More benign random peptides in E. coli are enriched for similar amino acids as young animal but not plant genes

Luke Kosinski[1]*, Nathan Aviles[2]*, Kevin Gomez[3], Joanna Masel[4]

[1] Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

[2] Graduate Interdisciplinary Program in Statistics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

[3] Graduate Interdisciplinary Program in Applied Math, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

[4] Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, 85721

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding author: Joanna Masel, masel@email.arizona.edu +1 520 626 9888

Abstract

Proteins are the workhorses of the cell, yet they carry great potential for harm via misfolding and aggregation. Despite the dangers, proteins are sometimes born *de novo* from non-coding DNA. Proteins are more likely to be born from non-coding regions that produce peptides that do little to no harm when translated than from regions that produce harmful peptides. To investigate which newborn proteins are most likely to "first, do no harm", we estimate fitnesses from an experiment that competed *Escherichia coli* lineages that each expressed a unique random peptide. A variety of peptide metrics significantly predict lineage fitness, but almost all this predictive power stems from simple amino acid composition. Amino acids that are smaller and that promote intrinsic structural disorder have more benign fitness effects. Our amino acid composition-based predictions also have validity for an independent dataset using small random N-terminal tags. The same amino acids that predict high fitness in *E. coli* are enriched in young Pfams in animals, but not in plants. To modify Jacques Monod's famous quote, what makes peptides benign in *E.coli* also makes them benign in elephants, but not in eucalyptus.

Keywords: Experimental evolution, evolvability, fitness estimation, preadaptation, de novo gene birth

Introduction

Proteins are the workhorses of the cell, but they are dangerous. The polypeptide backbone is the key structural feature of amyloids, putting all proteins at risk of forming insoluble aggregates (Chiti and Dobson 2017). The risks of aggregation are exacerbated by the fact that most proteins are expressed at or just beyond their solubility limits (Vecchi, et al. 2020). Despite these dangers, new protein-coding genes are nevertheless born *de novo* from essentially random sequences (McLysaght and Guerzoni 2015; Van Oss and Carvunis 2019; Vakirlis, Carvunis, et al. 2020). To be beneficial enough for *de novo* birth, a peptide must first do no serious harm, i.e. it must not be strongly deleterious (detrimental to the basic functioning of a cell). Here we ask what properties are predictive of whether a peptide is harmful.

Neme et al. (2017) competed over 2 million *Escherichia coli* lineages, each containing a plasmid designed to express a unique random peptide, and tracked lineage frequencies over four days using deep DNA sequencing. This study has been criticized for including too little evidence in support of the beneficial nature of the top candidates (Weisman and Eddy 2017; Knopp and Andersson 2018). But these criticisms do not detract from using the dataset to identify statistical predictors of serious harm versus relatively benign effect. Neme et al. used a strong promoter (Neme, et al. 2017), so evaluating whether a peptide is harmful or benign is largely an evaluation of tolerance of high expression. Given this high expression, fitness of these lineages might plausibly be influenced by properties of the peptide itself, not just variation in expression e.g. due to auto-downregulation at the RNA level (Knopp and Andersson 2018). Here we pursue analyses based on this hypothesis that the properties of the random peptides comprise some appreciable portion of the variation in fitness among lineages in this experiment.

Conveniently, some properties, such as intrinsic structural disorder and aggregation propensity, can be predicted computationally from peptide sequences alone. Because insoluble proteins have been implicated in toxicity and disease (Chiti and Dobson 2017) and peptides with high intrinsic structural disorder are less prone to forming insoluble aggregates (Linding, et al. 2004; Angyan, et al. 2012), we hypothesize that highly disordered peptides are least likely to be strongly deleterious. Random sequences with high predicted disorder are well-tolerated *in vivo* (Tretyachenko, et al. 2017). Existing mouse (Wilson, et al. 2017) and Drosophila (Heames, et al. 2020) proteins, which are the product of evolution, are predicted from their amino acid sequences to be more disordered than what would be translated from intergenic controls.

Younger protein-coding sequences should be particularly constrained to first do no harm, as they have

had little time to evolve more sophisticated harm-avoidance strategies (Foy, et al. 2019). In support of

the idea that high intrinsic structural disorder is an accessible way to avoid harm, young animal and

fungal domains (James, et al. 2020) and genes (James, et al. 2020), and novel overprinted viral genes

(Willis and Masel 2018) have higher predicted disorder than their older counterparts.

High predicted intrinsic structural disorder in young genes is driven primarily by amino acid composition,

with amino acid order playing a more minor role (Wilson, et al. 2017). Fortunately, the dataset of Neme

et al. (2017) is large enough to look at the frequencies of each amino acid as predictors, rather than

assume that existing prediction programs such as IUPred (Dosztányi, et al. 2005; Meszaros, et al. 2018)

or Tango (Fernandez-Escamilla, et al. 2004; Linding, et al. 2004; Rousseau, et al. 2006) integrate amino

acid composition (and more) in the best possible way. We can then test whether such programs have

additional ability to predict peptide fitness, above and beyond the influence of amino acid content.

How each amino acid frequency predicts peptide harm may also be useful in resolving disputes about

the technique of phylostratigraphy, which assigns ages to genes. Detecting homologs is more difficult for

fast-evolving sequences, which may be erroneously scored as young (Alba and Castresana 2007; Moyers

and Zhang 2015, 2016). Disordered proteins tend to be fast evolving (Chen, et al. 2011), casting doubt

over findings that young genes are more disordered. If the amino acid preferences of higher fitness

random peptides match those of purportedly young protein-coding sequences, this would be evidence

that the *de novo* gene birth process, rather than homology detection bias alone, causes trends in protein

properties as a function of apparent gene age.

Monod and Jacob (1961) famously claimed that "anything found to be true of *E. coli* must also be true of

Elephants." We test whether amino acids that are good for random peptides in *E. coli* are enriched in

young animal and plant proteins from a recent phylostratigraphy dataset (James, et al. 2020) of over 400

different eukaryotic species. We also test whether published, sequence-based estimators of disorder,

aggregation propensity, water solubility, hydrophobic residue clustering etc. predict fitness information

not already predicted by amino acid frequencies.

