MINIREVIEW

What we can learn from sushi: a review on seaweed–bacterial associations

Joke Hollants[1,2], Frederik Leliaert[2], Olivier De Clerck[2] & Anne Willems[1]

[1]Laboratory of Microbiology, Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; and [2]Phycology Research Group, Department of Biology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

Correspondence: Joke Hollants, Ghent University, Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology (WE10), Laboratory of Microbiology, K.L. Ledeganckstraat 35, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium.
Tel.: +32 9 264 5140; fax: +32 9 264 5092; e-mail: joke.hollants@gmail.com

Received 6 April 2012; revised 27 June 2012; accepted 3 July 2012.
Final version published online 30 July 2012.

DOI: 10.1111/j.1574-6941.2012.01446.x

Editor: Lily Young

Keywords
bacteria; diversity; interaction; macroalgae; symbiosis.

Abstract

Many eukaryotes are closely associated with bacteria which enable them to expand their physiological capacities. Associations between algae (photosynthetic eukaryotes) and bacteria have been described for over a hundred years. A wide range of beneficial and detrimental interactions exists between macroalgae (seaweeds) and epi- and endosymbiotic bacteria that reside either on the surface or within the algal cells. While it has been shown that these chemically mediated interactions are based on the exchange of nutrients, minerals, and secondary metabolites, the diversity and specificity of macroalgal–bacterial relationships have not been thoroughly investigated. Some of these alliances have been found to be algal or bacterial species-specific, whereas others are widespread among different symbiotic partners. Reviewing 161 macroalgal–bacterial studies from the last 55 years, a definite bacterial core community, consisting of Gammaproteobacteria, CFB group, Alphaproteobacteria, Firmicutes, and Actinobacteria species, seems to exist which is specifically (functionally) adapted to an algal host–associated lifestyle. Because seaweed–bacterial associations are appealing from evolutionary and applied perspectives, future studies should integrate the aspects of diverse biological fields.

If there is one thing we can learn from sushi, it is that seaweed-associated bacteria can have unexpected beneficial effects. The carbohydrate active enzyme porphyranase from the marine Bacteroidetes bacterium *Zobellia galactanivorans* breaks down the sulphated polysaccharide porphyran from the red alga *Porphyra* (nori) traditionally used to prepare sushi. Moreover, the genes coding for this porphyranase have been horizontally transferred through dietary seaweed from *Z. galactanivorans* to the gut microbe Bacteroides plebeius from particularly Japanese people, allowing them to digest the algae that wrap sushi rolls and other delicacies (Hehemann *et al.*, 2010). This not only indicates that the human gut microbiota may become proficient at using dietary polysaccharides by horizontal gene transfer; it also highlights the significance of macroalgal–bacterial associations.

Like sushi, algae come in many forms and flavors ranging from microscopic unicells to gigantic kelps inhabiting oceans, freshwater habitats, soils, rocks, and even trees (van den Hoek *et al.*, 1995). Consequently, this review needed some delimitation and is restricted to the studies of bacteria associated with marine macroalgae (seaweed) belonging to the Chlorophyta (green algae), Rhodophyta (red algae), and Phaeophyceae (brown algae). Seaweed and bacteria have come a long way because algal plastids originated from endosymbiotic cyanobacteria (Margulis, 1998). Like their unicellular ancestors, marine macroalgae form the modern-day playground for a wide diversity of bacterial associations ranging from beneficial (mutualistic), harmful (parasitic), and neutral (commensal), over obligate and facultative, to endo- and ectophytic interactions (Relman, 2008). This, along with applied aspects of current algal–bacterial symbioses, makes their associations appealing for evolutionary, ecological, and biochemical studies. Nevertheless, investigations of macroalgal–bacterial associations lag behind these of other marine eukaryotes (Goecke *et al.*, 2010). Whereas the full cycle 16S rRNA approach (Olsen *et al.*, 1986) is well established to characterize the microbial associates of unicellular algae, corals, and sponges (Geng & Belas, 2010; Olson &

Kellogg, 2010), these molecular techniques are just beginning to be applied to macroalgae (Goecke *et al.*, 2010 and references therein).

From a kitchen secret to molecular microbiology: a historical overview

Foundations

The first report of a seaweed–bacterium alliance – although artificial – is one that altered bacteriology forever. In 1881, Walther Hesse, a German physician, joined Robert Koch's laboratory to study the bacteria responsible for his patients' illnesses. But, like his colleagues, Hesse encountered major technical problems attaining pure bacterial cultures on solid gelatin-based media. The gelatin often liquefied because of bacterial enzymes or because of the incubation temperature. When he vented his frustrations to his wife Fanny, she suggested using a seaweed extract, agar–agar, which she had used to thicken her jellies and puddings for years (Hesse & Gröschel, 1992). The practical application of this kitchen secret accelerated bacteriological research greatly, opening the way also for real-life macroalgal–bacterial studies. In fact, it was Walther Hesse himself who developed agar plate techniques to count bacteria in water samples. Techniques the ship's physician Bernard Fischer (1889) used to great success in the tropical waters of the Sargasso Sea during the Plankton Expedition of the Humboldt Foundation across the Atlantic Ocean (ZoBell, 1946). Throughout that trip, Fischer noted that the greatest abundance of culturable marine bacteria was associated with planktonic organisms and seaweeds. Hans Gazert (1906) who was in charge of the bacteriological investigations of the German South Polar Expedition made similar observations in the South Atlantic and Antarctic Ocean where some of the largest bacterial populations were found in the vicinity of seaweeds (ZoBell, 1946). Although these observations are mainly founded on a high influx of organic matter from the remains of dead seaweeds (ZoBell, 1946), also symbiotic (here defined as mutualistic) associations with living macroalgae might have contributed. Simultaneously with these initial notes of seaweed–bacterial alliances at sea, scientists in the laboratory deduced similar conclusions from their preliminary late 19th century macroalgal culture work. The German botanist Georg Klebs (1896) was aware of the presence of bacteria in his seaweed cultures and tried to set up pure, axenic cultures of filamentous and siphonous algae. While he was successful in growing the algae, he was not able to keep his cultures bacteria-free (Andersen, 2006). Even though Klebs was a former assistant of Anton de Bary who first introduced the term 'symbiosis' in biology, it was Johannes Reinke (1903) who was the first to suggest a true symbiotic marcoalgal–bacterial partnership. The occurrence of *Azotobacter* as an epiphyte on marine algae led him to propose that a symbiosis may exist in which the algae supply *Azotobacter* with carbohydrates and use the nitrogen fixed by the bacteria (Waksman *et al.*, 1933; ZoBell, 1946). Also Edgar Johnson Allen (1910), Director of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, and his collaborator E.W. Nelson recognized a symbiotic aspect in xenic marcoalgal cultures (Andersen, 2006). As they laid the foundations for seaweed culture, they noticed good growth of algae only when small quantities of natural seawater were added to the artificial culture media. Allen remarked that these effects may be caused by products of the metabolism of bacteria (Andersen, 2006).

First cultivation and microscopy studies

It took until after World War II for Luigi Provasoli and colleagues to establish the first bacteria-free cultures of the green foliaceous seaweed *Ulva* using newly discovered antibiotics (Andersen, 2006). Provasoli, however, observed that the typical foliose morphology of *Ulva lactuca* was lost in the absence of bacteria and – even more interesting – that the normal thallus morphology was restored when certain bacteria previously isolated from the algal surface were re-added to the culture medium (Provasoli, 1958; Provasoli & Pintner, 1980). In 1955, Harold and Stanier were the first to exhaustively describe the bacterium *Leucothrix mucor* that was found consistently as an algal epiphyte, showing macroalgae not only to interact with bacteria but also to represent a distinct source of new microbial taxa. With the introduction of electron microscopy to study the macroalgal ultrastructure in the 1970s, an intriguing new form of seaweed–bacterial interactions was discovered. In addition to epiphytic bacteria, various siphonous seaweeds such as *Bryopsis*, *Caulerpa*, *Chlorodesmis*, *Halimeda*, *Penicillus*, and *Udotea* were also shown to harbor intracellular bacteria within their cytoplasm and/or vacuolar systems (Burr & West, 1970; Burr & Evert, 1972; Turner & Friedmann, 1974; Colombo, 1978; Dawes & Lohr, 1978; Menzel, 1987). Simultaneously with these early microscopic observations, the first cultivation studies aiming to examine the total diversity of bacteria associated with macroalgae arose. Although the bacteria were initially identified only by morphological and biochemical tests, the epiphytic flora on seaweeds was clearly very diverse, covering numerous bacterial taxa (Berland *et al.*, 1969; Chan & McManus, 1969; Tsukidate, 1971; Laycock, 1974; Kong & Chan, 1979; Mazure & Field, 1980; Shiba & Taga, 1980; Lakshmanaperumalsamy & Purushothaman, 1982; Lemos *et al.*, 1985; Lewis *et al.*, 1985). Not only were these macroalgal-associated bacteria

distinct from the surrounding seawater communities, they also appeared host-specific with clear differences in occurrence among green, red, and brown seaweeds (Kong & Chan, 1979; Shiba & Taga, 1980; Lakshmanaperumalsamy & Purushothaman, 1982; Lewis *et al.*, 1985). A stable association between algal hosts and bacteria was observed (Kong & Chan, 1979; Shiba & Taga, 1980; Lewis *et al.*, 1985), even though the bacterial flora may vary between seasons and/or between different parts of the algal thallus (Chan & McManus, 1969; Laycock, 1974; Mazure & Field, 1980). From these and other studies in the 1970s and 1980s, Bolinches *et al.* (1988) concluded the existence of both positive and negative macroalgal–bacterial interactions based on the algal capacity to produce organic compounds and oxygen that are utilized by bacteria. In turn, bacteria produce morphogenic factors, fixed nitrogen, enzymes, and vitamins which promote algal growth (Head & Carpenter, 1975; Provasoli & Pintner, 1980; Rosenberg & Paerl, 1981; Lakshmanaperumalsamy & Purushothaman, 1982; Croft *et al.*, 2005, 2006). In addition, epiphytic bacteria as well as the seaweed hosts themselves produce antibiotic substances that prevent colonization of the algal surface by bacterial competitors and pathogens (Sieburth, 1968; Lemos *et al.*, 1985).

