TITLE: A combination of metagenomic and cultivation approaches reveals hypermutator

phenotypes within *Vibrio cholerae* infected patients.

AUTHORS: Inès Levade[1,8], Ashraful I. Khan[2], Fahima Chowdhury[2], Stephen B.

Calderwood[3,4,5], Edward T. Ryan[3,4], Jason B. Harris[3,6], Regina C. LaRocque[3,4,], Taufiqur R.

Bhuiyan[2], Firdausi Qadri[2], Ana A. Weil[7], B. Jesse Shapiro[1,8,9*]

[1]Department of Biological Sciences, University of Montreal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

[2]Center for Vaccine Sciences, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Dhaka,

Bangladesh

[3]Division of Infectious Diseases, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

[4]Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA USA

[5]Department of Microbiology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA USA

[6]Department of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

[7]Division of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

[8]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

[9]McGill Genome Centre, Montreal, QC, Canada

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: jesse.shapiro@mcgill.ca

ABSTRACT

Vibrio cholerae can cause a range of symptoms, ranging from severe diarrhea to asymptomatic infection. Previous studies using whole genome sequencing (WGS) of multiple bacterial isolates per patient showed that *V. cholerae* can evolve modest genetic diversity during symptomatic infection. To further explore the extent of *V. cholerae* within-host diversity, we applied culture-based WGS and metagenomics to a cohort of both symptomatic and asymptomatic cholera patients from Bangladesh. While metagenomics allowed us to detect more mutations in symptomatic patients, WGS of cultured isolates was necessary to detect *V. cholerae* diversity in asymptomatic carriers, likely due to their low *V. cholerae* load. Using both metagenomics and isolate WGS, we report three lines of evidence that *V. cholerae* hypermutators evolve within patients. First, we identified nonsynonymous in *V. cholerae* DNA repair genes in five out of 11 patient metagenomes sequenced with sufficient coverage of the *V. cholerae* genome, and in one of three patients with isolate genomes sequenced. Second, mutations in DNA repair genes tended to be accompanied by an excess of intrahost single nucleotide variants (iSNVs). Third, these iSNVs were enriched in transversion mutations, a known hallmark of hypermutator phenotypes. While hypermutators appeared to generate mostly selectively neutral mutations, non-mutators showed signs of convergent mutation across multiple patients, suggesting *V. cholerae* adaptation within hosts. Our results highlight the power and limitations of metagenomics combined with isolate sequencing to characterize within-patient diversity in acute *V. cholerae* infections, while providing evidence for hypermutator phenotypes within cholera patients.

IMPORTANCE

Pathogen evolution within patients can impact phenotypes such as drug resistance and virulence, potentially affecting clinical outcomes. *V. cholerae* infection can result in life-threatening diarrheal disease, or asymptomatic infection. Here we describe whole-genome sequencing of *V. cholerae* isolates and culture-free metagenomic sequencing from stool of symptomatic cholera patients and asymptomatic carriers. Despite the typically short duration of cholera, we found evidence for adaptive mutations in the *V. cholerae* genome that occur independently and repeatedly within multiple symptomatic patients. We also identified *V. cholerae* hypermutator phenotypes within several patients, which appear to generate mainly neutral or deleterious mutations. Our work sets the stage for future studies of the role of hypermutators and within-patient evolution in explaining the variation from asymptomatic carriage to symptomatic cholera.

KEYWORDS: *Vibrio cholerae,* cholera, metagenomics, within-patient evolution, hypermutation, asymptomatic carriage

INTRODUCTION

Infection with *Vibrio cholerae,* the etiological agent of cholera, causes a clinical spectrum of symptoms that range from asymptomatic colonization of the intestine to severe watery diarrhea that can lead to death. Although absent from most resource-rich countries, this severe diarrheal disease still plagues many developing nations. According to the WHO, there are an estimated 1.3 to 4.0 million cases of cholera each year, with 21,000 to 143,000 deaths worldwide (1). Cholera predominantly occurs in endemic areas, but can also cause explosive outbreaks as seen in Haiti in 2010 or in Yemen, where over 2.2 million cases are suspected since 2016 (2, 3). Although cholera vaccines have reduced disease in some areas, the increasing number of people lacking access to sanitation and safe drinking water, the emergence of a pandemic lineage of *V. cholerae* with increased virulence (4), and environmental persistence of this waterborne pathogen underscore the need to understand and interrupt transmission of this disease.

Cholera epidemiology and evolutionary dynamics have been studied by high-throughput sequencing technologies and new modeling approaches, at a global and local scale (5, 6). Yet, many questions remain regarding asymptomatic carriers of *V. cholerae*, including their role and importance in the transmission chain during an epidemic (7, 8). Numerous observational studies have identified host factors that could impact the severity of symptoms, including lack of pre-existing immunity, blood group O status, age, polymorphisms in genes of the innate immune system, or variation in the gut microbiome (9–13).

Recent studies have shown that despite the acute nature of *V. cholerae* infection, which typically lasts only a few days, genetic diversity can appear and be detected in a *V. cholerae* population infecting individual patients (14, 15). In a previous study, we sampled multiple *V. cholerae* isolates from each of eight patients (five from Bangladesh and three from Haiti) and sequenced 122 bacterial genomes in total. Using stringent controls to guard against sequencing

errors, we detected a few (0-3 per patient) within-patient intra-host single nucleotide variants

(iSNVs), and a greater number of gene content variants (on the order of ~100 gene gain/loss

events within patients) (15). This variation may affect adaptation to the host environment, either

by resistance to phage predation (14) or by impacting biofilm formation (15).

Several pathogens are known to evolve within human hosts (16), and hypermutation has

been observed in some cases due to loss-of-function mutations in the mismatch repair machinery

(17–19). While these hypermutators may quickly acquire adaptive mutations, they also bear a

burden of deleterious mutations (20). For the population to survive the burden of deleterious

mutations, hypermutators may revert to a non-mutator state, or may recombine their adaptive

alleles into the genomes of non-mutators in the population (17, 21). The hypermutator phenotype

has been observed in vibrios in the aquatic environment (22), and induced in *V. cholerae* in an

experimental setting (23), but not clearly documented within infected patients. There is some

evidence for hypermutation in *V. cholerae* clinical strains isolated between 1961 and 1965 (24);

however, the authors recognized that these hypermutators could also have emerged during long-

term culture (25). It therefore remains unclear if hypermutators readily evolve within individual

cholera patients.

When within-patient pathogen populations are studied with culture-based methods, their

diversity may be underestimated because the culture process can select isolates more suited to

growth in culture, and due to undersampling of rare variants (26). In this study, we used a

combination of culture-free metagenomics and WGS of a limited number of cultured isolates to

characterize the within-patient diversity of *V. cholerae* in individuals with different clinical

syndromes ranging from symptomatic to asymptomatic infection. Using both approaches, we

report evidence of *V. cholerae* hypermutators within both symptomatic and asymptomatic

infected patients. These hypermutators are characterized by a high mutation rate, and

accumulation of an excess of likely neutral or deleterious mutations in the genome. Finally, we

provide evidence of adaptive mutations occurring in non-mutator *V. cholerae* infections.

RESULTS

Taxonomic analyses of metagenomics sequences from *Vibrio cholerae* infected index cases and household contacts.

To evaluate the level of within-patient diversity of *Vibrio cholerae* populations infecting symptomatic and asymptomatic patients in a cohort in Dhaka, Bangladesh, we used both culture-based whole genome sequencing and culture-free shotgun metagenomic approaches (Fig. 1). Cholera patients and their household contacts were enrolled, because household contacts of cholera patients are known to be at high risk of *V. cholerae* infection during the week after an index case of cholera occurs in the household (11). Household contact infections are known to exhibit a range of clinical outcomes from asymptomatic to severe symptomatic disease. We enrolled patients from February 2013 to May 2014, and collected demographic information, obtained rectal swabs, immunologic measures, and symptom histories during 30 days of prospective follow-up, as previously described (11–13). We excluded household contacts who reported antibiotic use during the week prior to enrollment.

We performed metagenomic sequencing of 22 samples from 21 index cases and 11 samples from 10 household contacts infected with *Vibrio cholerae,* of which two remained asymptomatic during the 30-day follow-up period (Table S1). After removal of reads mapping to the human genome, we used Kraken2 and MIDAS to taxonomically classify the remaining reads and identify samples with enough *Vibrio cholerae* reads to reconstruct genomes. Among symptomatic patients (index cases and household contacts), 15 samples from 14 patients contained enough reads to reconstruct the *Vibrio cholerae* genome with a mean depth of coverage > 5X. Neither of the two asymptomatic patients had enough *Vibrio cholerae* reads in their metagenomic sequences to reconstruct genomes by mapping or *de novo* assembly (mean

131 coverage depth <0.05X). We also detected reads from two *Vibrio* phages (ICP1 and ICP3) in

132 some of these samples (Table S1).

Recovery of high quality *Vibrio cholerae* MAGs from metagenomic samples

To reconstruct *Vibrio cholerae* metagenomic assembled genomes (MAGs) from the 11

samples with coverage depth > 10X, we *de novo* assembled each sample individually except for

patient E, for whom we co-assembled two samples from two consecutive sampling days. High

quality MAGs identified as *Vibrio cholerae* were obtained from each assembly, with no

redundancy, and completeness ranging from 91 to 100% (Table S2). We dereplicated the set of

bins and removed all but the highest quality genome from each redundant set, identifying the bin

from patient J as the best quality MAG overall, which was used as a *V. cholerae* reference for

read mapping and SNV calling.

Vibrio cholerae within patient nucleotide diversity estimated from metagenomic data

All metagenomes with *Vibrio cholerae* mean coverage depth >5X were mapped against the

dereplicated genome set, and we assessed within-patient genetic diversity using inStrain (27).

