Species boundaries in the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* complex and multi-level

modular evolution of their antibacterial type VI secretion system and tumor-

inducing plasmids

Running Title: ***Agrobacterium* species boundaries and modular evolution**

Lin Chou[a#], Yu-Chen Lin[a#], Mindia Haryono[a], Mary Nia M. Santos[a,b,c], Shu-Ting Cho[a],

Alexandra J. Weisberg[d], Chih-Feng Wu[a,d], Jeff H. Chang[d], Erh-Min Lai[a,b,e], Chih-Horng

Kuo[a,b,e]*

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

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

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

Taiwan

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

Taiwan

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

Oregon, USA

[e] Biotechnology Center, National Chung-Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan

[#]Equal contribution; ordered alphabetically

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

Abstract

Many pathogenic bacteria are recognized as species complexes and uncertainties regarding the organization of their genetic diversity are challenges for research efforts. Within *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*, multiple genomospecies have been identified; however, the exact species boundaries are unclear, which causes chaos in nomenclature and hampers communication. In this work, we conducted targeted genome sequencing to achieve a comprehensive and balanced taxon sampling within this complex. Our results from genome-wide sequence identity, core genome phylogeny, and gene content not only supported that those recognized genomospecies are distinct biological entities but also identified novel genomospecies. Based on the fully resolved phylogeny, we further investigated the evolution of genes critical in *Agrobacterium* fitness and ecology. For the type VI secretion system (T6SS) involved in interbacterial competition, multiple losses and one horizontal gene transfer (HGT) event were inferred. For the tumor-inducing plasmids (pTi) and the pTi-encoded type IV secretion system (T4SS) that determine *Agrobacterium* phytopathogenicity, the evolution of these accessory replicons was decoupled from the chromosomes, thus contributing to another level of complexity. Intriguingly, for both T6SS and T4SS, genes that encode the structural components are highly conserved, whereas extensive diversity exists at multiple levels (i.e., between-species, within-species, intra-genome, and intra-gene) for genes that encode effectors and associated proteins. These findings suggest that opposite modes of selection may act on components conferring different functions within a system. In conclusion, this work provides insights into the genomic

diversification of these bacteria and sheds light on the modularity of their molecular

evolution.

Importance

The alphaproteobacterium *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* is important as a plant

pathogen and a critical biotechnology tool for genetic engineering. Based on

comprehensive sampling within this species complex, this study utilized multiple

approaches of genome analysis to delineate the species boundaries and resolved the

phylogenetic relationships. The results shed light on the patterns of genomic divergence

among a group of closely related lineages, particularly regarding how these lineages

may be partitioned into distinct biological entities at the species level and above.

Additionally, targeted in-depth analysis of those genetic elements involved in critical

aspects of microbial fitness, including the secretion system for interbacterial competition

and the oncogenic plasmid for pathogenicity against eukaryotic hosts, provides novel

insights into the multi-level modularity and diverse modes of selection that govern the

evolution of these components. This work improves our understanding of this study

system and demonstrates a highly effective strategy applicable to other bacterial

species complexes.

Keywords

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

evolution

Introduction

Investigation of species boundaries in bacteria is fundamentally important to basic and applied microbiology because species is the basic unit for formal description of biological entities and the key identifier for application of microbial resources (1, 2). However, many bacterial groups, including several notable pathogens such as *Pseudomonas* spp. (3) and *Ralstonia solanacearum* (4), exist in the form of species complexes. Uncertainties regarding species boundaries within such groups could hamper research, communication, and policy-making (e.g., quarantine regulations). In a survey of > 20,000 bacterial genome sequences from 91 species belonging to 13 phyla, 21 were found to comprise multiple biological species based on barriers to homologous recombination (5). This finding highlighted the importance of utilizing comparative genomics to infer if certain species boundaries exist within a group of closely related bacteria, and possibly also the need towards a standardized taxonomy (6, 7). Improved understanding of the species boundaries can refine gene content analysis to provide insights into their biology and facilitate the interpretation of experimental works on microbial physiology or ecology.

In this study, we utilized the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* species complex, also commonly known as *Agrobacterium* biovar 1 (8), as the study system. These bacteria are noted for their phytopathogenicity as the causative agent of crown gall disease that affects over 90 plant families (9). More importantly, the development of *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation has provided a critical tool for genetic manipulation in plant sciences and agricultural biotechnology (10, 11).

The extensive genetic diversity of *A. tumefaciens* has been noted prior to the

availability of genome sequences. Based on DNA-DNA hybridization and biochemical

characteristics (12), amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP) analysis (13–15),

and recombination frequencies (16), 10 genomospecies (i.e., G1-G9 and G13; also

known as genomic species, genomic groups, or genomovars) have been identified.

Later on, based on microarray hybridization for comparisons with the reference strain

C58, 196 G8-specific genes were found to be mostly clustered into seven islands, which

provided the basis for the description of G8 as a distinct species *Agrobacterium fabrum*

(17). However, because C58 in G8 is the standard strain for most *A. tumefaciens*

studies and the progenitor for nearly all of the disarmed strains used in *Agrobacterium-*

mediated transformation (11, 18, 19), the continuing mixed usage of these two species

names causes confusion. Additionally, the name *Agrobacterium radiobacter* refers to *A.*

tumefaciens G4 (15, 17), the entire *A. tumefaciens* complex (20), or the more divergent

Agrobacterium biovar 2 (21). Using *A. radiobacter* for referring to *Agrobacterium* biovar

2 is particularly confusing because *Agrobacterium* biovar 2 is also known as *Rhizobium*

rhizogenes (22) and differs from the *A. tumefaciens* complex (i.e., *Agrobacterium* biovar

1) in their chromosomal organization (21, 23). Finally, within Rhizobiaceae,

Agrobacterium was designated as either clade B (24) or C (25), and these designations

were also used for *Neorhizobium* (25) or *Rhizobium* (24), respectively. All these issues

have caused further confusion and remain to be resolved.

