Discovery of positive and purifying selection in metagenomic time series of hypermutator microbial populations

Rohan Maddamsetti[1, †*] and Nkrumah A. Grant[2,3,4,†*]

[1]Department of Biomedical Engineering, Duke University, Durham, NC
[2]BEACON Center for the Study of Evolution in Action, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI
[3]Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI
[4]Department of Biological Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID
[†]Joint first author
[*]Correspondence to: rohan.maddamsetti@gmail.com, nkrumah.grant88@gmail.com

Short title: positive and purifying selection in hypermutators

ABSTRACT

A general method to infer both positive and purifying selection during the real-time evolution of

hypermutator pathogens would be broadly useful. To this end, we introduce a simple test to infer

mode of selection (STIMS) from metagenomic time series of evolving microbial populations.

We test STIMS on metagenomic data generated by simulations of bacterial evolution, and on

metagenomic data spanning 62,750 generations of Lenski's long-term evolution experiment with

Escherichia coli (LTEE). In both cases, STIMS recovers signals of positive and purifying

selection on gold standard sets of genes. Using STIMS, we find strong evidence of ongoing

positive selection on key regulators of the *E. coli* gene regulatory network, even in some

hypermutator populations. STIMS also detects positive selection on regulatory genes in

hypermutator populations of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* that adapted to subinhibitory

concentrations of colistin – an antibiotic of last resort – for just twenty-six days of laboratory

evolution. Our results show that the fine-tuning of gene regulatory networks is a general

mechanism for rapid and ongoing adaptation. The simplicity of STIMS, together with its

intuitive visual interpretation, make it a useful test for positive and purifying selection in

metagenomic data sets that track the evolution of hypermutator populations in real-time.

Keywords: positive selection, purifying selection, experimental evolution, metagenomics, gene

regulatory network, hypermutators

INTRODUCTION

Organisms often evolve defects in DNA repair and recombination pathways that cause very high mutation rates. Hypermutability is readily observed in cancer [1-3] and in opportunistic pathogens attacking immunocompromised individuals [4]. Hypermutability is also associated with the evolution of antibiotic resistance, including multi-drug-resistant tuberculosis [5]. Hypermutability can increase the rate of beneficial mutations, but it can also obscure the genomic basis of adaptation [6], because vast numbers of nearly-neutral mutations hitchhike to high frequencies with the beneficial mutations that drive the selection dynamics. In this regime, called "emergent neutrality" [7], it is challenging to identify selection on particular genes, unless those genes are under very strong selection [8, 9]. As such, there is a need for methods that can resolve positive and purifying selection in hypermutator populations, due to their importance in basic research, genetic engineering, and medicine. To address this research gap, we present a simple test to infer mode of selection (STIMS) from metagenomic time series of large asexual hypermutator populations, and use this method to study positive and purifying selection in bacterial populations that evolved hypermutability during long-term experimental evolution.

We developed STIMS in the context of Lenski's long-term evolution experiment with *Escherichia coli* (LTEE) [10, 11]. The LTEE has become an important test bed for many fundamental questions in evolutionary biology, due to its simplicity (daily serial transfer of twelve populations) and comprehensive record of frozen bacterial samples. Previous studies have used the LTEE as a model system to study the tempo and mode of both genomic [12-16] and phenotypic evolution [10, 17-22]. Many of those previous studies focused on the evolutionary dynamics underlying adaptive evolution. The evolution of hypermutability in six of the LTEE populations has obscured the genomic signatures of adaptation [6, 12, 15, 16, 23], again due to emergent neutrality. STIMS gains statistical power to infer selection despite emergent neutrality, by aggregating mutations within a focal set of genes, counting their occurrence, then comparing the counts to a background distribution of the number of mutations per gene set.

This work expands on previous observations suggesting the action of purifying selection on hypermutator populations of the LTEE [21]. In that work, we found that aerobic-specific genes were depleted in mutations compared to randomized sets of genes in three hypermutator populations: Ara−2, Ara+3, and Ara+6. That finding suggests that aerobic-specific genes may

have transitioned from positive selection to purifying selection in those LTEE populations [21].

Our work also complements recent findings of purifying selection affecting protein evolution

[24] and protein-protein-interaction network evolution in the LTEE [25].

Here, we demonstrate that STIMS recovers signals of positive and purifying selection in

evolutionary simulations of haploid populations under a Wright-Fisher model, and show that

STIMS recovers signals of positive and purifying selection on gold-standard sets of genes with *a*

priori evidence of those selection pressures in the LTEE. We then use STIMS to examine the

tempo of molecular evolution in modules of co-regulated genes [26-28], and to generate testable

hypotheses about the *mode* (i.e. purifying or positive selection) of evolution on those gene

modules in the LTEE. Finally, we use STIMS to test for positive selection on regulatory genes in

a 26-day evolution experiment involving adaptation of hypermutator *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

to subinhibitory concentrations of colistin, an antibiotic of last resort. These results indicate that

STIMS is a useful and general test for selection, even over relatively short timescales of

molecular evolution.

RESULTS

Simulations demonstrate the conditions in which STIMS is an effective test for positive and

purifying selection

The key premise of STIMS is that the tempo of molecular evolution differs across

different sets of genes, due to variation in the underlying selection pressures affecting those sets

of genes. As input, STIMS requires a list of mutations that have been observed in metagenomic

sequencing of a haploid population, sampled over time (Figure 1). STIMS then calculates a

simple summary statistic of the evolutionary dynamics: the number of observed mutations in a

query gene set, normalized by total gene length. A *p*-value is then calculated using the non-

parametric bootstrap, which is simply a count of the times that a random gene set accumulates

more mutations than the query gene set (Figure 2). The same logic applies when measuring

whether a gene set is depleted of mutations: in this case, STIMS counts the number of times that

a random selection of genes accumulates fewer mutations than the query gene set. Importantly,

the bootstrapped background distribution does *not*, in general, correspond to a neutral null model

of evolution: genome-wide positive and purifying selection may affect the background

distribution. Accordingly, STIMS is interpreted in relation to the overall tempo at which

mutations are observed across the genome in a given population, which is driven by population-

genetic parameters such as mutation rate, population size, and the genomic distribution of

mutation fitness effects (DFE).

For this reason, we evolved haploid populations *in silico* using a Wright-Fisher model to

examine the conditions under which STIMS can detect positive and purifying selection in

idealized populations, in which the strength of selection on various regions of the genome is

known *a priori*. We ran 10 replicate simulations of nonmutator haploid populations and 10

replicate simulations of hypermutator haploid populations, using large population sizes, mutation

rates parameterized from LTEE measurements, and an idealized genome and DFE based on *E.*

coli (Materials and Methods). The results of these simulations, and our analysis of these

simulations using STIMS, are shown in Figure 3 for the nonmutator case and in Figure 4 for the

hypermutator case.

The dynamics of adaptation in our simulations are strikingly similar to the dynamics

observed in the LTEE: both the nonmutator populations (Figure 3A) and the hypermutator

populations (Figure 4A) show periodic selective sweeps, cohorts of mutations rising to fixation

simultaneously, and clonal interference. These patterns are characteristic of the evolution of large

asexual populations in which the supply of beneficial mutations does not limit adaptation [14, 16,

29]. Thus, our *in silico* simulations are representative of the biology we aim to describe.

We designed the genomes of our simulated haploid populations such that we knew *a*

priori the mode of selection acting on particular genomic regions. Therefore, we used our

simulated data to evaluate how well STIMS could detect selection given that it exists

(sensitivity), and avoid false positives (specificity). Our simulations demonstrate that STIMS has

both high sensitivity and specificity in detecting positive selection in both nonmutator and

hypermutator populations (Figures 3B and 4B). Most mutations observed in the nonmutator

populations are beneficial. So, the background distribution for the nonmutator populations

reflects positive selection on beneficial driver mutations and the dynamics of passenger

mutations hitchhiking with those driver mutations. In the nonmutator populations, not enough

mutations are observed across the genome to see which genes are depleted of passenger

mutations. Consequently, STIMS cannot detect purifying selection in this context. Nevertheless,

STIMS is highly specific. It does not call any false positives in our tests for positive and purifying selection in the nonmutator populations (Figure 3C). Representative visualizations of STIMS when run on nonmutator populations are shown for genes evolving under positive selection in Figure 3D, for genes evolving completely neutrally in Figure 3E, and for genes evolving under purifying selection in Figure 3F. These visualizations show that for nonmutator populations, gene modules with trajectories below the background distribution could be evolving under purifying selection, or could be evolving completely neutrally due to relaxed selection. This apparent difference from the background distribution is never statistically significant, because most random gene sets have no mutations at all, and these empty sets are not plotted. Gene modules with trajectories above the background distribution are evolving under strong positive selection.

In contrast to the nonmutator populations, our simulations show that STIMS has high sensitivity and specificity in detecting purifying selection in hypermutator populations (Figure 4C). In this case, mutation rates are high enough that passenger mutations arise densely across the genome, allowing for the detection of genes that are depleted of observed passenger mutations due to purifying selection. The sensitivity with which STIMS detects purifying selection increases when 1) mutations can be reliably detected at lower frequencies; 2) the number of genes in the gene set increases; 3) the interval between metagenomic sampling time is smaller; and 4) the length of the time series increases (Figure 4C). All of these experimental variables increase the resolution of the data and increase the ability of STIMS to detect purifying selection in hypermutator populations. Representative visualizations of STIMS when run on hypermutator populations are shown for genes evolving under positive selection in Figure 4D, for genes evolving completely neutrally in Figure 4E, and for genes evolving under purifying selection in Figure 4F.

These results show that STIMS is an effective test for selection, given sufficient data. However, the realized DFE for microbial populations evolving in the laboratory or in nature may deviate substantially from the idealized DFE in the simulations that we have presented. For this reason, we validated STIMS on published metagenomic data tracking the allele frequency dynamics in the LTEE, using three gold standard sets of genes with empirical evidence of relaxed, purifying, and positive selection in the LTEE. These positive controls provide hard evidence that STIMS is effective in practice.

