

Iron Redox Transformation by the Thermo- Acidophilic Archaea from the Genus Sulfolobus

Masaki, Yusei

Department of Earth Resources Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Kyushu University

Tsutsumi, Katsutoshi

Department of Earth Resources Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Kyushu University

Okibe, Naoko

Department of Earth Resources Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Kyushu University

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/4737397>

出版情報 : Geomicrobiology Journal. 35 (9), pp.757-767, 2018-06-23. Taylor and Francis
バージョン :
権利関係 :

1 *Geomicrobiology Journal*

2 **Title:**

3 **Iron redox transformation by the thermo-acidophilic archaea from the genus**

4 ***Sulfolobus***

5 (Running title: Iron redox transformation by the genus *Sulfolobus*)

6

7 Yusei MASAKI, Katsutoshi TSUTSUMI, Naoko OKIBE*

8

9 Department of Earth Resources Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Kyushu University,

10 744 Motoooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan

11

12 *Corresponding author.

13 Tel. and Fax: + 81 92 802 3312

14 E-mail address: okibe@mine.kyushu-u.ac.jp (Naoko Okibe)

15

16 **Keywords:** Iron redox transformation, Chromium reduction, *Sulfolobus*, Acidophilic

17 archaea

18 **Abstract**

19 Iron redox transformations by five representative *Sulfolobus* strains (*S. metallicus* Kra23;
20 *S. tokodaii* 7; *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3; *S. solfataricus* P1; *S. shibatae* B12) were studied to
21 clarify the general trend of Fe metabolism across different species of the genus *Sulfolobus*.
22 Negligible to major Fe(II) oxidation was detected in cell-suspensions of the strains.
23 Fe(III)-reducing ability was differently expressed in each strain with dependence on the
24 oxygen level and growth status: Growth-uncoupled cell-suspensions of all strains reduced
25 Fe(III) under either anaerobic or micro-aerobic conditions, or under both conditions. A
26 linear correlation between cell growth and Fe(III) reduction was also found in *S. tokodaii*
27 7, *S. solfataricus* P1 and *S. shibatae* B12. In addition to Fe redox behaviors, the strains
28 were also tested for reduction of highly-toxic Cr(VI) to less toxic and soluble Cr(III), as
29 an application possibility: The trend in degree of Cr(VI) reduction did not necessarily
30 correspond to that of Fe(III) reduction, suggesting the involvement of different reduction
31 mechanisms.

32 **Introduction**

33 The genus *Sulfolobus* is generally recognized as a group of aerobic, thermo-
34 acidophilic sulfur-oxidizing archaea. They naturally occur in a number of sulfur-rich
35 acidic geothermal environments (Brock et al. 1972; Huber and Stetter 1991; Jan et al.
36 1999; Zillig et al. 1993). Consequently, utilization of S⁰ (either autotrophically or
37 heterotrophically) is widely seen in known *Sulfolobus* spp. (*S. tokodaii*, Suzuki et al.
38 2002; *S. metallicus*, Huber and Stetter 1991; *S. yangmingensis*, Jan et al. 1999; *S. shibatae*,
39 Grogan et al. 1990; *S. tengchongensis*, Xiang et al. 2003), although with an exception of
40 non-sulfur oxidizing *Sulfolobus* sp. GA1, as was recently reported (Masaki et al. 2016).

41 Given that microbial Fe(II) oxidation plays a major role in the geochemical Fe
42 cycle of highly acidic environments, and that a number of *Sulfolobus* species are widely
43 distributed in such environments, there are yet only limited studies evaluating Fe(II)
44 oxidation ability in this genus (*S. metallicus*, *S. tokodaii*; Bathe and Norris 2007). Owing
45 to its both Fe(II)- and S⁰-oxidizing metabolisms, *S. metallicus* has been employed to apply
46 for high-temperature bioleaching (oxidative dissolution) of sulfide minerals such as pyrite
47 and chalcopyrite (Sandström et al. 2005; Gautier et al. 2008; Vilcáez et al. 2008; Zhu et
48 al. 2011). A comprehensive search for Fe(II)-oxidizing ability among different *Sulfolobus*
49 species would therefore lead to better understandings of the role of this genus in natural

50 Fe cycles, as well as in possible utilities of the genus for application purposes.

51 So far, Fe(III)-reducing ability in the genus *Sulfolobus* is even less clear than its
52 Fe(II)-oxidizing ability: *S. acidocaldarius* was reported to reduce soluble Fe(III) to Fe(II)
53 under aerobic conditions in the presence of elemental sulfur or glutamate as electron
54 donor (Brock and Gustafson 1976), although it was controversially pointed out that this
55 archaeon does not grow autotrophically (Johnson et al. 2012). Our previous study
56 detected the Fe(III)-reducing ability during growth under micro-aerobic conditions in
57 recently isolated *Sulfolobus* sp. GA1 (Masaki et al. 2016). This observation thus further
58 motivated us to investigate general trend of Fe(III)-reducing ability across different
59 representative species of the genus *Sulfolobus*.

60 The possible importance of sulfur- and iron-oxidizing acidophiles in the natural
61 geochemical Fe cycle by means of not only Fe(II) oxidation but also Fe(III) reduction
62 was first pointed out by Brock and Gustafson (1976), by showing Fe(III)-reducing ability
63 in *Acidithiobacillus thiooxidans*, *At. ferrooxidans* and *S. acidocaldarius*. Later studies in
64 fact revealed a variety of acidophiles involved in microbial Fe(III) reduction: Anaerobic
65 growth via Fe(III) respiration using S⁰ (or other reduced inorganic sulfur compounds) as
66 electron donor was reported for *At. ferrooxidans* (Ohmura et al. 2002), *At. ferrivorans*
67 (Hallberg et al. 2010), and *Acidiferrobacter thiooxydans* (Hallberg et al. 2011b). The

68 ability to use Fe(III) as sole electron acceptor during heterotrophic growth was reported
69 in *Sulfobacillus* (*Sb.*) *acidophilus*, *Sb. thermosulfidooxidans*, *Acidimicrobium*
70 *ferrooxidans* (Bridge and Johnson 1998) and *Acidicaldus organivorus* (Johnson et al.
71 2006). Reductive dissolution of Fe(III) minerals was observed in micro-aerobic cultures
72 of heterotrophs, *Acidiphilium* spp. (Johnson and Mcginness 1991; Johnson and Bridge
73 2002; Coupland and Johnson 2008), *Acidocella* spp. and *Acidobacterium* spp. (Coupland
74 and Johnson 2008). Based on the above biodiversity found so far, it would be reasonable
75 to expect that Fe(III)-reducing abilities could also exist across different *Sulfolobus* spp.
76 coupled with growth on S⁰ and/or organic substrates.

