Modular evolution of secretion systems and virulence plasmids in a bacterial

species complex

Running Title: **Modular evolution of *Agrobacterium* genomes**

Lin Chou[1#], Yu-Chen Lin[1#], Mindia Haryono[1], Mary Nia M. Santos[1,2,3], Shu-Ting Cho[1],

Alexandra J. Weisberg[4], Chih-Feng Wu[1,4], Jeff H. Chang[4], Erh-Min Lai[1,2,5], Chih-Horng

Kuo[1,2,5]*

[1] Institute of Plant and Microbial Biology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan

[2] Molecular and Biological Agricultural Sciences Program, Taiwan International

Graduate Program, National Chung Hsing University and Academia Sinica, Taipei,

Taiwan

[3] Graduate Institute of Biotechnology, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung,

Taiwan

[4] Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Oregon State University, Corvallis,

Oregon, USA

[5] Biotechnology Center, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan

[#]Equal contribution; ordered alphabetically

*Correspondence: Chih-Horng Kuo, chk@gate.sinica.edu.tw

Abstract

<u>Background</u>

Many bacterial taxa are species complexes and uncertainties regarding the

organization of their genetic diversity challenge research efforts. We utilized

Agrobacterium tumefaciens, a taxon known for its phytopathogenicity and applications

in transformation, as a study system and devised strategies for investigating genome

diversity and evolution of species complexes.

<u>Results</u>

We utilized 35 genome assemblies to achieve a comprehensive and balanced

sampling of *A. tumefaciens*. Our confident inference of gene content and core-genome

phylogeny supported a quantitative guideline for delineating 12 species and allowed for

robust investigations of genes critical in fitness and ecology. For the type VI secretion

system (T6SS) involved in interbacterial competition and thought to be conserved, we

detected multiple losses and one horizontal gene transfer. For the tumor-inducing

plasmids (pTi) and pTi-encoded type IV secretion system (T4SS) that are essential for

agrobacterial phytopathogenicity, we uncovered novel diversity and hypothesized their

involvement in shaping this species complex. Intriguingly, for both T6SS and T4SS,

genes encoding structural components are highly conserved, whereas extensive

diversity exists for genes encoding effectors and other proteins.

<u>Conclusions</u>

We demonstrated that the combination of a phylogeny-guided sampling scheme

and an emphasis on high-quality assemblies provides a cost-effective approach for

robust analysis in evolutionary genomics. Our strategies for multi-level investigations at

scales that range from whole-genomes to intragenic domains and phylogenetic depths

of between- and within-species are applicable to other bacteria. Finally, modularity

observed in the molecular evolution of genes and domains is useful for inferring

functional constraints and informing experimental works.

Keywords

Agrobacterium, genome, secretion system, virulence, plasmid, molecular

evolution

Background

Investigation of species boundaries in bacteria is fundamentally important because species are the key identifiers for biological entities [1,2]. However, many bacterial groups are currently unresolved and are classified as species complexes. These uncertainties regarding species boundaries hamper research, communication, and policy-making such as in healthcare guidelines, pathogen quarantine regulations, and biological resource management. Based on barriers to homologous recombination, an analysis of > 20,000 bacterial genome sequences from 91 species belonging to 13 phyla found that 21 of the previously recognized species comprise multiple biological species [3]. These 21 groups include those that are important as pathogens (e.g., *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa,* and *Vibrio cholerae*) or beneficial microbes (e.g., *Lactobacillus casei* and *Sinorhizobium meliloti*). This finding highlights the ubiquity of species complexes across bacterial lineages, even for those that are extensively studied.

For such complexes, comprehensive understanding of the genetic diversity organization is required for robust species delineation, which in turn is essential for providing a reliable framework to interpretate experimental findings and to gain insights into the biology. The use of genomic information has long been suggested as a powerful approach for defining species boundaries because the comprehensive genetic information can provide definitive and potentially quantitative guidelines [4]. However, several issues regarding genomic studies of bacterial species have remained unresolved. First, while genomospecies defined by overall genome divergence were suggested to represent distinct biological entities [5–9], the exact criteria for establishing

the species boundaries are disputed. Although 95% average nucleotide identity (ANI)

across the conserved parts of genomes was proposed as a universal boundary for

defining species in bacteria [10], this criterion was challenged [11]. Additionally, ANI

values alone do not provide information such as gene content or phylogenetic

relationships, which are critical in understanding biological entities [4]. Second,

phylogenetic relationships among closely related bacterial strains often cannot be

resolved with confidence, yet such information is fundamental for evolutionary analysis.

Third, comparative genomics studies are often limited by taxon sampling and/or

assembly quality of available genome sequences.

In this study, we utilized the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* species complex, also

known as *Agrobacterium* biovar 1 [12], as the study system for developing strategies

that provide appropriate sampling and utilize multifaceted genomic analysis to resolve

species boundaries and to investigate molecular evolution of key traits. These bacteria

are known as the causative agents of crown gall disease that affects over 90 plant

families [13]. More importantly, the development of *Agrobacterium*-mediated

transformation has provided a critical tool for genetic manipulation in plant sciences and

agricultural biotechnology [14,15]. Due to their importance, this complex has been

studied for over a century and was found to harbor extensive phenotypic and genetic

diversity that continues to confound efforts to resolve their taxonomy [12–14]. Various

methods, such as DNA-DNA hybridization, biochemical characteristics, and molecular

markers have been used to define 10 genomospecies (i.e., G1-G9 and G13), which

have continually been associated to new nomenclature, a process that causes greater

confusion than resolution [5,6,16–18]. For example, the reference strain C58 used in

104 many *A. tumefaciens* studies [15,19,20] belongs to G8, which was renamed as

105 *Agrobacterium fabrum* in 2011 [21]. This has resulted in mixed usage of two names with

106 different meanings (i.e., *A. tumefaciens* for the entire complex and *A. fabrum* for G8) in

107 databases and literature. Compounding confusion, the name *Agrobacterium radiobacter*

108 refers to *A. tumefaciens* G4 [18,21], the entire *A. tumefaciens* complex [22], and the

109 more divergent *Agrobacterium* biovar 2 [23]. Hereafter, we use *A. tumefaciens* in

110 reference to the entire species complex and specific designations (i.e., G1-G9 and G13)

111 for genomospecies.

112  Previous characterizations found that *A. tumefaciens* strains have multipartite

113 genomes with one circular chromosome, one linear chromosome, and highly variable

114 plasmids [9,23–25]. Consistent with the high levels of genetic divergence inferred from

115 DNA-DNA hybridization [5], cross-genomospecies comparisons typically found that <

116 80% of the genes are conserved [7,26]. Strikingly, > 32,000 horizontal gene transfer

117 (HGT) events have been inferred to have shaped the evolutionary history of *A.*

118 *tumefaciens* [8]. Because the HGT patterns indicated co-transfers of genes that encode

119 coherent biochemical pathways, it was hypothesized that purifying selection on those

120 acquired gene clusters and overall gene content drove the ecological diversification

121 among genomospecies [8]. Moreover, the oncogenic plasmids that determine

122 *Agrobacterium* phytopathogenicity exhibit complex modularity and transmission

123 patterns, which further contributed to the diversification of these pathogens and their

124 global spread [9]. However, despite the progresses, those better-characterized

125 genomospecies (e.g., G1, G4, G7, and G8) and pathogenic strains were highly

overrepresented in previous genomics studies [7–9], and such biases may affect our

understanding of agrobacterial diversity and evolution.

To develop effective strategies for investigating bacterial species complexes

such as *A. tumefaciens*, we started by performing targeted genome sequencing for

strains in underrepresented lineages to achieve a comprehensive and balanced taxon

sampling of the study system. We also limited analyses to only high-quality assemblies,

which enabled detailed examinations of replicon-level synteny and confident inferences

of gene presence/absence. The global view of genomic diversity and resolved

phylogeny provided a robust framework for focused investigations of the genetic

elements involved in key aspects of agrobacterial fitness and ecology, namely the type

VI secretion system (T6SS) for interbacterial competition [7,27] and the virulence

plasmids for phytopathogenicity [13–15]. Taken together, the investigations, scaling

from whole-genome, whole-replicon, gene clusters, individual genes, and intragenic

protein domains, provided novel and detailed information on the evolution and genetic

diversity of bacteria important in plant pathology and biotechnology. Moreover, the

strategies developed in this work are applicable to the study of other bacterial species

complexes.

Results

Genome Sampling, Molecular Phylogeny, and Divergence

Based on existing knowledge of *A. tumefaciens* diversity [5,6,16–18] and

availability of genomics resources [7–9], we identified 12 strains that represent the six

poorly characterized genomospecies and two strains from the sister lineage

Agrobacterium larrymoorei to provide an ideal outgroup (Table 1). Whole-genome

sequencing with substantial efforts in iterative improvements of the assemblies based

on experimental and bioinformatic approaches were conducted for these 14 strains.

Additionally, we conducted multiple rounds of preliminary genome-scale phylogenetic

analysis to select 21 representatives from 98 *A. tumefaciens* genome assemblies

available from GenBank [28] (Table 1) to yield a dataset with maximal genetic diversity

without emphasis on including pathogenic strains. To ensure balanced sampling, we

selected between two and five strains for each of the 10 recognized *A. tumefaciens*

genomospecies. Importantly, 19 of these 35 assemblies, including nine produced in this

study, are complete and most others are nearly complete (i.e., average N50 = 1.3 Mb;

cf. the two chromosomes are ~2.9 and ~2.3 Mb, respectively).

Based on the comprehensive sampling of *A. tumefaciens* diversity, we identified

a core genome of 2,093 single-copy genes, which correspond to ~40% of the genes

annotated in each individual genome sequence. Compared to previous studies that

conducted genome-based phylogenetic analysis for *Agrobacterium* or higher taxonomic

ranks [8,9,29], the more focused sampling in this study yielded a higher core gene count

by one-to-two orders of magnitude. This increase in core gene count and the

improvement in taxon sampling allowed for the inference of a well-resolved maximum

likelihood phylogeny of the *A. tumefaciens* species complex (Figure 1A). Each of the 10

currently recognized genomospecies forms a distinct monophyletic clade with > 80%

bootstrap support. Additionally, we identified two novel genomospecies, G14 and G15,

each represented by a single strain. The pattern of overall genome similarities exhibits a

discrete multimodal distribution that supports use of a 95% ANI cutoff for delineating

bacterial species [10] and quantifies the divergence of the *A. tumefaciens* complex from

its most closely related sister lineage (Figure 1B).

The 12 *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies were classified into seven groups based

on 90% ANI, and further assigned to three supergroups according to the phylogeny

(Figure 1A). Based on a time-calibrated phylogeny [9], the most recent common

ancestor (MRCA) of *A. tumefaciens* emerged ~48 million years ago (Mya), the three

supergroups emerged ~40 Mya, the seven groups emerged ~30 Mya, and most of the

recognized genomospecies emerged ~2-10 Mya. The inferred rapid radiation in the

early history of *A. tumefaciens* likely prevented confident resolution of those deeper

relationships in previous studies [8,9,29]. Nevertheless, with improvements in the taxon

sampling of this work, we observed ~70% bootstrap support for those early nodes

(Figure 1A). This fully-resolved organismal tree provides a strong framework for our

downstream examination of gene and domain phylogenies.