Control 1: Resolving relaxed selection in the LTEE

As a first positive control, we examined 63 genes that have empirical evidence for neutral

fitness effects in REL606 (A. Couce, personal communication). Figure 5 shows the results of

applying STIMS on these genes, which we suppose are evolving under relaxed selection in the

LTEE. In 5 out of 6 nonmutator populations (top two rows), the trajectory of this gene set falls

within the null distribution. The remaining nonmutator population, Ara+5, has no mutations in

this gene set, and so falls significantly below the null distribution (two-tailed bootstrap:

Bonferroni-corrected $p < 0.005$). In 5 out of 6 hypermutator populations (bottom two rows), the

trajectory of this gene set falls within the null distribution. The remaining hypermutator

population, Ara+6 lies at the margin of the null distribution (two-tailed bootstrap: Bonferroni-

corrected $p = 0.06$). Supplementary Figure S1 shows the result of applying STIMS on these

genes, summed across all 12 LTEE populations. Overall, the global tempo of observed mutations

in the nonmutator populations is best explained by the occurrence and fixation of beneficial

mutations with small numbers of hitchhikers. By contrast, the global tempo of observed

mutations in the hypermutator populations is best explained by large numbers of nearly neutral

mutations hitchhiking to high frequency with a much smaller number of beneficial mutations

[15].

Control 2: Detecting purifying selection in the LTEE

As a second control, we examined genes that were experimentally shown to be essential

or nearly essential in REL606 under LTEE conditions [6]. Many of the genes under strongest

positive selection in the LTEE are also essential genes [23]. Thus, we excluded 24 essential

genes with evidence of parallel evolution in the LTEE (Materials and Methods). We

hypothesized that the remaining 491 essential genes would show evidence of purifying selection

in the hypermutator populations, such that those loci would be depleted in mutations in

comparison to the null distribution (Figure 6 and Supplementary Figure S2). Indeed, these 491

loci show significant depletion of observed mutations in all 6 hypermutator populations (one-

tailed bootstrap: $p < 0.0001$ for Ara−1; $p < 0.01$ for Ara−2; $p < 0.01$ for Ara−3; $p < 0.005$ for

Ara−4; $p < 0.02$ for Ara+3; $p < 0.0001$ for Ara+6). Additionally, one of the six nonmutator

populations, Ara+1 shows a marginally significant depletion of mutations at these loci (one-

tailed bootstrap: $p < 0.05$). Ara+1 evolved a insertion-sequence hypermutator phenotype early in

its evolutionary history [30-32], so it is plausible that signatures of purifying selection can be
seen in Ara+1 [25], even though it did not evolve an elevated point-mutation rate [31].
Despite the global signal of purifying selection on these 491 essential genes, it is not clear
which specific ones are under purifying selection. The best candidates are the ones that have no
mutations whatsoever in the LTEE, while the second-best are those that were only affected by
synonymous mutations. We found 65 genes with no observed mutations in the metagenomics
data, 18 of which are essential. 105 genes have only synonymous mutations, 30 of which are
essential. We examined 491 essential genes, out of 3948 genes in the genome that passed our
filters (Materials and Methods). Based on these numbers, there is a significant association
between essentiality and having no observed mutations (Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.0007$) and
between essentiality and only having synonymous mutations (Fisher's exact test: $p < 10^{-5}$). The
first set of candidates for purifying selection in the LTEE are reported in Supplementary Table
S1, and the second set of candidates are reported in Supplementary Table S2. As one would
expect, many of these genes encode proteins that catalyze key biological reactions, such as ATP
synthase and ribosomal proteins.
209
Control 3: Verifying positive selection in the LTEE
As a final control, we examined genes that have previously been shown to be evolving
under positive selection in the LTEE. We examined the genes with the strongest signal of
parallel evolution in genomes sampled over the first 50,000 generations of the LTEE [15].
We first considered the 50 genes with the most parallelism in the nonmutator populations
(Figure 7 and Supplementary Figure S3). STIMS recovered the expected signal of positive
selection on these genes in the nonmutator populations (one-tailed bootstrap: $p < 0.0001$ in all
cases). STIMS also found an overall signal of positive selection on these genes in the
hypermutator populations (one-tailed bootstrap: $p < 0.05$ in all hypermutator populations).
In the same fashion, we examined the genes with the strongest signal of parallel evolution
in the hypermutator genomes (Supplementary Figure S4 and Supplementary Figure S5). The
nonmutator populations accumulate mutations in this gene set at a rate similar to background. As
expected, 5 out 6 hypermutator populations show a strong excess of mutations above background
(one-tailed bootstrap: $p < 0.02$ in Ara−1, Ara−2, Ara−4, Ara+3, Ara+6). In the remaining
population, Ara−3, mutations in this gene set accumulate at the background rate. It is unclear

why this population is an outlier, but this finding may be related to the evolution of a citrate

metabolic innovation that modified the ecology of this population [33].

Comparison of STIMS to a test for selection based on the Poisson distribution

We also benchmarked STIMS against a statistical test for selection that uses the Poisson

distribution to model the expected distribution of mutations per genomic site per unit time under

neutral evolution [16, 34]. In brief, STIMS trades off sensitivity for higher specificity (lower

false positive rate) in comparison to the Poisson method, and also has the advantage of showing

how the tempo of molecular evolution varies over time in a gene set of interest. These findings,

and additional considerations, are described in detail in the Supplementary Text.

Application to module decompositions of the E. coli genome

Our control experiments demonstrate that STIMS is capable of recovering signals of

purifying and positive selection. In this section, we use STIMS to examine how different

modules of genes in the *E. coli* genome are evolving in the LTEE. Our goal is to develop testable

hypotheses for which genetic modules and biochemical pathways underlie the ongoing fitness

gains observed in the LTEE [35]. We examined three different module decompositions of the *E.*

coli genome. The first partitioned the *E. coli* proteome into sectors based on quantitative mass

spectrometry [26]; the second reported sets of genes ("eigengenes") whose expression best

predicted *E. coli* growth rates [28]; while the third partitioned the gene regulatory network into

independent components based on gene expression [27].

Two proteome sectors show evidence of purifying selection. We examined proteome

sectors that were identified by quantitative mass spectroscopy during carbon-, nitrogen-, and

ribosome-limiting growth conditions [26]. Supplementary Figure S6 shows our findings. One

proteome sector was significantly depleted in mutations in Ara−1, Ara+3, and Ara+6, suggesting

purifying selection, and also shows evidence of positive selection in Ara+5. This one, called the

U-sector (green), contains genes that were not upregulated by any of the growth-limitation

treatments in [26]. Rather, the expression of the proteins in the U-sector show a generic positive

correlation with growth rate across all of the conditions tested by Hui et al. [26]. When STIMS is

applied to these modules, considering mutations summed across *all* LTEE populations, we also

see an overall depletion of mutations in proteins in the R-sector (yellow; Supplementary Figure

S7). Proteins in the R-sector are upregulated under ribosome-limiting growth conditions, and are
associated with translation [26].

No evidence of selection on *E. coli* eigengenes. Finally, we examined the sets of genes
(called eigengenes), that were most predictive of *E. coli's* growth rate (and presumably fitness
under LTEE conditions), using different *E. coli* strains and growth environments [28]. No
eigengenes showed any evidence of selection in the LTEE (Supplementary Figure S8 and S9).

Regulators of I-modulons are under positive selection. Sastry et al. (2019) used
independent component analysis on the *E. coli* transcriptome, sampled across diverse conditions
and strains, to infer 92 independent modules (called I-modulons) in the *E. coli* gene regulatory
network (GRN). 61 of the 92 I-modulons correspond to known transcription factors and
regulators in the GRN. We asked two questions: first, is there a difference between how the
regulators and regulated genes in the I-modulons evolve in the LTEE? Second, are any I-
modulons enriched with or depleted of mutations in the LTEE?

We find that transcriptional regulators of the I-modulons are under strong positive
selection in the LTEE, while the genes within I-modulons are under much weaker selection
(Figure 8). In all 12 populations, regulators of I-modulons are under stronger selection than the
genes in the I-modulons themselves. I-modulon regulators are under very strong selection in all 6
nonmutator populations (one-tailed bootstrap: $p < 0.001$ in all nonmutator populations), and
show evidence of ongoing positive selection in some hypermutator populations as well (one-
tailed bootstrap: $p = 0.03$ in Ara−3, $p ≤ 0.0001$ in Ara+3 and Ara+6). By contrast, the evolution
of genes within I-modulons fits the null distribution in most populations, although Ara−4 and
Ara+3 show evidence of purifying selection. When mutations across all LTEE populations are
considered, genes regulated within I-modulons show an overall signal of purifying selection
(Supplementary Figure S10). Together, these results indicate that the upper levels of the
regulatory hierarchy of the *E. coli* GRN are under strong selection in the LTEE, while the
effector genes at the lower levels of the gene regulatory hierarchy are under weaker selection.

Figure 8 also shows that the tempo of I-modulon regulator evolution is quite variable
across populations. Consider the number of mutations in I-modulon regulators in the nonmutator
populations. After 40,000 generations, Ara+1 has 5, Ara+2 has 4, Ara+4 has 2, and Ara+5 has 1,
while Ara−5 and Ara−6 have none. Variation in the tempo of evolution of I-modulon regulators

is also seen in the hypermutator populations, in particular the strong signal of ongoing positive

selection found in Ara+3 and Ara+6, in contrast with the complete lack of signal in Ara−4.

While I-modulons tend to evolve at background rates within individual populations

(Figure 8), some specific I-modulons show evidence of idiosyncratic selection in the

hypermutator populations. We hypothesize that some of these cases represent historical

contingency and epistasis in the LTEE; these hypotheses could be tested in future studies. The

results for all I-modulons are provided in Supplementary Files 1 and 2, while particular I-

modulons of interest are listed in Supplementary Table 3.

