Abundance-based reconstitution of microbial pan-genomes from whole-metagenome shotgun sequencing data

Florian Plaza Oñate[1,2], Alessandra C. L. Cervino[1], Frédéric Magoulès[3], S. Dusko Ehrlich[2] & Matthieu Pichaud[1]§

[1] Enterome, 94-96 Avenue Ledru Rollin, 75011 Paris, France
[2] MGP MetaGénoPolis, INRA, Université Paris-Saclay, 78350 Jouy en Josas, France
[3] CentraleSupélec, Université Paris-Saclay, 92290 Châtenay-Malabry, France

§ Corresponding author

Email addresses:
FPO: fplaza-onate [at] enterome [dot] com
MP: matthieu.pichaud [at] gmail [dot] com

Abstract

Analysis toolkits for whole-metagenome shotgun sequencing data achieved strain-level characterization of complex microbial communities by capturing intra-species gene content variation. Yet, these tools are hampered by the extent of reference genomes that are far from covering all microbial variability, as many species are still not sequenced or have only few strains available.

Binning co-abundant genes obtained from de novo assembly is a powerful reference-free technique for discovering and reconstituting gene repertoire of microbial species. While current methods accurately identify species core genes, they miss many accessory genes or split them in small separated clusters.

We introduce MSPminer, a computationally efficient software tool that reconstitutes Metagenomic Species Pan-genomes (MSPs) by binning co-abundant genes across large-scale metagenomic datasets. MSPminer relies on a new robust measure for grouping not only species core genes but accessory genes also. In MSPs, an empirical classifier distinguishes core from accessory and shared genes.

We applied MSPminer to the largest publicly available gene abundance table which is composed of 9.9M genes quantified in 1 267 stool samples. We show that MSPminer successfully reconstitutes in a matter of several hours gene repertoire of > 1600 microbial species (some hitherto unknown) and detects many more accessory genes than existing tools. By compiling the information from thousands of samples, species gene content variability is better accounted for and their quantification is subsequently more precise

Introduction

Metagenomics has revolutionized microbiology by allowing culture-independent characterization of microbial communities. Its advent has allowed an unprecedented genetic characterization of the human gut microbiota and emphasized its fundamental role in health and disease [1–7]. Shotgun metagenomics where whole-community DNA is randomly sequenced bypasses the biases and limitations of 16S rRNA sequencing [8,9] by providing high resolution taxonomic profiling as well as insights into the diverse physiological roles and the metabolic potential of the community [10,11].

The analysis of large cohorts revealed a substantial inter-individual microbial gene content variability [12] and nucleotide polymorphism [13] which reflects that individuals are not only carriers of various species, but also of different strains of the same species [14,15]. The characterization of the accessory genes found in individual strains is crucial in many contexts as they can provide functional advantages such as complex carbohydrates metabolism [16], antibiotic resistance or pathogenicity [17,18].

Recent analysis toolkits for shotgun metagenomics data achieved strain-level resolution when coverage is sufficient. To this end, they either capture intra-species single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in pre-identified marker genes [19,20], gene content variation [21] or both [22]. However, these tools are hampered by the extent of the reference genomes.

Indeed, the microbial variability extends far beyond the content of reference genomes making metagenomic samples an untapped reservoir of information. First, it has been estimated that on average 50% of the species present in the human gut microbiota of western individuals lack reference genome and this proportion rises to 85% in individuals with traditional lifestyles [22]. Even if recent advancements of culture-based methods have proven that a substantial proportion of these species are actually culturable [23,24], the number of unknown species is probably still important. In addition, these techniques remain laborious and time consuming. Second, although species of public health interest (e.g. *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella enterica* or *Clostridium difficile)* are represented by hundreds or even thousands of strains in genome databases [25], only few strains are available for the great majority of commensal species.

Consequently, accessory genes associated with microbial phenotypic traits may be missing in

gene repertoires constructed from reference genomes.

Metagenomic assembly where overlapping reads are merged into longer sequences called

contigs, is a powerful reference-free technique for overcoming the limitations of reference-

based methods. Indeed, it allows the genetic survey of non-sequenced species and strains

with previously unknown accessory genes. However, assembly remains a computationally

challenging task [26] and despite the many dedicated tools proposed [27–30] the process only

recovers incomplete genomes scattered in multiple contigs. To retrieve an exhaustive set of

references, metagenomic assembly is performed on multiple samples. Then, non-redundant

reference gene catalogs [31] are created and used as proxy for disease-related analyses [3,6]

or descriptive purposes [12,32].

Metagenome-wide association studies have successfully identified associations between the

gut microbiome and disease based on universal marker genes [33], clade specific marker

genes [34] or whole gene sets [35]. The latter is the only method that allows an extensive

investigation of microorganism core, accessory genes and mobile elements. However, testing

millions of genes is biased and lacks statistical power. Testing all the variables is not adapted

to situations where some of them are highly correlated [36], which is expected for genes

coming from the same biological entity. The resulting list of significant genes will be biased

towards organisms with the most genes in the pool as they have more chances of being picked

up.

Considering that the genes originating from the same biological entity should have

proportional abundances across samples, binning co-abundant genes has been proposed.

However, clustering millions of genes is a very computationally intensive task and pairwise

comparison of all gene abundance profiles is not feasible. To reduce the number of

comparisons, some authors have performed binning on the subset of genes that were

statistically significant [3,4,6] which restricts the analysis to the genes that are significant by

themselves and does not improve the statistical power of the analysis. Others have proposed

methods to perform the clustering of complete gene references based either on the Markov

cluster algorithm [37] or a variant of the Canopy clustering algorithm [38].

Although direct proportionality is expected between co-abundant genes, these methods rely

either on Pearson's or Spearman's correlation coefficients which respectively assess a linear

association with a potentially non-null intercept or any monotonic association. Thus, these

coefficients are too loose and spurious associations can be discovered. In addition, they are

biased by sparse genes with many null counts [39], non-normal gene counts distributions [40]

and presence of outliers [41].

Current clustering strategies group species core genes and highly prevalent accessory genes

into the same cluster, but miss accessory genes of medium and low prevalence or assign them

to small separate clusters. Dependency between clusters of essential genes and accessory

clusters can be evaluated downstream using the Fisher's exact test [38], which compares their

presence/absence patterns across samples. Yet, this strategy does not account for the co-

abundance of genes and is poorly discriminative when considering accessory clusters that are

rare or associated with very prevalent species. In addition, it is not suitable for detecting

clusters shared between several species.

To overcome these limitations, we have developed MSPminer, the first tool that discovers,

delineates and structures Metagenomic Species Pan-genomes (MSPs) from large-scale

shotgun metagenomics datasets without referring to genomes from isolated strains.

MSPminer presents several significant improvements over existing methods. First, it relies on

a new robust measure of proportionality for detection of co-abundant but not necessarily co-

occurring genes as expected for non-core genes. Second, genes grouped in a MSP are

empirically classified as core, accessory and shared genes.

To illustrate its usefulness, we applied MSPminer to the largest publicly available gene

abundance table which is composed of 9.9M genes quantified in 1 267 samples [12]. We show

that MSPminer successfully groups genes from the same species and identifies additional

genes. Gene variability of microbial species is better captured and their quantification is

subsequently more precise. MSPminer is a computationally efficient multithreaded program

implemented in C++ that can process large datasets with millions of genes and thousands of

samples in just a few hours on a single node server.

Results

New measures of proportionality

The gene repertoire of microbial species is composed of core genes present in all strains and accessory genes present in only some of them [42]. In a shotgun metagenomic sequencing context, we assumed that core genes of a microbial species should have a directly proportional number of mapped reads across samples (co-abundance) and should be consistently observed in samples if sequencing depth allows (co-occurrence). Remarkably, core genes and an accessory gene should have directly proportional counts only in the subset of samples where they are both detected (Figure 1). To group the core genes of a species and then identify its accessory genes, we developed a measure that evaluates proportionality between gene counts using samples where the number of mapped reads is high enough (see Methods).

To evaluate this new measure of proportionality, we generated an abundance table that simulates the counts of genes from a single virtual species across 300 samples (see Methods). We considered that each sample was carrying a unique strain of the species with specific gene content. Genes present in all the samples were labeled as core and those detected in a subset as accessory. We used this dataset to compare the performance of the Pearson correlation coefficient, the Spearman correlation coefficient and the proposed measure of proportionality for detecting a relation between the abundance profile of the species core genome and all its genes including accessories (Figure 2). Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients decrease all the more as the prevalence of a tested gene decreases while the proposed measure remains high, as only samples where both the species core and its accessory gene are detected are used for calculation. Therefore, the association between core genes and many accessory genes will be missed using the correlation coefficients. However, accessory genes observed in similar subsets of samples may be grouped into small distinct clusters as their abundance profiles should be correlated.

Finally, we derived a robust version of the measure to identify associated genes despite the presence of samples with inconsistent counts named hereafter outliers. We evaluated this robust measure of proportionality against the non-robust version described above by adding an increasing percentage of outliers to the genes abundance profiles. For a given percentage

of outliers, each of these genes was compared to the outlier-free abundance profile of the

species core genome. This simulation showed that the non-robust measure of proportionality

decreases all the more as the percentage of outliers increases whereas the robust measure

remains high; demonstrating that proportionality is still detected (Supplementary Figure 1).

