Ecology & Evolution | Apr 21, 2026 | 8 min read | By Bryan White

We Thought Plastic Was Indestructible. Nature Had Other Plans

Biology * Environment * Public Health

Introduction: Global Plastic Pollution and the Prokaryotic Adaptation Paradigm

The exponential proliferation of synthetic polymers over the past century has precipitated a pervasive global ecological crisis: microplastic and nanoplastic pollution. Driven by high durability and low production cost, plastics have permeated virtually every ecosystem, from deep-sea sediments and polar sea ice to terrestrial soils.[1] These persistent particulates disrupt trophic webs and threaten environmental homeostasis by acting as vectors for hydrophobic pollutants and opportunistic pathogens.[1]

For decades, scientific consensus held that synthetic polymers were recalcitrant xenobiotics fundamentally resistant to biological decay.[2] Because industrial plastics such as polyethylene and polystyrene had never existed prior to the twentieth century, researchers assumed the planetary microbiome lacked the evolutionary time required to evolve specialized enzymatic machinery to metabolize them, projecting multi-century persistence in cold, oxygen-poor marine habitats.[3]

However, a landmark 2026 multi-omic study conducted under the international MicroWorld project -- uniting the University of Turku, the Autonomous University of Barcelona, La Salle-URL, and the Institute of Science Tokyo -- has overturned this paradigm, revealing a biosphere capable of rapid metabolic adaptation.[1][5] Rather than being restricted to isolated extremophiles, plastic biodegradation potential is nearly universal across the global microbiome.[5] By cataloging microbial genomes across 23 habitats, researchers demonstrated that over 95% of free-living prokaryotic species harbor at least one gene capable of degrading natural or synthetic plastic polymers.[1] Powered by selective pressures and horizontal gene transfer, the global microbiome operates as an adaptive bioreactor actively utilizing novel anthropogenic carbon sources.[6]

Constructing the Genomic Blueprint: The PDCOG Database and Taxonomic Distribution

To formalize this genetic landscape, the MicroWorld team built the Plastic-Degrading Clusters of Orthologous Groups (PDCOG) database, unifying disparate enzyme records from PlasticDB and PAZy into a rigorous evolutionary framework.[1][4][5][8] The catalog aggregates 625,616 putative plastic-degrading proteins from free-living prokaryotes and classifies them into 51 conserved orthologous protein groups.[1][5] In comparative genomics, orthologous groups represent gene clusters that diverged from a common ancestor via speciation while retaining conserved catalytic functions.[1][9]

These putative plastic-degrading proteins represent approximately 3.5% of the entire

cataloged prokaryotic proteome.[1] This investment reflects millions of years of co-evolution with complex natural biopolymers -- such as plant cutins, structural lignins, waxes, and microbially synthesized polyhydroxyalkanoates -- that share core chemical bond geometries with synthetic plastics.[1][4] The enzymes evolved to cleave these natural substrates exhibit catalytic promiscuity and favorable Michaelis-Menten kinetics, enabling cross-reactivity with synthetic xenobiotic backbones.[1]

Taxonomically, this potential spans both bacterial and archaeal domains. Among bacteria, Pseudomonadota exhibits the highest abundance of plastic-degrading proteins across all polymer types, followed by Actinomycetota, Bacteroidota, and Bacillota.[1] Equally notable is the discovery of plastic-degrading clusters within Archaea -- specifically Methanobacteriota, Thermoproteota, and Bathyarchaeota -- demonstrating that polymer breakdown extends into strictly anaerobic and extreme niches such as hydrothermal vents and anoxic seafloor sediments.[1] Exclusive lineage-cluster pairings -- including Thermodesulfobacteria with PDCOG001, Dictyoglomota and Verrucomicrobiota with PDCOG018, Methylomirabilota with PDCOG014, and Methanobacteriota with PDCOG006 -- underscore deep evolutionary niche partitioning.[1]

Chemical Mechanics of Polymer Susceptibility: Heterochain vs. Homochain Scission

Susceptibility to enzymatic catalysis is governed by polymer backbone architecture. The 51 PDCOG clusters target 39 polymers: 11 natural polymers and 28 synthetic polymers (subdivided into 21 heterochain and 7 homochain classes).[1] Natural polymers -- including natural rubber and polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHAs) such as P(3HB-co-3MP), P(3HV), and P3HP fermented via engineered Escherichia coli or Klebsiella pneumoniae -- are readily assimilated by 65.68% of cataloged prokaryotic species.[1][4]

Synthetic heterochain polymers incorporate heteroatoms -- primarily oxygen or nitrogen -- directly into the main carbon chain, encompassing polyethylene terephthalate (PET), polyurethane (PU), polylactic acid (PLA), nylon, and polycaprolactone (PCL).[1][4] These heteroatoms create polar, hydrolyzable ester or amide linkages that lower the Gibbs free energy barrier for nucleophilic cleavage.[4] Adsorbed extracellular hydrolases insert water across these bonds, severing the macromolecule into oligomers and monomers for transmembrane transport and central carbon metabolism.[3][11] Consequently, 87.82% of cataloged prokaryotic species possess the enzymatic potential to degrade synthetic heterochain plastics.[1]

