there have been consistent calls from the community to promote more standardization across the entire microbiome research lifecycle, several barriers remain^{8–12}. Researchers, publishers, funders and data repositories must be brought together to establish consensus guidelines that address the unique complexities of environmental and synthetic microbiome data generation, analysis and sharing.

Community-driven efforts to develop best practices, reporting guidelines and standards have advanced how microbiome data are shared and reused. When the Genomic Standards Consortium developed the Minimum Information about any (x) Sequence (MIxS) standards for metadata management in 2011, it quickly became a foundation for standardized microbiome metadata capture^{13–15}. More recently, several genome-based community-driven efforts have advanced cross-study comparisons, including standards for viral and prokaryotic genomes^{16,17}. The Strengthening the Organization and Reporting of

✉ e-mail: jkelliher@lanl.gov; eaerloefadros@lbl.gov

Microbiome Studies (STORMS) checklist leverages the MIxS standards as well as the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) and Strengthening the Reporting of Genetic Association Studies (STREGA) guidelines to provide a framework for the reporting of human microbiome studies^{18–20}. The microbiome research community has already widely adopted the STORMS checklist. However, these guidelines apply only to human-associated microbiome studies, and there has been no equivalent generated for environmental microbiomes.

To address the current gaps in comprehensive guidelines for environmental (for example, terrestrial, aquatic, atmospheric or engineered), non-human host-associated (for example, animal- or plant-associated) and synthetic microbiome research, we present the Standards for Technical Reporting in Environmental and host-Associated Microbiome Studies (STREAMS) guidelines. These guidelines were constructed using the STORMS checklist as a framework and were iterated using extensive community feedback. The STREAMS guidelines and associated materials provide authors with clear, actionable recommendations for manuscript preparation and data sharing, while offering reviewers a structured framework for evaluating methodology and data quality. The STORMS checklist and its subsequent iterations will continue to support human-associated microbiome studies, whereas the STREAMS guidelines provide guidance to microbiomes not directly associated with human subjects. The STORMS and STREAMS guidelines will be collaboratively updated to maintain synergy. These guidelines were created to lower barriers to proper microbiome data management and reporting by providing a clear and structured framework. They are designed to foster greater standardization and promote FAIR data principles, ultimately maximizing the utility and impact of microbiome data for the broader scientific community.

Methodology

In June 2024, we convened the Microbiome Data Management in Action workshop in Atlanta, USA, which brought together 50 invited microbiome researchers, publishers, funders and data repository representatives to discuss the current state of microbiome data management and reporting²¹. More details regarding the workshop agenda, participants, panels, presentations and discussions are available in the Microbiome Data Management in Action workshop report²¹. A large focus of the workshop was adapting the human-associated microbiome STORMS checklist to make it applicable to these systems. A preliminary review of the STORMS guidelines revealed that many of its items would need to be revised based on differences in terminology, data access requirements, metadata standards and conventions within environmental microbiome research compared with human-associated studies. Several limitations with the STORMS checklist, such as the limited information about metabolomics and proteomics, varied interpretations of STORMS Item 6.0 related to causal inference, and the fact that several items may be outdated, were also presented by the STORMS lead author. Six breakout groups worked on the checklist, and the suggested changes were discussed and concatenated. This led to a first draft version of the STREAMS guidelines.

Obtaining community feedback was a priority for the STREAMS effort, and therefore, the first draft of the guidelines was circulated across the broader microbiome research community through targeted emails, social media posts, microbiome-relevant newsletters and the STREAMS website <https://streamsmicrobiome.org/>. A modified Delphi methodology was implemented, featuring multiple rounds of community feedback reviewed by a working group formed by attendees of the workshop. We designed and distributed a feedback form that included prompts about suggested changes, revisions and items to consider as ‘must-keep’ in the STREAMS draft, or respondents could comment directly in the Google Sheet with the STREAMS draft. From the first round of community feedback via direct comments and

responses to the feedback form, we obtained over 700 comments that were discussed and implemented, or were deemed to be infeasible (for example, the feedback was too prescriptive or did not align with existing reporting guidelines or standards). All comments from this first round were addressed by members of the STREAMS working group who continued to meet biweekly. Subsequently, an updated second draft of the STREAMS guidelines was then circulated, which received 400 additional comments, all of which were responded to and implemented into the consensus guidelines whenever possible and when agreed upon by the working group. A few examples of comments received during the rounds of feedback that were incorporated into the final guidelines include: “Software: would be good to specify actual parameters used rather than ‘default parameters’ as the defaults can change over time”; “Item 3: For agricultural studies, greenhouse studies sometimes serve as an in-between for field and laboratory studies. Greenhouse or semi-controlled spaces could be added as a category.”; “Similar to the STORMS checklist, having exemplary checklists for recent or past studies would be very helpful.”. There were very few instances of conflicting comments, and in those cases, the STREAMS working group and expert researchers in the microbiome research field were consulted to determine the optimal course of action. Overall, 248 researchers from 28 countries provided feedback, although we acknowledge the lack of representation from researchers in Africa and parts of Asia and South America. Together, this group spans a range of career stages, works with various sample and data types and represents varied facets of microbiome research.

Checklist

The STREAMS guidelines (Supplementary Table 1) consist of 67 items organized into six sections aligned with the architecture of a scientific manuscript, reflecting which section they pertain to (Fig. 1). The guidelines are also publicly available via Zenodo²², on the STREAMS website and as a machine-actionable data management plan (DMP) building tool within a free, publicly available web resource hosted by the California Digital Library called DMP Tool²³ (available under Templates, as ‘STREAMS Microbiome Guidelines DMP Tool template’). Each STREAMS item comprises eight elements: its number, name, the recommendation, where the item derived from (for example, if derived from another existing standard), additional guidance, example(s) and two manuscript-associated columns to be used by authors or reviewers for noting if the item is reported in the manuscript and, if so, in which section. The ‘Item Source’ column references STORMS, the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), MIxS, the Environment Ontology (ENVO), the Open Biomedical Ontologies Foundry, the Chemical Analysis Working Group of the Metabolomics Standards Initiative, STROBE or STREGA, or denotes if the item is considered new for STREAMS. While not all studies may capture every reporting detail, the intent of the STREAMS guidelines is to be broadly descriptive and inclusive of diverse use cases spanning environmental, synthetic and non-human host-associated microbiomes. STREAMS is intended to act as a reflective framework for assessing manuscripts, and the content, item order and organization are not designed to be strict requirements.

Abstract (1.0–1.5)

The Abstract section (Items 1.0–1.5) provides guidance on how to organize and report sufficient information in an abstract for environmental, non-human host-associated or synthetic microbiome studies. Abstracts are often replicated across platforms (for example, associated with the data in a data repository), magnifying their importance as independent summaries of key study elements. Overall guidance for the abstract organization is provided along with notes regarding graphical abstracts (Item 1.0). Items 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 1.5 encompass the study design, environments and samples, experiments or methodology (including specific information about omics methods utilized), the analyses performed and the overall results of the study and their




Fig. 1 | Overview of the STREAMS guidelines. a, The guidelines encompass microbiomes ranging from terrestrial and aquatic (environmental) to synthetic and non-human host-associated environments. **b**, The six key sections include (1) abstract, (2) introduction, (3) methods, (4) results, (5) discussion and (6) other information. Figure created with [BioRender.com](https://www.biorender.com).

importance. As noted throughout the guidelines, several items are applicable only to host-associated studies. The first such instance appears in Item 1.3, which requests a summary of host information.