However, the robust measure decreases significantly when the percentage of outliers is high

and the gene prevalence is low.

Reconstitution of Metagenomic Species Pan-genomes of the human gut microbiota

We developed MSPminer, a program that uses measures of proportionality to group co-

abundant genes into Metagenomic Species Pan-genomes (MSPs, Figure 3). MSPminer

empirically distinguishes core from accessory genes based on their presence absence patterns

(see Methods) and tags genes observed in samples where the core is not detected as shared

(Figure 4). Finally, non-core genes observed in the same subset of samples are grouped into

modules of co-occurring genes.

We applied MSPminer to the largest publicly available gene abundance table provided with

the Integrated Gene Catalog of the human gut microbiome [12]. In this table, 9 879 896 genes

are quantified across 1 267 stool samples from individuals of various geographical origin

(Europe, USA and China) and diverse health status (healthy, obese, diabetic, with

inflammatory bowel disease etc.). 6 971 229 (70.6%) genes with counts greater than 6 in at

least 3 samples were kept. Among these, 3 262 914 (46.8%) were organized into 1 677

Metagenomic Species Pan-Genomes (MSPs) with at least 200 core genes (Supplementary

Table 1).

Taxonomy

By considering the lowest taxonomic rank assigned to MSPs, 278 (16.6%) were annotated at

species level, 85 (5%) at genus level, 119 (7.1%) at phylum level and the remaining 1 213 MSPs

(71.5%) could not be annotated (Supplementary Figure 2) indicating that a clear majority of

MSPs correspond to species not represented in reference genomes databases. Only 4 MSPs

were annotated as Eukaryotes and corresponded to intestinal parasites of the *Blastocystis*

genus. All others MSPs were assigned to prokaryotic species of which only 3 were Archaea and

corresponded to the species *Methanobrevibacter smithii, Candidatus Methanomethylophilus*

alvus and *Methanosphaera stadtmanae*. Among the MSPs annotated as Bacteria, the phyla *Firmicutes* (268 MSPs), *Bacteroidetes* (118 MSPs), *Proteobacteria* (50 MSPs) and *Actinobacteria* (29 MSPs) were the most represented (Supplementary Figure 3) as expected from human gut metagenomes [43]. Some species were represented by multiple MSPs such as *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* (5 MSPs), *Bacteroides fragilis* (2 MSPs), *Methanobrevibacter smithii* (2 MSPs) or *Hungatella hathewayi* (2 MSPs) suggesting a high nucleotide and gene content variability between strains attributed so far to the same species. Conversely, some MSPs had their core genes attributed to multiple species, usually from the same genus (Supplementary Table 3). Although some inconsistencies in the taxonomy assignment have previously been reported [22,44], it is possible that several MSPs regroup genes from highly related species with high average nucleotide identity and similar gene content. MSPs annotated at species level had a consistent taxonomical annotation as 97% of the core genes (median) were assigned to the same species (Supplementary Figure 4). Consistency of the taxonomic annotation was lower for accessory genes (62%) caused mainly by unannotated genes.

MSP content

Most MSPs were small (median number of genes = 1 784) even if 53 had more than 5 000 genes (Supplementary Figure 5). As expected, a strong positive correlation (Pearson's r = 0.8) between the total number of genes in a MSP and its number of accessory genes was observed (Supplementary Figure 6). Interestingly, four outliers corresponding to the intestinal parasites previously described had a high number of core genes and few accessory genes. This suggests that Eukaryotic genomes have a larger number of genes and a lower gene content variability than Prokaryotes. Among the MSPs with the most accessory genes (Supplementary Table 2), many corresponded to species reported as highly variable such as *Escherichia coli* [45], *Klebsiella pneumoniae* [46] or *Clostridium bolteae* [47]. As previously observed in population genomics studies comparing multiple strains of the same species [48,49], the prevalence of accessory genes in MSPs often follows a bimodal distribution (Supplementary Figure 7) showing either a high or low prevalence but rarely intermediate. Thus, the number of accessory genes in a MSP is correlated (Spearman's rho = 0.86) with its prevalence (Supplementary Figure 8). Indeed, the more a MSP is detected in many samples, the more exhaustively MSPminer will recover its accessory genes, especially the rare ones. Many MSPs

annotated at species level had accessory genes previously unobserved in available genomes

(Supplementary Table 2)

Prevalence

As for the genes in the catalog, most MSPs were detected in very few samples (Supplementary

Figure 9). Only 40 MSPs were detected in at least 70% of the samples showing that the

common microbial core of the human gut microbiota is limited to a few dozen species

(Supplementary Table 2). No clear relation between the prevalence of the MSPs and their

mean abundance was found (Supplementary Figure 10). However, 2 MSPs corresponding to

Bacteroides vulgatus and *Bacteroides uniformis* were both very prevalent (detected in 97.6%

and 94.6% of the samples respectively) and very abundant (mean relative abundance of 7.8%

and 4.4% respectively). Interestingly, many rare MSPs were abundant in the few samples

which carried them. Many of these MSPs were annotated as bacteria of the *Lactobacillus*

genus most likely consumed as probiotics. However, some others correspond to known

invasive species associated with severe dysbiosis such as *Fusobacterium nucleatum* [50] or

Clostridium clostridioforme [51].

Census of universal single copy marker genes

To check that MSPs correspond to real microbial species and evaluate the completeness of

their set of core genes, we identified in each of them 40 universal single copy marker genes

(SCM) [44]. 878 MSPs (54%) had at least 30 SCM and 403 (24%) had all of them (Supplementary

Figure 11 A and Supplementary Table 2). As housekeeping genes, SCMs are essential to the

microbe survival and should be found among core genes. Indeed, 92% of the SCMs were core

genes in their respective MSP and the rest was mainly high prevalent accessory genes

(Supplementary Figure 11 B). This shows the classification of genes as core or accessory

performed by MSPminer is reliable.

Comparison to sequenced genomes

We compared the MSPs to 642 sequenced genomes for which at least 10% of their constituent

genes were detected in the Integrated Genes Catalog of the human gut microbiome [12]

(Supplementary Table 4). In total, these genomes covered 398 species representing 114

different genera. 624 (97.1%) were unambiguously assigned to 281 different MSPs. By keeping

only one representative per species, 47.1% (resp. 60.4%) of the genomes had at least 75% of

their genes grouped in their corresponding MSP considering either all their genes or only those that were in the catalog (Supplementary Figure 12). In compliance with the results of the taxonomic analysis, highly related species were assigned to the same MSP such as *Escherichia coli*, *Escherichia fergusonii* and all genomes of the *Shigella* genus. Conversely, some species grouping highly divergent strains were represented by several MSPs including *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* or *Bacteroides fragilis.*

To give another perspective on the MSPs, we compared the complete genome of *Parabacteroides distasonis* ATCC 8503 [52] to its corresponding MSP (Figure 7). Among the 3 850 genes predicted in the genome, 3 781 (98%) had at least a close homolog in the Integrated Gene Catalogue and 3 442 (89%) were found in the msp_0011. As expected, almost all the core genes from the MSP were found in the genome (1 867 / 1 921, 97%), as well as accessory genes with a prevalence higher than 80% (522 / 599, 87%). Only a small fraction of less prevalent accessory genes was found in the genome (1371 / 5 090, 27%) (Supplementary Figure 13). Genes grouped in the same modules tended to be physically close, in coherence with genome organization of prokaryotes (Supplementary Figure 14). Remarkably, some singleton genes were surrounded by genes from the same module, which shows that the stringent grouping criteria used by MSPminer may split genes with slightly different presence/absence patterns into different modules while they could have been grouped (Supplementary Figure 15). Finally, few genomic regions contained genes that were not assigned to the MSP (Supplementary Table 5A). Interestingly, some of these regions were annotated as mobile elements (Supplementary Table 5B). Although some could be false negatives, many were appropriately excluded as they were observed in too few samples or their counts did not meet the proportionality-based grouping criterion (Supplementary Figure 16).

Comparison to the Canopy clustering algorithm

The Canopy clustering algorithm [38] was compared to MSPminer by applying both tools to the metagenomic dataset described above. In total, Canopy grouped 2 691 408 genes into 3 463 Co-Abundance gene Groups (CAGs) while MSPminer grouped 3 267 132 genes (+17.6%) into 1 677 MSPs (~ two-fold less objects).

178 MSPs encompassing 154 617 genes had no equivalent among the CAGs. Most MSPs were

rare as 75% were detected in fewer than 5 samples but had a significant size as 50% were

composed of at least 700 genes (Supplementary Figure 17). Remarkably, for 75% of them, the

3 samples with the highest counts represented at least 90% of the sum of MSP abundance on

all the samples. By default, Canopy discards such cases to avoid detection of spurious

correlations but MSPminer limits this risk by applying a variance-stabilizing transformation

and a stringent association criterion. In addition, Canopy grouped most core genes of a MSP

into a single CAG while many accessory genes were missed or assigned to small separate CAGs

(Figure 5). In agreement with the results of the simulation, most of the missed accessory genes

had a medium or low prevalence. As they contained many unexpected zeros, the correlations

with the core of their respective species were below the limit set in Canopy (Figure 6).