This program reconstructs the "strain cloud" of a bacterial population, by mapping metagenomic

reads to metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs) and calculates the allele frequency of each

single nucleotide variant (SNV) in the population. To remove potential false positive SNVs (due

to sequencing errors or mis-mapping of reads belonging to other species) we applied stringent

filtering thresholds (Methods) and identified both single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) that

varied between patients (Table S3), and intra-host single nucleotide variants (iSNVs) that varied

within patients (Table S4). We found a total of 39 SNPs between patients, and a range of two to

207 iSNVs within each patient metagenome (Table 1, Fig. 2). Given the wide variation in

coverage across samples, we checked for any bias toward detecting iSNVs in high-coverage

samples. We observed no correlation between the number of detected iSNVs and depth of

coverage (Fig. S3; $\rho = -0.12$, $P = 0.65$, Pearson correlation), suggesting no coverage bias, and

that diversity levels are comparable across samples.

Several mechanisms could account for the origins of the observed iSNVs, including *de novo*

mutation within a patient, co-infection by divergent *V. cholerae* strains, homologous

recombination, or sequencing errors. Despite stringent filters for iSNV calls in inStrain, some

iSNVs could be false-positives due to sequencing or read mapping errors. In patient E, sampled

on two consecutive days, we detected eight iSNVs on the first day, of which four were again

detected on the second day, along with 13 additional iSNVs. It would be unlikely for random

sequencing errors to occur in the exact same four sites on two consecutive days by chance alone,

therefore these iSNVs are likely true positives. The additional iSNVs detected at only one time

point could be sequencing errors, or could reflect iSNV allele frequency changes over time. In the

analyses that follow, we acknowledge that a subset of iSNVs could be false-positives, but assume

that this source of error is randomly distributed across samples and can thus be accounted for in

statistical tests.

Although it is difficult to distinguish *de novo* mutation from coinfection using metagenomic

data alone, the distribution of iSNV allele frequencies may provide clues. Specifically, under a

standard neutral coalescent model, a single evolving population or strain is expected to generate a

geometric distribution of iSNV frequencies, dominated by a peak of low-frequency mutations. In

contrast, simple mixtures of a few strains (*i.e.* coinfections) will produce distributions with one or

more peaks at intermediate allele frequencies (28). Examining the iSNV frequency distributions

in our data revealed four patients (A, B, H, and L) dominated by a single peak of low-frequency

alleles, and two patients (F and I) with a possible peak at intermediate frequency, consistent with

a mixture of strains at frequencies of roughly 0.15 and 0.85 (Fig. S1). Other patients had

distributions too noisy to interpret, often due to small number of iSNVs. The iSNV frequency

distributions of patients F and I are consistent with coinfection, but could equally be explained by

within-host balancing or negative frequency-dependent selection. Coinfections might be expected

to have lower ratios of nonsynonymous (NS) to synonymous (S) substitutions compared to within

host *de novo* mutations, since NS mutations are more likely to be deleterious and purged over

evolutionary time. However, the NS:S ratios in patients F and I were in the same range as those

observed in patients A, B, H, and L, providing no clear support for the coinfection hypothesis

(Table 1). We therefore cannot exclude coinfection as a source of iSNVs in a minority of

patients, although the evidence remains ambiguous.

Finally, iSNVs could arise via homologous recombination rather than point mutation. iSNVs

were distributed across the genome (Fig. 2A), rather than clustered in hotspots as would be

expected if iSNVs arose from recombination events (29). No iSNVs were observed at the exact

same nucleotide position in different patients, suggesting that iSNVs rarely spread by

homologous recombination, and are never precisely recurrent in our dataset.

Evidence for *V. cholerae* hypermutators within patients

In five of the six patients with a high number of iSNVs (>25), we identified nonsynonymous

(NS) mutations in genes involved in DNA mismatch repair pathways, including the DNA

polymerase II in patient D, or proteins of the methyl-directed mismatch repair (MMR) system in

patient F, I and K (Table 1). We henceforth define these five patients as containing potential

hypermutator lineages of *V. cholerae.* Although the precise functional consequences of these NS

mutations are unknown, they are potential loss-of-function mutations that could plausibly result

in hypermutator phenotypes (17). In the patient harboring the highest number of variants (Patient

F, 207 iSNVs), we detected two NS mutations in two different genes coding for proteins involved

in DNA repair: the DNA mismatch repair endonuclease MutL (17), and the nuclease SbcCD

subunit C (24)(30)(31). Even with such a high number of iSNVs, it is surprising to observe NS

mutations in two DNA repair genes in patient F (133 NS mutations in ~4000 genes; $p = 0.033$ for

a mutation in one gene and $p = 0.0011$ for two genes). In patient I, where we also detected a high

number of iSNVs, a NS mutation in the gene coding for the MutT/nudix protein, involved in the

repair of oxidative DNA damage (32), could also cause a strong hypermutation phenotype.

Patients D, H and K presented fewer iSNVs but also contained NS mutations in genes involved in

DNA damage repair (33–35). However, some of these genes have been shown to play less critical

roles in bacterial DNA repair than MutSLH (17, 36), which could lead to a weaker hypermutator

phenotype.

The patient with the second highest number of iSNVs, patient A, contained a high number of

intergenic variants (87 out of 96 iSNVs, Fig. 2B), but no apparent NS mutations in genes

involved in DNA repair; we therefore did not consider patient A as a hypermutator. This large

number of intergenic iSNVs could be caused by read mapping errors to a distantly related *V.*

cholerae reference genome; however, the same iSNV calls were obtained when using the MAG

from patient A as a reference genome. False iSNVs could also occur due to mismapping of reads

from different species to the *V. cholerae* genome. Although we took measures to exclude such

mismapping by removing reads mapped to 79 representative MAGs in our patient microbiomes,

and by excluding sites with aberrant high or low depth of coverage (Methods), we cannot exclude

the possibility that patient A contained a cryptic member of the gut microbiome that resulted in

mismapping.

Previous studies have noted mutational biases in hypermutators, such as an increase of

transition over transversion mutations in a *Burkholderia dolosa* mutator with a defective MutL

(18), or an excess of G:C→T:A transversions in a *Bacillus anthracis* hypermutator (37), and in

members of the gut microbiome (38). When we compared the spectrum of mutations observed in

suspected hypermutators to non-mutator samples, we found a significance difference (Chi-square

test, P<0.01) due to an apparent excess of G:C→T:A transversions in hypermutators (Fig. 2C;

Fig. S2). While not all NS mutations in DNA repair genes necessarily cause defects, we observed

an increase in transversion mutations concordant with the MMR gene mutated (Fig. S2). For

instance, it has been shown in other bacterial pathogens that mutations in *mutT* and *mutL* lead to a

strong mutator phenotype, increasing the rate of A:T→C:G and G:C →A:T transversions

respectively (34), which we observed in patients (F and I) containing these mutations (Table 1,

Fig. S2). Mutations in *mutM* were also previously associated with G:C →T:A mutations, as

observed in patient K (Fig. S2). More experiments are clearly needed to confirm the phenotypes

of these DNA repair mutants, but our results are largely consistent with known hypermutation

profiles.

Current theory suggests that hypermutators may be adaptive under novel or stressful

environmental conditions because they more rapidly explore the mutational space and are the first

to acquire adaptive mutations. However, hypermutation comes at the cost of the accumulation of

deleterious mutations. To test the hypothesis that hypermutation leads to fitness costs due to these

deleterious mutations, we used iRep (39) to estimate *V. cholerae* replication rates in each sample,

and test whether replication rate was negatively associated with the number of iSNVs. iRep infers

replication rates from MAGs and metagenomic reads (39). For instance, an iRep value of 2 would

indicate that most of the population is replicating one copy of its genome. In our data (Table 1),

iRep values varied from 1.23 (patient E at day 2) to 5.43 (patient D), and we did not find any

association between the replication rate of *Vibrio cholerae* and the number of iSNVs detected

within each subject (Fig. S3, Pearson correlation, $\rho = 0.15$, $P > 0.05$). This suggests that

deleterious mutations in hypermutators could be counterbalanced by adaptive mutations that

maintain growth. Alternatively, higher iRep values could be associated with larger *V. cholerae*

population sizes, which could support greater genetic diversity and yield a positive correlation

between iRep values and the number of iSNVs. These hypotheses merit testing in larger patient

cohorts.

Convergent evolution suggests adaptation of non-mutator *V. cholerae* within patients

While none of the patients shared iSNVs at the exact same nucleotide position, some

contained mutations in the same gene that occurred independently in more than one patient

(Table 2). These are examples of convergent evolution at the gene level. To determine whether

genes that acquired multiple mutations in independent patients could be under convergent

selection within the host, we performed permutation tests for hypermutator and non-mutator

samples separately (Methods). Such a test would identify consistent signatures of either positive

or relaxed purifying selection common to multiple hosts. Among the hypermutator samples, we

identified five genes with NS mutations in two or more patients (Table 2), which was not an

unexpectedly high level of convergence given the large number of mutations in hypermutators

(permutation test, $P=0.97$). That the *P*-value approaches 1 suggests either that the hypermutators

are actually selected against mutating the same genes in different patients, or – more likely – that

the permutation test is conservative. For the samples with no evidence of hypermutator

phenotypes, we identified two genes with NS mutations in two patients. The first gene, *hlyA*,

encodes a hemolysin that causes cytolysis by forming heptameric pores in human cell membranes

(40), while the second gene encodes a putative ABC transporter ferric-binding protein (Table 2).