As genome sequences became available from more *A. tumefaciens*

genomospecies, the understanding of their divergence and evolution was improved. For

example, with ~5,200 protein-coding genes per genome, pairwise comparisons between

different genomospecies typically found only ~4,000 shared genes and their core-

genome contains < 3,600 genes (26, 27). Strikingly, > 32,000 horizontal gene transfer

(HGT) events were inferred for the history of *A. tumefaciens* evolution (28). Because the

HGT patterns indicated co-transfers of genes that encode coherent biochemical

pathways, it was hypothesized that purifying selection on those acquired gene clusters

and overall gene content drove the ecological diversification among genomospecies

(28). Also, their oncogenic plasmids exhibit complex modularity and transmission

patterns, which further contributes to the evolution of these bacteria (29).

Despite these progresses, several key issues have remained unresolved. First,

although previous studies suggested that each of the *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies

should be considered as a distinct species (12, 16, 27–29), quantitative and definitive

guidelines for establishing the species boundaries are lacking. Second, the phylogenetic

relationships among these genomospecies needs to be resolved with confidence,

particularly for the deeper branches, to provide a concrete foundation for evolutionary

analysis. Third, previous studies were limited by the taxon sampling and/or the

assembly quality of available genome sequences, hence those better-characterized

genomospecies (e.g., G1 and G8) were overrepresented while others (e.g., G2, G3, G5,

G6, and G9) were underrepresented. Such biases may have affected the conclusions

obtained from previous evolutionary genomics studies (27–29).

To address these issues, we performed targeted genome sequencing for those

underrepresented genomospecies to achieve a comprehensive and balanced taxon

sampling of *A. tumefaciens* diversity. By limiting the analysis to high-quality assemblies,

this dataset enabled us to conduct detailed examinations of replicon-level synteny and

confident inferences of gene presence/absence. In addition to providing a global view of

their genomic diversity and resolving the phylogeny, we also performed focused

analysis of genetic elements involved in key aspects of *A. tumefaciens* fitness and

ecology, namely the type VI secretion system (T6SS) for interbacterial competition (27,

30) and the tumor-inducing plasmids (pTi) for phytopathogenicity (9–11). Taken

together, the investigations conducted at the levels of whole-genome, whole-replicon,

gene clusters, individual genes, and protein domains provide novel and detailed

information on the evolution and genetic diversity of these bacteria that are important in

plant pathology and biotechnology.

Results

<u>Molecular Phylogeny and Genome Divergence</u>

Whole-genome sequencing was conducted for 12 strains belonging to the *A.*

tumefaciens species complex to improve taxon sampling and two for the sister species

Agrobacterium larrymoorei to provide an ideal outgroup. Twenty-one additional *A.*

tumefaciens genome sequences were obtained from GenBank (31) (Table 1). In

consideration of a balanced sampling, each of the 10 known *A. tumefaciens*

genomospecies was represented by at least two but no more than five genome

sequences. Multiple rounds of preliminary phylogenetic analysis were performed to

select representative genome sequences that yielded a dataset with maximal within-

genomospecies diversity.

A total of 2,093 single-copy genes are shared by the 35 genomes analyzed,

corresponding to ~40% of the genes in each individual genome. Compared to previous

studies that conducted genome-based phylogenetic analysis for Rhizobiaceae or

beyond (22, 28, 29), the more focused sampling of this work increased the core gene

count by one-to-two orders of magnitude and produced a well-resolved maximum

likelihood phylogeny for *A. tumefaciens* (Figure 1A). All 10 recognized genomospecies

form distinct monophyletic clades with > 80% bootstrap support. Two novel

genomospecies were identified, each represented by a single strain (i.e., KCJK1736

and MAFF210266), and are sister to G2 and G3, respectively. The patterns of genome

sequence divergence were entirely consistent with the 95% average nucleotide identity

(ANI) cutoff suggested for delineating bacterial species (32). For pairwise comparisons

within each genomospecies, 73.5%-97.9% of the genomic segments were mapped and

those segments have 95.1-99.9% ANI (Figure 1B). For between-genomospecies

comparisons, 65.2-82.6% of the genomes were mapped with 85.0-92.9% ANI. For *A.*

tumefaciens-A. larrymoorei comparisons, only ~50% of the genomes were mapped with

< 82% ANI.

The 12 *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies could be classified into seven groups

based on 90% ANI, and may be further classified into three supergroups according to

the phylogeny (Figure 1A). Based on a time-calibrated phylogeny (29), the most recent

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

those three supergroups emerged ~40 Mya, those seven groups emerged ~30 Mya,

and most of the recognized genomospecies emerged ~2-10 Mya. The rapid radiation in

the early history of *A. tumefaciens* had made the inference of those deeper relationships

difficult (22, 28, 29). Nevertheless, those early nodes were supported by ~70%

bootstrap in this work (Figure 1A).

For gene content comparisons, the principal coordinate analysis and hierarchical

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

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

Nevertheless, with the exception of G4 and G7, these genomospecies could be

distinguished based on gene content (Supplementary Figure S1B and S1D). This

finding conflicts with a previous work that stated it is inappropriate to use gene content

to distinguish these genomospecies (28). This conflict may be explained by the

improvements in taxon sampling and assembly quality.

<u>The Type VI Secretion System (T6SS) Genes</u>

Using the fully resolved organismal phylogeny as a framework, next we

examined the molecular evolution of their T6SS genes. The T6SS is a phage tail-like

contractile nanomachine for injecting effectors (i.e., toxins) into eukaryotic or bacterial

cells, and plays a major role in pathogenesis, symbiosis, or interbacterial competition

(33, 34). For *A. tumefaciens*, the T6SS is a key weapon for *in planta* competition

between different genomospecies (27) and against other bacteria (30). Thus,

investigation on the T6SS genes may shed light on the genetic basis for their

competition against rivals in the same niche.