77 In the viewpoint of biochemical Fe(II) oxidation mechanism, the responsible
78 molecular complexes often seem quite versatile in different acidophiles: In the well-
79 studied mesophilic Fe-oxidizing bacterium, *At. ferrooxidans*, electrons transfer from
80 Fe(II) via cytochromes *c* and rusticyanin (Rus; a periplasmic blue copper protein),
81 followed by the “downhill” and “uphill” pathways using a cytochrome *c* oxidase (Cox
82 complex) and *bc*₁ complex (PetI), respectively. Unlike *At. ferrooxidans*, cytochrome *c*
83 has not been detected in mesophilic Fe-oxidizing archaea *Ferroplasma* spp., but the
84 terminal oxidase combines cytochrome *c* oxidase-like and *bc*₁ complex-like components.
85 Also, a blue copper protein, sulfocyanin, may be serving as the branch point like

86 rusticyanin between downhill and uphill electron flows (Bonney and Holmes, 2012). In
87 the case of iron-oxidizing thermophilic archaea, such as *Sulfolobus* spp. (She et al., 2001;
88 Kawarabayashi et al., 2001; Hiller et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2005; Bathe and Norris, 2007),
89 *Metallosphaera sedula* (Auernik et al., 2008) and *Acidanus cophhuensis* (Urbieta et al.,
90 2017), again their genomic sequences have no evidence for cytochrome *c*, but the *fox* gene
91 cluster (encoding FoxA/FoxB with identity to cytochrome *c* oxidase subunits,
92 FoxC/FoxD with identity to cytochrome *b_{558/566}* subunits (CbsA-like) and others) was
93 found, which may have an analogous role to the *rus* operon of *At. ferrooxidans* (Johnson
94 et al., 2012). Likewise to *Ferroplasma* sp., sulfocyanin genes (*soxE*) were found in
95 genomes of these thermophiles (cf. in the case of *A. cophhuensis*, an additional
96 rusticyanin-like gene was also detected; Urbieta et al., 2017).

97 Whilst Fe(III) reduction widely takes place among acidophilic prokaryotes, its
98 biochemical mechanism is yet largely unknown, compared to the Fe(II) oxidation
99 mechanism. So far most of the work focused on neutrophilic and mesophilic bacteria such
100 as *Geobacter* sp. and *Shewanella* sp., and found that cytochromes *c* were responsible for
101 their Fe(III) respiration (Lovely et al., 2011; Fredrickson et al., 2008). Compared to the
102 neutrophilic counterparts, even fewer studies are available with acidophiles. In *At.*
103 *ferrooxidans*, it was suggested that electrons travel from S⁰ to Fe(III) via a respiratory

104 chain containing *bc*₁ complex and cytochrome *c* (Osorio et al., 2013). In thermo-
105 acidophilic archaea, the involvement of cytochrome *c* proteins seems to vary: Whilst a
106 number of other species have few to no cytochrome *c* genes, *Ferroglobus placidus* and
107 *Geoglobus ahangari* contained numerous cytochromes *c*. The importance of several
108 genes was suggested in Fe(III) respiration by *F. placidus* (i.e. three multiheme
109 cytochromes *c*, a menaquinol oxidoreductase Cbc4 complex, and a unique periplasmic
110 cytochrome *c* fused to a cytochrome *b*₅-type heme/steroid binding domain (CbcZ); Smith
111 et al., 2015).

112 From the viewpoint of biohydrometallurgical application, search for microbial
113 Fe(III)-reducing abilities would benefit the development of bio-processes such as
114 bioremediation of toxic metals (e.g., hexavalent chromium; Masaki et al. 2015;
115 Cummings et al. 2007) and reductive bioleaching of Fe(III)-minerals (e.g., nickel laterites
116 where Ni is associated with goethite; Hallberg et al. 2011a; Johnson 2012; Johnson et al.
117 2013; Ñancuqueo et al. 2014).

118 With the aim to clarify the roles of *Sulfolobus* spp. in natural geochemical Fe
119 cycles, as well as to further explore their potentials in biohydrometallurgical applications,
120 this study has chosen representative strains; *S. metallicus* Kra23, *S. tokodaii* 7, *S.*
121 *acidocaldarius* 98-3, *S. solfataricus* P1 and *S. shibatae* B12, to test and compare their Fe

122 redox transformation capabilities as well as to search for a genetic clue to support their
123 Fe transformation behaviors by analyzing the available genome sequences. Additionally,
124 their abilities in Cr(VI) reduction were also investigated to compare with those in Fe(III)
125 reduction.

126 **Materials and Methods**

127 **Microorganisms**

128 *S. metallicus* Kra23^T (DSM 6482), *S. tokodaii* 7^T (DSM 16993), *S.*
129 *acidocaldarius* 98-3^T (DSM 639), *S. solfataricus* P1^T (DSM 1616) and *S. shibatae* B12^T
130 (DSM 5389) were purchased from the National Institute of Technology and Evaluation
131 (Tokyo, Japan).

132 *S. tokodaii* 7 and *S. shibatae* B12 were maintained and pre-grown in 300 mL
133 Erlenmeyer flasks containing 150 mL of heterotrophic basal salts (HBS) medium (pH
134 2.0 with H₂SO₄; Masaki et al. 2015) supplemented with 10 mM glucose and 0.01%
135 (w/v) yeast extract. Elemental sulfur (S⁰; 0.1% (w/v)), instead of glucose, was added to
136 HBS medium (pH 2.5 with H₂SO₄) for *S. metallicus* Kra23, *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3 and
137 *S. solfataricus* P1. Cultures were incubated at 70°C, shaken at 120 rpm.

138 In all below experiments, water evaporation was compensated with sterile
139 deionized water before each sampling. All of the experiments were conducted in
140 duplicates.

141

142 **Fe(II) oxidation test using growth-uncoupled cell-suspensions under aerobic**
143 **conditions**

144 Each of the five strains was pre-grown as described in the previous section except
145 that 500 mL flasks containing 200 mL medium were used. The cultures were harvested
146 at the late exponential phase by centrifugation (12,000 g, 10 min), washed twice, and
147 finally re-suspended in 200 mL of fresh HBS medium (in 500 mL flasks; pH 2.0)
148 containing 10 mM Fe(II) (as FeSO₄·7H₂O): Densities of the resultant cell-suspensions
149 were approx. 5×10⁸ cells mL⁻¹ for *S. tokodaii* 7 and *S. shibatae* B12, and 2×10⁸ cells mL⁻¹
150 for *S. metallicus* Kra23, *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3 and *S. solfataricus* P1. Cell-suspensions
151 were incubated shaken (70°C, 120 rpm) and samples were regularly taken to monitor the
152 concentrations of Fe(II) and total soluble Fe.

153 The Fe(II) oxidation rates (mg-Fe h⁻¹; for comparison between abiotic and biotic
154 Fe(II) oxidations) and specific Fe(II) oxidation rates (mg-Fe h⁻¹ cell⁻¹; for comparison
155 between *Sulfolobus* strains) were calculated.