Observing convergent mutations in two different genes is unexpected (permutation test, P=0.039)

in a test that is likely to be conservative. We also note that the three iSNVs in *hlyA* have

relatively high minor allele frequencies (0.22-0.43) compared to other convergent NS mutations

(median minor allele frequency of 0.11; Table 2) and to NS mutations overall (median of 0.12;

Table S4). Together, these analyses suggest that *V. cholerae* hypermutators produce NS

mutations that are predominantly deleterious or neutral, while evidence for within-patient

positive selection on certain genes in non-mutators merits further investigation.

To further explore differential selection at the protein level within and between patients,

we applied the McDonald-Kreitman test (41) to the 9 patients with no evidence for

hypermutation, and to the five patients harboring potential hypermutators. Based on whole-

genome sequences of *V. cholerae* isolates, we previously found an excess of NS mutations fixed

between patients in Bangladesh, based on a small sample of five patients (15). Here, based on

metagenomes from a larger number of patients, we found the opposite pattern of a slight excess

of NS mutations segregating as iSNVs within patients, consistent with slightly deleterious

mutations occurring within patients and purged over evolutionary time. However, the difference

between NS:S ratios within and between patients was not statistically significant (Fisher's exact

test, P>0.05; Table S5); thus, the evidence for differential selective pressures within versus

between cholera patients remains inconclusive.

Many NS mutations occurred in genes involved in transmembrane transport,

pathogenesis, response to antibiotics, secretion systems, chemotaxis, and metabolic processes

(Fig. S4). Both hypermutator samples (Fig. S4B) and non-mutators (Fig. S4C) have a high NS:S

ratio in genes of unknown function, while hypermutators have many NS mutations in

transmembrane proteins, which are absent in non-mutators. However, non-mutator samples have

more NS mutations in genes involved in pathogenesis and secretion systems. Most of the NS

mutations involved in pathogenesis were found in the gene *hlyA* (a target of convergent

evolution, mentioned above).

Evidence for a hypermutator from isolate whole-genome sequencing

In addition to metagenomic analyses, we performed whole genome sequencing of

multiple *Vibrio cholerae* clinical isolates from index cases and asymptomatic contacts (Fig. 1A)

from three households (56, 57, and 58, Table S1). As noted above, asymptomatic infected

contacts did not yield sufficient metagenomic reads to assemble the *V. cholerae* genome or call

iSNVs, but their stool cultures yielded colonies for whole-genome sequencing. The first

asymptomatic contact, 58.01, tested positive for *Vibrio cholerae* on day 4 after the presentation of

the index case to the hospital, and *Vibrio cholerae* was cultured from the stool on days 4, 6, 7 and

8. We sequenced five isolates respectively from day 4 and 6 samples, and four isolates from each

of the subsequent days. For households 56 and 57, five isolates were sequenced from each

sample, at day 1 for the index cases and day 2 for the asymptomatic carriers (Table S6).

The index case from household 58 (called 58.00 or patient N) was also included in the

metagenomic analysis described above, allowing a comparison between culture-dependent and -

independent assessments of within-patient diversity. We did not detect any iSNVs among the five

isolates sequenced from patient 58.00. In contrast, the metagenomic analysis of patient N

revealed seven iSNVs (Table 1), suggesting a potentially higher sensitivity for the detection of

rare variants, or possibly false-positive iSNVs inferred from metageomic reading mapping

compared to isolate sequencing. Distinguishing between these possibilities would require

sequencing a much larger number of colonies, which is beyond the scope of the current study.

In contrast to metagenomes consisting of many unlinked reads, whole-genome sequencing

allows the reconstruction of a phylogeny describing the evolution of *V. cholerae* within and

between patients based on SNVs in the core genome (Fig. 3). As described previously (6),

isolates from members of the same household tended to cluster together. In index case 57.00, all

isolates were identical in terms of SNVs, with the exception of one isolate that was identical to

the five isolates sequenced from the asymptomatic contact from the same household, patient

57.01 (Table 3, Fig. 3). In the inferred phylogeny, isolates from the contact 57.01 are ancestral,

and the more common genotype in the index case 57.00 has one additional derived mutation. This

shared ancestral genotype between the two individuals was unexpected, and could suggest a

potential transmission event from the asymptomatic contact to the index case, followed by a

mutational event and the spreading of the new variant in the index case. The only mutation found

in four of the five isolates from the index case was a non-synonymous mutation in a gene coding

for a cyclic-di-GMP-modulating response regulator, which could have an impact on the

regulation of biofilm formation in the host (42). However, the direction of transmission (from

contact to index case) is only supported by one mutation, and therefore remains uncertain. The

genomes from household 57 are also similar or identical to genomes from household 56,

suggesting further caution in inferring transmission chains. Among the other index cases, we

found no iSNVs in patient 58.00 and two iSNVs in patient 56.00. One isolate from this patient

had a synonymous mutation in a hypothetical protein, and another isolate had a non-synonymous

mutation in a UDP-N-acetylglucosamine 4,6-dehydratase gene (Table 3). We detected iSNVs in

the other asymptomatic contacts, with one synonymous and one intergenic mutation in contact

58.02, and one non-synonymous mutation in one isolate from contact 56.01 (Table 3, Fig. 3).

Notably, we also found evidence for a hypermutator in contact 58.01. One isolate sampled

from this contact had the highest number of mutations seen in any branch in the phylogeny (five

NS mutations, all G:C→T:A transversions) which could be explained by a NS mutation in the

gene encoding MutS, another key component of the methyl-directed mismatch repair (MMR)

system (Table 3, Fig. 3). The mutation in this gene could explain the accumulation of a surprising

number of mutations in this isolate, which is likely a hypermutator with a characteristic

transversion bias. This contact contained no SNVs among the isolates sampled on days 4 and 6,

and we found this likely hypermutator isolate on day 7. However, the hypermutator was not

observed again at day eight, either due to the lower resolution in the detection of variants with the

WGS of cultured isolates, or the disappearance of this mutant from the population.

Pan-genome analyses

Whole-genome isolate sequencing also provides the opportunity to study variation in

gene content (the pangenome) within and between patients. We identified a total of 3478 core

genes common to all *V. cholerae* genomes, and 106 flexible genes present in some but not all

genomes (Fig. 3; Table S7). We also found an additional 251 genes present uniquely in isolate

56.00C4, assembled into one single contig identified as the genome of the lytic Vibrio phage

ICP1, which was assembled alongside the *Vibrio cholerae* genome. This phage contig contained

the ICP1 CRISPR/Cas system, which consists of two CRISPR loci (designated CR1 and CR2)

and six *cas* genes, as previously described (43, 44). These genes were excluded from subsequent

V. cholerae pan genome analyses.

Among the 106 flexible genes, some varied in presence/absence within a patient, ranging

from 36 to 88 genes gained or lost per patient (Table S7; Fig. 3). The majority of these flexible

genes (75%) were annotated as hypothetical, and several were transposases or prophage genes. A

large deletion of 24 genes was detected in patient 58.00, in an 18kb phage-inducible

chromosomal island (PICI) previously shown to prevent phage reproduction, and which is

targeted by the ICP1 CRISPR/Cas system (44). These PICI-like elements are induced during

phage infection, and interfere with phage reproduction via multiple mechanisms (45, 46). The

deletion of this PICI element in the *V. cholerae* genome may be a consequence of an ongoing

evolutionary arms race between *V. cholerae* and its phages.

DISCUSSION

Although within-patient *Vibrio cholerae* genetic diversity has been reported previously

(14, 15, 47, 48), our results confirmed that within-patient diversity is a common feature observed

in both symptomatic patients with cholera but also in a small sample of asymptomatically

infected individuals. In this study, we used a combination of metagenomic and WGS sequencing

technologies to characterize this within-patient diversity, revealing evidence for hypermutator

phenotypes in both symptomatic and asymptomatic infections.

In our previous study, we detected between zero and three iSNVs in cultured isolates

from patients with acute infection (15). In contrast, metagenomic analyses allowed us to detect

two iSNVs in the patient with the lowest level of diversity, but up to 207 iSNVs in another

individual (Table 1). In the only patient for which we were able to characterize *Vibrio cholerae*

intra-host diversity both from the metagenome and from cultured isolates, we did not identify any

iSNVs among five sequenced isolates, but detected 7 iSNVs from the metagenomic analyses.

This is could be due to false-positive iSNV calls inferred from metagenomes, but could also

represent a higher sensitivity to identify rare mutations (49). Our previous phylogenetic analysis

of *V. cholerae* isolate genomes also concluded that within-patient mutation was a more likely

source of variation than coinfection with multiple strains of *V. cholerae* (15). Although neither

isolate WGS or metagenomic analysis can fully exclude the possibility of coinfection (especially

involving very closely related strains), neither our earlier nor our present study provides strong

evidence for coinfection.

Despite its potential sensitivity to detect rare variants (26), metagenomics has limitations.

As already mentioned, some of the iSNVs inferred from metagenomes could be false-positives,

and this deserves further benchmarking. Within-sample diversity profiles cannot be established

for low-abundance microbes with insufficient sequence coverage (< 5X) and depth, and this level

of coverage is difficult to obtain in diverse microbial communities. In this study, only 48% of the

samples from patients with acute symptoms, known to harbor a high fraction of vibrios in their

stool (10^{10}-10^{12} vibrios per liter of stool), contained enough reads to reconstruct *Vibrio cholerae*

MAGs and to quantify within-patient diversity. Asymptomatic patients typically shed even less

V. cholerae in their stool (50), making it even more challenging to assemble their genomes using

metagenomics without depletion of host DNA or targeted sequence capture techniques (51, 52).

