Identification of a specific biomarker of *Acinetobacter baumannii*

Global Clone 1 by machine learning and PCR related to metabolic

fitness of ESKAPE pathogens.

Verónica Elizabeth Álvarez[1]#, María Paula Quiroga[1,2] and Daniela Centrón[1]

[1]Laboratorio de Investigaciones en Mecanismos de Resistencia a Antibióticos (LIMRA),

Instituto de Investigaciones en Microbiología y Parasitología Médica, Facultad de

Medicina, Universidad de Buenos Aires - Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y

Tecnológicas (IMPaM, UBA-CONICET), Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[2]Nodo de Bioinformática. Instituto de Investigaciones en Microbiología y Parasitología

Médica, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Buenos Aires - Consejo Nacional de

Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (IMPaM, UBA-CONICET), Ciudad Autónoma de

Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Running Head: Identification of *Acinetobacter baumannii* GC1

#Address correspondence to Verónica E. Álvarez, valvarez@gmail.com

Word count for the abstract: 198

Word count for the text: 6973

ABSTRACT

Since the emergence of high-risk clones worldwide, constant investigations have been

undertaken to comprehend the molecular basis that led to their prevalent dissemination

in nosocomial settings over time. So far, the complex and multifactorial genetic traits of

this type of epidemic clones have only allowed the identification of biomarkers with low

specificity. A machine learning algorithm was able to recognize unequivocally a biomarker

for the early and accurate detection of *Acinetobacter baumannii* Global Clone 1 (GC1), one

of the most disseminated high-risk clones. Support Vector Machine identified the U1

sequence with 367 nucleotides length that matched a fragment of the *moaCB* gene, which

encodes the molybdenum cofactor biosynthesis C and B proteins. U1 differentiates

specifically between *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 strains, becoming a suitable

biomarker capable of being translated into clinical settings as a molecular typing method

for early diagnosis based on PCR as shown here. Since the metabolic pathways of Mo

enzymes have been recognized as putative therapeutic targets for ESKAPE pathogens, our

findings highlighted that machine learning can be also useful in intricate knowledge gaps

of high-risk clones and implies noteworthy support to the literature to identify challenging

nosocomial biomarkers for other multidrug-resistant high-risk clones.

IMPORTANCE

A. baumannii GC1 is an important high-risk clone that rapidly develops extreme drug

resistance in the nosocomial niche. Furthermore, several strains were identified

worldwide in environmental samples exacerbating the risk of human interactions. Early

diagnosis is mandatory to limit its dissemination and to outline appropriate antibiotic

stewardship schedules. A region of 367 bp length (U1) within the *moaCB* gene not

subjected to Lateral Genetic Transfer or to antibiotic pressures was successfully found by

Support Vector Machine algorithm that predicts *A. baumannii* GC1 strains. PCR assays

have confirmed that U1 specifically identifies *A. baumannii* GC1 strains. At the same time,

research on the group of Mo enzymes proposed this metabolic pathway related to

superbug´s metabolism as a potential future drug target site for ESKAPE pathogens due to

its central role in bacterial fitness during infection. These findings confirmed the

importance of machine learning applied to the burden of the rise of antibiotic resistance.

INTRODUCTION

Acinetobacter baumannii is an opportunistic and nosocomial Gram-negative pathogen that causes a wide range of nosocomial infections. It is included in the group of ESKAPE pathogens (1, 2). Nosocomial infections by this species have increased in recent years, which added to its ability to acquire and spread antibiotic resistance genes to all families of antibiotics, are considered a serious global threat worldwide (3, 4). The majority of *A. baumannii* isolates that are broadly resistant to antibiotics belong to two pandemic clones, known as global clones 1 (GC1) and 2 (GC2) (3, 5, 6). Recent epidemiological studies of carbapenem-resistant *A. baumannii* (CRAB) isolates, revealed that *A. baumannii* GC1 is the prevalent CRAB clone in several countries (7–10). In addition, *A. baumannii* GC1 strains have been found worldwide in environmental samples from water, soil, and animals (11, http://www.acinetobacterbaumannii.no/).

Over time, molecular methods with different degrees of resolution have been used to type *A. baumannii* strains such as amplified fragment length polymorphism analysis, ribotyping, macrorestriction analysis by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis, multiplex polymerase chain reactions (PCR), multilocus sequence typing (MLST) and more recently whole genome sequencing (WGS) (12–18). A typing scheme based on two multiplex PCR targeting three genes (*ompA*, *csuE*, and *bla*$_{OXA-51-like}$) has been used for the assignment of *A. baumannii* isolates into two major PCR-based groups corresponding to *A. baumannii* GC1 and GC2 (19). Also, since correlation has been detected between particular *bla*$_{OXA-51-like}$ alleles and some epidemic lineages, sequence analysis of the *bla*$_{OXA-51-like}$ gene has been proposed as a useful typing method for *A. baumannii* isolates (19–21). In agreement to

this, a study conducted on sixty *A. baumannii* isolates collected worldwide demonstrated

that isolates belonging to *A. baumannii* GC1 encoded enzymes from the OXA-69 cluster

which included OXA-69, OXA-92, OXA-107, OXA-110 and OXA-112 enzymes (20). However,

not all the isolates encoding the OXA-69 cluster belonged to *A. baumannii* GC1 such as *A.*

baumannii A92 strain that belongs to GC2 (20). An additional typing method of *A.*

baumannii GC1 strains, consisted in the detection of 108 bp deletion in the 5'-conserved

segment (5'-CS) of the class 1 integron located in AbaR3 genomic island (22). Nevertheless,

since AbaR3 is not present in all *A. baumannii* GC1 strains, this approach serves as a

marker for some diverged lineages within *A. baumannii* GC1 clone (22). All the previously

described methods based on PCR include target genes that are subjected to Lateral