156

157 **Fe(III) reduction test using growth-uncoupled cell-suspensions under anaerobic /**
158 **micro-aerobic conditions**

159 Anaerobic experiments: Each of the five strains was pre-grown, harvested,
160 washed (as described in the previous section), and finally re-suspended (to a final cell
161 density of 1×10⁹ cells mL⁻¹) in 10 mL of HBS medium (in 25 mL serum bottles with

162 rubber stoppers; pH 2.0) containing 10 mM Fe(III) (as $\text{Fe}_2(\text{SO}_4)_3 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$). One millimolar
163 glucose (N_2 -purged) and 0.01% S^0 were tested as electron donor (except for the case of *S.*
164 *metallicus* Kra23, where only S^0 was used). All solutions used for anaerobic experiments
165 were N_2 -purged until the DO (dissolved oxygen) level reached $< 0.1 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ (DO-14P;
166 TOA-DKK). After that, all media preparations were conducted in the anaerobic chamber
167 (Coy laboratory products). Sealed serum bottles were taken out of the anaerobic chamber
168 and incubated (unshaken, 70°C).

169 Micro-aerobic experiments: Each of the five strains was pre-grown, harvested,
170 washed, and finally re-suspended (to a final cell density of $1 \times 10^9 \text{ cells mL}^{-1}$) in 15 mL of
171 HBS medium (in 15 mL Falcon tubes to allow little headspace for aeration; pH 2.0)
172 containing 10 mM Fe(III) (as $\text{Fe}_2(\text{SO}_4)_3 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$). Reagents were not N_2 -purged. One
173 millimolar glucose was used as electron donor (except that 0.01% S^0 was used for
174 autotrophic *S. metallicus* Kra23). The Falcon tubes were incubated unshaken at 70°C .

175 Samples were regularly taken (using syringe needles for anaerobic experiments)
176 to monitor concentrations of Fe(II) and total soluble Fe. All of the experiments were
177 conducted in duplicates.

178 The specific Fe(III) reduction rates ($\text{mg-Fe h}^{-1} (1 \times 10^{10} \text{ cells})^{-1}$ for anaerobic
179 experiments; $\text{mg-Fe h}^{-1} (1.5 \times 10^{10} \text{ cells})^{-1}$ for micro-aerobic experiments) were calculated.

180

181 **Growth-coupled dissimilatory Fe(III) reduction test under anaerobic conditions**

182 In order to investigate whether or not Fe(III) can serve as sole electron acceptor
183 for *Sulfolobus* growth, correlation between cell density and Fe(III) reduction was
184 monitored after inoculation under strictly anaerobic condition. Each of the five strains
185 was pre-grown and inoculated (to a final cell density of 1×10^7 cells mL⁻¹) into 20 mL of
186 HBS medium (in 25 mL serum bottles with rubber stoppers; pH 2.0) containing either
187 0.01% S⁰ and trace elements (Masaki et al. 2016) (for *S. metallicus* Kra23 only), or 10
188 mM glucose and 0.01% yeast extract (for other 5 strains). The headspace of serum bottles
189 were flushed with N₂(80%)-CO₂(20%) gas for obligately autotrophic *S. metallicus* Kra23
190 cultures. Different initial concentrations of Fe(III) (0, 5, 10, or 15 mM) were added to the
191 growth media. All solutions were N₂-purged until the DO level reached < 0.1 mg L⁻¹ (DO-
192 14P; TOA-DKK). After that, all media preparations were conducted in an anaerobic
193 chamber (Coy laboratory products), until serum bottles were sealed and incubated (120
194 rpm, 70°C).

195 Samples were taken using N₂-purged syringe needles. The positive pressure
196 inside the serum bottles automatically pushed out the liquid sample as the needle was
197 stuck into the bottle, preventing contamination of oxygen. Cell densities (Thoma counting

198 chamber, phase contrast microscope) and concentrations of Fe(II) and total soluble Fe
199 were regularly monitored from duplicate flasks.

200

201

202 **Cr(VI) reduction test using growth-uncoupled cell-suspensions under micro-aerobic**
203 **conditions**

204 Cell-suspensions (1×10^9 cells mL⁻¹; in 50 mL HBS medium (pH 2.0) in 50 mL Falcon
205 tubes) were prepared for each strain as described in previous sections. One millimolar
206 glucose (or 0.01% S⁰ in the case of *S. metallicus* Kra23) and 0.2 mM Cr(VI) (as
207 Na₂CrO₄·4H₂O) were added to the cell-suspensions, which were then incubated at 70°C
208 without shaking. Samples were regularly taken to monitor concentrations of Cr(VI) and
209 total soluble Cr. All of the experiments were carried out in duplicates.

210

211 **Solution analysis**

212 Liquid samples were filtered using 0.20-µm cartridge filters to determine concentrations
213 of Fe(II) and total soluble Fe (*o*-phenanthroline method; Caldwell and Adams 1946, using
214 ascorbic acid as a reducing agent), Cr(VI) (diphenylcarbazide method; Noroozifar and
215 Khorasani-Motlagh 2003), and total soluble Cr (ICP-OES; SEIKO Vista-MPX).

216 **Results and Discussion**

217 **Comparison of Fe(II) oxidation by five *Sulfolobus* strains in growth-uncoupled cell-**
218 **suspensions under aerobic condition**

219 Fe(II) oxidation in cell-suspensions of five *Sulfolobus* strains are compared in
220 Figure 1. No further cell growth was observed in cell-suspensions during the experiments
221 by cell counting (data not shown). A decrease in total Fe concentrations in cell-
222 suspensions during Fe(II) oxidation experiments was attributed to Fe(III) precipitation
223 (data not shown), rather than Fe sorption on cell surfaces. Thus, any decline in Fe(II) was
224 attributed to oxidation of Fe(II) to Fe(III).

225 The Fe(II) oxidation rates (mg-Fe h⁻¹ for comparison between abiotic and biotic
226 Fe(II) oxidations) and specific Fe(II) oxidation rates (mg-Fe h⁻¹ cell⁻¹ for comparison
227 between *Sulfolobus* strains) were calculated (using the data points from designated hours
228 in Figure 1) and listed in Table 1. *S. solfataricus* P1 and *S. shibatae* B12 showed only
229 negligible Fe(II) oxidation, compared with the abiotic counterpart. The most effective
230 Fe(II) oxidation was observed in cell-suspensions of *S. metallicus* Kra23, followed by *S.*
231 *tokodaii* 7 (Figure 1). It should be noted that the final cell density regularly achieved in
232 pre-grown cultures (for preparation of cell-suspensions) of strictly autotrophic *S.*
233 *metallicus* Kra23 (approx. 2×10⁸ cells mL⁻¹) was much lower than that of heterotrophic

234 *S. tokodaii* 7 (approx. 5×10^8 cells mL⁻¹). Therefore, the specific Fe(II) oxidation rate (mg-
235 Fe h⁻¹ cell⁻¹) was over 4 times greater with *S. metallicus* Kra23 than with *S. tokodaii* 7
236 (Table 1). *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3 was less effective Fe(II) oxidizer than *S. metallicus*
237 Kra23 and *S. tokodaii* 7, but marginally more effective than the rest (Figure 1; Table 1).
238 Theoretical conversion from per cell to per g-protein (Table 1) found that the specific
239 Fe(II) oxidation rate (mg-Fe h⁻¹ g-protein⁻¹) of *S. metallicus* Kra23 is still much smaller
240 than those of Fe(II) oxidizing bacteria (Johnson et al., 2012), although a simultaneous
241 comparison test would be needed to confirm this observation. Bathe and Norris (2007)
242 reported that *S. tokodaii* readily oxidized Fe(II) during heterotrophic growth on yeast
243 extract, but its autotrophic Fe(II) oxidation was much weaker than that by *S. metallicus*.
244 Our results demonstrated that *S. metallicus* Kra23 and *S. tokodaii* 7 oxidize Fe(II) much
245 more readily than the others tested. Since *S. metallicus* is the only known strictly
246 autotrophic type strain in the genus (Huber and Stetter 1991), it is reasonable that this
247 species oxidizes Fe(II) much more effectively than all the others to support its growth.