In *A. tumefaciens*, the T6SS genes are located on the linear chromosome and

mostly form a cluster of ~20 genes that are organized into two adjacent operons (i.e.,

imp and *hcp*) with opposite orientations (27, 35) (Figure 2). Some strains harbor

accessary T6SS loci located elsewhere on the same chromosome (27, 35, 36)

(Supplementary Figure S2). Among the strains examined, a patchy distribution of the

T6SS genes was observed (Figure 1). The T6SS gene phylogeny is largely congruent

with the species tree (Figure 2). The only incongruence is that the MRCA of G1 appears

to have acquired this gene cluster from G8. Consistent with this inference, the

chromosomal location of this gene cluster is conserved except in G1 strains

(Supplementary Figure S2). Based on these findings, it is likely that this T6SS gene

cluster was present in the MRCA of G8-G6-G2-G4-G7-G9-G3 and at least two

independent losses have occurred (i.e., G6 and G2). It is unclear if the MRCA of *A.*

tumefaciens harbored the T6SS gene cluster or not, as presence followed by a loss in

the MRCA of G13-G5-G1 or absence followed by a gain in the MRCA of G8-G6-G2-G4-

G7-G9-G3 are equally parsimonious. Although the outgroup *A. larrymoorei* harbors the

T6SS genes, the T6SS genes are known to have a patchy distribution among

Rhizobiaceae (36, 37), indicating that these genes are not essential for these bacteria

and have high rates of gains and losses. Consistent with this, multiple pseudogenes

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

these gene clusters may be in the process of degradation and possibly will be lost

eventually. The presence or absence of the T6SS genes do not have obvious links to

the isolation sources or geographic origins (Table 1), so the determinants for

maintaining these genes are unknown.

Examination of the synteny revealed that the *imp* operon has near-perfect

conservation, whereas the *hcp* operon often has different genes downstream of *vgrG*

(Figure 2). Importantly, because the genes downstream of *vgrG* include those that

encode effector and immunity (EI) protein pairs, this genetic diversity may play a key

role in interbacterial competition (27). The rapid evolution of these genes is illustrated by

three examples. First, despite the low levels of sequence divergence among G1 strains

(i.e., > 98% ANI in all pairwise comparisons), different genes are found downstream of

vgrG and these variations are not consistent with either the species phylogeny or the

T6SS gene phylogeny. Second, CFBP4996 of G7 shares the same EI genes with 12D1

and 183 of G4, rather than with other G7 strains. Third, for G3 strains, *vgrG* and the

associated EI genes are located elsewhere on the linear chromosome, rather than a

part of the T6SS-*hcp* operon (Figure 2 and Supplementary Figure S2). These results

suggest that recombination involving gene modules has contributed to the genetic

diversity of these *A. tumefaciens* T6SS EI genes.

The modularity of *vgrG* and its downstream genes is expected based on the

knowledge that *vgrG* homologs encode proteins with distinct C-terminal domains, which

are responsible for effector-binding specificities (36, 37). For in-depth investigation, we

examined the VgrG protein domain architecture among these homologs. The 44 *vgrG*

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

homologs located elsewhere, could be classified into six major types and nine subtypes

(Figure 3). Among the eight protein domains identified, only three are present in all

homologs. The N-terminal domain 1 was the most conserved domain (Supplementary

Figure S3) and the only domain that could be found in current databases. This domain

corresponds to TIGR03361, which accounts for ~66-77% of the protein length and the

bulk of the predicted 3D structures that presumably form a trimeric complex analogous

to phage tail spike (38, 39) (Supplementary Figure S4). The variable C-terminal

domains are difficult for protein structure prediction programs due to sequence

divergence from the reference and thus were often omitted. Nevertheless, when the

structure predictions are available for these variable domains (e.g., domain 5 of E1 and

domain 7 of F1), some differences could be observed (Supplementary Figure S4),

which may provide information on the determinants of effector-binding specificities. For

domain 5 that was found in all homologs belonging to subtypes A1-A3 and E1 (Figure

3), its presence is perfectly correlated with 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* (37) and *Vibrio cholerae* (40, 41), this

strong co-occurrence suggests specific interactions between VgrG domain 5 and

DUF4123. Similar strategies based on co-occurrence patterns may be used to infer the

interacting domains of VgrG with other T6SS components.

Intriguingly, despite the conservation of domain architecture within each subtype

(Figure 3), the phylogenies inferred from the three domains present in all *vgrG*

homologs do not share 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

may have evolved independently and can recombine between subtypes. At the level of

gene cluster organization, some *vgrG* homologs belonging to the same subtype have

distinct downstream genes (e.g., A1 and B1), regardless of whether these *vgrG*

homologs are associated with the main T6SS gene cluster or not (Figure 4 and

Supplementary Data Set S1). 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, the numbers and

the types of *vgrG* homologs, as well as their linked EI genes, lack any strong correlation

with the species phylogeny (Figure 5). For genomes that harbor multiple *vgrG*

homologs, typically those *vgrG* homologs belong to different subtypes. Strain 1D1609 is

a notable exception by having the highest number of *vgrG* homologs and all four

belonging to subtype B1. However, our experimental characterization of this strain

demonstrated that while these four homologs were functionally redundant in mediating

T6SS secretion, only three of these homologs contributed to antibacterial activity (36).

Among the putative EI genes, EI15 (i.e., the peptidoglycan amidase gene *tae* and

its cognate immunity gene *tai*) were found in nearly all T6SS-harboring strains (Figure

5). The conservation may be attributed to their locations, as these are the only EI genes

located upstream of *vgrG*, which is a more central part of the T6SS-*hcp* operon.

Additionally, or alternatively, the conservation may be explained by purifying selection

on maintaining these genes for their functions, as Tae could provide competitive growth

advantage over other *A. tumefaciens* or *Escherichia coli* that lack *tai* (42). Based on

functional classifications of the 63 putative effector genes, peptidoglycan-targeting

toxins and nucleases are the two most commonly found categories with 21 each

(Supplementary Data Set S1). This finding is consistent with an investigation of the

T6SS-harboring Proteobacteria (43), which also found these two as the dominant

categories and suggested that they play complementary roles in T6SS-mediated

competition. Finally, we found 10 putative effector genes families without an identifiable

cognate immunity gene (Figure 5). These findings may be explained by the lack of

known domains for immunity genes, as well as our conservative approaches of

annotation. It is likely that the cognate immunity genes are those immediately

downstream of the putative effector genes. Alternatively, some of these orphan effector

genes may not encode bacterial toxins.