Genetic Transfer and/or antibiotic pressure, which represents a limitation for the

specificity of the technique.

With the increasing throughput and decreasing cost of DNA sequencing, large

numbers of bacterial genomes have been submitted to public databases (23, 24).

Genome-wide studies of DNA variation related to antibiotic resistance phenotypes have

garnered high public interest, especially since several multidrug-resistant strains have

emerged worldwide (25). New candidate biomarkers leading to the identification of

resistant pathogens require the study and development of fast, easily applicable, and

accurate tools. Furthermore, with the help of computational algorithms, such studies can

be conducted at a much larger scale producing more significant results (26–29). Machine

learning (ML) algorithms and statistics have been used increasingly to build models that

correlate genomic variations with phenotypes that may help to predict bacterial

phenotypes and genotypes (30–36). In supervised ML, each learning sample includes the

outcome (class label) of interest, and it is used to build a prediction model (37). The model

takes an outcome measurement (e.g., a bacterium having a resistant phenotype or

genotype) and tries to learn from the available data (e.g., information on genomic

mutations) to predict the outcome measure. The developed model is then applied to new

and unseen data. The goal of the algorithm is to train a model that accurately foresees the

correct outcome for any input (38).

Support Vector Machine (SVM) is a supervised learning algorithm formally

characterized by a separating hyperplane that divides binary data to solve both

classification and regression problems. SVM aims to correctly classify samples based on

examples in the training dataset (39–41). On the other hand, Set Covering Machine (SCM)

is a supervised learning algorithm that uses a greedy approach to produce

uncharacteristically sparse rule-based models from the input data (42). Both algorithms

have been applied to several biological knowledge gaps and proved to be accurate in

predicting novel antibacterial agents (43), antibiotic resistance genes (32, 33, 44–46),

identification of microorganisms (47–49), cancer diagnosis (50–53), among others (30, 47,

54–57).

ML can deal with large and diverse datasets to extract relevant information (58).

Given the wide use of ML in biology, and the absence of accurate identifiers for early

diagnosis of *A. baumannii* GC1 strains, our study aimed to assess whether ML could be

applied to process thousands of genomes to identify a suitable *A. baumannii* GC1

biomarker. We also wanted to analyze whether ML could be combined with other

techniques such as PCR and/or qPCR with high-resolution melting (HRM) assays to provide

a molecular typing method capable of being translated into clinical settings. For these

reasons, we built predictive models for typing *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes by training SVM

and SCM classifiers. From these classifiers, we identified a new and specific genomic

biomarker for the early detection of *A. baumannii* GC1 strains by PCR technique not

subjected to selective pressure of antibiotics nor to Lateral Genetic Transfer.

RESULTS

To identify new genomic biomarkers that uniquely identify strains belonging to *A.*

baumannii GC1, we applied the SVM and SCM algorithms to the Dataset 1 (500 genomes)

and the Dataset 2 (4799 genomes) (Table S1 and S2). Firstly, we applied both algorithms to

the Dataset 1 which was composed of 200 *A. baumannii* GC1 and 300 *A. baumannii* non-

GC1 genomes. We aimed to predict whether a particular genome in the Dataset 1

belonged to *A. baumannii* GC1 or not by using SVM and SCM algorithms. The Dataset 1

was used as input for both algorithms during the training and the testing of the models.

Once we obtained accurate models that predicted putative biomarkers sequences, we

used the second *A. baumannii* genome collection, the Dataset 2 (Table S2). The Dataset 2

was composed of 312 *A. baumannii* GC1 and 4487 *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes. By

using blastn searches, we analyzed whether the predicted putative biomarker sequences

were also found in the Dataset 2 genomes maintaining the same pattern found in the

Dataset 1. This analysis was done to perform an external validation of the predictions

made by both algorithms. The study workflow is summarized in Figure 1.

Obtaining unique *A. baumannii* GC1 predictive sequences with SVM

The Pasteur scheme for Multilocus Sequence Typing (MLST) has the potential to

identify isolates belonging to *A. baumannii* GC1 providing a neat demarcation of STs

composing GC1 and non-*A. baumannii* clonal complexes (5, 59–62). Considering this fact,

we annotated the ST of each genome in the Datasets 1 and 2 and categorized them as

"GC1" or "non-GC1" (see Materials and Methods: "MLST classification" section). Then we

run the DBGWAS program using the Dataset 1 genome sequences as input; we obtained a

total of 1,622,573 distinct unitigs that represented sequences of diverse length of the

Dataset 1 taking into account the genomic variation (63). The length of the unitigs

obtained was between 31 and 32,759 bp. We used the variant matrix built by DBGWAS to

create the binary matrix used as input for the SVN algorithm. Unitigs that were found in

less than 50 genomes from the Dataset 1 were discarded; we kept in the input binary

matrix only the unitigs of size 31 to 385 bp.