Hypermutation is defined as an excess of mutations due to deficiency in DNA mismatch

repair, and hypermutator strains have been described in diverse pathogenic infections and *in vivo*

experiments, including *Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Haemophilus influenzae* and *Streptococcus*

pneumoniae in cystic fibrosis patients, or *E. coli* in diverse habitats (17, 34, 53). In *Vibrio*

cholerae, a previous study of 260 clinical isolate genomes identified 17 isolates with an unusually

high number of SNPs uniformly distributed along the genome (24). Most of these genomes

contained mutations in one or more of four genes (*mutS, mutH, mutL* and *uvrD*) that play key

roles in DNA mismatch repair (24). These authors cautiously suggested that this apparent high

frequency of hypermutators could be associated with the rapid spread of the seventh cholera

pandemic, particularly because hypermutators may be a sign of population bottlenecks and recent

selective pressure. However, they also hypothesized that these high mutation rates could be

artefactual because the *V. cholerae* isolates had been maintained in stab cultures for many years.

It thus remains unclear if a hypermutator phenotype was derived within patients or during culture

(24, 25). Using our metagenomic approach, we provide evidence that hypermutators can indeed

emerge during infection, because DNA was extracted directly from patient samples without a

culture step in which mutations could have occurred during DNA replication. Using culture-

based WGS, using only a brief overnight culture, we report further evidence that hypermutators

occur in asymptomatic patients as well. An alternative explanation would be that hypermutators

evolved very recently prior to infection – a possibility which is difficult to exclude or test. Even if

the number of iSNVs is somewhat inflated by metagenomic sequencing, the concordance of

known DNA repair mutations with a transversion-skewed mutation profile is consistent with

current knowledge of hypermutation, and not easily explained by sequencing errors alone. Future

work will be required to determine any impacts of hypermutation on cholera disease severity or

transmission.

Hypermutator phenotypes are believed to be advantageous for the colonization of new

environments or hosts, allowing the hypermutator bacteria to generate adaptive mutations more

quickly, which leads to the more efficient exploitation of resources or increased resistance to

environmental stressful conditions, such as antibiotics (17, 20, 34, 53). However, this high

mutation rate can have a negative impact on fitness on the long term, with most of the mutations

being neutral or deleterious (20, 22, 54). A mouse model study showed that hypermutation can be

an adaptive strategy for *V. cholerae* to resist host-produced reactive oxygen induced stress, and

lead to a colonization advantage by increased catalase production and increased biofilm

formation (23). In our study of convergent evolution, we found no evidence for adaptive

mutations in the hypermutators. This could be because the signal from a small number of

adaptive mutations are obscured by overwhelming noise from a large number of neutral or

deleterious mutations. Further work is therefore needed to determine if *V. cholerae* mutators

produce adaptive mutations during human infection.

In contrast, we did find evidence for an excess of convergent mutations occurring

independently in the same genes in different patients, suggesting parallel adaptation in non-

mutator *V. cholerae* infections. Specifically, two patients contained mutations in the same

hemolysin gene, *hlyA*, which codes for a toxin that has both vacuolating and cytocidal activities

against a number of cell lines, including human intestinal cells (55), and is known to be an

important virulence factor in *Vibrio cholerae* El Tor O1 and a major target of immune responses

during acute infection (56, 57). Previous studies of within-patient *V. cholerae* evolution did not

identify mutations in *hlyA*, and instead identified different mutations possibly under selection for

biofilm formation (15) or phage resistance phenotypes (14). This lack of concordance could be

explained by relatively modest sample sizes of cholera patients in these studies, but could also

suggest that selective pressures may be idiosyncratic and person-specific across *Vibrio cholerae*

infections.

In conclusion, our results illustrate the potential and limitations of metagenomics as a

culture-independent approach for the characterization of within-host pathogen diversity. We also

provide evidence that hypermutators emerge within human *V. cholerae* infection, and their

evolutionary dynamics and relevance to disease progression merits further study.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample collection, clinical outcomes and metagenomic sequencing

To study within-host diversity of *V. cholerae* during infection, we used stool and rectal swab

samples collected from cholera patients admitted to the icddr,b (International Center for Diarrheal

Disease Research, Bangladesh) Dhaka Hospital, and from their household contacts, as previously

described (12). Patients present to the icddr,b year-round with cholera, and cases peak during

biannual floods (58, 59). Index cases were defined as patients presenting to the hospital with

severe acute diarrhea and a stool culture positive for *V. cholerae*. Individuals who shared the

same cooking pot with an index patient for three or more days are considered household contacts

and were enrolled within 6 hours of the presentation of the index patient to the hospital. Rectal

swabs were collected each day during a ten-day follow up period after presentation of the index

case. Household contacts underwent daily clinical assessment of symptoms and collection of

blood for serological testing. Contacts were determined to be infected if any rectal swab culture

was positive for *V. cholerae* or if the contact developed diarrhea and a 4-fold increase in

vibriocidal titer during the follow-up period (10, 11). If they developed watery diarrhea during

the follow up period, contacts with positive rectal swabs were categorized as symptomatic and

those without diarrhea were considered asymptomatic. We excluded patients with age below two

and above 60 years old, or with major comorbid conditions (10, 11).

Fecal samples and rectal swabs from the day of infection and follow up timepoints were

collected and immediately placed on ice after collection and stored at -80°C until DNA

extraction. DNA extraction was performed with the PowerSoil DNA extraction kits (Qiagen)

after pre-heating to 65°C for 10 min and to 95°C for 10 min. Sequencing libraries were

constructed for 33 samples from 31 patients, for which we obtained enough DNA. We used the

NEBNext Ultra II DNA library prep kit and sequenced the libraries on the Illumina HiSeq 2500

(paired-end 125 bp) and the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 S4 (paired-end 150 bp) platforms at the

Genome Québec sequencing platform (McGill University).

Metagenomic analyses

Sequence preprocessing and assembly

Sequencing fastq files were quality checked with FastQC

(https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/). We removed human and technical

contaminant DNA by aligning reads to the PhiX genome and the human genome (hg19) with

Bowtie2 (60) , and used the iu-filter-quality-minoche script of the illumina-utils program with

default parameters to filter the reads (61).

Taxonomic assignment

Processed paired-end metagenomics sequences were classified using two taxonomic

profilers: Kraken2 v.2.0.8_beta (a k-mer matching algorithm) (62) and MIDAS v.1.3.0 (a read

mapping algorithm) (63). Kraken 2 examines the k-mers within a query sequence and uses the

information within those k-mers to query a database, then maps k-mers to the lowest common

ancestor (LCA) of all genomes known to contain a given k-mer. Kraken2 was run against a

reference database containing all RefSeq viral, bacterial and archaeal genomes (built in May

2019), with default parameters. MIDAS uses a panel of 15 single-copy marker genes present in

all of ~31,000 bacterial species included in its database to perform taxonomic classification, and

maps metagenomic reads to this database to estimate the read depth and relative abundance of

5,952 bacterial species. We identified metagenomic samples containing *V. cholerae* and

vibriophage reads, and computed the mean depth of coverage (number of reads per base-pair) of

the *V. cholerae* pangenome in the MIDAS database (Table 1).

Assembly and binning of Vibrio cholerae genomes

To recover good quality metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs) of *V. cholerae,* we

selected metagenomic samples with coverage >10X against the *V. cholerae* pangenome in the

MIDAS database, and used MEGAHIT v.1.2.9 (64) to perform *de novo* assembly. For 9 of the 11

selected samples, we independently assembled the genome of each sample, and co-assembled the

two remaining samples, which belong to the same patient (a symptomatic infected contact on

days 9 and 10). Contigs of <1.5 kb were discarded.

We extracted MAGs by binning of our metagenomic assemblies. Because no single

binning approach is superior in every case, with performance of the algorithms varying across

samples, we used different binning tools to recover MAGs. The quality of a metagenomic bin is

evaluated by its completeness (the level of coverage of a population genome), and the

contamination level (the amount of sequence that does not belong to this population from another

genome). These metrics can be estimated by counting the frequency of single-copy marker genes

within each bin (65). We inferred bins using CONCOCT v.1.1.0 (66), MaxBin 2 v.2.2.7 (67) and

MetaBAT 2 v.2.12.1 (68), with default parameters. We then used DAS_Tool v.1.1.1 on the

results of these three methods, to select a single set of non-redundant, high-quality bins per

sample (69). DAS_Tool is a bin consolidation tool, which predicts single-copy genes in all the

provided bin sets, aggregates bins from the different binning predictions, and extracts a more

complete consensus bin from each aggregate such that the resulting bin has the most single-copy

genes while having a reasonably low number of duplicate genes (69). We then used Anvi'o v.6.1

(70) to manually refine the bins with contamination higher than 10% and Centrifuge v.1.0.4_beta

(71) to determine the taxonomy of all bins in each sample, in order to identify *V. cholerae*

MAGs.

Bins with completeness > 60% and contamination <10% were first selected, and those

assigned to *V. cholerae* were further filtered (completeness > 90% and contamination <1% for

the *V. cholerae* bins). We dereplicated the entire set of bins with dRep v.2.2.3 using a minimum

completeness of 60%, the ANImf algorithm, 99% secondary clustering threshold, maximum

contamination of 10%, and 25% minimum coverage overlap, and obtained 79 MAGs displaying

the best quality and representing individual metagenomic species (MGS).