Results

Estimating the fitness effects of random peptides

Assessing predictors of the fitness effects of random peptides requires those fitness effects to be measured accurately and precisely. Neme et al. (2017) tracked lineage frequencies over four days, and categorized a peptide as increasing or decreasing in frequency by comparing the counts of day 4 to day 1 using DESeq2 (Love, et al. 2014). Out of the 1082 peptides with at least five sequencing reads, they found that 277 were increasing, while 436 were decreasing.

We reanalyze the same data, instead using a custom maximum likelihood framework (see Materials & Methods) to quantitatively estimate "fitness" and its associated confidence interval / weight. "Fitness" here refers to allele frequency changes over an entire cycle of population growth and dilution, rather than per generation. Our method classifies peptides quantitatively rather than qualitatively. It accounts for the fact that mean population fitness increases over the four days (see Materials and Methods). Our use of all available data within an appropriate maximum likelihood framework should make our method more sensitive and specific for identifying benign vs harmful peptides. We find statistical support for increases in frequency (i.e. fitness – 1.96 × standard error > 1) for 475 peptides (Dataset S1). We exclude 22 of the previously reported 277, at least some of which arose from a bug we located in Neme et al.'s (2017) pipeline. 509 peptides had statistical support for decreases in frequency, with support lost for 9 of the previously reported 436 deleterious peptides.

Note that some peptides are pseudoreplicates (see Materials & Methods). There were 646 total clusters, of which there was statistical support for increases in frequency for the highest-weighted peptide in 138, and for decreases in 488. Some of our statistics use cluster as a random effect within a linear mixed model. When interpretable R^2 values are needed, we instead collapse each cluster into a single pseudo-datapoint with value given by the weighted mean and weight given by the sum of weights, and then use fixed effect models.

Amino acid counts are the best predictor of random peptide fitness effects

We estimated peptide disorder using IUPred (Dosztányi, et al. 2005; Meszaros, et al. 2018), water solubility using CamSol (Sormanni, et al. 2015), and general aggregation propensity using Tango (Fernandez-Escamilla, et al. 2004; Linding, et al. 2004; Rousseau, et al. 2006). Fewer than 6% of the

random peptides have a predicted transmembrane helix (Dataset S1) from TMHMM (Krogh, et al. 2001),

so our choice of these predictors is guided by our assumption that the random peptides are

predominantly located in the cytosol. Having a predicted transmembrane helix did not in itself predict

random peptide fitness effects (P = 0.2, likelihood ratio test relative to mixed model with only the

intercept as a fixed effect). In contrast, each of our cytosol-solubility-inspired metrics significantly

predicted random peptide fitness (Fig. 1A – 1C), with effects in the predicted direction (more disorder

and more solubility are good, more aggregation propensity is bad). Another aggregation predictor, Waltz

(Maurer-Stroh, et al. 2010), that specializes in β aggregates, was in the right direction but did not quite

meet statistical significance (P = 0.06).

Fig. 1. **Many metrics, on their own, predict peptide fitness effects, but amino acid composition**

predicts the most. A) ISD (on a square root scale), B) CamSol, and C) the number of amino acids in

Tango-predicted aggregation-prone regions each significantly predict peptide fitness on their own (P = 7

× 10^{-4}, 0.003, and 0.02, respectively, likelihood ratio test in mixed model). D) The best model is fitness

predicted by amino acid composition; weighted R^2 values for predicting cluster fitness (n = 646) from the

ISD, CamSol, Tango, and amino acid composition models are 0.029, 0.031, 0.017, and 0.15, respectively.

Each point shows a cluster with area is proportional to summed weights across that cluster. Seven

clusters with fitness greater than 2 are not shown here for ease of visualization; a complete y-axis is

shown in supplemental fig. 1. Log-transforming fitness would remove high fitness skew, but creates

systematic heteroscedasticity, and so was not done (supplemental fig. 2). The lack of systematic

heteroscedasticity can be seen here in the form of similar point size across fitness values. Blue lines

come from weighted linear mixed regression models (see Materials and Methods), where a random

effect term controls for pseudoreplication within clusters.

While IUPred, CamSol, and Tango are all statistically supported predictors of fitness, all pale in

comparison to amino acid composition. Weighted R^2 values for IUPred, CamSol, and Tango are 0.029,

0.031, 0.017, respectively. However, when the frequencies of each of the twenty amino acids were also

used as predictors (Fig. 1D), IUPred, CamSol, and Tango were no longer significant predictors of fitness

(P = 0.2, 0.2, and 0.3, respectively, likelihood ratio test in mixed model, see Supplemental Table S1),

suggesting that their predictive power in our dataset came merely from being metrics of amino acid

composition. Amino acid composition also explains a much greater amount of the variation in fitness

than any of the other predictors, with a weighted adjusted R^2 of 0.15. We are surprised that such a high

proportion of fitness can be predicted merely by a linear function of the amino acid content of a single

highly expressed peptide – both protein folding and organismal function are generally assumed not to

be so easily reduced.

We next tried two predictors that focus exclusively on the order rather than the frequency of amino

acids in a peptide. First, the contribution of amino acid order to ISD (calculated as ΔISD = original

sequence ISD – scrambled sequence ISD), is higher in younger mouse genes (Wilson, et al. 2017).

However, this was not the case for the very youngest mouse genes, and including ΔISD did not

significantly improve our model (P = 0.2).

Second, previous work found that young proteins have their hydrophobic amino acids more clustered

together along the primary sequence than expected by chance, while old proteins have them more

interspersed (Foy, et al. 2019; James, et al. 2020). This hydrophobic dispersion metric (Irback, et al.

1996; Irback and Sandelin 2000), which is normalized to exclude any influence from amino acid

composition, did not significantly predict the fitness of our random peptides on its own (P = 0.2,

likelihood ratio test in mixed model), nor did including it significantly improve our model with amino

acid composition (P = 0.2, Supplemental Table S1).

