Available online at
http://agrospheresmagazine.vitalbiotech.org/

ISSN (E): 2582 – 7022
Agrospheres:e- Newsletter, (2026) 7(8), 56-60

Article ID: 1050

Eavesdropping on Microbes: How Transcriptomics is Changing the Way We Clean Up Pollution

Rashmi Upadhyay[1]
Renu Kushwah[2]

[1]Technical Advisor to the Vice Chancellor, Maharana Pratap Horticultural University Karnal, Haryana, India
[2]Senior Research Fellow, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

*Corresponding Author
Rashmi Upadhyay*

Article History
Received: 14.08.2026
Revised: 19.08.2026
Accepted: 24.08.2026

INTRODUCTION

Most of us now check the air quality index before we step out of the house. A generation ago, that would have sounded absurd. Today it is routine — a small, everyday admission that the air, water and soil around us carry the leftovers of the way we live. Factories, vehicles, mines, farms and landfills have loaded the environment with oil, solvents, pesticides, heavy metals and plastics. Cleaning all of that up with machines and chemicals would be ruinously expensive, and would often create fresh problems of its own.

Fortunately, nature already employs a cleaning crew. Bacteria and fungi have spent billions of years learning to eat difficult molecules, and many of them will happily eat our pollutants too. Putting these microbes to work is called bioremediation, and it is among the cheapest and gentlest cleanup technologies we have. The trouble has never been finding microbes. The trouble has been knowing what they are actually doing once we turn them loose.

The problem with counting microbes

Imagine you are handed a printed telephone directory for a city and asked whether anyone is talking to anyone else. The directory tells you who lives there. It tells you nothing about who is on a call right now.That is roughly the position environmental scientists have been in. The standard toolkit has two blunt instruments. The first is chemistry: measure how much pollutant is left. The second is DNA-based analysis: sequence the DNA in a soil or water sample and list the microbes present, along with the degradation genes they carry.Both fall short. Chemistry only tells you the parent compound is disappearing — it does not tell you what it became. Many pollutants break down into intermediates that are more toxic than the original molecule, so a falling chemical reading can hide a worsening problem. DNA is no better at this, because DNA is stubborn. It survives in soil and sediment long after the cell that carried it has died. A DNA survey cannot separate a thriving degrader from a dormant one, or from a corpse.So, we end up knowing the potential of a site and almost nothing about its performance. Practitioners call this the black box of bioremediation.

RNA: the live feed

The way out runs through a molecule most of us met briefly in school and then forgot. Genetic information flows from DNA to RNA to protein. DNA is the permanent archive. RNA — messenger RNA, or mRNA — is the working copy a cell makes when it actually intends to build something.

This is what makes RNA so useful. It is fragile and short-lived, and only a living, working cell bothers to make it. **If a microbe is making RNA for an oil-eating enzyme, that microbe is eating oil. Right now.** There is no ambiguity, no leftover signal from something that died last season.

Reading all the RNA in a sample at once is called transcriptomics. The full set of RNA molecules is the transcriptome, and modern sequencing lets us capture it in a single experiment. Where a genome is a fixed list of possibilities, a transcriptome is a snapshot of decisions — which genes the organism has switched on, at this place, at this moment, under this particular stress.

Take the telephone directory again. Transcriptomics is not the directory. It is the live call log.

What the RNA actually tells us

1. Which pathway is running, step by step

Microbes rarely destroy a pollutant in one move. They dismantle it in stages, each stage handled by a different enzyme. Bacteria conveniently store the genes for such a pathway side by side in a cluster called an operon, and switch the whole cluster on together when they detect the pollutant. Sequencing the RNA lets us watch that happen. In *Pseudomonas putida*, the arrival of alkanes triggers a burst of RNA from the *alk* gene cluster — a clear signal that hydrocarbons are being converted into fatty acids and fed into growth.

The gaps are just as informative. If the early genes of a pathway light up but the later ones stay quiet, the breakdown is stalling midway and toxic intermediates are probably piling up. Chemistry alone would never show you this. In one study, three crude-oil-degrading *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strains were compared this way, and each turned out to run a noticeably different set of genes — 81, 269 and 137 significantly altered genes respectively — even though all three were doing the same broad job.