Introduction (2.0–2.1)

The Introduction section (Items 2.0–2.1) parallels that of the original STORMS checklist. This section requests that authors describe the background and rationale for their study (Item 2.0) in the context of previous work that has been conducted in their specific field. The synthesis of previous publications and datasets in their area of research should highlight any knowledge gaps. Researcher hypotheses, objectives or research questions are also requested to be included in the Introduction (Item 2.1), which are encouraged to relate to the aforementioned knowledge gaps and broader importance of the reported study.

Methods (3.0–8.5)

Methods comprise a majority of the checklist, as outlined below.

Study and sample information (3.0–3.6). The ‘Study and sample information’ items (3.0–3.6) request detailed information on the study design, any associated host(s), any datasets that were reused for the study, and the samples that were analysed. This section is designed to capture sufficient contextual information about the study. The overall study design should be stated (Item 3.0) and should acknowledge if the study includes meta-analyses, combined analyses or involves datasets derived from previously published work. The sample type(s) as well as any associated sample metadata are requested in Item 3.1, which also necessitates the inclusion of specific information on how any relevant synthetic communities (SynComs) were generated, as well as accurate citation information on datasets that have been reused¹². The ‘Environmental context and geographic location’ item (Item 3.2) requires that the author states where the samples originated. This item generated considerable discussion within the STREAMS Consortium, as some researchers preferred requiring geographic coordinates, while

others noted that ethical and privacy considerations may prevent this. The consortium decided on strongly encouraging the inclusion of coordinates and requiring a justification if they cannot be provided. The MixS standards as well as ENVO are referenced in this item to standardize how the environmental context and the geographic location are reported²⁴. Item 3.3 requests any relevant dates, including when samples were collected, over what time period, the frequency of sampling and other temporal factors (for example, seasonality). Item 3.4 applies only to host-associated studies and is intended to capture as much detailed information about the host(s) as possible. Comprehensive, well-researched and detailed information on the ethics of the study design must be reported (Item 3.5). This item includes guidance on reporting permits, permissions and sampling ethics. The CARE principles for Indigenous data governance (Collective benefit, Authority to control, Responsibility and Ethics) are referenced here, and researchers are expected to adhere to these guidelines and ensure Indigenous data sovereignty whenever applicable²⁵. Item 3.6 refers to any treatments or conditions that the sampling environment(s) or host(s) were subjected to, and the relevant MixS references are included in the additional guidance for this item^{26–28}.

Sample collection (3.7–3.9). Authors should report detailed information regarding sample collection methods and metadata, including if previously published protocols were followed (Item 3.7). Specifics regarding the tools that were used, the host body site or environmental niche sampled, and potential sample destruction can be critical to a comprehensive understanding of the samples and the reproducibility of the methods and should also be provided. Information on sample eligibility and selection criteria should also be included (Item 3.8), which leads to reporting on the final analytic sample size (Item 3.9).

Experimental information (4.0–4.6). Information on sample storage, preservation, transportation and shipping should be included (Items 4.0 and 4.1). In terms of experimental steps, nucleic acid, protein and/

or metabolite extraction methods should be reported (Item 4.2), along with steps relating to experimental manipulations, sample processing and culturing (Item 4.3). Information on nucleic acid library preparation protocols was separated into another item to better align with submission requirements to data repositories such as the NCBI Sequence Read Archive²⁹ (Item 4.4). Methods for enriching or depleting samples should be discussed in depth (Item 4.5), including if amplification was used and, if so, the targeted region and primer sequences (Item 4.6). These items are of particular importance to microbiome samples, as each depletion or enrichment method could exclude signatures from some members of the microbial community and can have particular biases.

Controls and quality information (5.0–6.2). Feedback from the community suggested that the guidelines be extremely explicit for items referring to controls and replicates. Therefore, the ‘Control and quality information’ categories were split into several items (Items 5.0–6.2). Any positive (Item 5.0) and negative (Item 5.1) controls should include detailed descriptions, specifying what they were and at which stage they were implemented. Justification should be provided if no positive or negative controls were included. Information on quantity and quality assessments of samples, nucleic acids, proteins and metabolites should be included in Item 6.0, referencing any pre-existing protocols. Any laboratory-based strategies utilized to minimize and identify contamination can be specifically stated (Item 6.1) or discussed throughout the Methods at each step. Biological and technical replicates should be discussed (Item 6.2), and the additional guidance recommends that authors explain why certain replicates were included and how they were incorporated into bioinformatics and statistical analyses.

Omics data generation (6.3–6.6). Items 6.3–6.6 encompass omics data generation, specifically for sequencing (Item 6.3) and mass spectrometry (Item 6.4) applications³⁰. Specificity in the information provided in this section is paramount as these metadata can directly affect results and interpretations. Vendor and kit information as well as established protocols should be referenced whenever possible. For the sequencing information, synergy with specific NCBI Sequence Read Archive submission fields and requirements is noted to assist researchers. Item 6.5 requests information on other contextual or linked datasets and how these relate to the study and the omics data. While other omics or data types may not be fully encompassed by the guidelines, additional information would be required for analyses involving these datasets. Anticipated or potential batch effects (Item 6.6) should also be reported for the sampling and processing steps outlined in earlier Items as well as for the omics and data generation Items in this section (Items 6.3–6.5).

Data analysis (7.0–7.9). Feedback from the community indicated that a key challenge for microbiome data reuse has been a lack of transparency regarding specifics about bioinformatics tools, workflows, parameters and code in associated publications. Therefore, we split the bioinformatics, data analysis and statistical processing steps into ten detailed items. Information regarding all bioinformatics analyses and steps included in the study should be reported as noted in Item 7.0³¹. Standardization between workflow runs is encouraged, and all relevant processing metadata should be included so that any researcher can fully replicate all bioinformatics steps. Quality control information should be reported, including how low-quality data were filtered out and the performance of any negative or positive controls that were included (Item 7.1). Normalization processes can often differ between studies, and this information should be specifically reported (Item 7.2). Many STREAMS Consortium members appreciated the inclusion of database information in the STORMS guidelines but requested that this be expanded to its own item with more guidance. Item 7.3 captures database information for taxonomic classifications as well

as metabolite and protein identification. Database names, versions, dates of creation and access, digital object identifiers, citations and/or relevant links are requested. Information on the construction of custom databases should also be included.

The statistical methods used in the study should be exhaustively reported (Item 7.4) and should include details about how calculations were performed, any transformations that were performed and why particular statistical tests were chosen³². Item 7.5 is critical for research transparency relating to missing information. The potential for biases and confounding variables as well as methods utilized to minimize these effects are suggested to be included here in the Methods (Item 7.6), and can be expanded upon in the Discussion (Item 11.2) in the context of overall study limitations³³. If any subgroups were formed during analysis, Item 7.7 should detail how and why these subgroups were created. Information on any sensitivity analyses that were performed, in particular those that may impact results, should be reported in Item 7.8. Significance thresholds should be included as described in Item 7.9, and false discovery assessments are also recommended for reporting.

