

Provisional Title

Authors^{1,2,3} and Álvaro Sánchez^{1,2,†}

¹*Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA*

²*Microbial Sciences Institute, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA*

³*Other affiliations...*

[†]*To whom correspondence should be addressed: alvaro.sanchez@yale.edu*

Abstract

The abstract goes here.

Test section

This is an example cite [1, 2]. This is how you refer to Figure 1. This is how you refer to Figure 1a. This is how you refer to Table 1. This is how you refer to Figure S1. This is how you refer to the section Simulations of the Methods. This is a cleaner way to refer to the Methods: Simulations.

Introduction

Microbial communities often invade one another. This has been observed, for instance, in river courses where terrestrial microbial communities mix with aquatic microorganisms [1–3] or in soil communities being invaded as a result of tillage and outplanting [4] or by aurally dispersed bacteria and fungi [5]. The human digestive system can get invaded several times a day by the microbial consortia that reside on the ingested food, and the skin microbiota is also subject to invasions when making contact with environmental sources of microbes [6].

The phenomenon by which entire microbiomes invade one another has been termed *community coalescence* [7]. Ecologists have long contemplated the idea that interactions between multiple co-invading species can produce correlated invasional outcomes [7–13]. One example is the hypothesis known as *invasional meltdown*, which proposes that positive interactions between co-invading species can enhance their invasive success and facilitate future invasions [14–16]. However, and in spite of its clear potential importance, the role of coalescence in microbiome assembly is only beginning to be addressed and little is known about the mechanisms that govern it and its potential implications. Early mathematical models of community-community invasions [8, 17] as well as more recent work [18–21] suggest that high-order invasion effects are common during community coalescence. Communities that have a previous history of coexistence may exhibit an emergent “cohesiveness” which produces correlated invasional outcomes among species from the same community [11, 22]. The situation where ecological partners in the invading community recruit each other into the final coalesced community has been called *ecological co-selection* [22, 23].

The mechanisms of ecological co-selection during community coalescence are still poorly understood. Do a few key species recruit everyone else, or are collective interactions among all species (including the rarer members of the community) relevant for coalescence outcomes? While it is reasonable to expect species with larger population sizes to have a proportionally oversized effect, natural communities tend to be highly diverse [24] and the role played by the less abundant species has long been subject to debate [25]. Laboratory cultures have also been found to contain uneven distributions of multiple strains that feed off the metabolic secretions of the dominant species [26, 27]. The fate of these sub-dominant taxa may be dependent on the invasional success of their dominant species, or, alternatively, the dominant itself may owe its dominance (at least in part) to cross-feeding or other forms of facilitation from the rarer members of the population. These scenarios would give rise to “top-down” or “bottom-up” community cohesiveness, respectively. Either of these forms of co-selection could, in principle, be positive (recruitment) or

44 negative (antagonism), as illustrated in [Figure 1e](#). Which of these situations are typically found in nature?
45 Addressing this question has been experimentally challenging in the past [[22](#), [23](#)].

46 Check this reference [[13](#)]

47 Uncovering the rules of microbial community invasions [[20](#)]

48 **Results & Discussion**

49 Resource availability modulates biodiversity–invasion relationships by altering competitive interactions
50 [[28](#)]

51 Resource pulses can alleviate the biodiversity–invasion relationship in soil microbial communities [[29](#)]

Methods

Stabilization of environmental communities in simple synthetic environments

Communities were stabilized *ex situ* as described in [27]. In short, environmental samples (soil, leaves...) within one meter radius in eight different geographical locations were collected with sterile tweezers or spatulas into 50mL sterile tubes (Fig. [missing ref(s)]). One gram of each sample was allowed to sit at room temperature in 10mL of phosphate buffered saline (1×PBS) containing 200μg/mL cycloheximide to suppress eukaryotic growth. After 48h, samples were mixed 1:1 with 80% glycerol and kept frozen at −80°C. Starting microbial communities were prepared by scrapping the frozen stocks into 200μL of 1×PBS and adding a volume of 4μL to 500μL of synthetic minimal media (1×M9) supplemented with 200μg/mL cycloheximide and 0.07 C-mol/L glutamine or sodium citrate as the carbon source in 96 deep-well plates (1.2mL; VWR). Cultures were then incubated still at 30°C to allow for re-growth. After 48h, samples were fully homogenized and biomass increase was followed by measuring the optical density (620nm) of 100μL of the cultures in a Multiskan FC plate reader (Thermo Scientific). Communities were stabilized [27] by passaging 4μL of the cultures into 500μL of fresh media (1×M9 with the carbon source) every 48h for a total of 12 transfers at a dilution factor of 1:100, roughly equivalent to 80 generations per culture (Fig. [missing ref(s)]). Cycloheximide was not added to the media after the first two transfers.