2. Whether the pollutant is even within reach

Pollutants often lock themselves into soil particles or oily droplets where microbes simply cannot get at them. A laboratory chemical test will report a high concentration; the microbes will report nothing, because there is nothing they can touch. Scientists call this the bioavailability problem, and RNA solves it neatly: if the degradation genes are silent despite a high chemical reading, the pollutant is out of reach and no amount of adding more microbes will help. What the site needs instead is a surfactant, tilling, or another way of freeing the compound.

The same data doubles as a toxicity alarm. Alongside their degradation genes, stressed microbes switch on heat-shock and oxidative-stress genes. When those signatures rise sharply, the pollution has crossed from food into poison and the cleanup crew itself is being killed. That is an early warning worth having, and it arrives well before the cleanup visibly stalls.

3. Who is doing the real work — including the ones nobody noticed

Abundance and importance are not the same thing. In mercury-contaminated microbial mats, transcriptomic work found that some of the rarest organisms present were the ones running the *merA* gene that converts toxic mercury into a harmless vapour — while other community members were busy running *hgcA*, which does the opposite and converts mercury into the far nastier methylmercury. Counting cells would have missed both. Reading RNA identified the detoxifiers and the troublemakers by name.

ISSN (E): 2582 – 7022

4. How the community divides the labour

Bioremediation is a team sport. One species cracks open the difficult molecule; a second lives off the fragments the first leaves behind. When RNA is sequenced from an entire community at once — a technique called meta transcriptomics — this hand-off becomes visible. In consortia degrading polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, primary degraders were found running ring-cleaving enzymes at full tilt while scavenger species simultaneously ramped up their central metabolism to mop up the resulting organic acids. That mopping-up is not a courtesy: without it, the intermediates accumulate and poison the primary degraders. The team only works because both halves are running at once.

5. Whether the cleanup is speeding up or grinding to a halt

Because RNA levels shift within minutes, transcriptomics works as a live dashboard rather than an autopsy. If the RNA for a key enzyme such as *alkB* falls while pollutant levels stay high, something is throttling the process — often a shortage of nitrogen or phosphorus, sometimes accumulated stress. The fix is then a targeted intervention rather than guesswork. This matters most for slow, stubborn jobs like plastic degradation, where conventional monitoring means weighing plastic fragments or photographing their surfaces under a microscope, and waiting months for a verdict.

Genes worth watching

Over the years a set of genes has emerged as reliable indicators — if these are being transcribed, the corresponding cleanup chemistry is genuinely underway.

Table 1: Signature catabolic genes commonly tracked when monitoring bioremediation sites.

Pollutant	Enzyme that does the job	Gene to watch	Microbe often involved	Where it matters
Short-chain alkanes (petrol-range)	Alkane monooxygenase	*alkB*	*Pseudomonas, Alcanivorax*	Crude oil spills at sea
Heavy, long-chain oil	Long-chain alkane monooxygenase	*ladA, almA*	*Geobacillus, Acinetobacter*	Thick oil sludge
PAHs (coal tar, soot)	Naphthalene dioxygenase	*nahAc*	*Pseudomonas putida*	Contaminated soil
BTEX (benzene, toluene)	Toluene dioxygenase	*todC1, xylX*	*Pseudomonas, Burkholderia*	Fuel station leaks
Chlorinated solvents	Reductive dehalogenase	*tceA, vcrA*	*Dehalococcoides mccartyi*	Groundwater cleanup
Organophosphate pesticides	Methyl parathion hydrolase	*mpd, oph*	*Burkholderia, Sphingomonas*	Farm runoff
Mercury	Mercuric reductase	*merA*	*Bacillus, Pseudomonas*	Toxic Hg turned to vapour
PET plastic	PETase	*petA*	*Ideonella sakaiensis*	Plastic waste breakdown

ISSN (E): 2582 – 7022

How such a study is actually done

The workflow is less exotic than it sounds. A sample of contaminated soil, sediment or water is collected and immediately stabilised — flash-frozen or dropped into a preservative on the spot — because RNA begins breaking down within minutes of leaving its environment. In parallel, an uncontaminated sample from a comparable site is collected as a control, since every conclusion in this field rests on a comparison rather than on an absolute number.