The high levels of assembly completeness provided confident inference of gene

content comparisons. The principal coordinate analysis and hierarchical clustering

results indicated that all 12 *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies are similar to one another

while distinct from *A. larrymoorei* (Supplementary Figure S1A and S1C). Nonetheless,

with the exception of G4 and G7, these genomospecies are distinguishable based on

gene content (Supplementary Figure S1B and S1D). This finding suggests that despite

the extensive HGT inferred within this complex [8], the genomospecies defined by 95%

ANI likely represent distinct biological entities.

Diversity and Evolution of the T6SS Genes

The fully-resolved organismal phylogeny and confidence in gene content

inference, particularly for the cases of gene absence, provide a robust framework for

evolutionary analysis of key traits. We first focus on genes encoding the T6SS, a phage

tail-like contractile nanomachine commonly found in Proteobacteria and used to inject

effectors into eukaryotic or bacterial cells. The T6SS has major roles in pathogenesis,

symbiosis, and interbacterial competition [30–33]. For *A. tumefaciens*, the T6SS is a key

weapon for *in planta* competition between different genomospecies [7] and against

other bacteria [27]. Thus, investigating the diversity and evolution of T6SS genes may

shed light on a trait that influences the ecology and evolution of *A. tumefaciens*.

In a previous study that examined four *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies, T6SS-

mediated anti-bacterial activity was observed for all 11 strains sampled and thought to

be a conserved trait of this species complex [7]. To our surprise, among the 33 *A.*

tumefaciens strains examined in this work, a patchy distribution of the T6SS genes was

observed (Figure 1). Gene absences are in strains corresponding to previously under-

characterized genomospecies and were confirmed by examining syntenic regions and

using TBLASTN [34] to search entire genome sequences. For strains encoding a T6SS,

corresponding genes are consistently located on the linear chromosome and mostly

form a cluster of ~20 genes organized as two adjacent and oppositely oriented *imp* and

hcp operons [7,35] (Figure 2). Some strains harbor accessary loci containing *vgrG*

(involved in effector delivery) and other T6SS genes located elsewhere on the linear

chromosome [7,33,35] (Supplementary Figure S2). The T6SS gene phylogeny is largely

congruent with the species tree (Figure 2). One notable exception is that the MRCA of

G1 appears to have acquired the T6SS genes from a G8-related donor. Consistent with

this inference, the T6SS genes in G1 strains are located in a different chromosomal

location compared to strains of other genomospecies (Supplementary Figure S2).

Based on these observations, it is likely that a T6SS gene cluster was present in the

MRCA of G8-G6-G14-G2-G4-G7-G9-G3-G15 and at least two independent losses have

occurred in G6 and G14-G2. Regarding the ancestral state in the MRCA of the *A.*

tumefaciens complex, presence of the T6SS genes appears to be a more parsimonious

hypothesis based on the presence of these genes in the outgroup (Figure 2). However,

the lack of synteny conservation between the linear chromosomes of *A. tumefaciens*

and *A. larrymoorei* and the variable locations of *vgrG* homologs (Supplementary Figure

S2) suggest that multiple independent origins are also possible. For broader scales, the

T6SS genes have a patchy distribution among Rhizobiaceae [33,36], indicating that

these genes are not essential for these bacteria and have high rates of gains and

losses. Consistent with this, multiple pseudogenes confirmed by manual curation of

annotation were found (e.g., *tssH* in S56 and *tssA*/*vgrG* in ATCC31749) (Figure 2),

suggesting that for some strains these gene clusters are in the process of degradation

and will be eventually lost.

Examining synteny revealed that the *imp* operon, which encodes the majority of

T6SS structural components [37], is more conserved in gene composition and order

than the *hcp* operon, which often has different genes downstream of *vgrG* (Figure 2).

This genetic diversity may play a key role in interbacterial competition because genes

downstream of *vgrG* include those that encode effector and immunity (EI) protein pairs

[7]. The agrobacterial T6SS effectors often correspond to different toxins and the

240 cognate immunity proteins provide protection against self-intoxication [7,27,33,36]. The

241 rapid evolution of EI gene pairs is illustrated by three examples. First, despite the low

242 levels of sequence divergence among G1 strains (i.e., > 98% ANI in all pairwise

243 comparisons), different genes are found downstream of their *vgrG* homologs and this

244 variation is not consistent with either the species phylogeny or the T6SS core gene

245 phylogeny. Second, strain CFBP4996 of G7 has homologs of the same EI gene pair as

246 strains 12D1 and 183 of G4, rather than with other members of G7. Third, in both G3

247 strains, *vgrG* and the associated EI genes are located elsewhere on the linear

248 chromosome, rather than being a part of the *hcp* operon (Figure 2 and Supplementary

249 Figure S2). These results suggest that recombination involving gene modules has

250 contributed to the genetic diversity of these *A. tumefaciens* T6SS EI gene pairs.

252 <u>Modularity of VgrG and Its Associated EI Pairs</u>

253   The knowledge that *vgrG* homologs encode proteins with distinct C-terminal

254 domains responsible for binding specificities of different T6SS effectors for delivery

255 suggested that each *vgrG* homolog and its downstream EI gene pair may evolve as a

256 functional module [33,36]. Here, we sought to investigate the patterns of gene co-

257 occurrence and intra-module recombination to better understand the diversity and

258 evolution of these genes. For in-depth investigation of *vgrG* evolution, we began by

259 examining domain architecture of VgrG proteins and uncovered eight distinct domains

260 (Supplementary Figure S3). Based on differences in domain composition, the 44 *vgrG*

261 homologs, including 17 associated with the main T6SS gene cluster and 27 associated

262 with accessory loci, were classified into six major types and nine subtypes (Figure 3).

Only three of the domains are present in all VgrG variants. The N-terminal domain 1 is

the most conserved (Supplementary Figure S3) and the only one found in databases.

This domain corresponds to TIGR03361, which accounts for ~66-77% of the protein

length and the bulk of the structures that forms a trimeric complex analogous to a phage

tail spike [38,39] (Supplementary Figure S4). For domain 5 that was found in all *vgrG*

homologs belonging to subtypes A1-A3 and E1 (Figure 3), the presence of this domain

is perfectly correlated with the presence of a downstream DUF4123-domain-containing

gene (Figure 4). Because this DUF4123 domain acts as an adaptor/chaperone for

effector loading onto VgrG in *A. tumefaciens* [36] and *Vibrio cholerae* [40,41], this strong

co-occurrence suggests specific interactions between VgrG domain 5 and DUF4123.

Thus, combining domain analysis with gene co-occurrence provides a new strategy for

predicting the interacting domains of VgrG with other T6SS components.

Intriguingly, despite conservation of domain architecture within each subtype

(Figure 3), the phylogenies inferred from the three domains encoded by all *vgrG*

homologs do not have the same topology (Supplementary Figure S5). For domain 1,

sequences from the same subtype do not always form monophyletic groups. For

domains 2 and 3, the short sequence lengths limited the phylogenetic resolution;

nonetheless, low divergence within the same subtype and high divergence between

subtypes were observed. These patterns suggest that each domain-encoding region

evolved independently and can recombine between subtypes.

At the level of gene cluster organization, *vgrG* homologs within a subtype can

have distinct downstream genes (e.g., A1 and B1), regardless of whether they are

associated with the main T6SS gene cluster (Figure 4 and Supplementary Dataset

S1A). These findings suggest that in addition to domain shuffling among *vgrG*

homologs, recombination also facilitated novel *vgrG*-effector pairings in the evolution of

these T6SS genes.

When T6SS diversity was examined in a phylogenetic context, numbers and

types of *vgrG* homologs, as well as their linked EI genes, lack strong correlations with

species phylogeny (Figure 5). Based on our manual curation of *vgrG*-associated genes,

a total of 63 putative effector genes were identified (Supplementary Dataset S1A).

Among these, peptidoglycan-targeting toxins and nucleases are the two most commonly

found categories with 21 each. This finding is consistent with an investigation of > 1,000

T6SS effectors sampled from 466 species in the phylum Proteobacteria [32], which also

found these two as the dominant categories and suggested that they play

complementary roles in T6SS-mediated competition.

<u>The Virulence Plasmids and Associated Genes</u>

The tumor-inducing plasmids (pTi) are an important component of *A. tumefaciens*

genomes. These large accessory replicons harbor the virulence (*vir*) regulon genes that

encode the Vir proteins and type IV secretion system (T4SS) for processing and

delivering a transfer DNA (T-DNA) into plant cells, and are essential for agrobacterial

phytopathogenicity [13–15]. Among the 35 strains examined, we identified 15 pTi

sequences (Table 2). Two novel putative pTi (i.e., pTiCFBP4996 and pTiCFBP5473)

were found in the 14 newly sequenced strains. This efficiency of discovering novel pTi

types is surprising, given our previous study that defined pTi types I-VI was based on

comprehensive sampling of diverse historical collections containing 162 *Agrobacterium*

strains [9]. This finding demonstrates the importance and usefulness of a phylogeny-

guided approach for investigating genetic diversity. Our recent examination of > 4,000

Rhizobiaceae plasmids assigned these two novel pTi to types X and XI, and found that

both types are species-specific [42], These two novel pTi are distinctive in their large

sizes (Table 2), gene organization (Figure 6), gene content (Supplementary Figure S6),

and sequence divergence of core genes (Supplementary Figure S7). Moreover, their T-

DNA regions also differ from the typical sizes of ~18-26 kb observed in types I-III pTi

(Figure 6). For the tumorigenic strain CFBP5473 (Supplementary Figure S8), the

predicted T-DNA border sequences flank an extraordinarily large (~93 kb) region that

contains all of the *vir* regulon genes in addition to the typical T-DNA-associated genes

(e.g., synthesis of opine and plant hormone) (Figure 6). This reflects either a

translocation of a T-DNA border sequence or reliance on a non-canonical T-DNA border

sequence that we could not identify. For pTiCFBP4996, its 7-kb T-DNA is predicted to

contain only four genes (i.e., two correspond to opine synthesis and two encode

hypothetical proteins). Plant hormone synthesis genes, which are necessary to cause

visible disease symptoms, were not identified in this predicted T-DNA region or

elsewhere on this plasmid. Consistent with predictions, strain CFBP4996 did not induce

tumor formation when inoculated onto stems of tomato plants (Supplementary Figure

S8). Considering that pTiCFBP4996 encodes all essential *vir* genes required for T-DNA

processing and transfer, CFBP4996 may serve as a naturally disarmed strain capable

of T-DNA transfer without causing diseases.