539   *Detection of Vibrio cholerae genetic diversity within and between metagenomic samples*

We created a bowtie2 index of the 79 representative genomes from the dereplicated set,

including a single high-quality *Vibrio cholerae* MAG, and mapped reads from each sample to this

set. By including many diverse microbial genomes in the bowtie2 index, we aimed to avoid the

mismapping of reads from other species to the *V. cholerae* genome, and to reduce potential false

positive intra-host single nucleotide variant (iSNV) calls. As recommended, we used *Vibrio*

cholerae MAGs from the samples we under study rather than a genetically distant reference, as

read mapping to the most closely-related genome available is expected to reduce the rate of false

positive iSNV calls (72). We mapped the metagenomics reads of each sample with a *V. cholerae*

coverage value >5X (obtained with MIDAS) against the set of 79 MAGs, using Bowtie2 (60)

with the --very-sensitive parameters. We also used Prodigal (73) on the concatenated MAGs, in

order to predict open reading frames using default metagenomic settings.

We then used inStrain on the 15 selected samples

(https://instrain.readthedocs.io/en/latest/index.html). This program aims to identify and compare

the genetic heterogeneity of microbial populations within and between metagenomic samples

(27). "InStrain profile" was run on the mapping results, with the minimum percent identity of

read pairs to consensus set to 99%, minimum depth of coverage to call a variant of 5X, and

minimum allele frequency to confirm a SNV equal to 0.05. All non-paired reads were filtered

out, as well as reads with an identity value below 0.99. Coverage and breadth of coverage

(percentage of reference base pairs covered by at least one read) were computed for each

genome. InStrain identified both bialllelic and multiallelic SNV frequencies at positions where

phred30 quality filtered reads differ from the reference genome and at positions where multiple

bases were simultaneously detected at levels above the expected sequencing error rate. SNVs

were classified as non-synonymous, synonymous, or intergenic based on gene annotations, and

gene functions were recovered from the Uniprot database (74) and BLAST (75). Then, similar

filters to those described in (28) were applied to the detected SNVs. We excluded from the

analysis positions with very low or high coverage value D compared to the median coverage $\overline{D}$,

and positions within 100 bp of contig extremities. As sites with very low coverage could result

from a bias in sequencing or library preparation, and sites with higher coverage could arise from

mapping error or be the result of repetitive region or multi-copy genes not well assembled, we

masked sites in all the samples if D was $< 0.3\overline{D}$ and if D was $> 3\overline{D}$ in at least two samples.

Mutation spectrum of hypermutator and non-mutator samples

For each sample, iSNVs were categorized into six mutation types based on the chemical

nature of the nucleotide changes (transitions or transversions). We combined all the samples with

hypermutators and compared them to the mutation spectrum of the non-mutators. The mutation

spectrum was significantly different between the hypermutator samples and the non-

hypermutator samples (Chi-square test, P<0.01). We then computed the mutation mean and

standard error of each of the six mutation types and compared the two groups (Fig. 2C).

Bacterial replication rate estimation

Replication rates were estimated with the metric iRep (index of replication), which is

based on the measurement of the rate of the decrease in average sequence coverage from the

origin to the terminus of replication. iRep values (39) were calculated by mapping the sequencing

reads of each sample to the *V. cholerae* MAG assembled from that sample.

Tests for natural selection

First, we identified signals of convergent evolution in the form of nonsynonymous iSNVs

occurring independently in the same gene in multiple patients. To assess the significance of

convergent mutations, we compared their observed frequencies to expected frequencies in a

simple permutations model. We ran separate permutations for non-mutators (two genes with

convergent mutations in at least two out of eight non-mutator samples, including only one time

point from the patient sampled twice, and excluding the outlier patient A with a large number of

intergenic iSNVs) and possible hypermutators (five genes with convergent mutations in at least

two out of five possible hypermutator samples). In each permutation, we randomized the

locations of the nonsynonymous mutations, preserving the observed number of nonsynonymous

mutations in each sample, and the observed distribution of gene lengths. For simplicity, we

assumed that 2/3 of nucleotide sites in coding regions were nonsynonymous. We repeated the

permutations 1000 times and estimated a *P*-value as the fraction of permutations yielding greater

than or equal to the observed number of genes mutated in two or more samples.

Second, we compared natural selection at the protein level within versus between patients,

using the McDonald-Kreitman test (41). We again considered hypermutators separately. Briefly,

the four counts (Pn, Ps, Dn, Ds) of between-patient divergence (D) vs. within-patient

polymorphism (P), and non-synonymous (n) vs synonymous (s) mutations were computed and

tested for neutrality using a Fisher's exact test (FDR corrected *P*-values < 0.05).

Whole genome sequencing analyses

Culture of Vibrio cholerae isolates

We selected three of the households with asymptomatic infected contacts (households 56,

57, and 58) for within-patient diversity analysis using multiple *V. cholerae* colonies per

individual. Each index case was sampled on the day of presentation to the icddr,b, and

asymptomatic contacts positive for *V. cholerae* were sampled on the following day, except for

one contact (household 58, contact 02). This individual was only positive on day 4 following

presentation of the index case, and we collected samples and cultured isolates from day 4 to day

8. Stool samples collected from three index cases and their respective infected contacts were

streaked onto thiosulfate-citrate-bile salts-sucrose agar (TCBS), a medium selective for *V.*

cholerae. After overnight incubation, individual colonies were inoculated into 5 ml Luria-Bertani

broth and grown at 37 °C overnight. For each colony, 1 ml of broth culture was stored at −80 °C

with 30% glycerol until DNA extraction. We used the Qiagen DNeasy Blood and Tissue kit,

using 1.5 ml bacteria grown in LB media, to extract the genomic DNA. In order to obtain pure

gDNA templates, we performed a RNase treatment followed by a purification with the MoBio

PowerClean Pro DNA Clean-Up Kit.

Whole genome sequencing and preprocessing

We prepared 48 sequencing libraries using the NEBNext Ultra II DNA library prep kit

(New England Biolabs) and sequenced them on the Illumina HiSeq 2500 (paired-end 125 bp)

platform at the Genome Québec sequencing platform (McGill University). Sequencing fastq files

were quality checked with FastQC, and Kraken2 was used to test for potential contamination with

other bacterial species (62).

Variant calling and phylogeny

We mapped the reads for each sample to the MJ-1236 reference genome and called single

nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs, fixed within patients) and single nucleotide variants (SNVs,

variable within patients) using Snippy v.4.6.0 (76), with default parameters. A concatenated

alignment of these core variants was generated, and an unrooted phylogenic tree was inferred

using maximum parsimony (MP) in MEGA X (77). The percentage of replicate trees in which the

associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test (1000 replicates) are shown next to the

branches. The MP tree was obtained using the Subtree-Pruning-Regrafting (SPR) algorithm with

search level 1 in which the initial trees were obtained by the random addition of sequences (10

replicates).

De novo assembly and pan genome analyses

We *de novo* assembled genomes from each isolate using SPAdes v.3.14 on the short reads, with

default parameters (78) and used Prokka v1.14.6 (79) to annotate them. We constructed a pan-

genome from the resulting annotated assemblies combining Roary v.3.13.0 (80) and GenAPI

(81), identifying genes present in all isolates (core genome) and genes only present in some

isolates (flexible genome). The flexible genome and the phylogenetic tree were visualized with

Phandango v.1.1.0 (82).

DATA AVAILABILITY

All metagenomic sequence data are available in NCBI GenBank under BioProject

PRJNA668607, and isolate genome sequences under BioProject PRJNA668606.

651
652

FUNDING INFORMATION

This study was supported by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Operating Grant to BJS, the icddr,b Centre for Health and Population Research, grants AI103055 (J.B.H and F.Q), AI106878 (E.T.R and F.Q.), AI058935 (E.T.R, S.B.C and F.Q.), T32A1070611976 and K08AI123494 (A.A.W.), and Emerging Global Fellowship Award TW010362 (T.R.B.), from the National Institutes of Health, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Harold Amos Medical Faculty Development Program (R.C.C.).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the people of Dhaka where our study was undertaken; to the field, laboratory and data management staff who provided a tremendous effort to make the study successful; and to the people who provided valuable support in our study. The icddr,b gratefully acknowledges the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh; Global Affairs Canada (GAC); Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Department for International Development, (UKAid). We declare that we have no competing financial interest.

ETHICAL STATEMENT

The Ethical and Research Review Committees of the icddr,b and the Institutional Review Board of MGH reviewed the study. All adult subjects provided informed consent and parents/guardians of children provided informed consent. Informed consent was written.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

678 **FIGURES AND TABLES**

679
Figure 1. Summary of the culture-dependent and the culture-free metagenomics workflows

for the characterization of the *Vibrio cholerae* within-patient diversity. Stool or rectal swab

samples were collected from symptomatic and asymptomatic *Vibrio cholerae* infected individuals

and processed using two different approaches: (A) Culture, DNA extraction and whole genome

sequencing of multiple isolates per patient; (B) Genome-resolved metagenomics involves DNA

extraction directly from a microbiome sample followed by sequencing, assembly, genome

binning and dereplication to generate metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs), and within-host

diversity profiling by mapping reads back to the MAGs.

Figure 2. Within-patient *Vibrio cholerae* diversity quantified from metagenomic data. (A) Minor allele frequency and distribution of intergenic, synonymous and non-synonymous iSNVs across the two *Vibrio cholerae* chromosomes for 14 patients with over 5X coverage of the *V. cholerae* genome. (B) Numbers of intergenic, synonymous and non-synonymous iSNVs for each patient. (C) Spectrum of within-patient mutations in hypermutators compared to non-mutators.

694 Error bars represent standard error of the mean. Only samples with 6 or more iSNVs were
695 included to reduce noise from low counts.
696

Figure 3. Phylogeny and pan-genome of 48 *Vibrio cholerae* isolates from index cases and

their asymptomatic contacts. The phylogeny was inferred using Maximum Parsimony. The

percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test

(1000 replicates) are shown next to the branches. Filled circles represent isolates from index

cases and empty circles represent isolates from their asymptomatic contacts. The heatmap of gene

presence-absence is based on 106 genes in the flexible genome. Colored blocks in the heatmap

indicate gene presence; white indicates gene absence. Each row corresponds to an isolate from

the phylogenetic tree and each column represents an orthologous gene family. Each unique color

represents a different individual. Different contigs are represented as alternating blocks of black

and light grey.