Emergence of molecular techniques

Although the number of macroalgal–bacterial studies has risen steadily during the last two decades, these have not significantly increased our understanding of macroalgal–bacterial interactions as postulated above. Thanks to the improvement of analysis techniques, both symbiotic partners can be characterized biochemically and phylogenetically in more detail. However, many questions remain (Goecke *et al.*, 2010). In the following sections, we review the current knowledge on the diversity and functional ecology of bacterial communities associated with green, red, and brown marine macroalgae.

Chemical interactions between seaweeds and bacteria

The relationship between macroalgae and bacteria in which seaweeds provide nutrients, while the bacterial community promotes algal growth and protects the host against pathogens, has been elaborated over the last 20 years. Figure 1 depicts the complex, chemically mediated interplay of beneficial and detrimental relations that exists between macroalgae and bacteria. The variety and nature of these chemical interactions have been exhaustively reviewed by Goecke *et al.* (2010) and are summarized in the remainder of this section.

Seaweed partner

From the algal host perspective, macroalgal–bacterial interactions are not unexpected. Seaweed surfaces provide a protected and nutrient-rich 'hot spot' for opportunistic bacteria that are abound wherever organic material is available (Armstrong *et al.*, 2001). In most cases, molecular investigations have confirmed the outcome of initial cultivation studies, that is, that the attraction of bacteria by seaweeds turns out to be highly specific. While the composition of the bacterial flora can change over seasons, life span and different thallus parts as a result of biotic and abiotic factors (Staufenberger *et al.*, 2008; Bengtsson *et al.*, 2010; Tujula *et al.*, 2010), marine macroalgae generally associate with specific bacterial communities that differ significantly from those occurring in the surrounding seawater (Longford *et al.*, 2007; Lachnit *et al.*, 2009). Recently, however, Burke *et al.* (2011b) found highly variable bacterial species compositions among local individuals of *Ulva australis* by means of in-depth 16S rRNA screening, suggesting each *U. australis* plant hosts a unique assemblage of bacterial species. Moreover, using a metagenomic approach, they subsequently showed that the bacterial community composition on *U. australis* is driven by functional genes rather than the taxonomic or phylogenetic composition of its species (Burke *et al.*, 2011a). This implies that functional groupings (or 'guilds') of – not necessarily phylogenetically related – bacterial species exist of which the composition on a single algal individual is determined stochastically by recruitment from within those guilds. Even if the specificity of a seaweed-associated bacterial community may be based on functional genes rather than species, it is known that the physiological and biochemical properties of the algal host predetermine the composition of the adhering bacterial communities. For example, algal cell wall components and secondary metabolites can trigger specific interactions between seaweeds and beneficial bacteria (reviewed in Engel *et al.*, 2002; Lachnit *et al.*, 2010). Algal bioactive compounds also have antimicrobial properties – with interesting biomedical and industrial applications – which protect the seaweed surface from bacterial pathogens, grazers, and biofouling, that is, the undesirable accumulation of micro- and macroorganisms as biofilms on the seaweed surface (Steinberg *et al.*, 1997; Engel *et al.*, 2002; Bhadury & Wright, 2004; Paul *et al.*, 2006; Lam *et al.*, 2008; Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 5). Besides these bioactive compounds, macroalgae control bacterial colonization by interfering with bacterial quorum sensing (QS) systems that regulate bacterial cell-to-cell communication (Kjelleberg *et al.*, 1997; Maximilien *et al.*, 1998; Steinberg & de Nys, 2002; Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 6). In addition to these induced defense mechanisms, seaweeds



Fig. 1. Overview of beneficial (green) and detrimental (red) interactions between macroalgae and bacteria.

also possess nonspecific defense responses against bacterial pathogens similar to the 'oxidative burst' process of higher plants (Weinberger, 2007; Potin, 2008).

Bacterial partner

Many bacteria growing on seaweed surfaces are able to enzymatically decompose algal cell walls, making them key players in biotransformation and nutrient recycling in the oceans (Michel *et al.*, 2006; Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 2). Also specific, beneficial bacterial–macroalgal interactions are based on the bacterial capacity to mineralize algal organic substrates and subsequently supply the seaweed host with carbon dioxide, minerals, vitamins, and growth factors (Armstrong *et al.*, 2001; Croft *et al.*, 2005, 2006; Dimitrieva *et al.*, 2006; Singh *et al.*, 2011b). Several studies also revealed that seaweed-associated bacteria are important sources of fixed nitrogen and detoxifying compounds (Chisholm *et al.*, 1996; Riquelme *et al.*, 1997; Goecke *et al.*, 2010 and references therein). Besides nutritional and growth-promoting effects, bacteria may shape the morphology and life cycle of their algal host. Bacterial effects on morphogenesis have been reported in foliaceous green macroalgae such as *Ulva* and *Monostroma* (Fries, 1975; Provasoli & Pintner, 1980; Tatewaki *et al.*, 1983; Nakanishi *et al.*, 1996; Matsuo *et al.*, 2003; Marshall *et al.*, 2006) and have been shown to be controlled by a highly potent differentiation inducer, thallusin, isolated from well-defined associated bacteria (Matsuo *et al.*, 2005; Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 4). Thallusin and other secondary metabolites, including signaling and QS molecules, also play a role in the host's life cycle completion as well as in algal spore release and germination (Joint *et al.*, 2002; Patel *et al.*, 2003; Matsuo *et al.*, 2005; Joint *et al.*, 2007; Weinberger *et al.*, 2007; Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 4; Wichard & Oertel, 2010). Furthermore, QS inhibitors and antimicrobial compounds produced by numerous epiphytic bacteria work in concert with seaweed-derived metabolites to protect the seaweed surface from pathogens, herbivores, and fouling organisms (Boyd *et al.*, 1999; Egan *et al.*, 2000; Zheng *et al.*, 2000; Armstrong *et al.*, 2001; Dobretsov & Qian, 2002; Rao *et al.*, 2007; Wiese *et al.*, 2009; Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 4). Pathogenic bacteria can cause severe degradation of algal host cells or even lead to seaweed mortality, causing major financial losses to seaweed mariculture every year (Correa *et al.*, 1993; Vairappan *et al.*, 2008; Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 4). Also biofouling forms a permanent threat to macroalgae as bacterial biofilms increase the hydrodynamic drag on their host and enhance the attachment of other fouling organisms and grazers. Biofilms may also compete for nutrients, inhibit gaseous exchange, or block light, essential for photosynthesis. Thus, both bacterial and algal secondary metabolites are essential chemical mediators in macroalgal–bacterial associations that jointly control the composition and density of bacterial biofilms thereby defending the seaweed surfaces against biofouling (Steinberg *et al.*, 1997; Goecke *et al.*, 2010 and references therein). In addition, bacterial bioactive compounds may represent a more promising – and easier to handle – source of natural products with biotechnological applications in comparison with seaweed-derived compounds (Burgess *et al.*, 1999; Zheng *et al.*, 2005; Penesyan *et al.*, 2009; Qian *et al.*, 2009).

Endophytic seaweed–bacterial relationships

Besides being epiphytic on algal surfaces, bacteria also live inside the thallus or cells. Seaweed grazers or epiphytic

bacteria capable of degrading algal cell walls can damage algal thalli and provide an entrance for pathogenic and opportunistic bacteria (Craigie *et al.*, 1992; Correa & McLachlan, 1994; Craigie & Correa, 1996; Wang *et al.*, 2008). These latter bacteria might become detrimental if they are able to enter the algal tissue and contribute to further disintegration of the host, finally leading to thallus rupture (Goecke *et al.*, 2010 and references therein). In addition to these pathogenic associations, also nondetrimental seaweed-associated endophytic bacteria are described. Bacteria are present inside algal galls (i.e. abnormal tissue growths of seaweeds) reported on more than 20 species of red and brown macroalgae (reviewed in Apt, 1988). In the red seaweed *Prionitis*, endophytic bacteria are responsible for gall formation by overproduction of the phytohormone indole-3-acetic acid (IAA), thereby creating a suitable microhabitat for their own proliferation (Ashen & Goff, 1998, 2000). Even though the benefits for the seaweed partner are not well understood, coevolution between *Prionitis* hosts and their gall-forming endobionts has been suggested (Ashen & Goff, 2000). Also in the red macroalga *Gracilaria dura* endophytic bacteria enhance the algal bud induction by the production of IAA and fixed nitrogen (Singh *et al.*, 2011b). In various siphonous (single celled, multinucleate) green seaweeds, endophytic bacteria have been reported over the past 40 years. Even though these endophytic bacteria have been associated with detoxification, nitrogen fixation, and photosynthetic functions (Chisholm *et al.*, 1996; Meusnier *et al.*, 2001; Delbridge *et al.*, 2004; Hollants *et al.*, 2011a, b), the true physiological nature of these endobiotic siphonous seaweed–bacterial symbioses remains unknown.