248 Putative genes possibly involved in Fe(II) oxidation / Fe(III) reduction in
249 *Sulfolobus* spp. were summarized in Supplemental Table 1. Based on the available
250 genomic sequences, a series of *sox*, *cbs* and *ods* genes (likely involved in the respiratory
251 chains) were evident in *Sulfolobus* spp. including both Fe(II)-oxidizing (*S. tokodaii*) and

252 non- or minor-Fe(II) oxidizing (*S. solfataricus* or *S. acidocaldarius*, respectively) strains.
253 A clear difference was the presence of the *fox* gene cluster solely in Fe(II)-oxidizing
254 strains (*S. metallicus* and *S. tokodaii*), as was previously suggested by Bathe and Norris
255 (2007). Whether or not Sox, Cbs, Ods and/or proteins with some homology to Fe(II)-
256 upregulated genes of *At. ferrooxidans* (Quairini et al., 2009; Supplemental Table 1) are
257 possibly responsible for any minor Fe(II) oxidation (e.g., by *S. acidocaldarius*) is yet
258 unclear.

259

260 **Comparison of Fe(III) reduction by five *Sulfolobus* strains in growth-uncoupled cell-**
261 **suspensions under anaerobic / micro-aerobic conditions**

262 Among the five *Sulfolobus* strains tested, only *S. metallicus* Kra23 is known to
263 grow autotrophically on S⁰ as energy source (Huber and Stetter 1991). Other five strains
264 grow heterotrophically on glucose as sole electron donor (Grogan 1989; Grogan et al.
265 1990; Suzuki et al. 2002; Masaki et al. 2016). The following Fe(III) reduction
266 experiments therefore used S⁰ and glucose as electron donor for *S. metallicus* Kra23 and
267 the rest, respectively.

268 Fe(III) reduction in cell-suspensions of five *Sulfolobus* strains under anaerobic
269 and micro-aerobic conditions are compared in Figure 2 and 3, respectively. No further

270 cell growth was seen in cell-suspensions during the experiments by cell counting (data
271 not shown). The rates of Fe(III) reduction (mg-Fe h^{-1}) and specific Fe(III) reduction (mg-
272 $\text{Fe h}^{-1} \text{ cell}^{-1}$) were calculated (using the data points from designated hours in Figure 2 and
273 3) and listed in Table 2.

274 *S. metallicus* Kra23, the strongest Fe(II) oxidizer among the five strains, was
275 shown to be also the most effective Fe(III) reducer under anaerobic conditions (Figure
276 2a; Table 2). When tested micro-aerobically, however, its Fe(III)-reducing ability was
277 almost totally suppressed (Figure 3a; Table 2).

278 *S. tokodaii* 7 readily reduced Fe(III) under anaerobic conditions with both S^0 and
279 glucose as electron donor (Figure 2b; Table 2). Under micro-aerobic conditions, however,
280 Fe(III) reduction started off to build up Fe(II) for the first 20 hours, but later switching to
281 an apparent Fe(II) oxidation phase (20-65 hours), which was finally followed solely by
282 steady Fe(III) reduction (Figure 3b). The Fe(II) hump between 0-65 hours in glucose-free
283 controls mimicked (but about half) that with glucose addition (Figure 3b). This is likely
284 due to the presence of residual intracellular electron carriers, such as NADH, accumulated
285 during pre-growth (Magnuson et al. 2000; Okibe et al., 2017). Therefore, this observation
286 may be explained by a gradual and steady depletion of oxygen in the system as follows:
287 During 0-20 hours, electrons (deriving from externally added glucose plus residual

288 intracellular NADH) were supposedly accepted by both oxygen and some Fe(III). Build-
289 up of a certain amount of the resultant Fe(II) may have triggered Fe(II) oxidation with the
290 residual oxygen (20-65 hours). Eventually, the oxygen was consumed to support steady
291 Fe(III) reduction (after 65 hours).

292 *S. solfataricus* P1 also displayed fairly strong Fe(III)-reducing ability (more
293 readily with glucose than S⁰ as electron donor) under anaerobic conditions (Figure 2d;
294 Table 2), which was slightly negatively affected by the presence of residual oxygen when
295 glucose was used as electron donor (Figure 3d; Table 2).

296 *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3 and *S. shibatae* B12 showed the least Fe(III) reduction
297 among the five strains under anaerobic conditions (glucose was the better electron donor
298 than S⁰ for Fe(III) reduction in both strains) (Figure 2c, e; Table 2). However, Fe(III)
299 reduction by the two strains were greatly facilitated under micro-aerobic conditions,
300 showing the most effective Fe(III) reduction among the five strains (Figure 3c, e; Table
301 2). Again, this was not caused by a cell number increase in the presence of residual oxygen,
302 since there was no further cell growth in cell-suspensions during the experiment (by cell
303 counting; data not shown). A similar observation was reported with Fe(III) reduction by
304 *Acidiphilium* spp.: Whilst most strains do not grow under strictly anoxic conditions in the
305 presence of Fe(III), growth-coupled Fe(III) reduction was most readily observed under

306 micro-aerobic conditions (Johnson and McGinness, 1991; Bridge and Johnson,2000).
307 Fe(III) reduction was constitutive in *A. cryptum* SJH but was inducible in *A. acidophilum*
308 and low oxygen concentrations, rather than Fe(III) was suggested to induce a putative
309 “iron reductase” in the latter (Bridge and Johnson,2000; Johnson et al., 2012). This could
310 possibly be the case also for some *Sulfolobus* spp.. Relatively high standard redox
311 potential of Fe(III)/Fe(II) (+0.76V; pH 2.0), comparable to that of 1/2O₂/H₂O (+0.82V),
312 makes iron favorable alternative electron acceptor for acidophiles (Madigan and Martinko
313 2006). The results suggested that this is also applicable to *Sulfolobus* spp. under
314 both/either microaerobic and/or anaerobic condition.

315 Theoretical conversion of the specific Fe(III) reduction rate from per cell to per
316 g-protein (Table 2) indicated that Fe(III) reduction by *S. metallicus* Kra23 (anaerobic
317 condition) is comparable to that reported in other bacterial counterparts (Johnson et al.,
318 2012). However, again, a simultaneous comparison is necessary to verify this (Johnson et
319 al., 2012).