<u>The Tumor-inducing Plasmids (pTi) and Associated Genes</u>

The virulence plasmids pTi are an important component of *A. tumefaciens*

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

delivering a transfer DNA (T-DNA) into plant cells via the type IV secretion system

(T4SS), and are the determinant of *A. tumefaciens* phytopathogenicity (9–11). Our

recent work on the oncogenic plasmids in Rhizobiaceae, including pTi and root-inducing

plasmids (pRi), established a k-mer based classification scheme for these plasmids and

revealed complex patterns in their evolution and transmission (29). To gain a

comprehensive and detailed look into the pTi diversity and evolution within the *A.*

tumefaciens species complex, we adopted this classification scheme on the available

sequences for in-depth characterization. Among the 35 genome sequences analyzed in

this work (Table 1), 15 were found to harbor a putative pTi (Figure 1). Additionally,

exhaustive GenBank searches identified five other key representatives (Table 2).

Within the *A. tumefaciens* species complex, type I pTi is the most abundant type,

followed by types III and II (Figure 1). This observation is consistent with our previous

study that examined 57 pTi-harboring *A. tumefaciens* strains without considering the

balance of taxon sampling (29). The type assignments based on k-mer profiles were

consistent with the patterns observed in global alignment (Figure 6), molecular

phylogeny of shared genes (Supplementary Figure S6), and gene content comparison

(Supplementary Figure S7). No notable congruence was found between the

chromosomal and plasmid phylogenies (Figure 6), indicating frequent transfers of pTi

across genomospecies in the evolutionary history.

Based on phylogeny and gene content, types II and III pTi are more similar to

each other than to type I pTi. Within type I, the two subtypes (i.e., I.a and I.b) are

distinguishable by gene content (Supplementary Figure S7) but do not form mutually

exclusive clades in the core-gene phylogeny (Supplementary Figure S6). All putative

pTi, including the outgroup pTiS4 (i.e., type V from *Agrobacterium vitis*) and the

unclassified pTiCFBP4996/pTiCFBP5473, 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 differentiations 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 (44), 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 (45), can

be classified into three sequence types and each is associated with a specific pTi type.

Those less well-characterized *vir* genes, such as *virD3* (46, 47), *virJ* (48), and *virP*, are

also distributed differently among types I-III pTi. Finally, in addition to the

presence/absence of individual genes, the overall organization of *vir* regulons also differ

among these pTi (Supplementary Figure S8). 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 (29) (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, these genetic variations may contribute to the host range differences observed

among strains harboring different types of pTi (49).

Two novel putative pTi (i.e., pTiCFBP4996 and pTiCFBP5473) were found from

the 14 newly sequenced strains. This efficiency of discovering novel pTi is surprising,

given that our previous study of defining those six pTi types was comprehensive in

sampling historical collections of 162 *Agrobacterium* strains that spanned the past 90

years and > 50 host species from six continents (29), and demonstrated the usefulness

of a phylogeny-guided approach for investigating genetic diversity. These two novel pTi

are distinctive in their large sizes (Table 2), gene organization (Figure 6), phylogenetic

placements (Supplementary Figure S6), and gene content (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 pTiCFBP4996, its 7-kb T-DNA contains only four genes

(i.e., two for opine synthesis and two encode hypothetical proteins). Consistent with the

lack of identifiable plant hormone synthesis genes, CFBP4996 did not induce tumor

formation on tomato (Supplementary Figure S9). It is unclear if this plasmid represents

a primitive pTi that has not acquired the plant hormone synthesis genes yet, or it

represents a degraded pTi that has lost these genes. For the tumorigenic strain

CFBP5473, its T-DNA is ~93 kb in size and contains all of the *vir* regulon genes. The

extremely large T-DNA may have resulted from a translocation of the T-DNA border

sequence. Alternatively, there may be some non-canonical T-DNA border sequences

and the T-DNA of pTiCFBP5473 is smaller than predicted.

Discussion

<u>Biological Entities at the Species Level and Above</u>

The new genome sequences reported in this work greatly improved the taxon

sampling for a group of bacteria with importance in plant pathology and biotechnology.

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

(Supplementary Figure S2), 95% ANI is a reliable approach for defining species within

the *A. tumefaciens* complex, as is the case for most other bacteria (32). The discrete

multimodal distribution of genome similarities (Supplementary Figure S1) suggested

that there are genetic barriers between different genomospecies, which may be

explained by neutral processes and/or selection (28, 32). 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 (5). With the continuing drop in sequencing cost, it is foreseeable that the ANI

analysis may become 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%

(32). 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. In our set

of strains that provided a more detailed look at a group of closely-related species, the

~85-93% ANI observed between *A. tumefaciens* genomospecies (Supplementary

Figure S1) 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 *A. tumefaciens*, 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 (8). The promiscuous nature of their pTi (29, 50–52) 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 the sister lineages (e.g.,

A. larrymoorei and *A. rubi*), the more diverse host range of *A. tumefaciens* (8, 9) may

have facilitated the divergence of this complex into multiple genomospecies.

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

Although it may be desirable to establish a standardized taxonomy with a defined range

of genomic divergence for each taxonomic work, large variations in the divergence

values at a given rank were observed among different taxonomic groups in previous

attempts (6, 7, 53). 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 (6). 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 (54). Given these considerations, other aspects of biology

(e.g., physiology, ecology, etc) may play more important roles in defining those higher

taxonomic ranks. Thus, the current system used by the International Committee on

Systematics of Prokaryotes that assigns one subcommittee to each major taxonomic

group is helpful in incorporating the organism-specific knowledge.

<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 (55). 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 (56, 57), despite rampant HGT in bacterial evolution (57–60) and the

importance of HGT in adaptation (61–63). A possible explanation for these seemingly

conflicting observations is that most of the acquired genes are lost quickly (62),

presumably due to the strong mutational bias towards deletions observed in bacteria

(64, 65). Additionally, acquired genes are subjected to the selection that drives species

diversification (28), which should 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 (51), and the spread of plasmids have important

implications on the evolution of virulence (29, 66) and antimicrobial resistance (67),

further investigations on the evolution of plasmids and their compatibilities with

chromosomes are important (29, 68, 69).