For replicon-level comparisons, types II and III pTi are more similar to each other

than to type I pTi based on gene content (Supplementary Figure S6) and core gene

phylogeny (Supplementary Figure S7). Within type I, the two subtypes (i.e., I.a and I.b)

are distinguishable by gene content (Supplementary Figure S6) but do not form

mutually exclusive clades in the core-gene phylogeny (Supplementary Figure S7). All

putative pTi, including the two novel types and pTiS4 (i.e., type V from distantly-related

Agrobacterium vitis), contain genes for the T4SS that mediates T-DNA transfer into

plant cells (i.e., *virB1-B11* and *virD4*) and the corresponding two-component regulatory

system (i.e., *virA* and *virG*) (Figure 7). Strain 1D1609 is a notable case because its *virA*

and *virJ* are located on another plasmid, rather than the pTi [26]. For the other *vir*

regulon genes, several differences among pTi types were observed (Figure 7). For

example, while all pTi harbor a conserved *virE3a* that facilitates T-DNA protection and

entry into host [43], type I pTi harbor one or two additional copies of *virE3* that belong to

different sequence types (i.e., sharing the same annotation but classified as distinct

homologs due to sequence divergence). Similarly, *virF*, which encodes an F-box protein

that is a putative host-range determinant [44], can be classified into three sequence

types with distinct distributions. Those less well-characterized *vir* genes, such as *virD3*

[45,46], *virJ* [47], and *virP*, are also distributed differently among pTi types. Finally, in

addition to the presence/absence of individual genes, the overall organization of *vir*

regulons also differ among these pTi (Supplementary Figure S9). All type I pTi are

conserved in sharing a ~40 kb region that contains all *vir* genes. In comparison,

locations of *vir* genes are more variable among type II/III pTi; *virF/P* (and *virQ/H* if

present) are located ~5-50 kb away from the main *vir* gene cluster. Other than *vir*

genes, the gene content and organization of T-DNA are also different (Figure 8). All

type I pTi have one single T-DNA region, while types II and III have two and type V have

four, respectively [9] (Figure 6). Within the T-DNA regions, the plant hormone synthesis

genes (i.e., *tms1/iaaM*, *tms2/iaaH*, and *ipt*) are the most conserved ones, while others

are more variable (Figure 8). Taken together, this genetic variation may contribute to the

host range differences observed among strains harboring different types of pTi [48].

Discussion

Biological Entities at the Species Level and Above

Based on the divergence of core gene sequences (Figure 1A) and gene content

(Supplementary Figure S1), 95% ANI is a reliable approach for defining species within

the *A. tumefaciens* complex, as is the case for most other bacteria [10]. The discrete

multimodal distribution of genome similarities (Figure 1B) suggested that there are

genetic barriers between different genomospecies, which may be explained by neutral

processes and/or selection [8,10]. Regardless of the exact mechanisms, these patterns

supported application of the biological species concept, which is based on genetic

barriers, to these *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies and other bacteria [3]. With the

continuing drop in sequencing cost, it is foreseeable that ANI analysis can serve as a

practical or even a standard approach for accurate classification of additional strains,

which in turn could facilitate research and communication, and ideally leads to

improvements in bacterial taxonomy for basic works and applications.

At the above-species level, *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies exhibited some

intriguing patterns of genome divergence. In a previous study that compared ~90,000

prokaryotic genomes, it was extremely rare to find ANI values in the range of 82-96%

[10]. In other words, strains either belong to the same natural biological entity at the

species level and have > 95% ANI, or belong to different species and have < 82% ANI.

This observation could be due to biases in the sampling of available genomes, or the

all-against-all pairwise comparisons included mostly distantly-related species [11]. In

our study that provided a detailed examination of closely-related species, the ~85-93%

ANI among *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies (Figure 1B) indicated that the *A.*

tumefaciens complex is indeed a coherent entity with high divergence from its closest

sister lineage within the same genus (i.e., *A. larrymoorei*). The driving forces for

maintaining species complexes and the prevalence of such above-species level entities

are interesting questions that require further investigations. For the *A. tumefaciens*

complex, although the nomenclature originated from its phytopathogenicity, it is well-

established that this group contains both pathogenic and non-pathogenic strains that

differ in the possession of an oncogenic plasmid (i.e., pTi) or not [12]. The promiscuous

nature of their pTi [9,49–51] (Figure 6) suggested that lineages within this complex may

experience frequent transitions between pathogenic and non-pathogenic lifestyles, and

such shared ecological niches may be the force that maintains the coherence of this

species complex. Compared to sister lineages (e.g., *A. larrymoorei* and *A. rubi*), the

more diverse host range of *A. tumefaciens* [12,13] may have facilitated the divergence

of this complex into multiple genomospecies. To test this hypothesis, better sampling of

these sister lineages is required.

At the genus level and above, genome-based classification is more challenging.

The ANI approach is expected to have limited resolution when nucleotide sequence

identities are below ~80% [10]. Moreover, the fractions of genome sequences alignable

for ANI value calculation are highly variable for genus-level comparisons [52], which

raises concerns on the robustness of applying the ANI method to higher taxonomic

ranks. To resolve this challenge, analysis of protein sequence divergence among core

genes was proposed as a suitable approach [53]. However, while it may be desirable to

establish a standardized taxonomy with a defined range of genomic divergence for each

taxonomic rank, large variations in the divergence values at a given rank were observed

among different taxonomic groups in previous attempts [52–54]. These variations

created situations where some families contain higher divergence levels than some

orders or lower divergence levels than some genera, even after normalization and a full

revision of the current taxonomy [53]. Such situations demonstrated the challenges of

establishing a new standardized taxonomy even when the practical issues of

transitioning from the current taxonomy are not considered, and perhaps is to be

expected given the highly variable evolutionary rates across different lineages [55].

Given these considerations, other aspects of biology (e.g., physiology, ecology, etc)

may play more important roles in defining those higher taxonomic ranks.

<u>Units and Modularity of Molecular Evolution</u>

For evolutionary studies, the levels at which selection and other processes

operate on have been a topic that received much attention [56]. For prokaryotes, levels

from the entire genome to individual functional domains within genes are of particular

interest. Based on our results, all of these levels must be considered to comprehend the

complex patterns.

At the whole-genome level, the clear species boundaries based on overall

similarity (Figure 1 and Supplementary Figure S1) suggested that the entire genome

largely evolves as a single coherent unit. This result is consistent with previous findings

that at the global level HGT has very little impact on the reconstruction of organismal

phylogeny [57,58], despite the extensive HGT inferred in bacterial evolution [58–61] and

the importance of HGT in adaptation [62–64]. A possible explanation for these

seemingly conflicting observations is that most of the acquired genes are lost quickly

[63], presumably due to the strong mutational bias towards deletions observed in

bacteria [65,66]. Additionally, acquired genes are subjected to the selection that drives

species diversification [8], which is expected to act on all genes in a genome together.

At the level of individual replicons, chromosomes and plasmids certainly have

distinct evolutionary histories (Figure 6). Because novel chromosome/plasmid

combinations may lead to speciation [50], and the spread of plasmids have important

implications on the evolution of virulence [9,67] and antimicrobial resistance [68], further

investigations on the evolution of plasmids and their compatibilies with chromosomes

are important [9,69,70]. Additionally, for bacteria with multiple chromosomes, examining

the evolution of individual chromosomes may provide novel insights. In the case of *A.*

tumefaciens, the multipartite genome was hypothesized to originate from intragenomic

gene transfer from the ancestral circular chromosome to a plasmid, followed by

linearization of this plasmid to form the secondary chromosome [23]. The secondary

chromosome is known to exhibit higher levels of divergence in overall organization,

gene content, and sequences [23,26]. In this regard, it is curious to note that the

apparently rapid-evolving T6SS genes are all located on the secondary chromosome,

rather than the more conserved primary chromosome. For future studies, it may be

interesting to compare the molecular evolution of T6SS and other genes between

species with mono- and multi-partite genomes.

At the levels of gene clusters and below, several interesting observations were

made based on the loci of the two secretion systems investigated in this work. First,

although these two systems may provide some fitness advantages (e.g., T6SS for

interbacterial competitions and T4SS for host exploitation), complex patterns of gains

and losses were observed (Figures 2 and 6). These patterns suggested that there is not

a strong selective pressure to maintain these genes and non-adaptive stochastic

processes are important. Furthermore, there is a certain degree of modularity regarding

their evolution, such that the presence patterns are all-or-none and no partial cluster

was found for the chromosomal T6SS genes or the plasmid-encoded T4SS genes. This

is particularly evident for the T6SS genes, as when the main cluster was lost (e.g., G2

and G6), no accessory *vgrG* loci located elsewhere was found (Supplementary Figure

S3). Second, for both systems, genes for the structural components are conserved,

while those for the effectors and others are not (Figures 2, 5, and 7). This is consistent

with the expectation that opposite selective forces may act on these two categories of

genes, with purifying selection against changes to preserve the apparatus of a

functional secretion system and positive selection for more diverse effectors and other

accessory components. Third, modularity that may reflect functional constraints were

observed at finer scales. For example, each *vgrG* is linked to its cognate

effector/chaperone genes, and each effector is linked to its cognate immunity gene.

Such modularity is expected to be maintained by selection, similar to the observations

regarding co-transfers of genes involved in associated biochemical pathways [8].

However, the linkage could be broken down by recombination at within- or between-

species levels, as evident in the diversity of *vgrG* gene neighborhoods, even for those

homologs belonging to the same type (Figure 4). Fourth, at the level of individual genes,

the within-genome diversity of *vgrG* homologs (Figure 5) provides further support to the

hypothesis that HGT is more important than duplications in driving gene family

expansions in bacteria [71]. Finally, at the intra-gene level, within- or between-species

recombination may be important in generating novel combinations of domains, thus

promoting the diversification of homologs (Figure 3 and Supplementary Figure S6).

Taken together, these observations illustrated the complexity of biological

systems. While it is difficult to draw up generalized rules or to estimate the relative

importance of each evolutionary process at different levels, it is important to consider

and examine these complexities to better understand organisms of interest.

Conclusions

In summary, by using a group of important bacteria as the study system, this

work utilized a strategy of phylogeny-conscious genome sampling for systematic

investigations of a species complex. This approach is not only cost-effective but also

critical in obtaining an unbiased picture that does not over-emphasize certain

subgroups. Additionally, the emphasis on generating and utilizing high-quality

assemblies improves the confidence in gene content analysis. With the continuing

advancements in sequencing technologies and bioinformatic tools, this emphasis

becomes increasingly accessible. For this study system, our examination of biological

boundaries at the species level and above improves the understanding of how natural

biodiversity is organized. The targeted analysis of those secretion system genes and

oncogenic plasmids provides novel insights regarding the key genetic variations

involved in the fitness and ecology of these soil-borne phytopathogens that need to

compete in complex microbiota and invade plant hosts. Moreover, the multi-level

analysis of their genetic diversity from whole-genome to intra-genic domains highlights

the complexity of these biological systems. The strategy and findings of this work

provide useful guides for future studies of other bacteria.