Parameter tuning and model validations were performed using a 5-fold cross-

validation and a grid search over a range of given values to determine the SVM kernel and

hyperparameters that generated the best area under the curve (AUC). Once we obtained

the SVM model that best fitted the Dataset 1 genomes, we extracted the first 100 unitigs

that contributed most to *A. baumannii* GC1 strain prediction (Tables 1 and S3) according

to the values of the features weight vector. By using blastn, we corroborated if the unitigs

predicted by SVM were specific for *A. baumannii* GC1 detection. For this purpose, we

searched for the unitig sequences in the genomes of the Dataset 2 to assess which were

the unitigs with the greatest number of matches within each genome class (*A. baumannii*

GC1 or non-GC1) (Tables 2 and S4). We also annotated the genome location and gene

product related to the 100 unitigs (Tables 1, S3, 3 and S5).

Building SCM models for *A. baumannii* GC1 identification

In an additional approach, we applied the SCM algorithm implemented in Kover

(30). We used as input the k-mers of the 500 *A. baumannii* genomes contained in the

Dataset 1 considering the class label for each genome (*A. baumannii* GC1 or non-GC1). We

ran Kover using k-mer sizes ranging from 31 to 127. Although output rules could be

conjunctions (logical-AND) or disjunctions (logical-OR), we obtained 49 simple rules

without conjunctions or disjunctions in the models of our study (Table 3 and S5). Rules

depicted the presence (n=10) or the absence (n=39) of k-mers in the Dataset 1 genomes.

Besides, we registered the number of matches of the k-mer sequences against *A.*

baumannii GC1 and non-GC1 genomes contained in the Dataset 1 (Table 4 and S6); we

also annotated the k-mer sequences (Tables 4 and S6).

We observed that the rules obtained by the SCM models selected fragments of

different length that matched the loci ACICU_02924 (n=23), ACICU_02095 (n=5),

ABAYE3455 (n=5), ACICU_01506 (n=2) and ABAYE2468 (n=2) (Table 3 and S5). This fact

could be caused by point mutations contained in the loci that the SCM models associated

with *A. baumannii* GC1 prediction would have made as previously found (30).

Selection of candidate biomarkers for rapid detection of *A. baumannii* GC1

We were interested in obtaining the longest DNA sequences shared by all *A.*

baumannii GC1 genomes, and at the same time, without matches among *A. baumannii*

non-GC1 genomes. For this purpose, unitigs and k-mer sequences obtained as candidate

biomarkers for *A. baumannii* GC1 using the SVM and SCM algorithms were sorted in

descending order according to the sequence length. Then, we considered the number of

A. baumannii GC1 genomes that matched the unitig sequence or the SCM rule and sorted

the candidate sequences in ascending order according to the number of *A. baumannii*

non-GC1 genome matches.

First, we analyzed the SVM results. Data related to unitigs obtained are listed in

Tables 1, 2, S3, S4 and, Figure 2. We named unitigs from U1 to U100. We observed that

the unitigs named U1 to U12 were found in 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes while

they were not found in *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 1. However, U1

was the only unitig found in 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes within the Datasets 1

and 2, as well as absent in *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes of both datasets, being a

specific biomarker for *A. baumannii* GC1 identification. Despite the U8 sequence was

found in 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes within the Dataset 1 and 2, it was found in

1/4487 of *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 2. The U8 sequence matched

A. baumannii AYE genome in the locus tag ABAYE1412 between 651 and 691 coordinates

(Table 1 and S3). The fragment is part of a gene that encodes a putative acyl-CoA

dehydrogenase protein (*acdB*-like). As U8 sequence was not found exclusively in *A.*

baumannii GC1 genomes, we discarded it as a possible biomarker of *A. baumannii* GC1. U4

was the sequence among these 12 unitigs that had the higher number of matches

(43/4487) with *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 2.

The SCM results are listed in Tables 3, 4, S5, S6, and Figure 3. We observed that

43/49 rules targeted 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes from the Dataset 1 but also

targeted between 1 and 4 of *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 1. Within

these 43 rules, two sets of rules targeted only 1 *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genome from the

Dataset 1; as an example of this, 26/49 rules targeted genome with AN: GCF_000248195.1

(ST 69) and 1/49 rules (R49) targeted genome with AN: GCF_000453745.1 (ST 2) (Figure 3).

Concerning the Dataset 2, 12/49 rules targeted 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes but

also targeted several *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 2. Since no rule

obtained can uniquely identify *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes contained in our datasets, we

were unable to obtain a putative biomarker from the results of the SCM models.