MSPs quantification for biomarkers discovery

To demonstrate that MSPminer was useful for biomarkers discovery, we first looked for

differentially abundant MSPs according to the geographical origin of samples. We discovered

94 MSPs differentially abundant between Westerners and Chinese (q-value < 10^{-3}, log2 fold

change ≥ 1) including 72 more abundant in Westerners and 22 in Chinese (Supplementary

Figure 18 and Supplementary Table 6A). Among the discriminant MSPs, all those assigned to

the *Proteobacteria* phylum (*Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Escherichia coli* and *Bilophila*

wadsworthia) were more abundant in Chinese which is consistent with previously published

results [12]. Interestingly, two MSPs assigned to *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* were significant

but one was more abundant in Westerners and the other in Chinese. This shows that some

strains of this species are associated with geographical origin of samples. In addition, we

discovered 75 MSPs differentially abundant between Europeans and Americans (q-value <

10^{-3}, log2 fold change ≥ 1) of which 70 were more abundant among Europeans.

(Supplementary Figure 19 and Supplementary Table 6B). This result is consistent with previous

studies showing lower gut microbiota diversity among Americans compared to Europeans

[33].

Secondly, we checked if MSPs could be used to perform strain-level analysis. To do this, we

tested if some accessory genes in the MSPs were more prevalent in samples of a given

geographical origin. By way of example, we found 680 accessory genes associated with

geographical origin (chi-squared test, p-value < 10^{-10}) in the msp_0011 corresponding to
Parabacteroides distasonis (Supplementary Figure 20 and Supplementary Table 7).
Remarkably, genes involved in cell filamentation (V1.UC58-4_GL0042624 and V1.UC18-
0_GL0014340) were more prevalent in Chinese than Westerners. More generally, many
significant genes were more prevalent among Westerners or Chinese although European and
American samples were separated in the analysis. This result suggests that strains of
Parabacteroides distasonis carried by Chinese are distinct from those of Westerners.

Discussion

Direct proportionality hypothesis and limits

MSPminer relies on a new robust measure to detect genes with directly proportional counts.
Even if this relation is more stringent than those assessed by Pearson's or Spearman's
correlation coefficients, it was successfully used to reconstitute Metagenomic Species Pan-
genomes of the human gut microbiota. In fact, most genes from sequenced genomes were
grouped into a single MSP showing that direct proportionality is the most common relation
between genes from the same biological entity. MSPminer misses some genes for which
counts are not ruled by this relation. Indeed, proportionality is disrupted when gene copy
number varies across samples [14] (Supplementary Figure 21), when a sample contains
multiples strains [19,20] and when a gene is shared between several MSPs (Supplementary
Figure 22) because of horizontal gene transfer [53] or grouping of highly similar orthologs.
Nevertheless, the first two cases have most likely a limited impact as the majority of strains
tend to have the same gene copy numbers [14] and samples often carry a dominant strain
[20]. Regarding shared genes, their signals are a linear combination of the MSPs that carry
them. Thus, they will be identified only if these MSPs are mostly detected in separate sets of
samples.

Computing performance

MSPminer can process large datasets made up of thousands of samples and millions of genes
in just a few hours on a regular single node server. The program is only limited by the amount
of RAM available on the machine on which it is executed as the input count matrix must be
fully loaded into memory. Consequently, RAM consumption grows linearly according to the
number of samples and genes in the count matrix (Supplementary Figure 23).

MSPminer achieves good parallel efficiency (Supplementary Figure 24) through two

parallelization strategies. First, a novel Map/Reduce programming model assigns genes to as

many subsets as the number of available samples. Genes with greatest counts in the same

sample are first compared, which not only decreases the number of comparisons to perform

but increases the probability that related genes are placed in the same bin compared to

random assignment (Supplementary Figure 25). Each subset of genes is processed in parallel

and synchronization is only required before the reduction/merging step (see Methods). To

avoid comparisons of all pairs of genes, others used an iterative algorithm where a random

gene is compared to all the others until a significant proportion of genes is clustered [38]. This

method allows fast identification of big clusters but struggles with the large number of small

clusters and singleton genes. Furthermore, parallelism implementation is more complex as

synchronization is required to detect duplicate clusters. In a second phase, MSPminer

performs pairwise comparison of clusters to detect those corresponding to MSPs core gene

sets. Then, full MSPs including accessory and shared genes are retrieved in parallel from the

signal of their respective core genes. Here, no synchronization is required as core genes sets

are supposedly independent.

Quality of MSPs

The quality of the MSPs is impacted by all the upstream steps required for generating the

count matrix, as well as with the biological and ecological characteristics of the dataset. At the

sequencing level, the number of reads (sequencing depth) generated for each sample impacts

the detection and coverage of subdominant species, while reads length affects the quality of

the assembly and the ability to assign a read to a gene without ambiguity. At the

bioinformatics level, assembly, gene prediction, gene redundancy removal, mapping and

counting require expertise to select the most appropriate strategies, tools and parameters.

Indeed, assemblers returning chimeric contigs which combine sequences from highly related

species, inaccurate predictors generating truncated or merged genes, redundancy removal

with a common threshold for all genes (95% of nucleotide identity) lead to genes of variable

quality in catalogues. Then, when quantifying genes, keeping only uniquely mapped reads

underestimates the abundance of some genes whereas considering shared reads can generate

false positives. Genes grouped in MSPs were significantly longer than those that were not

(median length of 780 bp vs 498 bp, Wilcoxon rank-sum test p-value= 0) (Supplementary

Figure 26) as longer genes have a higher and less dispersed counts. Nevertheless, end-to-end

mapping probably plays a role as it may fail to fully align a read whose size is approximately

the same as the target gene. Finally, at the biology level, a high number of samples with varied

phenotypes will improve the comprehensiveness and quality of MSPs. Indeed, as the number

of samples grows, MSPminer will identify rare species and will extend the list of accessory

genes of the MSPs corresponding to species with an open pan-genome. In addition, highly

prevalent accessory genes will be reclassified from core to accessory as observed while

sequencing an increasing number of strains of a species [49].

Applications

As illustrated in this paper, MSPminer supports the analysis of metagenomic data at species-

level by identifying and quantifying the MSPs present in samples. Subsequently, MSPs

associated with a given phenotype (e.g. the geographical origin) can be investigated both

quantitatively and qualitatively. Here, information from unknown or non-sequenced species

can be exploited. Compared to methods relying on marker genes [33,34], MSPminer improves

the estimation of species abundance by automatically detecting among core genes those with

the highest specificity, the highest counts and lowest dispersion.

Moreover, in each MSP, genes or modules of accessory genes associated with the tested

phenotype can be explored opening the way to a strain-level analysis. Thus, biomarkers

corresponding to functional traits specific to certain strains can be discovered.

MSPminer also provides microbial population genetics from large cohorts which can support

culture-dependent methods by identifying species of particular interest, such as those with no

reference genome available or with reference genomes distant from the strains actually

present. Reciprocally, MSPminer will benefit from advances in culture-dependent methods

which provide reference genomes of low abundance species detectable by shotgun

sequencing but difficult to assemble [23,24].

Further developments

Several improvements of MSPminer are considered. Algorithms that could identify relevant

associations currently missed by MSPminer will be evaluated. For instance, deconvolution

algorithms [14] may discover genes shared between several MSPs while kernel density

estimators [54] may be useful for detecting genes with highly variable copy numbers.

To increase MSPminer specificity, a statistical test determining how much an association

between the core genome of a MSP and a gene is unexpected would be highly useful. Such a

statistical test could assess both co-occurrence with a Fisher exact test and co-abundance with

correlation test or equivalent. Currently, zero counts are either classified as structural or

undetermined while comparing genes abundance profiles. However, a statistical model

determining the probability that a zero is structural would allow overcoming threshold effects

and classifying with more accuracy a gene as core, accessory or shared.

Alternatives to the median for computing the representative of a MSP are envisaged. The sum

which cumulates counts from multiple genes is a prime candidate, as clusters would be

quantified with higher accuracy and increased quantification range particularly in samples

where its abundance is low. However, one should carefully account for outliers

Finally, the robustness of the measure of proportionality could be improved. For instance, a

robust linear regression [55] may replace the median for estimating the coefficient of

proportionality between the abundance profiles of two genes while the median absolute

deviation (MAD) could improve the detection of outliers [56].

Methods

Measure of proportionality between two genes

Let M be a $n \times m$ matrix where n is the number of genes and m the number of samples.

M is composed of counts c_{ij} representing the number of reads mapped on gene i in sample j.

Let $g_i = (c_{i1}, c_{i2}, \ldots, c_{im}) \; i \in [1, n]$ be the vector of the number of mapped reads on the gene i across the m samples.

The distribution of count data g_i has the following properties:

1. Variance tends to be proportional to the counts.
2. It ranges over several orders of magnitude due to uneven sequencing depth and variable relative abundance of the gene between samples.
3. It usually contains many zeros as the majority of genes are observed in a few samples. For instance, the count matrix used in this study contains 92% of zeros.
4. It is prone to outliers. (see Discussion)

Let g_x and g_y $(x, y \in [1, n] \; and \; x \neq y)$ denote the vectors of the number of mapped reads on two distinct genes. A robust measure is proposed to assess direct proportionality between g_y and g_x (formally written $g_x \infty g_y$) which accounts for the points mentioned above.