Bacterial diversity associated with seaweeds

Broad-spectrum seaweed–bacterial diversity studies identifying the total bacterial community are scarce. This is not surprising given that the number of seaweed-associated bacteria exceeds those in the surrounding seawater by 100–10 000 times (Chan & McManus, 1969). Total viable counts reach up to 10^7 bacterial cells per gram dry algal weight using the agar spread plate method, a number that even increases by two orders of magnitude when applying direct enumeration techniques (Chan & McManus, 1969; Mazure & Field, 1980; Largo *et al.*, 1997). Consequently, most macroalgal–bacterial studies focus on the identification and characterization of specific bacterial taxa, for example those with bioactive potential or pathogenic activity, rather than investigating the total bacterial diversity (Nakanishi *et al.*, 1996; Dobretsov & Qian, 2002; Wang *et al.*, 2008; Wiese *et al.*, 2009). Until recently, most of these investigations used traditional culture-based approaches, which are often considered insufficient because only 1% of all known bacteria are estimated to be culturable (Amann *et al.*, 1995). However, current molecular methods such as clone libraries, denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis, quantitative PCR, and fluorescent *in situ* hybridization also have their limitations for grasping the entire diversity of a microbial community, even in a single environmental sample, because they mainly reveal a snapshot in time of the dominant bacterial community members only (Philippot *et al.*, 2010).

In the following paragraphs, we review 161 studies from the last 55 years which dealt with bacteria associated with a total of 159 seaweed species (36 green, 72 red, and 51 brown marine macroalgae, see Supporting Information, Table S1). The bacterial diversity was compared between brown, green, and red seaweeds at all taxonomical levels. Wherever possible, the identity of the associated bacteria was linked to their ecological function.

Identity of bacteria associated with seaweeds: higher taxonomic ranks

Bacteria described from seaweed surfaces or within algal thalli belong to the (super)phyla Proteobacteria, Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes (CFB group), Cyanobacteria, Firmicutes, Planctomycetes, Verrucomicrobia, Chloroflexi, Deinococcus-Thermus, Fusobacteria, Tenericutes, and the candidate division OP11. In all studies reviewed, Gammaproteobacteria were the most common bacterial clade associated with seaweeds (37% relative abundance, that is, percentage of published records), followed by the CFB group (20%), Alphaproteobacteria (13%), Firmicutes (10%), and Actinobacteria (9%) (Fig. 2a). On a lower taxonomic level, the orders Flavobacteriales (14% relative abundance), Alteromonadales (12%), Vibrionales (10%), Pseudomonadales (9%), Bacillales (9%), Actinomycetales (8%), and Rhodobacterales (7%) were most abundant in seaweed-associated bacterial communities (Fig. 2b). Comparing the relative abundance of bacterial taxa on brown, green, and red macroalgae, bacterial representatives of the major phylogenetic groups mentioned above were isolated from all three seaweed groups (Fig. 3a). Despite this similarity, green macroalgae associated more with the CFB group, and Alphaproteobacteria compared to brown and red seaweeds. Brown and red macroalgae, on the other hand, harbored more Firmicutes, Actinobacteria, and Planctomycetes species, respectively. Figure 3b shows that the discrepancy between brown, green, and red seaweed-associated bacteria at the order level can mainly be attributed to the differences in the number of reports of Rhizobiales, Rhodobacterales, Alteromonadales, Vibrionales, Cythophagales, Flavobacteriales, Bacillales, and Actinomycetales species.



Fig. 2. Percentage of reports of bacterial classes or phyla (a) and number of reports of bacterial orders (b) associated with seaweeds.

Identity of bacteria associated with seaweeds: genus/species level

The similarities observed at high taxonomic ranks appear to decrease at lower ranks of both the host and bacterial partner. Even though a consistent bacterial core community at higher taxonomic levels (i.e. Alphaproteobacteria and Bacteroidetes) was observed on different *U. australis* and *Saccharina latissima* samples (Staufenberger *et al.*, 2008; Tujula *et al.*, 2010; Burke *et al.*, 2011b), closely related seaweeds do not necessarily harbor the same bacterial taxa (for example, different species in the genera *Fucus*, *Laminaria*, *Monostroma*, *Ulva*, *Gracilaria*, *Polysiphonia* and *Porphyra*, see Fig. S1 and Table S2). Likewise, only 33 bacterial genera including *Alteromonas*, *Bacillus*, *Flavobacterium*, *Pseudoalteromonas*, *Pseudomonas*, and *Vibrio* have, to a greater or lesser extent, been described from green, red, and brown seaweeds (Fig. 4). Genera like *Cytophaga*, *Planococcus* and *Tenacibaculum*, on the other hand, are regularly reported from green and red seaweeds, whereas they are virtually absent on brown macroalgal surfaces. Also specific bacterial species have rarely been isolated from different seaweed species, even within a single algal genus (see Table S2). Exceptions are outlined in Table 1 and include for example certain *Bacillus* and *Pseudoalteromonas* species that are present on or within a variety of brown, green, and red seaweeds. This table also illustrates that several of these bacterial species (*Cellulophaga fucicola*, *L. mucor*, *Pseudoalteromonas elyakovii*, *Tenacibaculum amylolyticum*, and *Zobellia galactanovorans*)



Fig. 3. Percentage of reports of bacterial classes (a) and number of reports of bacterial orders (b) associated with brown, green, and red seaweeds.

were newly described from their algal host, indicating marine macroalgae represent an important habitat for the discovery of novel bacterial diversity. To date, more than 50 new bacterial species initially isolated from seaweeds have been validly published (for an overview, see Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 1). In contrast to the similarities in bacterial communities at higher taxonomic levels, almost no individual species was consistently found on the surface of different *U. australis* and *S. latissima* samples (Staufenberger *et al.*, 2008; Burke *et al.*, 2011b). Consequently, there does not appear to be a consistent core community of macroalgal-associated bacterial species, suggesting that a large number of bacterial species are able to colonize seaweed surfaces. This variability at the species level appears to be an emerging feature of host-associated microbial communities in general (Burke *et al.*, 2011b). Endobiotic associations, on the other hand, seem to be more uniform at lower taxonomic ranks compared with epiphytic bacteria. For example, different *Prionitis* species host similar bacteria of the *Roseobacter* group inside their galls (Ashen & Goff, 2000). Also, the siphonous seaweeds *Caulerpa* and *Bryopsis* harbor one and the same *Herbaspirillum* and Flavobacteriaceae species, respectively (Meusnier *et al.*, 2001; Hollants *et al.*, 2011b; Hollants *et al.*, submitted). These host-specific endophytes were found to be present in different *Caulerpa* or *Bryopsis* species as well as in geographical diverse algal samples from the same host species.



Fig. 4. Number of reports of bacterial genera isolated from all three macroalgal groups.

Linking identity to function

Although the ecological relevance of most bacterial associates on or within macroalgae remains unclear, a number of beneficial and detrimental functions have been postulated for particular bacterial species. For example, Alpha- and Gammaproteobacteria, Cyanobacteria, Actinobacteria, and CFB group species have been identified as the causative agent of various macroalgal diseases (for an overview of macroalgal diseases caused by bacteria, see Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 3). The sushi-alga nori (*Porphyra*), for example, may be infected by species of *Flavobacterium* (Anaaki disease, Sunairi *et al.*, 1995), *Pseudomonas* (green spot rotting, Fujita *et al.*, 1972; Nakao *et al.*, 1972), and *Vibrio* (green spot rotting and white rot disease, Fujita *et al.*, 1972; Nakao *et al.*, 1972; Tsukidate, 1977, 1983). In addition, a wide variety of bacterial species isolated from seaweeds are capable of assimilating algal cell wall sugars. Besides key players in nutrient recycling processes, they are thus also potential pathogens as they can damage algal tissues and provide an entrance for opportunistic bacteria. These algal cell wall degrading bacteria mainly belong to the Alphaproteobacteria, Gammaproteobacteria, and the CFB group. Especially *Alteromonas*, *Flavobacterium*, *Pseudoalteromonas*, *Pseudomonas*, *Vibrio*, and *Zobellia* species possess sugar-degrading enzymes like agarases, carrageenases, and aliginases (for an overview of macroalgal cell wall–degrading bacteria, see reference Goecke *et al.*, 2010, table 2). Also antimicrobial, including anti-settlement and QS inhibiting, functions that protect the algal surface from pathogens, herbivores, and fouling organisms have been assigned to a broad range of seaweed-associated bacterial species. Not unexpectedly, nutrient-rich seaweed surfaces attract many opportunistic micro- and macroorganisms, thereby creating a highly competitive environment in which the production of defensive compounds can serve as a powerful tool for bacteria to outcompete other surface colonizers (Burgess *et al.*, 1999; Armstrong *et al.*, 2001; Penesyan *et al.*, 2009). As a result, the production of these antimicrobial compounds is not restricted to a certain bacterial group but appears to be widespread across alphaproteobacterial, betaproteobacterial, gammaproteobacterial, flavobacterial, actinobacterial, and bacilli clades (Fig. 5). In particular, *Micrococcus*, *Phaeobacter*, *Pseudoalteromonas*, *Shewanella*, *Vibrio*, and various *Bacillus* species are efficient producers of compounds with antimicrobial, antifouling, and QS inhibiting features, making them highly successful colonizers of seaweed surfaces (Kanagasabhapathy *et al.*, 2006; Goecke *et al.*, 2010). Besides these defense functions, bacteria also sustain the normal morphology and life cycle of their algal hosts. Morphogenesis and germination of