320

321 **Cell growth-coupled dissimilatory Fe(III) reduction in *Sulfolobus* spp. under** 322 **anaerobic conditions**

323 Linear correlations between cell densities and the amounts of Fe(III) reduced

324 were observed in *S. tokodaii* 7 (Figure 4b), *S. solfataricus* P1 (Figure 4d) and *S. shibatae*
325 B12 (Figure 4e) (Figure 4f), indicating that cell growth of these three strains is supported
326 by Fe(III) reduction using glucose as electron donor.

327 In the case of other two strains, *S. metallicus* Kra23 and *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3,
328 Fe(III) reduction did occur by the existing cells, but no correlation between cell growth
329 and Fe(III) reduction was found (Figure 4a, c). Interestingly, the microbial capability of
330 growth-coupled Fe(III) respiration (Figure 4) did not necessarily correspond to efficient
331 Fe(III) reduction in its growth-uncoupled cell suspensions (Figures 2, 3). The results from
332 a series of Fe(III) reduction experiments using cell-suspensions (Figure 2, 3) revealed that
333 all tested *Sulfolobus* spp. showed major Fe(III) reduction compared to sterile controls,
334 either/both under anaerobic (Figure 2) or/and micro-aerobic (Figure 3) conditions, as
335 summarized as follows:

336 (i) *S. metallicus* Kra23 (Figures 2-4a): Strong Fe(III) reducer under anaerobic
337 conditions, though incapable of anaerobic growth using S^0 and Fe(III) as sole electron
338 donor and acceptor, respectively; residual oxygen significantly suppresses its Fe(III)
339 reduction. (ii) *S. tokodaii* 7 (Figures 2-4b): Readily reduces Fe(III) under anaerobic
340 conditions; its Fe(II) oxidation can overtake Fe(III) reduction in the presence of residual
341 oxygen, exhibiting apparent alternate switch on/off of Fe(III) reduction and Fe(II)

342 oxidation; anaerobic cell growth coupled with Fe(III) reduction using glucose as sole
343 electron donor. (iii) *S. solfataricus* P1 (Figures 2-4d): Readily reduces Fe(III) under both
344 anaerobic and micro-aerobic conditions; anaerobic cell growth likely coupled with Fe(III)
345 reduction using glucose and Fe(III) as sole electron donor and acceptor, respectively. (iv)
346 *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3 (Figures 2-4c): No clear evidence for anaerobic Fe(III) reduction,
347 whilst micro-aerobic conditions significantly facilitate its Fe(III)-reducing ability; no
348 anaerobic growth observed using glucose and Fe(III) as sole electron donor and acceptor,
349 respectively. (v) (Figures 2-4e) *S. shibatae* B12: Anaerobic Fe(III) reduction is negligible,
350 whilst micro-aerobic conditions significantly accelerate its Fe(III)-reducing ability;
351 capable of anaerobic growth using Fe(III) as sole electron acceptor (glucose as electron
352 donor).

353 Since genomes of *Sulfolobus* spp. do not possess cytochromes *c*, their Fe(III)
354 reduction mechanisms seem to take place differently from that of *F. placidus*
355 (Supplemental Table 1; Smith et al., 2015). However, genomic sequence analysis detected
356 Ferp_1268 (4Fe-4S ferredoxin iron-sulfur binding domain protein) and Ferp_1269 (NrfD;
357 polysulphide reductase)-like proteins in *S. tokodaii*, *S. acidocaldarius* and *S. solfataricus*
358 (Supplemental Table 1). By utilizing different cytochrome systems (e.g., cytochrome
359 *b*_{558/566}, as was suggested in Fe(II) oxidation mechanism) it may still be possible that 4Fe-

360 4S ferredoxin and/or polysulphide reductase-type protein are involved in the Fe(III)
361 reduction mechanism of *Sulfolobus* spp.. Nonetheless, such hypothesis requires detailed
362 biochemical studies to be clarified.

363

364 **Comparison of Cr(VI) reduction by five *Sulfolobus* strains in growth-uncoupled cell-**
365 **suspensions under micro-aerobic condition**

366 Following the previous observation that Fe(III)-reducing *Sulfolobus* sp. GA1 is
367 also capable of Cr(VI) reduction to Cr(III) (Masaki et al. 2016), this study tested five
368 *Sulfolobus* strains to investigate whether or not Cr(VI)-reducing ability is also widely
369 found across different representative *Sulfolobus* species.

370 No further cell growth was observed in cell-suspensions during the experiments
371 (by cell counting; data not shown). Since no changes in total soluble Cr concentration
372 were observed throughout the experiment (data not shown), Cr(VI) reduced by *Sulfolobus*
373 strains remained soluble mostly in the form of Cr(III). Liquid media were free of any
374 trace of iron and no noticeable abiotic reduction of Cr(VI) was observed in sterile controls
375 (Figure 5).

376 All five strains were found to reduce Cr(VI), though to a different extent (Figure
377 5) and with different specific Cr(VI) reduction rates (Table 3). Interestingly, the trend in

378 degree of Fe(III) reduction by five strains (under the same micro-aerobic conditions) did
379 not necessarily correspond to that of Cr(VI) reduction: e.g., *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3 and *S.*
380 *shibatae* B12 showed the highest Fe(III) reduction under micro-aerobic conditions
381 (Figure 3c, e, respectively). Nonetheless, the former was the least effective Cr(VI) reducer
382 while the latter was the most effective among the five strains.

383 **Oxido-reduction of metal species is often mediated** by cytochromes in electron
384 transport chains: In the case of acidophilic bacteria, cytochromes *c* in cell membranes
385 were found to be involved in anaerobic Fe(III) reduction by *At. ferrooxidans* (Ohmura et
386 al. 2002). Cr(VI) reduction by Fe(III)-respiring acidophile *A. cryptum* was also reported
387 to involve cytochromes *c* (Magnuson et al. 2010). In the case of Fe(III)-reducing
388 neutrophiles, cytochromes *c* were found to function in Fe(III) reduction by *Geobacter*
389 *sulfurreducens* (Magnuson et al. 2000) and both Fe(III) and Cr(VI) reduction by
390 *Shewanella putrefaciens* (Beliaev et al. 2001). In the latter bacterium, Cr(VI) reductase
391 was reported to be distinct from Fe(III) reductase, and was not irreversibly inhibited by
392 oxygen (Myers et al. 2000). The fact that the trend in Fe(III) reduction by five *Sulfolobus*
393 strains does not always match that in Cr(VI) reduction implies that different mechanisms
394 may be involved in microbial reduction of the two metals in *Sulfolobus* spp., as was the
395 case with *Shewanella putrefaciens* (Beliaev et al. 2001).