Materials and Methods

<u>Genome Sequencing</u>

A total of 14 strains were acquired from the French International Center for

Microbial Resources (CIRM) Collection for Plant-associated Bacteria (CFBP) (Table 1).

These include 12 strains that belong to the *A. tumefaciens* species complex and two *A.*

larrymoorei strains as the outgroup.

The procedure for whole-genome shotgun sequencing was based on that

described in our previous studies [7,72,73]. All bioinformatics tools were used with the

default settings unless stated otherwise. Briefly, total genomic DNA was prepared using

the Wizard Genomic DNA purification kit (Promega, USA). The Illumina paired-end

sequencing libraries were prepared using KAPA LTP Library Preparation Kits (Roche

Sequencing, USA) with a targeted insert size of ~550 bp. The Illumina MiSeq platform

was used to generate 300x2 reads with an average coverage of 306-fold per strain

(range: 141- to 443-fold). The raw reads were quality trimmed using a Q20 cutoff and

used for *de novo* assembly based on Velvet v1.2.10 [74] with the settings "-exp_cov

auto -min_contig_lgth 2000 -scaffolding no". The contigs were oriented by mapping to

those complete genome assemblies available (Table 1) using MAUVE v2015-02-13

[75]. Due to the difficulties of identifying appropriate reference genomes for several

evolutionary branches, four strains (i.e., CFBP5473, CFBP5875, CFBP5877, and

CFBP6623) were selected for PacBio long-read sequencing and PacBio HGAP v3

assembly. These PacBio-based assemblies were used as a guide for scaffolding, rather

than the finalized results.

To improve the Illumina-based draft assemblies, an iterative process was used to

examine the raw reads mapping results and to incorporate gap-filling results based on

PCR and Sanger sequencing. This process was repeated until the complete assembly

was obtained or the draft assembly could not be improved further. The finalized

assemblies were submitted to the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI)

and annotated using the Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline (PGAP) [76].

Comparative and Evolutionary Analysis

The genomes analyzed are listed in Table 1. The procedures for genome

comparisons were based on those described in our previous studies [7,77–79]. Briefly,

pairwise genome similarities were calculated using FastANI v1.1 [10]. For comparisons

of plasmids, FastANI was executed with the custom settings that reduced fragment

length to 1,000 bp and minimum matched fragments to 25. For global alignments of

chromosomes and plasmids, the syntenic regions were identified by BLASTN v2.6.0

[34] and visualized using genoPlotR v0.8.9 [80]. For gene content comparison, BLASTP

v2.6.0 [34] with e-value cutoff set to $1e^{-15}$ and OrthoMCL v1.3 [81] were used to infer the

homologous gene clusters. The result was converted into a matrix of 35 genomes by

17,058 clusters, with the value in each cell corresponding to the copy number. This

matrix was further converted into a Jaccard distance matrix among genomes using the

VEGAN package v2.5-6 in R, then processed using the principal coordinates analysis

function in the APE package [82] and visualized using ggplot2 v3.3.2 [83]. The

hierarchical clustering analysis was performed using PVCLUST v3.4.4 [84].

For phylogenetic analysis, homologous sequences were aligned using MUSCLE

v3.8.31 [85] for maximum likelihood inference by PhyML v.3.3.20180214 [86]. The

proportion of invariable sites and the gamma distribution parameter were estimated

from the data set, the number of substitute rate categories was set to four. The

bootstrap supports were estimated based on 1,000 replicates.

<u>Analysis of the Type VI Secretion System Genes</u>

To identify the T6SS-associated genes, C58 [27,36,37] and other strains [7,33]

that have been characterized experimentally were used as the references. Based on the

known T6SS genes in these genomes, homologous genes in other genomes were

identified based on the OrthoMCL result. To screen for novel T6SS effector, chaperone,

and immunity genes, genes that are located near *vgrG* (i.e., three upstream and ten

downstream) were examined manually by using the NCBI conserved domain database

(CDD) [87] and the Phyre2 protein fold recognition server [88]; the e-value cutoff was

set to 0.01. A few genes with a hit to the DUF4123 domain (i.e., a known T6SS

chaperone) but have an e-value above the cutoff were manually added back to the list

of T6SS-associated genes (e.g., CFBP5477_RS20350). To confirm the absence of

specific T6SS genes, the genome sequences were used as the subjects and the protein

sequences of known genes were used as the queries to run TBLASTN searches.

For classification of the *vgrG* homologs, we developed a domain-based scheme.

The conserved N-terminal TIGR03361 domain was first identified by the NCBI CDD

searches. A global alignment of all homologs was used to determine the exact

boundaries of this domain. After this TIGR03361 domain was removed, the remaining

C-terminal sequences were processed using MEME v5.1.1 [89] to identify conserved

domains that meet these criteria: (1) present in at least two sequences, (2) with zero or

one occurrence per sequence, (3) with a size between 30 and 300 a.a., and (4) with an

e-value lower than 0.05. The results were manually curated to break down large

domains that are composed of smaller domains. Pairwise BLASTP searches were

conducted to verify that each domain is unique and no two domains have a BLASTP e-

value of lower than 1e-05. For each domain, the consensus sequence was generated

using Jalview v2.10.5 [90] and sequence conservation was visualized using WebLogo

server v3 [91]. For functional prediction, the consensus sequence of each domain was

used to query against NCBI CDD and Phyre2. Additionally, one representative from

each subtype of *vgrG* homologs was used for structure modeling using Phyre2 with the

"normal" mode. The chain D of PA0091 VgrG1 (PDB identifier: 4MTK) was selected as

the template. The predicted structures were visualized using PyMOL v1.2r3pre

(Schrödinger, USA).

For the EI gene pairs identified, EI1 through EI11 were named based on the

nomenclature proposed previously [7] and novel pairs were named starting from EI12.

When only the putative effector (E) or the putative immunity (I) genes were found, those

genes were classified in the format of "E??" or "I??", respectively. For some of the EI

pairs that were identified previously based on adjacency to T6SS genes but lacked

high-confidence annotation (i.e., EI2, EI3, EI5, and EI8), we chose a more conservative

approach and annotated those genes as hypothetical proteins.

Analysis of the Tumor-inducing Plasmids and Type IV Secretion System Genes

The list of 20 putative pTi sequences analyzed is provided in Table 2. These

included all of the 15 complete pTi sequences determined in this study and five

representatives from GenBank that are important in *Agrobacterium* research [15]. The

pTi typing was performed based on k-mer profile clustering with a reference set of 143

oncogenic plasmids in Rhizobiaceae [9] and a second set that contains > 4,000

Rhizobiaceae plasmids [42]. For T-DNA identification, putative T-DNA borders were

identified based on the motif YGRCAGGATATATNNNNNKGTMAWN [92]. Genes

involved in opine metabolism [93] and T4SS [94] were identified based on the

annotation and homologous gene clustering results produced by OrthoMCL.

Additionally, putative T4SS effectors were identified using the T4SEpre tool [95] in

EffectiveDB [96] with the minimal score set to 0.8. All protein sequences of pTi-encoded

genes were used as the queries.

Tumorigenesis Assay

Tomato tumorigenesis assays [97] were performed to evaluate the virulence of

selected strains. The plants (cultivar Known-You 301) were maintained in growth

chambers with a 16-/8-h light/dark regime and a constant temperature of 22°C.

Inoculation was performed on three-week old seedlings. Bacterial strains were

transferred from stock to 5 mL 523 broth and cultured overnight at 28°C in a shaker

incubator (250 rpm), then sub-cultured for four hours prior to inoculation. Bacterial cells

were washed and resuspended in 0.9% NaCl solution with a concentration of OD_{600} 0.2.

The stem was punctured with a sterilized sewing needle and 5 μL of bacterial

suspension was added to the wounding site. The plants were collected three weeks

after inoculation and 1-cm stem segments centered at the wounding site were cut for

weighing.

Data Availability

The 14 new genome sequences are available in NCBI under BioProject

accessions PRJNA534385-PRJNA534397 and PRJNA534399.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author Contribution

Conceptualization: CHK

Funding acquisition: JHC, EML, CHK

Investigation: LC, YCL, MH, MNS, AJW, CFW

Methodology: LC, YCL, MNS, STC, CHK

Project administration: CHK

Supervision: JHC, EML, CHK

Validation: LC, YCL, MH, MNS, AJW

Visualization: LC, YCL

Writing – original draft: LC, YCL, CHK

Writing – review & editing: LC, YCL, AJW, CFW, JHC, EML, CHK

Funding

Research in the Chang lab was supported by the National Institute of Food and

Agriculture, US Department of Agriculture awards 2014-51181-22384 and 2020-51181-

32154. Research in the Lai lab was supported by Academia Sinica and the Ministry of

Science and Technology of Taiwan (MOST 104-2311-B-001-025-MY3 and MOST 107-

2311-B-001-019-MY3). Research in the Kuo lab was supported by Academia Sinica and

the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan (MOST 109-2628-B-001-012). The

funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to

submit the work for publication.

Acknowledgement

We thank Ai-Ping Chen, Hsin-Ying Chiang, Shu-Jen Chou, Mei-Jane Fang, Ya-Yi

Huang, and Wen-Sui Lo for technical assistance. Sophien Kamoun provided helpful

comments that improved the writing of this manuscript. The bacterial strains were

imported under the permits 103-B-003 and 104-B-002 issued by the Council of

Agriculture of Taiwan. The Sanger sequencing service and the Illumina sequencing

library preparation service were provided by the Genomic Technology Core (Institute of

Plant and Microbial Biology, Academia Sinica). The Illumina MiSeq sequencing service

References

1. Rosselló-Mora R, Amann R. The species concept for prokaryotes. FEMS Microbiol Rev.
2001;25:39–67.

2. Fraser C, Alm EJ, Polz MF, Spratt BG, Hanage WP. The bacterial species challenge: making
sense of genetic and ecological diversity. Science. 2009;323:741–6.

3. Bobay L-M, Ochman H. Biological species are universal across life's domains. Genome Biol
Evol. 2017;9:491–501.

4. Konstantinidis Konstantinos T, Ramette Alban, Tiedje James M. The bacterial species
definition in the genomic era. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci. 2006;361:1929–40.

5. Popoff MY, Kersters K, Kiredjian M, Miras I, Coynault C. Position taxonomique de souches de
Agrobacterium d'origine hospitalière. Ann Inst Pasteur Microbiol. 1984;135:427–42.

6. Costechareyre D, Bertolla F, Nesme X. Homologous recombination in *Agrobacterium*:
potential implications for the genomic species concept in bacteria. Mol Biol Evol. 2009;26:167–
76.

7. Wu C-F, Santos MNM, Cho S-T, Chang H-H, Tsai Y-M, Smith DA, et al. Plant-pathogenic
Agrobacterium tumefaciens strains have diverse type VI effector-immunity pairs and vary in in-
planta competitiveness. Mol Plant Microbe Interact. 2019;32:961–71.