Table 1. Overview of bacterial species isolated from two or more host species/samples in independent macroalgal–bacterial studies

Bacterial species	Host (bacterial type/bacterial function)	References
Bacillus licheniformis	*Colpomenia sinuosa* (QSI), *Fucus serratus* (AB), *Palmaria palmate* (AM) and *Gracilaria dura* (EP/GF, NF)	Yan *et al.* (2002); Jamal *et al.* (2006); Kanagasabhapathy *et al.* (2009); Singh *et al.* (2011b)
Bacillus pumilus	*Ecklonia cava* (AM), *Sargassum fusiforme* (AM), *Porphyra yezoensis* (AM), *Lomentaria catenata* (AM), *Chondrus oncellatus* (AM), *Colpomenia sinuosa* (AM), *Gracilaria dura* (EP/GF, NF) and *Delisea pulchra* (AM)	Kanagasabhapathy *et al.* (2006, 2008, 2009); Penesyan *et al.* (2009); Singh *et al.* (2011c)
Cellulophaga fucicola	*Ulva australis* and *Fucus serratus* (SN)	Johansen *et al.* (1999); Rao *et al.* (2005, 2006, 2007)
Cobetia marina	*Antithamnion plumula*, *Cladophora rupestris*, *Ulva linza* (GF, MG), *Ulva compressa* (GF, MG) and *Ulva lactuca* (GF, MG)	Barbeyron & Berger (1989); Marshall *et al.* (2006)
Escherichia coli	*Monostroma undulatum* (FI), *Cladophora* mats (FI), *Kappaphycus alvarezii* (FI), *Laminaria religiosa* (FI) and *Ulva reticulate* (FI)	Vairappan & Suzuki (2000); Vairappan *et al.* (2001, 2008); Gallardo *et al.* (2004); Olapade *et al.* (2006)
Leucothrix mucor	*Ulva lactuca* (SN), *Clathromorphum* and *Sporolithon* sp.	Harold & Stanier (1955); Johnson *et al.* (1971); Bland & Brock (1973)
Phaeobacter gallaeciensis	*Ulva australis* (AF) and *Delisea pulchra* (AM)	Rao *et al.* (2005, 2006, 2007); Penesyan *et al.* (2009)
Pseudoalteromonas citrea	*Ulva* spp. (GF, MG)	Patel *et al.* (2003); Marshall *et al.* (2006)
Pseudoalteromonas elyakovii	'*Enteromorpha*' sp. (SZ) and *Laminaria japonica* (SN/D)	Sawabe *et al.* (1998, 2000); Patel *et al.* (2003)
Pseudoalteromonas gracilis	*Ulva australis* and *Gracilaria gracilis* (D)	Schroeder *et al.* (2003); Rao *et al.* (2005, 2006, 2007)
Pseudoalteromonas tunicata	*Ulva australis* (AF, AM) and *Ulva lactuca* (AF, AM, AS, SZ)	Egan *et al.* (2000); Rao *et al.* (2005, 2006, 2007); Penesyan *et al.* (2009)
Shewanella japonica	*Ulva australis* (AM)	Burmolle *et al.* (2006); Penesyan *et al.* (2009)
Tenacibaculum amylolyticum	*Ulva* sp. (GF, MG), *Monostroma* sp. (GF, MG) and *Avrainvillea riukiuensis* (SN)	Suzuki *et al.* (2001); Matsuo *et al.* (2003, 2005)
Vibrio tasmaniensis	*Laminaria japonica*, *Polysiphonia urceolata* and *Plocamium telfairiae* (AM)	Kanagasabhapathy *et al.* (2008); Wang *et al.* (2009)
Zobellia galactanovorans	*Ulva* sp. (GF, MG), *Monostroma* sp. (GF, MG), *Delesseria sanguine* (SN) and *Enteromorpha*' sp. (SZ)	Barbeyron *et al.* (2001); Matsuo *et al.* (2003, 2005); Patel *et al.* (2003)

Type: EP, endophyte; FI, fecal indicator bacteria; SN, new bacterial species (sp. nov.) originally described from the algal host.
Function: AB, antibacterial activity; AF, antifouling activity; AM, antimicrobial activity; AS, antisettlement of invertebrate larvae; D, disease; GF, growth-enhancing activity; MG, morphogenesis activity; NF, nitrogen fixation; SZ, settlement of zoospores; QSI, quorum sensing inhibitory activity.

foliaceous green macroalgae was linked to the production of thallusin by an epiphytic *Cytophaga* species isolated from *Monostroma* (Matsuo *et al.*, 2005). But also other bacterial species from the CFB group and members of the Alphaproteobacteria, Gammaproteobacteria, Actinomycetales, and Bacillales have been described as inducing morphogenic effects (Tatewaki *et al.*, 1983; Nakanishi *et al.*, 1996; Matsuo *et al.*, 2003; Marshall *et al.*, 2006; Singh *et al.*, 2011a). Likewise, *Cytophaga*, *Polaribacter*, *Pseudoalteromonas*, *Pseudomonas*, *Psychroserpens*, *Shewanella*, *Vibrio*, and *Zobellia* species have been shown to either stimulate or inhibit the zoospore settlement of *Ulva* seaweeds (Fig. 5) by the production of QS metabolites (Egan *et al.*, 2001; Patel *et al.*, 2003). Growth-promoting and nutritional effects, on the other hand, have been attributed to endophytic *Bacillus pumilus* and *Bacillus licheniformis* as well as to epiphytic *Exiguobacterium homiense*, *Pseudoalteromonas porphyrae*, *Azotobacter*, and various cyanobacterial species (Fig. 5) (Head & Carpenter, 1975; Rosenberg & Paerl, 1981; Dimitrieva *et al.*, 2006). These latter two bacterial taxa fix nitrogen and subsequently supply it to their *Codium* host. In other green siphonous seaweeds such as *Caulerpa* and *Bryopsis*, this nitrogen supply is provided by endosymbiotic bacteria from the order Rhizobiales (Chisholm *et al.*, 1996; Hollants *et al.*, submitted). Additionally, these macroalgae also host photosynthetic Alphaproteobacteria in their cytoplasm (Delbridge *et al.*, 2004; Hollants *et al.*, 2011b). These endosymbiotic associations may provide a physiological explanation for the successful – and sometimes invasive – spread of siphonous green algae in oligotrophic environments (Chisholm *et al.*, 1996).



Fig. 5. Potential host-beneficial functions associated with certain bacterial genera.

Beyond sushi: the applied aspects of seaweeds and the role of bacteria therein

As key and engineering species, seaweeds play critical roles in the structuring and biodiversity of marine communities (Burke *et al.*, 2011b). Besides these significant natural functions, marine macroalgae also possess a wealth of applied aspects. First of all, seaweeds are a substantial part of the daily diet in Asian countries and are included in a great variety of dishes such as sushi, salads, and soups. In the west, seaweeds are largely regarded as health food, but in the last decades, there is a renewed interest in the Americas and Europe in their use as sea vegetables (Moore *et al.*, 2002; MacArtain *et al.*, 2007; Gupta & Abu-Ghannam, 2011). In addition, algal cell wall polysaccharides such as alginate, agar, and carrageenan have commercial significance as food additives with preservative, prebiotic, and gelling properties (O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2010; Gupta & Abu-Ghannam, 2011). Because of this latter feature, seaweed sugars are also used in a variety of industrial and laboratory applications with agar-based solid culture media as one of the best examples (Hesse & Gröschel, 1992; Michel *et al.*, 2006). Furthermore, marine macroalgae are one of nature's most rich resources of biologically active compounds. They form an important source of iodine and produce various metabolites with antimicrobial and antimacrofouling activities. As a result, seaweed-derived compounds have mayor therapeutic applications and can be used in cosmetics or antifouling paints (Bhadury & Wright, 2004; Smit, 2004; Qian *et al.*, 2009). Besides this, macroalgae can be used as animal feed additives, fertilizers and biofilters (Neori *et al.*, 2004; Hernández *et al.*, 2005; Gardiner *et al.*, 2008; Khan *et al.*, 2009) and are a potential source of bioethanol (Borines *et al.*, 2011). For most of the applications mentioned above, the algae need to be farmed on a large scale. Seaweed mariculture is a huge industry in Asian countries as recent cultivation figures suggest a harvest of tens of millions of tons per year (http://www.seaweed.ie/). However, as this success gradually promotes monocultures, bacterial diseases have started to surface (Vairappan *et al.*, 2001). Surface-associated pathogenic bacteria cause substantial financial losses and are a major threat to the mariculture industry (Steinberg *et al.*, 1997). From this point of view, there is an extensive need to characterize seaweed-associated pathogenic and decomposing bacteria (Goecke *et al.*, 2010). On the other hand, also an increasing interest in beneficial macroalgal–bacterial associations exists as many bacterial epiphytes represent a rich source of toxins, signaling compounds, and secondary metabolites with an array of biological activities (Armstrong *et al.*, 2001; Penesyan *et al.*, 2009). Moreover, it has been proven that seaweed-associated bacteria are involved in metabolite production originally attributed to the host (Penesyan *et al.*, 2009). Because seaweed mariculture for chemical compound production is technically challenging, epiphytic bacteria may represent a more promising and manageable source of bioactive metabolites. Therefore, it is anticipated that increasing numbers of natural product research teams will turn their focus to seaweed-associated bacteria instead of their hosts (Qian *et al.*, 2009).