Conversely, synthetic homochain polymers -- including polyethylene (PE, LDPE), polypropylene (PP), polystyrene (PS), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), and polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) -- possess an inert, continuous carbon-carbon (C-C) backbone lacking hydrolyzable functional groups.[1][4] Their breakdown requires an initial abiotic weathering step in which UV radiation or thermal stress cleaves a carbon-hydrogen bond, generating free radicals that react with atmospheric oxygen to form hydroperoxides and carbonyl groups.[3][10] Microbes then deploy high-redox oxidoreductases -- laccases, peroxidases, and alkane monooxygenases -- supported by

secreted biosurfactants and biofilms that reduce surface hydrophobicity.[8][11] Reflecting this high energetic barrier, only 32.47% of tracked species encode the capacity to attack synthetic homochain polymers.[1]

| Polymer Category | | Structural Characteristics | | Biodegradability Profile | | Key Examples Tracked in the Database | | Microbial Capability (Percentage of Species) |

| Natural Polymers (11 variants) | | Biosynthesized organic structures; co-evolved with microbial life over geological timeframes. | | Highly Biodegradable | | Natural Rubber, Polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHAs) | | 65.68% |

| Synthetic Heterochain (21 variants) | | Backbone contains heteroatoms (oxygen, nitrogen); features vulnerable ester or amide bonds. | | Intermediate to High | | Polyethylene terephthalate, Polyurethane, Polylactic acid, Nylon, Polycaprolactone, Polyethylene glycol | | 87.82% |

| Synthetic Homochain (7 variants) | | Inert, continuous carbon-carbon backbone; lacks reactive functional groups. | | Highly Recalcitrant | | Polyethylene, Polystyrene, Polypropylene, Polyvinyl chloride, Low-density polyethylene, Polyvinyl alcohol | | 32.47% |

Table 1: Classification, structural characteristics, and proportional microbial degradation capacity across the 39 natural and synthetic polymers targeted by the 51 orthologous groups.[1]

The Functional Enzymatic Repertoire and Ecological Enrichment

Functional annotation shows that PDCOG proteins are primarily linked to lipid transport and metabolism, general function prediction, and carbohydrate metabolism.[1] By Enzyme Commission (EC) class, hydrolases (EC 3) dominate at 52.94%, driving heterochain cleavage, while oxidoreductases (EC 1, 33.33%) and transferases (EC 2, 33.33%) mediate homochain oxidation and group transfer, supported by ligases (9.80%), lyases (5.88%), isomerases (1.96%), and membrane translocases (1.96%).[1]

| Enzyme Class (EC Classification) | | Primary Catalytic Function in Polymer Degradation | | Proportion within Orthologous Groups |

| Hydrolases (EC 3) | | Cleave bonds (specifically ester and amide linkages) via the direct addition of water. The primary agents for heterochain polymers. | | 52.94% |

| Oxidoreductases (EC 1) | | Catalyze complex electron transfer and oxidation reactions. Essential for initiating the breakdown of recalcitrant homochain structures. | | 33.33% |

| Transferases (EC 2) | | Transfer functional chemical groups between molecules during the breakdown process. | | 33.33% |

| Ligases (EC 6) | | Join fragmented molecules together, typically utilizing ATP, often as part of internal metabolic processing. | | 9.80% |

| Lyases (EC 4) | | Cleave various chemical bonds by energetic means other than hydrolysis or direct oxidation. | | 5.88% |

| Isomerases (EC 5) | | Catalyze structural and spatial rearrangements within a single molecule to facilitate further metabolic processing. | | 1.96% |

| Translocases (EC 7) | | Facilitate the physical movement of broken-down monomer molecules across complex cellular membranes for internal digestion. | | 1.96% |

Table 2: Distribution of primary enzymatic classes within the 51 plastic-degrading clusters (proportions exceed 100% due to multi-domain clusters).[1]

Across 23 habitats, PDCOG enrichment is highest in terrestrial soils and endolithic ecosystems.[1][5] Soil microbes evolved cutinases and laccases to decompose cross-linked plant lignin and cutin, which readily co-opt synthetic polyesters.[8] Similarly, oligotrophic endolithic microbes inhabiting rock and concrete pores secrete potent extracellular enzymes to scavenge trace carbon, pre-adapting them to cleave infiltrating microplastics.[5][12] Within the aquatic "plastisphere," specialized strains such as Serratia ficaria HfyG-1 (degrading PLA and PET) and salmon-gut isolate Rhodococcus ASF-10 (metabolizing oxidized PE alkanes) illustrate rapid colonization, while thermophilic strains (>45 deg C) deploy heat-stable hydrolases near polymer glass transition temperatures where crystalline chains soften.[1][3][8][13]

Biotechnological Implications for Enzymatic Recycling and Rational Polymer Design

