

RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Seasonal Shifts in Diet and Gut Microbiota of the American Bison (*Bison bison*)

Gaddy T. Bergmann<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Joseph M. Craine<sup>3</sup>, Michael S. Robeson, II<sup>4,5</sup>, Noah Fierer<sup>1,2</sup>

**1** Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Boulder, Colorado, United States of America, **2** Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, Boulder, Colorado, United States of America, **3** Division of Biology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, United States of America, **4** Fish and Wildlife Conservation Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, United States of America, **5** USDA APHIS, National Wildlife Research Center, Fort Collins, Colorado, United States of America

\* [Gaddy.Bergmann@colorado.edu](mailto:Gaddy.Bergmann@colorado.edu); [GaddyBergmann@Gmail.com](mailto:GaddyBergmann@Gmail.com)



CrossMark  
click for updates

**OPEN ACCESS**

**Citation:** Bergmann GT, Craine JM, Robeson MS, II, Fierer N (2015) Seasonal Shifts in Diet and Gut Microbiota of the American Bison (*Bison bison*). PLoS ONE 10(11): e0142409. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0142409

**Editor:** Jesus E. Maldonado, Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, UNITED STATES

**Received:** November 18, 2014

**Accepted:** October 21, 2015

**Published:** November 12, 2015

**Copyright:** © 2015 Bergmann et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Data Availability Statement:** All relevant data are available via Figshare. Relevant DOIs are provided via the following URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1394662>.

**Funding:** These authors have no support or funding to report.

**Competing Interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## Abstract

North American bison (*Bison bison*) are becoming increasingly important to both grassland management and commercial ranching. However, a lack of quantitative data on their diet constrains conservation efforts and the ability to predict bison effects on grasslands. In particular, we know little about the seasonality of the bison diet, the degree to which bison supplement their diet with eudicots, and how changes in diet influence gut microbial communities, all of which play important roles in ungulate performance. To address these knowledge gaps, we quantified seasonal patterns in bison diet and gut microbial community composition for a bison herd in Kansas using DNA sequencing-based analyses of both chloroplast and microbial DNA contained in fecal matter. Across the 11 sampling dates that spanned 166 days, we found that diet shifted continuously over the growing season, allowing bison to take advantage of the seasonal availability of high-protein plant species. Bison consumed more woody shrubs in spring and fall than in summer, when forb and grass intake predominated. In examining gut microbiota, the bacterial phylum *Tenericutes* shifted significantly in relative abundance over the growing season. This work suggests that North American bison can continuously adjust their diet with a high reliance on non-grasses throughout the year. In addition, we find evidence for seasonal patterns in gut community composition that are likely driven by the observed dietary changes.

## Introduction

North American bison (*Bison bison*) are a keystone species in the grasslands of the Great Plains, where their feeding, migration, and wallowing activities promote plant diversity [1]. Bison are considered primarily grazers, meaning they consume mostly graminoids (grasses and sedges) [2–5]. The bison diet varies across different geographic regions, depending on the type and abundance of potential forage available. For example, in northern habitats, bison diets are dominated by cool-season graminoids [3]. Yet bison may also browse, feeding on shrubs such as *Salix* as their primary forage when graminoids are scarce [6,7].

In general, herbivores have been shown to prefer fresh shoots, because they are often lower in plant secondary compounds and richer in protein, making such plants more palatable, easier to digest, and more nourishing [8–10]. Phenologically driven pursuit of new growth was first observed in geese [11–14], and then in deer [8,15–17]. Bison prefer newly produced shoots as well, including those on mowed areas [18], burned areas [19–22], and prairie dog towns [23–25]. Despite their historic keystone role in North American grasslands, little is known about how the bison diet changes seasonally. Bison have been observed exhibiting seasonal variation in diet, continuing to feed on graminoids [3,26], but also incorporating forbs, woody plants, and even lichen into their diet [27]. These temporal shifts in the bison diet are likely due to the changing nutritional quality of plants, and likely important to understanding the health of bison, as well as the impacts of bison on grassland ecosystems.

Along with our poor understanding of the seasonal patterns of bison diet, we do not know if bison gut microbial communities shift in response to changes in diet. Like all ruminants, bison rely on symbiotic microbes to help them digest vegetation [28]. Digestion begins in the reticulorumen, and continues in other parts of the digestive tract, concluding in the colon [5]. Domestic cattle (*Bos taurus*) on pasture or forage retain a diverse, benign gut microbiota associated with a healthy digestive tract. The few studies on the seasonal patterns of gut microbiota in wild herbivores have found changes in gut community composition that are associated with changes in diet [29,30]. If changes in gut microbial communities are associated with dietary shifts in bison, this would suggest that microbes respond to changes in nutritional quality, anti-nutritional secondary metabolites, or plant species composition of the diet [31–33].

Understanding seasonal variation in plant consumption will increase our understanding of bison's dietary needs. Documenting concurrent shifts in gut microbiota will help us establish baseline rates of change in gut community composition throughout the year, and assess whether microbial shifts are associated with dietary changes. In order to better understand seasonal patterns of diet and gut microbial community composition, bison fecal material was collected from adult and subadult bison in a Kansas prairie approximately every 14 d during the growing season. An herbivore's diet is affected by both plant availability and forager preference for different plant species [34–36], so both plant availability and the preferences of bison will affect the amounts of different plants ultimately consumed by bison. However, computing preference indices requires assessing plant abundance and dispersion in the environment [37,38]. Diet and gut microbial community changes over time were reconstructed using DNA sequencing-based analyses of both plant chloroplast DNA and the 16S rRNA gene of bacteria and archaea. These data were used to address two main questions: to what degree does the bison diet change throughout the growing season, and do temporal changes in diet drive corresponding shifts in gut microbial community composition?

## Materials and Methods

### Study design

The Konza Prairie Biological Station is a private 3,487-ha native tallgrass prairie preserve in the Flint Hills of northeastern Kansas (39.08 N, 96.57 W). American bison (*Bison bison*) were reintroduced to the preserve in 1987, and now about 300 of them live in a fenced range of about 970 ha. To study their diet and gut microbiota, fecal samples were collected every other week from adult and subadult bison (three male and three female) during the period of April 17–September 30, 2011. Samples were collected from the first individuals observed to defecate during each collection trip, which may or may not have been the same individuals from one trip to the next. Fecal samples were sampled 48 times and divided into two demographic groups: 24 adult or subadult males, and 24 adult or subadult females. Collectors waited at a distance for

the bison to defecate, and once they moved away, fresh fecal material was sampled with an inverted plastic bag, taking care to avoid contamination from soil underneath. Fecal samples were transported on ice, and stored at -20°C. Because only bison fecal material and vegetation were collected for the present study, no Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval was required. John Briggs, Director of Konza Prairie Biological Station, was the authority who reviewed our procedures and granted us permission to collect samples.