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

made based on 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 may not be a

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

processes may be 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 (i.e., purifying selection against changes to preserve

the apparatus of a functional secretion system versus positive selection for more

diverse effectors and other accessory components). Third, modularity that may reflect

functional constraints could be 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 (28). 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 (70). 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 in order to better understand the organisms of interest.

<u>Conclusions</u>

In summary, 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. Our examination of biological boundaries at the species level and above

improves the understanding of how natural biodiversity is organized, and provides a

strong foundation for future taxonomic revisions that could facilitate communication. 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

Genome Sequencing

A total of 14 *Agrobacterium* 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 *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* species complex, and two *Agrobacterium larrymoorei* strains (i.e., CFBP5473 and CFBP5477) as the outgroup.

The procedure for whole-genome shotgun sequencing was based on that described in our previous studies (27, 71, 72). 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 (73) with the settings "-exp_cov auto -min_contig_lgth 2000 -scaffolding no". The contigs were oriented by mapping to those complete genomes available (Table 1) using MAUVE v2015-02-13 (74). 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) (75).

<u>Comparative and Evolutionary Analysis</u>

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

comparisons were based on those described in our previous studies (27, 76–78).

Briefly, pairwise genome similarities were calculated using FastANI v1.1 (32). 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 (79) and visualized using genoPlotR v0.8.9 (80). For gene content

comparison, BLASTP v2.6.0 (79) 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 (30, 37, 87) and other strains (27,

36) 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) (88) and the Phyre2 protein fold recognition server (89); 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 subject and the

protein sequences of known genes were used as the query 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. 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 (90) 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 (91) and sequence conservation was visualized using WebLogo server v3 (92).

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 (27) 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. The pTi typing was performed based on k-mer profile

clustering with a reference set of 143 oncogenic plasmids in Rhizobiaceae (29). For T-

DNA identification, putative T-DNA borders were identified based on the motif

YGRCAGGATATATNNNNNKGTMAWN (93). Genes involved in opine metabolism (94)

and T4SS (95) were identified based on the annotation and homologous gene clustering

results produced by OrthoMCL. Additionally, putative T4SS effectors were identified

using the T4SEpre tool (96) in EffectiveDB (97) 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 (98) 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 have been deposited in NCBI under the

BioProjects PRJNA534385-PRJNA534397 and PRJNA534399.

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 103-2321-B-001-009). 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. 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 was provided by the

Genomics Core (Institute of Molecular Biology, Academia Sinica). The PacBio

sequencing and data processing service was provided by Genomics BioSci & Tech. Co.

Ltd. (New Taipei City, Taiwan). The Institute of Plant and Microbial Biology (Academia

Sinica) and the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology (Oregon State University)

provided computing resources.

References

References

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

2. Fraser C, Alm EJ, Polz MF, Spratt BG, Hanage WP. 2009. The bacterial species
challenge: making sense of genetic and ecological diversity. Science 323:741–
746.

3. Peix A, Ramírez-Bahena M-H, Velázquez E. 2018. The current status on the
taxonomy of *Pseudomonas* revisited: an update. Infect Genet Evol 57:106–116.

4. Genin S, Denny TP. 2012. Pathogenomics of the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species
complex. Annu Rev Phytopathol 50:67–89.

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

6. Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Waite DW, Rinke C, Skarshewski A, Chaumeil P-A,
Hugenholtz P. 2018. A standardized bacterial taxonomy based on genome
phylogeny substantially revises the tree of life. 10. Nat Biotechnol 36:996–1004.

7. Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Chaumeil P-A, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P.
2020. A complete domain-to-species taxonomy for Bacteria and Archaea. 9. Nat
Biotechnol 38:1079–1086.

8. Young JM. 2008. *Agrobacterium*—taxonomy of plant-pathogenic *Rhizobium*
species, p. 183–220. *In* Tzfira, T, Citovsky, V (eds.), *Agrobacterium*: From Biology
to Biotechnology. Springer New York.

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

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

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

12. Popoff MY, Kersters K, Kiredjian M, Miras I, Coynault C. 1984. Position
taxonomique de souches de *Agrobacterium* d'origine hospitalière. Ann Inst
Pasteur Microbiol 135:427–442.

13. Mougel C, Thioulouse J, Perrière G, Nesme X. 2002. A mathematical method for
determining genome divergence and species delineation using AFLP. Int J Syst
Evol Microbiol 52:573–586.

14.   Portier P, Saux MF-L, Mougel C, Lerondelle C, Chapulliot D, Thioulouse J, Nesme
688   X. 2006. Identification of genomic species in *Agrobacterium* biovar 1 by AFLP
689   genomic markers. Appl Environ Microbiol 72:7123–7131.

690   15.   Costechareyre D, Rhouma A, Lavire C, Portier P, Chapulliot D, Bertolla F,
691   Boubaker A, Dessaux Y, Nesme X. 2010. Rapid and efficient identification of
692   *Agrobacterium* species by *recA* allele analysis: *Agrobacterium recA* diversity.
693   Microb Ecol 60:862–872.

694   16.   Costechareyre D, Bertolla F, Nesme X. 2009. Homologous recombination in
695   *Agrobacterium*: potential implications for the genomic species concept in bacteria.
696   Mol Biol Evol 26:167–176.

697   17.   Lassalle F, Campillo T, Vial L, Baude J, Costechareyre D, Chapulliot D, Shams M,
698   Abrouk D, Lavire C, Oger-Desfeux C, Hommais F, Gueguen L, Daubin V, Muller D,
699   Nesme X. 2011. Genomic species are ecological species as revealed by
700   comparative genomics in *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Genome Biol Evol 3:762–
701   781.

702   18.   Hellens R, Mullineaux P, Klee H. 2000. A guide to *Agrobacterium* binary Ti
703   vectors. Trends Plant Sci 5:446–451.

704   19.   Lee L-Y, Gelvin SB. 2008. T-DNA binary vectors and systems. Plant Physiol
705   146:325–332.