Young animal sequences are enriched for amino acids that increase fitness in

random peptides

For ease of interpretation, we calculated the marginal effect of each amino acid on fitness (see

supplementary text and Table S2, displayed in fig. 2, y-axis), instead of simply using its slope in a

regression model. Fitness effects are correlated with both amino acid volume (Tsai, et al. 1999) and with

a metric of how often an amino acid tends to be found in known disordered versus ordered proteins

(Theillet, et al. 2013) (fig. 2A and 2B; P = 0.01 for both disorder propensity and volume, likelihood ratio

test for dropping either term from weighted regression containing both). Volume and disorder

propensity together explain over half the weighted variation in marginal fitness effect (weighted

adjusted R^2 = 0.52). Other properties of amino acids, such as stickiness (Levy, et al. 2012), relative

solvent accessibility (Tien, et al. 2013), amino acid cost in *E. coli* (Akashi and Gojobori 2002), and

isoelectric point (Liu, et al. 2004) did not provide significant explanatory power on top of disorder

propensity and volume (all P > 0.1, likelihood ratio test).

Fig. 2. **Amino acids that are small and are associated with intrinsic structural disorder promote higher**

fitness. The y-axis shows each amino acid's marginal effect on fitness, which is the change in fitness

when one amino acid of the focal type replaces one randomly chosen amino acid of a different type in a

random peptide (see Supporting Information). Error bars are +/- one standard error. P-values and

correlation coefficients come from weighted Pearson's correlations, where weights for marginal effects

are calculated as 1 / s.e.(marginal fitness effect)^2, and volume and disorder propensity are unweighted.

Amino acid fitness effects are correlated with (A) amino acid volume and with (B) disorder propensity.

Tryptophan is an outlier for amino acid effects on fitness, predicting minor positive effects on fitness

despite both its large volume and its underrepresentation in disordered regions. Removing tryptophan

from a weighted regression model of volume and disorder propensity predicting marginal effect changes

the weighted adjusted R^2 from 0.52 to 0.68. Tryptophan, encoded only by UGG, is nearly 60% more

common among peptides with at least 5 sequences reads than we expect from the 58% GC content of

our dataset. With the confidence interval for its marginal fitness effect including 1, this provides further

evidence that tryptophan is advantageous, making it a distinct outlier, for reasons that are not clear to

us.

Isoleucine also stands out, as even more harmful than expected by its size and order propensity.

Isoleucine's harmful effects may be exacerbated by its role in amyloid formation. For example, familial

amyloid cardiomyopathy is most commonly caused by a valine to isoleucine mutation (Jacobson, et al.

1997; Dubrey, et al. 2015), suggesting isoleucine has potential to form dangerous amyloids where other

hydrophobic amino acids do not. Isoleucine, valine, and leucine are all hydrophobic amino acids with a

branched carbon, but only raised isoleucine levels are associated with a higher risk of Alzheimer's

disease (Larsson and Markus 2017), further suggesting that isoleucine may be especially prone to

amyloid formation.

Next we tested whether the amino acids that are relatively benign in random peptides expressed under

laboratory conditions in *E. coli* are similar to the amino acids that are found in purportedly young

protein-coding sequences in natural populations. We took the latter from James et al. (2020) who

quantified how amino acid frequencies depend on the age of the protein domain, across over 400

eukaryotic species. As predicted by the de novo gene birth interpretation of phylostratigraphy trends,

amino acids that are good for random peptides are enriched among the youngest animal Pfams (fig. 3A).

Fig. 3. **Purportedly young animal Pfams are enriched for amino acids that predict high fitness in**

random peptides. The y-axis represents the change in the frequency of each amino acid per billion years

(BY) for non-transmembrane Pfam domains (James, et al. 2020). Change is in number of percentage

points, not percentage increase or decrease. For example, a change in glutamic acid content from 5% to

6% is a change of 1 percentage point. The x-axis shows each amino acid's marginal effect on fitness,

which is the change in fitness when one amino acid of the focal type replaces one randomly chosen

amino acid of a different type in a random peptide (see Supporting Information). Error bars are +/- one

standard error. Fitness effects predict A) animal, but not B) plant, or C) ancient (older than 2.1 billion

years) Pfam phylostratigraphy slopes. Correlation coefficients and P-values come from weighted

Pearson correlations. Note that the P-value for animal phylostratigraphy slopes vs marginal effects

survives a conservative Bonferroni correction (P = 0.002 < 0.05/3 = 0.017).

This prediction was not, however, supported for trends among recent plant domains (fig. 3B) nor among

ancient (fig. 3C) domains older than 2.1 billion years. Plant and ancient trends reflect a *de novo* gene

birth process that enriches for the most abundant amino acids in their respective lineages, rather than

for amino acids that promote intrinsic structural disorder (James, et al. 2020). We find that intrinsic

structural disorder still predicts harmlessness in *E. coli*, even though we do not find evidence it shaped

de novo gene birth in its distant ancestors. We also note that intrinsic structural disorder does shape

recent *de novo* gene birth in viruses (Willis and Masel 2018).

The correlation in fig. 3A is nevertheless an important external validation that patterns observed using

phylostratigraphy can be indicative of the gene birth process, at least in animals. As Monod suggested,

what makes a peptide benign in *E. coli* does also make a peptide benign in elephants – with the caveat

that this might not be the case in eucalyptus.

Determining which sequences are young is difficult, and may be subject to systematic error (homology

detection bias) (Alba and Castresana 2007; Moyers and Zhang 2015, 2016). Our ability to externally

validate animal phylostratigraphy slopes against an independent dataset generated in *E. coli* is a

powerful demonstration that these slopes represent more than mere bias. This conclusion is also

supported by the fact that these slopes differ among taxa and are not correlated with amino acid

changeability (James, et al. 2020).

Fitness is better predicted by amino acid composition than by GC content

Long et al. (2018) proposed that selection acts directly on GC content, perhaps due to the three

hydrogen bonds of G-C pairs. Amino acids encoded by Gs and Cs tend to promote higher intrinsic

structural disorder (Angyan, et al. 2012), making it difficult to distinguish between selection for high GC

content and selection for disorder-promoting amino acids. To do this, we compare amino acids that

always have G or C to those that always have A or T, at both the first and second nucleotide positions in

the codon. If selection were for GC nucleotides, we would expect GC to predict high marginal amino acid

fitness effects at both positions. But if results are dramatically different at the two positions, this would

show that it is selection on amino acid content that drives GC as a correlated trait. Results are

statistically significant in the predicted direction at the second position (fig. 4A, P = 0.001, weighted

Welch's t-test), and in the predicted direction but not statistically significant at the first (fig. 4B, P = 0.2).