## Diet analyses

We used analyses of plant chloroplast DNA in feces to infer which plant species the bison had consumed, and to track changes in these plants' relative abundance in the diet over time. This method, known as the *trnL* approach [39], uses the P6 loop of the *trnL* (UAA) intron to assay diet in herbivores [40]. We used the *trnL* g-h primer pair, whose targeted gene region is only 10–146 bp long, making it likely that the gene region can be amplified and sequenced from feces after passage of the plant material through the bison gut. The amplified region is also highly variable, so it can be used to differentiate many plant species [41]. An identical approach has been used previously for non-invasive analysis of herbivore diet [42–44].

To match the *trnL* sequences to plant species, we created a *trnL* reference library for the site by acquiring representative samples of 73 plant species to which the bison had access. Single specimens of plants were collected in the field and placed in sealable plastic bags. They were identified and stored in the freezer at -20°C. To extract DNA from plants, vegetation samples were finely chopped with a sterile razor prior to DNA extraction. To extract DNA from bison feces, sterile swabs were dipped in thawed fecal samples before also being placed in reaction wells. For both sample types, DNA was extracted using the MO BIO PowerSoil®-htp 96 Well Soil DNA Isolation Kit [45].

To amplify the *trnL* fragment from the plants and fecal samples for barcoded pyrosequencing, we followed [46], except with the primer pair g-forward/h-reverse, which targets the *trnL* fragment [41]. The forward primers included the Roche 454-B pyrosequencing adapter, while the reverse primers included the Roche 454-A sequencing adapter and a 12-bp barcode that was unique to each sample. Amplicons from the triplicate reactions were combined, cleaned, quantified, and pooled in equimolar concentrations. The pooled sample was sent to the University of South Carolina for sequencing on a Roche 454 automated sequencer.

Sequence data were processed using the QIIME pipeline [47]. Sequences were assigned to specific plant samples based on their unique barcodes, and sequences were clustered at 100% similarity for each plant species. A reference library of *trnL* sequences was constructed using consensus sequences from identified plant specimens. For plants with at least 10 representative sequences, the consensus sequence was the one that made up at least 40% of sequences in a given sample, and was at least 30% more abundant than the second-most common sequence. As some of the plant species shared identical *trnL* sequences, our collection of 73 plant species was represented by 44 *trnL* sequences, with 32 species (44%) having unique representative sequences (S1 Table). For the remaining 41 plants (56%), two or more species shared sequences, meaning they could not be distinguished if detected [39]. The *trnL* sequences from fecal samples were matched against this *trnL* reference database using the BLAST algorithm at  $\geq 98\%$  similarity over the entire length of the reference sequence [48].

Because different fecal samples have different *trnL* sequence counts, we rarefied down to 50 sequences, to compare all samples at an equivalent sequencing depth. Chloroplast *trnL* sequences in feces might be affected not only by the abundance of plants from which they came, but also by chloroplast and gene copy number in living plants, and by the digestibility of plants in the herbivore digestive tract. Thus, the sequence of *trnL* genes in feces depends not

only on the plant species consumed, but also on the density of chloroplasts in the plant biomass, and the degree to which chloroplasts of different species are digested. One feeding trial demonstrated no consistent bias between the percentage intake of biomass and percentage of sequences in fecal matter of sheep [49]. Given that *trnL* is a chloroplast gene with no known variation in copy number in the chloroplast genome, we assume for the purposes of the present study that the percent of sequences recovered from fecal matter is proportional to the relative intake of chloroplasts from the different plant taxa. Thus, although the proportions of different plants in the diet may not correspond perfectly to proportions of different *trnL* sequences in feces, the *trnL* approach allows us to document relative changes in the composition of specific plant taxa over time [49].

## Microbial analyses

We also used the collected fecal samples to track shifts in gut microbiota across the sampling period, and to assess if the changes in gut microbial communities are associated with temporal shifts in diet. We sequenced a portion of the 16S rRNA gene from bison fecal DNA to study bacterial and archaeal community composition in the colon. Fecal DNA was extracted as described above. Amplification and sequencing followed the approach used previously [46]. Briefly, we used the 515F/806R primer pair containing Illumina adapters, with a 12-bp error-correcting barcode unique to each sample on the reverse primer. The V4–V5 region of the 16S rRNA gene amplified by this primer set is well-suited to accurate phylogenetic placement of bacterial and archaeal sequences [50]. Together, these primers are expected to amplify nearly all bacterial and archaeal taxa with few biases [51].

After quantification and pooling, the amplicons were sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq instrument at the University of Colorado Genomics Core Facility with the  $2 \times 100$  bp paired-end protocol [52]. We used the QIIME pipeline for data analysis on the forward reads only [53]. Quality filtering and processing of reads was performed following [52]. Bacterial 16S rRNA sequences were clustered at 97% similarity, and a representative sequence from each OTU was classified against the RDP II database [54]. Due to unequal numbers of 16S rRNA sequences in each fecal sample, we rarefied down to a depth of 15,000 sequences to compare all samples at an equivalent sequencing depth.

## Statistical analysis


To test the effect of time on diet, plants were grouped into three functional groups, corresponding to the following growth habits: graminoids (grasses and sedges), forbs (non-graminoid herbaceous plants), and woody vegetation (shrubs and trees). A small number of *trnL* sequences ( $\leq 2\%$ ) could not be distinguished between forbs and graminoids, and were not included in downstream analysis. OTU tables for both *trnL* data and the 16S rRNA data were square root-transformed, and the Bray-Curtis method was used to generate distance matrices for multivariate statistical analysis, namely principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) and PERMANOVA in the PRIMER 6.1.12 & PERMANOVA + 1.0.2 software package [55]. PERMANOVA indicated that diet and gut community composition were not significantly different between the sexes or between adults and subadults ( $P = 0.53$ ), so we combined all these non-calf bison prior to further analysis. We used repeated measures ANOVA with Bonferroni correction to test for the effect of time on the relative abundance of the three plant functional groups, the ten most abundant plant species, and the three most abundant microbial phyla using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) post-hoc test [56,57]. We used linear regression to test the relationship between the proportions of plant functional groups and microbial phyla. Finally, we fit quadratic curves to the mean proportions of each plant growth habit over the growing

season in the bison diet. Repeated measures ANOVA, Tukey’s HSD, linear regression, and quadratic fitting were all conducted in the R statistical package [58].