Patient	Total number of iSNVs	Number of non-synonymous iSNVs	Number of synonymous iSNVs	Number of intergenic iSNVs	Mean coverage	iRep value	DNA repair and proofreading genes with NS mutation
Patient A	93	6	0	87	451.3X	3.34	-
Patient B	18	7	5	6	111.4X	1.7	-
Patient C	6	0	1	5	111.8X	1.7	-
Patient D	41	22	9	10	10X	5.43	DNA polymerase II
Patient E day 1	8	2	1	5	351X	3.25	-
Patient E day 2	21	7	1	13	258X	1.23	-
Patient F	207	133	47	27	18.2X	2.48	DNA mismatch repair endonuclease MutL Nuclease SbcCD subunit C
Patient G	16	12	3	1	7.7X	1.73	-
Patient H	32	21	11	0	98.5X	4.75	Excinuclease ABC subunit UvrB
Patient I	75	55	20	0	13X	2.79	MutT/nudix family protein
Patient J	6	1	0	5	424.6X	1.84	-
Patient K	25	13	6	6	18X	1.69	Formamidopyrimidine-DNA glycosylase mutM
Patient L	13	9	1	3	164.4X	2.67	-
Patient M	2	0	1	1	113X	2.65	-
Patient N	7	2	1	3	6.7X	2.27	-

707   **Table 1. Within-patient *Vibrio cholerae* diversity profiles from 15 metagenomes.** Mutations

708   segregating within patients are denoted iSNVs. The number of iSNVs and mean coverage values

709   were computed with InStrain (27) and replication rate with iRep (39).

Protein (Uniprot ID)	Patient A	Patient B	Patient D	Patient E	Patient F	Patient H	Patient I	Patient K
Hemolysin (VC cytolysin) (P09545)	NS (0.22)	-	-	3 NS (0.22-0.43)	-	-	-	-
2-aminoethylphosphonate ABC transporter ferric-binding protein (Q9KLY8)	-	NS (0.05)	-	NS (0.05)	-	-	-	-
Peptidase B (Q9KTX5)	-	-	NS (0.33)	-	-	-	NS (0.09)	-
Nuclease SbcCD subunit C (Q9KM67)	-	-	S (0.28)	-	NS (0.09)	-	-	-
C4-dicarboxylate transport sensor protein (Q9KN25)	-	-	-	-	NS (0.08)	-	NS (0.11)	-
zinc/cadmium/mercury/lead-transporting ATPase (Q9KT72)	-	-	-	-	NS (0.08)	-	-	NS (0.06)
hypothetical protein (A0A0H3AI44)	-	-	-	-	NS (0.14)	-	-	NS (0.14)
hypothetical protein (Q9KLL1)	-	-	-	-	NS (0.33)	NS (0.11)	-	-
Formamidopyrimidine-DNA glycosylase mutM (C3LQI3)	-	-	-	-	S (0.18)	-	-	NS (0.08)
Phosphoribosylformylglycinamidine synthase (Q9KTN2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	NS (0.06)	S (0.08)

Table 2. Set of genes with convergent mutations identified in more than one patient. The

presence of a synonymous or non-synonymous iSNV in each gene and each patient is indicated

with S or NS, respectively, and the minor allele frequency is shown in parentheses. None of the

mutations were found at the same nucleotide or codon position. Patients containing likely

hypermutators are underlined. Only genes and patients containing more than one mutated gene

are shown.

Type	Isolates	Mutation type	Nucleotide position in MJ-1236	Ref. nucleotide	Alt. nucleotide	Gene annotation	Metagenomic samples with same variant
iSNV	58.01d7C1	NS	Chr1,53054	G	A	DNA mismatch repair protein MutS	-
SNP	Households 56 and 57	S	Chr1, 198988	G	A	MSHA biogenesis protein MshQ	-
iSNV	58.01d7C1	NS	Chr1, 209665	G	A	MSHA biogenesis protein MshN	-
iSNV	56.00C4	NS	Chr1,374172	C	T	UDP-N-acetylglucosamine 4,6-dehydratase	-
SNP	Household 58	NS	Chr1,410638	G	A	Phosphopantetheine adenylyltransferase	Patients M, N
SNP	Households 56 and 57	NS	Chr1,754154	C	T	1,4-dihydroxy-2-naphthoate polyprenyltransferase	-
SNP	Household 58	S	Chr1,841538	C	T	SSU ribosomal protein S4p	Patients L, M, N
SNP	Household 58	S	Chr1,1315021	T	G	Exported zinc metalloprotease YfgC precursor	Patients L, M, N
iSNV	58.02C1	S	Chr1,1576083	C	A	Periplasmic thiol:disulfide oxidoreductase DsbB	-
SNP	Patient 58.00	NS	Chr1,1689779	A	C	Sigma-54 dependent transcriptional regulator	-
SNP	Contacts 58.01 and 58.02	NS	Chr1,2301641	G	A	Putative membrane protein	-
iSNV	58.01d7C1	NS	Chr1,1744854	C	T	Hypothetical protein	-
SNP	Contacts 58.01 and 58.02	NS	Chr1,2262202	A	G	Serine transporter	-
SNP	Households 56 and 57	NS	Chr1,2301641	C	T	LacI family DNA-binding transcriptional regulator	Patients D, J, K
iSNV	57.00C5	NS	Chr1,2509468	C	T	cyclic-di-GMP-modulating response regulator	-
iSNV	56.01C1	NS	Chr1,2588496	C	T	Amidophosphoribosyltransferase	-
iSNV	58.01d7C1	NS	Chr1,2693815	C	T	PTS system, trehalose-specific IIB component	-
SNP	Household 58	NS	Chr1,2806858	A	T	Citrate lyase alpha chain	Patients L, M, N
iSNV	56.00C1	S	Chr1,3037471	A	G	Hypothetical protein	-
SNP	Patient 58.00	NS	Chr1,3059131	C	T	DNA polymerase V (UmuC)	-
SNP	Households 56 and 57	NS	Chr1,3095039	G	A	Outer membrane protein OmpU	Patients D, F, G, I ,J, K
SNP	Contacts 58.01 and 58.02	S	Chr1,3105102	C	T	Glutamate-1-semialdehyde aminotransferase	-
iSNV	58.01d7C1	NS	Chr1,528409	C	T	Vibriolysin, extracellular zinc protease	-

Table 3. Nucleotide changes identified in core genes of the *V. cholerae* isolates from index

cases (56.00, 57.00 and 58.00) and their asymptomatic contacts. Genome position is according

to the MJ-1236 reference genome (CP001485.1, CP001486.1). Mutations segregating within

patients are denoted iSNVs; mutations fixed between patients are denoted SNP. Patient allele

frequency shows the allele frequency of the alternative (minor) allele. Ref=Reference allele;

Alt=Alternative allele. NS=non-synonymous; S=synonymous. Chr1=chromosome 1;

Chr2=chromosome

Figure S1. Minor allele frequency distributions for iSNVs in 15 metagenomic samples.

Allele frequencies and mean coverage values (cov) were computed with Instrain (27)

733 **Figure S2.** Spectrum of within-patient mutation (iSNVs) in patients with potential hypermutators

734 (orange; bottom two rows) compared to others (blue; top three rows). Only samples with 6 or

735 more iSNVs were included to reduce noise from low counts.

737
738
739 **Figure S3. iSNVs numbers are not linked to average depth of read coverage (A) or**
740 **replication rate (B).** Patients with strong potential hypermutation phenotypes are represented in
741 red, weak hypermutation phenotypes in orange, and other samples in yellow.

743
744 **Figure S4. Functional categories of genes containing within-patient variants (iSNVs).** The
745 total number of synonymous and non-synonymous iSNVs in different functional categories was
746 represented for all patients (A), for the 5 patients with hypermutation phenotypes (B), and for the
747 9 patients without hypermutation phenotypes (C). Categories are ranked in descending order of
748 the number of non-synonymous iSNVs.

REFERENCES

1. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. 2015. Updated Global Burden of Cholera in Endemic Countries. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 9:e0003832.

2. Weil AA, Ivers LC, Harris JB. 2011. Cholera: Lessons from Haiti and Beyond. Current Infectious Disease Reports 14:1–8.

3. Camacho A, Bouhenia M, Alyusfi R, Alkohlani A, Naji MAM, de Radiguès X, Abubakar AM, Almoalmi A, Seguin C, Sagrado MJ, Poncin M, McRae M, Musoke M, Rakesh A, Porten K, Haskew C, Atkins KE, Eggo RM, Azman AS, Broekhuijsen M, Saatcioglu MA, Pezzoli L, Quilici M-L, Al-Mesbahy AR, Zagaria N, Luquero FJ. 2018. Cholera epidemic in Yemen, 2016–18: an analysis of surveillance data. The Lancet Global Health 6:e680–e690.

4. Satchell KJF, Jones CJ, Wong J, Queen J, Agarwal S, Yildiz FH. 2016. Phenotypic Analysis Reveals that the 2010 Haiti Cholera Epidemic Is Linked to a Hypervirulent Strain. Infection and Immunity 84:2473–2481.

5. Weil AA, Ryan ET. 2018. Cholera: recent updates. Current Opinion in Infectious Diseases 31:455–461.

6. Domman D, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Dorman MJ, Mutreja A, Uddin MI, Paul A, Begum YA, Charles RC, Calderwood SB, Bhuiyan TR, Harris JB, LaRocque RC, Ryan ET, Qadri F, Thomson NR. 2018. Defining endemic cholera at three levels of spatiotemporal resolution within Bangladesh. 7. Nature Genetics 50:951–955.