The effect size of GC content on fitness could not be statistically distinguished between the first and

second position (fig. 4C), with wide and hence inconclusive error bars.

However, amino acid composition is a far stronger predictor of fitness than GC content. While GC

content is a predictor, offering a significant improvement over an intercept-only model (P = 6 × 10^{-11},

likelihood ratio test for nested fixed-effect models, weighted adjusted R^2 = 0.06), it predicts considerably

less than amino acid composition (P = 10^{-18}, weighted adjusted R^2 = 0.15). Adding GC content to the

amino acid frequencies-only model offers a modest improvement (P = 0.004, weighted adjusted R^2

values improves from 0.15 to 0.16), while adding amino acid composition to a GC content only model

offers a major improvement (P = 10^{-11}, weighted adjusted R^2 improves from 0.06 to 0.16). These findings

suggest that while there may be some direct selection on GC content, the strength of this selection pales

in comparison to selection on amino acid composition.

Fig. 4. **Amino acids that are constrained to use Gs and Cs tend to have higher marginal effects on**

fitness than those constrained to use As and Ts. The difference is significant for constraints at the

second nucleotide position of a codon (A) (P = 0.001, weighted Welch's t-test), but not at the first (B) (P

= 0.2). Point area is proportional to weight, which is calculated as 1 / s.e.(marginal fitness effect)^2, as

described in Supporting Information. The y-axis is the same as the fig. 2 y-axis and fig. 3 x-axis. C) The

mean advantage of amino acids constrained to use GC rather than constrained to use AT is not

distinguishable in size between the first and second codon positions. Y-axis gives the difference in the

two weighted means of marginal fitness effects from A) and B). Error bars represent 95% confidence

intervals on the difference between the means (calculated as difference +/- t_{crit} × se), where $t_{crit} \approx 2.1$ is

the critical value of the t-statistic with the appropriate degrees of freedom. Weighted Welch's t-test

statistic and the corresponding standard error of the difference in means were calculated using the

"wtd.t.test" function from the "weights" R package, version 1.0.1.

Our fitness predictor is validated on random N-terminal tags

In order to validate our fitness predictor against an external dataset, we tested the ability of our amino-

acid-only model to predict the fitness effects of shorter random peptides present as N-terminal tags.

Goodman et al. (2013) tagged the N-prime end of green fluorescent protein (GFP) with 137 different

short random sequences (11 amino acids long), allowing random peptide expression level to be

measured via fluorescence. Frumkin et al. (2017) measured the fitness effects of these random peptide-

tagged GFPs in *E. coli* using FitSeq (Li, et al. 2018). For 89 of them, Frumkin et al. (2017) were able to

calculate a "fitness residual" based on the deviation from the fitness expected from the level of GFP

expression. Note that this fitness residual combines the cost of inefficient expression (as per the

intention of these papers) with the fitness effect of the peptide itself. Frumkin et al. (2017) interpreted

the low fitness residuals of hydrophobic and expensive-to-synthesize amino acids as caused by low

expression efficiency. However, these findings are consistent with our own estimates of direct peptide

effects, as hydrophobic amino acids tend to be order-prone (Linding, et al. 2004; Angyan, et al. 2012),

and amino acid size is highly correlated with synthesis cost in *E. coli* (Pearson's correlation coefficient =

0.85, P = 2 × 10^{-6}, cost for amino acid synthesis in *E. coli* taken from (Akashi and Gojobori 2002)). Indeed,

our fitness predictions were significantly correlated with their fitness residuals (fig. 5). The consistency

between our results and the findings of Frumkin et al. (2017), who used a different dataset and

methodology, provide an external validation of the accuracy of our fitness predictor, even in cases

where a random segment makes up only a small portion of a total protein.

Fig. 5. **Fitness predictions trained on the random peptides of Neme et al. (2017) also work for short random tags attached to the N-terminus of GFP**. Predicted fitness comes from our amino acid composition-only mixed model. "Fitness residuals" of N-terminal tags are from Frumkin et al. (2017), and represent the difference between the fitness of the construct and the expected fitness from expression level. *n* = 89.

Discussion

295 We found that amino acid composition is the primary predictor of the fitness effects of random peptides expressed in *E. coli*. Amino acids that are small and promote intrinsic structural disorder predict high fitness. Amino acids that are good for random peptides in *E. coli* are enriched in young proteins in animals, suggesting that harm is avoided in similar ways across diverse lineages. What is truly astonishing is that simply knowing how many of which amino acids are present in a single highly expressed random peptide can account for 15% of the variance in fitness. This indicates both the success of our statistical method for minimizing the noise in our fitness estimates, and that mere amino acid content without amino acid order can be highly informative of peptide properties.

Most studies of random peptides have focused on finding peptides that have specific binding or function (e.g. Kaiser, et al. 1987; Keefe and Szostak 2001; Frulloni, et al. 2009). Some were motivated as proof-of-

concept that random peptides can exhibit properties of native proteins, such as folding (Davidson and

Sauer 1994; Chiarabelli, et al. 2006; LaBean, et al. 2011) and being soluble (Prijambada, et al. 1996).

Others focus on how to increase the percentage of native-like random peptides, e.g. by showing that

more hydrophilic random peptide libraries have a higher percentage of stable and soluble peptides

(Davidson, et al. 1995). Our work has a different intent, identifying properties that make a peptide less

likely to be harmful. Neme et al.'s (2017) experiment was perfect for this purpose because it used a

large library of peptides with diverse properties, and selected under relatively permissive conditions,

simply for relative growth rates in the presence of peptide expression. In contrast, a study design such

as that of Knopp et al. (2019), who selected random peptides that rescue viability in the presence of

antibiotics, is less useful for our purposes.