396

397 **Conclusions**

398 This study clarified the presence and the degree of Fe oxido-reduction abilities in five
399 representative *Sulfolobus* strains (*S. metallicus* Kra23; *S. tokodaii* 7; *S. acidocaldarius*
400 98-3; *S. solfataricus* P1; *S. shibatae* B12). The degree of Fe(II)-oxidizing abilities were
401 found to differ largely between the strains. Three strains (*S. tokodaii* 7, *S. solfataricus* P1
402 and *S. shibatae* B12) were capable of growth via Fe(III) respiration. All five strains
403 displayed Fe(III)-reducing abilities in growth-uncoupled cell-suspensions: Nonetheless,
404 Fe(III)-reducing ability in each strain responded significantly differently to the oxygen
405 level. Highly-toxic Cr(VI) was also reduced in growth-uncoupled cell-suspensions of all
406 strains, though to a varying degree. The trend of Fe(III) reduction in five strains did not
407 correspond to that of Cr(VI), suggesting different mechanisms being involved in Fe(III)
408 and Cr(VI) reduction in *Sulfolobus* spp. For being a major member in the acidophile
409 community, Fe redox transformation in the genus *Sulfolobus* remained so far largely
410 ambiguous. The results of this study provide comprehensive understandings over the
411 genus *Sulfolobus* on its Fe redox transformation capabilities and the potential utility of
412 the *Sulfolobus* spp. for biohydrometallurgical applications.

413

414 **Acknowledgments**

415 Y.M. is thankful to financial support provided by the Kyushu University Advanced
416 Graduate Program in Global Strategy for Green Asia.

417

418 **References**

419 Auernik KS, Maezato Y, Blum PH, Kelly RM. 2008. The genome sequence of the metal-
420 mobilizing, extremely thermoacidophilic archaeon *Metallosphaera sedula* provides
421 insights into bioleaching-associated metabolism. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 74: 682-692.

422

423 Bathe S, Norris PR. 2007. Ferrous iron- and sulfur-induced genes in *Sulfolobus metallicus*.
424 *Appl Environ Microbiol* 73:2491-2497.

425

426 Beliaev AS, Saffarini DA, McLaughlin JL, Hunnicutt D. 2001. MtrC, an outer membrane
427 decahaem *c* cytochrome required for metal reduction in *Shewanella putrefaciens* MR-1.
428 *Mol Microbiol* 39:722-730.

429

430 Bonnefoy V, Holmes DS. 2012. Genomic insights into microbial iron oxidation and iron
431 uptake strategies in extremely acidic environments. *Environ Microbiol* 14:1597-1611.

432

433 Bridge TAM, Johnson DB. 1998. Reduction of soluble iron and reductive dissolution of
434 ferric iron-containing minerals by moderately thermophilic iron-oxidizing bacteria. Appl
435 Environ Microbiol 64:2181-2186.

436

437 Brock TD, Brock KM, Belly RT, Weiss RL. 1972. *Sulfolobus*: A new genus of sulfur-
438 oxidizing bacteria living at low pH and high temperature. Arch Microbiol 84:54-68.

439

440 Brock TD, Cook S, Petersen S, Mosser JL. 1976. Biogeochemistry and bacteriology of
441 ferrous iron oxidation in geothermal habitats. Geochim Cosmochim Acta 40:493-500.

442

443 Brock TD, Gustafson J. 1976. Ferric iron reduction by sulfur- and iron-oxidizing bacteria.
444 Appl Environ Microbiol 32:567-571.

445

446 Caldwell DH, Adams RB. 1946. Colorimetric determination of iron in water with *o*-
447 phenanthroline. J Am Water Works Ass 38:727-730.

448

449 Chen L, Brügger K, Skovgaard M, Redder P, She Q, Torarinsson E, Greve B, Aways M,
450 Zibat A, Klenk HP, Garrett RA. 2005. The genome of *Sulfolobus acidocaldarius*, a model
451 organism of the Crenarchaeota. J Bacteriol 187:4992-4999.

452

453 Coupland K, Johnson DB. 2008. Evidence that the potential for dissimilatory ferric iron
454 reduction is widespread among acidophilic heterotrophic bacteria. FEMS Microbiol Lett
455 279:30-35.

456

457 Cummings DE, Fendorf S, Singh N, Sani RK, Peyton BM, Magnuson TS. 2007.
458 Reduction of Cr(VI) under acidic conditions by the facultative Fe(III)-reducing bacterium
459 *Acidiphilium cryptum*. Environ Sci Technol 41:146-152.

460

461 Dean JA. 1999. Lange's Handbook of Chemistry 15th edn, New York:McGraw-Hill.

462 Gautier V, Escobar B, Vargas T. 2008. Cooperative action of attached and planktonic
463 cells during bioleaching of chalcopyrite with *Sulfolobus metallicus* at 70°C.
464 Hydrometallurgy 94:121-126.

465

466 Fredrickson LK, Romine MF, Beliaev AS, Auchtung JM, Driscoll ME, Gardner TS,
467 Nealson KH, Osterman AL, Pinchuk G, Reed JL, Rodionov DA, Rodrigues JLM,
468 Saffarini DA, Serres MH, Spormann AM, Zhulin IB, Tiedje JM. 2008. Towards
469 environmental systems biology of *Shewanella*. Nature Rev Microbiol 6:592-603.

470

471 Grogan D, Palm P, Zillig W. 1990. Isolate B12, which harbours a virus-like element,
472 represents a new species of the archaeobacterial genus *Sulfolobus*, *Sulfolobus shibatae*, sp.
473 nov. Arch Microbiol 154:594-599.

474

475 Grogan DW. 1989. Phenotypic characterization of the archaeobacterial genus *Sulfolobus*:
476 comparison of five wild-type strains. J Bacteriol 171:6710-6719.

477

478 Hallberg KB, Grail BM, du Plessis CA, Johnson DB. 2011a. Reductive dissolution of
479 ferric iron minerals: A new approach for bio-processing nickel laterites. Miner Eng
480 24:620-624.

481

482 Hallberg KB, Hedrich S, Johnson DB. 2011b. *Acidiferrobacter thiooxydans*, gen. nov. sp.
483 nov.; an acidophilic, thermo-tolerant, facultatively anaerobic iron- and sulfur-oxidizer of
484 the family *Ectothiorhodospiraceae*. *Extremophiles* 15:271-279.

485

486 Hallberg KB, Toril EG, Johnson DB. 2010. *Acidithiobacillus ferrivorans*, sp. nov.;

487 facultatively anaerobic, psychrotolerant iron-, and sulfur-oxidizing acidophiles isolated

488 from metal mine-impacted environments. *Extremophiles* 14:9-19.

489

490 Hiller A, Henninger T, Schäfer G, Schmidt CL. 2003. New genes encoding subunits of a

491 cytochrome *bc*₁-analogous complex in the respiratory chain of the

492 hyperthermoacidophilic crenarchaeon *Sulfolobus acidocaldarius*. *J Bioenerg Biomembr*

493 35:121-131.

494

495 Huber G, Stetter KO. 1991. *Sulfolobus metallicus*, sp. nov., a novel strictly

496 chemolithoautotrophic thermophilic archaeal species of metal-mobilizers. *Syst Appl*

497 *Microbiol* 14:372-378.