Summary of module decomposition results. Altogether, we find that the protein-coding

genes with the strongest transcriptional response to changing conditions show little to no

evidence of selection in the LTEE. By contrast, top-level transcriptional regulators showed

strong signatures of positive selection in all nonmutator populations, as well as in some

hypermutator populations. Based on these findings, we hypothesize that the genes that show the

strongest transcriptional response to changing conditions tend to be at the lower levels of the

gene regulatory network, while natural selection in the LTEE is largely operating on regulators

of those genes.

Cis-*regulatory regions of key regulators show significantly more parallel evolution than the cis-*

regulatory regions of downstream targets

If upper levels of the gene regulatory network are under stronger selection in the LTEE,

then *cis*-regulatory regions of I-modulon regulators should also show more evidence of positive

selection than the genes within I-modulons. We tested this prediction by examining non-coding

mutations associated with I-modulon regulators and their downstream targets. These non-coding

mutations occurred within the promoter regions (up to 100 bp upstream) of their annotated gene

[16]. There are 48 non-coding mutations associated with 70 I-modulon regulators, and 542 non-

coding mutations associated with 1394 genes regulated within I-modulons. These data are

consistent with our prediction (Binomial test with 48 successes out of 590 trials and expected

probability of success = 70/1464: $p = 0.0005$).

Application of STIMS to hypermutator populations of Pseudomonas aeruginosa *evolving under*

antibiotic selection

We wanted to know whether STIMS could be applied beyond the LTEE. Unlike the

LTEE, however, most evolution experiments do not have genomic, let alone metagenomic, data

spanning 30+ years of evolutionary history. We sourced the metagenomic time series data

reported by Mehta et al. [8], in which replicate populations of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* adapted

to subinhibitory concentrations of colistin in continuous chemostat culture for one month. We

reasoned that the Mehta dataset would be ideal for applying STIMS since both replicate

populations in that experiment rapidly evolved hypermutator phenotypes. We asked whether

annotated regulatory genes in the *P. aeruginosa* PAO11 genome showed evidence of positive

selection in this evolution experiment (Figure 9, Supplementary Figure S11); indeed, STIMS

reveals a clear signal of positive selection on the pre-specified set of 424 regulatory genes (one-

tailed bootstrap: $p < 0.001$). This finding reveals that STIMS has the power to detect gene sets

under strong positive or purifying selection, even when applied to metagenomic time series

which span relatively short time periods.

DISCUSSION

We show that signals of both positive and purifying selection can be detected in

metagenomic time series of large asexual haploid populations, including *Escherichia coli* from

Lenski's long-term evolution experiment (LTEE) and a clinically relevant pathogen,

Pseudomonas aeruginosa, in a short-term evolution experiment under antibiotic selection.

In contrast to previous studies, which examined global patterns in the tempo and mode of

evolution in the LTEE [13, 15, 16], our analysis focuses on functional modules encoded by the

E. coli genome. We find that the tempo of evolution in particular molecular subsystems gives us

insight into the mode of evolution acting on those modules (i.e., relaxed, purifying, or positive

selection). We ran simulations to demonstrate that STIMS works in an idealized system in which

selection pressures and the genomic DFE can be pre-specified *a priori*, and we ran

computational positive control experiments to confirm that STIMS works on genes with prior

evidence of relaxed (Figure 5), purifying (Figure 6), and positive selection (Figure 7).

Our findings indicate that the accelerated pace of genomic evolution in the
hypermutators, combined with the detailed record of molecular evolution provided by
metagenomic time series, may open new opportunities for understanding the genomic basis of
adaptive evolution, even though the signal of selection is obscured in hypermutator genomes due
to genomic draft [6]. First, the vast number of nearly neutral hitchhikers that are observed in
hypermutator populations provides insight into how mutations in modifier alleles affect genome-
wide and local mutation rates and biases [31]. Second, regions of the genome that are highly
depleted in mutations in the hypermutator populations are strong candidates for purifying
selection. Third and most importantly— metagenomic sequencing gives deep sampling of
genetic variation off the (eventual) line of descent.

We found compelling evidence of purifying selection in the hypermutator populations of
the LTEE. Many of the strongest candidate genes for purifying selection are deeply conserved
over evolutionary time, such as those encoding ribosomal subunits. The action of purifying
selection on the hypermutator populations is also consistent with the observation that antimutator
alleles have fixed in several populations of the LTEE [31, 36], and with the experimental finding
that overexpressing RNA chaperones in some hypermutator LTEE strains reduces the mutation
load in those strains [37]. Together, these observations suggest that hypermutator lineages are
accumulating some deleterious passenger mutations, even as their fitness continues to increase.
In any case, our analysis shows that the depletion of mutations in particular genes is not due to
the evolution of antimutator alleles: by bootstrapping a null distribution of background rates,
STIMS controls for the genome- and population-wide effects of antimutator alleles over time.

The resampling approach used by STIMS can also take the effects of local mutation
biases into account [38]. For instance, one can control for local mutation biases by constructing
null distributions that directly model chromosomal variation in mutation rates and biases. This
can be somewhat complicated, given that mutational biases [6] and regional mutation rates over
the chromosome have evolved idiosyncratically across the replicate LTEE populations [31]. Our
implementation of STIMS samples gene sets uniformly over the *E. coli* genome: we also
implemented a sampling procedure that take the wave pattern of mutation rate variation over the
E. coli chromosome into account [31, 39, 40], but this more complicated procedure produced the
same results as sampling genes uniformly over the chromosome (Materials and Methods).

When we applied STIMS to different module decompositions of the *E. coli* genome, we

found compelling evidence of strong positive selection on key global regulators of the *E. coli*

gene regulatory network, especially in comparison to the genes that they regulate. Furthermore,

we found an excess of mutations in the *cis*-regulatory regions of those regulators in comparison

to the genes that they regulate. One explanation could be that mutations that affect the *cis*-

regulation and structure of global regulators at higher levels of the GRN cause a cascade of

effects on downstream targets, and so are more effective targets for fine-tuning the *E. coli* GRN.

Strikingly, we found evidence of continued strong positive selection on key regulatory genes in

the two populations with the most mutations in the LTEE: Ara+3 and Ara+6 (Figure 8). By

contrast, two nonmutator populations, Ara−5 and Ara−6, showed no mutations at all in I-

modulon regulators in the last 20,000 generations of the time course. This suggests that the GRN

may initially evolve close to some local fitness maximum (subject to pleiotropic constraints), but

then evolve further to compensate for the effects of mutations elsewhere in the genome.

Further work will be needed to test the hypothesis that ongoing evolution of I-modulon

regulators is related to compensatory evolution. It is possible that the hypermutator populations

are evolving to compensate for an increasing mutation load of deleterious hitchhiker mutations

[8]. The appearance of multiple antimutator alleles in the LTEE suggests that that

hypermutability has a hidden cost [15, 31, 36], but the magnitude of any mutation load in the

LTEE populations remains unknown. Ongoing positive selection on the *E. coli* GRN could also

be due to compensatory evolution that is not specifically for hitchhiking deleterious mutations.

For instance, it is possible that early beneficial mutations become deleterious due to further

mutations [41, 42]. Furthermore, natural selection may greedily favor mutationally accessible but

suboptimal trajectories [43, 44] that then open new, idiosyncratic paths for further refinement

[45].

Our work has some limitations. By using STIMS to examine the tempo of GRN evolution

in the LTEE using the same dataset, we find a number of patterns with an unknown rate of false

positives. Therefore, future work is needed to test the specific hypotheses that we have

generated, either by using additional time-course data from the LTEE, by analyzing related

evolution experiments, or by experimental validation. An important caveat is that deletions that

fix in the LTEE can lead to spurious inferences of purifying selection, if they are not taken into

account, since deleted genes cannot accumulate mutations. By that same token, gene

duplications, amplifications, or other forms of copy number variation could lead to spurious

inferences of positive selection, or elevated mutation rates [46, 47]. Those types of mutations

appear to be rare in these data, in comparison to the point mutations, indels, and transposon

insertions that we count. The complications induced by copy number variation may need to be

considered (or safely ignored), depending on the context in which STIMS is used. Finally,

STIMS is computationally intensive due to its use of bootstrapping. Often equivalent statistical

results can be derived much faster, using exact tests like the binomial test or Fisher's exact test

[8], or by using tests based on the Poisson distribution [34, 48]. The advantage of STIMS is that

it provides greater biological insight, by visualizing *how* statistical signatures of positive and

purifying selection change in an evolving population over time.

Overall, our work provides greater insight into the mechanistic connection between

genotypic and phenotypic evolution in evolution experiments like the LTEE. The genetic

architecture underlying fitness improvements in the LTEE likely involves a relatively small

number of loci that control global aspects of cellular physiology [15, 16, 23, 49]. These factors

may control many downstream pathways, which are being modulated in response to selection in

the LTEE. Hence, we hypothesize that the regulation of these pathways is being rewired during

the LTEE, often without significantly changing their downstream effectors. This would explain

why the modules that show the strongest changes in expression, and best predict growth rate and

fitness in response to environmental conditions [26-28] show little evidence of adaptive

evolution in the LTEE. Overall, the genotype-phenotype map of *E. coli*, at least in the context of

the LTEE, resembles the hierarchical "supervisor-worker" gene architecture proposed by Chen et

al. [50] to explain the genetic architecture of quantitative traits in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.

As the costs of protein production exerts a strong contrast on cellular energetics, the

proper allocation of proteome resources in order to maximize growth, rather the evolution of

particular genetic modules, may be the cellular phenotype under strongest selection in the LTEE

[51-54]. Future work could test this hypothesis by trying to mimic evolutionary changes in the

LTEE by directly perturbing the balance of global physiological and metabolic state variables

(chromosome conformation, ppGpp, cAMP levels and redox potential) to maximize growth in

the ancestral REL606 strain. Coevolution between the function of those proteome resources,

pleiotropic constraints on optimal allocation, as well as feedback with the environment could all

play a part in causing the open-ended increases in fitness seen in the LTEE [20, 35].