Having a higher proportion of random peptides do no harm is expected to increase the success rate of

future screens for peptide with specific properties. Nucleotide sequences with high %GC content tend to

encode peptides with more benign fitness effects, suggesting that higher %GC should be used in future

random peptide libraries. However, very high GC content will yield low complexity sequences, which our

predictor has not been trained on. The marginal fitness effects of each amino acid might be different in

this very different context.

While the library used by Neme et al. (2017) was designed to have equal frequencies of each nucleotide

in the random region, and thus 50% GC content, the over two million random peptides that had at least

one sequencing read had a GC content of ~59% in their random portion. The mean GC content of the

peptide clusters we analyzed (see Materials and Methods) was similar, at ~58%, with higher fitness

peptides within this group having higher %GC, as discussed in the Results. This might be because many

lower GC content sequences were so harmful that lineages that carried them went extinct prior to

detection via sequencing. Note that it might also reflect a bias toward GC in sequencing methods

(Benjamini and Speed 2012; Choudhari and Grigoriev 2017) – a bias that affects all timepoints equally

and so should not affect our fitness estimates.

Long et al. (2018) proposed that there is direct selection for high GC content, as evidenced in part by a

preference for amino acids with G or C at the second position of codons, in excess of that predicted from

mutation accumulation experiments. Our findings cannot exclude this hypothesis, but show stronger

selection on amino acid composition, selection that is capable of driving increased GC content in coding

regions as a correlated trait. In intergenic regions, elevated %GC is likely driven mostly by GC-biased

gene conversion. However, if driven in part by selection, it is possibly not just on GC content, but also on

peptides from non-coding regions translated by error (Rajon and Masel 2011; Wilson and Masel 2011).

Selection on translation errors is for example strong enough to shape non-coding sequences beyond

stop codons in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Kosinski and Masel 2020).

The fact that IUPred, CamSol, and Tango have predictive power only when amino acid composition is

not controlled for suggests that both predictors serve here primarily as summary statistics of amino acid

content. Metrics like hydrophobic clustering, which are independent of amino acid composition by

construction, do not add predictive power.

While driven by amino acid composition, our findings still strongly support the hypothesis that peptides

with low structural disorder tend to be harmful. Disorder-promoting amino acids may help a peptide

remain soluble even if unfolded. Small amino acids also tend to be benign, perhaps because they are

hydrophobic enough to promote some amount of folding but flexible enough to avoid too much

hydrophobic residue exposure.

Our findings suggest that the easiest way to avoid harm is through disorder and small size, but do not

rule out other, more order-prone strategies. Indeed, BCS4, a de novo evolved protein in *Saccharomyces*

cerevisiae, has a hydrophobic core and is capable of folding (Bungard, et al. 2017). Vakirlis et al. (2020)

found that de novo proteins can emerge as transmembrane proteins, which need to be lipid soluble,

presumably requiring different harm-avoidance strategies than peptides that are located in the cytosol.

Plants have different trends in amino acid composition change over time than animals, with young

genes seeming to prefer readily available amino acids, rather than amino acids that promote intrinsic

structural disorder (James, et al. 2020). Nevertheless, our finding of consistency between what is benign

in *E. coli* and what is benign in animals suggests a deep concordance in what makes a peptide harmful

between two apparently disparate branches of life. The forces that drive protein birth therefore appear

to share a key similarity between bacteria and Animalia. To modify Monod's famous quote, what is

harmful in *E. coli* is also harmful in elephants, but not necessarily in eucalyptus.

Methods

Data retrieval

Neme et al. (2017) performed seven experiments where *E. coli* lineages, each with a plasmid containing

a unique random peptide, were grown and tracked using deep DNA sequencing. We downloaded

sequencing counts from Dryad at http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.6f356, and obtained amino acid and

nucleotide sequences directly from Rafik Neme. Experiment 7 was by far the largest, containing all the

peptides that the other six experiments classified as "increasing" or "decreasing," and more. We thus

chose to focus on experiment 7 in our work. Experiment 7 consists of the numbers of reads of each

random peptide sequence in 5 replicate populations of *E. coli* at 4 time points. We summed across all 5

replicates to obtain a total number of reads for each polypeptide at each time point. Following Neme et

al. (2017), we took the 1061 peptides out of over one million that had ≥5 reads across all 5 replicates of

experiment 7. We further excluded the six peptides that, while meeting the criterion of ≥5 reads, had all

of those reads at the same timepoint, leaving 1055 peptides for analysis.

Estimating lineage fitness from random peptide sequencing counts

374   The expected number of reads λ_{it} of peptide i at times t=1,2,3,4 was modeled as:

$$\lambda_{it} = N_t p_{i0} \prod_{k=1}^{t} \frac{\omega_i}{W_{k-1}},$$

where N_t is the observed total number of reads, p_{i0} is the initial frequency of peptide i at the beginning

of the experiment (prior to the round of selection used to produce the first measured timepoint $t = 1$),

$\frac{\omega_i}{W_t}$ is the fitness of bacteria with peptide i at time t (i.e. their propensity to contribute to the next time

point), and W_k is population mean fitness at time k.

The likelihoods of observed peptide counts were estimated from this expectation and two different

error models. A Poisson distribution, which captures sampling error alone, was used to generate our

initial estimates of p_{io}, ω_i, and W_k (collectively yielding λ_{it}) because it is analytically tractable. Under a

Poisson error function, the likelihood of observing n_{it} reads of peptide i at time t is

$$f_{Poiss}(n_{it}|\lambda_{it}) = \frac{\lambda_{it}^{n_{it}} e^{-\lambda_{it}}}{n_{it}!}.$$

385   To also capture variance inflation κ due to PCR amplification, we used a negative binomial distribution in

386   the Polya form:

$$f_{NBP}\left(n_{it}\middle| \lambda_{i,t}, \kappa\right) = \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(n_{it} + \frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{\kappa - 1}\right)}{n_{it}!\,\Gamma\left(\frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{\kappa - 1}\right)}\right)\left(\frac{1}{\kappa}\right)^{\frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{\kappa - 1}}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right)^{n_{it}}$$

388 where $\Gamma(\,\cdot\,)$ is the gamma function. We used the initial estimates of p_{io}, ω_i, and W_k to numerically fit

389 the negative binomial model. For the specifics of fitting the Poisson and negative binomial models, see

390 Supporting Information. Weights were calculated, for use in downstream linear models, from this

391 likelihood inference procedure, as the inverse of Fisher information (see Supporting Information).