Isolation of dominant species

For each community, the most abundant colony morphotype at the end of the ninth transfer was selected, resuspended in 100μL 1×PBS and serially diluted (1:10). Next, 20μL of the cells diluted to 10^{−6} were plated in the corresponding synthetic minimal media and allowed to regrow at 30°C for 48h. Dominants were then inoculated into 500μL of fresh media and incubated still at 30°C for 48h. After this period, the communities stabilized for eleven transfers and the isolated dominants were ready for the competition experiments (Fig [missing ref(s)]) at the onset of the twelfth transfer.

Dominant-dominant and community-community competitions

All possible pairwise dominant-dominant and community-community competition experiments were performed by mixing equal volumes (4μL) of each of the eight communities or eight dominants at the onset of the twelfth transfer. Competitions were set up in their native media, i.e. in 500μL of 1×M9 supplemented with 0.07 C-mol/L of either glutamine or citrate in 96 deep-well plates. Plates were incubated at 30°C for 48h. Pairwise competitions were further propagated for seven serial transfers (roughly 42 generations; Fig. [missing ref(s)]) by transferring 8μL of each culture to fresh media (500μL).

Determination of community composition by 16S sequencing

The sequencing protocol was identical to that described in [27]. Community samples were collected by spinning down at 3500rpm for 25min in a bench-top centrifuge at room temperature; cell pellets were stored at −80°C before processing. To maximize Gram-positive bacteria cell wall lysis, the cell pellets were re-suspended and incubated at 37°C for 30min in enzymatic lysis buffer (20mM Tris-HCl, 2mM sodium EDTA, 1.2% Triton X-100) and 20mg/mL of lysozyme from chicken egg white (Sigma-Aldrich). After cell lysis, the DNA extraction and purification was performed using the DNeasy 96 protocol for animal tissues (Qiagen). The clean DNA in 100μL elution buffer of 10mM Tris-HCl, 0.5mM EDTA at pH 9.0 was quantified using Quan-iT PicoGreen dsDNA Assay Kit (Molecular Probes, Inc.) and normalized to 5ng/μL in nuclease-free water (Qiagen) for subsequent 16S rRNA illumina sequencing. 16S rRNA amplicon library preparation was performed following a dual-index paired-end approach [30]. Briefly, PCR amplicon libraries of V4 regions of the 16S rRNA were prepared using dual-index primers (F515/R805), then pooled and sequenced using the Illumina MiSeq chemistry and platform. Each sample went through a 30-cycle PCR in duplicate of 20μL reaction volumes using 5ng of DNA each, dual index primers, and AccuPrime Pfx SuperMix (Invitrogen). The thermocycling procedure includes a 2min initial denaturation step at 95°C, and 30 cycles of the following PCR scheme: (a) 20-second denaturation at 95°C, (b) 15-second annealing at 55°C, and (c) 5-minute extension at 72°C. The duplicate PCR products of each sample were pooled, purified, and normalized using SequelPrep PCR cleanup and normalization kit (Invitrogen). Barcoded amplicon libraries were then pooled and sequenced using Illumina Miseq v2 reagent kit, which

generated 2×250bp paired-end reads at the Yale Center for Genome Analysis (YCGA). The sequencing reads were demultiplexed on QIIME 1.9.0 [31]. The barcodes, indexes, and primers were removed from raw reads, producing FASTQ files with both the forward and reverse reads for each sample, ready for DADA2 analysis [32]. DADA2 version 1.1.6 was used to infer unique biological exact sequence variants (ESVs) for each sample and naïve Bayes was used to assign taxonomy using the SILVA version 123 database [33, 34].