## Results

### Diet

Across 11 sampling dates spanning 166 days, analysis of bison feces revealed 44 unique *trnL* sequences, representing up to 73 different plant species in the bison diet. Dietary composition varied seasonally ( $P < 0.001$ , S2 Table and S1 Fig). The four most abundant clusters (groups of species with a single *trnL* sequence) were the *Achillea* forb cluster (*Achillea millefolium*, *Chloris verticillata*), the *Ageratina* forb cluster (*Ageratina altissima*, *Ambrosia artemisiifolia*, *Ambrosia psilostachya*, *Ambrosia trifida*, *Antennaria neglecta*, *Echinacea angustifolia*, *Helianthus maximiliani*, *Helianthus tuberosus*, *Ratibida pinnata*, *Silphium laciniatum*, *Taraxacum officinale*, and *Euphorbia corollata*), the *Andropogon* graminoid cluster (*Andropogon gerardii*, *Bothriochloa bladhii*, *Bothriochloa laguroides*, and *Schizachyrium scoparium*), and the *Oligoneuron* forb cluster (*Oligoneuron rigidum*, *Solidago canadensis*, *Solidago missouriensis*, *Solidago speciosa*, *Symphotrichum ericoides*, and *Symphotrichum laeve*). Plotting the relative abundance of plants by growth habit over time (Fig 1), bison consumption of woody vegetation was greater




**Fig 1. Changes in plant diet as indicated by shifts in the relative abundance of *trnL* chloroplast gene sequences.** Plant species were grouped by growth habit (forb, graminoid, and woody). The effect of time in each dataset was tested using repeated measures ANOVA with Bonferroni correction. All three functional groups exhibited significant temporal change in proportion of the diet ( $P < 0.05$ ).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0142409.g001

early and late in the growing season than in mid-season ( $P < 0.001$ , quadratic fit:  $y = 0.55 - 0.0025 * \text{DOY} + 7.31 * 10^{-5} * (\text{DOY} - 178.2)^2$ ; DOY = Day of Year). *Ceanothus herbaceus*, an actinorhizal N<sub>2</sub>-fixing shrub, was the primary woody species consumed. This species exhibited a significant change in proportion over the growing season ( $P < 0.001$ ), contributing on average as many as 56% of the sequences in the spring and 60% in the fall.

Consumption of herbaceous species peaked in the middle of the season (Fig 1,  $y = 0.44 + 0.0024 * \text{DOY} - 7.3 * 10^{-5} * (\text{DOY} - 178.2)^2$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ). At their greatest relative abundance, 84% of the sequences on average could come from forbs. *Lespedeza violacea*, a legume, was the most abundant forb during the summer. Its proportion in the diet also changed significantly over time ( $P < 0.05$ ), with as many as 77% of the dietary sequences on average coming from this species. The *Oligoneuron* cluster was another predominant group of forbs to exhibit significant temporal change ( $P < 0.05$ ). The percentage of sequences derived from grasses was never higher than 12% on average, and grasses were consumed more in summer than in spring or fall ( $P < 0.001$ , Fig 2). The *Andropogon* cluster was the most abundant of the graminoid *trnL* clusters, but individually it did not show significant change over time ( $P > 0.1$ ).




**Fig 2. Plant relative abundance as indicated by sequencing of *trnL* chloroplast genes.** Plants were identified to species by matching database sequences at the 100% level. See Results for the identity of species in clusters. The effect of time in each dataset was tested using repeated measures ANOVA with Bonferroni correction. Three taxa (*Lespedeza violacea*, *Ceanothus herbaceus*, and the *Oligoneuron* forb cluster) exhibited significant temporal change in proportion of the diet ( $P < 0.01$ ).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0142409.g002

### Gut microbiota

Using 16S rRNA gene sequence data, we identified 46,061 bacterial species, 355 archaeal species, and 7 unclassified microbial species in the sampled bison during the growing season. Gut microbial community composition varied over time ( $P < 0.001$ , [S2 Table](#) and [S1 Fig](#)). The three most abundant microbial phyla were *Firmicutes* (53% of sequences on average), *Bacteroidetes* (33%) and *Tenericutes* (4%). The *Firmicutes* phylum was dominated by taxa within the *Clostridiales* order, while taxa within the *Bacteroidetes* order were the dominant *Bacteroidales*. Finally, *Tenericutes* consisted entirely of taxa within the *Mollicutes* class, which was comprised entirely of the putative order RF39 ([S3 Table](#)). Although there was no significant relationship between the proportion of sequences from graminoid, forb, or woody plants and the relative abundance of *Firmicutes*, *Bacteroidetes*, or *Tenericutes* ( $P > 0.05$ ), the phylum *Tenericutes* exhibited significant temporal change in relative abundance over the growing season, increasing more than twofold from about 2% of the gut microbial community in April to about 5% in May ( $P < 0.001$ , [S3 Table](#) and [Fig 3](#)).



**Fig 3. Relative abundance of microbial phyla as indicated by sequencing of 16S ribosomal RNA genes.** The effect of time on each microbial phylum was tested using repeated measures ANOVA with Bonferroni correction. The phylum *Tenericutes* exhibited a significant shift in relative abundance over the growing season ( $P < 0.001$ ).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0142409.g003

## Discussion

### Diet

Bison are considered to be primarily grazers [2–4], but in this study the proportion of grass chloroplast sequences recovered from fecal samples was relatively low during the summer. This could imply that the proportion of chloroplasts ingested from grass biomass was relatively low. The present study did not quantify forage availability or compute preference indices, but previous research has shown good correspondence between the relative amounts of biomass and sequence abundances in feeding trials [49]. However, the relatively low percentage of grass *trnL* sequences could be due to preferential degradation of grass DNA during passage through the gastrointestinal tract. Alternatively, differences in protein concentration among plants are likely to be associated with differences in chloroplast density, so high-protein plants could be over-represented in the *trnL* libraries relative to biomass intake. Further research is needed to determine if the proportion of *trnL* sequences in fecal material accurately reflects the consumption of the respective plants. Because some plant species could not be distinguished using the current method, future work could improve taxonomic resolution by using a different *trnL* primer pair than g-h, such as c-h or c-d, which produce longer sequences [41], or by incorporating additional loci, such as *rbcL*, into the identification system [59,60]. Nevertheless, we can use the data presented here to assess changes in the relative intake of plant taxa over time.