498 Jan RL, Wu J, Chaw SM, Tsai CW, Tsen SD. 1999. A novel species of thermoacidophilic

499 archaeon, *Sulfolobus yangmingensis* sp. nov. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* 49:1809-1816.

500

501 Johnson DB, Bridge TAM. 2002. Reduction of ferric iron by acidophilic heterotrophic
502 bacteria: evidence for constitutive and inducible enzyme systems in *Acidiphilium* spp. J
503 Appl Microbiol 92:315-321.

504

505 Johnson DB, Grail BM, Hallberg KB. 2013. A new direction for biomining: Extraction
506 of metals by reductive dissolution of oxidized ores. Minerals 3:49-58.

507

508 Johnson DB, Kanao T, Hedrich S. 2012. Redox transformations of iron at extremely low
509 pH: fundamental and applied aspects. Front Microbiol 3:1-13.

510

511 Johnson DB, McGinness S. 1991. Ferric iron reduction by acidophilic heterotrophic
512 bacteria. Appl Environ Microbiol 57:207-211.

513

514 Johnson DB, Stallwood B, Kimura S, Hallberg KB. 2006. Isolation and characterization
515 of *Acidicaldus organivorus*, gen. nov., sp. nov.: a novel sulfur-oxidizing, ferric iron-
516 reducing thermo-acidophilic heterotrophic *Proteobacterium*. Arch Microbiol 185:212-
517 221.

518

519 Johnson DB. 2012. Reductive dissolution of minerals and selective recovery of metals
520 using acidophilic iron- and sulfate-reducing acidophiles. *Hydrometallurgy* 127-128:172-
521 177.

522

523 Kawarabayasi Y, Hino Y, Horikawa H, Jin-no K, Takahashi M, Sekine M, Baba
524 S, Ankai A, Kosugi H, Hosoyama A, Fukui S, Nagai Y, Nishijima K, Otsuka
525 R, Nakazawa H, Takamiya M, Kato Y, Yoshizawa T, Tanaka T, Kudoh Y, Yamazaki
526 J, Kushida N, Oguchi A, Aoki K, Masuda S, Yanagii M, Nishimura M, Yamagishi
527 A, Oshima T, Kikuchi H. 2001. Complete genome sequence of an aerobic
528 thermoacidophilic crenarchaeon, *Sulfolobus tokodaii* strain 7. *DNA Res* 8:123-140.

529

530 Loferer-Kröbächer M, Klima J, Psenner R. 1998. Determination of bacterial cell dry
531 mass by transmission electron microscopy and densitometric image analysis. *Appl*
532 *Environ Microbiol* 64:688-694.

533

534 Lovley DR, Ueki T, Zhang T, Malvankar NS, Shrestha PM, Flanagan KA, Aklujkar
535 M, Butler JE, Giloteaux L, Rotaru AE, Holmes DE, Franks AE, Orellana R, Risso

536 C, Nevin KP. 2011. *Geobacter*: The microbe electric's physiology, ecology, and practical
537 applications. *Adv Microb Physiol* 59:1-100.

538

539 Madigan MT, Martinko JM. 2006. *Brock Biology of Microorganisms* 11th edn, New
540 Jersey:Pearson.

541

542 Madigan MT, Martinko JM, Clark DP, Stahl DA. 201. *Brock Biology of Microorganisms*
543 13th edn, Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company.

544

545 Magnuson TS, Hodges-Myerson AL, Lovley DR. 2000. Characterization of a membrane-
546 bound NADH-dependent Fe^{3+} reductase from the dissimilatory Fe^{3+} -reducing bacterium
547 *Geobacter sulfurreducens*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 185:205-211.

548

549 Magnuson TS, Swenson MW, Paszczynski AJ, Deobald LA, Kerk D, Cummings DE.
550 2010. Proteogenomic and functional analysis of chromate reduction in *Acidiphilium*
551 *cryptum* JF-5, an Fe(III)-respiring acidophile. *Biometals* 23:1129-1138.

552

553 Masaki Y, Hirajima T, Sasaki K, Okibe, N. 2015. Bioreduction and immobilization of
554 hexavalent chromium by the extremely acidophilic Fe(III)-reducing bacterium *Acidocella*
555 *aromatica* strain PFBC. *Extremophiles* 19:495-503.

556

557 Masaki Y, Tsutsumi K, Hirano S, Okibe N. 2016. Microbial community profiling of
558 Chinoike Jigoku (“Blood Pond Hell”) hot spring in Beppu, Japan and isolation and
559 characterization of Fe(III)-reducing *Sulfolobus* sp. strain GA1. *Res Microbiol* 167:595-
560 603.

561

562 Myers CR, Carstens BP, Antholine WE, Myers JM. 2000. Chromium(VI) reductase
563 activity is associated with the cytoplasmic membrane of anaerobically grown *Shewanella*
564 *putrefaciens* MR-1. *J Appl Microbiol* 88:98-106.

565

566 Ñancucheo I, Grail BM, Hilario F, du Plessis C, Johnson DB. 2014. Extraction of copper
567 from an oxidized (lateritic) ore using bacterially catalysed reductive dissolution. *Appl*
568 *Microbiol Biotechnol* 98:6297-6305.

569

570 Neidhardt FC, Ingraham JL, Schaechter M. 1990. Physiology of the bacterial cell: a
571 molecular approach. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Mass.

572

573 Noroozifar M, Khorasani-Motlagh M. 2003. Specific extraction of chromium as
574 tetrabutylammonium-chromate and spectrophotometric determination by
575 diphenylcarbazide: speciation of chromium in effluent streams. Anal Sci 19:705-708.

576

577 Ohmura N, Sasaki K, Matsumoto N, Saiki H. 2002. Anaerobic respiration using Fe^{3+} , S^0 ,
578 and H_2 in the chemolithoautotrophic bacterium *Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans*. J
579 Bacteriol 184:2081-2087.

580

581 Osorio H, Mangold S, Denis Y, Ñancucheo I, Esparza M, Johnson DB, Bonnefoy V,
582 Dopson M, Holmes DS. 2013. Anaerobic sulfur metabolism coupled to dissimilatory iron
583 reduction in the extremophile *Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans*. Appl Environ Microbiol
584 79:2172-2181.