Let α be the coefficient of proportionality between g_x and g_y. α is a strictly positive constant expected to be roughly equal to the ratio of g_x and g_y length. However, it can be impacted by other factors such as uneven coverage or gene duplication (Supplementary Figure 27). Therefore, instead of relying on genes length, α was robustly estimated as follow:

$$\sqrt{\alpha} = median\left(\frac{\sqrt{c_{ys}}}{\sqrt{c_{xs}}}\right) \forall s \in [1, m] \text{ such as } c_{ys} \geq t \text{ and } c_{xs} \geq t \text{ with } t = 6 \text{ by default}$$

A square root transformation was applied to stabilize variance as suggested by several authors for count data [57,58]. For a comparison of some data transformations, refer to Supplementary Figure 28. The median was used to tolerate some outliers.

456   To estimate the coefficient of proportionality, only samples were both genes counts were

457   above a threshold t were kept. This has the following advantages:

458   1. It discards samples were both genes are absent as they do not provide any quantitative

459   information for the estimation.

460   2. It discards samples with overdispersed low counts which do not allow a precise

461   estimation of the coefficient of proportionality.

462   3. It discards samples where only one gene has a null count. In such sample, the zero

463   count can be either a sampling zero that corresponds to an undetected gene because

464   of sampling or technical effects or a structural zero that corresponds to unobserved

465   gene actually absent in the sample. Distinguish structural from sampling zeros is crucial

466   to classify a gene as core or accessory. Here, zeros below the threshold t were of an

467   undetermined type (yellow points in Figure 4) whereas those above were classified as

468   structural (red points in Figure 4).

470   When $\alpha > 1$, g_y yields more counts than g_x. As a result, a null count from g_x can be

471   misclassified as a structural zero.

473   When $\alpha \neq 1$, different quantification thresholds for g_x and g_y respectively named t_x and t_y

474   were used to reflect the different yields for g_x and g_y:

$$\alpha \geq 1 \rightarrow \left(t_x = t \ and \ t_y = \alpha \cdot t\right)$$

$$\alpha < 1 \rightarrow \left(t_x = \frac{t}{\alpha} \ and \ t_y = t\right)$$

Non-robust version

The relationship of proportionality between two genes was evaluated by the Lin's

concordance correlation coefficient [59] computed on samples that can be used for

quantification.

The Lin's concordance correlation coefficient was modified to detect strictly proportional

variables, and not relations of the type $y = x$ as originally designed:

$$\frac{2 \cdot \alpha \cdot s_{xy}}{\alpha^2 \cdot s_x + (\alpha \cdot \bar{x} - y^2)}$$

486 where $x = \sqrt{g_x}$, $y = \sqrt{g_y}$, $\bar{x}$ is the mean of x, s_x is the unbiased variance of x and s_{xy} is the

487 biased covariance of x and y.

Robust version

489 This measure was used to assess the proportionality between two genes in presence of few

490 outliers. If not treated specifically, even a small number of outliers may decrease significantly

491 the concordance coefficient calculated.

493 Residuals were computed in samples where both genes have non-null counts with the

494 following formula:

495
$$abs\left(\sqrt{g_y} - \alpha \cdot \sqrt{g_x}\right)$$

Let Q_1 and Q_3 be the first and third quartiles of the residuals. Let IQR be the interquartile

range defined by $IQR = Q_3 - Q_1$. Samples with residuals above $Q_3 + 1.5 \cdot IQR$ were

considered as outliers (purple points in Figure 4).

Let m be the number of samples for which residuals were computed. If there were more than

$(m - 5) \cdot 0.3$ outliers (percentage of outliers asymptotically equal to 30%), the robust

measure of proportionality was not computed. Otherwise, the concordance coefficient was

calculated on non-outlier samples.

Simulation

A simulated gene abundance table which quantifies genes of a single virtual species across

300 virtual samples was generated.

The species pan-genome consisted of 2 000 core genes and 2 900 accessory genes of variable

length. Genes length was generated from a negative binomial (mean = 1 000; overdispersion

= 0.3) and values below 100 and above 5 000 were rejected.

Each sample was carrier of a strain with specific gene content. For each prevalence ranging

from 10 to 299 samples, 10 accessory genes were considered. The subset of genes in which

an accessory gene was detected was drawn randomly.

The number of mapped reads per sample was generated from a log normal law (mean=log(1

000 000), sd=1) and values below 100 000 and above 10 000 000 were rejected.

The theoretical number of counts attributed to each gene was calculated according to its

length and its presence or not in the strain. The observed gene counts were generated by

using a negative binomial distribution (mean=theoretical gene count; overdispersion=0.05) to

approach real metagenomic data.

Outliers were added in each gene by selecting 5%, 10% and 20% of their non-null samples and

multiplying each observed count by either ¼, ⅓, 2 ,3 or 4.

Metagenomic Species Pan-genome generation

523 The Supplementary Figure 29 gives an overview of the MSPminer workflow.

Input data

525 MSPminer processes raw gene counts tables. In this study, we used the table provided with

526 the Integrated Gene Catalog of the human gut microbiome (1267sample.gene.pairNum.table)

527 available on GigaDB [60].

Data filtering

529 Rare genes which do not support enough quantitative information for further processing were

530 discarded. By default, genes with counts greater than 6 in at least 3 samples were kept.

Data transformation

532 A square root transformation was applied to gene counts. This transformation stabilizes gene

533 counts variance and limits the skewness of gene counts distribution.

Genes binning

535 Genes with the highest counts in the same sample were binned. To limit bias due to variable

536 sequencing depth, raw read counts were normalized by the number of mapped reads prior to

537 bin assignment (Supplementary Figure 30). Note that normalized counts were used in this step

538 only.

Seeds creation

This step identifies sets of co-abundant and co-occurring genes called *seeds* hereafter.

Seeds were created in parallel in each bin by a greedy approach. First, genes were compared

pairwise. All pairs of genes with a non-robust measure of proportionality of at least 0.8 and

no structural zeros were saved in a list. Then, the list was sorted by decreasing measure of

proportionality. The pair of genes with the highest measure of proportionality was selected as

a centroid. Genes related to one of the centroid genes were grouped together in a new seed.

Seed representative

For each seed, a pseudo gene referred as *representative* was computed as follow. First, the

seed representative was defined as the median vector of the counts of all its genes. Then, each

gene of the seed was compared to the seed representative using the measure proportionality.

The final seed representative corresponded to the median vector of the counts of the 30 genes

with the highest measure of proportionality.

Seeds merging

Some related genes may have been assigned to different bins, for instance, in a situation

where samples with the highest counts had close values. Therefore, a merging step was

performed. First, seeds from all the bins were pooled and sorted by decreasing size. Then, the

representative of the largest seed was compared to the representatives of the other seeds.

Seeds with a non-robust measure of proportionality of at least 0.8 and no structural zeros

counts were merged with the largest seed to form the final seed. Merged seeds were removed

from the list and the procedure was iterated until or there were no more seeds to process.

After merging, seeds with less than 200 genes were discarded.

Core seeds identification

In this step, core seeds were identified among final seeds, based on the assumption that in a

set of related seeds, the largest corresponds to a species core genome and the others are

modules of either accessory or shared genes.

First, seeds were sorted by decreasing number of genes. The largest seed was defined as a

new core seed. Then, the representative of the core seed was compared to the representative

of all remaining seeds. The seeds with a robust measure of proportionality of at least 0.8 were

considered as related to the core seed and discarded from the list of potential cores. The

procedure was iterated until there was no more seed to process.

Metagenomic Species Pan-genome generation

The representatives of each core seed were compared to all the genes. Because core seeds

were identified all at once in the previous step, the MSPs generation was run in parallel. Genes

with a robust measure of proportionality of at least 0.8 were considered as related to the core

seed.

Let g_x be the median vector of the number of mapped reads on the core seed and g_y the

vector of the number of mapped reads on a gene related to the core seed. The related gene

was assigned to one of the 4 following categories:

1. core genes were detected in the same samples as the core seed (Figure 4A).

$$\left(g_y \infty g_x\right) and \left(\forall s \in [1, m] c_{xs} \geq t_x \rightarrow c_{ys} \neq 0 \ and \ c_{ys} \geq t_y \rightarrow c_{xs} \neq 0\right)$$

2. accessory genes were detected in a subset of samples where the core seed was

582   detected (Figure 4B).

583    $$\left(g_y \infty g_x\right) and \left(\exists s \in [1, m] c_{xs} \geq t_x and \ c_{ys} = 0\right) and \left(\forall s \in [1, m] \ c_{ys} \geq t_y \rightarrow c_{xs} \neq 0\right)$$

584   3. shared core genes were detected in all the samples where the core seed was detected

585   plus some samples where it was not (Figure 4C).

586    $$\left(g_y \infty g_x\right) and \left(\forall s \in [1, m] \ c_{xs} \geq t_x \rightarrow c_{ys} \neq 0 \ \right) and \left(\exists s \in [1, m] c_{ys} \geq t_y and \ c_{xs} = 0\right)$$

587   4. shared accessory genes were detected in a subset of samples where the core seed was

588   detected plus some samples where it was not (Figure 4D).

$$\left(g_y \infty g_x\right) and \left(\exists s \in [1, m] c_{xs} \geq t_x and \ c_{ys} = 0\right) and \left(\exists s \in [1, m] c_{ys} \geq t_y and \ c_{xs} = 0\right)$$

In each category, a clustering procedure similar to the one used to create seeds was run. It

identified modules of co-occurring genes that may be interpreted as functional units, i.e.

operons. Unclustered genes were saved as singleton modules.