Our results from *trnL* sequencing indicate that plains bison at Konza shift their diet among high-protein plant species seasonally. In the spring and fall, intake of *Ceanothus herbaceus*, an N<sub>2</sub>-fixing shrub, is relatively high. During the summer, bison consumption of N<sub>2</sub>-fixing legumes like *Lespedeza violacea* and *Mimosa nuttallii* peaks (Fig 2). This pattern may be driven by plant phenology, as changes in the inferred diet of the bison roughly corresponded to plant phenology at this site [61]. Herbivores generally prefer to feed on new growth, because fresh shoots of a given type of plant are higher in moisture and nutrient content (including protein), and lower in fiber and secondary metabolites, making them both more palatable and more nutritious, even for grazers [62]. The bison's diet was likely influenced by both the availability of and preference for nutritious vegetation [26,63], with the bison appearing to favor high-protein plant species and life stages [24,27,49].

Many ruminants in both the Afrotropic and Holarctic ecozones exhibit seasonal variation in plant consumption [64–67], and ruminant species that do not change diet with the seasons change location instead [17,68–70]. Domestic cattle [71], European wisent (*Bison bonasus*) [72], and North American bison [21,73] are all among the temperate ruminants that take advantage of preferred vegetation during the summer, and tolerate suboptimal vegetation during the winter. Our results appear to corroborate this pattern in bison. Fresh shoots of forbs and graminoids in summer are likely relatively high in protein and relatively low in secondary metabolites [62,74,75]. Woody shrubs selected in spring and fall, such as *Ceanothus*, are potentially high in secondary metabolites [74–76], but also high in protein [77–79]. Thus, like other ruminants [80–82], bison appear to exploit more nutritious forage during the growing season, but still accept less nutritious forage outside the growing season [27,63].

The relative abundance of eudicots in the bison diet raises questions about the degree to which bison should be considered obligate grazers [4,83,84]. Their broad mouth, massive shoulders, and low-slung head allow them to crop vegetation close to the ground [85–87], and their large reticulorumen facilitates digesting large amounts of low-nutrient graminoids [88]. However, our work shows that North American bison, like wisent and cattle, supplement their diet with more nutritious forbs and woody species throughout the growing season. *Bison* and *Bos* species, like their common ancestor *Leptobos*, have adaptations for grazing [89]. However, today's plains bison subspecies (*B. bison bison*) is thought to have a more grass-dominated diet

than fossil *Bison* populations [90,91], the contemporary wood bison subspecies (*B. bison athabascae*) [92], and European wisent (the closest living relative of the American bison species). Yet this does not mean that plains bison do not browse or utilize non-graminoids [40]. The molecular evidence presented here suggests that the dependence of *Bison* species on grasses might be more labile than previously thought.

## Microbiota

As in other mammals, *Firmicutes* and *Bacteroidetes* were the most abundant bacterial phyla in the bison digestive tract [93–95]. As in other studies showing that gut microbial community composition can be structured by diet [96–99], we found correspondence between major microbial phyla and dietary composition. In the change from spring to summer, *Tenericutes* became significantly more abundant ( $P < 0.05$ , S3 Table and Fig 3). This increase may be driven by members of this phylum that preferentially metabolize simple sugars [100], which could have been associated with higher caloric and protein yields in the bison diet during summer and fall [101]. Together, these results highlight that there are subtle but significant shifts in gut bacterial community composition that correspond to seasonal changes in the bison diet. The changes we observed are unlikely to be due to the influx of bacteria adhering to ingested plant matter, for although some microbes (and their DNA) can survive passage through the digestive tract [102], the vast majority of dominant bacterial taxa in fecal samples are rarely found in the phyllosphere (see [97] and [103]). Factors contributing to this difference include the harsh environment of the stomach [104], differences between the enteric and ambient environments [105], and strong competition from established members of the gut microbial community in mature animals [106–108]. Thus, the shift in microbial communities observed here are most likely to reflect shifts in enteric communities more than phyllosphere communities.

Although we do not know the impact of this microbial community shift on bison health, the results of the present study indicate that gut microbial communities are not static, and that even presumably healthy animals can experience significant temporal variability in gut microbial community composition.

## Supporting Information

**S1 Fig. Changes in the composition of (A) diet and (B) gut microbiota over time, as indicated by *trnL* chloroplast genes and 16S ribosomal RNA genes, respectively.** Plot depicts primary axis of principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) for relative abundance data. In PCoA, the first axis accounts for the greatest amount of variation in the dataset. The effect of time in each dataset was tested using PERMANOVA ( $P < 0.001$  in both cases).

(TIF)

**S1 Table. Summary of 44 operational taxonomic units based on plants sharing the same *trnL* sequences, representing 73 separate plant species.**

(XLSX)

**S2 Table. Table showing results from the principal coordinate analysis (PCoA).**

(XLSX)

**S3 Table. Heat map showing relative abundance of microbial phyla over time, based on sequences recovered from the feces of free-ranging bison.** Numbers indicate mean relative abundance. Colors indicate z-score, with red representing positive z-scores, blue representing negative z-scores, and brightness of color representing absolute value of z-scores.

(TIF)

## Acknowledgments

We thank Donna Berg-Lyons, Jessica Henley, Chris Lauber, and Jonathan Leff, for their assistance with molecular analysis. Gene Towne collected the bison fecal material for this study.

## Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: GTB JMC. Performed the experiments: GTB. Analyzed the data: GTB JMC MSR NF. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: GTB JMC MSR NF. Wrote the paper: GTB JMC MSR NF.