585

586 Quatrini R, Appia-Ayme C, Denis Y, Jedlicki E, Holmes DS, Bonnefoy V. 2009.
587 Extending the models for iron and sulfur oxidation in the extreme acidophile
588 *Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans*. BMC Genomics 10:394.
589
590 Sandström Å, Shchukarev A, Paul J. 2005. XPS characterisation of chalcopyrite
591 chemically and bio-leached at high and low redox potential. Miner Eng 18:505-515.
592
593 She Q, Singh RK, Confalonieri F, Zivanovic Y, Allard G, Awayez MJ, Chan-Weiher CC,
594 Clausen IG, Curtis BA, De Moors A, Erauso G, Fletcher C, Gordon PM, Heikamp-de
595 Jong I, Jeffries AC, Kozera CJ, Medina N, Peng X, Thi-Ngoc HP, Redder P, Schenk ME,
596 Theriault C, Tolstrup N, Charlebois RL, Doolittle WF, Duguet M, Gaasterland T, Garrett
597 RA, Ragan MA, Sensen CW, Van der Oost J. 2001. The complete genome of the
598 crenarchaeon *Sulfolobus solfataricus* P2. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 98:7835-7840.
599 Smith JA, Aklujkar M, Risso C, Leang C, Giloteaux L, Holmes DE. 2015. Mechanisms
600 involved in Fe(III) respiration by the hyperthermophilic archaeon *Ferroglobus placidus*.
601 Appl Environ Microbiol 81:2735-2744.
602

603 Suzuki T, Iwasaki T, Uzawa T, Hara K, Nemoto N, Kon T, Ueki T, Yamagishi A, Oshima
604 T. 2002. *Sulfolobus tokodaii* sp. nov. (f. *Sulfolobus* sp. strain 7), a new member of the
605 genus *Sulfolobus* isolated from Beppu Hot Springs, Japan. *Extremophiles* 6:39-44.
606
607 Urbietta MS, Rascovan N, Vázquez MP, Donati E. 2017. Genome analysis of the
608 thermoacidophilic archaeon *Acidianus copahuensis* focusing on the metabolisms
609 associated to biomining activities. *BMC Genomics* 18: 445.
610
611 Vilcáez J, Suto K, Inoue C. 2008. Bioleaching of chalcopyrite with thermophiles:
612 Temperature–pH–ORP dependence. *Int J Miner Process* 88:37-44.
613
614 Xiang X, Dong X, Huang L. 2003. *Sulfolobus tengchongensis* sp. nov., a novel
615 thermoacidophilic archaeon isolated from a hot spring in Tengchong, China.
616 *Extremophiles* 7:493-498.
617
618 Zhu W, Xia J, Yang Y, Nie ZY, Zheng L, Ma CY, Zhang RY, Peng AA, Tang L, Qui GZ.
619 2011. Sulfur oxidation activities of pure and mixed thermophiles and sulfur speciation in
620 bioleaching of chalcopyrite. *Bioresour Technol* 102:3877-3882.

621

622 Zillig W, Kletzin A, Schleper C, Holz I, Janekovic D, Hain J, Lanzendörfer M,

623 Kristjansson JK. 1993. Screening for *Sulfolobales*, their plasmids and their viruses in

624 Icelandic solfataras. Syst Appl Microbiol 16:609-628.

625

626 **Figure Legends**

627 **Figure 1.**

628 Growth-uncoupled Fe(II) oxidation in cell-suspensions of five *Sulfolobus* strains (pH 2.0,
629 70°C, aerobic conditions): *S. metallicus* Kra23 (▲, △); *S. tokodaii* 7 (■, □); *S.*
630 *acidocaldarius* 98-3 (◆, ◇); *S. solfataricus* P1 (▼, ▽); *S. shibatae* B12 (●, ○); sterile
631 controls (+, ×) (duplicate data are individually plotted). The initial cell densities of cell-
632 suspensions (naturally achieved after pre-growing each strain) were 2×10^8 cells mL⁻¹ (*S.*
633 *metallicus* Kra23; *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3; *S. solfataricus* P1) and 5×10^8 cells mL⁻¹ (*S.*
634 *tokodaii* 7; *S. shibatae* B12).

635

636 **Figure 2.**

637 Growth-uncoupled Fe(III) reduction in cell-suspensions of five *Sulfolobus* strains (pH 2.0,
638 70°C, anaerobic conditions): (a) *S. metallicus* Kra23, (b) *S. tokodaii* 7, (c) *S.*
639 *acidocaldarius* 98-3, (d) *S. solfataricus* P1, (e) *S. shibatae* B12, (f) sterile controls.
640 Glucose (●, ○) or elemental sulfur (▲, △) was used as electron donor. Solid or broken
641 lines indicate concentrations of total soluble Fe or Fe(II), respectively. Duplicate data are
642 individually plotted.

643

644 **Figure 3.**

645 Growth-uncoupled Fe(III) reduction in cell-suspensions of five *Sulfolobus* strains (pH 2.0,
646 70°C, micro-aerobic conditions): (a) *S. metallicus* Kra23 (0-25 h), (b) *S. tokodaii* 7 (0-25
647 h), (c) *S. acidocaldarius* 98-3 (0-100 h), (d) *S. solfataricus* P1 (0-25 h), (e) *S. shibatae*
648 B12 (0-100 h), (f) sterile controls (0-100 h). Glucose (●, ○) or elemental sulfur (▲,
649 △) was used as electron donor. Electron-donor-free controls (■, □) were also prepared.
650 Solid or broken lines indicate concentrations of total soluble Fe or Fe(II), respectively.
651 Duplicate data are individually plotted.

652

653 **Figure 4.**

654 Correlation between anaerobic cell growth and the amount of Fe(III) reduced by five
655 *Sulfolobus* strains (pH 2.0, 70°C): (a) *S. metallicus* Kra23, (b) *S. tokodaii* 7, (c) *S.*
656 *acidocaldarius* 98-3, (d) *S. solfataricus* P1, (e) *S. shibatae* B12. The initial Fe(III)
657 concentration used were 0 (▼), 5 (●), 10 (■), or 15 (▲) mM. The number indicated for
658 each plot indicates the time for sampling. Data points are the average of two
659 measurements from duplicate flasks (error bars show the average difference in the two
660 values).

661

662 **Figure 5.**

663 Cr(VI) reduction in cell-suspensions of five *Sulfolobus* strains (pH 2.0, 70°C, micro-
664 aerobic conditions): *S. metallicus* Kra23 (▲,△); *S. tokodaii* 7 (■,□); *S. acidocaldarius*
665 98-3 (◆,◇); *S. solfataricus* P1 (▼,▽); *S. shibatae* B12 (●,○); sterile controls with
666 glucose (+, ×) or elemental sulfur (/, \) as electron donor. Duplicate data are
667 individually plotted.

668

669 **Table 1.**

670 Fe(II) oxidation rates and specific Fe(II) oxidation rates determined for five *Sulfolobus*
671 strains in growth-uncoupled cell suspensions.

672

673 **Table 2.**

674 Fe(III) reduction rates and specific Fe(III) reduction rates determined for five *Sulfolobus*
675 strains in growth-uncoupled cells suspensions under anaerobic or micro-aerobic
676 conditions.

677

678 **Table 3.**

679 Cr(VI) reduction rates and specific Cr(VI) reduction rates determined for five *Sulfolobus*

680 strains in growth-uncoupled cell suspensions under micro-aerobic condition.

681

682 **Supplemental Table 1.**

683 Putative genes possibly involved in Fe(II) oxidation / Fe(III) reduction in *Sulfolobus* spp.

684 searched using the KEGG (Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes) database.