Metrics of community distance

Beta-diversity indexes between the invasive and coalesced communities or the resident and coalesced communities were computed using various similarity metrics. For two arbitrary communities with ESV abundances represented by the vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N)$ (where x_i and y_i represent the relative abundance of the i th ESV in each community respectively and N is the total number of ESVs), the Bray-Curtis similarity $BC(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is calculated as [35]

$$BC(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_i \min(x_i, y_i) \quad (1)$$

The Jensen-Shannon similarity $JS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is defined as one minus the Jensen-Shannon distance (which is, in turn, the square root of the Jensen-Shannon divergence [36])

$$JS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}KL(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}) + \frac{1}{2}KL(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{m})} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})/2$ and KL denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence [37]

$$KL(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_i x_i \log_2 \left(\frac{x_i}{y_i} \right) \quad (3)$$

The Jaccard similarity is given by $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ [38]

$$J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{|\mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{y}|}{|\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}|} \quad (4)$$

Additionally, we quantify coalescence outcomes by examining the fraction of the endemic cohort of the original communities that persists in the coalesced one. We call $E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ to the fraction of endemic species of \mathbf{x} that are also found in \mathbf{y} .

For all the metrics above, we quantify the relative similarity between the invasive and the coalesced communities using relative metrics (Q):

$$Q(\mathbf{x}_I, \mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_C) = \frac{F(\mathbf{x}_I, \mathbf{x}_C)}{F(\mathbf{x}_I, \mathbf{x}_C) + F(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_C)} \quad (5)$$

where the subindices I, R and C correspond to the invasive, resident and coalesced communities respectively, and F represents one of BC (Bray-Curtis similarity), JS (Jensen-Shannon similarity), J (Jaccard similarity) or E (endemic survival) defined above.

Simulations

We used the Community Simulator package [39] and included new features for our simulations. In the package, species are characterized by their resource uptake rates ($c_{i\alpha}$ for species i and resource α), and they all share a common metabolic matrix \mathbf{D} . The element $D_{\alpha\beta}$ of this matrix represents the fraction of energy in the form of resource α secreted when resource β is consumed. Here we implemented a new operation mode in which species can secrete different metabolites (and/or in different abundances) when consuming a same resource. Experimental observations support the idea of distinct species producing different sets of byproducts when growing in the same primary resource [missing ref(s)]. We call $D_{i\alpha\beta}$ to the fraction of energy in the form of resource α secreted by species i when consuming resource β —note that now $D_{i\alpha\beta}$ need not be equal to $D_{j\alpha\beta}$ if $i \neq j$, unlike in the original Community Simulator. In the package’s underlying Microbial Consumer Resource Model [27, 40], this just means that the energy flux $J_{i\beta}^{\text{out}}$ now takes the form

$$J_{i\beta}^{\text{out}} = \sum_{\alpha} D_{i\beta\alpha} l_{\alpha} J_{i\alpha}^{\text{in}} \quad (6)$$

The documentation for the Community Simulator contains detailed descriptions of the model, parameters and package use. For the updated package with the new functionality, see [Data & code availability](#).

For our simulations, we first generate a library of 660 species (divided into three specialist families of 200 members each and a generalist family of 60 members) and 30 resources (divided into three classes of 10 members each). We split this library into two non-overlapping pools of 330 species each. We randomly sample 50 species from each pool in equal ratios to seed 100 resident and 100 invasive communities respectively. We then grow and dilute the communities serially, replenishing the primary resource after each dilution. We repeat the process 20 times to ensure generational equilibrium is achieved [27]. We then perform the *in silico* experiments by using the generationally stable communities to seed 100 coalesced communities that we again stabilize as described previously. Similarly, we identify the dominant (most abundant) species of every resident and invasive community to carry out pairwise competition and single invasion simulations. Most parameters are set to the defaults of the original Community Simulator package. Table [\[missing ref\(s\)\]](#) shows those that are given non-default values to ensure enough variation in the primary communities.