Comparison to the Canopy clustering algorithm

The implementation of the Canopy clustering algorithm was downloaded at

https://www.cbs.dtu.dk/projects/CAG/Supplementary_Software_canopy_clustering.zip. The

gene count table normalized following the procedure described in [3] was taken as an input.

Default parameters were used.

MSPs were projected on Co-Abundance gene Groups (CAGs) and reciprocally with an in-house

script.

Biomarkers discovery

Identification of MSPs associated with geographical origin

A two-tailed Wilcoxon rank-sum test was used on relative median abundance of the 30 best
representative core genes of each MSP (1 696 tested variables). The obtained p-values were
adjusted by the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure. In addition, a $\log_2$ ratio was computed
between the median abundances of the MSP in the two populations tested. MSPs with an
adjusted p-value inferior to 10^{-2} and a $\log_2$ ratio superior to 1 were considered significant.

Identification of accessory genes associated with geographical origin

For each accessory gene of a MSP, a 2x2 contingency table counting in both populations the
number of samples where the gene was present or absent was built. Only samples where the
MSP core genome was detected were kept. A gene was considered as present in a sample if
at least two reads were mapped on it. Then, a chi-squared test was performed on each
contingency table. Accessory genes with a p-value inferior to 10^{-10} were considered
significant. $\log_2$ presence ratios equal to +infinity or −infinity were replaced by +10 or −10
respectively.

Taxonomic annotation of the gene catalog

Genes were aligned at the nucleotide level using BLASTn [61] (version 2.6.0) against KEGG
GENOME [62] (Release 82.0, April 2017) and RefSeq [63] (Release 81, March 2017). Hits that
covered less than 80% of the query gene or with a e-value superior to 0.01 were discarded.
Thresholds of 95%, 80% and 65% of nucleotide identity were respectively used for taxonomic
annotation at species, genus and phylum level.

At a given taxonomic level, "no consensus" was reported if the selected hits did not share the
same annotation. Finally, results from KEGG were preferred to those from RefSeq.

MSPs were assigned to the lowest level taxon representing more than 50% of the annotations
of their core genes. Taxonomic annotations of MSPs with at least 50% of their core genes
annotated at species level (including "no consensus") and less than 80% assigned to the most
represented species were considered ambiguous (c.f. Supplementary Table 3)

Functional annotation of the gene catalog

Translated genes were annotated with eggnog-mapper [64] (version 0.12.7) based on eggNOG orthology assignments [65]. Sequence similarity searches were performed using HMMER [66].

The 40 universal single copy marker genes were discovered using fetchMG v1.0 [67]

Comparison of the MSPs to sequenced genomes

Genomes used to build the integrated catalog of the human gut microbiome [12], HMP reference genomes [68] and genomes from species detected while performing the taxonomic annotation of the MSPs were downloaded from GenBank [69]. When not provided, CDS were predicted with Prodigal [70]. Genes from the reference catalog were aligned against the genomes with BLASTn [61] (version 2.6.0; arguments: -perc_identity 95 -ungapped). Alignments of less than 100 nucleotides were discarded. Hits found for a single gene at neighboring positions on the target genome were merged. 642 genomes with less than 10% of their constituent genes detected in the reference catalog were kept. Genes were annotated with the related MSP information when available. Hits from most abundant MSP were kept and overlapping hits from less abundant MSPs were discarded. The local GC-content of genome was computed using a sliding window of approximately 100 nucleotides. Finally these data were plotted using Circos [71].

Declarations

Funding

This work was funded by Enterome, the ANRT (Association Nationale de la Recherche Technique) via the grant CIFRE 2014/0057 and INRA MetaGenoPolis via the grant "Investissements d'avenir" ANR-11-DPBS-0001.

Authors' contributions

FPO and MP designed the software, performed the analyses and wrote the manuscript. FPO implemented the software. FM, AC and SDE supervised the project and revised the manuscript.

Additional files

Supplementary Table 1: Tab-separated file listing the genes and modules in the MSPs

Supplementary Table 2: XLS file describing the MSPs (taxonomic annotation, number of genes, number of universal marker genes, prevalence and abundance)

Supplementary Table 3: XLS file listing the MSPs with ambiguous annotation at species level.

Supplementary Table 4: XLS file summarizing the comparison of the MSPs to 642 sequenced genomes.

Supplementary Table 5: XLS file listing the genomic regions of *Parabacteroides distasonis* ATCC 8503 containing genes not assigned to the msp_0011.

Supplementary Table 6: XLS file listing the MSPs associated with the geographic origin of samples.

Supplementary Table 7: XLS file listing the accessory genes of the msp_0011 (*Parabacteroides distasonis*) associated with the geographic origin of samples.

References

1. O'Hara AM, Shanahan F. The gut flora as a forgotten organ. EMBO Rep. [Internet]. 2006;7:688–93. Available from: http://embor.embopress.org/cgi/doi/10.1038/sj.embor.7400731

2. Morgan XC, Tickle TL, Sokol H, Gevers D, Devaney KL, Ward D V, et al. Dysfunction of the intestinal microbiome in inflammatory bowel disease and treatment. Genome Biol. [Internet]. 2012;13:R79. Available from: http://genomebiology.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/gb-2012-13-9-r79

3. Qin J, Li Y, Cai Z, Li S, Zhu J, Zhang F, et al. A metagenome-wide association study of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetes. Nature [Internet]. 2012;490:55–60. Available from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature11450

4. Le Chatelier E, Nielsen T, Qin J, Prifti E, Hildebrand F, Falony G, et al. Richness of human gut microbiome correlates with metabolic markers. Nature [Internet]. 2013;500:541–6. Available from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature12506

5. Kostic AD, Xavier RJ, Gevers D. The Microbiome in Inflammatory Bowel Disease: Current Status and the Future Ahead. Gastroenterology [Internet]. 2014;146:1489–99. Available from: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0016508514002200

6. Qin N, Yang F, Li A, Prifti E, Chen Y, Shao L, et al. Alterations of the human gut microbiome in liver cirrhosis. Nature [Internet]. 2014;513:59–64. Available from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature13568

7. Feng Q, Liang S, Jia H, Stadlmayr A, Tang L, Lan Z, et al. Gut microbiome development along the colorectal adenoma–carcinoma sequence. Nat. Commun. [Internet]. 2015;6:6528. Available from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/ncomms7528

8. Větrovský T, Baldrian P. The Variability of the 16S rRNA Gene in Bacterial Genomes and Its Consequences for Bacterial Community Analyses. PLoS One. 2013;8.

9. Brooks JP, Edwards DJ, Harwich MD, Rivera MC, Fettweis JM, Serrano MG, et al. The truth

about metagenomics: quantifying and counteracting bias in 16S rRNA studies. BMC Microbiol.

[Internet]. 2015;15:66. Available from: http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2180/15/66

10. Ranjan R, Rani A, Metwally A, McGee HS, Perkins DL. Analysis of the microbiome:

Advantages of whole genome shotgun versus 16S amplicon sequencing. Biochem. Biophys.

Res. Commun. [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2016;469:967–77. Available from:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2015.12.083

11. Jovel J, Patterson J, Wang W, Hotte N, O'Keefe S, Mitchel T, et al. Characterization of the

Gut Microbiome Using 16S or Shotgun Metagenomics. Front. Microbiol. [Internet]. 2016;7.

Available from: http://journal.frontiersin.org/Article/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00459/abstract

12. Li J, Jia H, Cai X, Zhong H, Feng Q, Sunagawa S, et al. An integrated catalog of reference

genes in the human gut microbiome. Nat. Biotechnol. [Internet]. 2014;32:834–41. Available

from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nbt.2942

13. Schloissnig S, Arumugam M, Sunagawa S, Mitreva M, Tap J, Zhu A, et al. Genomic variation

landscape of the human gut microbiome. Nature [Internet]. 2012;493:45–50. Available from:

http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature11711

14. Greenblum S, Carr R, Borenstein E. Extensive Strain-Level Copy-Number Variation across

Human Gut Microbiome Species. Cell [Internet]. 2015;160:583–94. Available from:

http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0092867415000136

15. Zhu A, Sunagawa S, Mende DR, Bork P. Inter-individual differences in the gene content of

human gut bacterial species. Genome Biol. [Internet]. 2015;16:82. Available from:

http://genomebiology.com/2015/16/1/82

16. Larsbrink J, Rogers TE, Hemsworth GR, McKee LS, Tauzin AS, Spadiut O, et al. A discrete

genetic locus confers xyloglucan metabolism in select human gut Bacteroidetes. Nature

[Internet]. 2014;506:498–502. Available from:

http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature12907

17. Loman NJ, Constantinidou C, Christner M, Rohde H, Chan JZ-M, Quick J, et al. A Culture-

Independent Sequence-Based Metagenomics Approach to the Investigation of an Outbreak of

Shiga-Toxigenic Escherichia coli O104:H4. JAMA [Internet]. 2013;309:1502. Available from:

http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jama.2013.3231

18. Scaria J, Ponnala L, Janvilisri T, Yan W, Mueller LA, Chang Y-F. Analysis of Ultra Low Genome

Conservation in Clostridium difficile. Horsburgh MJ, editor. PLoS One [Internet].