8. Lassalle F, Planel R, Penel S, Chapulliot D, Barbe V, Dubost A, et al. Ancestral genome
estimation reveals the history of ecological diversification in *Agrobacterium*. Genome Biol Evol.
2017;9:3413–31.

9. Weisberg AJ, Davis EW, Tabima J, Belcher MS, Miller M, Kuo C-H, et al. Unexpected
conservation and global transmission of agrobacterial virulence plasmids. Science. American
Association for the Advancement of Science; 2020;368:eaba5256.

10. Jain C, Rodriguez-R LM, Phillippy AM, Konstantinidis KT, Aluru S. High throughput ANI
analysis of 90K prokaryotic genomes reveals clear species boundaries. Nat Commun.
2018;9:5114.

11. Murray CS, Gao Y, Wu M. Re-evaluating the evidence for a universal genetic boundary
among microbial species. Nat Commun. 2021;12:4059.

12. Young JM. *Agrobacterium*—taxonomy of plant-pathogenic *Rhizobium* species. In: Tzfira T,
Citovsky V, editors. Agrobacterium Biol Biotechnol [Internet]. Springer New York; 2008 [cited
2016 Oct 21]. p. 183–220. Available from: http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-0-387-
72290-0_5

13. Kado CI. Historical account on gaining insights on the mechanism of crown gall
tumorigenesis induced by *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Front Microbiol. 2014;5:340.

14. Nester EW. *Agrobacterium*: nature's genetic engineer. Front Plant Sci. 2015;5:730.

15. Hwang H-H, Yu M, Lai E-M. *Agrobacterium*-mediated plant transformation: biology and
applications. Arab Book. 2017;15:e0186.

16. Mougel C, Thioulouse J, Perrière G, Nesme X. A mathematical method for determining
genome divergence and species delineation using AFLP. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.
2002;52:573–86.

17. Portier P, Saux MF-L, Mougel C, Lerondelle C, Chapulliot D, Thioulouse J, et al.
Identification of genomic species in *Agrobacterium* biovar 1 by AFLP genomic markers. Appl
Environ Microbiol. American Society for Microbiology; 2006;72:7123–31.

18. Costechareyre D, Rhouma A, Lavire C, Portier P, Chapulliot D, Bertolla F, et al. Rapid and
efficient identification of *Agrobacterium* species by *recA* allele analysis: Agrobacterium recA
diversity. Microb Ecol. 2010;60:862–72.

19. Hellens R, Mullineaux P, Klee H. A guide to *Agrobacterium* binary Ti vectors. Trends Plant
Sci. 2000;5:446–51.

20. Lee L-Y, Gelvin SB. T-DNA binary vectors and systems. Plant Physiol. 2008;146:325–32.

21. Lassalle F, Campillo T, Vial L, Baude J, Costechareyre D, Chapulliot D, et al. Genomic
species are ecological species as revealed by comparative genomics in *Agrobacterium*
tumefaciens. Genome Biol Evol. 2011;3:762–81.

22. Young JM, Pennycook SR, Watson DRW. Proposal that *Agrobacterium radiobacter* has
priority over *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Request for an Opinion. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.
2006;56:491–3.

23. Slater SC, Goldman BS, Goodner B, Setubal JC, Farrand SK, Nester EW, et al. Genome
sequences of three *Agrobacterium* biovars help elucidate the evolution of multichromosome
genomes in bacteria. J Bacteriol. 2009;191:2501–11.

24. Goodner B, Hinkle G, Gattung S, Miller N, Blanchard M, Qurollo B, et al. Genome sequence
of the plant pathogen and biotechnology agent *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* C58. Science.
2001;294:2323–8.

25. Wood DW, Setubal JC, Kaul R, Monks DE, Kitajima JP, Okura VK, et al. The genome of the
natural genetic engineer *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* C58. Science. 2001;294:2317–23.

26. Haryono M, Cho S-T, Fang M-J, Chen A-P, Chou S-J, Lai E-M, et al. Differentiations in gene
content and expression response to virulence induction between two *Agrobacterium* strains.
Front Microbiol. 2019;10:1554.

27. Ma L-S, Hachani A, Lin J-S, Filloux A, Lai E-M. *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* deploys a
superfamily of type VI secretion DNase effectors as weapons for interbacterial competition in
planta. Cell Host Microbe. 2014;16:94–104.

28. Benson DA, Cavanaugh M, Clark K, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Ostell J, Pruitt KD, et al. GenBank.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2018;46:D41–7.

29. Ormeño-Orrillo E, Servín-Garcidueñas LE, Rogel MA, González V, Peralta H, Mora J, et al.
Taxonomy of rhizobia and agrobacteria from the Rhizobiaceae family in light of genomics. Syst
Appl Microbiol. 2015;38:287–91.

30. Hernandez RE, Gallegos-Monterrosa R, Coulthurst SJ. Type VI secretion system effector
proteins: Effective weapons for bacterial competitiveness. Cell Microbiol. 2020;22:e13241.

31. Jurėnas D, Journet L. Activity, delivery, and diversity of Type VI secretion effectors. Mol
Microbiol. 2021;115:383–94.

32. Smith WPJ, Vettiger A, Winter J, Ryser T, Comstock LE, Basler M, et al. The evolution of
the type VI secretion system as a disintegration weapon. PLOS Biol. Public Library of Science;
2020;18:e3000720.

33. Santos MNM, Cho S-T, Wu C-F, Chang C-J, Kuo C-H, Lai E-M. Redundancy and specificity
of type VI secretion vgrG loci in antibacterial activity of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* 1D1609
strain. Front Microbiol. Frontiers; 2020;10:3004.

34. Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, et al. BLAST+:
architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics. 2009;10:421.

35. Wu H-Y, Chung P-C, Shih H-W, Wen S-R, Lai E-M. Secretome analysis uncovers an Hcp-
family protein secreted via a type VI secretion system in *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. J
Bacteriol. American Society for Microbiology Journals; 2008;190:2841–50.

36. Bondage DD, Lin J-S, Ma L-S, Kuo C-H, Lai E-M. VgrG C terminus confers the type VI
effector transport specificity and is required for binding with PAAR and adaptor–effector
complex. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2016;113:E3931–40.

37. Lin J-S, Ma L-S, Lai E-M. Systematic dissection of the *Agrobacterium* type VI secretion
system reveals machinery and secreted components for subcomplex formation. PLOS ONE.
2013;8:e67647.

38. Pukatzki S, Ma AT, Revel AT, Sturtevant D, Mekalanos JJ. Type VI secretion system
translocates a phage tail spike-like protein into target cells where it cross-links actin. Proc Natl
Acad Sci. National Academy of Sciences; 2007;104:15508–13.

39. Leiman PG, Basler M, Ramagopal UA, Bonanno JB, Sauder JM, Pukatzki S, et al. Type VI
secretion apparatus and phage tail-associated protein complexes share a common evolutionary
origin. Proc Natl Acad Sci. National Academy of Sciences; 2009;106:4154–9.

40. Liang X, Moore R, Wilton M, Wong MJQ, Lam L, Dong TG. Identification of divergent type VI
secretion effectors using a conserved chaperone domain. Proc Natl Acad Sci. National
Academy of Sciences; 2015;112:9106–11.

41. Unterweger D, Kostiuk B, Ötjengerdes R, Wilton A, Diaz-Satizabal L, Pukatzki S. Chimeric
adaptor proteins translocate diverse type VI secretion system effectors in *Vibrio cholerae*.
EMBO J. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2015;34:2198–210.

42. Weisberg AJ, Miller M, Ream W, Grünwald NJ, Chang JH. Rapid diversification of plasmids
in a genus of pathogenic and nitrogen fixing bacteria. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2021;

43. Li X, Tu H, Pan SQ. *Agrobacterium* delivers anchorage protein VirE3 for companion VirE2 to
aggregate at host entry sites for T-DNA protection. Cell Rep. 2018;25:302-311.e6.

44. Jarchow E, Grimsley NH, Hohn B. virF, the host-range-determining virulence gene of
Agrobacterium tumefaciens, affects T-DNA transfer to Zea mays. Proc Natl Acad Sci. National
Academy of Sciences; 1991;88:10426–30.

45. Vogel AM, Das A. The *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* virD3 gene is not essential for
tumorigenicity on plants. J Bacteriol. American Society for Microbiology Journals;
1992;174:5161–4.

46. Lin T-S, Kado CI. The virD4 gene is required for virulence while virD3 and orf5 are not
required for virulence of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Mol Microbiol. 1993;9:803–12.

47. Pan SQ, Jin S, Boulton MI, Hawes M, Gordon MP, Nester EW. An *Agrobacterium* virulence
factor encoded by a Ti plasmid gene or a chromosomal gene is required for T-DNA transfer into
plants. Mol Microbiol. 1995;17:259–69.

48. Hwang H-H, Wu ET, Liu S-Y, Chang S-C, Tzeng K-C, Kado CI. Characterization and host
range of five tumorigenic *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strains and possible application in plant
transient transformation assays. Plant Pathol. 2013;62:1384–97.

49. Hooykaas PJJ, Klapwijk PM, Nuti MP, Schilperoort RA, Rörsch A. Transfer of the
Agrobacterium tumefaciens Ti plasmid to avirulent agrobacteria and to *Rhizobium ex planta*. J
Gen Microbiol. 1977;98:477–84.

50. Haryono M, Tsai Y-M, Lin C-T, Huang F-C, Ye Y-C, Deng W-L, et al. Presence of an
Agrobacterium-type tumor-inducing plasmid in *Neorhizobium* sp. NCHU2750 and the link to
phytopathogenicity. Genome Biol Evol. 2018;10:3188–95.

51. Rathore DS, Mullins E. Alternative non-*Agrobacterium* based methods for plant
transformation. In: Roberts JA, editor. Annu Plant Rev Online [Internet]. Hoboken, New Jersey,
USA: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.; 2018 [cited 2020 Dec 16]. p. 891–908. Available from:
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781119312994.apr0659

52. Barco RA, Garrity GM, Scott JJ, Amend JP, Nealson KH, Emerson D. A genus definition for
Bacteria and Archaea based on a standard genome relatedness index. mBio. American Society
for Microbiology; 2020;11:e02475-19.

53. Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Waite DW, Rinke C, Skarshewski A, Chaumeil P-A, et al. A
standardized bacterial taxonomy based on genome phylogeny substantially revises the tree of
life. Nat Biotechnol. Nature Publishing Group; 2018;36:996–1004.

54. Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Chaumeil P-A, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P. A complete
domain-to-species taxonomy for Bacteria and Archaea. Nat Biotechnol. Nature Publishing
Group; 2020;38:1079–86.

55. Kuo C-H, Ochman H. Inferring clocks when lacking rocks: the variable rates of molecular
evolution in bacteria. Biol Direct. 2009;4:35.