Finally, we expect our methodology will be broadly useful, especially for workers in the

experimental evolution field. To demonstrate the generality of STIMS, we reanalyzed data from

a second evolution experiment in which two replicate hypermutator populations of *P. aeruginosa*

adapted to subinhibitory concentrations of colistin [8]. Our finding of positive selection on

regulatory genes in this experiment validates STIMS as a general method and indicates that the

rapid evolution of bacterial gene regulatory networks may be a general mechanism for adaptation

during experimental evolution, and perhaps during adaptation to novel environments in general.

We expect that our basic idea could be more rigorously justified by deeper theoretical work, and

further extended to study evolving populations and communities in both the laboratory and in the

wild. Purifying selection is of particular interest in the study of viruses and cancers, for the sake

of finding conserved and effective drug targets [55-58]. In particular, we anticipate that STIMS

could be applied to clinical time series, such as genomic sampling from cystic fibrosis patients

[59, 60], in order to discover gene modules that are under selection in pathogens as they adapt to

their host [61, 62].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The STIMS algorithm

In brief, STIMS counts the cumulative number of mutations occurring over time in a

module of interest, and compares that number to a null distribution that is constructed by

subsampling random sets of genes over the genome, in which the cardinality of these random

gene sets is fixed to the cardinality of the module of interest. We normalize the number of

observed mutations in a gene set by the total length of that gene set in base-pairs.

In this work, we specifically counted point mutations, small insertions and deletions

(indels), and transposon insertions (structural variants) that were detected in metagenomic time

series using the *breseq* pipeline [8, 16, 63]. Nonetheless, STIMS does not depend on any specific

variant calling software, nor does it specifically require metagenomic time series (genomic time

series would suffice). STIMS only requires a list of observed *de novo* mutations over time (i.e.

information about the location of each mutation, and the time at which each was first observed in

the population).

By bootstrapping a null distribution based on random gene sets, STIMS implicitly

controls for genome-wide variation in the mutation rate (since this will affect all genes). In order

to control for local variations in mutation rate [31, 39, 40], we subsampled random modules from

the same chromosomal neighborhood as the module of interest (dividing the REL606 genome

into 46 bins, roughly ~100,000 bp each), under the assumption that nearby genes have similar

mutation rates. This approach gave the same results as sampling genes uniformly across the

genome, despite a higher computational cost. For this reason, the results reported here use the

simplest method to construct the null distribution, in which genes are sampled without

considering their position on the chromosome.

Bootstrapped p-values were calculated separately for each population. p-values for one-

sided tests are exact estimates of the relevant tail of the null distribution, where p is the upper-tail

(or lower-tail) probability of the event of sampling a normalized cumulative number of mutations

under the null distribution that is greater than (or less than) the normalized cumulative number of

mutations of the module of interest. Two-tailed tests against the bootstrapped null distribution

were calculated with a false-positive (type I error) probability $\alpha = 0.025$ to account for both tails;

this is equivalent to multiplying p-values by a factor of 2, in a Bonferroni correction for two

statistical tests (i.e., on the upper tail and on the lower tail of the null distribution).

In the visualizations shown in the figures, the top 2.5% and bottom 2.5% of points in the

null distribution are omitted, such that each panel can be directly interpreted as a randomization

test with a false-positive (type I error) probability $\alpha = 0.05$.

Filtering of genes in REL606 genome

We analyzed the pre-processed LTEE metagenomics data published by [16], and so we

applied filters to exclude regions of the REL606 genome that were omitted from that analysis. In

particular, pseudogenes and genes in repetitive regions of the genome were excluded. A site was

marked as repetitive if (1) it was annotated as a repeat region in the REL606 reference, (2) it was

present in the set of masked regions compiled by [15], or (3) it fell within the putative prophage

at REL606 genome coordinates 880528–904682.

Essential genes excluded from purifying selection control experiment

We excluded essential genes that showed parallel evolution in Tenaillon et al. [15]. In

that work, a G-score was calculated to measure parallel evolution. G-scores were calculated

separately for the nonmutator and hypermutator populations. We ranked all genes in REL606

that passed our filters by their nonmutator and hypermutator G-scores. Essential genes that were

in the top 50 of either list were excluded from the purifying selection control experiment. 21 out

of the top 50 G-scoring nonmutator genes were essential in REL606, based on the transposon

mutagenesis and sequencing experiments carried out by Couce et al. [6]. These genes were:

arcA, *arcB*, *crp*, *fabF*, *ftsI*, *hflB*, *infB*, *infC*, *mrdA*, *mreB*, *mreC*, *mreD*, *nusA*, *rne*, *rplF*, *rpoB*,

rpsD, *sapF*, *spoT*, *topA*, and *yabB*. 3 out of the top 50 G-scoring hypermutator genes were

essential in REL606. These genes were: *sapA*, *tilS*, and *yhbH*.

Analysis of regulatory genes in the month-long hypermutator P. aeruginosa evolution experiment

We analyzed the pre-processed metagenomics data from the hypermutator *P. aeruginosa*

evolution experiment published by Mehta et al. [8]. We excluded the Pf4 bacteriophage in the *P.*

aeruginosa PAO11 reference genome used by Mehta et al. from the STIMS analysis; this region

was also omitted from the statistical analysis in the original report [8].

We used the keywords "regulator", "regulatory", and "regulation" to search for

regulatory genes in the PAO11 genome to identify *de novo* mutations arising in their evolution

experiment. This search resulted in a set of 424 regulatory genes, which we then analyzed using

STIMS.

Implementation of a test for selection based on the Poisson distribution

We implemented the Poisson method described by Kinnersley et al. [34]. We summed all

mutations across the LTEE associated with genes that passed our filters, and divided by the total

length of those genes to calculate the background density of mutations per site, λ. For each gene

g in the genome, we scale λ by the length of g, to calculate the expected number of mutations at

gene g: λ_g. The same calculation holds for a set of genes: by multiplying λ by the total length of

genes in the set, we can calculate the expected number of mutations in the gene set, λ_{set}. Suppose

x mutations were counted in the gene set of interest. Then, a one-tailed test for purifying

selection in this gene set can be done by calculating a *p*-value from the lower-tail of the Poisson

distribution: $P(X \leq x) = \sum_{k=0}^{k=x} \frac{\lambda_{set}^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda_{set}}$. Similarly, a one-tailed test for positive selection in

the gene set can be done by directly calculating a *p*-value from the upper-tail of the Poisson

distribution:

$P(X \geq x) = \sum_{k=x}^{k=\infty} \frac{\lambda_{set}^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda_{set}}$. When multiple genes or gene sets were tested for positive or

purifying selection, we applied a Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple-testing, and report

those false-discovery-rate (FDR) corrected *p*-values.

Wright-Fisher simulations of microbial evolution

We implemented Wright-Fisher evolutionary simulations of asexual haploid populations

in SLiM [64]. We simulated populations of 1 million cells, each containing a genome of 1,000

contiguous genes. We tested STIMS in two scenarios: the evolution of a nonmutator populations

with a point-mutation rate of 10^{-10} per base-pair per generation, and the evolution of a

hypermutator populations with a 100-fold increase in mutation rate: 10^{-8} per base-pair per

generation. These population genetic parameters are comparable to the effective population size

(3.3×10^7) and the ancestral mutation rate (8.9×10^{-11}) of Lenski's LTEE [29], and the 100-fold

evolved increases in mutation rates observed in the LTEE [31]. Our simulations assume a

background genomic distribution of mutation fitness effects (DFE) in which the vast majority of

mutations are nearly neutral, with a long tail of deleterious mutations, based on high-throughput

measurements of the DFE in *E. coli* in microfluidic mutation accumulation experiments [65]. We

assume that 100 genes are evolving under positive selection, such that 10% of mutations

occurring in those genes are beneficial. This assumption implies that 0.0025 of mutations are

beneficial in our model, which is comparable to the experimental estimate that 1 out of 150

newly arising mutations in *E. coli* are beneficial in laboratory conditions [66]. Following recent

simulations of adaptive evolution in the LTEE, we draw beneficial mutations from an

exponential DFE with mean 0.01578 [29]. We further assume that 100 genes are evolving

completely neutrally such that mutations in these genes have no fitness effect, and assume that

another set of 100 genes are evolving under purifying selection, such that 40% of mutations in

those genes cause a 30% decrease in fitness. This last assumption matches the finding that 1% of

new mutations in *E. coli* are lethal under laboratory conditions [65].

Ten replicate simulations were run for both the nonmutator and hypermutator

populations, and all mutations in each simulation were saved at 100-generation intervals.

Mutations were filtered based on a 1% allele frequency threshold, to simulate metagenomic

sequencing: this is equivalent to uniform 100× short-read sequencing coverage across the

genome per sequencing sample, with no sequencing errors. We then ran STIMS on the 100 genes

under positive selection, the 100 genes under relaxed selection (those evolving completely

neutrally), and the 100 genes under purifying selection. We examined the sensitivity and

specificity of STIMS by varying the allele frequency detection threshold, the number of genes

sampled per module, the sampling interval in the time series, and the length of the time series,

holding all other setting to their default values. Four values of the allele frequency detection limit

were examined: 0.01%, 1%, 5%, 10%. The number of genes sampled per module was varied

between 1, 25, 50, and 100 genes. The sampling interval was either 100- or 500-generation

intervals. The length of the time series was 500, 1000, 2000, or 5000 generations. True positives

and false negatives were counted by the number of STIMS tests on the genes evolving under

positive or purifying selection that passed a one-sided p-value significance threshold of 0.05.