## References

1. Knapp AK, Blair JM, Briggs JM, Collins SL, Hartnett DC, Johnson LC, et al. (1999) The keystone role of bison in North American tallgrass prairie. *Bioscience* 49: 39–50.
2. Peden DG, Van Dyne GM, Rice RW, Hansen RM (1974) The trophic ecology of Bison bison L. on shortgrass plains. *J Appl Ecol* 11: 489–497.
3. Reynolds H, Hansen R, Peden D (1978) Diets of the Slave River lowland bison herd, Northwest Territories, Canada. *J Wildl Manage* 42: 581–590.
4. Coppedge BR, Leslie DM, Shaw JH (1998) Botanical composition of bison diets on tallgrass prairie in Oklahoma. *J Range Manag* 51: 379–382.
5. Van Soest PJ (1994) *Nutritional Ecology of the Ruminant*. 2nd ed. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. 488 p.
6. Waggoner V, Hinkes M (1986) Summer and fall browse utilization by an Alaskan bison herd. *J Wildl Manage* 50: 322–324.
7. Painter LE, Ripple WJ (2012) Effects of bison on willow and cottonwood in northern Yellowstone National Park. *For Ecol Manage* 264: 150–158. doi: [10.1016/j.foreco.2011.10.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.10.010)
8. Albon SD, Langvatn R (1992) Plant phenology and the benefits of migration in a temperate ungulate. *Oikos* 65: 502–513.
9. Villalba JJ, Provenza FD, Bryant JP (2002) Consequences of the interaction between nutrients and plant secondary metabolites on herbivore selectivity: benefits or detriments for plants? *Oikos* 97: 282–292.
10. Villalba JJ, Provenza FD, Han G, Provenza D (2004) Experience influences diet mixing by herbivores: implications for plant biochemical diversity. *Oikos* 107: 100–109.
11. Drent R, Ebbinge B, Weijand B (1978) Balancing the energy budgets of arctic-breeding geese throughout the annual cycle: a progress report. *Verhandlungen der Ornithol Gesellschaft Bayern* 23: 239–263.
12. Drent R, Eichhorn G, Flagstad A, Graaf A, Litvin K, Stahl J (2007) Migratory connectivity in Arctic geese: spring stopovers are the weak links in meeting targets for breeding. *J Ornithol* 148: 501–514. doi: [10.1007/s10336-007-0223-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-007-0223-4)
13. Graaf SAJ Van Der, Stahl J, Klimkowska A, Bakker JP, Drent RH (2006) Surfing on a green wave—how plant growth drives spring migration in the Barnacle Goose *Branta leucopsis*. *Ardea* 94: 567–578.
14. van Wijk RE, Kölzsch A, Kruckenberg H, Ebbinge BS, Müskens GJDM, Nolet BA (2012) Individually tracked geese follow peaks of temperature acceleration during spring migration. *Oikos* 121: 655–664. doi: [10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.20083.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.20083.x)
15. Smallidge ST, Baker TT, VanLeeuwen D, Gould WR, Thompson BC (2010) Elk distributions relative to spring normalized difference vegetation index values. *Int J Ecol* 2010: 1–10. doi: [10.1155/2010/579808](https://doi.org/10.1155/2010/579808)
16. Sawyer H, Kauffman MJ (2011) Stopover ecology of a migratory ungulate. *J Anim Ecol* 80: 1078–1087. doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01845.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01845.x) PMID: [21545586](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21545586/)
17. Bischof R, Loe LE, Meisingset EL, Zimmermann B, Van Moorter B, Mysterud A (2012) A migratory northern ungulate in the pursuit of spring: jumping or surfing the green wave? *Am Nat* 180: 407–424. doi: [10.1086/667590](https://doi.org/10.1086/667590) PMID: [22976006](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22976006/)
18. Larson L, Murdock G (1989) Small bison herd utilization of tallgrass prairie. *North Am Prairie Conf Proc* 50: 243–245.
19. Coppock DL, Detling JK (1986) Alteration of bison and black-tailed prairie dog grazing interaction by prescribed burning. *J Wildl Manage* 50: 452–455.

20. Coppedge BR, Shaw JH (1998) Bison grazing patterns on seasonally burned tallgrass prairie. *J Range Manag* 51: 258–264.
21. Schuler KL, Leslie DM, Shaw JH, Maichak EJ (2006) Temporal-spatial distribution of American bison (*Bison bison*) in tallgrass prairie fire mosaic. *J Mammal* 87: 539–544.
22. Biondini ME, Steuter AA, Hamilton RG (2013) Bison use of fire-managed remnant prairies. *J Range Manag* 52: 454–461.
23. Coppock DL, Detling JK, Ellis JE, Dyer MI (1983) Plant-herbivore interactions in a North American mixed-grass prairie. I. Effects of black-tailed prairie dogs on intraseasonal aboveground plant biomass and nutrient dynamics and plant species diversity. *Oecologia* 56: 1–9.
24. Coppock D, Ellis J, Detling J, Dyer M (1983) Plant-herbivore interactions in a North American mixed-grass prairie. II. Responses of bison to modification of vegetation by prairie dogs. *Oecologia* 56: 10–15.
25. Krueger K (1986) Feeding relationships among bison, pronghorn, and prairie dogs: an experimental analysis. *Ecology* 67: 760–770.
26. Fortin D, Fryxell JM, Pilote R (2002) The temporal scale of foraging decisions in bison. *Ecology* 83: 970–982. doi: [10.2307/3071906](https://doi.org/10.2307/3071906)
27. Larter N, Gates C (1991) Diet and habitat selection of wood bison in relation to seasonal changes in forage quantity and quality. *Can J Zool* 69: 2677–2685.
28. Varel VH, Dehority BA (1989) Ruminal cellulolytic bacteria and protozoa from bison, cattle-bison hybrids, and cattle fed three alfalfa-corn diets. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 55: 148–153. PMID: [2705767](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2705767/)
29. Schwab C, Cristescu B, Northrup JM, Stenhouse GB, Gänzle M (2011) Diet and environment shape fecal bacterial microbiota composition and enteric pathogen load of grizzly bears. *PLoS One* 6: e27905. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0027905](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0027905) PMID: [22194798](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22194798/)
30. Dittmer J, Lesobre J, Raimond R, Zimmer M, Bouchon D (2012) Influence of changing plant food sources on the gut microbiota of saltmarsh detritivores. *Microb Ecol* 64: 814–825. doi: [10.1007/s00248-012-0056-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-012-0056-4) PMID: [22614939](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22614939/)
31. de Menezes AB, Lewis E, O'Donovan M, O'Neill BF, Clipson N, Doyle EM (2011) Microbiome analysis of dairy cows fed pasture or total mixed ration diets. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 78: 256–265. doi: [10.1111/j.1574-6941.2011.01151.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6941.2011.01151.x) PMID: [21671962](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21671962/)
32. Kohl KD, Dearing MD (2012) Experience matters: prior exposure to plant toxins enhances diversity of gut microbes in herbivores. *Ecol Lett* 15: 1008–1015. doi: [10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01822.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01822.x) PMID: [22715970](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22715970/)
33. McCann JC, Wickersham TA, Loor JJ (2014) High-throughput methods redefine the rumen microbiome and its relationship with nutrition and metabolism. *Bioinform Biol Insights* 8: 109–125. doi: [10.4137/BBI.S15389](https://doi.org/10.4137/BBI.S15389) Received. PMID: [24940050](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24940050/)
34. White RG, Trudell J (1980) Habitat preference and forage consumption by reindeer and caribou near Atkasook, Alaska. *Arct Alp Res* 12: 511–529. doi: [10.1657/1523-0430\(07-021\)](https://doi.org/10.1657/1523-0430(07-021))
35. Odo BI, Omeje FU, Okwor JN (2001) Forage species availability, food preference and grazing behaviour of goats in southeastern Nigeria. *Small Rumin Res* 42: 161–166. doi: [10.1016/S0921-4488\(01\)00228-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-4488(01)00228-0)
36. Udeh I, Isikwenu JO, Obika GC (2013) Forage species availability, preference, and grazing behavior of mutur and zebu cattle in Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria. *Online J Anim Feed Res* 3: 197–201.
37. Krueger WC (1972) Evaluating animal forage preference. *J Range Manag* 25: 471–475.
38. Vreede G Van, Bradley LC, Bryant FC, Deliberto TJ (1989) Evaluation of forage preference indices for white-tailed deer. *J Wildl Manage* 53: 210–213.
39. Valentini A, Miquel C, Nawaz MA, Bellemain E, Coissac E, Pompanon F, et al. (2009) New perspectives in diet analysis based on DNA barcoding and parallel pyrosequencing: the trnL approach. *Mol Ecol Resour* 9: 51–60. doi: [10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02352.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02352.x) PMID: [21564566](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21564566/)
40. Kowalczyk R, Taberlet P, Coissac E, Valentini A, Miquel C, Kamiński T, et al. (2011) Influence of management practices on large herbivore diet—Case of European bison in Białowieża Primeval Forest (Poland). *For Ecol Manage* 261: 821–828. doi: [10.1016/j.foreco.2010.11.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2010.11.026)
41. Taberlet P, Coissac E, Pompanon F, Gielly L, Miquel C, Valentini A, et al. (2007) Power and limitations of the chloroplast trnL (UAA) intron for plant DNA barcoding. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35: e14. doi: [10.1093/nar/gkl938](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkl938) PMID: [17169982](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17169982/)
42. Frey JC, Pell AN, Berthiaume R, Lapierre H, Lee S, Ha JK, et al. (2010) Comparative studies of microbial populations in the rumen, duodenum, ileum and faeces of lactating dairy cows. *J Appl Microbiol* 108: 1982–1993. doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2672.2009.04602.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2009.04602.x) PMID: [19863686](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19863686/)