56. Okasha S. Evolution and the Levels of Selection [Internet]. Oxford University Press; 2006
[cited 2021 Jan 25]. Available from:
https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199267972.001.000
1/acprof-9780199267972

57. Daubin V, Moran NA, Ochman H. Phylogenetics and the cohesion of bacterial genomes.
Science. 2003;301:829–32.

58. Choi I-G, Kim S-H. Global extent of horizontal gene transfer. Proc Natl Acad Sci.
2007;104:4489–94.

59. Ochman H, Lawrence JG, Groisman EA. Lateral gene transfer and the nature of bacterial
innovation. Nature. 2000;405:299–304.

60. Dagan T, Artzy-Randrup Y, Martin W. Modular networks and cumulative impact of lateral
transfer in prokaryote genome evolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2008;105:10039–44.

61. Chan CX, Beiko RG, Darling AE, Ragan MA. Lateral transfer of genes and gene fragments
in prokaryotes. Genome Biol Evol. 2009;1:429–38.

62. Pál C, Papp B, Lercher MJ. Adaptive evolution of bacterial metabolic networks by horizontal
gene transfer. Nat Genet. 2005;37:1372–5.

63. Kuo C-H, Ochman H. The fate of new bacterial genes. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2009;33:38–43.

64. Wiedenbeck J, Cohan FM. Origins of bacterial diversity through horizontal genetic transfer
and adaptation to new ecological niches. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2011;35:957–76.

65. Mira A, Ochman H, Moran NA. Deletional bias and the evolution of bacterial genomes.
Trends Genet. 2001;17:589–96.

66. Kuo C-H, Ochman H. Deletional bias across the three domains of life. Genome Biol Evol.
2009;1:145–52.

67. Sundin GW. Genomic insights into the contribution of phytopathogenic bacterial plasmids to
the evolutionary history of their hosts. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2007;45:129–51.

68. Bennett PM. Plasmid encoded antibiotic resistance: acquisition and transfer of antibiotic
resistance genes in bacteria. Br J Pharmacol. 2009;153:S347–57.

69. Smillie C, Garcillán-Barcia MP, Francia MV, Rocha EPC, Cruz F de la. Mobility of plasmids.
Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2010;74:434–52.

70. Redondo-Salvo S, Fernández-López R, Ruiz R, Vielva L, de Toro M, Rocha EPC, et al.
Pathways for horizontal gene transfer in bacteria revealed by a global map of their plasmids.
Nat Commun. 2020;11:3602.

71. Treangen TJ, Rocha EPC. Horizontal transfer, not duplication, drives the expansion of
protein families in prokaryotes. PLOS Genet. 2011;7:e1001284.

72. Huang Y-Y, Cho S-T, Lo W-S, Wang Y-C, Lai E-M, Kuo C-H. Complete genome sequence
of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* Ach5. Genome Announc. 2015;3:e00570-15.

73. Cho S-T, Haryono M, Chang H-H, Santos MNM, Lai E-M, Kuo C-H. Complete genome
sequence of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* 1D1609. Genome Announc. 2018;6:e00253-18.

74. Zerbino DR, Birney E. Velvet: algorithms for *de novo* short read assembly using de Bruijn
graphs. Genome Res. 2008;18:821–9.

75. Darling ACE, Mau B, Blattner FR, Perna NT. Mauve: multiple alignment of conserved
genomic sequence with rearrangements. Genome Res. 2004;14:1394–403.

76. Tatusova T, DiCuccio M, Badretdin A, Chetvernin V, Nawrocki EP, Zaslavsky L, et al. NCBI
prokaryotic genome annotation pipeline. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016;44:6614–24.

77. Lo W-S, Chen L-L, Chung W-C, Gasparich GE, Kuo C-H. Comparative genome analysis of
Spiroplasma melliferum IPMB4A, a honeybee-associated bacterium. BMC Genomics.
2013;14:22.

78. Lo W-S, Gasparich GE, Kuo C-H. Convergent evolution among ruminant-pathogenic
Mycoplasma involved extensive gene content changes. Genome Biol Evol. 2018;10:2130–9.

79. Cho S-T, Kung H-J, Huang W, Hogenhout SA, Kuo C-H. Species boundaries and molecular
markers for the classification of 16SrI phytoplasmas inferred by genome analysis. Front
Microbiol. Frontiers; 2020;11:1531.

80. Guy L, Roat Kultima J, Andersson SGE. genoPlotR: comparative gene and genome
visualization in R. Bioinformatics. 2010;26:2334–5.

81. Li L, Stoeckert CJ, Roos DS. OrthoMCL: identification of ortholog groups for eukaryotic
genomes. Genome Res. 2003;13:2178–89.

82. Popescu A-A, Huber KT, Paradis E. ape 3.0: New tools for distance-based phylogenetics
and evolutionary analysis in R. Bioinformatics. 2012;28:1536–7.

83. Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis [Internet]. New York, NY: Springer-
Verlag New York; 2016 [cited 2019 Aug 1]. Available from: https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

84. Suzuki R, Shimodaira H. Pvclust: an R package for assessing the uncertainty in hierarchical
clustering. Bioinformatics. 2006;22:1540–2.

85. Edgar RC. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2004;32:1792–7.

86. Guindon S, Gascuel O. A simple, fast, and accurate algorithm to estimate large phylogenies
by maximum likelihood. Syst Biol. 2003;52:696–704.

87. Marchler-Bauer A, Zheng C, Chitsaz F, Derbyshire MK, Geer LY, Geer RC, et al. CDD:
conserved domains and protein three-dimensional structure. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41:D348–
52.

88. Kelley LA, Mezulis S, Yates CM, Wass MN, Sternberg MJE. The Phyre2 web portal for
protein modeling, prediction and analysis. Nat Protoc. 2015;10:845–58.

89. Bailey TL, Boden M, Buske FA, Frith M, Grant CE, Clementi L, et al. MEME Suite: tools for
motif discovery and searching. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009;37:W202–8.

90. Waterhouse AM, Procter JB, Martin DMA, Clamp M, Barton GJ. Jalview version 2—a
multiple sequence alignment editor and analysis workbench. Bioinformatics. 2009;25:1189–91.

91. Crooks GE, Hon G, Chandonia J-M, Brenner SE. WebLogo: a sequence logo generator.
Genome Res. 2004;14:1188–90.

92. Conner AJ, Barrell PJ, Baldwin SJ, Lokerse AS, Cooper PA, Erasmuson AK, et al.
Intragenic vectors for gene transfer without foreign DNA. Euphytica. 2007;154:341–53.

93. Vladimirov IA, Matveeva TV, Lutova LA. Opine biosynthesis and catabolism genes of
Agrobacterium tumefaciens and *Agrobacterium rhizogenes*. Russ J Genet. 2015;51:121–9.

94. Bhatty M, Laverde Gomez JA, Christie PJ. The expanding bacterial type IV secretion
lexicon. Res Microbiol. 2013;164:620–39.

95. Wang Y, Wei X, Bao H, Liu S-L. Prediction of bacterial type IV secreted effectors by C-
terminal features. BMC Genomics. 2014;15:50.

96. Eichinger V, Nussbaumer T, Platzer A, Jehl M-A, Arnold R, Rattei T. EffectiveDB—updates
and novel features for a better annotation of bacterial secreted proteins and Type III, IV, VI
secretion systems. Nucleic Acids Res. Oxford Academic; 2016;44:D669–74.

97. Wu H-Y, Chen C-Y, Lai E-M. Expression and functional characterization of the
Agrobacterium VirB2 amino acid substitution variants in T-pilus biogenesis, virulence, and
transient transformation efficiency. PLOS ONE. 2014;9:e101142.

Tables

Table 1. List of the genome sequences used in this study. These include 14 new

genomes derived from this study and 21 additional representatives from GenBank. Two

Agrobacterium larrymoorei strains are included as the outgroup. Species name

abbreviations: *At*, *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*; *Al*, *Agrobacterium larrymoorei.*

903
904 **Table 2.** List of the pTi sequences analyzed. These include 15 from the genome data

905 set listed in **Table 1** and five additional representatives downloaded from GenBank. The

906 pTi type assignments are based on k-mer profiles. A type V pTi from *Agrobacterium vitis*

907 is included as the outgroup. Species name abbreviations: *At*, *Agrobacterium*

908 *tumefaciens*; *Al*, *Agrobacterium larrymoorei*; *Av*, *Agrobacterium vitis.*

 Figure Legends

Figure 1. Relationships among representatives of the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*

species complex. The sister species *Agrobacterium larrymoorei* (*A. l.*) is included as the

outgroup. (A) Maximum likelihood phylogeny based on a concatenated alignment of

2,093 single-copy genes shared by all 35 genomes (635,594 aligned amino acid sites).

Bootstrap support values in the range of 60-80% are labeled. Strains with complete

genome assemblies are highlighted with an asterisk ('*'). The genomospecies

assignments (i.e., G1-G9 and G13-G15) are labeled to the right of strain names. The

three *A. tumefaciens* supergroups are indicated by the colored background of the

genomospecies assignments. Information to the right of the genomospecies

assignments shows the grouping of genomes according to different cutoff values of

genome-wide average nucleotide identity (ANI), the presence/absence of type VI

secretion system (T6SS)-encoding gene cluster (green: present; white: absent), copy

number of *vgrG* (white background: absent), number of plasmids, and the tumor-

inducing plasmid (pTi) type based on k-mer profile (white background: absent). (B)

Pairwise genome similarities based on the percentages of genomic segments mapped

and the ANI values.

Figure 2. Phylogeny and organization of the T6SS gene cluster. The maximum

likelihood phylogeny was inferred based on a concatenated alignment (5,960 aligned

amino acid sites) of 14 core T6SS genes, including *tagE*, *tagF*, *tssM*, *tssL*, *tssK*, *tagH*,

tssG, *tssF*, *tssE*, *tagJ*, *tssC40*, *tssC41*, *tssB*, and *tssD*. Two other core genes, *tssA* and

tssH, are excluded because some homologs are pseudogenized. Genes downstream of

tssD (e.g., *tai*, *tae*, and *vgrG*) are excluded due to variable presence. The species

phylogeny on the right is based on **Figure 1**. Genes are color-coded according to

annotation, syntenic regions are indicated by gray blocks.

Figure 3. Domain organization and classification of *vgrG* homologs. Six major types

(i.e., A-F) and nine subtypes were identified and labeled on the right. For each homolog,

the genomospecies assignment is provided in square brackets, followed by the locus

tag. The gene names are provided in parenthesis for those functionally characterized

homologs (i.e., *vgrG1-2* for C58 homologs and *vgrGa-d* for 1D1609 homologs).

Figure 4. Gene neighborhoods of *vgrG* homologs. The grouping and labeling of *vgrG*

homologs are based on the convention used in **Figure 3**. For each *vgrG* homolog, three

upstream genes are plotted to illustrate if it is associated with the main T6SS gene

cluster or not, and 10 downstream genes are plotted to illustrate putative

effector/immunity genes. Two A1-type homologs from the strain S56 (i.e.,

AGR1B_RS27940 and AGR1B_RS27960) are in close association with each other and

plotted together.