False positives and true negatives were counted by the number of STIMS tests on the genes

evolving neutrally that nevertheless passed the same p-value significance threshold. Sensitivity

(also known as the true positive rate, or as statistical power) was calculated as the number of true

positives divided by the sum of true positives and false negatives, out of the 10 tests on the 10

replicate datasets. Specificity (also known as the true negative rate) was calculated as the number

of true negatives divided by the sum of true negatives and false positives, out of the 10 tests on

the 10 replicate datasets.

Data and analysis code availability

All analysis codes for this project are available at:

www.github.com/rohanmaddamsetti/LTEE-purifying-selection. A stand-alone implementation of

STIMS in the Julia programming language is available at:

www.github.com/rohanmaddamsetti/STIMS. The sequence data used in our study have already

been deposited into a public database. The other data and analysis scripts in this manuscript have

been archived on the Zenodo Digital Repository (DOI: http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4783368).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Alejandro Couce for sharing the list of gold-standard neutral genes in *E. coli* B strain REL606. We thank Richard Lenski for valuable discussions and advice. We thank Jeffrey Barrick for valuable discussions, advice, and comments on an earlier version of our manuscript. We also thank Benjamin Good for making pre-processed LTEE metagenomic data and analysis scripts accessible for the research community. The LTEE that generated the bacteria we used in this study is supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation (currently DEB-1951307) to Richard Lenski and Jeffrey Barrick. N.A.G. was supported in part by the BEACON Center for the Study of Evolution in Action (NSF cooperative agreement DBI-0939454) and by Michigan State University.

REFERENCES

1.   Jeggo PA, Pearl LH, Carr AM. DNA repair, genome stability and cancer: a historical perspective. Nature Reviews Cancer. 2016;16(1):35.

2.   Loeb LA. A mutator phenotype in cancer. Cancer research. 2001;61(8):3230-9.

3.   Modrich P. Mismatch repair, genetic stability, and cancer. Science. 1994;266(5193):1959-61.

4.   Feliziani S, Marvig RL, Lujan AM, Moyano AJ, Di Rienzo JA, Johansen HK, et al. Coexistence and within-host evolution of diversified lineages of hypermutable Pseudomonas aeruginosa in long-term cystic fibrosis infections. PLoS Genet. 2014;10(10):e1004651.

5.   Ford CB, Shah RR, Maeda MK, Gagneux S, Murray MB, Cohen T, et al. Mycobacterium tuberculosis mutation rate estimates from different lineages predict substantial differences in the emergence of drug-resistant tuberculosis. Nature genetics. 2013;45(7):784-90.

6.   Couce A, Caudwell LV, Feinauer C, Hindré T, Feugeas J-P, Weigt M, et al. Mutator genomes decay, despite sustained fitness gains, in a long-term experiment with bacteria. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2017;114(43):E9026-E35.

7.   Schiffels S, Szöllősi GJ, Mustonen V, Lässig M. Emergent neutrality in adaptive asexual evolution. Genetics. 2011;189(4):1361-75.

8.   Mehta HH, Prater AG, Beabout K, Elworth RA, Karavis M, Gibbons HS, et al. The essential role of hypermutation in rapid adaptation to antibiotic stress. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2019;63(7):e00744-19.

9.   Hammerstrom TG, Beabout K, Clements TP, Saxer G, Shamoo Y. Acinetobacter
baumannii repeatedly evolves a hypermutator phenotype in response to tigecycline that
effectively surveys evolutionary trajectories to resistance. PloS one. 2015;10(10):e0140489.

10.   Lenski RE, Rose MR, Simpson SC, Tadler SC. Long-term experimental evolution in
Escherichia coli. I. Adaptation and divergence during 2,000 generations. The American
Naturalist. 1991;138(6):1315-41.

11.   Lenski RE. Experimental evolution and the dynamics of adaptation and genome
evolution in microbial populations. The ISME journal. 2017;11(10):2181-94.

12.   Barrick JE, Lenski RE. Genome-wide mutational diversity in an evolving population of
Escherichia coli. Cold Spring Harbor symposia on quantitative biology. 2009;74:119-29.

13.   Barrick JE, Yu DS, Yoon SH, Jeong H, Oh TK, Schneider D, et al. Genome evolution
and adaptation in a long-term experiment with Escherichia coli. Nature. 2009;461(7268):1243-7.

14.   Maddamsetti R, Lenski RE, Barrick JE. Adaptation, clonal interference, and frequency-
dependent interactions in a long-term evolution experiment with Escherichia coli. Genetics.
2015;200(2):619-31.

15.   Tenaillon O, Barrick JE, Ribeck N, Deatherage DE, Blanchard JL, Dasgupta A, et al.
Tempo and mode of genome evolution in a 50,000-generation experiment. Nature.
2016;536(7615):165-70.

16.   Good BH, McDonald MJ, Barrick JE, Lenski RE, Desai MM. The dynamics of molecular
evolution over 60,000 generations. Nature. 2017;551(7678):45-50.

17.   Vasi F, Travisano M, Lenski RE. Long-term experimental evolution in Escherichia coli.
II. Changes in life-history traits during adaptation to a seasonal environment. The american
naturalist. 1994;144(3):432-56.

18.   Lenski RE, Mongold JA, Sniegowski PD, Travisano M, Vasi F, Gerrish PJ, et al.
Evolution of competitive fitness in experimental populations of E. coli: what makes one
genotype a better competitor than another? Antonie van Leeuwenhoek. 1998;73(1):35-47.

19.   Elena SF, Cooper VS, Lenski RE. Punctuated evolution caused by selection of rare
beneficial mutations. Science. 1996;272(5269):1802-4.

20.   Wiser MJ, Ribeck N, Lenski RE. Long-term dynamics of adaptation in asexual
populations. Science. 2013;342(6164):1364-7.

21.   Grant NA, Maddamsetti R, Lenski RE. Maintenance of metabolic plasticity despite
relaxed selection in a long-term evolution experiment with Escherichia coli. The American
Naturalist. 2021;0(ja):null. doi: 10.1086/714530.

22.   Grant NA, Magid AA, Franklin J, Dufour Y, Lenski RE. Changes in Cell Size and Shape
During 50,000 Generations of Experimental Evolution with Escherichia coli. Journal of
Bacteriology. 2021;203(10).

23.   Maddamsetti R, Hatcher PJ, Green AG, Williams BL, Marks DS, Lenski RE. Core genes
evolve rapidly in the long-term evolution experiment with Escherichia coli. Genome biology and
evolution. 2017;9(4):1072-83.

24.   Maddamsetti R. Universal constraints on protein evolution in the long-term evolution
experiment with Escherichia coli. Genome Biology and Evolution. 2021. doi:
10.1093/gbe/evab070.

25.   Maddamsetti R. Selection maintains protein interactome resilience in the long-term
evolution experiment with Escherichia coli. Genome Biology and Evolution. 2021. doi:
10.1093/gbe/evab074.

26.   Hui S, Silverman JM, Chen SS, Erickson DW, Basan M, Wang J, et al. Quantitative
proteomic analysis reveals a simple strategy of global resource allocation in bacteria. Molecular
systems biology. 2015;11(2).

27.   Sastry AV, Gao Y, Szubin R, Hefner Y, Xu S, Kim D, et al. The Escherichia coli
transcriptome mostly consists of independently regulated modules. Nature communications.
2019;10(1):1-14.

28.   Wytock TP, Motter AE. Predicting growth rate from gene expression. Proceedings of the
National Academy of Sciences. 2019;116(2):367-72.

29.   Izutsu M, Lake DM, Matson ZW, Dodson JP, Lenski RE. Effects of periodic bottlenecks
on the dynamics of adaptive evolution in microbial populations. bioRxiv. 2021.

30.   Papadopoulos D, Schneider D, Meier-Eiss J, Arber W, Lenski RE, Blot M. Genomic
evolution during a 10,000-generation experiment with bacteria. Proceedings of the National
Academy of Sciences. 1999;96(7):3807-12.

31.   Maddamsetti R, Grant NA. Divergent evolution of mutation rates and biases in the long-
term evolution experiment with Escherichia coli. Genome Biology and Evolution. 2020. doi:
10.1093/gbe/evaa178.

32.   Consuegra J, Gaffé J, Lenski RE, Hindré T, Barrick JE, Tenaillon O, et al. Insertion-
sequence-mediated mutations both promote and constrain evolvability during a long-term
experiment with bacteria. Nature communications. 2021;12(1):1-12.

33.   Turner CB, Blount ZD, Mitchell DH, Lenski RE. Evolution and coexistence in response
to a key innovation in a long-term evolution experiment with Escherichia coli. bioRxiv.
2015:020958.

34.   Kinnersley M, Schwartz K, Yang D-D, Sherlock G, Rosenzweig F. Evolutionary
dynamics and structural consequences of de novo beneficial mutations and mutant lineages
arising in a constant environment. BMC biology. 2021;19(1):1-21.

35.   Lenski RE, Wiser MJ, Ribeck N, Blount ZD, Nahum JR, Morris JJ, et al. Sustained
fitness gains and variability in fitness trajectories in the long-term evolution experiment with
Escherichia coli. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences.
2015;282(1821):20152292.

36.   Wielgoss S, Barrick JE, Tenaillon O, Wiser MJ, Dittmar WJ, Cruveiller S, et al. Mutation
rate dynamics in a bacterial population reflect tension between adaptation and genetic load.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2013;110(1):222-7.

37.   Rudan M, Schneider D, Warnecke T, Krisko A. RNA chaperones buffer deleterious
mutations in E. coli. Elife. 2015;4:e04745.

38.   Bailey SF, Guo Q, Bataillon T. Identifying drivers of parallel evolution: A regression
model approach. Genome biology and evolution. 2018;10(10):2801-12.

39.   Foster PL, Hanson AJ, Lee H, Popodi EM, Tang H. On the mutational topology of the
bacterial genome. G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics. 2013;3(3):399-407.