392 An existing software package for estimating lineage fitness from sequencing counts is Fit-Seq (Li, et al.

393 2018), which captures the amplification of PCR error through a more sophisticated distribution for the

394 number of reads that is derived in the supplementary information of Levy et al. (2015). However, Fit-Seq

395 assumes that mean fitness is a simple average of all measured lineages' fitness, requiring all individuals

396 to be tagged and measured. But Neme et al.'s (2017) experiment included lineages carrying an empty

397 plasmid, i.e. with the selectable marker but no random peptide. Worse, the proportion of cells with an

398 empty vector can be presumed to increase over time. In the absence of a reliable way to quantify these,

399 we instead consider mean population fitness over time to be a set of independent parameters to be

400 fitted.

Clustering non-independent sequences

402 Upon visual inspection, we found that some peptide sequences were extremely similar, with only one or

403 two amino acid differences; these data points will not contain independent information about the

404 relationship between sequence and fitness. To account for non-independence, we clustered peptides by

405 their Hamming distance, and either took only the peptide whose fitness had the highest weight within

406 its cluster, or took weighted means within clusters, or included cluster in our regression models as a

407 random effect term. Single-link clustering with Hamming distance cutoffs of 6 to 29 amino acids all

408 produced an identical set of 646 clusters for our 1055 peptides. The largest cluster had 228 random

409 peptides, and the second largest had only 13. The vast majorities of clusters contained only 1 sequence

410 (Dataset S1). A few peptides had mutations in their non-random regions; these mutations were counted

411 in our Hamming distance measurements.

412 Such similar sequences are highly unlikely to arise by chance if the peptides were truly random; $20^{50} \approx$

413 10^{65} peptides are possible, far more than the $\sim 2 \times 10^6$ observed. Because we analyze only peptides with

414 at least 5 reads, replicated sequencing error is an unlikely cause. We see the same nearly-identical

415 sequences appearing in every experimental replicate, suggesting either that mutations occurred during

416 Neme et al.'s (2017) initial growth phase, or that the "random" peptides synthesized for the experiment

417   are not entirely random. We note that construction of the "random" peptide library involved ligations of
418   a smaller set of "seed" sequences, introducing non-randomness at this stage.

Predictors of fitness

420   All peptides are exactly 65 amino acids long with 50 amino acids of random sequence, so there was no
421   need to control for length.

GC content

Many amino acid sequences mapped to several possible nucleotide sequences, as part of the same
problem of mutation or non-random construction discussed above. To calculate one GC content for each
random peptide, we calculated a simple average of GC content across all the nucleotide sequences in
the dataset that map to the peptide with the largest weight in the cluster.

To calculate GC content for the over two million peptides with at least one sequencing read, we took a
simple average of the GC content from the random portion of the peptides.

Disorder

IUPred (Dosztányi, et al. 2005; Meszaros, et al. 2018) returns an ISD score between zero and one for
each amino acid in a sequence, with higher scores indicating greater intrinsic disorder. To calculate an
ISD score for each random peptide, we took the average of the scores for the whole sequence (i.e.
including non-random parts). We used a square root transform because it produced a more linear
relationship with fitness than no transform. IUPred2 was used for all analyses except ΔISD, which used
the original IUPred program – differences between the two are minimal (Meszaros, et al. 2018).

Aggregation propensity

Tango (Fernandez-Escamilla, et al. 2004; Linding, et al. 2004; Rousseau, et al. 2006) returns an
aggregation score for each amino acid in a sequence. At least five sequential amino acids with a score
greater than or equal to five indicates an aggregation-prone region. We scored peptide aggregation
propensity as the number of amino acids within regions scored as aggregation-prone, including
contributions from non-random regions.

Solubility

CamSol (Sormanni, et al. 2015) returns a solubility score for each amino acid in a sequence, as well as a

simple average of all scores for a sequence, which CamSol calls a "solubility profile." We used the

solubility profile of the full sequences, including non-random regions.

Hydrophobic clustering

We used a Perl script developed by Scott Foy ("calculate_hydrophobic_dispersion.pl" at

https://github.com/MaselLab/A-shift-in-aggregation-avoidance-strategy-marks-a-long-term-direction-

to-protein-evolution/tree/master/script) to calculate Irback's hydrophobicity dispersion metric (Irback,

et al. 1996; Irback and Sandelin 2000). This metric splits a sequence into blocks of equal length and

calculates dispersion as the variance of the hydrophobicity per block by the mean hydrophobicity per

block, normalized to account for differences in mean hydrophobicity and length. We used blocks of 6

amino acids, considered I, L, M, F, and V hydrophobic, and scored whole peptide sequences including

non-random regions.

Amino acid composition

We scored amino acid composition by counting frequencies among the 50 amino acids in the random

portion of each peptide.

The values for all the above predictors for each peptide are listed in Dataset S1.

Statistics

All statistical tests were carried out in R version 3.6.3 (R Core Team 2019), with figures generated using

"ggplot2" (Wickham 2016). Weighted linear mixed models were implemented using the "lmer" function

from the "lme4" package (Bates, et al. 2015), with cluster as a random effect. See Supporting

Information for details, including justification of a log-transform for fitness. When R^2 values were

needed, we instead averaged peptides within the same cluster into a combined datapoint, allowing us

to avoid the use of random effect term, and took R^2 values from the base R "lm" function.

Code availability

467 All code is available on GitHub at https://github.com/MaselLab/RandomPeptides.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the John Templeton Foundation (39667, 60814) and the National Institutes of Health (GM-104040, T32GM-008659, T32GM-084905). We thank Rafik Neme and Diethard Tautz for sharing their data with us and for graciously answering all our questions regarding their analyses, Dvir Schirman and Tzachi Pilpel for sharing their data with us, Joe Watkins for helpful discussions about our likelihood estimation procedure, and Catherine Weibel for driving the GC content analysis forward.