7. King AA, Ionides EL, Pascual M, Bouma MJ. 2008. Inapparent infections and cholera

dynamics. 7206. Nature 454:877–880.

8. Phelps MD, Simonsen L, Jensen PKM. 2019. Individual and household exposures

associated with cholera transmission in case–control studies: a systematic review. Tropical

Medicine & International Health 24:1151–1168.

9. Harris JB, Khan AI, LaRocque RC, Dorer DJ, Chowdhury F, Faruque ASG, Sack DA, Ryan

ET, Qadri F, Calderwood SB. 2005. Blood Group, Immunity, and Risk of Infection with

Vibrio cholerae in an Area of Endemicity. Infection and Immunity 73:7422–7427.

10. Harris JB, LaRocque RC, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Logvinenko T, Faruque ASG, Ryan ET,

Qadri F, Calderwood SB. 2008. Susceptibility to *Vibrio cholerae* Infection in a Cohort of

Household Contacts of Patients with Cholera in Bangladesh. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 2.

11. Weil AA, Khan AI, Chowdhury F, LaRocque RC, Faruque ASG, Ryan ET, Calderwood SB,

Qadri F, Harris JB. 2009. Clinical Outcomes in Household Contacts of Patients with

Cholera in Bangladesh. Clin Infect Dis 49:1473–1479.

12. Midani FS, Weil AA, Chowdhury F, Begum YA, Khan AI, Debela MD, Durand HK, Reese

AT, Nimmagadda SN, Silverman JD, Ellis CN, Ryan ET, Calderwood SB, Harris JB, Qadri

F, David LA, LaRocque RC. 2018. Human Gut Microbiota Predicts Susceptibility to *Vibrio

cholerae* Infection. J Infect Dis 218:645–653.

13. Levade I, Saber MM, Midani FS, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Begum YA, Ryan ET, David LA,

Calderwood SB, Harris JB, LaRocque RC, Qadri F, Shapiro BJ, Weil AA. 2021. Predicting

Vibrio cholerae Infection and Disease Severity Using Metagenomics in a Prospective

Cohort Study. The Journal of Infectious Diseases 223:342–351.

14.   Seed KD, Yen M, Shapiro BJ, Hilaire IJ, Charles RC, Teng JE, Ivers LC, Boncy J, Harris

JB, Camilli A. 2014. Evolutionary consequences of intra-patient phage predation on

microbial populations. eLife 3:e03497.

15.   Levade I, Terrat Y, Leducq J-B, Weil AA, Mayo-Smith LM, Chowdhury F, Khan AI,

Boncy J, Buteau J, Ivers LC, Ryan ET, Charles RC, Calderwood SB, Qadri F, Harris JB,

LaRocque RC, Shapiro BJ. 2017. *Vibrio cholerae* genomic diversity within and between

patients. Microb Genom 3.

16.   Didelot X, Walker AS, Peto TE, Crook DW, Wilson DJ. 2016. Within-host evolution of

bacterial pathogens. Nature Publishing Group 14:150–162.

17.   Jolivet-Gougeon A, Kovacs B, Le Gall-David S, Le Bars H, Bousarghin L, Bonnaure-Mallet

M, Lobel B, Guillé F, Soussy C-J, Tenke P. 2011. Bacterial hypermutation: clinical

implications. Journal of Medical Microbiology, 60:563–573.

18.   Lieberman TD, Flett KB, Yelin I, Martin TR, McAdam AJ, Priebe GP, Kishony R. 2013.

Genetic variation of a bacterial pathogen within individuals with cystic fibrosis provides a

record of selective pressures. Nature Genetics 46:82–87.

19.   Marvig RL, Johansen HK, Molin S, Jelsbak L. 2013. Genome Analysis of a Transmissible

Lineage of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Reveals Pathoadaptive Mutations and Distinct

Evolutionary Paths of Hypermutators. PLOS Genetics 9:e1003741.

20. Giraud A, Matic I, Tenaillon O, Clara A, Radman M, Fons M, Taddei F. 2001. Costs and

Benefits of High Mutation Rates: Adaptive Evolution of Bacteria in the Mouse Gut. Science

291:2606–2608.

21. Denamur E, Lecointre G, Darlu P, Tenaillon O, Acquaviva C, Sayada C, Sunjevaric I,

Rothstein R, Elion J, Taddei F, Radman M, Matic I. 2000. Evolutionary Implications of the

Frequent Horizontal Transfer of Mismatch Repair Genes. Cell 103:711–721.

22. Chu ND, Clarke SA, Timberlake S, Polz MF, Grossman AD, Alm EJ. 2017. A Mobile

Element in mutS Drives Hypermutation in a Marine Vibrio. mBio 8.

23. Wang H, Xing X, Wang J, Pang B, Liu M, Larios-Valencia J, Liu T, Liu G, Xie S, Hao G,

Liu Z, Kan B, Zhu J. 2018. Hypermutation-induced in vivo oxidative stress resistance

enhances *Vibrio cholerae* host adaptation. PLOS Pathogens 14:e1007413.

24. Didelot X, Pang B, Zhou Z, McCann A, Ni P, Li D, Achtman M, Kan B. 2015. The Role of

China in the Global Spread of the Current Cholera Pandemic. PLOS Genetics 11:e1005072.

25. Eisenstark A. 2010. Genetic Diversity among Offspring from Archived *Salmonella enterica*

ssp. enterica Serovar Typhimurium (Demerec Collection): In Search of Survival Strategies.

Annu Rev Microbiol 64:277–292.

26. Anyansi C, Straub TJ, Manson AL, Earl AM, Abeel T. 2020. Computational Methods for

Strain-Level Microbial Detection in Colony and Metagenome Sequencing Data. Front

Microbiol 11.

27. Olm MR, Crits-Christoph A, Bouma-Gregson K, Firek BA, Morowitz MJ, Banfield JF.

2021. inStrain profiles population microdiversity from metagenomic data and sensitively

detects shared microbial strains. Nature Biotechnology 1–10.

28. Garud NR, Good BH, Hallatschek O, Pollard KS. 2019. Evolutionary dynamics of bacteria

in the gut microbiome within and across hosts. PLOS Biology 17:e3000102.

29. Croucher NJ, Harris SR, Fraser C, Quail MA, Burton J, Linden M van der, McGee L,

Gottberg A von, Song JH, Ko KS, Pichon B, Baker S, Parry CM, Lambertsen LM, Shahinas

D, Pillai DR, Mitchell TJ, Dougan G, Tomasz A, Klugman KP, Parkhill J, Hanage WP,

Bentley SD. 2011. Rapid Pneumococcal Evolution in Response to Clinical Interventions.

Science 331:430–434.

30. Lovett ST. 2011. The DNA exonucleases of Escherichia coli. EcoSal Plus 4.

31. Darmon E, Lopez-Vernaza MA, Helness AC, Borking A, Wilson E, Thacker Z, Wardrope

L, Leach DRF. 2007. SbcCD Regulation and Localization in *Escherichia coli*. Journal of

Bacteriology 189:6686–6694.

32. Lu A-L, Li X, Gu Y, Wright PM, Chang D-Y. 2001. Repair of oxidative DNA damage. Cell

Biochem Biophys 35:141–170.

33. Foster PL, Gudmundsson G, Trimarchi JM, Cai H, Goodman MF. 1995. Proofreading-

defective DNA polymerase II increases adaptive mutation in Escherichia coli. PNAS

92:7951–7955.

34. Oliver A, Mena A. 2010. Bacterial hypermutation in cystic fibrosis, not only for antibiotic

resistance. Clinical Microbiology and Infection 16:798–808.

35.   Lee S-J, Sung R-J, Verdine GL. 2019. Mechanism of DNA Lesion Homing and Recognition

by the Uvr Nucleotide Excision Repair System. Research. Research article.

36.   Kunkel TA, Erie DA. 2005. Dna mismatch repair. Annu Rev Biochem 74:681–710.

37.   Zeibell K, Aguila S, Shi VY, Chan A, Yang H, Miller JH. 2007. Mutagenesis and Repair in

Bacillus anthracis: the Effect of Mutators. Journal of Bacteriology 189:2331–2338.

38.   Zhao S, Lieberman TD, Poyet M, Kauffman KM, Gibbons SM, Groussin M, Xavier RJ,

Alm EJ. 2019. Adaptive Evolution within Gut Microbiomes of Healthy People. Cell Host &

Microbe 25:656-667.e8.

39.   Brown CT, Olm MR, Thomas BC, Banfield JF. 2016. Measurement of bacterial replication

rates in microbial communities. 12. Nature Biotechnology 34:1256–1263.

40.   Olson R, Gouaux E. 2005. Crystal Structure of the *Vibrio cholerae* Cytolysin (VCC) Pro-

toxin and its Assembly into a Heptameric Transmembrane Pore. Journal of Molecular

Biology 350:997–1016.

41.   McDonald JH, Kreitman M. 1991. Adaptive protein evolution at the Adh locus in

Drosophila. Nature 351:652–654.

42.   Tischler AD, Camilli A. 2004. Cyclic diguanylate (c-di-GMP) regulates *Vibrio cholerae*

biofilm formation. Mol Microbiol 53:857–869.

43.   Seed KD, Bodi KL, Kropinski AM, Ackermann H-W, Calderwood SB, Qadri F, Camilli A.

2011. Evidence of a Dominant Lineage of *Vibrio cholerae*-Specific Lytic Bacteriophages

Shed by Cholera Patients over a 10-Year Period in Dhaka, Bangladesh. mBio 2.