When using the Dataset 2 to validate the results obtained by the SVM and SCM

models from the Dataset 1, we observed that in the case of the SVM classifier there was

no statistically significant difference (P > 0.05) in the number of matches of the unitigs

regardless of the genome dataset (Dataset 1 or 2) except for the unitig U69 (Tables 2 and

S4). In the case of U69, we found a significant difference between the number of matches

with *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 1 and 2 (P = 0.01077). Concerning

the SCM classifier, we observed that there was no statistically significant difference in the

number of *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 1 and 2 that

matched the rules (P > 0.05) (Tables 4 and S6). As we mentioned, the SVM model

predicted the U1 sequence as a specific biomarker for *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes. The U1

sequence had 367 nucleotides and matched *A. baumannii* AYE genome in the locus tag

ABAYE1552 between coordinates 558 and 924 (Table 1 and S3). This region corresponds to

a fragment of the *moaCB* gene which encodes a bifunctional protein that includes the

molybdenum cofactor biosynthesis protein C and protein B (64). In particular, the U1

sequence matched the region of the *moaCB* gene, which encodes for MoaB protein. The

molybdenum cofactor (Moco) is an essential component of a large family of enzymes

involved in carbon, nitrogen, and sulfur metabolism whose biosynthetic pathway is

evolutionarily conserved. The MoaC protein, together with the MoaA protein, is involved

in the first step of Moco biosynthesis (64). Interestingly, various studies have linked in-

host survival of prevalent pathogenic bacteria such as *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*,

Escherichia coli, and *Salmonella enterica* to the presence of functional molybdoenzymes

(65–68). In our study, we found that the U1 sequence was 100% conserved in *A.*

baumannii GC1 genomes (0 SNPs) while it was a variable region with 1 to 74 SNPs in the

total of 4987 *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 1 and 2 rendering 94

allelic variants in *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes. According to these results, the

sequence of the *moaCB* gene comprised between 558 and 924 nucleotides allowed

accurate discrimination for *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes, becoming a

biomarker that differentiates both groups. Moreover, we observed that the U1 sequence

is conserved in all the *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes, but this is not the case for *A.*

baumannii GC2. For this reason, U1 sequence could not be used as a biomarker for the

early detection of *A. baumannii* GC2 strains.

Since 95 variants within 5299 *A. baumannii* strains were identified with multiple

SNPs along the entire sequence of U1, we proposed that a strategy based on PCR

amplification, would allow us to accurately differentiate *A. baumannii* GC1 from non-GC1

strains. For this reason, we designed the primer´s pair BioM_GC1_ABA F 5'-

TATTCATAGCCTCCTGGATGC-3' and BioM_GC1_ABA R 5'-CCAGATGAAGCGGATACTTTG-3',

with coordinates 559 to 914 from ABAYE1552 locus tag representing 356 bp of U1

sequence (position 2 to 357). By a blastn search, we identified that this primer pair

amplified only the U1 sequence recognized in *A. baumannii* GC1 strains amongst all the

variants detected so far. The closest variants showed a mismatch of one nucleotide at the

3' end of the reverse primer in *A. baumannii* ST163, ST411 and ST976 (AN

GCF_015537765, GCF_000453725 and GCF_010500415, respectively).

Experimental analysis, with a total of 35 *A. baumannii* strains, which were 10 *A.*

baumannii GC1 and 25 *A. baumannii* non-GC1 including 4 ST2 (GC2), 15 ST79, 5 ST119 and

1 ST404, was performed to test the primer´s pair BioM_GC1_ABA F and BioM_GC1_ABA F

(Figure S1). *A. baumannii* GC1 strains that were isolated more than 25 years apart were

tested such as A144 (1997), A155 (1994) and HAX25Aba (2021) (69, 70). The pair of

primers designed in this study only amplified by PCR the *A. baumannii* GC1 strains, and as

expected, the subsequent DNA sequence analysis showed a 100% identity and query

coverage with 356 bp of U1 as confirmed by the clustal alignment (Figure S2).

Interestingly, *A. baumannii* Ab103 ST119 that has two mismatches in each primer, at

positions 15 and 21 of the 21nts of BioM_GC1_ABA F, and at positions 9 and 21 of the

21nts of BioM_GC1_ABA R rendered also a negative result in this PCR´s conditions (see

below). This result confirmed the specificity of this pair of primers.

The optimum PCR amplification was established in a final volume of 25 µl

containing 0.625 U GoTaq® DNA Polymerase (cat. # M3005, Promega, USA), 5 µl 5 X Green

GoTaq® buffer with MgCl$_2$ for a final concentration of 1.5mM in the 1X reaction, 0.4 pM

each dNTP, 1 µM each primer, and 5 µl of DNA from the boiling of 3-4 *A. baumannii*

colonies in 100 µl of sterile H$_2$O. DNA of *A. baumannii* GC1 strain A144 and water were

used as positive and negative control, respectively. The PCR cycling conditions were an

initial denaturation at 94 °C for five minutes, followed by 30 cycles of denaturation at 94

°C for 45 seconds, annealing at 58 °C for 45 seconds and extension at 72 °C for 30 seconds,

with a final extension at 72 °C for five minutes. Alternatively, to this PCR to identify *A.*

baumannii GC1, TaqMan assays could also provide a molecular typing method capable of

being translated into clinical settings to differentiate *A. baumannii* GC1 and other relevant

GC or ST.