Access and reproducibility (8.0–8.5). Access to the metadata, host data, raw data, processed data, software and code are all critical for adhering to the FAIR principles and ensuring reproducibility and reusability of microbiome studies. The metadata standards that were followed (for example, MIxS) and how the metadata can be accessed should be reported as indicated in Item 8.0, and justification should be provided if not all metadata are made publicly available³⁴. If applicable, host information, data and metadata should also be directly linked in the publication, and details should be provided on how to link host data to the microbiome data (Item 8.1). All raw data (Item 8.2) and processed data (when applicable; Item 8.3) should also be made publicly available in robust long-term databases. Item 8.4 outlines recommended details to include when reporting on the software, tools, workflows and code used to perform assessments and analyses, which should all be made publicly available whenever possible³⁵. Item 8.5 closely matches the STORMS checklist to request information regarding the reproducibility of the methodologies and analyses used in the study³⁶.

Results (9.0–10.3)

While microbiome research results can be presented in a myriad of ways, Items 9.0–10.3 provide recommendations for proper manuscript reporting of common types of results. Results and information relating to the environment(s), host(s) and sample(s), including the variables of interest (as well as potential confounding variables to the results), are requested in Item 9.0. Results, specifically from sequencing analyses, are encapsulated in Item 10.0, and results from positive and negative controls should be referenced. Results from other omics analyses (for example, metabolomics and proteomics) should also be reported in the context of any standards that were used to identify metabolites and proteins (Item 10.1). Item 10.2 relates to the methods reported in Item 7.4 and includes guidelines for reporting on the results of statistical analyses performed on the data. Item 10.3 provides overall guidance for figures, tables and captions.

Discussion (11.0–13.0)

The Discussion section is meant to be minimally prescriptive, and we recognize that each journal, researcher and group have unique approaches to Discussion sections. The STREAMS guidelines request a summary of the key results and how they relate to the overall study objective(s) (Item 11.0). This can also include if any hypotheses have been rejected or supported. Item 11.1 describes how interpretations of results can be reported, and how the results fit into the broader context of the field and other existing datasets. It is noted that caution should be used when including certain terms and language, and that formal definitions may need to be included³⁷. The overall limitations of the study should be included, with an emphasis on areas of potential

Table 1 | STREAMS exemplars serve as practical examples of how to apply the guidelines for a broad range of environmental, synthetic and host-associated microbiome studies

Environment/host	Microbiome study	STREAMS exemplar
Agriculture/broiler chickens	Fonseca et al. ³⁸	Supplementary Table 2
Deep-sea corals	Kellogg and Pratte ³⁹	Supplementary Table 3
Freshwater lake	Berg et al. ⁴⁰	Supplementary Table 4
Deadwood	Tláškal et al. ⁴¹	Supplementary Table 5
Synthetic community	Novak et al. ⁴²	Supplementary Table 6
Wastewater	Becsei et al. ⁴³	Supplementary Table 7
Subsurface groundwater and extreme conditions	Chen et al. ⁴⁴	Supplementary Table 8
Soil	Fernandes et al. ⁴⁵	Supplementary Table 9

bias (Item 11.2). The generalizability of the study results should also be reported (Item 11.3); for example, authors should indicate how the results are expected to change—or remain the same—across different hosts or environments. Guidelines are also provided for the reporting of ongoing or future work (Item 12.0) and for overarching conclusions (Item 13.0).

Other information (14.0–18.0)

The ‘Other information’ section encompasses items that are typically required during journal submission. Journals may have different thresholds for awarding acknowledgements, but typically they are given to researchers who did not meet the criteria for authorship, or to other groups, facilities or institutions that provided assistance to the study (Item 14.0). As permitted by the publisher and authors’ affiliates, Indigenous land acknowledgements may also be reported here, along with other information described in Item 3.5. Item 14.1 provides guidance for how funding statements should be reported for each author. Any known or potentially perceived conflicts of interest must be reported to the journal following publisher guidance (Item 15.0). Proper management and reporting of supplementary information (Item 16.0) is often necessary to ensure FAIRness of the research, and this can often be overlooked by authors, reviewers and readers. Links to digital object identifiers and external supplementary information should be provided, and metadata, supplementary figures and data processing information should all be properly reported in this section. Similarly, information on how all the samples and data associated with the study can be accessed should be reported, along with information on how disparate datasets and information can be linked (Item 17.0). Finally, many journals now require the reporting of any machine learning or artificial intelligence (AI) methods that were utilized throughout the study (Item 18.0). We encourage authors to include this information in the Methods, as well as in the supplementary information section. Authors should describe the exact ways in which AI was used (for example, language translations, writing assistance and figure generation) and refer to journal-specific guidance for acceptable usage. We expect the guidance for this item to continuously evolve as AI usage becomes more prevalent, and as guidance and restrictions change.

Implementation

Throughout the process of creating STREAMS, it became clear that providing these guidelines during the manuscript writing process may be too late in the research process to ensure that the information and metadata noted in the STREAMS items are captured. Therefore, we constructed a STREAMS template through an existing DMP-building resource, the DMP Tool. While this template is not meant to be

used directly as a DMP, it can assist in the creation of information recommended in the STREAMS guidelines. Any researcher can access the ‘STREAMS Microbiome Guidelines’ DMP Tool template to help craft a machine-actionable template, automating the process of pulling institutional information and linking persistent identifiers, for work they plan to perform or have already conducted.

To ensure these guidelines are broadly comprehensible and user-friendly, we created an overall STREAMS User Guide document (Supplementary Note 1), as well as a tutorial video that is available on the STREAMS website (<https://streamsmicrobiome.org>). A simplified STREAMS document is also available on the website as a quick checklist for those already familiar with the comprehensive guidelines, or for those who prefer a less detailed version while still referencing the main STREAMS guidelines for context. A list of acronyms used in STREAMS, along with relevant links, is also available (Supplementary Note 2).

To demonstrate how the STREAMS guidelines can be applied, we selected eight publications spanning various environmental, synthetic and non-human host-associated microbiome studies (Table 1 and Supplementary Tables 2–9). Examples for each STREAMS item, where applicable, as well as their respective locations in the manuscripts were manually recorded on a STREAMS template. Each completed exemplar was internally reviewed for accuracy and made available here and on the STREAMS website.

Discussion

Reporting guidelines and checklists have demonstrated their efficacy across various disciplines, and the STORMS checklist continues to be adopted across human microbiome research and by funding agencies and publishers¹⁸. Using STORMS as the template for STREAMS leverages the successes seen with STORMS, while aiming to provide an effective checklist for necessary study, experimental design and analytical methods reporting for environmental, non-human host-associated and synthetic microbiomes. We also recognize the impact and utility of previously generated standards such as STROBE, STREGA, ENVO and MixS, which were implemented throughout the STREAMS guidelines whenever possible^{14,19,20,24}. A more detailed explanation of the Item Source column in STREAMS—including its connections to other standards and initiatives, as well as a comparison between STORMS and STREAMS—is also available (Supplementary Note 3).

While the items listed in the guidelines do not capture information relevant to every study, they are designed to be generalizable without being exhaustive. There are several noted limitations of these guidelines. There is the possibility of ‘checklist fatigue’ due to the length and amount of content captured in the STREAMS guidelines. The simplified version of STREAMS (<https://streamsmicrobiome.org>) was designed to help with this; however, we recognize that these guidelines may still appear overwhelming. The order of the items may also be perceived as a strict recommendation for manuscript ordering and flow, which could potentially hinder creativity and prevent non-traditional manuscript formatting. In addition, STREAMS may be interpreted by some as a set of strict requirements to assess compliance, rather than a reflective framework as it is intended. It can also be difficult to retroactively obtain the information or perform steps recommended by STREAMS. If researchers are not aware of these guidelines until the manuscript submission step, critical reporting information could be missed. We also recognize that the specific caveats associated with various research areas, environments, experiments or contexts may not be captured in sufficient detail by these guidelines.