40.   Niccum BA, Lee H, MohammedIsmail W, Tang H, Foster PL. The Symmetrical Wave
Pattern of Base-Pair Substitution Rates across the Escherichia coli Chromosome Has Multiple
Causes. mBio. 2019;10(4).

41.   Quandt EM, Gollihar J, Blount ZD, Ellington AD, Georgiou G, Barrick JE. Fine-tuning
citrate synthase flux potentiates and refines metabolic innovation in the Lenski evolution
experiment. Elife. 2015;4:e09696.

42.   Zee PC, Mendes-Soares H, Yu YTN, Kraemer SA, Keller H, Ossowski S, et al. A shift
from magnitude to sign epistasis during adaptive evolution of a bacterial social trait. Evolution.
2014;68(9):2701-8.

43.   Venkataram S, Monasky R, Sikaroodi SH, Kryazhimskiy S, Kacar B. Evolutionary
stalling and a limit on the power of natural selection to improve a cellular module. Proceedings
of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(31):18582-90.

44.   Rodrigues JV, Shakhnovich EI. Adaptation to mutational inactivation of an essential gene
converges to an accessible suboptimal fitness peak. Elife. 2019;8.

45.   Kaznatcheev A. Computational complexity as an ultimate constraint on evolution.
Genetics. 2019;212(1):245-65.

46.   Andersson DI, Slechta ES, Roth JR. Evidence that gene amplification underlies adaptive
mutability of the bacterial lac operon. Science. 1998;282(5391):1133-5.

47.   Hendrickson H, Slechta ES, Bergthorsson U, Andersson DI, Roth JR. Amplification–
mutagenesis: evidence that "directed" adaptive mutation and general hypermutability result from
growth with a selected gene amplification. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
2002;99(4):2164-9.

48.   Good BH, Desai MM. Evolution of mutation rates in rapidly adapting asexual
populations. Genetics. 2016;204(3):1249-66.

49.   Philippe N, Crozat E, Lenski RE, Schneider D. Evolution of global regulatory networks
during a long-term experiment with Escherichia coli. Bioessays. 2007;29(9):846-60.

50.   Chen H, Wu C-I, He X. The genotype–phenotype relationships in the light of natural
selection. Molecular biology and evolution. 2018;35(3):525-42.

51.   Scott M, Gunderson CW, Mateescu EM, Zhang Z, Hwa T. Interdependence of cell
growth and gene expression: origins and consequences. Science. 2010;330(6007):1099-102.

52.   Erickson DW, Schink SJ, Patsalo V, Williamson JR, Gerland U, Hwa T. A global
resource allocation strategy governs growth transition kinetics of Escherichia coli. Nature.
2017;551(7678):119-23.

53.   Klumpp S, Hwa T. Bacterial growth: global effects on gene expression, growth feedback
and proteome partition. Current opinion in biotechnology. 2014;28:96-102.

54.   Basan M, Hui S, Okano H, Zhang Z, Shen Y, Williamson JR, et al. Overflow metabolism
in Escherichia coli results from efficient proteome allocation. Nature. 2015;528(7580):99-104.

55.   Mathis RA, Sokol ES, Gupta PB. Identification of Genes under Purifying Selection in
Human Cancers. BioRxiv. 2017:129205.

56.   Weghorn D, Sunyaev S. Bayesian inference of negative and positive selection in human
cancers. Nature genetics. 2017;49(12):1785-8.

57.   Patel SJ, Sanjana NE, Kishton RJ, Eidizadeh A, Vodnala SK, Cam M, et al. Identification
of essential genes for cancer immunotherapy. Nature. 2017;548(7669):537-42.

58.   Li X, Giorgi EE, Marichannegowda MH, Foley B, Xiao C, Kong X-P, et al. Emergence
of SARS-CoV-2 through recombination and strong purifying selection. Science Advances.
2020;6(27):eabb9153.

59.   Lieberman TD, Michel J-B, Aingaran M, Potter-Bynoe G, Roux D, Davis MR, et al.
Parallel bacterial evolution within multiple patients identifies candidate pathogenicity genes.
Nature genetics. 2011;43(12):1275-80.

60.   Caballero JD, Clark ST, Coburn B, Zhang Y, Wang PW, Donaldson SL, et al. Selective
sweeps and parallel pathoadaptation drive Pseudomonas aeruginosa evolution in the cystic
fibrosis lung. MBio. 2015;6(5).

61.   Chung H, Lieberman TD, Vargas SO, Flett KB, McAdam AJ, Priebe GP, et al. Global
and local selection acting on the pathogen Stenotrophomonas maltophilia in the human lung.
Nature communications. 2017;8:14078.

62.   Cooper VS, Honsa E, Rowe H, Deitrick C, Iverson AR, Whittall JJ, et al. Experimental
Evolution in vivo to Identify Selective Pressures During Pneumococcal Colonization. Msystems.
2020;5(3).

63.   Deatherage DE, Traverse CC, Wolf LN, Barrick JE. Detecting rare structural variation in
evolving microbial populations from new sequence junctions using breseq. Frontiers in genetics.
2015;5:468.

64.   Haller BC, Messer PW. SLiM 3: forward genetic simulations beyond the Wright–Fisher
model. Molecular biology and evolution. 2019;36(3):632-7.

65.   Robert L, Ollion J, Robert J, Song X, Matic I, Elez M. Mutation dynamics and fitness
effects followed in single cells. Science. 2018;359(6381):1283-6.

66.   Perfeito L, Fernandes L, Mota C, Gordo I. Adaptive mutations in bacteria: high rate and
small effects. science. 2007;317(5839):813-5.
772

 FIGURES

Figure 1. Data analysis workflow. 12 *E. coli* populations have evolved for more than 60,000
generations in Lenski's long-term evolution experiment (LTEE). We reanalyzed metagenomic
time series of the LTEE, described in Good et al. (2017). We also evolved 20 asexual haploid
populations *in silico* for 5,000 generations. We identified variants segregating during the
simulations to model metagenomic sequencing and variant calling. We designed a simple test to
infer mode of selection (STIMS) to test pre-defined query gene sets for positive or purifying
selection in the metagenomic time series. See the Materials and Methods for further details.

In vitro microbial evolution   *In silico* microbial evolution

12 *E. coli* populations evolved for over 60,000 generations   20 asexual haploid populations evolved for 5,000 generations

Metagenomic sequencing and variant calling to identify segregating mutations within each population.

Gene set of interest

Test for positive or purifying selection using STIMS

Figure 2. The STIMS algorithm. When examining the evolutionary dynamics of a gene set of
interest, one often wants to know whether the set is enriched or depleted of observed mutations.
To test for depletion, we use the non-parametric bootstrap to estimate the fraction of randomized
gene sets that have fewer mutations than the query gene set. For example, if 11% of randomized
gene sets have fewer mutations than the query gene set, then the query gene set is not depleted of
mutations (one-tailed p-value = 0.11). A similar derivation holds for tests of enrichment. This
worked example uses the allele frequency dynamics of ribosome-associated proteins in the
Ara−1 population of Lenski's long term evolution experiment with *Escherichia coli* (LTEE) to
illustrate how the STIMS algorithm works. This population evolved a hypermutator phenotype
around the 26,250-generation time point.
795

A Simple Test to Infer Mode of Selection (STIMS)

A worked example: Are ribosome-associated proteins depleted of mutations?

1 Sum the mutations observed in the gene set of interest, and normalize by total gene length.

2 Randomly sample N genes, where N is the cardinality of the gene set of interest, sum mutations over time, and normalize. Repeat 10,000 times.

3 Count the number of random gene sets with fewer observed mutations *at the end of the timeseries* than the gene set of interest (after normalization to take differences in gene length into account). Divide by 10,000 to directly calculate a *p*-value.

Figure 3. *In silico* **evolution experiments demonstrate that STIMS can detect positive but not purifying selection in nonmutator populations.** Bacterial evolution was simulated using a Wright-Fisher model. Each simulation lasted 5,000 generations. The effective population size was set to 1 million individuals. Nonmutator bacteria were modeled using a mutation rate of 10^{-10} per base-pair per generation. Each individual contains an idealized genome of 4,000 genes, each 1,000 base-pairs in length, for a genome of 4 million base-pairs. 100 genes are targets of positive selection, 100 genes are evolving completely neutrally (relaxed selection), and 100 genes are evolving under purifying selection. The remaining 3,700 genes evolve nearly neutrally, based on published estimates of the genomic distribution of mutation fitness effects in *Escherichia coli*. See the Materials and Methods for further details. A) Typical allele frequency dynamics of a nonmutator population, showing selective sweeps and clonal interference. B) STIMS shows high sensitivity and specificity for detecting positive selection in nonmutator populations. C) STIMS is unable to detect purifying selection (low sensitivity), but shows no false positives (high specificity). D) Typical result of running STIMS on genes evolving under positive selection in the nonmutator simulations. E) Typical result of running STIMS on genes evolving neutrally in the nonmutator simulations. F) Typical result of running STIMS on genes evolving under purifying selection in the nonmutator simulations.

Nonmutator: N_e = 1,000,000 individuals and $\mu = 10^{-10}$ (bp^{-1} generation^{-1})

A

D **Positive selection**

B STIMS detects positive selection in nonmutator populations

E **Relaxed selection**

C STIMS does not detect purifying selection in nonmutator populations

F **Purifying selection**

815
816

Figure 4. *In silico* evolution experiments demonstrate that STIMS can detect both positive and purifying selection in hypermutator populations. Bacterial evolution was simulated using a Wright-Fisher model. Each simulation lasted 5,000 generations. The effective population size was set to 1 million individuals. Hypermutator bacteria were modeled using a mutation rate of 10^{-8} per base-pair per generation. Each individual contains an idealized genome of 4,000 genes, each 1,000 base-pairs in length, for a genome of 4 million base-pairs. 100 genes are targets of positive selection, 100 genes are evolving completely neutrally (relaxed selection), and 100 genes are evolving under purifying selection. The remaining 3,700 genes evolve nearly neutrally, based on published estimates of the genomic distribution of mutation fitness effects in *Escherichia coli*. See the Materials and Methods for further details. A) Typical allele frequency dynamics of a hypermutator population, showing selective sweeps and clonal interference. B) STIMS shows high sensitivity and specificity for detecting positive selection in hypermutator populations. C) STIMS detects purifying selection with increasing sensitivity at lower allele frequency mutation detection thresholds, more genes sampled from the set of genes evolving under purifying selection, the length of the time series, and shorter intervals between metagenomic sampling, and shows high specificity across all tested parameters. D) Typical result of running STIMS on genes evolving under positive selection in the hypermutator simulations. E) Typical result of running STIMS on genes evolving neutrally in the hypermutator simulations. F) Typical result of running STIMS on genes evolving under purifying selection in the hypermutator simulations.