43. Romero-Pérez G a, Ominski KH, McAllister T a, Krause DO (2011) Effect of environmental factors and influence of rumen and hindgut biogeography on bacterial communities in steers. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 77: 258–268. doi: [10.1128/AEM.01289-09](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01289-09) PMID: [21075877](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21075877/)
44. de Oliveira MNV, Jewell KA, Freitas FS, Benjamin LA, Tótola MR, Borges AC, et al. (2013) Characterizing the microbiota across the gastrointestinal tract of a Brazilian Nelore steer. *Vet Microbiol* 164: 307–314. doi: [10.1016/j.vetmic.2013.02.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2013.02.013) PMID: [23490556](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23490556/)
45. Lauber CL, Strickland MS, Bradford MA, Fierer N (2008) The influence of soil properties on the structure of bacterial and fungal communities across land-use types. *Soil Biol Biochem* 40: 2407–2415. doi: [10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.05.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.05.021)
46. Lauber CL, Hamady M, Knight R, Fierer N (2009) Pyrosequencing-based assessment of soil pH as a predictor of soil bacterial community structure at the continental scale. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 75: 5111–5120. doi: [10.1128/AEM.00335-09](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00335-09) PMID: [19502440](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19502440/)
47. Caporaso JG, Kuczynski J, Stombaugh J, Bittinger K, Bushman FD, Costello EK, et al. (2010) QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. *Nat Publ Gr* 7: 335–336. doi: [10.1038/nmeth0510-335](https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth0510-335)
48. Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ (1990) Basic local alignment search tool. *J Mol Biol* 215: 403–410. doi: [10.1016/S0022-2836\(05\)80360-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-2836(05)80360-2) PMID: [2231712](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2231712/)
49. Willerslev E, Davison J, Moora M, Zobel M, Coissac E, Edwards ME, et al. (2014) Fifty thousand years of Arctic vegetation and megafaunal diet. *Nature* 506: 47–51. doi: [10.1038/nature12921](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12921) PMID: [24499916](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24499916/)
50. Liu Z, Lozupone C, Hamady M, Bushman FD, Knight R (2007) Short pyrosequencing reads suffice for accurate microbial community analysis. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35: e120. doi: [10.1093/nar/gkm541](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkm541) PMID: [17881377](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17881377/)
51. Bergmann GT, Bates ST, Eilers KG, Lauber CL, Caporaso JG, Walters WA, et al. (2011) The under-recognized dominance of Verrucomicrobia in soil bacterial communities. *Soil Biol Biochem* 43: 1450–1455. doi: [10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.03.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.03.012) PMID: [22267877](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22267877/)
52. Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Walters W a, Berg-Lyons D, Lozupone CA, Turnbaugh PJ, et al. (2011) Global patterns of 16S rRNA diversity at a depth of millions of sequences per sample. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*: 1–7. doi: [10.1073/pnas.1000080107](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1000080107)
53. Werner JJ, Koren O, Hugenholtz P, DeSantis TZ, Walters WA, Caporaso JG, et al. (2012) Impact of training sets on classification of high-throughput bacterial 16s rRNA gene surveys. *ISME J* 6: 94–103. doi: [10.1038/ismej.2011.82](https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2011.82) PMID: [21716311](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21716311/)
54. Cole JR, Chai B, Farris RJ, Wang Q, Kulam-Syed-Mohideen AS, McGarrell DM, et al. (2007) The ribosomal database project (RDP-II): introducing myRDP space and quality controlled public data. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35: D169–D172. doi: [10.1093/nar/gkl889](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkl889) PMID: [17090583](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17090583/)
55. Leff JW, Fierer N (2013) Bacterial communities associated with the surfaces of fresh fruits and vegetables. *PLoS One* 8: e59310. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0059310](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059310) PMID: [23544058](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23544058/)
56. Green RH (1993) Application of repeated measures designs in environmental impact and monitoring studies. *Aust J Ecol* 18: 81–98.
57. Zar JH (2009) *Biostatistical Analysis* (5th Edition). 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson. 960 p.
58. R Core Team (2014) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Available: <http://www.r-project.org/>.
59. Jurado-Rivera J a, Vogler a. P, Reid C a., Petitpierre E, Gomez-Zurita J (2009) DNA barcoding insect-host plant associations. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 276: 639–648. doi: [10.1098/rspb.2008.1264](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1264)
60. García-Robledo C, Erickson DL, Staines CL, Erwin TL, Kress WJ (2013) Tropical Plant–Herbivore Networks: Reconstructing Species Interactions Using DNA Barcodes. *PLoS One* 8: e52967. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0052967](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0052967) PMID: [23308128](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23308128/)
61. Craine JM, Wolkovich EM, Gene Towne E, Kembel SW (2012) Flowering phenology as a functional trait in a tallgrass prairie. *New Phytol* 193: 673–682. doi: [10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03953.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03953.x) PMID: [22074383](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22074383/)
62. Craine JM (2009) *Resource Strategies of Wild Plants*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 352 p.
63. Fortin D, Fryxell JM, O’Brodivich L, Frandsen D (2003) Foraging ecology of bison at the landscape and plant community levels: the applicability of energy maximization principles. *Oecologia* 134: 219–227. doi: [10.1007/s00442-002-1112-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-002-1112-4) PMID: [12647163](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12647163/)
64. Watson LH, Owen-smith N (2002) Phenological influences on the utilization of woody plants by eland in semi-arid shrubland. *Afr J Ecol* 40: 65–75.