Conclusion

Seaweed–bacterial associations have been studied from the end of the 19th century onwards and were shown to be highly diverse, covering a wide range of beneficial and detrimental interactions between various macroalgal and bacterial partners. A rather complex – chemically mediated – interplay exists among seaweeds and bacteria based on the exchange of nutrients, minerals and secondary metabolites (Fig. 1). Notwithstanding this diversity, all studies conducted so far have shown that seaweed-associated bacterial communities are highly specific as they differ significantly from those occurring in the surrounding seawater. This specificity is predetermined by physiological and biochemical properties of both the seaweed and bacterial partner; however, the taxonomic level at which to address this specificity remains unknown. Lower levels

seem not the answer as similar bacterial taxa are present on different algal hosts, and on the other hand, samples from the same seaweed species harbor distinct bacterial communities. Hence, it has been proposed that functional genes, rather than species may be the appropriate perspective from which to understand these specificity patterns (Burke *et al.*, 2011a). Macroalgal-associated bacterial communities appear to contain a consistent functional profile with features related to an algal host-associated lifestyle. Most of these functions can be performed by phylogenetically distinct bacterial taxa (Fig. 5). Nevertheless, a definite bacterial core community at higher taxonomic levels, mainly consisting of Gammaproteobacteria, CFB group, Alphaproteobacteria, Firmicutes, and Actinobacteria species, seems to exist which is specifically (functionally) adapted to life on brown, green, and/or red seaweed surfaces (Fig. 2). These three macroalgal groups, however, show some quantitative, rather than qualitative, differences as they harbor the same higher bacterial taxa at dissimilar (relative) abundances (Fig. 3). While such an ecological coherence at high bacterial taxonomic ranks has also been observed in other aquatic systems, intra- and intercellular bacterial communities generally show more specificity at lower taxonomic levels (Philippot *et al.*, 2010). Likewise, endobiotic macroalgal–bacterial relationships seem to be highly species specific.

As both epi- and endobiotic seaweed–bacterial associations are appealing from evolutionary, ecological, and applied perspectives, studies should be scaled up. Sequenced-based metagenomic analyses in combination with high-throughput next-generation sequencing technologies would be required to examine the macroalgal-associated bacterial diversity in a more effective way. Advances in molecular techniques have, however, revealed that obtaining an accurate picture of the composition of symbiotic bacterial communities presents an unusually difficult challenge (McFall-Ngai, 2008). Therefore, summarizing the immense bacterial diversity at the species level by integrating it into higher levels of organization (both phylogenetic and functional) would provide a framework to study (epiphytic) macroalgal-associated bacterial communities in a more practical way (Philippot *et al.*, 2010). Besides looking at 'who is (in) there', also the question 'what are they doing there?' should be tackled more profoundly in future research. Whole-genome sequencing and functional metagenomics could reveal insights into the role of bacteria associated with seaweed hosts. Sequence-based analyses of complete genome sequences may shed light on the metabolic potential of the bacterial epi- and endophytes (Medina & Sachs, 2010; Shi *et al.*, 2010; Hongoh, 2011), and functional screening of metagenome libraries may identify new genes and/or novel natural products of bacterial origin (Zaneveld *et al.*, 2008; Brady *et al.*, 2009). To fully elucidate symbiosis systems, however, it will be necessary to go beyond bacterial genome studies alone by integrating data at all levels (genes, transcripts, and proteins) from all symbiosis partners, including the seaweed host, as well as information on the interaction of these molecules at a systems biology level (Medina & Sachs, 2010; Knief *et al.*, 2011). Despite the potential of 'omics' technologies and high-throughput screening methods in generating data, the extraction of useful biological information from these data sets remains a significant (computational) challenge (Shi *et al.*, 2010). It has been suggested that the true 'omics' power will be realized when these technologies are integrated with 'classical' approaches that examine gene expression or functional activity *in vivo* (Riesenfeld *et al.*, 2004). Nevertheless, macroalgal–bacterial studies will always remain a difficult balancing act between examining the seaweed and bacterial partner on their own or studying them as a whole (i.e. as a holobiont). Either way, there is a strong need to integrate the aspects of different biological disciplines such as microbiology, phycology, ecology, and chemistry in future macroalgal–bacterial studies.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by Research Foundation – Flanders project G.0045.08. The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

References

Amann RI, Ludwig W & Schleifer KH (1995) Phylogenetic identification and *in situ* detection of individual microbial cells without cultivation. *Microbiol Rev* **59**: 143–169.

Andersen RA (2006) *Algal Culturing Techniques*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

Apt KE (1988) Galls and tumor-like growths on marine macroalgae. *Dis Aquat Org* **4**: 211–217.

Armstrong E, Yan L, Boyd KG, Wright PC & Burgess JG (2001) The symbiotic role of marine microbes on living surfaces. *Hydrobiologia* **461**: 37–40.

Ashen JB & Goff LJ (1998) Galls on the marine red alga *Prionitis lanceolata* (Halymeniaceae): specific induction and subsequent development of an algal-bacterial symbiosis. *Am J Bot* **85**: 1710–1721.

Ashen JB & Goff LJ (2000) Molecular and ecological evidence for species specificity and coevolution in a group of marine algal-bacterial symbioses. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **66**: 3024–3030.

Barbeyron T & Berger Y (1989) Commensal bacteria living with two multicellular algae: *Antithamnion plumula* (Ellis) Thuret and *Cladophora rupestris* (L.) Kuetzing (Linne),

Kuetzing: phenotypic characterization. *Cah Biol Mar* **30**: 361–374.

Barbeyron T, L'Haridon S, Corre E, Kloareg B & Potin P (2001) *Zobellia galactanovorans* gen. nov., sp. nov., a marine species of Flavobacteriaceae isolated from a red alga, and classification of [*Cytophaga*] *uliginosa* (ZoBell and Upham 1944) Reichenbach 1989 as *Zobellia uliginosa* gen. nov., comb. nov. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **51**: 985–997.

Bengtsson MM, Sjotun K & Ovreas L (2010) Seasonal dynamics of bacterial biofilms on the kelp *Laminaria hyperborea*. *Aquat Microb Ecol* **60**: 71–83.

Berland BR, Bianchi MG & Maestrini SY (1969) Etude des bactéries associées aux algues marines en culture. I. Détermination préliminaire des espèces. *Mar Biol* **2**: 350–355.

Bhadury P & Wright PC (2004) Exploitation of marine algae: biogenic compounds for potential antifouling applications. *Planta* **219**: 561–578.

Bland JA & Brock TD (1973) The marine bacterium *Leucothrix mucor* as an algal epiphyte. *Mar Biol* **23**: 283–292.

Bolinches J, Lemos ML & Barja JL (1988) Population dynamics of heterotrophic bacterial communities associated with *Fucus vesiculosus* and *Ulva rigida* in an estuary. *Microb Ecol* **15**: 345–357.

Borines MG, McHenry MP & de Leon RL (2011) Integrated macroalgae production for sustainable bioethanol, aquaculture and agriculture in Pacific island nations. *Biofuels, Bioprod Biorefin* **5**: 599–608.

Boyd KG, Mearns-Spragg A & Burgess JG (1999) Screening of marine bacteria for the production of microbial repellents using a spectrophotometric chemotaxis assay. *Mar Biotechnol* **1**: 359–363.

Brady SF, Simmons L, Kim JH & Schmidt EW (2009) Metagenomic approaches to natural products from free-living and symbiotic organisms. *Nat Prod Rep* **26**: 1488–1503.

Burgess JG, Jordan EM, Bregu M, Mearns-Spragg A & Boyd KG (1999) Microbial antagonism: a neglected avenue of natural products research. *J Biotechnol* **70**: 27–32.

Burke C, Steinberg P, Rusch D, Kjelleberg S & Thomas T (2011a) Bacterial community assembly based on functional genes rather than species. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **108**: 14288–14293.