Data & code availability

Experimental data and code for the analysis, as well as code for the simulations and the updated Community Simulator package with instructions for the new features can be found in github.com/jdiazc9/coalescence.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Joshua Goldford, Pankaj Mehta, Wenping Cui, Robert Marsland and all members of the Sanchez laboratory for many helpful discussions. We also wish to express our gratitude to the Goodman laboratory at Yale for technical help during the early stages of this project. The funding for this work partly results from a Scialog Program sponsored jointly by the Research Corporation for Science Advancement and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation through grants to Yale University by the Research Corporation and the Simons Foundation.


References

1. Luo X, Xiang X, Yang Y, Huang G, Fu K, Che R and Chen L (2020). Seasonal effects of river flow on microbial community coalescence and diversity in a riverine network. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* **96(8)**:fiae132
2. Vass M, Székely AJ, Lindström ES, Osman OA and Langenheder S (2021). Warming mediates the resistance of aquatic bacteria to invasion during community coalescence. *Molecular Ecology* **30(5)**:1345–1356
3. Mansour I, Heppell CM, Ryo M and Rillig MC (2018). Application of the microbial community coalescence concept to riverine networks. *Biological Reviews* **93(4)**:1832–1845
4. Rillig MC, Lehmann A, Aguilar-Trigueros CA, Antonovics J, Caruso T, Hempel S, Lehmann J, Valyi K, Verbruggen E et al. (2016). Soil microbes and community coalescence. *Pedobiologia* **59(1-2)**:37–40
5. Evans SE, Bell-Dereske LP, Dougherty KM and Kittredge HA (2019). Dispersal alters soil microbial community response to drought. *Environmental Microbiology* **22(3)**:905–916
6. Vandegrift R, Fahimipour AK, Muscarella M, Bateman AC, Wymelenberg KVD and Bohannon BJ (2019). Moving microbes: the dynamics of transient microbial residence on human skin. *bioRxiv*
7. Rillig MC, Antonovics J, Caruso T, Lehmann A, Powell JR, Veresoglou SD and Verbruggen E (2015). Interchange of entire communities: microbial community coalescence. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **30(8)**:470–476
8. Gilpin M (1994). Community-level competition: asymmetrical dominance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **91(8)**:3252–3254
9. Grosholz ED (2005). Recent biological invasion may hasten invasional meltdown by accelerating historical introductions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102(4)**:1088–1091
10. Green PT, O'Dowd DJ, Abbott KL, Jeffery M, Retallick K and Nally RM (2011). Invasional meltdown: Invader–invader mutualism facilitates a secondary invasion. *Ecology* **92(9)**:1758–1768
11. Livingston G, Jiang Y, Fox JW and Leibold MA (2013). The dynamics of community assembly under sudden mixing in experimental microcosms. *Ecology* **94(12)**:2898–2906
12. O'Loughlin LS and Green PT (2017). Secondary invasion: When invasion success is contingent on other invaders altering the properties of recipient ecosystems. *Ecology and Evolution* **7(19)**:7628–7637
13. Castledine M, Sierocinski P, Padfield D and Buckling A (2020). Community coalescence: an eco-evolutionary perspective. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **375(1798)**:20190252
14. Simberloff D and Holle BV (1999). Positive Interactions of Nonindigenous Species: Invasional Meltdown? *Biological Invasions* **1(1)**:21–32
15. Simberloff D (2006). Invasional meltdown 6 years later: important phenomenon, unfortunate metaphor, or both? *Ecology Letters* **9(8)**:912–919
16. Gurevitch J (2006). Commentary on Simberloff (2006): Meltdowns, snowballs and positive feedbacks. *Ecology Letters* **9(8)**:919–921
17. Toquenaga Y (1997). Historicity of a Simple Competition Model. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **187(2)**:175–181
18. Tikhonov M (2016). Community-level cohesion without cooperation. *eLife* **5**:e15747
19. Tikhonov M and Monasson R (2017). Collective Phase in Resource Competition in a Highly Diverse Ecosystem. *Physical Review Letters* **118(4)**:048103