Evaluation of the performance of the SVM and SCM models

To avoid overfitting, a 5-fold cross-validation was performed on the training

datasets used as input in both the SVM and SCM algorithms to select the best

hyperparameter values with the highest AUC. Performance during testing was evaluated

using the best hyperparameters obtained in terms of sensitivity, specificity, accuracy,

precision, and F1 score (Tables 5, 6 and S7). The sensitivity of the SVM model was 1 ± 0.00,

indicating that 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes were correctly identified within the

testing dataset. Also, the SVM model achieved a high specificity (1 ± 0.00) when predicting

A. baumannii non-GC1 genomes from the testing datasets. The precision value was 1 ±

0.00 when the model predicted that a genome was within *A. baumannii* GC1, being

correct 100% of the time. Accuracy was 1 ± 0.00 indicating that 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1

and non-GC1 were correctly predicted. No false positives and no false negatives were

predicted by the SVM model.

Regarding the SCM models, the mean values of sensitivity, specificity, precision,

and accuracy were 1 ± 0.01, 0.98 ± 0.01, 0.97 ± 0.01, and 0.99 ± 0.01, respectively. The

mean rate of false positives was 1.11% while the mean rate of false negatives was 0.097%.

All the rules obtained by the SCM models predicted false positives within the testing

dataset (Table 6).

The training and the testing accuracy of the SVM and SCM models were above 0.99

(Figure 4), indicating that the SVM and SCM models, were not overfitted. The F1 score,

which is the harmonic mean of precision and recall and is commonly used to compare

different classification algorithms, was similarly high in the SVM and SCM models (1.00

and 0.99 ± 0.01, respectively). We used Fisher's Exact Test to evaluate the performance of

the SVM and SCM predictions comparing the actual genome classes (*A. baumannii* GC1

and non-GC1) typed by MLST and the predicted classes obtained by the models. In both

cases, we obtained P < 2.2e-16 (Table 5, 6 and S7) indicating that the SVM and SCM models

could significantly classify *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 strains. Despite these results, as

the aim of this work was to find a biomarker that uniquely identifies *A. baumannii* GC1

genomes, the SVM model performed better than the SCM models since it did not predict

false positives or false negatives.

DISCUSSION

High-risk clones or also named "superbugs" are dangerous clonal complexes with

epidemic behavior equipped with exceptional resources both to infect the host and to

evolve to extreme drug resistance phenotypes over time in the nosocomial niche (1, 71–

77). The molecular understanding of the genetic and/or transcriptomic traits that lead to

these capabilities remains still unknown (78, 79). Our study showed that ML applied to the

study of high-risk clones can help not only in the identification of thoroughly accurate

biomarkers but also contribute to disentangling molecular pathways that drive to

epidemic lineages in the nosocomial niche which have not yet been completely

deciphered. Accordingly, these findings could be used as therapeutic targets to reduce the

dissemination of lineages with epidemic behavior. This is the case of the U1 sequence

identified in the present study, which corresponded to 367 bp of the *moaCB* gene that

encodes a bifunctional protein that includes the molybdenum cofactor biosynthesis

protein C and protein B (64). Mononuclear molybdoenzymes (Mo enzymes) occur in

organisms in all domains of life, where they mediate essential cellular functions such as

energy generation and detoxification reactions (80). It has been shown that in bacterial

pathogens, several processes such as the molybdate uptake, the cofactor biosynthesis,

and the activities of Mo enzymes, affect fitness in the host as well as virulence (80). In

addition to many studies on Mo enzymes that identified their crucial role in pathogenic

species such as *E. coli*, *S. enterica*, *Campylobacter jejuni*, and *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*,

some reports recently identified that these enzymes also contribute to the survival of

ESKAPE pathogens (66, 81–85). Experimental studies must be undertaken to investigate

the role of the *moaCB* gene in the virulence and fitness of *A. baumannii* which is also

included in the ESKAPE group. Based on our results and previous experimental data in

other pathogenic species (80), we can hypothesize that the U1 fragment of the *moaCB*

gene in *A. baumannii* GC1 may be related to an essential metabolic pathway that play a

vital role in the maintenance of epidemic clones in the hospital environment. Since it has

been found that most of the Mo enzymes belong to groups that are unique to

prokaryotes, these have been proposed as promising targets for the development of new

antibiotic agents (80).

Given the variability observed in the biomarker U1 between *A. baumannii* GC1 and

the 94 variants in *A. baumannii* non-GC1 strains, we propose a simple molecular biology

strategy of one step of PCR amplification, to accurately differentiate *A. baumannii* GC1

from non-GC1 strains without performing MLST, or WGS and comparative genomics. The

strategy proposed here, that was experimentally tested through this study, is accessible to

a wide range of clinical and/or research laboratories. In addition, as the methodology

consists of a single PCR, the detection of *A. baumannii* GC1 strains can be performed from

the colony or directly from the clinical sample, giving the possibility of an early and simple

diagnosis of this lineage.