Throughout the development of STREAMS, we prioritized community feedback to generate consensus. The inherent interdisciplinarity of microbiome research necessitates feedback from across the field, which in turn also supports adoption. We broadly circulated the draft guidelines with the intent to reach researchers around the world; however, we recognize that many research groups and countries are not represented in the Consortium—specifically researchers from Africa

and parts of Asia and South America—which currently limits the generalizability. We also emphasize that these guidelines are not meant to be prohibitive to those in less well-resourced areas. We will continue to involve the global microbiome research community in future iterations of the STREAMS guidelines and will continue to expand the STREAMS Consortium. Furthermore, the lead author of the STORMS checklist is a co-author here and a core member of the STREAMS Consortium, and we will continue to work synergistically with the STORMS team on iterations to both sets of guidelines. An ongoing feedback form (<https://forms.gle/WgEpBAEAnx3m9o5UA>) is publicly available on the STREAMS website for any researcher to provide their input. Updated versions are planned, with new versions being posted publicly on the STREAMS website and via Zenodo²².

We believe the STREAMS guidelines will be valuable for researchers writing manuscripts and can help to streamline the peer review process for both the authors and reviewers. The DMP Tool template guidance will also assist with proper writing, reviewing and reporting on aspects of DMPs for funding agencies and is a machine-actionable implementation of these guidelines. Future efforts include the development of a STREAMS large language model that could be used by researchers to quickly assess microbiome manuscripts. Together, the STREAMS guidelines and accompanying resources will advance the ways in which microbiome research is reported and reviewed, increasing the short- and long-term value of these studies.

Data availability

The guidelines are publicly available via Zenodo at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15014818> (ref. 22), on the STREAMS website (<https://streamsmicrobiome.org/>), and through the DMP Tool site (<https://dmptool.org>) as the ‘STREAMS Microbiome Guidelines’ template.

References

- Alivisatos, A. P. et al. A unified initiative to harness Earth's microbiomes. *Science* **350**, 507–508 (2015).
- Thompson, L. R. et al. A communal catalogue reveals Earth's multiscale microbial diversity. *Nature* **551**, 457–463 (2017).
- Martiny, J. B. H. et al. The emergence of microbiome centres. *Nat. Microbiol.* **5**, 2–3 (2020).
- Banerjee, S. & van der Heijden, M. G. A. Soil microbiomes and one health. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **21**, 6–20 (2023).
- Stulberg, E. et al. An assessment of US microbiome research. *Nat. Microbiol.* **1**, 15015 (2016).
- Jansson, J. K. & Baker, E. S. A multi-omic future for microbiome studies. *Nat. Microbiol.* **1**, 16049 (2016).
- Wilkinson, M. D. et al. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci. Data* **3**, 160018 (2016).
- Berg, G. et al. Microbiome definition re-visited: old concepts and new challenges. *Microbiome* **8**, 103 (2020).
- Hornung, B. V. H., Zwartink, R. D. & Kuijper, E. J. Issues and current standards of controls in microbiome research. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* **95**, fiz045 (2019).
- Cernava, T. et al. Metadata harmonization—Standards are the key for a better usage of omics data for integrative microbiome analysis. *Environ. Microbiome* **17**, 33 (2022).
- Huttenhower, C., Finn, R. D. & McHardy, A. C. Challenges and opportunities in sharing microbiome data and analyses. *Nat. Microbiol.* **8**, 1960–1970 (2023).
- Northern, T. R. et al. Community standards and future opportunities for synthetic communities in plant–microbiota research. *Nat. Microbiol.* **9**, 2774–2784 (2024).
- Field, D. et al. The Genomic Standards Consortium. *PLoS Biol.* **9**, e1001088 (2011).
- Yilmaz, P. et al. Minimum information about a marker gene sequence (MIMARKS) and minimum information about any (x) sequence (MIXS) specifications. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **29**, 415–420 (2011).
- Eloe-Fadrosh, E. A. et al. A practical approach to using the Genomic Standards Consortium MIXS reporting standard for comparative genomics and metagenomics. *Methods Mol. Biol. Clifton NJ* **2802**, 587–609 (2024).
- Parks, D. H. et al. A standardized bacterial taxonomy based on genome phylogeny substantially revises the tree of life. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **36**, 996–1004 (2018).
- Roux, S. et al. Minimum Information about an Uncultivated Virus Genome (MIUViG). *Nat. Biotechnol.* **37**, 29–37 (2019).
- Mirzayi, C. et al. Reporting guidelines for human microbiome research: the STORMS checklist. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 1885–1892 (2021).
- Elm, E. von et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet* **370**, 1453–1457 (2007).
- Little, J. et al. Strengthening the REporting of Genetic Association Studies (STREGA)—an extension of the STROBE statement. *Genet. Epidemiol.* **33**, 581–598 (2009).
- Kelliher, J. M. et al. Microbiome data management in action workshop: Atlanta, GA, USA, June 12–13, 2024. *Environ. Microbiome* **20**, 40 (2025).
- Kelliher, J. & Eloe-Fadrosh, E. STREAMS guidelines. *Zenodo* <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15014818> (2025).
- About. DMP Tool https://dmptool.org/about_us (2025).
- Buttigieg, P. L. et al. The Environment Ontology: contextualising biological and biomedical entities. *J. Biomed. Semant.* **4**, 43 (2013).
- Carroll, S. R. et al. The CARE principles for indigenous data governance. *Data Sci. J.* **19**, 43–43 (2020).
- Glass, E. M. et al. MIXS-BE: a MIXS extension defining a minimum information standard for sequence data from the built environment. *ISME J.* **8**, 1–3 (2014).
- Dundore-Arias, J. P. et al. Community-driven metadata standards for agricultural microbiome. *Res. Phytobiomes J.* **4**, 115–121 (2020).
- Simpson, A. et al. MISIP: a data standard for the reuse and reproducibility of any stable isotope probing-derived nucleic acid sequence and experiment. *GigaScience* **13**, giae071 (2024).
- Katz, K. et al. The Sequence Read Archive: a decade more of explosive growth. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **50**, D387–D390 (2022).
- Sumner, L. W. et al. Proposed minimum reporting standards for chemical analysis. *Metabolomics* **3**, 211–221 (2007).
- Schymanski, E. L. et al. Identifying small molecules via high resolution mass spectrometry: communicating confidence. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **48**, 2097–2098 (2014).
- Willis, A. D. & Clausen, D. S. Planning and describing a microbiome data analysis. *Nat. Microbiol.* **10**, 604–607 (2025).
- Vujkovic-Cvijin, I. et al. Host variables confound gut microbiota studies of human disease. *Nature* **587**, 448–454 (2020).
- Kukutai, T. & Black, A. CARE-ing for Indigenous nonhuman genomic data—rethinking our approach. *Science* **385**, eadr2493 (2024).
- Boettiger, C. An introduction to Docker for reproducible research. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.* **49**, 71–79 (2015).
- Schloss, P. D. Identifying and overcoming threats to reproducibility, replicability, robustness, and generalizability in microbiome research. *mBio* <https://doi.org/10.1128/mbio.00525-18> (2018).
- Joos, R. et al. Examining the healthy human microbiome concept. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **23**, 192–205 (2025).
- Fonseca, A. et al. Investigating antibiotic free feed additives for growth promotion in poultry: effects on performance and microbiota. *Poult. Sci.* **103**, 103604 (2024).
- Kellogg, C. A. & Pratte, Z. A. Unexpected diversity of *Endozoicomonas* in deep-sea corals. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **673**, 1–15 (2021).