Figure 5. Phylogenetic distribution of *vgrG* homologs and T6SS effector/immunity

genes. The species tree is based on **Figure 1**. Gene presence is illustrated with colored

cells in the heatmap, gene copy numbers are labeled when applicable.

Figure 6. Molecular phylogeny and global alignment of pTi. The maximum likelihood

phylogeny was inferred based on the concatenated alignment of 21 core genes and

8,534 aligned amino acid sites (**Supplementary Figure S6A**). The species phylogeny

on the right is based on **Figure 1**. The pTi sequences derived from this study are

highlighted in bold. For those with relevant information available, the genomospecies

assignments are indicated in square brackets and the opine types are indicated in

parentheses. For the alignment, all plasmids are visualized in linear form starting from

the replication genes. Other gene clusters are color-coded according to functions.

Syntenic regions are indicated by gray blocks.

Figure 7. Distribution of key *vir* genes among the putative pTi. The pTi sequences

derived from this study are highlighted in bold. For those with relevant information

available, the genomospecies assignments are indicated in square brackets and the

opine types are indicated in parentheses. Gene presence and absence are indicated by

filled and empty circles, respectively. The main *vir* genes include the components of the

type IV secretion system (T4SS; *virB1-B11* and *virD4*). For *virE3*, the three sequence

types are listed separately. For *virF* and *virD3*, the sequence types are labeled inside

the circles. For 1D1609, the genes *virA* and *virJ* are located on another plasmid and

plotted as absent in this figure. The locus tags are provided in **Supplementary Dataset**

S1B.

Figure 8. Organization of the transfer DNA (T-DNA) on tumor-inducing plasmids (pTi).

Two unusual putative pTi sequences (i.e., pTiCFBP4996 and pTiCFBP4573) are

excluded, other pTi sequences derived from this study are highlighted in bold. For those

with relevant information available, the genomospecies assignments are indicated in

square brackets and the opine types are indicated in parentheses. Genes are color-

coded according to annotation, syntenic regions are indicated by gray blocks.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Figure S1. Gene content dissimilarity among the *Agrobacterium* genomes. (A) and (B): principal coordinate analysis with and without the outgroup *A. larrymoorei*, respectively. The % variance explained by each axis is provided in parentheses. (C) and (D): hierarchical clustering with and without the outgroup *A. larrymoorei*, respectively.

Supplementary Figure S2. Global alignment of the linear chromosomes. Locations of T6SS-*hcp* operons and *vgrG* homologs are labeled.

Supplementary Figure S3. Logo plots of the putative protein domains identified among *vgrG* homologs. For each domain, the length and the number of homologs with the domain is labeled. Domain 1 is the only domain with a corresponding database entry (TIGR03361).

Supplementary Figure S4. Predicted structures of VgrG homologs. Regions are colored according to the scheme used in the domain analysis (**Figure. 3**). The chain D of PA0091 VgrG1 (PDB identifier: 4MTK) from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was selected as the template. The C-terminal parts that could not be confidently inferred are omitted. In all cases, the coverage (i.e., percentage of the sequence included in the structure prediction) are at least 75%, the sequence identity to the template is at least 30% and the confidence score is 100%.

1007 **Supplementary Figure S5.** Maximum likelihood phylogenies of *vgrG*-associated

1008 domains. (A) Domain 1 (TIGR03361; VI_Rhs_Vgr super family), (B) Domain 2

1009 (unknown function), and (C) Domain 3 (unknown function).

1010

1011 **Supplementary Figure S6.** Principal coordinate analysis of gene content among the

1012 putative pTi analyzed.

1013

1014 **Supplementary Figure S7.** Maximum likelihood phylogeny of pTi based on the

1015 concatenated alignment of shared single-copy genes. (A) All of the 20 pTi sequences

1016 analyzed; 21 core genes and 8,534 aligned amino acid sites. (B) Excluding the two

1017 novel pTi; 40 core genes and 15,473 aligned amino acid sites, all branches received >

1018 80% bootstrap support.

1019

Supplementary Figure S8. Tomato tumor assay of strains 12D1, CFBP4996, and

CFBP5473. Mock was inoculated with sterilized water as a negative control and strain

C58 was included as a positive control. Strain 12D1 harbors a plasmid with opine

transporter and catabolism genes but lacks *vir* regulon genes and identifiable T-DNA.

CFBP4996 and CFBP5473 harbor novel types of putative tumor-inducing plasmids

(pTi). (A) Tomato stems at three weeks after inoculation. Scale bar: 0.25 cm. (B) Weight

distribution of five biological replicates (1-cm segments of the stem centered at the

inoculation site). The letters indicate ANOVA results.

1028

1029　**Supplementary Figure S9.** Gene organization of the *vir* regulons on pTi. Syntenic

1030　regions are indicated by grey blocks. The virulence (*vir*) genes are highlighted in red,

1031　the conjugation (*tra*) genes are highlighted in yellow, and other genes are plotted in

1032　white.

1033

Supplementary Dataset S1. Detailed information of the analyzed genes. (A) List of

vgrG-associated genes. Information including genomic location, RefSeq annotation, and

domain prediction are included. (B) Locus tags of the *vir* regulon genes on pTi. The

virA/*J* of 1D1609 are located on another plasmid and are highlighted by "*". The *virB7* of

pTiChry5 and pTiEU6 are unannotated in the GenBank RefSeq records so no locus tag

is available but the gene presence was confirmed by BLASTN searches.

1040

Table 1. List of the genome sequences used in this study. These include 14 new genomes derived from this study and 21 additional representatives from GenBank. Two *Agrobacterium larrymoorei* strains are included as the outgroup. Species name abbreviations: *At, Agrobacterium tumefaciens*; *Al, Agrobacterium larrymoorei.*

Species	Strain	Accession	Assembly	Coding Sequences	Pseudo-genes	Geographic Origin	Isolation Source
At G1	1D1108	GCF_003666425	Complete	5,312	167	MD, USA	*Euonymus* sp.
At G1	5A	GCF_000236125	50 contigs	5,343	169	MT, USA	Soil
At G1	Ach5	GCF_000971565	Complete	5,184	145	CA, USA	*Achillea ptarmica*
At G1	N2/73	GCF_001692195	29 scaffolds	5,345	157	OR, USA	Cranberry
At G1	S56	GCF_900014385	6 scaffolds	5,414	218	?	Plant
At G2	CFBP5494	GCF_900013495	5 scaffolds	5,469	233	France	Human
At G2	CFBP5496	GCF_005144405	9 contigs	5,137	223	France	Human
At G2	CFBP5875	GCF_005221365	Complete	4,570	146	Belgium	Ditch water
At G3	CFBP6623	GCF_005221385	Complete	5,081	180	France	Antiseptic flask
At G3	CFBP6624	GCF_005221425	Complete	5,157	148	France	Human
At G4	183	GCF_004023565	Complete	5,051	199	Tunisia	*Prunus dulcis*
At G4	186	GCF_002591665	Complete	5,298	207	CA, USA	*Juglans regia*
At G4	12D1	GCF_003667905	Complete	5,005	167	?	?
At G4	1D1460	GCF_003666445	Complete	5,290	269	CA, USA	*Rubus* sp.
At G5	CFBP6625	GCF_005221465	Complete	5,446	198	France	Food
At G5	CFBP6626	GCF_005221445	Complete	5,080	199	France	Human
At G5	F2	GCF_000219665	8 contigs	5,085	135	Harbin, China	Soil
At G6	CFBP5499	GCF_005221325	Complete	5,654	240	South Africa	*Dahlia* sp.
At G6	CFBP5877	GCF_005221345	Complete	5,463	236	Israel	*Dahlia* sp.

At G7	1D1609	GCF_002943835	Complete	5,539	254	CA, USA	*Medicago sativa*
At G7	CFBP4996	GCF_005144435	10 contigs	5,741	213	UK	*Flacourtia ramontchi*
At G7	CFBP7129	GCF_005221405	Complete	5,927	285	Tunisia	*Pyrus communis*
At G8	12D13	GCF_003667945	Complete	5,083	178	?	?
At G8	1D132	GCF_003667725	Complete	5,176	169	CA, USA	*Cerasus pseudocerasus*
At G8	ATCC31749	GCF_002916755	4 contigs	4,560	811	China	Plant
At G8	C58	GCF_000092025	Complete	5,355	29	NY, USA	*Cerasus pseudocerasus*
At G9	CFBP5506	GCF_005144495	15 contigs	4,236	157	Australia	Soil
At G9	CFBP5507	GCF_005144505	16 contigs	5,299	253	Australia	Soil
At G9	GBBC3283	GCF_007002765	48 contigs	4,946	203	Belgium	*Solanum lycopersicum*
At G13	CFBP6927	GCF_900012615	9 scaffolds	4,722	94	France	Rhizospheric soil from *Prunus persicae*
At G13	S2	GCF_000723345	60 contigs	5,574	167	?	?
At G14	KCJK1736	GCF_001641425	41 contigs	4,933	162	FL, USA	*Bos taurus* feces
At G15	MAFF210266	GCF_007002865	26 contigs	5,199	162	Japan	*Cucumis melo*
Al	CFBP5473	GCF_005145045	Complete	4,777	142	FL, USA	*Ficus benjamina*
Al	CFBP5477	GCF_005144425	24 contigs	4,657	95	Italy	?

Table 2. List of the pTi sequences analyzed. These include 15 from the genome data set listed in **Table 1** and five additional representatives downloaded from GenBank. The pTi type assignments are based on k-mer profiles. A type V pTi from *Agrobacterium vitis* is included as the outgroup. Species name abbreviations: *At, Agrobacterium tumefaciens*; *Al, Agrobacterium larrymoorei*; *Av, Agrobacterium vitis*.