Works cited

Akashi H, Gojobori T. 2002. Metabolic efficiency and amino acid composition in the proteomes of Escherichia coli and Bacillus subtilis. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 99:3695-3700.

Alba MM, Castresana J. 2007. On homology searches by protein Blast and the characterization of the age of genes. BMC Evolutionary Biology 7:53.

Angyan AF, Perczel A, Gaspari Z. 2012. Estimating intrinsic structural preferences of *de novo* emerging random-sequence proteins: Is aggregation the main bottleneck? FEBS Letters 586:2468-2472.

Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software 67:1-48.

Benjamini Y, Speed TP. 2012. Summarizing and correcting the GC content bias in high-throughput sequencing. Nucleic Acids Research 40:e72.

Bungard D, Copple JS, Yan J, Chhun JJ, Kumirov VK, Foy SG, Masel J, Wysocki VH, Cordes MHJ. 2017. Foldability of a natural de novo evolved protein. Structure 25:1687-1696.

Chen SCC, Chuang TJ, Li WH. 2011. The Relationships Among MicroRNA Regulation, Intrinsically Disordered Regions, and Other Indicators of Protein Evolutionary Rate. Molecular Biology and Evolution 28:2513-2520.

Chiarabelli C, Vrijbloed JW, De Lucrezia D, Thomas RM, Stano P, Polticelli F, Ottone T, Papa E, Luisi PL. 2006. Investigation of de novo totally random biosequences Part II: On the folding frequency in a totally random library of de novo proteins obtained by phage display. Chemistry & Biodiversity 3:840-859.

Chiti F, Dobson CM. 2017. Protein misfolding, amyloid formation, and human disease: A summary of progress over the last decade. Annual Review of Biochemistry 86:27-68.

Choudhari S, Grigoriev A. 2017. Phylogenetic heatmaps highlight composition biases in sequenced reads.

Microorganisms 5:4.

Davidson AR, Lumb KJ, Sauer RT. 1995. Cooperatively folded proteins in random sequence libraries.

Nature Structural Biology 2:856-864.

Davidson AR, Sauer RT. 1994. Folded proteins occur frequently in libraries of random amino-acid

sequences. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

91:2146-2150.

Dosztányi Z, Csizmok V, Tompa P, Simon I. 2005. The pairwise energy content estimated from amino acid

composition discriminates between folded and intrinsically unstructured proteins. Journal of

Molecular Biology 347:827-839.

Dubrey S, Ackermann E, Gillmore J. 2015. The transthyretin amyloidoses: advances in therapy.

Postgraduate Medical Journal 91:439-448.

Fernandez-Escamilla A-M, Rousseau F, Schymkowitz J, Serrano L. 2004. Prediction of sequence-

dependent and mutational effects on the aggregation of peptides and proteins. Nature

biotechnology 22:1302-1306.

Foy SG, Wilson BA, Bertram J, Cordes MHJ, Masel J. 2019. A shift in aggregation avoidance strategy

marks a long-term direction to protein evolution. Genetics 211:1345-1355.

Frulloni L, Lunardi C, Simone R, Dolcino M, Scattolini C, Falconi M, Benini L, Vantini I, Corrocher R,

Puccetti A. 2009. Identification of a Novel Antibody Associated with Autoimmune Pancreatitis.

New England Journal of Medicine 361:2135-2142.

Frumkin I, Schirman D, Rotman A, Li F, Zahavi L, Mordret E, Asraf O, Wu S, Levy SF, Pilpel Y. 2017. Gene

Architectures that Minimize Cost of Gene Expression. Molecular Cell 65:142-153.

Goodman DB, Church GM, Kosuri S. 2013. Causes and effects of N-terminal codon bias in bacterial

genes. Science 342:475-479.

Heames B, Schmitz J, Bornberg-Bauer E. 2020. A continuum of evolving de novo genes drives protein-

coding novelty in Drosophila. Journal of Molecular Evolution 38:382-398.

Irback A, Peterson C, Potthast F. 1996. Evidence for nonrandom hydrophobicity structures in protein

chains. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

93:9533-9538.

Irback A, Sandelin E. 2000. On hydrophobicity correlations in protein chains. Biophysical Journal

79:2252-2258.

Jacobson DR, Pastore RD, Yaghoubian R, Kane I, Gallo G, Buck FS, Buxbaum JN. 1997. Variant-sequence
transthyretin (isoleucine 122) in late-onset cardiac amyloidosis in black Americans. New England
Journal of Medicine 336:466-473.
James JE, Willis SM, Nelson PG, Weibel C, Kosinski LJ, Masel J. 2020. Universal and taxon-specific trends
in protein sequences as a function of age. bioRxiv:2020.2003.2026.010728.
Kaiser CA, Preuss D, Grisafi P, Botstein D. 1987. Many random sequences functionally replace the
secretion signal sequence of yeast invertase. Science 235:312-317.
Keefe AD, Szostak JW. 2001. Functional proteins from a random-sequence library. Nature 410:715-718.
Knopp M, Andersson DI. 2018. No beneficial fitness effects of random peptides. Nature Ecology &
Evolution 2:1046-1047.
Knopp M, Gudmundsdottir JS, Nilsson T, Konig F, Warsi O, Rajer F, Adelroth P, Andersson DI. 2019. De
novo emergence of peptides that confer antibiotic resistance. Mbio 10:e00837-00819.
Kosinski LJ, Masel J. 2020. Readthrough errors purge cryptic sequences, facilitating the birth of coding
sequence. Molecular Biology and Evolution 37:1761–1774.
Krogh A, Larsson B, von Heijne G, Sonnhammer ELL. 2001. Predicting transmembrane protein topology
with a hidden Markov model: Application to complete genomes. Journal of Molecular Biology
305:567-580.
LaBean TH, Butt TR, Kauffman SA, Schultes EA. 2011. Protein folding absent selection. Genes 2:608-626.
Larsson SC, Markus HS. 2017. Branched-chain amino acids and Alzheimer's disease: a Mendelian
randomization analysis. Scientific Reports 7:13604.
Levy ED, De S, Teichmann SA. 2012. Cellular crowding imposes global constraints on the chemistry and
evolution of proteomes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States
of America 109:20461-20466.
Levy SF, Blundell JR, Venkataram S, Petrov DA, Fisher DS, Sherlock G. 2015. Quantitative evolutionary
dynamics using high-resolution lineage tracking. Nature 519:181-186.
Li F, Salit ML, Levy SF. 2018. Unbiased fitness estimation of pooled barcode or amplicon sequencing
studies. Cell Systems 7:521-525.
Linding R, Schymkowitz J, Rousseau F, Diella F, Serrano L. 2004. A comparative study of the relationship
between protein structure and β-aggregation in globular and intrinsically disordered proteins.
Journal of Molecular Biology 342:345-353.