2010;5:e15147. Available from: http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0015147

19. Luo C, Knight R, Siljander H, Knip M, Xavier RJ, Gevers D. ConStrains identifies microbial

strains in metagenomic datasets. Nat. Biotechnol. [Internet]. 2015;33:1045–52. Available

from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nbt.3319

20. Truong DT, Tett A, Pasolli E, Huttenhower C, Segata N. Microbial strain-level population

structure & genetic diversity from metagenomes. Genome Res. 2017;27:626–38.

21. Scholz M, Ward D V, Pasolli E, Tolio T, Zolfo M, Asnicar F, et al. Strain-level microbial

epidemiology and population genomics from shotgun metagenomics. Nat. Methods

[Internet]. 2016;13:435–8. Available from:

http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nmeth.3802

22. Nayfach S, Rodriguez-Mueller B, Garud N, Pollard KS. An integrated metagenomics pipeline

for strain profiling reveals novel patterns of bacterial transmission and biogeography. Genome

Res. [Internet]. 2016;26:1612–25. Available from:

http://genome.cshlp.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/gr.201863.115

23. Browne HP, Forster SC, Anonye BO, Kumar N, Neville BA, Stares MD, et al. Culturing

of ?unculturable? human microbiota reveals novel taxa and extensive sporulation. Nature

[Internet]. 2016;533:543–6. Available from:

http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature17645

24. Lagier J-C, Khelaifia S, Alou MT, Ndongo S, Dione N, Hugon P, et al. Culture of previously

uncultured members of the human gut microbiota by culturomics. Nat. Microbiol. [Internet].

2016;1:16203. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/nmicrobiol2016203

25. Wattam AR, Abraham D, Dalay O, Disz TL, Driscoll T, Gabbard JL, et al. PATRIC, the bacterial

bioinformatics database and analysis resource. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014;42.

26. Pop M. Genome assembly reborn: Recent computational challenges. Brief. Bioinform.
2009;10:354–66.

27. Boisvert S, Raymond F, Godzaridis É, Laviolette F, Corbeil J. Ray Meta: scalable de novo
metagenome assembly and profiling. Genome Biol. [Internet]. 2012;13:R122. Available from:
http://genomebiology.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/gb-2012-13-12-r122

28. Peng Y, Leung HCM, Yiu SM, Chin FYL. IDBA-UD: A de novo assembler for single-cell and
metagenomic sequencing data with highly uneven depth. Bioinformatics. 2012;28:1420–8.

29. Li D, Liu C-M, Luo R, Sadakane K, Lam T-W. MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-node solution for
large and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph. Bioinformatics
[Internet].   2015;31:1674–6.   Available   from:
https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article-
lookup/doi/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv033

30. Nurk S, Meleshko D, Korobeynikov A, Pevzner PA. metaSPAdes: a new versatile
metagenomic   assembler.   Genome   Res.   [Internet].   2017;   Available   from:
http://genome.cshlp.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/gr.213959.116

31. Sharpton TJ. An introduction to the analysis of shotgun metagenomic data. Front. Plant
Sci.   [Internet].   2014   [cited   2017   Jan   9];5.   Available   from:
http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpls.2014.00209/abstract

32. Qin J, Li R, Raes J, Arumugam M, Burgdorf KS, Manichanh C, et al. A human gut microbial
gene catalogue established by metagenomic sequencing. Nature [Internet]. 2010;464:59–65.
Available from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature08821

33. Sunagawa S, Mende DR, Zeller G, Izquierdo-Carrasco F, Berger SA, Kultima JR, et al.
Metagenomic species profiling using universal phylogenetic marker genes. Nat. Methods
[Internet].   2013;10:1196–9.   Available   from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nmeth.2693

34. Truong DT, Franzosa EA, Tickle TL, Scholz M, Weingart G, Pasolli E, et al. MetaPhlAn2 for
enhanced metagenomic taxonomic profiling. Nat. Methods [Internet]. 2015;12:902–3.

Available from: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nmeth.3589

35. Wang J, Jia H. Metagenome-wide association studies: fine-mining the microbiome. Nat.
Rev.   Microbiol.   [Internet].   2016;14:508–22.   Available   from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nrmicro.2016.83

36. Schwartzman A, Lin X. The effect of correlation in false discovery rate estimation.
Biometrika   [Internet].   2011;98:199–214.   Available   from:
https://academic.oup.com/biomet/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/biomet/asq075

37. Karlsson FH, Tremaroli V, Nookaew I, Bergstr?m G, Behre CJ, Fagerberg B, et al. Gut
metagenome in European women with normal, impaired and diabetic glucose control. Nature
[Internet].   2013;498:99–103.   Available   from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature12198

38. Nielsen HB, Almeida M, Juncker AS, Rasmussen S, Li J, Sunagawa S, et al. Identification and
assembly of genomes and genetic elements in complex metagenomic samples without using
reference genomes. Nat. Biotechnol. [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2014 Jul 9];32:822–8. Available
from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24997787

39. Huson LW. Performance of Some Correlation Coefficients When Applied to Zero-Clustered
Data.   J.   Mod.   Appl.   Stat.   Methods   [Internet].   2007;6:530–6.   Available   from:
http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/jmasm%5Cnhttp://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/jmasm/vo
l6/iss2/17

40. Kowalski CJ. On the Effects of Non-Normality on the Distribution of the Sample Product-
Moment   Correlation   Coefficient.   Appl.   Stat.   [Internet].   1972;21:1.   Available   from:
http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/2346598?origin=crossref

41. Osborne JW, Overbay A. The power of outliers (and why researchers should always check
for them). Pract. Assessment, Res. Eval. 2004;9:1–8.

42. Medini D, Donati C, Tettelin H, Masignani V, Rappuoli R. The microbial pan-genome. Curr.
Opin. Genet. Dev. 2005. p. 589–94.

43. Arumugam M, Raes J, Pelletier E, Le Paslier D, Yamada T, Mende DR, et al. Enterotypes of

the human gut microbiome. Nature [Internet]. 2011;474:666–666. Available from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature10187

44. Mende DR, Sunagawa S, Zeller G, Bork P. Accurate and universal delineation of prokaryotic
species. Nat. Methods [Internet]. 2013;10:881–4. Available from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nmeth.2575

45. Tenaillon O, Skurnik D, Picard B, Denamur E. The population genetics of commensal
Escherichia coli. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. [Internet]. 2010;8:207–17. Available from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nrmicro2298

46. Holt KE, Wertheim H, Zadoks RN, Baker S, Whitehouse CA, Dance D, et al. Genomic analysis
of diversity, population structure, virulence, and antimicrobial resistance in *Klebsiella*
pneumoniae , an urgent threat to public health. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. [Internet].
2015;112:E3574–81. Available from:
http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1501049112

47. Dehoux P, Marvaud JC, Abouelleil A, Earl AM, Lambert T, Dauga C. Comparative genomics
of Clostridium bolteae and Clostridium clostridioforme reveals species-specific genomic
properties and numerous putative antibiotic resistance determinants. BMC Genomics
[Internet]. 2016;17:819. Available from:
http://bmcgenomics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12864-016-3152-x

48. Donati C, Hiller NL, Tettelin H, Muzzi A, Croucher NJ, Angiuoli S V, et al. Structure and
dynamics of the pan-genome of Streptococcus pneumoniae and closely related species.
Genome Biol. [Internet]. 2010;11:R107. Available from:
http://genomebiology.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/gb-2010-11-10-r107

49. Touchon M, Hoede C, Tenaillon O, Barbe V, Baeriswyl S, Bidet P, et al. Organised Genome
Dynamics in the Escherichia coli Species Results in Highly Diverse Adaptive Paths. Casades?s J,
editor. PLoS Genet. [Internet]. 2009;5:e1000344. Available from:
http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1000344

50. Castellarin M, Warren RL, Freeman JD, Dreolini L, Krzywinski M, Strauss J, et al.
Fusobacterium nucleatum infection is prevalent in human colorectal carcinoma. Genome Res.

2012;22:299–306.

51. Finegold SM, Song Y, Liu C, Hecht DW, Summanen P, Könönen E, et al. Clostridium
clostridioforme: A mixture of three clinically important species. Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect.
Dis. 2005;24:319–24.

52. Xu J, Mahowald MA, Ley RE, Lozupone CA, Hamady M, Martens EC, et al. Evolution of
Symbiotic Bacteria in the Distal Human Intestine. PLoS Biol. 2007;5:1574–86.

53. Dagan T, Artzy-Randrup Y, Martin W. Modular networks and cumulative impact of lateral
transfer in prokaryote genome evolution. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. [Internet]. 2008;105:10039–
44. Available from: http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0800679105

54. Silverman BW. Using Kernel Density Estimates to Investigate Multimodality. J. R. Stat. Soc.
Ser. B. 1981;43:97–9.

55. Maronna RA, Martin RD, Yohai VJ. Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods. Ann. Stat.
2006;30:17–23.

56. Leys C, Ley C, Klein O, Bernard P, Licata L. Detecting outliers: Do not use standard deviation
around the mean, use absolute deviation around the median. J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.
2013;49:764–6.

57. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistics Notes: Transforming data. Bmj [Internet]. 1996;312:770–
770. Available from: http://www.bmj.com/cgi/doi/10.1136/bmj.312.7033.770

58. Osborne J. Notes on the use of data transformations. Pract. Assess. [Internet]. 2002;8:4–
13.   Available   from:
c:%5CUsers%5CTeresa%5CDocuments%5CTeseFinal%5C2010%5Cserinus2010%5CPDF'sPara
Organizar%5CPDF's2010%5Ctransformation.pdf

59. Lin LI-K. A Concordance Correlation Coefficient to Evaluate Reproducibility. Biometrics
[Internet].   1989;45:255.   Available   from:
http://www.jstor.org/stable/2532051?origin=crossref

60. Li J, Jia H, Cai X, Zhong H, Feng Q, Sunagawa S, et al. Supporting data for the paper: "An

integrated catalog of reference genes in the human gut microbiome" [Internet]. GigaScience

Database; 2014. Available from: http://gigadb.org/dataset/100064

61. Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. Basic local alignment search tool. J.

Mol.   Biol.   [Internet].   1990;215:403–10.   Available   from:

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022283605803602

62. Ogata H, Goto S, Sato K, Fujibuchi W, Bono H, Kanehisa M. KEGG: Kyoto encyclopedia of

genes and genomes. Nucleic Acids Res. 1999. p. 29–34.

63. Pruitt KD, Tatusova T, Maglott DR. NCBI reference sequences (RefSeq): A curated non-

redundant sequence database of genomes, transcripts and proteins. Nucleic Acids Res.

2007;35.

64. Huerta-Cepas J, Forslund K, Coelho LP, Szklarczyk D, Jensen LJ, von Mering C, et al. Fast

Genome-Wide Functional Annotation through Orthology Assignment by eggNOG-Mapper.

Mol. Biol. Evol. [Internet]. 2017;278:631–7. Available from: https://oup.silverchair-

cdn.com/oup/backfile/Content_public/Journal/mbe/PAP/10.1093_molbev_msx148/3/msx1

48.pdf?Expires=1499795422&Signature=W7WZu1nfufNHcrf1QFCH~13BjwFo82LccucPBoCvq

GvLaCIaQFIzzY6iT3cfR4A1bFPxYnhBaz6D-wBoorppxD5SfKpgd63KRkl2HHDcb2BEBArfT4f

65. Huerta-Cepas J, Szklarczyk D, Forslund K, Cook H, Heller D, Walter MC, et al. EGGNOG 4.5:

A hierarchical orthology framework with improved functional annotations for eukaryotic,

prokaryotic and viral sequences. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016;44:D286–93.

66. Eddy SR. Accelerated profile HMM searches. PLoS Comput. Biol. 2011;7.

67. Kultima JR, Sunagawa S, Li J, Chen W, Chen H, Mende DR, et al. MOCAT: A Metagenomics

Assembly and Gene Prediction Toolkit. PLoS One. 2012;7.

68. Nelson KE, Weinstock GM, Highlander SK, Worley KC, Creasy HH, Wortman JR, et al. A

Catalog of Reference Genomes from the Human Microbiome. Science (80-.). [Internet].

2010;328:994–9.   Available   from:

http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.1183605

69. Benson DA, Cavanaugh M, Clark K, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Lipman DJ, Ostell J, et al. GenBank.

Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41.

70. Hyatt D, Chen G-L, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. Prodigal: prokaryotic gene

recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC Bioinformatics. 2010;11:119.

71. Krzywinski M, Schein J, Birol I, Connors J, Gascoyne R, Horsman D, et al. Circos: An

information aesthetic for comparative genomics. Genome Res. [Internet]. 2009;19:1639–45.

Available from: http://genome.cshlp.org/cgi/doi/10.1101/gr.092759.109

Figures

		sample1	sample2	sample3	sample4	sample5	
core gene 1	—	1	2	1	3	2	Co-abundant genes
core gene 2	—	3	6	3	9	6	
core gene 3	—	2	4	2	6	4	
accessory gene 1	—	3	**0**	3	**0**	6	**Partially** co-abundant with core genes
accessory gene2	—	**0**	4	2	6	**0**	

Figure 1

896   Figure 2

898   Figure 3

900   Figure 4

904   Figure 6

905
906   Figure 7

Figures legends

Figure 1: Simple model illustrating the rationale behind the method

5 samples carry different strains from the same species. Three core genes (red, blue, orange) are present in all the strains. Two accessory genes (green, purple) are present only in some strains. The abundance of the species in each sample ranges from 1 to 3 copies.

After shotgun sequencing, a raw gene abundance matrix is built.

A strict proportionality relationship is expected between two core genes, the proportionality coefficient being equal to the ratio of their length. In contrast, such relationship between a core and an accessory gene should be observed only in the subset of samples where the accessory gene is present.

Figure 2: Comparison of the genes abundance profiles of the virtual species to the median signal of its core genome

using:

    A. the Pearson correlation coefficient

    B. the Spearman correlation coefficient

    C. the measure of proportionality

Figure 3: Structure of Metagenomic Species Pan-genomes (MSPs)

Figure 4: Illustration of the four types of genes in a MSP

The core genome median abundance of the msp_0043 (*Ruminococcus bromii*) is compared to:

    A. the gene MH0003_GL0010264 classified as core. The gene is detected in all the samples where MSP is detected.

    B. the gene MH0025_GL0082295 classified as accessory. The gene is missing in 516 samples where the MSP is detected.

    C. the gene 657321.RBR_R_22270 classified as its shared core. The gene is present in all the samples where MSP is detected but also in 286 samples where the MSP is not.

    D. the gene MH0205_GL0102923 classified as shared accessory. The gene is missing in 454 samples where the MSP is detected but present in 28 samples where the MSP is not.

Figure 5: Comparison of the gene content of some MSPs and their corresponding CAGs

Figure 6: Comparison of the genes abundance profiles of the msp_0011 (*Parabacteroides distasonis*) to the median signal of its core genome.

Three measures are compared:

    A. the Pearson correlation coefficient

    B. the Spearman correlation coefficient

    C. the measure of proportionality.

Grey points correspond to genes unclassified by Canopy whereas those colored were grouped in CAGs.

Figure 7: Circos representation of the mapping of the msp_0011 on the genome of *P. distasonis strain* ATCC 8503

Description of layers from outside to inside:

    A. Position on chromosome

    B. GC-content (format: histogram)

    C. gene or module type (format: highlight):

- green: core
- yellow: accessory
- blue: shared core
- purple: shared accessory

    D. MSP (format: highlight):

- Bandwidth:
  - · wide: gene grouped in a MSP
  - · narrow: gene grouped in a seed
- color code:
  - · red: gene grouped in the most represented MSP
  - · other color + grey: gene grouped in another MSP or a seed

    E. Sample assignment (format: histogram):

- facing outwards if the gene is related to the most represented MSP, facing inwards otherwise.

965   • color code:

966   · grey: samples where the MSP module is not detected

967   · green: samples where the MSP core and the gene are detected

968   · yellow: samples where the MSP core is detected but not the gene

969   · purple: samples where the gene is detected but not the MSP core

970   F. relation between genes associated to a MSP different from the most represented

971   (format: edges). Genes from the same alien MSP are linked by edges.

Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2

Supplementary Figure 3

Supplementary Figure 4

983 Supplementary Figure 5

985   Supplementary Figure 6

Supplementary Figure 7

989 Supplementary Figure 8

Supplementary Figure 9

993   Supplementary Figure 10

995 Supplementary Figure 11

997   Supplementary Figure 12

1 square = 5 genes

999   Supplementary Figure 13

1000

1001   Supplementary Figure 14

1002

1003 Supplementary Figure 15

1004

1005 Supplementary Figure 16

1006

1007   Supplementary Figure 17

msp_0161 unassigned Firmicutes		q = 2.32e-131
msp_0028 Klebsiella pneumoniae		q = 1.54e-88
msp_0280 not annotated		q = 1.32e-71
msp_0297 Dorea longicatena		q = 4.44e-68
msp_0005 Escherichia coli		q = 1.18e-66
msp_0603 unassigned Faecalibacterium		q = 3.96e-66
msp_0285 not annotated		q = 1.5e-57
msp_0448 unassigned Firmicutes		q = 3.37e-54
msp_0133 not annotated		q = 3.82e-53
msp_0833 unassigned Faecalibacterium		q = 6.35e-52
msp_0460 Clostridium phoceensis		q = 1.19e-48
msp_1304 not annotated		q = 3.53e-48
msp_0062 Barnesiella intestinihominis		q = 7.04e-48
msp_0722 unassigned Firmicutes		q = 1.31e-47
msp_0255 Bifidobacterium adolescentis		q = 1.64e-45

relative abundance

Chinese Westerners

0   1e-09   1e-08   1e-07   1e-06   1e-05   1e-04

1008

1009   Supplementary Figure 18

1010

1011   Supplementary Figure 19

1012

Supplementary Figure 20

1014

1015 Supplementary Figure 21

1016

1017 Supplementary Figure 22

1018

1019   Supplementary Figure 23

1020

1021 Supplementary Figure 24

1022

1023   Supplementary Figure 25

1024

1025   Supplementary Figure 26

1026

1027   Supplementary Figure 27

1028

1029 Supplementary Figure 28

samples

genes

raw gene counts table

1. data preparation
- filter rare genes
- sqrt transformation

2. clustering
- genes binning
- clustering of co-abundant and co-occurring genes (seeds)
- seeds merging

3. MSP generation
- core seeds identification
- identification of core-related genes
- genes classification (core , acc., shared)
- identification of co-occurring non-core genes (modules)

1030

1031   Supplementary Figure 29

1032

1033   Supplementary Figure 30

Supplementary Figures legends

Supplementary Figure 1: Comparison of the noisy genes abundance profiles of the virtual species to the original median signal of its core genome

using either the non-robust or robust measure of proportionality with an increasing percentage of outliers (5%, 10% and 20%).