706   20.   Young JM, Pennycook SR, Watson DRW. 2006. Proposal that *Agrobacterium
707   radiobacter* has priority over *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Request for an Opinion.
708   Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 56:491–493.

709   21.   Slater SC, Goldman BS, Goodner B, Setubal JC, Farrand SK, Nester EW, Burr TJ,
710   Banta L, Dickerman AW, Paulsen I, Otten L, Suen G, Welch R, Almeida NF,
711   Arnold F, Burton OT, Du Z, Ewing A, Godsy E, Heisel S, Houmiel KL, Jhaveri J, Lu
712   J, Miller NM, Norton S, Chen Q, Phoolcharoen W, Ohlin V, Ondrusek D, Pride N,
713   Stricklin SL, Sun J, Wheeler C, Wilson L, Zhu H, Wood DW. 2009. Genome
714   sequences of three *Agrobacterium* biovars help elucidate the evolution of
715   multichromosome genomes in bacteria. J Bacteriol 191:2501–2511.

716   22.   Ormeño-Orrillo E, Servín-Garcidueñas LE, Rogel MA, González V, Peralta H,
717   Mora J, Martínez-Romero J, Martínez-Romero E. 2015. Taxonomy of rhizobia and
718   agrobacteria from the Rhizobiaceae family in light of genomics. Syst Appl Microbiol
719   38:287–291.

720   23.   Slater S, Setubal JC, Goodner B, Houmiel K, Sun J, Kaul R, Goldman BS, Farrand
721   SK, Almeida N, Burr T, Nester E, Rhoads DM, Kadoi R, Ostheimer T, Pride N,
722   Sabo A, Henry E, Telepak E, Cromes L, Harkleroad A, Oliphant L, Pratt-Szegila P,
723   Welch R, Wood D. 2013. Reconciliation of sequence data and updated annotation

of the genome of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* C58, and distribution of a linear
chromosome in the genus *Agrobacterium*. Appl Environ Microbiol 79:1414–1417.

24.   Mousavi SA, Österman J, Wahlberg N, Nesme X, Lavire C, Vial L, Paulin L, de
Lajudie P, Lindström K. 2014. Phylogeny of the *Rhizobium–Allorhizobium–*
Agrobacterium clade supports the delineation of *Neorhizobium* gen. nov. Syst Appl
Microbiol 37:208–215.

25.   Mousavi SA, Willems A, Nesme X, de Lajudie P, Lindström K. 2015. Revised
phylogeny of Rhizobiaceae: proposal of the delineation of *Pararhizobium* gen.
nov., and 13 new species combinations. Syst Appl Microbiol 38:84–90.

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

27.   Wu C-F, Santos MNM, Cho S-T, Chang H-H, Tsai Y-M, Smith DA, Kuo C-H,
Chang JH, Lai E-M. 2019. Plant-pathogenic *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strains
have diverse type VI effector-immunity pairs and vary in in-planta competitiveness.
Mol Plant Microbe Interact 32:961–971.

28.   Lassalle F, Planel R, Penel S, Chapulliot D, Barbe V, Dubost A, Calteau A,
Vallenet D, Mornico D, Bigot T, Guéguen L, Vial L, Muller D, Daubin V, Nesme X.
2017. Ancestral genome estimation reveals the history of ecological diversification
in *Agrobacterium*. Genome Biol Evol 9:3413–3431.

29.   Weisberg AJ, Davis EW, Tabima J, Belcher MS, Miller M, Kuo C-H, Loper JE,
Grünwald NJ, Putnam ML, Chang JH. 2020. Unexpected conservation and global
transmission of agrobacterial virulence plasmids. Science 368:eaba5256.

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

31.   Benson DA, Cavanaugh M, Clark K, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Ostell J, Pruitt KD, Sayers
EW. 2018. GenBank. Nucleic Acids Res 46:D41–D47.

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

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

34.   Jurėnas D, Journet L. 2021. Activity, delivery, and diversity of Type VI secretion
effectors. Mol Microbiol 115:383–394.

35.   Wu H-Y, Chung P-C, Shih H-W, Wen S-R, Lai E-M. 2008. Secretome analysis
uncovers an Hcp-family protein secreted via a type VI secretion system in
Agrobacterium tumefaciens. J Bacteriol 190:2841–2850.

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

37.   Bondage DD, Lin J-S, Ma L-S, Kuo C-H, Lai E-M. 2016. 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 113:E3931–E3940.

38.   Pukatzki S, Ma AT, Revel AT, Sturtevant D, Mekalanos JJ. 2007. Type VI
secretion system translocates a phage tail spike-like protein into target cells where
it cross-links actin. Proc Natl Acad Sci 104:15508–15513.

39.   Leiman PG, Basler M, Ramagopal UA, Bonanno JB, Sauder JM, Pukatzki S,
Burley SK, Almo SC, Mekalanos JJ. 2009. Type VI secretion apparatus and phage
tail-associated protein complexes share a common evolutionary origin. Proc Natl
Acad Sci 106:4154–4159.

40.   Liang X, Moore R, Wilton M, Wong MJQ, Lam L, Dong TG. 2015. Identification of
divergent type VI secretion effectors using a conserved chaperone domain. Proc
Natl Acad Sci 112:9106–9111.

41.   Unterweger D, Kostiuk B, Ötjengerdes R, Wilton A, Diaz-Satizabal L, Pukatzki S.
2015. Chimeric adaptor proteins translocate diverse type VI secretion system
effectors in *Vibrio cholerae*. EMBO J 34:2198–2210.

42.   Yu M, Wang Y-C, Huang C-J, Ma L-S, Lai E-M. 2021. *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*
deploys a versatile antibacterial strategy to increase its competitiveness. J
Bacteriol 203:e00490-20.

43.   Smith WPJ, Vettiger A, Winter J, Ryser T, Comstock LE, Basler M, Foster KR.
2020. The evolution of the type VI secretion system as a disintegration weapon.
PLOS Biol 18:e3000720.