40. Berg, M. et al. Host population diversity as a driver of viral infection cycle in wild populations of green sulfur bacteria with long standing virus–host interactions. *ISME J.* **15**, 1569–1584 (2021).
41. Tláskal, V. et al. Complementary roles of wood-inhabiting fungi and bacteria facilitate deadwood decomposition. *mSystems* <https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.01078-20> (2021).
42. Novak, V. et al. Multi-laboratory study establishes reproducible methods for plant-microbiome research in fabricated ecosystems. Preprint at *bioRxiv* <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.02.615924> (2024).
43. Becsei, A. et al. Time-series sewage metagenomics distinguishes seasonal, human-derived and environmental microbial communities potentially allowing source-attributed surveillance. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 7551 (2024).
44. Chen, M. et al. Molecular mechanisms and environmental adaptations of flagellar loss and biofilm growth of *Rhodanobacter* under environmental stress. *ISME J.* **18**, wræ151 (2024).
45. Fernandes, V. M. C. et al. Rainfall pulse regime drives biomass and community composition in biological soil crusts. *Ecology* **103**, e3744 (2022).

Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under award number 2422717. We thank the American Society for Microbiology for support during the Microbiome Data Management in Action workshop in June 2024, and especially A. Corby and N. Nguyen for their participation. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this presentation are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF, NOAA/OAR or the Department of Commerce. Any use of trade, firm or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the US Government. This material is based in part upon work supported by the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), a programme sponsored by the NSF and operated under cooperative agreement by Battelle. The work conducted by the National Microbiome Data Collaborative (<https://ror.org/05cwx3318>) is supported by the Genomic Science Program in the US Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Science and Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) under contract numbers DE-AC02-05CH11231 (LBNL), 89233218CNA000001 (LANL) and DE-AC05-76RL01830 (PNNL). This work was supported by the US Geological Survey Coastal and Marine Hazards and Resources Program. This work was supported (in part) by the National Center for Biotechnology Information of the National Library of Medicine (NLM), National Institutes of Health (NIH). The contributions of the NIH author(s) are considered Works of the United States Government. The findings and conclusions presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NIH or the US Department of Health and Human Services. G.B. was supported by a Science Focus Area Grant from the DOE, BER, Biological System Science Division (BSSD) under grant number LANLF59T and the Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center, DOE BER award number DE-SC0018409. J.P.D.A.

was supported by the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research New Innovator in Food and Agriculture Research award number FF-NIA20--0000000056. The work conducted by the US Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute (<https://ror.org/04xm1d337>), a DOE Office of Science User Facility, is supported by the Office of Science of the DOE operated under contract number DE-AC02-05CH11231. P.B. was supported by MEYS LUC23152. M.S. was supported by NSF award number ABI2149505. Work conducted at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory was supported under the auspices of the US DOE under award SCW1632 and contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. S. Record was supported by Hatch project award number [MEO-022425], from the US Department of Agriculture's National Institute of Food and Agriculture. V.R. was supported by NSF Biology Integration Institutes Program award number 2022070. T.N. and V.N. were supported by DOE BER through the Trial Ecosystem Advancement for Microbiome Science (TEAMS) and m-CAFEs Microbial Community Analysis and Functional Evaluation in Soils, a Science Focus Area led by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory under contract number DE-AC02-05CH11231. L.R.T. was supported by award NA21OAR4320190 to the Northern Gulf Institute from NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, US Department of Commerce (LA-UR-25-22860).

Author contributions

J.M.K. and E.A.E.-F. wrote the paper with input from all authors. All authors contributed to, read, and approved the final version of the paper.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Supplementary information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-025-02186-2>.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Julia M. Kelliher or Emiley A. Eloë-Fadrosch.

Peer review information *Nature Microbiology* thanks Chris Greening, Thulani Makhalanyane and the other, anonymous, reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2025

Julia M. Kelliher^{1,2,3}✉, Chloe Mirzayi⁴, Sarah R. Bordenstein^{5,6}, Aaron Oliver⁷, Christina A. Kellogg⁸, Eneida L. Hatcher⁹, Maureen Berg¹⁰, Petr Baldrian¹¹, Mashael Aljumaah^{12,13}, Cassandra Maria Luz Miller¹⁴, Christopher Mungall¹⁵, Vlastimil Novak¹⁵, Alexis Palucki¹⁶, Ethan Smith¹⁷, Nazifa Tabassum¹⁸, Gregory Bonito², J. Rodney Brister⁹, Patrick S. G. Chain³, Mingfei Chen¹⁵, Samuel Degregori¹⁹, Jose Pablo Dundore-Arias²⁰, Joanne B. Emerson²¹, Vanessa Moreira C. Fernandes²², Roberto Flores²³, Antonio Gonzalez¹⁹, Zoe A. Hansen²⁴, Scott A. Jackson²⁵, Ahmed M. Moustafa^{26,27,28}, Trent R. Northen¹⁵, Nonia Pariente^{29,30}, Jennifer Pett-Ridge^{31,32,33}, Sydne Record^{34,35}, Linta Reji³⁶, Anna-Louise Reysenbach³⁷, Virginia I. Rich^{38,39}, Lorna Richardson⁴⁰, Simon Roux¹⁵, Lynn M. Schriml⁴¹, Reed S. Shabman⁴², Maria A. Sierra⁴³, Matthew B. Sullivan^{38,39}, Punithavathi Sundaramurthy⁴⁴, Katherine M. Thibault⁴⁵, Luke R. Thompson^{46,47}, Scott Tighe⁴⁸, Ethell Vereen⁴⁹, STREAMS Consortium* & Emiley A. Eloë-Fadrosch¹⁵✉