Hypermutator: N_e = 1,000,000 individuals and μ = 10^{-8} (bp^{-1} generation^{-1})

A

B STIMS detects positive selection in hypermutator populations

C STIMS detects purifying selection in hypermutator populations

D Positive selection

E Relaxed selection

F Purifying selection

838
839

Figure 5. Gold-standard genes under relaxed selection. Each panel shows the cumulative
number of mutations in the gold-standard neutral genes (black) in the 12 LTEE populations. For
comparison, random sets of 57 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of
mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle
95% of this null distribution is shown in gray, in order to show a two-tailed statistical
comparison of the cumulative number of mutations in the gold-standard neutral gene set to the
null distribution at $\alpha = 0.05$. The top six panels are populations with the ancestral mutation rate
(nonmutator populations) and the bottom six panels are those that evolved elevated mutation
rates (hypermutator populations).
849

850
851
852

Figure 6. Gold-standard genes under purifying selection. Each panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in the gold standard set of genes under purifying selection (black) in the 12 LTEE populations. For comparison, random sets of 490 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray. The top six panels are the nonmutator populations and the bottom six panels are the hypermutator populations.

Figure 7. Gold-standard genes under positive selection. Each panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in the gold standard set of genes under positive selection (black) in the 12 LTEE populations. These genes are the 50 genes with the strongest signal of parallel evolution in clones isolated from the six nonmutator populations, as scored by Tenaillon et al. (2016). For comparison, random sets of 50 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray. The top six panels are the nonmutator populations and the bottom six panels are the hypermutator populations.

 Figure 8. I-modulon regulators evolve under strong positive selection, while genes
regulated within I-modulon evolve under weaker selection. Each panel shows the cumulative
number of mutations in 70 I-modulon regulators (black) and in 1,394 genes regulated within I-
modulons (red) in the 12 LTEE populations. For comparison to the I-modulon regulators,
random sets of 70 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in
those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of the null
distribution for I-modulon regulators is shown in gray. A similar procedure was used with
random sets of 1,394 genes to make a null distribution in pink to compare to the genes regulated
within I-modulons. The top six panels are the nonmutator populations and the bottom six panels
are the hypermutator populations.

Figure 9. Regulatory genes are under positive selection in hypermutator *Pseudomonas*
***aeruginosa* populations evolving under subinhibitory concentrations of colistin.** The
cumulative number of mutations in 424 annotated regulatory genes in two replicate populations
of hypermutator *P. aeruginosa* is shown in black. For comparison, random sets of 424 genes
were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets,
normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in
gray.
900

901
902
903

904 **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**
905
906 **Supplementary File 1. Results of running STIMS, over all LTEE populations, on each I-**
907 **modulon in Sastry et al. (2019).**
908
909 **Supplementary File 2. Results of running STIMS, individually on each each LTEE**
910 **population, on each I-modulon in Sastry et al. (2019).**
911
912 **Supplementary File 3. Results of running Poisson method as a genome-wide screen for**
913 **positive and purifying selection, over all LTEE populations, and individually on each**
914 **LTEE population.**
915
916

917   **SUPPLEMENTARY TEXT**

919   *Comparison of STIMS to a test for selection based on the Poisson distribution*

920   One class of statistical tests for selection in evolution experiments uses the Poisson

distribution to model the expected distribution of mutations per genomic site per unit time under

neutral evolution [16, 34]. Using this framework, significant deviations from the Poisson null

expectation can indicate positive or purifying selection. In principle, Poisson methods should be

simpler to implement and computationally cheaper than STIMS. However, methods based on the

Poisson distribution may be sensitive to model misspecification, due to local mutation biases that

can cause deviation from the Poisson expectation in the absence of selection [31]. Variations of

the bootstrapping approach used by STIMS, on the other hand, can account for such mutational

biases through randomization (Materials and Methods).

929   To better understand the relative strengths and weaknesses of STIMS in comparison to

Poisson methods, we implemented the Poisson method used by Kinnersley *et al.* [34], and re-ran

all of our positive control experiments on gold-standard sets of genes (Materials and Methods).

Overall, both STIMS and the Poisson method give similar results. The Poisson method

successfully recovers signals of purifying selection ($p < 10^{-14}$) and positive selection ($p < 10^{-50}$)

on the respective sets of gold-standard genes. However, the Poisson method finds a weak signal

of positive selection on the gold-standard set of genes under relaxed selection ($p = 0.0397$). The

Poisson method finds a signal of purifying selection on most proteome sectors (FDR-corrected p

$< 10^{-11}$ for U-sector; FDR-corrected $p < 0.00001$ for A-sector; FDR-corrected $p = 0.000162$ for

R-sector; FDR-corrected $p = 0.00182$ for S-sector; FDR-corrected $p = 0.00217$ for O-sector;

FDR-corrected $p = 0.391$ for C-sector). Eigengenes show little to no evidence of selection under

the Poisson method (FDR-corrected $p = 0.0327$ for Eigengene 2; the rest are nonsignificant). I-

modulon regulators show evidence of very strong positive selection ($p < 10^{-13}$), while 16 I-

modulons show evidence of either positive or purifying selection at a Benjamini-Hochberg

corrected p-value threshold of 0.01 (Supplementary Table 4). 14 out of these 16 I-modulons are

significant by STIMS, while the other two, "flu-yeeRS" and "Pyruvate", trend toward

significance (Supplementary File S1). Finally, we used the Poisson method as a genome-wide

screen for positive and purifying selection, both over all LTEE populations, and on each

population individually. We report these results at a Benjamini-Hochberg corrected p-value

threshold of 0.01 in Supplementary File S3. Most of the genes showing evidence of positive

selection have been reported before [15, 16, 23]. However, this screen finds 7 genes with a

significant signal of purifying selection across the LTEE, none of which have been reported

before: *acnB* (aconitate hydratase), *ybjL* (hypothetical protein), *yhdP* (conserved membrane

protein predicted transporter), *recG* (ATP-dependent DNA helicase), *cyoB* (cytochrome o

ubiquinol oxidase subunit I), *wcaJ* (predicted UDP-glucose lipid carrier transferase), and *atpD*

(F0F1 ATP synthase subunit beta). All of these genes are longer than 1,300 bp, and three of them

(*ybjL*, *wcaJ*, and *atpD*) have no observed mutations at all.

Altogether, this detailed comparison indicates the Poisson method is faster and is more

practical for genome-wide scans for positive and purifying selection on single genes, but that its

sensitivity comes at the price of more false positives. STIMS is more conservative than the

Poisson method, and gives results that are more consistent with ground truth, as defined by the

sets of gold-standard genes that we used for empirical validation. STIMS, unlike the Poisson

method, also provides a picture of the tempo of evolution in a gene set over time, as well as

changes in statistical significance over time. These visualizations are especially useful for

observing *how* the tempo of evolutionary change in a gene set of interest changes over time, and

for generating further hypotheses and predictions for empirical validation (Supplementary Files 1

and 2).

966
967

968   **SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES AND FIGURES**
969
970   **Supplementary Table S1. Essential genes in REL606 with no observed mutations in the**
971   **LTEE metagenomics data.**
972

Gene	Locus tag	Gene length	Product
rlpB	ECB_00610	582	minor lipoprotein
rplJ	ECB_03861	498	50S ribosomal protein L10
ECB_01539	ECB_01539	408	protein similar to DicA regulator of DicB encoded by prophage CP-933O
sdhD	ECB_00682	348	succinate dehydrogenase cytochrome b556 small membrane subunit
rplV	ECB_03166	333	50S ribosomal protein L22
rpsJ	ECB_03172	312	30S ribosomal protein S10
rpsN	ECB_03158	306	30S ribosomal protein S14
yrbB	ECB_03056	294	hypothetical protein
groES	ECB_04012	294	co-chaperonin GroES
rpsS	ECB_03167	279	30S ribosomal protein S19
rpsT	ECB_00027	264	30S ribosomal protein S20
rpsQ	ECB_03162	255	30S ribosomal protein S17
atpE	ECB_03621	240	F0F1 ATP synthase subunit C
rpmC	ECB_03163	192	50S ribosomal protein L29
ydaE	ECB_01329	171	conserved protein
rpmJ	ECB_03150	117	50S ribosomal protein L36
ybgT	ECB_00694	114	hypothetical protein
rhoL	ECB_03660	102	rho operon leader peptide

973
974

Supplementary Table S2. Essential genes in REL606 with only synonymous mutations in the LTEE metagenomics data.