Liu HX, Zhang RS, Yao XJ, Liu MC, Hu ZD, Fan BT. 2004. Prediction of the isoelectric point of an amino

559   acid based on GA-PLS and SVMs. Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences

560   44:161-167.

561   Long H, Sung W, Kucukyildirim S, Williams E, Miller SF, Guo W, Patterson C, Gregory C, Strauss C, Stone

562   C, et al. 2018. Evolutionary determinants of genome-wide nucleotide composition. Nature

563   Ecology & Evolution 2:237-240.

564   Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq

565   data with DESeq2. Genome Biology 15:550.

566   Maurer-Stroh S, Debulpaep M, Kuemmerer N, de la Paz ML, Martins IC, Reumers J, Morris KL, Copland A,

567   Serpell L, Serrano L, et al. 2010. Exploring the sequence determinants of amyloid structure using

568   position-specific scoring matrices. Nature Methods 7:237-242.

569   McLysaght A, Guerzoni D. 2015. New genes from non-coding sequence: the role of de novo protein-

570   coding genes in eukaryotic evolutionary innovation. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal

571   Society B-Biological Sciences 370:20140332.

572   Meszaros B, Erdos G, Dosztanyi Z. 2018. IUPred2A: context-dependent prediction of protein disorder as

573   a function of redox state and protein binding. Nucleic Acids Research 46:W329-W337.

574   Monod J, Jacob F. 1961. General conclusions - teleonomic mechanisms in cellular metabolism, growth,

575   and differentiation. Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology 26:389-401.

576   Moyers BA, Zhang JZ. 2016. Evaluating Phylostratigraphic Evidence for Widespread De Novo Gene Birth

577   in Genome Evolution. Molecular Biology and Evolution 33:1245-1256.

578   Moyers BA, Zhang JZ. 2015. Phylostratigraphic Bias Creates Spurious Patterns of Genome Evolution.

579   Molecular Biology and Evolution 32:258-267.

580   Neme R, Amador C, Yildirim B, McConnell E, Tautz D. 2017. Random sequences are an abundant source

581   of bioactive RNAs or peptides. Nature Ecology & Evolution 1:0127.

582   Prijambada ID, Yomo T, Tanaka F, Kawama T, Yamamoto K, Hasegawa A, Shima Y, Negoro S, Urabe I.

583   1996. Solubility of artificial proteins with random sequences. FEBS Letters 382:21-25.

584   R Core Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing: R Foundation for Statistical

585   Computing.

586   Rajon E, Masel J. 2011. Evolution of molecular error rates and the consequences for evolvability.

587   Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 108:1082-

588   1087.

Rousseau F, Schymkowitz J, Serrano L. 2006. Protein aggregation and amyloidosis: confusion of the
kinds? Current Opinion in Structural Biology 16:118-126.

Sormanni P, Aprile FA, Vendruscolo M. 2015. The CamSol Method of Rational Design of Protein Mutants
with Enhanced Solubility. Journal of Molecular Biology 427:478-490.

Theillet F-X, Kalmar L, Tompa P, Han K-H, Selenko P, Dunker AK, Daughdrill GW, Uversky VN. 2013. The
alphabet of intrinsic disorder: I. Act like a Pro: On the abundance and roles of proline residues in
intrinsically disordered proteins. Intrinsically Disordered Proteins 1:e24360.

Tien MZ, Meyer AG, Sydykova DK, Spielman SJ, Wilke CO. 2013. Maximum allowed solvent accessibilites
of residues in proteins. PLoS One 8:e80635.

Tretyachenko V, Vymetal J, Bednarova L, Kopecky V, Hofbauerova K, Jindrova H, Hubalek M, Soucek R,
Konvalinka J, Vondrasek J, et al. 2017. Random protein sequences can form defined secondary
structures and are well-tolerated in vivo. Scientific Reports 7:15449.

Tsai J, Taylor R, Chothia C, Gerstein M. 1999. The packing density in proteins: Standard radii and
volumes. Journal of Molecular Biology 290:253-266.

Vakirlis N, Acar O, Hsu B, Coelho NC, Van Oss SB, Wacholder A, Medetgul-Ernar K, Bowman RW, Hines
CP, Iannotta J, et al. 2020. De novo emergence of adaptive membrane proteins from thymine-
rich genomic sequences. Nature Communications 11:781.

Vakirlis N, Carvunis A-R, McLysaght A. 2020. Synteny-based analyses indicate that sequence divergence
is not the main source of orphan genes. eLife 9:e53500.

Van Oss SB, Carvunis AR. 2019. *De novo* gene birth. PLoS Genetics 15:e1008160.

Vecchi G, Sormanni P, Mannini B, Vandelli A, Tartaglia GG, Dobson CM, Hartl FU, Vendruscolo M. 2020.
Proteome-wide observation of the phenomenon of life on the edge of solubility. Proceedings of
the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 117:1015-1020.

Weisman CM, Eddy SR. 2017. Gene Evolution: Getting Something from Nothing. Current Biology
27:R661-R663.

Wickham H. 2016. ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Willis S, Masel J. 2018. Gene birth contributes to structural disorder encoded by overlapping genes.
Genetics 210:303-313.

Wilson BA, Foy SG, Neme R, Masel J. 2017. Young genes are highly disordered as predicted by the
preadaptation hypothesis of *de novo* gene birth. Nature Ecology & Evolution 1:0146.

Wilson BA, Masel J. 2011. Putatively noncoding transcripts show extensive association with ribosomes.
Genome Biology and Evolution 3:1245-1252.