65. Tshabalala T, Dube S, Lent PC (2009) Seasonal variation in forages utilized by the African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*) in the succulent thicket of South Africa. *Afr J Ecol* 48: 438–445.
66. Van Der Merwe J, Marshal JP (2012) Hierarchical resource selection by impala in a savanna environment. *Austral Ecol* 37: 401–412. doi: [10.1111/j.1442-9993.2011.02297.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2011.02297.x)
67. Hjeljord O, Hövik N, Pedersen HB, Hovik N (1990) Choice of feeding sites by moose during summer, the influence of forest structure and plant phenology. *Holarct Ecol* 13: 281–292.
68. Wilmshurst JF, Fryxell JM, Farm BP, Sinclair ARE, Henschel CP (1999) Spatial distribution of Serengeti wildebeest in relation to resources. *Can J Zool* 77: 1223–1232. doi: [10.1139/cjz-77-8-1223](https://doi.org/10.1139/cjz-77-8-1223)
69. Wilmshurst JF, Fryxell JM, Bergman CM (2000) The allometry of patch selection in ruminants. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 267: 345–349. doi: [10.1098/rspb.2000.1007](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.1007)
70. Pettorelli N, Weladji RB, Holand O, Mysterud A, Breie H, Stenseth NC, et al. (2005) The relative role of winter and spring conditions: linking climate and landscape-scale plant phenology to alpine reindeer body mass. *Biol Lett* 1: 24–26. doi: [10.1098/rsbl.2004.0262](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2004.0262) PMID: [17148119](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17148119/)
71. Ganskopp D, Cruz R (1999) Selective differences between naive and experienced cattle foraging among eight grasses. *Appl Anim Behav Sci* 62: 293–303. doi: [10.1016/S0168-1591\(98\)00233-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(98)00233-0)
72. Mysterud A, Bartoń KA, Jędrzejewska B, Krasieński ZA, Niedziałkowska M, Kamler JF, et al. (2007) Population ecology and conservation of endangered megafauna: the case of European bison in Białowieża Primeval Forest, Poland. *Anim Conserv* 10: 77–87. doi: [10.1111/j.1469-1795.2006.00075.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2006.00075.x)
73. Fortin D, Fortin M-E (2009) Group-size-dependent association between food profitability, predation risk and distribution of free-ranging bison. *Anim Behav* 78: 887–892. doi: [10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.06.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.06.026)
74. Glasby J (1991) *Dictionary Of Plants Containing Secondary Metabolites*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press. 488 p.
75. Palo RT, Robbins CT (1991) *Plant Defenses Against Mammalian Herbivory*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press. 200 p.
76. Kie JG (1986) Nutritive quality of *Ceanothus* shrubs in California mixed conifer forest. *J Range Manag* 39: 521–526.
77. Sidahmed AE, Morris JG, Radosevich SR (1981) Chaparral diet of Spanish goats grazing. *J Range Manag* 34: 33–35.
78. Sidahmed AE, Morris JG, Radosevich SR, Koong LJ (1983) Seasonal changes in composition and intake of chaparral by Spanish goats. *Anim Feed Sci Technol* 8: 47–61.
79. Beck JL, Peek JM (2005) Great Basin summer range forage quality: do plant nutrients meet elk requirements? *West North Am Nat* 65: 516–527.
80. Christianson D, Creel S (2013) A review of environmental factors affecting elk winter diets. *J Wildl Manage* 71: 164–176.
81. Gad SD, Soorambail KS (2011) Diet composition and quality in Indian bison (*Bos gaurus*) based on fecal analysis. *Zoolog Sci* 28: 264–267. doi: [10.2108/zsj.28.264](https://doi.org/10.2108/zsj.28.264) PMID: [21466343](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21466343/)
82. Renecker LA, Hudson RJ (1986) Seasonal foraging rates of free-ranging moose. *J Wildl Manage* 50: 143–147.
83. Hofmann RR (1989) Evolutionary steps of ecophysiological adaptation and diversification of ruminants: a comparative view of their digestive system. *Oecologia* 78: 443–457.
84. Coppedge BR, Engle DM, Toepfer CS, Shaw JH (1998) Effects of seasonal fire, bison grazing and climatic variation on tallgrass prairie vegetation. *Plant Ecol* 139: 235–246.
85. Shrader AM, Owen-Smith N, Ogutu JO (2006) How a mega-grazer copes with the dry season: food and nutrient intake rates by white rhinoceros in the wild. *Funct Ecol* 20: 376–384. doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2435.2006.01107.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2006.01107.x)
86. Waldram MS, Bond WJ, Stock WD (2007) Ecological engineering by a mega-grazer: white rhino impacts on a South African savanna. *Ecosystems* 11: 101–112. doi: [10.1007/s10021-007-9109-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-007-9109-9)
87. Steuer P, Clauss M, Südekum K-H, Hatt J-M, Silinski S, Klomburg S, et al. (2010) Comparative investigations on digestion in grazing (*Ceratotherium simum*) and browsing (*Diceros bicornis*) rhinoceroses. *Comp Biochem Physiol A Mol Integr Physiol* 156: 380–388. doi: [10.1016/j.cbpa.2010.03.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpa.2010.03.006) PMID: [20227512](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20227512/)
88. Hudson RJ, Frank S (1987) Foraging ecology of bison in aspen boreal habitats. *J Range Manag* 40: 71–75.
89. Palmqvist P, Gro DR, Arribas A, Farin R a (2003) Paleoecological reconstruction of a lower Pleistocene large Zn) and ecomorphological approaches. 29: 205–229.