¹New Mexico Consortium, Los Alamos, NM, USA. ²Department of Microbiology, Genetics, and Immunology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA. ³Bioscience Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, USA. ⁴Institute for Implementation Science in Public Health, CUNY Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, New York, NY, USA. ⁵Departments of Biology and Entomology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ⁶One Health Microbiome Center, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ⁷Center for Marine Biotechnology and Biomedicine, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA. ⁸US Geological Survey, St. Petersburg, FL, USA. ⁹National Center for Biotechnology Information, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA. ¹⁰DOE Joint Genome Institute, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA. ¹¹Laboratory of Environmental Microbiology, Institute of Microbiology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic. ¹²UNC Microbiome Core, Center for Gastrointestinal Biology and Disease, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA. ¹³Department of Botany and Microbiology, College of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. ¹⁴Department of Biology, University of New Mexico, Sevilleta LTER, Albuquerque, NM, USA. ¹⁵Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA. ¹⁶MCIBS, Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹⁷Department of Animal Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹⁸Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹⁹Department of Pediatrics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA. ²⁰Department of Biology and Chemistry, California State University, Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA, USA. ²¹University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA. ²²Department of Biological Sciences, Charles E. Schmidt College of Science, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL, USA. ²³National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA. ²⁴Department of Plant Pathology, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN, USA. ²⁵National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, USA. ²⁶Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA, USA. ²⁷Center for Microbial Medicine, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA, USA. ²⁸Department of Pediatrics, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA. ²⁹Public Library of Science, San Francisco, CA, USA. ³⁰Public Library of Science, Cambridge, UK. ³¹Physical and Life Sciences Directorate, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, USA. ³²Life and Environmental Sciences Department, University of California, Merced, Merced, CA, USA. ³³Innovative Genomics Institute, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA. ³⁴University of Maine, Orono, ME, USA. ³⁵Maine Agricultural and Forest Experiment Station, Orono, ME, USA. ³⁶University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA. ³⁷Center for Life in Extreme Environments, Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA. ³⁸Department of Microbiology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA. ³⁹The Ohio State University Center of Microbiome Science, Columbus, OH, USA. ⁴⁰EMBL-European Bioinformatics Institute, Hinxton, UK. ⁴¹Institute for Genome Sciences, University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA. ⁴²Office of Data Science and Emerging Technologies, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Bethesda, MD, USA. ⁴³Tri-Institutional Computational Biology, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA. ⁴⁴University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA. ⁴⁵National Ecological Observatory Network, Battelle, Boulder, CO, USA. ⁴⁶Northern Gulf Institute, Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS, USA. ⁴⁷Ocean Chemistry and Ecosystems Division, Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Miami, FL, USA. ⁴⁸University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA. ⁴⁹Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA, USA. *A list of authors and their affiliations appears at the end of the paper. ✉e-mail: jkelliher@lanl.gov; eaerloefadros@lbl.gov

STREAMS Consortium

Aaron Robinson³, Abdoul R. Sare⁵⁰, Abdulmalik A. Oladipupo⁵¹, Adrien Vigneron⁵², Ahmed A. Shibl^{53,54}, Alejandro De Santiago⁵⁵, Alexander J. Probst⁵⁶, Ali Navid³¹, Alice C. McHardy^{57,58}, Alicia Clum¹⁵, Alison Buchan⁵⁹, Alison Murray⁶⁰, Alla Lapidus⁶¹, Amanda Araujo Serrao de Andrade⁶², Andreas Bremges⁶³, Archana Anand⁶⁴, Ashvini Chauhan⁶⁵, Avishek Dutta⁶⁶, Bablu Kumar^{67,68}, Bela Hausmann^{69,70}, Benoit Chassaing⁷¹, Braden T. Tierney⁷², Brian P. Hedlund⁷³, Bridget Chalifour⁷⁴, Buck T. Hanson³, Carly Muletz Wolz^{75,226}, Cassandra L. Ettinger⁷⁶, Chongle Pan⁷⁷, Chris Robinson⁷⁸, Christian Hodar Quiroga⁷⁹, Christine Moissl-Eichinger⁸⁰, Christopher Hunter⁸¹, Christopher Schadt⁸², Christos Ouzounis⁸³, Craig W. Herbold⁸⁴, Cristal Zuniga⁸⁵, Cruz Mercedes Cecilia^{86,87}, Curtis Huttenhower⁸⁸, D. Lee Taylor⁸⁹, Daniel McDonald⁹⁰, Daniel D. Sprockett⁹¹, Daniel P. Schachtman⁹², Dennis J. Zhang⁹³, Dennis Metze⁹⁴, Devin Coleman-Derr⁹⁵, Dominik Merges⁹⁶, Donald M. Walker⁹⁷, Donovan H. Parks⁹⁸, Durgesh Kumar Jaiswal⁹⁹, E. Anders Kiledal¹⁰⁰, Edoardo Pasoli¹⁰¹, Eduardo Vinicius Kuhn¹⁰², Elisha Wood-Charlson¹⁵, Elliott Barnhart¹⁰³, Emanuele Chisari¹⁰⁴, Emilie J. Skoog¹⁰⁵, Emily B. Graham^{106,107}, Emily F. Wissel¹⁰⁸, Emily R. Davenport¹⁰⁹, Emily St. John³⁷, Eric Cavanna¹⁵, Erica Young¹¹⁰, Erika Ganda^{6,17}, Federico M. Lauro¹¹¹, Francesco Asnicar¹¹², Francisca E. Rodriguez³, Francisco Dini-Andreote^{113,114}, Frederik Artz^{2,115}, Frederik Bak¹¹⁶, Frederik Schulz¹⁰, Gabriela Canto-Encalada⁸⁵, Gareth Trubl³¹, Grace Pold¹¹⁷, Gregorio Iraola¹¹⁸, Hanareia Ehau-Taumaunu^{119,120}, Heather R. Skeen¹²¹, Hermes Hernan Bolivar-Torres¹²², Hinsby Cadillo-Quiroz¹²³, Holly M. Bik¹²⁴, Imelda Forteza¹²⁵, Ishi Keenum¹²⁶, Iyanu Oduwole¹²⁷, Jaci Saunders¹²⁸, Jack A. Gilbert¹²⁹, Jada Daniels¹³⁰, James R. Henriksen⁷², Janani Hariharan¹³¹, Jason A. Rothman⁷⁶, Jaime Puig^{132,133}, Jeffrey Kimbrel³¹, Jesús Mercado-Blanco¹³⁴, Jiarong Guo¹³⁵, Joao Carlos Setubal¹³⁶, Joel F. Swift¹³⁷, Johannes R. Krause¹³⁸, Jonathan L. Klassen¹²¹, Jordan E. Bisanz¹³⁹, Jorge L. Mazza Rodrigues¹⁴⁰, Jose L. Balcazar¹⁴¹, Josh D. Neufeld¹⁴², Brooke E. Sykes³, Joy Watts¹⁴³, Judson Van Wyk¹⁴⁴, Justine Debelius¹⁴⁵, Kaelan J. Prime³, Karthik Anantharaman¹⁴⁶, Karthik Raman¹⁴⁷, Katherine D. McMahon¹⁴⁸, Kelly Goodwin¹⁴⁹, Kent Pham¹⁵⁰, Keren Yanuka-Golub¹⁵¹, Kevin S. Myers¹⁵², Krista A. Ryon⁷², Kristen Peach¹⁵³, Kunal R. Jain¹⁵⁴, L. M. Ward¹⁵⁵, Leah Johnson³, Leandro Nascimento Lemos¹⁵⁶, Lee Ann McCue¹⁵⁷, Lennel A. Camuy-Vélez¹⁵⁸, Levi Waldron⁴, Lilian Caesar¹⁵⁹, Liping Zhao¹⁶⁰, Lisa Karstens^{161,162}, Lorena Rodriguez-Rubio¹⁶³, Maite Muniesa¹⁶³, Maneesh Dave¹⁶⁴, Marc W. Van Goethem¹⁶⁵, María Dolores Ramos Barbero¹⁶³, Maria Pachiadaki¹⁶⁶, Mariana Lozada¹⁶⁷, Marie Kroeger¹⁶⁸, Mark McCauley¹⁶⁹, Mark A. Miller¹⁵, Matthew Grisnik¹⁷⁰, Matthew Kellom¹⁰, Melissa A. Cregger¹⁷¹, Mia Howard¹⁷², Michael Poulsen¹⁷³, Michelle A. Allen¹⁷⁴, Mireia Valles-Colomer¹⁷⁵, Mitiku Mihiret Seyoum¹⁷⁶, Moamen M. Elmassry¹⁷⁷, Montana Smith¹⁰⁶, Mostafa S. Elshahed¹⁷⁸, Natascha Varona¹⁷⁹,