Species	Strain	pTi	pTi Type	Opine Type	Accession	Size (bp)	Coding Sequences	Geographic Origin	Isolation Source
At G1	1D1108	pTi1D1108	I.b	?	NZ_CP032925	176,213	159	MD, USA	*Euonymus* sp.
At G1	Ach5	pTiAch5	II	Octopine	NZ_CP011249	194,264	153	CA, USA	*Achillea ptarmica*
At G1	183	pTi183	I.b	?	NZ_CP029048	192,674	173	Tunisia	*Prunus dulcis*
At G4	186	pTi186	I.b	?	NZ_CP042277	177,577	159	CA, USA	*Juglans regia*
At G4	1D1460	pTi1D1460	I.a	?	NZ_CP032929	214,233	198	CA, USA	*Rubus* sp.
At G4	MAFF301001	pTiSAKURA	I.b	Nopaline	NC_002147	206,479	195	Japan	*Cerasus pseudocerasus*
At G6	CFBP5499	pTiCFBP5499	III	?	NZ_CP039893	220,025	178	South Africa	*Dahlia* sp.
At G6	CFBP5877	pTiCFBP5877	III	?	NZ_CP039902	220,025	181	Israel	*Dahlia* sp.
At G7	1D1609	pTi1D1609	II	Octopine	NZ_CP026926	166,117	138	CA, USA	*Medicago sativa*
At G7	CFBP4996	pTiCFBP4996	XI	?	NZ_CM016551	605,495	521	UK	*Flacourtia ramontchi*
At G7	CFBP7129	pTiCFBP7129	I.b	?	NZ_CP039927	189,955	176	Tunisia	*Pyrus communis*
At G8	1D132	pTi1D132	I.b	?	NZ_CP033026	177,577	160	CA, USA	*Cerasus pseudocerasus*
At G8	C58	pTiC58	I.a	Nopaline	NC_003065	214,233	197	NY, USA	*Cerasus pseudocerasus*
At G9	CFBP5507	pTiCFBP5507	I.a	?	NZ_CM016546	248,634	225	Australia	Soil
?	Bo542	pTiBo542	III	Agropine	NC_010929	244,978	223	Germany	*Dahlia* sp.

?	Chry5	pTiChry5	III	Chrysopine	KX388536	197,268	210	FL, USA	*Chrysanthemum* sp.
?	EU6	pTiEU6	I.b	Succinamopine	KX388535	176,375	194	CT, USA	*Euonymus* sp.
Al	CFBP5473	pTiCFBP5473	X	?	NZ_CP039694	404,101	360	FL, USA	*Ficus benjamina*
Al	CFBP5477	pTiCFBP5477	I.b	?	NZ_CM016547	190,036	169	Italy	?
Av	S4	pTiS4	V	Vitopine	NC_011982	258,824	193	Hungary	*Vitis* sp.

Figures

Figure 1. Relationships among representatives of the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* species complex. The sister species *Agrobacterium larrymoorei* (*A. l.*) is included as the outgroup. (A) Maximum likelihood phylogeny based on a concatenated alignment of 2,093 single-copy genes shared by all 35 genomes (635,594 aligned amino acid sites). Bootstrap support values in the range of 60-80% are labeled. Strains with complete genome assemblies are highlighted with an asterisk ('*'). The genomospecies assignments (i.e., G1-G9 and G13-G15) are labeled to the right of strain names. The three *A. tumefaciens* supergroups are indicated by the colored background of the genomospecies assignments. Information to the right of the genomospecies assignments shows the grouping of genomes according to different cutoff values of genome-wide average nucleotide identity (ANI), the presence/absence of type VI secretion system (T6SS)-encoding gene cluster (green: present; white: absent), copy number of *vgrG* (white background: absent), number of plasmids, and the tumor-inducing plasmid (pTi) type based on k-mer profile (white background: absent). (B) Pairwise genome similarities based on the percentages of genomic segments mapped and the ANI values.

Figure 2. Phylogeny and organization of the T6SS gene cluster. The maximum likelihood phylogeny was inferred based on a concatenated alignment (5,960 aligned amino acid sites) of 14 core T6SS genes, including *tagE*, *tagF*, *tssM*, *tssL*, *tssK*, *tagH*, *tssG*, *tssF*, *tssE*, *tagJ*, *tssC40*, *tssC41*, *tssB*, and *tssD*. Two other core genes, *tssA* and *tssH*, are excluded because some homologs are pseudogenized. Genes downstream of *tssD* (e.g., *tai*, *tae*, and *vgrG*) are excluded due to variable presence. The species phylogeny on the right is based on **Figure 1**. Genes are color-coded according to annotation, syntenic regions are indicated by gray blocks.

Figure 3. Domain organization and classification of *vgrG* homologs. Six major types (i.e., A-F) and nine subtypes were identified and labeled on the right. For each homolog, the genomospecies assignment is provided in square brackets, followed by the locus tag. The gene names are provided in parenthesis for those functionally characterized homologs (i.e., *vgrG1-2* for C58 homologs and *vgrGa-d* for 1D1609 homologs).

Figure 4. Gene neighborhoods of *vgrG* homologs. The grouping and labeling of *vgrG* homologs are based on the convention used in **Figure 3**. For each *vgrG* homolog, three upstream genes are plotted to illustrate if it is associated with the main T6SS gene cluster or not, and 10 downstream genes are plotted to illustrate putative effector/immunity genes. Two A1-type homologs from the strain S56 (i.e., AGR1B_RS27940 and AGR1B_RS27960) are in close association with each other and plotted together.

Figure 5. Phylogenetic distribution of *vgrG* homologs and T6SS effector/immunity genes. The species tree is based on **Figure 1**. Gene presence is illustrated with colored cells in the heatmap, gene copy numbers are labeled when applicable.

Figure 6. Molecular phylogeny and global alignment of pTi. The maximum likelihood phylogeny was inferred based on the concatenated alignment of 21 core genes and 8,534 aligned amino acid sites (**Supplementary Figure S6A**). The species phylogeny on the right is based on **Figure 1**. The pTi sequences derived from this study are highlighted in bold. For those with relevant information available, the genomospecies assignments are indicated in square brackets and the opine types are indicated in parentheses. For the alignment, all plasmids are visualized in linear form starting from the replication genes. Other gene clusters are color-coded according to functions. Syntenic regions are indicated by gray blocks.

Figure 7. Distribution of key *vir* genes among the putative pTi. The pTi sequences derived from this study are highlighted in bold. For those with relevant information available, the genomospecies assignments are indicated in square brackets and the opine types are indicated in parentheses. Gene presence and absence are indicated by filled and empty circles, respectively. The main *vir* genes include the components of the type IV secretion system (T4SS; *virB1-B11* and *virD4*). For *virE3*, the three sequence types are listed separately. For *virF* and *virD3*, the sequence types are labeled inside the circles. For 1D1609, the genes *virA* and *virJ* are located on another plasmid and plotted as absent in this figure. The locus tags are provided in **Supplementary Dataset S1B**.

Figure 8. Organization of the transfer DNA (T-DNA) on tumor-inducing plasmids (pTi). Two unusual putative pTi sequences (i.e., pTiCFBP4996 and pTiCFBP4573) are excluded, other pTi sequences derived from this study are highlighted in bold. For those with relevant information available, the genomospecies assignments are indicated in square brackets and the opine types are indicated in parentheses. Genes are color-coded according to annotation, syntenic regions are indicated by gray blocks.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Figure S1. Gene content dissimilarity among the *Agrobacterium* genomes. (A) and (B): principal coordinate analysis with and without the outgroup *A. larrymoorei*, respectively. The % variance explained by each axis is provided in parentheses. (C) and (D): hierarchical clustering with and without the outgroup *A. larrymoorei*, respectively.

Supplementary Figure S2. Global alignment of the linear chromosomes. Locations of T6SS-*hcp* operons and *vgrG* homologs are labeled.

Domain 1 (538 a.a; 44/44; TIGR03361)

Domain 2 (42 a.a.; 44/44)

Domain 3 (59 a.a.; 44/44)

Domain 4 (67 a.a.; 32/44)

Domain 5 (42 a.a.; 20/44)

Domain 6 (30 a.a.; 8/44)

Domain 7 (117 a.a.; 3/44)

Domain 8 (42 a.a.; 2/44)

Hydrophobicity
Hydrophilic
Neutral
Hydrophobic

Supplementary Figure S3. Logo plots of the putative protein domains identified among *vgrG* homologs. For each domain, the length and the number of homologs with the domain is labeled. Domain 1 is the only domain with a corresponding database entry (TIGR03361).

Type A1
(Atu4348)
Coverage = 75%
Identity = 30%

Type A2
(At1D1460_RS14800)
Coverage = 75%
Identity = 30%

Type A3
(At12D1_RS23095)
Coverage = 77%
Identity = 30%

Type B1
(Atu3642)
Coverage = 81%
Identity = 30%

Type C1
(CFBP5507_RS22530)
Coverage = 78%
Identity = 30%

Type D1
(At1D1108_RS23250)
Coverage = 86%
Identity = 30%

Type D2
(CFBP5477_RS20375)
Coverage = 87%
Identity = 30%

Type E1
(Ach5_RS22800)
Coverage = 86%
Identity = 33%

Type F1
(CFBP5477_RS22925)
Coverage = 78%
Identity = 30%

Supplementary Figure S4. Predicted structures of VgrG homologs. Regions are colored according to the scheme used in the domain analysis (**Figure. 3**). The chain D of PA0091 VgrG1 (PDB identifier: 4MTK) from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was selected as the template. The C-terminal parts that could not be confidently inferred are omitted. In all cases, the coverage (i.e., percentage of the sequence included in the structure prediction) are at least 75%, the sequence identity to the template is at least 30% and the confidence score is 100%.

Supplementary Figure S5. Maximum likelihood phylogenies of *vgrG*-associated domains. (A) Domain 1 (TIGR03361; VI_Rhs_Vgr super family), (B) Domain 2 (unknown function), and (C) Domain 3 (unknown function).

Supplementary Figure S6. Principal coordinate analysis of gene content among the putative pTi analyzed.

Supplementary Figure S7. Maximum likelihood phylogeny of pTi based on the concatenated alignment of shared single-copy genes. (A) All of the 20 pTi sequences analyzed; 21 core genes and 8,534 aligned amino acid sites. (B) Excluding the two novel pTi; 40 core genes and 15,473 aligned amino acid sites, all branches received > 80% bootstrap support.

A

Mock   C58   12D1   CFBP4996   CFBP5473

(scale bar = 0.25 cm)

B

Supplementary Figure S8. Tomato tumor assay of strains 12D1, CFBP4996, and CFBP5473. Mock was inoculated with sterilized water as a negative control and strain C58 was included as a positive control. Strain 12D1 harbors a plasmid with opine transporter and catabolism genes but lacks *vir* regulon genes and identifiable T-DNA. CFBP4996 and CFBP5473 harbor novel types of putative tumor-inducing plasmids (pTi). (A) Tomato stems at three weeks after inoculation. Scale bar: 0.25 cm. (B) Weight distribution of five biological replicates (1-cm segments of the stem centered at the inoculation site). The letters indicate ANOVA results.

Supplementary Figure S9. Gene organization of the *vir* regulons on pTi. Syntenic regions are indicated by grey blocks. The virulence (*vir*) genes are highlighted in red, the conjugation (*tra*) genes are highlighted in yellow, and other genes are plotted in white.

Supplementary Dataset S1. Detailed information of the analyzed genes. (A) List of *vgrG*-associated genes. Information including genomic location, RefSeq annotation, and domain prediction are included. (B) Locus tags of the *vir* regulon genes on pTi. The *virA*/*J* of 1D1609 are located on another plasmid and are highlighted by "*". The *virB7* of pTiChry5 and pTiEU6 are unannotated in the GenBank RefSeq records so no locus tag is available but the gene presence was confirmed by BLASTN searches.