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

45.   Jarchow E, Grimsley NH, Hohn B. 1991. virF, the host-range-determining virulence
gene of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*, affects T-DNA transfer to *Zea mays*. Proc
Natl Acad Sci 88:10426–10430.

46.   Vogel AM, Das A. 1992. The *Agrobacterium tumefaciens virD3* gene is not
essential for tumorigenicity on plants. J Bacteriol 174:5161–5164.

47. Lin T-S, Kado CI. 1993. The *virD4* gene is required for virulence while *virD3* and
orf5 are not required for virulence of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Mol Microbiol
9:803–812.

48. Pan SQ, Jin S, Boulton MI, Hawes M, Gordon MP, Nester EW. 1995. An
Agrobacterium virulence factor encoded by a Ti plasmid gene or a chromosomal
gene is required for T-DNA transfer into plants. Mol Microbiol 17:259–269.

49. Hwang H-H, Wu ET, Liu S-Y, Chang S-C, Tzeng K-C, Kado CI. 2013.
Characterization and host range of five tumorigenic *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*
strains and possible application in plant transient transformation assays. Plant
Pathol 62:1384–1397.

50. Hooykaas PJJ, Klapwijk PM, Nuti MP, Schilperoort RA, Rörsch A. 1977. Transfer
of the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* Ti plasmid to avirulent agrobacteria and to
Rhizobium ex planta. J Gen Microbiol 98:477–484.

51. Haryono M, Tsai Y-M, Lin C-T, Huang F-C, Ye Y-C, Deng W-L, Hwang H-H, Kuo
C-H. 2018. Presence of an *Agrobacterium*-type tumor-inducing plasmid in
Neorhizobium sp. NCHU2750 and the link to phytopathogenicity. Genome Biol
Evol 10:3188–3195.

52. Rathore DS, Mullins E. 2018. Alternative non-*Agrobacterium* based methods for
plant transformation, p. 891–908. *In* Roberts, JA (ed.), Annual Plant Reviews
online. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Hoboken, New Jersey, USA.

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

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

55. Okasha S. 2006. Evolution and the Levels of Selection. Oxford University Press.

56. Daubin V, Moran NA, Ochman H. 2003. Phylogenetics and the cohesion of
bacterial genomes. Science 301:829–832.

57. Choi I-G, Kim S-H. 2007. Global extent of horizontal gene transfer. Proc Natl Acad
Sci 104:4489–4494.

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

59. Dagan T, Artzy-Randrup Y, Martin W. 2008. Modular networks and cumulative
impact of lateral transfer in prokaryote genome evolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci
105:10039–10044.

831 60. Chan CX, Beiko RG, Darling AE, Ragan MA. 2009. Lateral transfer of genes and
832   gene fragments in prokaryotes. Genome Biol Evol 1:429–438.

833 61. Pál C, Papp B, Lercher MJ. 2005. Adaptive evolution of bacterial metabolic
834   networks by horizontal gene transfer. Nat Genet 37:1372–1375.

835 62. Kuo C-H, Ochman H. 2009. The fate of new bacterial genes. FEMS Microbiol Rev
836   33:38–43.

837 63. Wiedenbeck J, Cohan FM. 2011. Origins of bacterial diversity through horizontal
838   genetic transfer and adaptation to new ecological niches. FEMS Microbiol Rev
839   35:957–976.

840 64. Mira A, Ochman H, Moran NA. 2001. Deletional bias and the evolution of bacterial
841   genomes. Trends Genet 17:589–596.

842 65. Kuo C-H, Ochman H. 2009. Deletional bias across the three domains of life.
843   Genome Biol Evol 1:145–152.

844 66. Sundin GW. 2007. Genomic insights into the contribution of phytopathogenic
845   bacterial plasmids to the evolutionary history of their hosts. Annu Rev Phytopathol
846   45:129–151.

847 67. Bennett PM. 2009. Plasmid encoded antibiotic resistance: acquisition and transfer
848   of antibiotic resistance genes in bacteria. Br J Pharmacol 153:S347–S357.

849 68. Smillie C, Garcillán-Barcia MP, Francia MV, Rocha EPC, Cruz F de la. 2010.
850   Mobility of plasmids. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 74:434–452.

851 69. Redondo-Salvo S, Fernández-López R, Ruiz R, Vielva L, de Toro M, Rocha EPC,
852   Garcillán-Barcia MP, de la Cruz F. 2020. Pathways for horizontal gene transfer in
853   bacteria revealed by a global map of their plasmids. Nat Commun 11:3602.

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

856 71. Huang Y-Y, Cho S-T, Lo W-S, Wang Y-C, Lai E-M, Kuo C-H. 2015. Complete
857   genome sequence of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* Ach5. Genome Announc
858   3:e00570-15.

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

862 73. Zerbino DR, Birney E. 2008. Velvet: algorithms for *de novo* short read assembly
863   using de Bruijn graphs. Genome Res 18:821–829.

864 74. Darling ACE, Mau B, Blattner FR, Perna NT. 2004. Mauve: multiple alignment of
865   conserved genomic sequence with rearrangements. Genome Res 14:1394–1403.

75.   Tatusova T, DiCuccio M, Badretdin A, Chetvernin V, Nawrocki EP, Zaslavsky L,
Lomsadze A, Pruitt KD, Borodovsky M, Ostell J. 2016. NCBI prokaryotic genome
annotation pipeline. Nucleic Acids Res 44:6614–6624.

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

77.   Lo W-S, Gasparich GE, Kuo C-H. 2018. Convergent evolution among ruminant-
pathogenic *Mycoplasma* involved extensive gene content changes. Genome Biol
Evol 10:2130–2139.

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

79.   Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden
T. 2009. BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10:421.

80.   Guy L, Roat Kultima J, Andersson SGE. 2010. genoPlotR: comparative gene and
genome visualization in R. Bioinformatics 26:2334–2335.

81.   Li L, Stoeckert CJ, Roos DS. 2003. OrthoMCL: identification of ortholog groups for
eukaryotic genomes. Genome Res 13:2178–2189.

82.   Popescu A-A, Huber KT, Paradis E. 2012. ape 3.0: New tools for distance-based
phylogenetics and evolutionary analysis in R. Bioinformatics 28:1536–1537.