Gene	Locus tag	Gene length	Product
atpD	ECB_03616	1383	F0F1 ATP synthase subunit beta
icdA	ECB_01134	1251	isocitrate dehydrogenase
thyA	ECB_02675	795	thymidylate synthase
plsC	ECB_02890	738	1-acyl-sn-glycerol-3-phosphate acyltransferase
pdxH	ECB_01608	657	pyridoxamine 5'-phosphate oxidase
rplD	ECB_03170	606	50S ribosomal protein L4
lpcA	ECB_00217	579	phosphoheptose isomerase
rimM	ECB_02497	549	16S rRNA-processing protein
rplE	ECB_03159	540	50S ribosomal protein L5
sixA	ECB_02264	486	phosphohistidine phosphatase
folK	ECB_00141	480	2-amino-4-hydroxy-6-hydroxymethyldihyropteridine pyrophosphokinase
accB	ECB_03113	471	acetyl-CoA carboxylase
holD	ECB_04247	414	DNA polymerase III subunit psi
rpsI	ECB_03090	393	30S ribosomal protein S9
iscU	ECB_02421	387	scaffold protein
rplQ	ECB_03145	384	50S ribosomal protein L17
panD	ECB_00130	381	aspartate 1-decarboxylase precursor
rpsL	ECB_03193	375	30S ribosomal protein S12
rplN	ECB_03161	372	50S ribosomal protein L14
rnpA	ECB_03587	360	ribonuclease P
rplT	ECB_01685	357	50S ribosomal protein L20
yadR	ECB_00155	345	hypothetical protein
fdx	ECB_02417	336	[2Fe-2S] ferredoxin
secG	ECB_03040	333	protein-export membrane protein
ybaB	ECB_00422	330	hypothetical protein
acpP	ECB_01090	237	acyl carrier protein
rpmI	ECB_01686	198	50S ribosomal protein L35
rpmH	ECB_03586	141	50S ribosomal protein L34
pheL	ECB_02487	48	pheA gene leader peptide
trpL	ECB_01239	45	trp operon leader peptide

979
980

Supplementary Table S3. I-modulons showing evidence of selection, historical contingency and epistasis in the LTEE, using STIMS.

Page[*]	I-modulon	Populations of Interest	Hypothesis
3	ArcA-2	Ara−2, Ara−3	purifying selection
11	CpxR	Ara−3, Ara−4, Ara+6	positive and purifying selection
13	Crp-1	Ara−5, Ara+1	positive selection
16	CsqR	Ara+3, Ara+6	purifying selection
18	CysB	Ara−1, Ara+6	purifying selection
19	Deletion-1	Ara−3	positive selection
22	Duplication-1	Ara−2, Ara−3, Ara−4, Ara+3	strong purifying selection
23	e14-deletion	Ara−3	strong positive selection
24	efeU-repair	Ara+3, Ara+6	strong positive selection, purifying selection
28	FadR	Ara−1, Ara−2, Ara+6	purifying selection
30	fimbriae	Ara−2	strong positive selection
31	FlhDC	Ara−2, Ara+6	positive selection
37	fur-KO	Ara−3	strong positive selection
38	GadEWX	Ara−1, Ara−3, Ara+6	positive selection
40	GadWX-KO	Ara+6	positive selection
46	insertion	Ara−1, Ara+6	strong positive selection
48	Leu/Ile	Ara−1, Ara−4, Ara+3, Ara+6	strong purifying selection
49	lipopolysaccharide	Ara−1	strong positive selection
50	Lrp	Ara+6	purifying selection
53	MetJ	Ara−4, Ara+3, Ara+6	purifying selection
63	PurR-1	Ara−1	purifying selection
69	RcsAB	Ara−3, Ara+3	purifying selection
72	sgrT	Ara−1, Ara−4,	purifying selection
77	translation	Ara+1, Ara+2, Ara+5, Ara−3, Ara+6	positive and purifying selection
79	uncharacterized-1	Ara+2, Ara+5, Ara+3	positive selection
81	uncharacterized-3	Ara−1	positive selection
82	uncharacterized-4	Ara−6, Ara+1, Ara+2, Ara+4, Ara+5, Ara−2, Ara−3, Ara−4, Ara+3, Ara+6	strong positive and purifying selection
90	YieP	Ara−2, Ara−4	positive selection

[*]Page numbers refers to Supplementary Files 1 (STIMS across all LTEE populations) and Supplementary File 2 (STIMS on individual LTEE populations).

986 **Supplementary Table S4. I-modulons showing evidence of selection across all LTEE**
987 **populations based on the Poisson method, at a FDR-corrected *p*-value threshold of 0.01.**
988

I-modulon	FDR-corrected *p*-value	Inference
CysB	$p < 10^{-5}$	purifying selection
Leu/Ile	$p < 10^{-5}$	purifying selection
Duplication-1	$p < 10^{-4}$	purifying selection
fimbrae	$p < 10^{-4}$	purifying selection
RcsAB	$p = 0.000172$	purifying selection
Crp-1	$p = 0.000317$	positive selection
flu-yeeRS	$p = 0.000636$	positive selection
MetJ	$p = 0.000877$	purifying selection
FadR	$p = 0.000989$	purifying selection
Pyruvate	$p = 0.00241$	purifying selection
translation	$p = 0.00268$	purifying selection
CsqR	$p = 0.00288$	purifying selection
Lrp	$p = 0.00347$	purifying selection
ArcA-2	$p = 0.00358$	purifying selection
GadEWX	$p = 0.00369$	positive selection
Insertion	$p = 0.00775$	positive selection

Supplementary Figure S1. Gold-standard genes under relaxed selection. Each panel shows
the cumulative number of mutations in the gold-standard neutral genes (black) in all 12 LTEE
populations. For comparison, random sets of 57 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the
cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were
calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray, in order to show a two-
tailed statistical comparison of the cumulative number of mutations in the gold-standard neutral
gene set to the null distribution at $\alpha = 0.05$.
997

998
999
1000

1001 **Supplementary Figure S2. Gold-standard genes under purifying selection.** Each panel shows
1002 the cumulative number of mutations in the gold standard set of genes under purifying selection
1003 (black) in all 12 LTEE populations. For comparison, random sets of 490 genes were sampled
1004 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by
1005 gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray.

1006

Supplementary Figure S3. Gold-standard genes under positive selection. Each panel shows
the cumulative number of mutations in the gold standard set of genes under positive selection
(black) in all 12 LTEE populations. These genes are the 50 genes with the strongest signal of
parallel evolution in clones isolated from the six nonmutator populations, as scored by Tenaillon
et al. (2016). For comparison, random sets of 50 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the
cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were
calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray.

1014

Supplementary Figure S4. Genes evolving in parallel in hypermutator populations. Each
panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in the 50 genes with the strongest signal of
parallel evolution in clones isolated from the six hypermutator populations, as scored by
Tenaillon et al. (2016), in the 12 LTEE populations. These curves are drawn in black. For
comparison, random sets of 50 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of
mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle
95% of this null distribution is shown in gray. The top six panels are the nonmutator populations
and the bottom six panels are the hypermutator populations.
1023

1024
1025
1026

Supplementary Figure S5. Genes evolving in parallel in hypermutator populations. Each
panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in the 50 genes with the strongest signal of
parallel evolution in clones isolated from the six hypermutator populations, as scored by
Tenaillon et al. (2016), in all 12 LTEE populations. These curves are drawn in black. For
comparison, random sets of 50 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of
mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle
95% of this null distribution is shown in gray.

1034
1035

Supplementary Figure S6. Purifying selection on the proteome U-sector. Each panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in the A-sector (black), S-sector (red), O-sector (blue), U-sector (green), R-sector (yellow), and C-sector (orange) in the 12 LTEE populations. For comparison, random sets of 92 genes (i.e. the smallest proteome sector cardinality) were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray. The top six panels are the nonmutator populations and the bottom six panels are the hypermutator populations.

Supplementary Figure S7. Purifying selection on the proteome U-sector and R-sector. Each
panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in the A-sector (black), S-sector (red), O-sector
(blue), U-sector (green), R-sector (yellow), and C-sector (orange) in all 12 LTEE populations.
For comparison, random sets of 92 genes (i.e. the smallest proteome sector cardinality) were
sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets,
normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in
gray.
1054

1055

Supplementary Figure S8. No evidence of selection on *E. coli* eigengenes. Each panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in eigengene 1 (red), eigengene 2 (orange), eigengene 3 (yellow), eigengene 4 (green), eigengene 5 (cyan), eigengene 6 (blue), eigengene 7 (violet), eigengene 8 (pink), and eigengene 9 (black) in the 12 LTEE populations. For comparison, random sets of 15 genes (i.e. the smallest eigengene cardinality) were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray. The top six panels are the nonmutator populations and the bottom six panels are the hypermutator populations.

Supplementary Figure S9. No evidence of selection on *E. coli* eigengenes. Each panel shows
the cumulative number of mutations in eigengene 1 (red), eigengene 2 (orange), eigengene 3
(yellow), eigengene 4 (green), eigengene 5 (cyan), eigengene 6 (blue), eigengene 7 (violet),
eigengene 8 (pink), and eigengene 9 (black) in the 12 LTEE populations. For comparison,
random sets of 15 genes (i.e. the smallest eigengene cardinality) were sampled 1,000 times, and
the cumulative number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were
calculated.
1076

1077

Supplementary Figure S10. I-modulon regulators evolve under strong positive selection,
while genes regulated within I-modulon evolve under purifying selection. Each panel shows
the cumulative number of mutations in 70 I-modulon regulators (black) and in 1,394 genes
regulated by I-modulon regulators (red) in the 12 LTEE populations. For comparison to the I-
modulon regulators, random sets of 70 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative
number of mutations in those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The
middle 95% of this null distribution is shown in gray. A similar procedure was used with random
sets of 1,394 genes to make a comparable distribution in pink to compare to the genes regulated
by I-modulon regulators.
1087

1088

Supplementary Figure S11. Regulatory genes are under positive selection in hypermutator
Pseudomonas aeruginosa **populations evolving under subinhibitory concentrations of**
colistin. Each panel shows the cumulative number of mutations in 424 annotated regulatory
genes (black), in two replicate populations of hypermutator *P. aeruginosa*. For comparison,
random sets of 424 genes were sampled 1,000 times, and the cumulative number of mutations in
those random gene sets, normalized by gene length, were calculated. The middle 95% of this null
distribution is shown in gray.
1096

1097
1098