- 202 20. Vila JCC, Jones ML, Patel M, Bell T and Rosindell J (2019). Uncovering the rules of microbial
203 community invasions. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **3**(8):1162–1171
- 204 21. Lechón P, Clegg T, Cook J, Smith TP and Pawar S (2021). The role of competition versus cooperation
205 in microbial community coalescence. *bioRxiv*
- 206 22. Sierocinski P, Milferstedt K, Bayer F, Großkopf T, Alston M, Bastkowski S, Swarbreck D, Hobbs
207 PJ, Soyer OS et al. (2017). A Single Community Dominates Structure and Function of a Mixture of
208 Multiple Methanogenic Communities. *Current Biology* **27**(21):3390–3395.e4
- 209 23. Rillig MC and Mansour I (2017). Microbial Ecology: Community Coalescence Stirs Things Up.
210 *Current Biology* **27**(23):R1280–R1282
- 211 24. Louca S, Jacques SMS, Pires APF, Leal JS, Srivastava DS, Parfrey LW, Farjalla VF and Doebeli M
212 (2016). High taxonomic variability despite stable functional structure across microbial communities.
213 *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **1**(1):0015
- 214 25. Winfree R, Fox JW, Williams NM, Reilly JR and Cariveau DP (2015). Abundance of common species,
215 not species richness, drives delivery of a real-world ecosystem service. *Ecology Letters* **18**(7):626–635
- 216 26. Rosenzweig RF, Sharp RR, Treves DS and Adams J (1994). Microbial evolution in a simple unstruc-
217 tured environment: genetic differentiation in *Escherichia coli*. *Genetics* **137**(4):903–917
- 218 27. Goldford JE, Lu N, Bajić D, Estrela S, Tikhonov M, Sanchez-Gorostiaga A, Segrè D, Mehta P and
219 Sanchez A (2018). Emergent simplicity in microbial community assembly. *Science* **361**(6401):469–
220 474
- 221 28. Yang T, Wei Z, Friman VP, Xu Y, Shen Q, Kowalchuk GA and Jousset A (2017). Resource availabil-
222 ity modulates biodiversity-invasion relationships by altering competitive interactions. *Environmental*
223 *Microbiology* **19**(8):2984–2991
- 224 29. Mallon CA, Poly F, Roux XL, Marring I, van Elsas JD and Salles JF (2015). Resource pulses can
225 alleviate the biodiversity–invasion relationship in soil microbial communities. *Ecology* **96**(4):915–926
- 226 30. Kozich JJ, Westcott SL, Baxter NT, Highlander SK and Schloss PD (2013). Development of a Dual-
227 Index Sequencing Strategy and Curation Pipeline for Analyzing Amplicon Sequence Data on the MiSeq
228 Illumina Sequencing Platform. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **79**(17):5112–5120
- 229 31. Caporaso JG, Kuczynski J, Stombaugh J, Bittinger K, Bushman FD, Costello EK, Fierer N, Peña AG,
230 Goodrich JK et al. (2010). QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data.
231 *Nature Methods* **7**:335–336
- 232 32. Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ and Holmes SP (2017). Exact sequence variants should replace operational
233 taxonomic units in marker-gene data analysis. *The ISME Journal* **11**:2639–2643
- 234 33. Wang Q, Garrity GM, Tiedje JM and Cole JR (2007). Naïve Bayesian Classifier for Rapid Assign-
235 ment of rRNA Sequences into the New Bacterial Taxonomy. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*
236 **73**(16):5261–5267
- 237 34. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, Peplies J and Glöckner FO (2013). The
238 SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic*
239 *Acids Research* **41**(D1):D590–D596
- 240 35. Curtis JT and Bray JR (1957). An Ordination of the Upland Forest Communities of Southern Wiscon-
241 sin. *Ecological Monographs* **27**(4):325–349
- 242 36. Lin J (1991). Divergence measures based on the Shannon entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information*
243 *Theory* **37**(1):145–151
- 244 37. Kullback S and Leibler RA (1951). On Information and Sufficiency. *The Annals of Mathematical*
245 *Statistics* **22**(1):79–86
- 246 38. Jaccard P (1912). The distribution of the flora in the alpine zone. *New Phytologist* **11**(2):37–50


- 247 39. Marsland R, Cui W, Goldford J and Mehta P (2020). The Community Simulator: A Python package
248 for microbial ecology. *PLoS ONE* **15(3)**:e0230430
- 249 40. Marsland III R, Cui W, Goldford J, Sanchez A, Korolev K and Mehta P (2019). Available energy fluxes
250 drive a transition in the diversity, stability, and functional structure of microbial communities. *PLoS*
251 *Computational Biology* **15(2)**:e1006793