Total RNA is then extracted, and the ribosomal RNA — which makes up the overwhelming bulk of the material but says little about metabolism — is depleted so that the informative messenger RNA is not drowned out. What remains is converted into a form that can be sequenced, and run on a high-throughput sequencer. The output is tens of millions of short sequence reads per sample.

Those reads are matched against reference genomes or assembled afresh, and counted. Genes whose counts are reliably higher at the polluted site than in the control are flagged as up-regulated; those that fall are down-regulated. This comparison is the core result, and it is where the biology sits: an up-regulated degradation gene is a microbe declaring, in its own language, that it has detected a pollutant and started work on it. The final step is to place those genes on known metabolic maps and see which routes they add up to.

Turning sequence into sense

A single RNA sequencing run produces tens of millions of short sequences — far beyond anything a person can read. Making sense of them takes bioinformatics, and this is where the field has quietly built its most useful infrastructure. Reference collections such as KEGG and MetaCyc hold the metabolic blueprints against which observed genes are matched, so that a list of gene names becomes a map of pathways. Specialised resources such as enviPath and the University of Minnesota biodegradation database go further, linking a detected transcript to the specific chemical transformation it performs. Only then does the data answer the question that matters: is this molecule actually being taken apart, and into what?

It is also worth being honest about the limits. RNA degrades quickly, so samples must be handled carefully from the moment they leave the field. RNA is a signal of intent rather than proof of action — a cell can transcribe a gene and still fail to make a working enzyme, which is why transcriptomics is increasingly paired with proteomics, the study of the proteins actually present. And the analysis demands computing power and trained people, which remain unevenly distributed. None of this undermines the approach; it simply means transcriptomics is one strong layer of evidence rather than a complete answer on its own.

Where this is heading

The direction of travel is from watching to predicting. As datasets accumulate, researchers are mining them for degradation pathways nobody has described yet, and for new molecular markers that report on site performance in real time. Combining RNA data with genomics, proteomics and metabolomics is beginning to yield models that forecast how a microbial community will behave before a treatment is applied — which strains to seed, which nutrients to add, and what to expect by week six.

For India this is not an abstract prospect. Pesticide residues in farm soil, industrial effluent in rivers, mine spoil, urban plastic waste and metal-loaded irrigation water are all problems for which a cheap, biological, well-monitored cleanup would be transformative. The microbes are already here and already working. Transcriptomics is simply how we finally started listening to them.

What it would take to use this routinely

None of this is beyond reach for an Indian research institution, but three things have to line up. The first is sampling discipline. RNA work fails at the collection stage far more often than

ISSN (E): 2582 – 7022

at the sequencing stage, and a site team that cannot freeze or preserve samples within minutes will produce expensive, uninterpretable data. The second is a genuine control. A polluted site sampled on its own tells you very little; the meaning lives in the comparison with an unpolluted site of similar soil type, moisture and season.

The third is analytical capacity, and this is the real bottleneck. Sequencing itself has become a service one can buy; interpreting the output has not. A single run produces more data than a laboratory notebook can hold, and turning it into a usable answer requires someone comfortable with command-line tools and statistics. Building that skill within environmental and agricultural departments — rather than outsourcing it each time — is what will decide whether transcriptomics becomes a routine monitoring tool or stays a publication exercise.

Where it is worth the effort is on sites that have resisted simpler approaches: an effluent channel where the chemistry improves and then stops improving, a pesticide-loaded field where added microbes make no difference, a metal-contaminated stretch where nobody can say whether the organisms present are detoxifying or making things worse. In each of these, the missing information is biological, and RNA is the only place it is written down.

The take-home message

- DNA tells us which microbes could clean a site. RNA tells us which ones actually are.
- Transcriptomics reads that RNA, turning invisible microbial effort into numbers a site manager can act on.
- It shows whether a pollutant is even reachable by microbes, whether the breakdown is finishing or stalling halfway, and whether the microbes are coping or dying.
- It reveals teamwork: no single microbe cleans a site alone, and RNA shows who passes what to whom.
- The next step is prediction, not just observation — designing cleanups before we start, rather than explaining them afterwards.