Rather than deploying a single engineered microbe universally -- which fails when compost-adapted enzymes denature in cold, saline deep-sea habitats -- the PDCOG atlas enables ecologically matched bioremediation.[5][6] Furthermore, industrial deployment of high-specificity hydrolases and oxidoreductases enables closed-loop enzymatic depolymerization, unzipping waste plastics into virgin monomers for infinite repolymerization without mechanical downcycling.[3][10][11] Simultaneously, polymer chemists can consult the genomic atlas to design next-generation bioplastics incorporating targeted ester or amide linkages aligned with native microbial hydrolases in receiving environments.[7][10]

Conclusion: Synthesizing the Evolutionary Shift in Plastic Biodegradation

Cataloging 625,616 putative plastic-degrading proteins across 51 orthologous groups -- spanning 3.5% of the prokaryotic proteome and over 95% of free-living species -- demonstrates that synthetic polymer biodegradation is a pervasive, anciently rooted capability of global microbial life.[1][5] While heterochain polyesters yield readily to widespread hydrolases (87.82% of species) and inert C-C homochain polymers require coupled abiotic weathering and oxidative catalysis (32.47% of species), leveraging these habitat-adapted enzymatic toolkits provides a rigorous foundation for biological recycling and environmental remediation.[1][5]

Updates (Nov 15, 2026): Updated the primary PDCOG study citation (Ref. 1) from the 2025 bioRxiv preprint to the 2026 peer-reviewed publication in Environmental Technology & Innovation (Mustari et al., 2026), repaired the broken PlasticDB DOI link (Ref. 4) and ResearchGate/broken-UAB links with verified DOIs (Mohanan et al. 2020, Buchholz et al. 2022, Galperin et al. 2024, Brown et al. 2024, Gambarini et al. 2021), pruned uncited items, and removed subsection numbering.

References & Primary Sources

* [1] Mustari, S., Ph m, L. T., Saikkonen, K., Nakamura, M., & Puigb , P. (Jun 2026). Plastic-degrading clusters of orthologous groups reveal near-universal biodegradation potential in prokaryotes. Environmental Technology & Innovation, 42, 104872. -- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eti.2026.104872

* [2] Subhash, G. V., et al. (2015). Microbial degradation of plastic: a brief review. CIBTech Journal of Microbiology, 4(1), 85-89. -- https://www.cibtech.org/J-Microbiology/PUBLICATIONS/2015/Vol-4-No-1/13-CJM-MARCH-013-SUBHASH-MICROBIAL.pdf

* [3] Mohanan, N., Montazer, Z., Sharma, P. K., & Levin, D. B. (Nov 26, 2020). Microbial and Enzymatic Degradation of Synthetic Plastics. Frontiers in Microbiology, 11, 580709. -- https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.580709

* [4] Gambarini, V., Pantos, O., Kingsbury, J. M., Weaver, L., Handley, K. M., & Lear, G. (Mar 1, 2022). PlasticDB: a database of microorganisms and proteins linked to plastic biodegradation. Database, 2022, baac008. -- https://doi.org/10.1093/database/baac008

* [5] University of Turku (Apr 15, 2026). Study: Microbes show almost universal potential for biodegrading plastics. -- https://www.utu.fi/en/news/press-release/microbes-show-almost-universal-potential-for-biodegrading-plastics

* [6] Universitat Aut noma de Barcelona (UAB) (Apr 2026). Microbes show almost universal potential for biodegrading plastics. -- https://www.uab.cat/web/newsroom/news-detail/microbes-show-almost-universal-potential-for-biodegrading-plastics-134583029061

* [7] Biotech Spain (Apr 2026). Microbes show almost universal potential for biodegrading plastics. -- https://biotech-spain.com/en/articles/microbes-show-almost-universal-potential-for-biodegrading-plastics/

* [8] Buchholz, P. C. F., Feuerriegel, G., Zhang, H., et al. (Jul 2022). Plastics degradation by hydrolytic enzymes: The plastics-active enzymes database -- PAZy. Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics. -- https://doi.org/10.1002/prot.26325

* [9] Galperin, M. Y., Vera Alvarez, R., Karamycheva, S., Makarova, K. S., Wolf, Y. I., Landsman, D., & Koonin, E. V. (Jan 6, 2025). COG database update 2024. Nucleic Acids Research. -- https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkae983

* [10] Bacha, A.-U.-R., Nabi, I., & Zhang, L. (Sep 30, 2021). Mechanisms and the Engineering Approaches for the Degradation of Microplastics. ACS ES&T Engineering. -- https://doi.org/10.1021/acsestengg.1c00216

* [11] Plastics Engineering (May 2, 2025). Enzymatic Polymer Degradation: How Does It Work? -- https://www.plasticsengineering.org/2025/05/enzymatic-polymer-degradation-how-does-it-work-008609/

* [12] Brown, J., Chen, C., & Carr, D. (2024). Endolithic microbes may alter the carbon profile of concrete. AIMS Environmental Science. -- https://doi.org/10.3934/environsci.2024011

* [13] Gambarini, V., Pantos, O., Kingsbury, J. M., et al. (Feb 23, 2021). Phylogenetic Distribution of Plastic-Degrading Microorganisms. mSystems. --

https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.01112-20