Due to the increasing availability of bacterial WGS data, very active research has

emerged on the use of this tool for genotype-phenotype prediction of antibiotic

susceptibility (30, 33, 34, 44, 54, 86–88); however, there is no data available concerning

the identification of high-risk clones based in WGS data excluding the MLST. Previous PCR-

based studies used $bla_{OXA\text{-}51}$ as one out of the three targeted genes to discriminate strains

of *A. baumannii* GC1, GC2 and, GC3 (18, 19), and also the detection of deletion of 108 bp

in the 5'-conserved segment (5'-CS) of the class 1 integron for identification of *A.*

baumannii GC1 strains (19) have been proposed. Since $bla_{OXA\text{-}51}$ has been found in other

species (89–91) and the deletion of 108 bp as a biomarker differentiates partially two

lineages within *A. baumannii* GC1 (7), and considering that both can be subjected to

Lateral Genetic Transfer events, the analysis provided by ML in the present study supports

a more accurate and solid implement to evaluate the presence of *A. baumannii* GC1

strains. Accordingly, U1 is part of an essential gene in *A. baumannii* GC1 genome (*moaCB*).

This suggests that the optimization of metabolic genes from the core genome may be

related to the exceptional abilities of high-risk clones. Interestingly, our data suggest that

the accessory genome such as genomic islands or transposons involved in pathogenicity or

antibiotic resistance, at least in *A. baumannii* GC1 strains, would not have played a causal

role in the adaptation of this lineage to the hospital niche over time.

In our work, we applied two ML algorithms that differ substantially in

methodology. The SVM algorithm used the number of occurring unitigs in *A. baumannii*

GC1 and *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes to learn and predict clonal membership of the

strains, while the SCM model used a greedy approach to construct conjunction or

disjunction rules to find the most concise set of k-mers that allows for accurate *A.*

baumannii GC1 or *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genome prediction. Previously, methods that

combined the use of the SVM and SCM algorithms, and the representation of genomic

data as k-mers were used to find genomic biomarkers to identify antibiotic resistance (30)

or to predict antibiotic resistance from WGS data (54, 86). We ran the SCM algorithm

through the Kover program with k-mer lengths between 31 and 127 nucleotides to be able

to analyze all the possible rules obtained from these k-mers lengths. Also, we ran the SVM

algorithm using unitigs that usually corresponded to a longer sequence than the individual

equivalent k-mers. Unitigs are defined as the longest sequences that can be obtained

when k-mers overlap by exactly k-1 nucleotides (63, 92, 93). In k-mer-based genome

representations, the main downside is that the representation contains a lot of

redundancy, since many k-mers are always present or absent simultaneously (e.g., gene

deletion/ insertion). In this sense, it has been proposed to replace k-mers with unitigs (63,

92, 93).

We also proved by using statistical methods that the SVM and SCM models could

significantly classify *A. baumannii* GC1 isolates (P < 0.05). While the SVM classifier

predicted the U1 sequence as a specific biomarker for *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes, none

of the rules obtained with the SCM models was able to uniquely identify *A. baumannii* GC1

genomes. All the rules obtained by the SCM models matched in *A. baumannii* GC1 and *A.*

baumannii non-GC1 genomes from both the Dataset 1 and 2. Due to this result, it was not

possible to obtain a sequence that could be used as a specific biomarker for *A. baumannii*

GC1 strains from the rules obtained by the SCM models. A key step for the successful

implementation of ML algorithms is the preparation of the input datasets (58, 94–96). In

our study, we faced two issues related to the preparation of the Datasets 1 and 2. On one

hand, a limitation in the program DBGWAS during the preparation of the matrix used in

the SVM algorithm meant that only a total of 500 genomes could be included in the

training dataset. Since our goal was to use the same training dataset for the SVM and SCM

models, the 500 genomes were also used as input in the SCM algorithm. On the other

hand, the scarcity of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes available in GenBank compared to *A.*

baumannii non-GC1 genomes caused the Dataset 2 to have visibly more genomes

representing *A. baumannii* non-GC1 class. Despite this fact, the results obtained from the

Dataset 1 and 2 remained consistent in 100% (P > 0.05) of the cases for the SVM model

and more than 91.83% (P > 0.05) of the cases for the SCM models. Perhaps the limitation

in the number of genomes in the training dataset is one of the reasons why the SCM

models did not have enough samples to learn from *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes and

therefore could not find a rule that uniquely identifies them. Conversely, the numbers of

isolates predicted to be *A. baumannii* GC1 or non-GC1 by the SVM model using the unitig

U1 were the same as the result obtained by the MLST typification technique. This fact

indicated that the SVM model obtained was excellent in the classification of *A. baumannii*

GC1 and non-GC1 genomes. It will be interesting to study in future works how the Dataset

1 splitting strategy (unitigs or k-mers), the number of genomes of each class (*A. baumannii*

GC1 and non-GC1) in the Dataset 1, and the total number of *A. baumannii* genomes in the

Dataset 1 impact on the SVM and SCM models predictions and performance. One possible

approach could be using as input the binary matrix obtained from the unitigs representing

the Dataset 1 genomes generated by the program DBGWAS in the program Kover and

then to analyze the SCM model results. In the same way, we could obtain k-mer profiles

(k-mer sizes ranging from 31 to 127) from the Dataset 1 genomes and the k-mer matrixes

associated with each profile using the DSK k-mer counter (97). DSK is used by Kover to

internally compute k-mer profiles from the input genomes (98). Then we could use the k-

mer matrixes as input in the SVM algorithm. As result, we would obtain new putative

sequence biomarkers from both approaches, and we could compare them with the ones

obtained in the current work.