Figures



253


Figure 1. Overview of the experimental protocol. **a.** Environmental samples collected from eight different locations were used to inoculate our communities. **b.** Communities were stabilized in serial batch culture bioreactors [27] in minimal synthetic media with glutamine or citrate as the only supplied carbon source. **c.** Communities were plated in minimal media agar plates and the most abundant species (the “dominants”) from each community were isolated. We refer to the set of sub-dominant species as the “cohorts”. **d.** Rank-frequency distributions of all eight communities stabilized in either glutamine (red) or citrate (blue), sequenced at a depth of 10^{-4} reads. Three biological replicates per community are shown. Community compositions are skewed and long-tailed. **e.** Our hypothesis is that ecological co-selection can take place from the top-down, i.e. the dominant co-selecting the cohort, or from the bottom-up, i.e. the cohort co-selecting the dominant. Both forms of co-selection can be positive (recruitment) or negative (antagonism). **f.** Illustration of the protocol of our coalescence experiments. All pairs of communities were inoculated into fresh minimal media supplemented with the same carbon source where communities had been previously stabilized. The coalesced (C) and original resident (R) and invasive (I) communities were then serially diluted and allowed to grow for seven additional transfers.



268


269 **Figure 2. Co-selection in microbial community coalescence.** **a.** Coalescence outcomes are quantified by the relative
 270 Bray-Curtis similarity (Q) between the coalesced and invasive communities (Methods: Metrics of community distance).
 271 These outcomes are predicted by the pairwise competition between the invasive and resident dominant species ($R^2 =$
 272 0.15 for glutamine and $R^2 = 0.57$ for citrate). This is consistent with a scenario of top-down positive co-selection where
 273 dominants recruit their cohorts for the final coalesced community. Two biological replicates per experiment are plotted
 274 individually. **b.** We represent the frequency reached by the invasive dominant species when they invade the resident
 275 communities on their own versus when they are in the company of their cohort. Three scenarios are possible: green
 276 and red shaded areas represent limit cases of positive (recruitment) or negative (antagonism) bottom-up co-selection,
 277 gray area corresponds to situations where invasive dominant species can invade with equal success regardless of the
 278 presence of their cohorts. Data shows that positive co-selection is common, whereas antagonistic co-selection is rare
 279 in our experiments. Two biological replicates per experiment are plotted individually. **c-d.** Simulations of community
 280 coalescence with a consumer-resource model are able to capture these trends.

Supplementary Figures




283

Figure S1. Community compositions after seven additional transfers without coalescence. Each color of the pie plots corresponds to a different exact sequence variant ([Methods: Determination of community composition by 16S sequencing](#)). Replicate 2 of community 1 from glutamine, as well as replicate 2 of community 8 from citrate (highlighted) were removed based on their dissimilarity to the other two replicates (details in code for data analysis, see [Data & code availability](#)). Communities clustered in dashed boxes shared the same dominant species as revealed by sequencing data. For communities enclosed in red boxes, sequencing data showed that the species isolated by plating was not detectable in the community after seven additional transfers (i.e. the dominant was incorrectly identified) and were therefore excluded from downstream analyses.



293

294 **Figure S2. Alternative metrics of community distance.** Quantifying coalescence outcomes using different metrics
 295 of community similarity ([Methods: Metrics of community distance](#)) gives similar results to those shown in [Figure 2a](#).
 296 Metrics that account for the relative species abundances (**a.** Jensen-Shannon similarity or [Figure 2a](#) Bray-Curtis simi-
 297 larity) yield higher correlations than less quantitative metrics that only account for species presence/absence (**b.** Jaccard
 298 similarity or **c.** Fraction of endemic invasive species persisting in the coalesced community).



300

301 **Figure S3. Dominant species have limited effects on coalescence outcomes.** We repeated the analyses shown in
 302 [Figure 2a](#) and [Figure S2](#), but this time we removed the dominants from the compositional data prior to quantifying
 303 community distances. The trends observed before are maintained.