Burke C, Thomas T, Lewis M, Steinberg P & Kjelleberg S (2011b) Composition, uniqueness and variability of the epiphytic bacterial community of the green alga *Ulva australis*. *ISME J* **5**: 590–600.

Burmolle M, Webb JS, Rao D, Hansen LH, Sorensen SJ & Kjelleberg S (2006) Enhanced biofilm formation and increased resistance to antimicrobial agents and bacterial invasion are caused by synergistic interactions in multispecies biofilms. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **72**: 3916–3923.

Burr FA & Evert RF (1972) Cytochemical study of wound-healing protein in *Bryopsis hypnoides*. *Cytobios* **6**: 199–215.

Burr FA & West JA (1970) Light and electron microscope observations on the vegetative and reproductive structures of *Bryopsis hypnoides*. *Phycologia* **9**: 17–37.

Chan ECS & McManus EA (1969) Distribution, characterization, and nutrition of marine microorganisms from the algae *Polysiphonia lanosa* and *Ascophyllum nodosum*. *Can J Microbiol* **15**: 409–420.

Chisholm JRM, Dauga C, Ageron E, Grimont PAD & Jaubert JM (1996) 'Roots' in mixotrophic algae. *Nature* **381**: 382.

Colombo PM (1978) Occurrence of endophytic bacteria in siphonous algae. *Phycologia* **17**: 148–151.

Correa JA & McLachlan JL (1994) Endophytic algae of *Chondrus crispus* (Rhodophyta). V. Fine structure of the infection by *Acrochaete operculata* (Chlorophyta). *Eur J Phycol* **29**: 33–47.

Correa JA, Flores V & Sánchez P (1993) Deformative disease in *Iridaea laminarioides* (Rhodophyta): gall development associated with an endophytic cyanobacterium. *J Phycol* **29**: 853–860.

Craigie JS & Correa JA (1996) Etiology of infectious diseases in cultivated *Chondrus crispus* (Gigartinales, Rhodophyta). *Hydrobiologia* **326–327**: 97–104.

Craigie JS, Correa JA & Gordon ME (1992) Cuticles from *Chondrus crispus* (Rhodophyta). *J Phycol* **28**: 777–786.

Croft MT, Lawrence AD, Raux-Deery E, Warren MJ & Smith AG (2005) Algae acquire vitamin B12 through a symbiotic relationship with bacteria. *Nature* **438**: 90–93.

Croft MT, Warren MJ & Smith AG (2006) Algae need their vitamins. *Eukaryot Cell* **5**: 1175–1183.

Dawes CJ & Lohr CA (1978) Cytoplasmic organization and endosymbiotic bacteria in the growing points of *Caulerpa prolifera*. *Rev Algol* **13**: 309–314.

Delbridge L, Coulburn J, Fagerberg W & Tisa LS (2004) Community profiles of bacterial endosymbionts in four species of *Caulerpa*. *Symbiosis* **37**: 335–344.

Dimitrieva GY, Crawford RL & Yüksel GÜ (2006) The nature of plant growth-promoting effects of a pseudoalteromonad associated with the marine algae *Laminaria japonica* and linked to catalase excretion. *J Appl Microbiol* **100**: 1159–1169.

Dobretsov SV & Qian P-Y (2002) Effect of bacteria associated with the green alga *Ulva reticulata* on marine micro- and macrofouling. *Biofouling* **18**: 217–228.

Egan S, Thomas T, Holmstrom C & Kjelleberg S (2000) Phylogenetic relationship and antifouling activity of bacterial epiphytes from the marine alga *Ulva lactuca*. *Environ Microbiol* **2**: 343–347.

Egan S, James S, Holmström C & Kjelleberg S (2001) Inhibition of algal spore germination by the marine bacterium *Pseudoalteromonas tunicata*. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **35**: 67–73.

Engel S, Jensen PR & Fenical W (2002) Chemical ecology of marine microbial defense. *J Chem Ecol* **28**: 1971–1985.

Fries L (1975) Some observations on the morphology of *Enteromorpha linza* (L.) J. Ag. and *Enteromorpha compressa* (L.) Grev. in axenic culture. *Bot Mar* **18**: 251–253.

Fujita Y, Matsubar T, Zenitani B & Nakao Y (1972) Bacteriological studies on diseases of cultured laver. II. Bacteria associated with diseased laver. *Bull Jpn Soc Sci Fish* **38**: 565–569.

Gallardo AA, Risso S, Fajardo MA & Estevao Belchior S (2004) Characterization of microbial population present in the edible seaweed, *Monostroma undulatum*, Wittrock. *Arch Latinoam Nutr* **54**: 337–345.

Gardiner GE, Campbell AJ, O'Doherty JV, Pierce E, Lynch PB, Leonard FC, Stanton C, Ross RP & Lawlor PG (2008) Effect of *Ascophyllum nodosum* extract on growth performance, digestibility, carcass characteristics and selected intestinal microflora populations of grower-finisher pigs. *Anim Feed Sci Tech* **141**: 259–273.

Geng H & Belas R (2010) Molecular mechanisms underlying *Roseobacter*–phytoplankton symbioses. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* **21**: 332–338.

Goecke F, Labes A, Wiese J & Imhoff JF (2010) Chemical interactions between marine macroalgae and bacteria. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* **409**: 267–299.

Gupta S & Abu-Ghannam N (2011) Bioactive potential and possible health effects of edible brown seaweeds. *Trends Food Sci Technol* **22**: 315–326.

Harold R & Stanier RY (1955) The genera *Leucothrix* and *Thiothrix*. *Bacteriol Rev* **19**: 49–58.

Head WD & Carpenter EJ (1975) Nitrogen fixation associated with the marine macroalga *Codium fragile*. *Limnol Oceanogr* **20**: 815–823.

Hehemann J-H, Correc G, Barbeyron T, Helbert W, Czjzek M & Michel G (2010) Transfer of carbohydrate-active enzymes from marine bacteria to Japanese gut microbiota. *Nature* **464**: 908–912.

Hernández I, Fernández-Engo M, Pérez-Lloréns J & Vergara J (2005) Integrated outdoor culture of two estuarine macroalgae as biofilters for dissolved nutrients from *Sparus auratus* waste waters. *J Appl Phycol* **17**: 557–567.

Hesse W & Gröschel DHM (1992) Walther and Angelina Hesse – early contributors to bacteriology. *ASM News* **58**: 425–428.

Hollants J, Decleyre H, Leliaert F, De Clerck O & Willems A (2011a) Life without a cell membrane: challenging the specificity of bacterial endophytes within *Bryopsis* (Bryopsidales, Chlorophyta). *BMC Microbiol* **11**: e255.

Hollants J, Leroux O, Leliaert F, Decleyre H, De Clerck O & Willems A (2011b) Who is in there? Exploration of endophytic bacteria within the siphonous green seaweed *Bryopsis* (Bryopsidales, Chlorophyta). *PLoS ONE* **6**: e26458.

Hongoh Y (2011) Toward the functional analysis of uncultivable, symbiotic microorganisms in the termite gut. *Cell Mol Life Sci* **68**: 1311–1325.

Jamal M, Morris P, Hansen R, Jamieson D, Burgess J & Austin B (2006) Recovery and characterization of a 30.7-kDa protein from *Bacillus licheniformis* associated with inhibitory activity against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, vancomycin-resistant Enterococci, and *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Mar Biotechnol* **8**: 587–592.

Johansen JE, Nielsen P & Sjøholm C (1999) Description of *Cellulophaga baltica* gen. nov., sp. nov. and *Cellulophaga fucicola* gen. nov., sp. nov. and reclassification of [*Cytophaga*] *lytica* to *Cellulophaga lytica* gen. nov., comb. nov. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **49**: 1231–1240.

Johnson PW, Sieburth JM, Sastry A, Arnold CR & Doty MS (1971) *Leucothrix mucor* infestation of benthic crustacea, fish eggs, and tropical algae. *Limnol Oceanogr* **16**: 962–969.

Joint I, Tait K, Callow ME, Callow JA, Milton D, Williams P & Camara M (2002) Cell-to-cell communication across the prokaryote-eukaryote boundary. *Science* **298**: 1207.

Joint I, Tait K & Wheeler G (2007) Cross-kingdom signalling: exploitation of bacterial quorum sensing molecules by the green seaweed *Ulva*. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **362**: 1223–1233.

Kanagasabhapathy M, Sasaki H, Haldar S, Yamasaki S & Nagata S (2006) Antibacterial activities of marine epibiotic bacteria isolated from brown algae of Japan. *Ann Microbiol* **56**: 167–173.

Kanagasabhapathy M, Sasaki H & Nagata S (2008) Phylogenetic identification of epibiotic bacteria possessing antimicrobial activities isolated from red algal species of Japan. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* **24**: 2315–2321.

Kanagasabhapathy M, Yamazaki G, Ishida A, Sasaki H & Nagata S (2009) Presence of quorum-sensing inhibitor-like compounds from bacteria isolated from the brown alga *Colpomenia sinuosa*. *Lett Appl Microbiol* **49**: 573–579.