In conclusion, these results suggest that the application of ML to identify

biomarkers for high-risk clones or superbugs can also be used at an exploratory level of

great precision since can provide novel understandings about bacterial adaptation to the

nosocomial niche. In turn, this data can contribute to the experimental work with the

possibility to be further translated to the clinical settings. The SVM algorithm made

genetic predictions based on the presence or absence of short genomic sequences present

in *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes, that detected a biomarker, U1, not related to

Lateral Genetic Transfer neither to accessory genome nor to antibiotic pressures that

uniquely identifies the CG1 strains, which in agreement with previous experimental works

on the group of Mo enzymes, showed that the application of ML could be a powerful tool

to discover new therapeutic targets for the development of new antibiotic agents.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

MLST classification. Multilocus sequence typing (MLST) of all genomes in the data

collection was performed *in silico* using the mlst software developed by T. Seemann

(https://github.com/tseemann/mlst) and the Pasteur's MLST database and schema for *A.*

baumannii (https://pubmlst.org/organisms/acinetobacter-baumannii). *A. baumannii*

sequence type (ST) numbers ST 1, 19, 20, 81, 94, 328, 460, 623, 315, 717 and 1106 were

classified into *A. baumannii* GC1 and others ST into *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes

(Tables S1 and S2).

Data collection. To perform an accurate ML analysis to identify an *A. baumannii* GC1

biomarker, we defined two datasets to do our studies.

The Dataset 1 was composed of 200 *A. baumannii* GC1 and 300 *A. baumannii* non-

GC1 genomes obtained from Genbank and typified by MLST as previously described. These

genomes were retrieved from the GenBank assembly database filtering by *Acinetobacter*

baumannii in the search by organism option

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/assembly/organism/, last accessed in July 2021). *A.*

baumannii GC1 genomes included 18 genomes used in a previous study (Álvarez et al.,

2020) and 182 *A. baumannii* genomes as scaffolds and contigs (Table S1). *A. baumannii*

non-GC1 genomes included five genomes belonging to other high-risk epidemic clones

such as ACICU (AN: CP031380.1) as representative of GC2, Naval-13 (AN:

AMDR01000001.1) as representative of GC3, AB33405 (NZ_JPXZ00000000.1) as

representative of local epidemic clone CC113 and both ATCC 17978 (AN: CP018664.1), and

A118 (AN: AEOW01000000) as sporadic clones. We also included 205 *A. baumannii* non-

GC1 genomes as scaffolds and contigs (Table S1). The Dataset 2 was composed of 312 *A.*

baumannii GC1 and 4487 *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes (Table S2) retrieved from the

GenBank assembly database (last accessed in July 2021). The number of genomes in this

dataset was limited by *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes available in the GenBank

database at the time of the query. We used the Dataset 2 to validate using blastn searches

the results obtained by the SVM model. (Table S2). STs were numbered according to the

Pasteur scheme for MLST (Table S1 and S2).

Machine learning analyses.

The SVM classifier is based on the maximization of the margin around the

hyperplane ($w^Tx + b$) separating samples or instances of the different classes (57, 99). Each

instance $i = 1,...,m$ consists of an N-dimensional feature vector x_i and a class label $y_i \in \{+1,$

$-1\}$. The maximization of the margin corresponds to the following minimization:

(1)

$$w^*, b^*, \xi^* \ = \ arg \ \min_{w,b,\xi} \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 + C\sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_i$$

$$s.t. \mathrm{y}_i(w^T x_i \ + b) \geq \ 1 \ - \ \xi_i; \ \xi_i \ \geq \ 0; \ i = 1,\dots,m$$

In this soft-margin SVM equation, ξ_i is a penalty for misclassification or

classification within the margin. Parameter C sets the weight of this penalty. The resulting

weight vector $w*$ encodes the contributions of all features to the classifier (57).

We created a Python script using scikit-learn (100) to run the SVM algorithm. The

script evaluated the classifier through a 5-fold cross-validation. In detail, the data was split

into five consecutive folds (without shuffling) using the Python scikit-learn (sklearn) KFold

function (https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/cross_validation.html#k-fold), and five

models were built. Each fold was used once as a test set while the four remaining folds

formed the training set. During each of the five iterations, the hyperparameter tuning was

done using a 5-fold cross-validated grid search using the GridSearchCV function

implemented in the sklearn.model_selection package (https://scikit-

learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.model_selection.GridSearchCV.html#sklearn

.model_selection.GridSearchCV) to find the best hyperparameters. We evaluated linear,

polynomial (with a default degree of 3), radial basis function (RBF), and sigmoid kernels.