83.   Wickham H. 2016. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag
New York, New York, NY.

84.   Suzuki R, Shimodaira H. 2006. Pvclust: an R package for assessing the
uncertainty in hierarchical clustering. Bioinformatics 22:1540–1542.

85.   Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and
high throughput. Nucleic Acids Res 32:1792–1797.

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

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

88.   Marchler-Bauer A, Zheng C, Chitsaz F, Derbyshire MK, Geer LY, Geer RC,
Gonzales NR, Gwadz M, Hurwitz DI, Lanczycki CJ, Lu F, Lu S, Marchler GH, Song
JS, Thanki N, Yamashita RA, Zhang D, Bryant SH. 2013. CDD: conserved
domains and protein three-dimensional structure. Nucleic Acids Res 41:D348–
D352.

89.   Kelley LA, Mezulis S, Yates CM, Wass MN, Sternberg MJE. 2015. The Phyre2
web portal for protein modeling, prediction and analysis. Nat Protoc 10:845–858.

90.   Bailey TL, Boden M, Buske FA, Frith M, Grant CE, Clementi L, Ren J, Li WW,
Noble WS. 2009. MEME Suite: tools for motif discovery and searching. Nucleic
Acids Res 37:W202–W208.

91.   Waterhouse AM, Procter JB, Martin DMA, Clamp M, Barton GJ. 2009. Jalview
version 2—a multiple sequence alignment editor and analysis workbench.
Bioinformatics 25:1189–1191.

92.   Crooks GE, Hon G, Chandonia J-M, Brenner SE. 2004. WebLogo: a sequence
logo generator. Genome Res 14:1188–1190.

93.   Conner AJ, Barrell PJ, Baldwin SJ, Lokerse AS, Cooper PA, Erasmuson AK, Nap
J-P, Jacobs JME. 2007. Intragenic vectors for gene transfer without foreign DNA.
Euphytica 154:341–353.

94.   Vladimirov IA, Matveeva TV, Lutova LA. 2015. Opine biosynthesis and catabolism
genes of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* and *Agrobacterium rhizogenes*. Russ J
Genet 51:121–129.

95.   Bhatty M, Laverde Gomez JA, Christie PJ. 2013. The expanding bacterial type IV
secretion lexicon. Res Microbiol 164:620–639.

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

97.   Eichinger V, Nussbaumer T, Platzer A, Jehl M-A, Arnold R, Rattei T. 2016.
EffectiveDB—updates and novel features for a better annotation of bacterial
secreted proteins and Type III, IV, VI secretion systems. Nucleic Acids Res
44:D669–D674.

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

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 G?	KCJK1736	GCF_001641425	41 contigs	4,933	162	FL, USA	*Bos taurus* feces
At G?	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	?	?	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	?	?	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.

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) 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 type of tumor-inducing plasmid (pTi) (?: novel type; 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 were 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).

A1	[G8] Atu4348 (*vgrG1*)
	[G8] At1D132_RS21400
	[G9] EXN23_RS10780
	[G3] CFBP6623_RS00635
	[?] EXN61_RS14250
	[G4] CG010_RS22900
	[G3] CFBP6624_RS00685
	[G8] At1D132_RS23920
	[AI] CFBP5473_RS14430
	[G1] AGR1B_RS27940/AGR1B_RS27960
A2	[G4] At1D1460_RS14800
A3	[G4] DC439_RS21805
	[G4] At12D1_RS23095
	[G7] CFBP4996_RS29220
	[?] EXN61_RS09490
B1	[G8] Atu3642 (*vgrG2*)
	[G8] At1D132_RS18005
	[G8] At12D13_RS20980
	[G7] CFBP4996_RS01315
	[G4] At1D1460_RS21395
	[G7] At1D1609_RS23245 (*vgrGa*)
	[G7] CFBP7129_RS22695
	[G7] At1D1609_RS18895 (*vgrGd*)
	[G7] At1D1609_RS22460 (*vgrGc*)
	[G7] At1D1609_RS26290 (*vgrGb*)
	[G4] CG010_RS21820
	[G7] CFBP7129_RS25485
	[G3] CFBP6623_RS24605
C1	[G9] CFBP5507_RS22530
	[G9] EXN23_RS14990
	[AI] CFBP5477_RS08655
D1	[G7] CFBP4996_RS25360
	[G3] CFBP6623_RS21645
	[G3] CFBP6624_RS21365
	[G1] At1D1108_RS23250
	[G1] AT5A_RS17190
D2	[AI] CFBP5477_RS20375
E1	[G1] Ach5_RS22800
	[G1] A6U91_RS21335
	[G1] AGR1B_RS23320
	[?] EXN61_RS24415
F1	[AI] CFBP5473_RS21265
	[AI] CFBP5477_RS22925

2 kb

Legend:

- Effector gene: nuclease (red)
- Effector gene: peptidoglycan-targeting (orange)
- Effector gene: others (pink)
- Immunity gene (yellow)
- DUF2169 (brown)
- DUF4123 (tan)
- PAAR (green)
- DUF4150 (PAAR-like) (dark green)
- VgrG (dark blue)
- T6SS genes (light blue)
- Pseudogene (gray)
- Other genes (white)

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 Data Set S2**.

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 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. 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

unclassified pTi; 40 core genes and 15,473 aligned amino acid sites, all branches

received > 80% bootstrap support.

Supplementary Figure S7. Principal coordinate analysis of gene content among the

pTi analyzed.

Supplementary Figure S8. 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.

A

Mock   C58   12D1   CFBP4996   CFBP5473

(scale bar = 0.25 cm)

B

Supplementary Figure S9. Tomato tumor assay of strains 12D1, CFBP4996, and CFBP5473. Mock was inoculated with sterilized water as a negative control and C58 was included as a positive control. The 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 Data Set S1. List of *vgrG*-associated genes. Information including genomic location, RefSeq annotation, and domain prediction are included.

Supplementary Data Set S2. Locus tags of the *vir* regulon genes. 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 could be confirmed by BLASTN searches.