Khan W, Rayirath U, Subramanian S, Jithesh M, Rayorath P, Hodges D, Critchley A, Craigie J, Norrie J & Prithiviraj B (2009) Seaweed extracts as biostimulants of plant growth and development. *J Plant Growth Regul* **28**: 386–399.

Kjelleberg S, Steinberg P, Givskov M, Gram L, Manefield M & de Nys R (1997) Do marine natural products interfere with prokaryotic AHL regulatory systems? *Aquat Microb Ecol* **13**: 85–93.

Knief C, Delmotte N & Vorholt JA (2011) Bacterial adaptation to life in association with plants – a proteomic perspective from culture to *in situ* conditions. *Proteomics* **11**: 3086–3105.

Kong MK & Chan K (1979) A study on the bacterial flora isolated from marine algae. *Bot Mar* **22**: 83–98.

Lachnit T, Blümel M, Imhoff JF & Wahl M (2009) Specific epibacterial communities on macroalgae: phylogeny matters more than habitat. *Aquat Biol* **5**: 181–186.

Lachnit T, Wahl M & Harder T (2010) Isolated thallus-associated compounds from the macroalga *Fucus vesiculosus* mediate bacterial surface colonization in the field similar to that on the natural alga. *Biofouling* **26**: 247–255.

Lakshmanaperumalsamy P & Purushothaman A (1982) Heterotrophic bacteria associated with seaweed. *Proc Indian Acad Sci* **91**: 487–493.

Lam C, Stang A & Harder T (2008) Planktonic bacteria and fungi are selectively eliminated by exposure to marine macroalgae in close proximity. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **63**: 283–291.

Largo DB, Fukami K, Adachi M & Nishijima T (1997) Direct enumeration of bacteria from macroalgae by epifluorescence microscopy as applied to the fleshy red algae *Kappaphycus alvarezii* and *Gracilaria* spp. (Rhodophyta). *J Phycol* **33**: 554–557.

Laycock RA (1974) The detrital food chain based on seaweeds. I. Bacteria associated with the surface of Laminaria fronds. *Mar Biol* **25**: 223–231.

Lemos ML, Toranzo AE & Barja JL (1985) Antibiotic activity of epiphytic bacteria isolated from intertidal seaweeds. *Microb Ecol* **11**: 149–163.

Lewis TE, Garland CD & McMeekin TA (1985) The bacterial biota on crustose (nonarticulated) coralline algae from Tasmanian waters. *Microb Ecol* **11**: 221–230.

Longford SR, Tujula NA, Crocetti GR, Holmes AJ, Holmström C, Kjelleberg S, Steinberg PD & Taylor MW (2007) Comparisons of diversity of bacterial communities associated with three sessile marine eukaryotes. *Aquat Microb Ecol* **48**: 217–229.

MacArtain P, Gill CIR, Brooks M, Campbell R & Rowland IR (2007) Nutritional value of edible seaweeds. *Nutr Rev* **65**: 535–543.

Margulis L (1998) *Symbiotic Planet: A New Look at Evolution*. Basic Books, New York.

Marshall K, Joint I, Callow ME & Callow JA (2006) Effect of marine bacterial isolates on the growth and morphology of axenic plantlets of the green alga *Ulva linza*. *Microb Ecol* **52**: 302–310.

Matsuo Y, Suzuki M, Kasai H, Shizuri Y & Harayama S (2003) Isolation and phylogenetic characterization of bacteria capable of inducing differentiation in the green alga *Monostroma oxyspermum*. *Environ Microbiol* **5**: 25–35.

Matsuo Y, Imagawa H, Nishizawa M & Shizuri Y (2005) Isolation of an algal morphogenesis inducer from a marine bacterium. *Science* **307**: 1598.

Maximilien R, de Nys R, Holmström C, Gram L, Givskov M, Crass K, Kjelleberg S & Steinberg PD (1998) Chemical mediation of bacterial surface colonisation by secondary metabolites from the red alga *Delisea pulchra*. *Aquat Microb Ecol* **15**: 233–246.

Mazure HGF & Field JG (1980) Density and ecological importance of bacteria on kelp fronds in an upwelling region. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* **43**: 173–182.

McFall-Ngai M (2008) Are biologists in 'future shock'? Symbiosis integrates biology across domains. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **6**: 789–792.

Medina M & Sachs JL (2010) Symbiont genomics, our new tangled bank. *Genomics* **95**: 129–137.

Menzel D (1987) Fine structure of vacuolar inclusions in the siphonous green alga *Chlorodesmis fastigiata* (Udoteaceae, Caulerpales) and their contribution to plug formation. *Phycologia* **26**: 205–221.

Meusnier I, Olsen JL, Stam WT, Destombe C & Valero M (2001) Phylogenetic analyses of *Caulerpa taxifolia* (Chlorophyta) and of its associated bacterial microflora provide clues to the origin of the Mediterranean introduction. *Mol Ecol* **10**: 931–946.

Michel G, Nyval-Collen P, Barbeyron T, Czjzek M & Helbert W (2006) Bioconversion of red seaweed galactans: a focus on bacterial agarases and carrageenases. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* **71**: 23–33.

Moore JE, Xu J & Millar BC (2002) Diversity of the microflora of edible macroalga (*Palmaria palmata*). *Food Microbiol* **19**: 249–257.

Nakanishi K, Nishijima M, Nishimura M, Kuwano K & Saga N (1996) Bacteria that induce morphogenesis in *Ulva pertusa* (Chlorophyta) grown under axenic conditions. *J Phycol* **32**: 479–482.

Nakao Y, Onohara T, Zenitani B, Fujita Y & Matsubar T (1972) Bacteriological studies on diseases of cultured laver. I. Green spot rotting-like deterioration of laver frond by bacteria, *in-vitro*. *Bull Jpn Soc Sci Fish* **38**: 561–564.

Neori A, Chopin T, Troell M, Buschmann AH, Kraemer GP, Halling C, Shpigel M & Yarish C (2004) Integrated aquaculture: rationale, evolution and state of the art emphasizing seaweed biofiltration in modern mariculture. *Aquaculture* **231**: 361–391.

Olapade OA, Depas MM, Jensen ET & McLellan SL (2006) Microbial communities and fecal indicator bacteria associated with *Cladophora* mats on beach sites along Lake Michigan shores. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **72**: 1932–1938.

Olsen GJ, Lane DJ, Giovannoni SJ, Pace NR & Stahl DA (1986) Microbial ecology and evolution: a ribosomal RNA approach. *Annu Rev Microbiol* **40**: 337–365.

Olson JB & Kellogg CA (2010) Microbial ecology of corals, sponges, and algae in mesophotic coral environments. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **73**: 17–30.

O'Sullivan L, Murphy B, McLoughlin P, Duggan P, Lawlor PG, Hughes H & Gardiner GE (2010) Prebiotics from marine macroalgae for human and animal health applications. *Mar Drugs* **8**: 2038–2064.

Patel P, Callow ME, Joint I & Callow JA (2003) Specificity in the settlement – modifying response of bacterial biofilms towards zoospores of the marine alga *Enteromorpha*. *Environ Microbiol* **5**: 338–349.

Paul NA, de Nys R & Steinberg PD (2006) Chemical defence against bacteria in the red alga *Asparagopsis armata*: linking structure with function. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* **306**: 87–101.

Penesyan A, Marshall-Jones Z, Holmstrom C, Kjelleberg S & Egan S (2009) Antimicrobial activity observed among cultured marine epiphytic bacteria reflects their potential as a source of new drugs. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **69**: 113–124.

Philippot L, Andersson SGE, Battin TJ, Prosser JI, Schimel JP, Whitman WB & Hallin S (2010) The ecological coherence of high bacterial taxonomic ranks. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **8**: 523–529.

Potin P (2008) Oxidative burst and related responses in biotic interactions of algae. *Algal Chemical Ecology* (Amsler CD, ed), pp. 245–271. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Provasoli L (1958) Effect of plant hormones on *Ulva*. *Biol Bull* **144**: 375–384.

Provasoli L & Pintner IJ (1980) Bacteria induced polymorphism in an axenic laboratory strain of *Ulva lactuca* (Chlorophyceae). *J Phycol* **16**: 196–200.

Qian P-Y, Xu Y & Fusetani N (2009) Natural products as antifouling compounds: recent progress and future perspectives. *Biofouling* **26**: 223–234.

Rao D, Webb JS & Kjelleberg S (2005) Competitive interactions in mixed-species biofilms containing the marine bacterium *Pseudoalteromonas tunicata*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **71**: 1729–1736.

Rao D, Webb JS & Kjelleberg S (2006) Microbial colonization and competition on the marine alga *Ulva australis*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **72**: 5547–5555.

Rao D, Webb JS, Holmstrom C, Case R, Low A, Steinberg P & Kjelleberg S (2007) Low densities of epiphytic bacteria from the marine alga *Ulva australis* inhibit settlement of fouling organisms. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **73**: 7844–7852.

Relman DA (2008) 'Til death do us part': coming to terms with symbiotic relationships. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **6**: 721–724.

Riesenfeld CS, Schloss PD & Handelsman J (2004) Metagenomics: genomic analysis of microbial communities. *Annu Rev Genet* **38**: 525–552.