Neslihan Tas¹⁸⁰, Nicholas J. B. Brereton¹⁸¹, Nicola G. Kriefall¹⁸², Nicola Segata¹¹², Noha H. Youssef¹⁷⁸, Ozge Eyice¹⁸³, Paul D. Cotter¹⁸⁴, Peter J. Turnbaugh^{185,186}, Petra Pjevac^{69,94}, Phillip B. Pope¹⁸⁷, Pilar Junier¹⁸⁸, Pratyay Sengupta¹⁸⁹, Pubudu P. Handakumbura¹⁹⁰, Rebecca A. Reiss¹⁹¹, Reese Saho⁵⁹, Reid Longley^{192,193}, Renato Augusto Corrêa dos Santos^{194,195}, Rhiannon Mondav¹⁹⁶, Richard Allen White III¹⁹⁷, Rob Knight^{198,199,200,201}, Robert J. Gruninger²⁰², Roland C. Wilhelm²⁰³, Rosanna ‘Anolani Alegado²⁰⁴, Samantha N. Miller²⁰⁵, Sara L. Jackrel²⁰⁶, Sarahi L. Garcia²⁰⁷, Sarai S. Finks¹⁸⁴, Sean P. Jungbluth²⁰⁸, Sehyun Oh²⁰⁹, Sergio E. Baranzini²¹⁰, Sergio Sanchez-Carrillo²¹¹, Shane Roesemann¹⁵⁰, Sierra Moxon¹⁵, Sigmund Jensen²¹², Sneha Couvillion¹⁵⁷, Stephania L. Tsola²¹³, Stephanie A. Yarwood²¹⁴, Sunil Mundra²¹⁵, Susan H. Brawley²¹⁶, Suzanne Hodgkins³⁸, Sydney Chen^{2,217}, Tanja Woyke¹⁰, Theodore M. Nelson²¹⁸, Thomas Mock²¹⁹, Tyler Myers⁵⁹, W. Judson Hervey²²⁰, William Boulton²²¹, William Nelson¹⁰⁶, Winston E. Anthony¹⁰⁶, Xiao Jun A. Liu¹³⁰, Xuefeng Peng²²², Yaqi You²²³, Ying Zhang²²⁴, Yun Kit Yeoh²²⁵ & Zachary M. Burcham⁵⁹

⁵⁰Biological Laboratory, Defence Laboratories Department, Belgian Defence, Brussels, Belgium. ⁵¹Auburn University, School of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Aquatic Sciences, Auburn, AL, USA. ⁵²Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, INSA Lyon, CNRS, UMR5240 Microbiologie Adaptation et Pathogénie, Villeurbanne, France. ⁵³Biology Department, New York University Abu Dhabi, Abu Dhabi, UAE. ⁵⁴KAUST Beacon Development, King Abdullah University for Science and Technology, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. ⁵⁵Institute of Bioinformatics and Department of Marine Sciences, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA. ⁵⁶Department for Environmental Metagenomics, Research Center One Health Ruhr of the University Alliance Ruhr, Faculty of Chemistry, University of Duisburg-Essen, Essen, Germany. ⁵⁷Computational Biology of Infection Research, Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research, Braunschweig, Germany. ⁵⁸Braunschweig Integrated Centre of Systems Biology, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany. ⁵⁹Department of Microbiology, University of Tennessee Knoxville, Knoxville, TN, USA. ⁶⁰Division of Earth and Ecosystem Sciences, Desert Research Institute, Reno, NV, USA. ⁶¹Independent Consultant, Bioinformatics, Chicago, IL, USA. ⁶²Integrative Viromics Lab, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada. ⁶³Evonik Operations GmbH, Halle-Kuensebeck, Germany. ⁶⁴Department of Biology, College of Science and Engineering, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA, USA. ⁶⁵Microbiomics Laboratory, School of the Environment, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Tallahassee, FL, USA. ⁶⁶Department of Geology and Savannah River Ecology Laboratory, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA. ⁶⁷Department of Oncology and Hematology-Oncology, University of Milan, Milan, Italy. ⁶⁸Department of Biosciences, Biotechnologies and Environment, University of Bari, Bari, Italy. ⁶⁹Joint Microbiome Facility of the Medical University of Vienna and the University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁷⁰Division of Clinical Microbiology, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁷¹Microbiome-Host Interactions, Institut Pasteur, Université Paris Cité, INSERM U1306, Paris, France. ⁷²The Two Frontiers Project, Fort Collins, CO, USA. ⁷³School of Life Sciences, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV, USA. ⁷⁴Denver Museum of Nature and Science, Denver, CO, USA. ⁷⁵Smithsonian's National Zoo and Conservation Biology Institute, Washington DC, USA. ⁷⁶Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA, USA. ⁷⁷University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA. ⁷⁸Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA. ⁷⁹Genomic Bioinformatics and Biostatistics Laboratory, INTA, University of Chile, Macul, Chile. ⁸⁰D&R Institute of Hygiene, Microbiology and Environmental Medicine, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria. ⁸¹GigaDB, GigaScience Press, Hong Kong, Hong Kong. ⁸²Biosciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, USA. ⁸³Aristotle University of Thessalonica, Thessaloniki, Greece. ⁸⁴Te Kura Pūtaiao Kōiora, School of Biological Sciences, Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. ⁸⁵Department of Biology, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, USA. ⁸⁶INIQUI-UNSA-CONICET, Salta, Argentina. ⁸⁷Department of Biology, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, USA. ⁸⁸Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA. ⁸⁹Department of Biology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA. ⁹⁰Pediatrics Department, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA. ⁹¹Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC, USA. ⁹²Department of Agronomy and Horticulture and Center for Plant Science Innovation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, USA. ⁹³Section of Microbiology, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark. ⁹⁴Centre for Microbiology and Environmental Systems Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁹⁵PGEC, USDA-ARS and UCB, Albany, CA, USA. ⁹⁶Senckenberg Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre, Frankfurt am Main, Germany. ⁹⁷Department of Biology, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN, USA. ⁹⁸Australian Centre for Ecogenomics, School of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. ⁹⁹Department of Bioscience, Graphic Era (Deemed to Be University), Dehradun, India. ¹⁰⁰Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA. ¹⁰¹Department of Agricultural Sciences, University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy. ¹⁰²LAPSE—Electronics and Signal Processing Laboratory, Department of Electronics Engineering, Federal University of Technology – Paraná, Toledo, Brazil. ¹⁰³US Geological Survey, Helena, MT, USA. ¹⁰⁴Institution of Health Sciences, Department of Medical Biotechnology, Acibadem University, Istanbul, Turkey. ¹⁰⁵Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA. ¹⁰⁶Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA. ¹⁰⁷Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA. ¹⁰⁸Institute of Biomedical Sciences, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC. ¹⁰⁹Department of Biology, One Health Microbiome Center, Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹¹⁰Department of Biological Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA. ¹¹¹Luminis Water Technologies, Singapore, Singapore. ¹¹²Department CIBIO, University of Trento, Trento, Italy. ¹¹³Department of Plant Science, Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹¹⁴One Health Microbiome Center, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹¹⁵Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany. ¹¹⁶Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Frederiksberg, Denmark. ¹¹⁷Department of Soil and Environment, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden. ¹¹⁸Center for Integrative Biology, Universidad Mayor, Santiago de Chile, Chile. ¹¹⁹New Zealand Institute for Bioeconomy Science Limited, Auckland, New Zealand. ¹²⁰Bioprotection Aotearoa, Lincoln University, Lincoln, New Zealand. ¹²¹Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA. ¹²²Department of Environmental Microbiology, Institute for Sanitary Engineering, Water Quality and Solid Waste Management, University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany. ¹²³School of Life Sciences, and Biodesign Institute, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA. ¹²⁴Department of Marine Sciences and Institute of Bioinformatics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA. ¹²⁵The Australian National University, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia. ¹²⁶Department of Civil, Environmental and Geospatial Engineering, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA. ¹²⁷Genome Science and Technology, Bredeben Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA. ¹²⁸Department of Marine Sciences, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA. ¹²⁹Department of Pediatrics, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA. ¹³⁰Department of Biological Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA. ¹³¹Department of Biology, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA, USA. ¹³²Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Department of Medicine and Life Sciences, Barcelona, Spain. ¹³³Biomolecular