44.   Seed KD, Lazinski DW, Calderwood SB, Camilli A. 2013. A bacteriophage encodes its own
CRISPR/Cas adaptive response to evade host innate immunity. 7438. Nature 494:489–491.

45.   Ram G, Chen J, Kumar K, Ross HF, Ubeda C, Damle PK, Lane KD, Penadés JR, Christie
GE, Novick RP. 2012. Staphylococcal pathogenicity island interference with helper phage
reproduction is a paradigm of molecular parasitism. PNAS 109:16300–16305.

46.   O'Hara BJ, Barth ZK, McKitterick AC, Seed KD. 2017. A highly specific phage defense
system is a conserved feature of the *Vibrio cholerae* mobilome. PLOS Genetics
13:e1006838.

47.   Seed KD, Faruque SM, Mekalanos JJ, Calderwood SB, Qadri F, Camilli A. 2012. Phase
Variable O Antigen Biosynthetic Genes Control Expression of the Major Protective Antigen
and Bacteriophage Receptor in *Vibrio cholerae* O1. PLoS Pathogens 8:e1002917.

48.   Kendall EA, Chowdhury F, Begum Y, Khan AI, Li S, Thierer JH, Bailey J, Kreisel K,
Tacket CO, LaRocque RC, Harris JB, Ryan ET, Qadri F, Calderwood SB, Stine OC. 2010.
Relatedness of *Vibrio cholerae* O1/O139 isolates from patients and their household
contacts, determined by multilocus variable-number tandem-repeat analysis. Journal of
Bacteriology 192:4367–4376.

49.   Brenzinger S, van der Aart LT, van Wezel GP, Lacroix J-M, Glatter T, Briegel A. 2019.
Structural and Proteomic Changes in Viable but Non-culturable *Vibrio cholerae*. Front
Microbiol 10.

50.   Nelson EJ, Harris JB, Glenn Morris J, Calderwood SB, Camilli A. 2009. Cholera

903   transmission: the host, pathogen and bacteriophage dynamic. Nature Reviews Microbiology

904   7:693–702.

905   51.   Bachmann NL, Rockett RJ, Timms VJ, Sintchenko V. 2018. Advances in Clinical Sample

906   Preparation for Identification and Characterization of Bacterial Pathogens Using

907   Metagenomics. Front Public Health 6.

908   52.   Vezzulli L, Grande C, Tassistro G, Brettar I, Höfle MG, Pereira RPA, Mushi D, Pallavicini

909   A, Vassallo P, Pruzzo C. 2017. Whole-Genome Enrichment Provides Deep Insights into

910   *Vibrio cholerae* Metagenome from an African River. Microb Ecol 73:734–738.

911   53.   Labat F, Pradillon O, Garry L, Peuchmaur M, Fantin B, Denamur E. 2005. Mutator

912   phenotype confers advantage in *Escherichia coli* chronic urinary tract infection

913   pathogenesis. FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol 44:317–321.

914   54.   Funchain P, Yeung A, Stewart JL, Lin R, Slupska MM, Miller JH. 2000. The Consequences

915   of Growth of a Mutator Strain of *Escherichia coli* as Measured by Loss of Function Among

916   Multiple Gene Targets and Loss of Fitness. Genetics 154:959–970.

917   55.   Tsou AM, Zhu J. 2010. Quorum Sensing Negatively Regulates Hemolysin Transcriptionally

918   and Posttranslationally in *Vibrio cholerae*. Infection and Immunity 78:461–467.

919   56.   Olivier V, Haines GK, Tan Y, Satchell KJF. 2007. Hemolysin and the Multifunctional

920   Autoprocessing RTX Toxin Are Virulence Factors during Intestinal Infection of Mice with

921   *Vibrio cholerae* El Tor O1 Strains. Infection and Immunity 75:5035–5042.

922   57.   Weil AA, Arifuzzaman M, Bhuiyan TR, LaRocque RC, Harris AM, Kendall EA, Hossain

923   A, Tarique AA, Sheikh A, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Murshed F, Parker KC, Banerjee KK,

924   Ryan ET, Harris JB, Qadri F, Calderwood SB. 2009. Memory T-Cell Responses to *Vibrio*

925   *cholerae* O1 Infection. Infection and Immunity 77:5090–5096.

926   58.   Ferdous F, Ahmed S, Farzana FD, Das J, Malek MA, Das SK, Salam MA, Faruque ASG.

927   2015. Aetiologies of diarrhoea in adults from urban and rural treatment facilities in

928   Bangladesh. Epidemiology & Infection 143:1377–1387.

929   59.   Azman AS, Lauer SA, Bhuiyan TR, Luquero FJ, Leung DT, Hegde ST, Harris JB, Paul KK,

930   Khaton F, Ferdous J, Lessler J, Salje H, Qadri F, Gurley ES. 2020. *Vibrio cholerae* O1

931   transmission in Bangladesh: insights from a nationally representative serosurvey. Lancet

932   Microbe 1:e336–e343.

933   60.   Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nature

934   Methods 9:357–359.

935   61.   Eren AM, Vineis JH, Morrison HG, Sogin ML. 2013. A Filtering Method to Generate High

936   Quality Short Reads Using Illumina Paired-End Technology. PLOS ONE 8:e66643.

937   62.   Wood DE, Lu J, Langmead B. 2019. Improved metagenomic analysis with Kraken 2.

938   Genome Biol 20:257.

939   63.   Nayfach S, Rodriguez-Mueller B, Garud N, Pollard KS. 2016. An integrated metagenomics

940   pipeline for strain profiling reveals novel patterns of bacterial transmission and

941   biogeography. Genome Res 26:1612–1625.

64. Li D, Luo R, Liu C-M, Leung C-M, Ting H-F, Sadakane K, Yamashita H, Lam T-W. 2016.

MEGAHIT v1.0: A fast and scalable metagenome assembler driven by advanced

methodologies and community practices. Methods (San Diego, Calif) 102:3–11.

65. Parks DH, Imelfort M, Skennerton CT, Hugenholtz P, Tyson GW. 2015. CheckM: assessing

the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and metagenomes.

Genome Res 25:1043–1055.

66. Alneberg J, Bjarnason BS, de Bruijn I, Schirmer M, Quick J, Ijaz UZ, Lahti L, Loman NJ,

Andersson AF, Quince C. 2014. Binning metagenomic contigs by coverage and

composition. Nature Methods 11:1144–1146.

67. Wu Y-W, Simmons BA, Singer SW. 2016. MaxBin 2.0: an automated binning algorithm to

recover genomes from multiple metagenomic datasets. Bioinformatics 32:605–607.

68. Kang D, Li F, Kirton ES, Thomas A, Egan RS, An H, Wang Z. 2019. MetaBAT 2: an

adaptive binning algorithm for robust and efficient genome reconstruction from

metagenome assemblies. preprint, PeerJ Preprints.

69. Sieber CMK, Probst AJ, Sharrar A, Thomas BC, Hess M, Tringe SG, Banfield JF. 2018.

Recovery of genomes from metagenomes via a dereplication, aggregation and scoring

strategy. 7. Nature Microbiology 3:836–843.

70. Eren AM, Esen ÖC, Quince C, Vineis JH, Morrison HG, Sogin ML, Delmont TO. 2015.

Anvi'o: an advanced analysis and visualization platform for 'omics data. PeerJ 3:e1319.

71. Kim D, Song L, Breitwieser FP, Salzberg SL. 2016. Centrifuge: rapid and sensitive

classification of metagenomic sequences. Genome Research 26:1721–1729.

72.   Bush SJ, Foster D, Eyre DW, Clark EL, De Maio N, Shaw LP, Stoesser N, Peto TEA,

964   Crook DW, Walker AS. 2020. Genomic diversity affects the accuracy of bacterial single-

965   nucleotide polymorphism–calling pipelines. Gigascience 9.

966   73.   Hyatt D, Chen G-L, LoCascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. 2010. Prodigal:

967   prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC

968   Bioinformatics 11:119.

969   74.   The UniProt Consortium. 2019. UniProt: a worldwide hub of protein knowledge. Nucleic

970   Acids Res 47:D506–D515.

971   75.   Madden T. 2003. The BLAST Sequence Analysis ToolThe NCBI Handbook [Internet].

972   National Center for Biotechnology Information (US).

973   76.   Seemann T. 2015. Snippy: fast bacterial variant calling from NGS reads.

974   77.   Stecher G, Tamura K, Kumar S. 2020. Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis (MEGA)

975   for macOS. Mol Biol Evol 37:1237–1239.

976   78.   Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Dvorkin M, Kulikov AS, Lesin VM,

977   Nikolenko SI, Pham S, Prjibelski AD, Pyshkin AV, Sirotkin AV, Vyahhi N, Tesler G,

978   Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA. 2012. SPAdes: A New Genome Assembly Algorithm and Its

979   Applications to Single-Cell Sequencing. Journal of Computational Biology 19:455–477.

980   79.   Seemann T. 2014. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics (Oxford,

981   England) 30:2068–2069.

982   80.   Page AJ, Cummins CA, Hunt M, Wong VK, Reuter S, Holden MTG, Fookes M, Falush D,

983   Keane JA, Parkhill J. 2015. Roary: rapid large-scale prokaryote pan genome analysis.

984   Bioinformatics 31:3691–3693.

985   81.   Gabrielaite M, Marvig RL. 2020. GenAPI: a tool for gene absence-presence identification in

986   fragmented bacterial genome sequences. BMC Bioinformatics 21:320.

987   82.   Hadfield J, Croucher NJ, Goater RJ, Abudahab K, Aanensen DM, Harris SR. 2018.

988   Phandango: an interactive viewer for bacterial population genomics. Bioinformatics

989   34:292–293.

990
991