Riquelme C, Rojas A, Flores V & Correa JA (1997) Epiphytic bacteria in a copper-enriched environment in northern Chile. *Mar Pollut Bull* **34**: 816–820.

Rosenberg G & Paerl HW (1981) Nitrogen fixation by blue-green algae associated with the siphonous green seaweed *Codium decorticatum*, effects on ammonium uptake. *Mar Biol* **61**: 151–158.

Sawabe T, Makino H, Tatsumi M, Nakano K, Tajima K, Iqbal MM, Yumoto I, Ezura Y & Christen R (1998) *Pseudoalteromonas bacteriolytica* sp. nov., a marine bacterium that is the causative agent of red spot disease of *Laminaria japonica*. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **48**: 769–774.

Sawabe T, Tanaka R, Iqbal MM, Tajima K, Ezura Y, Ivanova EP & Christen R (2000) Assignment of *Alteromonas elyakovii* KMM 162T and five strains isolated from spot-wounded fronds of *Laminaria japonica* to *Pseudoalteromonas elyakovii* comb, nov. and the extended description of the species. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **50**: 265–271.

Schroeder DC, Jaffer MA & Coyne VE (2003) Investigation of the role of a beta(1-4) agarase produced by *Pseudoalteromonas gracilis* B9 in eliciting disease symptoms in the red alga *Gracilaria gracilis*. *Microbiology* **149**: 2919–2929.

Shi W, Syrenne R, Sun J-Z & Yuan JS (2010) Molecular approaches to study the insect gut symbiotic microbiota at the 'omics' age. *Insect Sci* **17**: 199–219.

Shiba T & Taga N (1980) Heterotrophic bacteria attached to seaweeds. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* **47**: 251–258.

Sieburth JM (1968) The influence of algal antibiosis on the ecology of marine microorganisms. *Advances in Microbiology of the Sea* (Droop MR & Wood J, eds), pp. 63–94. Academic Press, London.

Singh RP, Mantri VA, Reddy CRK & Jha B (2011a) Isolation of seaweed-associated bacteria and their morphogenesis-inducing capability in axenic cultures of the green alga *Ulva fasciata*. *Aquat Biol* **12**: 13–21.

Singh RP, Bijo AJ, Baghel RS, Reddy CRK & Jha B (2011b) Role of bacterial isolates in enhancing the bud induction in the industrially important red alga *Gracilaria dura*. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **76**: 381–392.

Singh RP, Shukla MK, Mishra A, Kumari P, Reddy CRK & Jha B (2011c) Isolation and characterization of exopolysaccharides from seaweed associated bacteria *Bacillus licheniformis*. *Carbohydr Polym* **84**: 1019–1026.

Smit AJ (2004) Medicinal and pharmaceutical uses of seaweed natural products: a review. *J Appl Phycol* **16**: 245–262.

Staufenberger T, Thiel V, Wiese J & Imhoff JF (2008) Phylogenetic analysis of bacteria associated with *Laminaria saccharina*. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **64**: 65–77.

Steinberg PD & de Nys R (2002) Chemical mediation of colonization of seaweed surfaces. *J Phycol* **38**: 621–629.

Steinberg PD, Schneider R & Kjelleberg S (1997) Chemical defenses of seaweeds against microbial colonization. *Biodegradation* **8**: 211–220.

Sunairi M, Tsuchiya H, Tsuchiya T, Omura Y, Koyanagi Y, Ozawa M, Iwabuchi N, Murooka H & Nakajima M (1995) Isolation of a bacterium that causes anaaki disease of the red algae *Porphyra yezoensis*. *J Appl Microbiol* **79**: 225–229.

Suzuki M, Nakagawa Y, Harayama S & Yamamoto S (2001) Phylogenetic analysis and taxonomic study of marine Cytophaga-like bacteria: proposal for *Tenacibaculum* gen. nov. with *Tenacibaculum maritimum* comb. nov. and *Tenacibaculum ovolyticum* comb. nov., and description of *Tenacibaculum mesophilum* sp. nov. and *Tenacibaculum amylolyticum* sp. nov. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **51**: 1639–1652.

Tatewaki M, Provasoli L & Pintner IJ (1983) Morphogenesis of *Monostroma oxyspermum* (Kütz.) Doty (Chlorophyceae) in axenic culture, especially in bialgal culture. *J Phycol* **19**: 409–416.

Tsukidate J (1971) Microbiological studies of *Porphyra* plants. II. Bacteria isolated from Porphyra leucosticta in culture. *Bull Jpn Soc Sci Fish* **37**: 376–379.

Tsukidate IJ (1977) Microbiological studies of *Porphyra* plants. V. On the relation between bacteria and *Porphyra* diseases. *Bull Nansei Reg Fish Res Lab* **10**: 101–112.

Tsukidate J (1983) On the symbiotic relationship between *Porphyra* species and attached bacteria, and a bacterial pathogen in white rot. *Bull Nansei Reg Fish Res Lab* **15**: 29–96.

Tujula NA, Crocetti GR, Burke C, Thomas T, Holmstrom C & Kjelleberg S (2010) Variability and abundance of the epiphytic bacterial community associated with a green marine Ulvacean alga. *ISME J* **4**: 301–311.

Turner JB & Friedmann EI (1974) Fine structure of capitular filaments in the coenocytic green alga *Penicillus*. *J Phycol* **10**: 125–134.

Vairappan CS & Suzuki M (2000) Dynamics of total surface bacteria and bacterial species counts during desiccation in the Malaysian sea lettuce, *Ulva reticulata* (Ulvales, Chlorophyta). *Phycological Research* **48**: 55–61.

Vairappan CS, Suzuki M, Motomura T & Ichimura T (2001) Pathogenic bacteria associated with lesions and thallus bleaching symptoms in the Japanese kelp *Laminaria religiosa* Miyabe (Laminariales, Phaeophyceae). *Hydrobiologia* **445**: 183–191.

Vairappan CS, Chung C, Hurtado A, Soya F, Lhonneur G & Critchley A (2008) Distribution and symptoms of epiphyte infection in major carrageenophyte-producing farms. *J Appl Phycol* **20**: 477–483.

van den Hoek C, Mann DG & Jahns HM (1995) *Algae. An Introduction to Phycology*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Waksman SA, Hotchkiss M & Carey CL (1933) Marine bacteria and their role in the cycle of life of the sea: II. bacteria concerned with the cycle of nitrogen in the sea. *The Biology Bulletin* **65**: 137–167.

Wang G, Shuai L, Li Y, Lin W, Zhao XW & Duan DL (2008) Phylogenetic analysis of epiphytic marine bacteria on Hole-Rotten diseased sporophytes of *Laminaria japonica*. *J Appl Phycol* **20**: 403–409.

Wang ZF, Xiao T, Pang SJ, Liu M & Yue HD (2009) Isolation and identification of bacteria associated with the surfaces of several algal species. *Chin J Oceanol Limnol* **27**: 487–492.

Weinberger F (2007) Pathogen-induced defense and innate immunity in macroalgae. *The Biological Bulletin* **213**: 290–302.

Weinberger F, Beltran J, Correa JA, Lion U, Pohnert G, Kumar N, Steinberg P, Kloareg B & Potin P (2007) Spore release in *Acrochaetium* sp. (Rhodophyta) is bacterially controlled. *J Phycol* **43**: 235–241.

Wichard T & Oertel W (2010) Gametogenesis and gamete release of *Ulva mutabilis* and *Ulva lactuca* (Chlorophyta): regulatory effects and chemical characterization of the "swarming inhibitor". *J Phycol* **46**: 248–259.

Wiese J, Thiel V, Nagel K, Staufenberger T & Imhoff JF (2009) Diversity of antibiotic-active bacteria associated with the brown alga *Laminaria saccharina* from the Baltic Sea. *Mar Biotechnol* **11**: 287–300.

Yan LM, Boyd KG & Burgess JG (2002) Surface attachment induced production of antimicrobial compounds by marine epiphytic bacteria using modified roller bottle cultivation. *Mar Biotechnol* **4**: 356–366.

Zaneveld J, Turnbaugh PJ, Lozupone C, Ley RE, Hamady M, Gordon JI & Knight R (2008) Host-bacterial coevolution and the search for new drug targets. *Curr Opin Chem Biol* **12**: 109–114.

Zheng Z, Zeng W, Huang Y, Yang Z, Li J, Cai H & Su W (2000) Detection of antitumor and antimicrobial activities in marine organism associated actinomycetes isolated from the Taiwan Strait, China. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **188**: 87–91.

Zheng L, Han X, Chen H, Lin W & Yan X (2005) Marine bacteria associated with marine macroorganisms: the potential antimicrobial resources. *Ann Microbiol* **55**: 119–124.

ZoBell CE (1946) *Marine Microbiology*. Chronica Botanica Co, Waltham.

Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Fig. S1. Percentage of reports of bacterial classes associated with green (A), red (B) and brown (C) seaweeds.
Table S1. Overview of bacteria isolated from macroalgae in 161 studies from the last 55 years.
Table S2. Bacterial phylogenetic diversity (genus/species level) associated with brown, green and red seaweeds.

Please note: Wiley-Blackwell is not responsible for the content or functionality of any supporting materials supplied by the authors. Any queries (other than missing material) should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.