Sciences Program, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada. ¹³⁴Department of Soil and Plant Microbiology, Estación Experimental del Zaidin, CSIC, Granada, Spain. ¹³⁵Department of Microbiology, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA. ¹³⁶Institute of Chemistry, Department of Biochemistry, University of Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil. ¹³⁷Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA. ¹³⁸Institute of Environment, Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA. ¹³⁹Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, One Health Microbiome Center, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹⁴⁰Department of Land, Air, and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA. ¹⁴¹Catalan Institute for Water Research, Girona, Spain. ¹⁴²Department of Biology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. ¹⁴³School of the Environment and Life Sciences, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK. ¹⁴⁴Department of Plant, Soil and Microbial Sciences, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA. ¹⁴⁵Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA. ¹⁴⁶Department of Bacteriology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA. ¹⁴⁷Department of Data Science and AI, Wadhvani School of Data Science and AI, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India. ¹⁴⁸University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA. ¹⁴⁹National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, La Jolla, CA, USA. ¹⁵⁰Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA. ¹⁵¹The Institute of Applied Research, The Galilee Society, Shefa-Amr, Israel. ¹⁵²Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center and Wisconsin Energy Institute, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA. ¹⁵³Open Science Data Repository, Ames Research Center, Mountain View, CA, USA. ¹⁵⁴Department of Biosciences, Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar, India. ¹⁵⁵Department of Geosciences, Smith College, Northampton, MA, USA. ¹⁵⁶Illum School of Science, Brazilian Center for Research in Energy and Materials, Campinas, Brazil. ¹⁵⁷Biological Sciences Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Sequim, WA, USA. ¹⁵⁸Department of Microbiological Sciences, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, USA. ¹⁵⁹Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA. ¹⁶⁰Rutgers Center for Microbiome Analysis, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA. ¹⁶¹Division of Informatics, Clinical Epidemiology, and Translational Data Science, Department of Medicine, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR, USA. ¹⁶²Division of Oncological Sciences, Knight Cancer Institute, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR, USA. ¹⁶³Department of Genetics, Microbiology, and Statistics, Faculty of Biology, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain. ¹⁶⁴Department of Medicine, UC Davis School of Medicine, Sacramento, CA, USA. ¹⁶⁵Biological and Environmental Science and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia. ¹⁶⁶Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA, USA. ¹⁶⁷Environmental Microbiology Laboratory, Marine Organisms Biology Institute, Puerto Madryn, Argentina. ¹⁶⁸In-Pipe Technology, Wood Dale, IL, USA. ¹⁶⁹US Geological Survey, Wetland and Aquatic Research Center, Gainesville, FL, USA. ¹⁷⁰Department of Biology, Coastal Carolina University, Conway, SC, USA. ¹⁷¹Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Biosciences Division, Center for Bioenergy Innovation, Oak Ridge, TN, USA. ¹⁷²University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA. ¹⁷³Department of Biology, Section for Ecology and Evolution, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen East, Denmark. ¹⁷⁴The University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia. ¹⁷⁵Department MELIS, University Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain. ¹⁷⁶Department of Poultry Science, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA. ¹⁷⁷Department of Molecular Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA. ¹⁷⁸Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, USA. ¹⁷⁹Department of Biology, University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA. ¹⁸⁰Climate and Ecosystem Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA. ¹⁸¹School of Biology and Environmental Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland. ¹⁸²Pacific Biosciences Research Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA. ¹⁸³School of Biosciences, The University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK. ¹⁸⁴The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA. ¹⁸⁵Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA. ¹⁸⁶Chan Zuckerberg Biohub-San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA. ¹⁸⁷Centre for Microbiome Research, School of Biomedical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Translational Research Institute, Woolloongabba, Queensland, Australia. ¹⁸⁸University of Neuchâtel, Neuchâtel, Switzerland. ¹⁸⁹Department of Biotechnology, Bhupat and Jyoti Mehta School of Biosciences, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India. ¹⁹⁰Environmental Molecular Sciences Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA. ¹⁹¹New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, NM, USA. ¹⁹²Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, USA. ¹⁹³Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA. ¹⁹⁴Department of Crop and Soil Science, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA. ¹⁹⁵Laboratório de Biologia Computacional, Evolutiva e de Sistemas, Centro de Energia Nuclear na Agricultura, Universidade de São Paulo, Piracicaba, Brazil. ¹⁹⁶Centre for Environmental and Climate Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden. ¹⁹⁷Department of Bioinformatics and Genomics, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, USA. ¹⁹⁸Center for Microbiome Innovation, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA. ¹⁹⁹Department of Pediatrics, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA. ²⁰⁰Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA. ²⁰¹Department of Bioengineering, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA. ²⁰²Lethbridge Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada. ²⁰³Department of Agronomy, Lilly Hall of Life Science, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA. ²⁰⁴Department of Oceanography, University of Hawai'i Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA. ²⁰⁵Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA. ²⁰⁶Department of Ecology, Behavior and Evolution, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA. ²⁰⁷Institute for Chemistry and Biology of the Marine Environment, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg, Germany. ²⁰⁸Estuary and Ocean Science Center, San Francisco State University, Tiburon, CA, USA. ²⁰⁹Institute for Implementation Science in Population Health, City University of New York School of Public Health, New York, NY, USA. ²¹⁰Weill Institute for Neurosciences, Department of Neurology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA. ²¹¹School of Medicine, University of Galway, Galway, Ireland. ²¹²Department of Biological Sciences, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway. ²¹³School of Biological and Behavioural Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK. ²¹⁴Environmental Science and Technology Department, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA. ²¹⁵United Arab Emirates University, Al Ain, UAE. ²¹⁶School of Marine Sciences, University of Maine, Orono, ME, USA. ²¹⁷Department of Molecular Plant Sciences, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA. ²¹⁸Department of Physiology and Biophysics, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA. ²¹⁹School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, UK. ²²⁰Naval Research Laboratory, Washington DC, USA. ²²¹School of Computing Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, UK. ²²²School of Earth, Ocean and Environment, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA. ²²³Department of Environmental Resources Engineering, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Syracuse, NY, USA. ²²⁴University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, USA. ²²⁵Australian Institute of Marine Science, Cape Cleveland, Queensland, Australia. ²²⁶Present address: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, USA.