Supplementary Figure 2: Lowest taxonomic rank assigned to MSPs

(1 square = 1 MSP)

Supplementary Figure 3: Most represented phyla among MSPs

Supplementary Figure 4: Taxonomic homogeneity of MSPs

Only MSPs annotated at species level were kept.

Supplementary Figure 5: Histogram of the total number of genes in MSPs

Supplementary Figure 6: Comparison of the number of genes in a MSP and its number of accessory genes.

The four outliers in red correspond to eukaryotic intestinal parasites of the *Blastocystis* genus (msp_0001, msp_0002, msp_0004 and msp_0006).

Supplementary Figure 7: Prevalence of the accessory genes of some MSPs among samples where their respective core genes are detected.

Supplementary Figure 8: Comparison of the number of samples where a MSPs is detected and its number of accessory genes.

Supplementary Figure 9: Prevalence of MSPs among the 1267 samples.

Supplementary Figure 10: Comparison of the percentage of samples where a MSPs is detected and its mean abundance.

The red, blue and green points correspond to the MSPs associated to *Bacteroides vulgatus*, *Bacteroides uniformis* and *Prevotella copri* respectively.

Supplementary Figure 11: Single Copy Marker genes in MSPs

    A. Number of universal single copy marker genes (SCM) in MSPs

    B. Prevalence of the universal single copy marker genes (SCM) in the MSPs they belong to.

Supplementary Figure 12: Percentage of genes from reference genomes grouped in their best corresponding MSPs.

Supplementary Figure 13: Comparison of the genes detected in *P. distasonis* ATCC 8503 with those of its corresponding MSP.

Each square represents 5 genes. Dark colors correspond to genes detected both in the genome and the MSP while light colors correspond to genes not found in the genome.

Supplementary Figure 14: Median distance between consecutive genes in modules of the msp_0011 detected in P. distasonis ATCC 8503, as a function of module prevalence and module size.

The median distance between successive genes in a module was below 150 bp in 75% of the cases.

Median distances of 0 base pairs correspond to modules with overlapping genes.

Supplementary Figure 15: Example of genes found within a genomic region of *P. distasonis* ATCC 8503 delimited by a module

The 4 genes of the accessory module 0185 are detected in the genome of *P. distasonis* ATCC 8503 between positions 441 398 - 442 762.

The genes 435591.BDI_0388 and O2.UC52-0_GL0104470 are detected in this region between positions 441903 -442697 and 442472 - 442697 respectively but were not grouped in the module.

3.A, 3.B and 3.C: The association of the core of the msp_0011 with the module and the two singletons is clear.

3.D: The gene 435591.BDI_038 was not grouped in the module because it was missing in 3 samples where the module was detected. Here, one may consider that the clustering criteria was too stringent.

3.E: The gene O2.UC52-0_GL0104470 was not grouped in the module because it was missing in 77 samples where the module was detected. Here, excluding the module gene seems relevant.

Supplementary Figure 16: Example of genes of *P. distasonis* ATCC 8503 not found in the msp_0011

4.A: O2.UC27-0_GL0024692 (alien region 4) corresponds to a false negative with overdispersed counts. The robust measure of proportionality was above the threshold set by MSPMiner.

4.B: 435591.BDI_0319 (alien region 3) corresponds to a false negative subject to copy-number variation. The robust measure of proportionality was above the threshold set by MSPMiner.

4.C: MH0388_GL0156798 (alien region 10) probably corresponds to a false negative. The number of observations was too low to detect an association.

4.D: O2.UC32-1_GL0117083 (alien region 52) might correspond to a false negative. The number of observations was too low to detect an association.

4.E V1.UC40-1_GL0124158 (alien region 86) corresponds to a true negative as there is no clear association. Remarkably, this gene was annotated as a mobile element (conjugative transposon protein).

4.F V1.FI04_GL0019901 (alien region 21) corresponds to a true negative as there is no clear association. Interestingly, this gene was classified as shared accessory in the msp_0025 corresponding to *Parabacteroides merdae*.

Supplementary Figure 17: Description of the MSPs with no equivalent among CAGs.

A. Histogram of the prevalence of the MSPs with no equivalent among CAGs.
B. Histogram of the number of genes in the MSPs with no equivalent among CAGs.

Supplementary Figure 18: Relative abundance of the top 10 discriminant MSPs between Chinese and Westerners.

Supplementary Figure 19: Relative abundance of the top 10 discriminant MSPs between Americans and Europeans.

Supplementary Figure 20: The 40 accessory genes (in column) of the msp_0011 (*Parabacteroides distasonis*) most associated with the geographical origin of samples (in row).

Supplementary Figure 21: Example of genes subject to copy-number variation.

    A. Comparison of the core genome median abundance of the msp_0011 (*Parabacteroides distasonis*) to one of its core genes (MH0150_GL0074117) subject to Copy-Number Variation. Here, MSPminer wrongly estimates the coefficient of proportionality as there is no dominant gene copy number among the samples.

    B. Comparison of the core genome median abundance of the msp_0070 (*Eubacterium rectale*) to one of its core genes (BGI-17A_GL0065038) subject to Copy-Number Variation. Here, MSPminer correctly estimates the coefficient of proportionality for the majority of samples (blue points) that have the same number of copies of the gene. The others are classified as outliers (purple points).

Supplementary Figure 22: Example of genes shared between several MSPs.

The gene SZEY-26A_GL0070503 is classified as shared accessory in the msp_0140 (*Bifidobacterium pseudocatenulatum*) and the msp_0255 (*Bifidobacterium adolescentis*)

    A. Comparison of the core genome median abundance of the msp_0140 to the gene SZEY-26A_GL0070503. Despite the presence of outliers, a direct proportionality relationship is observed in many samples where both the msp and the gene are present.

    B. Comparison of the core genome median abundance of the msp_0255 to the gene SZEY-26A_GL0070503. Despite the presence of outliers, a direct proportionality relationship is observed in many samples where both the msp and the gene are present.

C. Comparison of the core genome median abundance of the msp_0140 to the core genome median abundance of the msp_0255. Although the two MSPs share a gene, they have distinct signals.

Supplementary Figure 23: Memory usage of MSPminer.

A. RAM consumption as a function of the number of genes. The number of samples was set at 1267. The grey line represents the best linear fit (intercept=5.05, slope=5.17).

B. RAM consumption as a function of the number of samples. The number of genes was set at 9 879 896. The grey line represents the best linear fit (intercept=6.14, slope=3.92).

Supplementary Figure 24: Parallel performance of MSPminer

The tests were performed on a server with an Intel® Xeon® processor E5-2630 (6 physical cores with hyperthreading) and 128Gb of RAM.

Supplementary Figure 25: Performance of MSPminer with or without genes binning.

A. Total number of comparisons performed by comparing all genes pairwise with or without binning. Here, genes binning divides the number of comparisons performed by 763.

B. Fraction of useful comparisons for MSP cores creation with or without binning. The fraction without binning was estimated by drawing randomly one billion pairs of genes. Here, genes binning multiplies the fraction of useful comparisons by 562.

Supplementary Figure 26: Comparison of the length of the genes grouped in the MSPs with those that were not.

Supplementary Figure 27: Comparison of the genes length and their respective coefficient of proportionality.

Core genes abundance profiles of the msp_0043 (*Ruminococcus bromii*) were compared to its core genome median abundance. For each gene, the estimated coefficient of proportionality α was compared to its length. Then, a robust linear regression with a null slope was performed (red line). As expected, the coefficient of proportionality α is proportional to the gene length.

However, some genes have a coefficient of proportionality lower than expected (points below the line) and may correspond to genes not uniformly covered.

Supplementary Figure 28: Impact of some data transformations on gene counts.

Raw (A), log-transformed (B) and square root transformed (C) abundance profiles of two core genes (MH0062_GL0071339 and MH0011_GL0069836) of the msp_0003 (*Bacteroides cellulosilyticus*) are compared.

   A. Raw data is not appropriate when the order of magnitude of counts is highly variable as it gives a too important weight to high counts.
   B. Log-transformation "spreads"the counts. However, it requires the introduction of a pseudo-count for zeros and variance tends to be proportional to the counts.
   C. Sqrt-transformation "spreads" the counts and stabilizes variance.

Supplementary Figure 29: MSPminer workflow

Supplementary Figure 30 Number of genes per bin on the Integrated Gut Catalog with or without normalization.

Normalization consists in dividing gene counts by number of mapped reads per sample. The black line represents the optimal bin size (6 971 229/1 267=5 502 genes)