90. Feranec R (2004) Geographic variation in the diet of hypsodont herbivores from the Rancholabrean of Florida. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol* 207: 359–369. doi: [10.1016/j.palaeo.2003.09.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2003.09.031)
91. Widga C (2006) Niche variability in late Holocene bison: a perspective from Big Bone Lick, KY. *J Archaeol Sci* 33: 1237–1255. doi: [10.1016/j.jas.2005.12.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2005.12.011)
92. Rivals F, Solounias N, Muhlbachler MC (2007) Evidence for geographic variation in the diets of late Pleistocene and early Holocene Bison in North America, and differences from the diets of recent Bison. *Quat Res* 68: 338–346. doi: [10.1016/j.yqres.2007.07.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yqres.2007.07.012)
93. De Filippo C, Cavalieri D, Di Paola M, Ramazzotti M, Poullet JB, Massart S, et al. (2010) Impact of diet in shaping gut microbiota revealed by a comparative study in children from Europe and rural Africa. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 107: 14691–14696. doi: [10.1073/pnas.1005963107](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1005963107) PMID: [20679230](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20679230/)
94. Abdallah Ismail N, Ragab SH, Abd Elbaky A, Shoeib ARSS, Alhosary Y, Fekry D, et al. (2011) Frequency of Firmicutes and Bacteroidetes in gut microbiota in obese and normal weight Egyptian children and adults. *Arch Med Sci* 7: 501–507. doi: [10.5114/aoms.2011.23418](https://doi.org/10.5114/aoms.2011.23418) PMID: [22295035](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22295035/)
95. Tilg H, Kaser A (2011) Gut microbiome, obesity, and metabolic dysfunction. *J Clin Invest* 121: 2126–2132. doi: [10.1172/JCI58109.2126](https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI58109.2126) PMID: [21633181](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21633181/)
96. Ley RE, Hamady M, Lozupone C, Turnbaugh PJ, Ramey RR, Bircher JS, et al. (2008) Evolution of mammals and their gut microbes. *Science* 320: 1647–1651. doi: [10.1126/science.1155725](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1155725) PMID: [18497261](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18497261/)
97. Ley RE, Lozupone C a, Hamady M, Knight R, Gordon JI (2008) Worlds within worlds: evolution of the vertebrate gut microbiota. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 6: 776–788. doi: [10.1038/nrmicro1978](https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1978) PMID: [18794915](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18794915/)
98. Muegge BD, Kuczynski J, Knights D, Clemente JC, González A, Fontana L, et al. (2011) Diet drives convergence in gut microbiome functions across mammalian phylogeny and within humans. *Science* 332: 970–974. doi: [10.1126/science.1198719](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1198719) PMID: [21596990](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21596990/)
99. Yatsunenko T, Rey FE, Manary MJ, Trehan I, Dominguez-Bello MG, Contreras M, et al. (2012) Human gut microbiome viewed across age and geography. *Nature* 486: 222–227. doi: [10.1038/nature11053](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11053) PMID: [22699611](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22699611/)
100. Manurung SI (2012) Fermented whey permeate for piglets as a strategy to reduce post-weaning diarrhoea. Technical University of Denmark.
101. Craine JM, Towne EG, Tolleson D, Nippert JB (2013) Precipitation timing and grazer performance in a tallgrass prairie. *Oikos* 122: 191–198. doi: [10.1111/j.1600-0706.2012.20400.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2012.20400.x)
102. David LA, Maurice CF, Carmody RN, Gootenberg DB, Button JE, Wolfe BE, et al. (2014) Diet rapidly and reproducibly alters the human gut microbiome. *Nature* 505: 559–563. doi: [10.1038/nature12820](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12820) PMID: [24336217](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24336217/)
103. Redford AJ, Bowers RM, Knight R, Linhart Y, Fierer N (2010) The ecology of the phyllosphere: geographic and phylogenetic variability in the distribution of bacteria on tree leaves. *Environ Microbiol* 12: 2885–2893. doi: [10.1111/j.1462-2920.2010.02258.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2010.02258.x) PMID: [20545741](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20545741/)
104. von Rosenvinge EC, Song Y, White JR, Maddox C, Blanchard T, Fricke WF, et al. (2013) Immune status, antibiotic medication and pH are associated with changes in the stomach fluid microbiota. *ISME J* 7: 1354–1366. doi: [10.1038/ismej.2013.33](https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2013.33) PMID: [23466701](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23466701/)
105. Costello EK, Stagaman K, Dethlefsen L, Bohannan BJM, Relman D a (2012) The application of ecological theory toward an understanding of the human microbiome. *Science* (80-) 336: 1255–1262. doi: [10.1126/science.1224203](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1224203) PMID: [22674335](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22674335/)
106. Dethlefsen L, McFall-Ngai M, Relman D a (2007) An ecological and evolutionary perspective on human-microbe mutualism and disease. *Nature* 449: 811–818. doi: [10.1038/nature06245](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06245) PMID: [17943117](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17943117/)
107. Stecher B, Hardt WD (2011) Mechanisms controlling pathogen colonization of the gut. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 14: 82–91. doi: [10.1016/j.mib.2010.10.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2010.10.003) PMID: [21036098](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21036098/)
108. Kamada N, Chen GY, Inohara N, Núñez G (2013) Control of pathogens and pathobionts by the gut microbiota. *Nat Immunol* 14: 685–690. doi: [10.1038/ni.2608](https://doi.org/10.1038/ni.2608) PMID: [23778796](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23778796/)