We considered values between 0.01 and 100 for the penalty parameter of the error term

(C) and values between 0.000001 and 10 for the gamma parameter. The predictions of all

five iterations were compared using the AUC score (https://scikit-

learn.org/stable/modules/model_evaluation.html#roc-metrics). Finally, we built up the

classifier from the entire training set using the best hyperparameters (with the highest

AUC) identified through cross-validation and applied the best model to the test set. The

highest AUC were obtained using kernel = linear, gamma = 0.000001 and C = 0.01 (code

available on GitHub at https://github.com/vealvarez/SVM_GC1).

The SCM (42), is a learning algorithm that produces models that are conjunctions

(logical-AND) or disjunctions (logical-OR) of boolean-valued rules $r : \mathbb{R}^d \to \{0,1\}$. Let us use

h(x) to denote the output of model *h* on genome *x*. When *h* consists of a conjunction (i.e.,

a logical-AND) of a set R^* of rules r^*, we have

$$h(x) = \bigwedge_{r^* \in R^*} r^*(x)$$

494   Whereas, for a disjunction (i.e., a logical-OR) of rules, we have

$$h(x) = \bigvee_{r^* \in R^*} r^*(x)$$

Given a set R of candidate rules, the SCM algorithm attempts to find a model that

minimizes the empirical error rate $R_S \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} I[h(x_{i)} \neq y_i]$, where I[True] = 1 and 0

otherwise while using the smallest number of rules in R (101).

We used the program Kover which implements the SCM algorithm (30, 98). Kover

combines the SCM algorithm with the k-mer representation of genomes, which reveals

uncharacteristically sparse models that explicitly highlight the relationship between

genomic variations and the phenotype of interest (30). We ran the program using the

Dataset 1 (see Input dataset preparation below) for k-mer sizes from 31 to 127 (taking

only the odd numbers between them). The smallest value of k was set to 31 since

extensive testing has shown that this size is optimal for bacterial genome assembly and

has been employed for studies based on reference-free bacterial genome comparisons

(92, 102). The greatest k-mer size was set to 127 since it is the maximum value accepted

as a parameter in Kover. We chose only odd values of k to avoid the formation of

palindromes (103). For each k-mer size, we split the Dataset 1 into a training dataset (2/3

of the genomes) and a testing dataset (1/3 of the genomes). Then, we trained the 49

models corresponding to each k-mer using a conjunction/disjunction model type. The best

conjunctive and/or disjunctive model for each k-mer was selected using 5-fold cross-

validation to determine the optimal rule scoring function with default parameters.

Input dataset preparation for ML models. We split the 500 genomes included in the

Dataset 1 into unitigs by using the program DBGWAS (63). Unitigs are stretches of DNA

shared by the strains in a dataset. The DBGWAS method proposes connecting the overlaps

of k-mers in a compressed de Bruijn graph (DBG) so that k-mers are extended using the

adjacent sequence information in the population, forming unitigs present in the same set

of samples as their constituent k-mers. During the first step of the DBGWAS process, the

program built a variant matrix, where each variant is a pattern of the presence/absence of

unitigs in each genome present in the Dataset 1 (63). We wrote a Python script (code

available on GitHub at https://github.com/vealvarez/SVM_GC1) to format the variant

matrix and create a presence/absence (coded with the values 1/0 respectively) binary

matrix with unitigs as columns (features) and the accession numbers of the genomes as

rows (instances). We used the binary matrix as input for the SVM algorithm. In this matrix,

we discarded the data about low frequency unitigs (unitigs found in less than 50 *A.*

baumannii GC1 and non-GC1 genomes). We also integrated the MLST data corresponding

to the Dataset 1 genomes and created a two-column matrix used as input for the SVM

algorithm. The first column of the matrix contained the accession number of the genomes,

and the second column contained a binary variable that indicated whether each genome

was typed or not as *A. baumannii* GC1 (-1 = *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genome / 1 = *A.*

baumannii GC1 genome) according to MLST typing.

For the SCM approach, we first packaged the Dataset 1 sequences stored in FASTA

files into a Kover dataset using the create from-contigs command. This command also

received a tab-separated value (TSV) with the Dataset 1 genome classification according to

MLST typing (*A. baumannii* GC1 or non-GC1). The first column of the TSV file described the

genome accession number and the second column had the value 1 whether the genome

belonged to *A. baumannii* GC1 or the value 0 otherwise. We ran Kover for k-mer sizes

from 31 to 127. For each k-mer size, Kover constructed a reference-free input matrix

based on k-mer profiles generated with the DSK k-mer counting software. A k-mer

presence/absence binary matrix based on the Dataset 1 genomes was then created and

used as input for the SCM models of each k-mer size.

Unitig selection using SVM for putative biomarkers analysis. After obtaining the SVM

model with the best hyperparameters, the values of the features weight vector (referred

to as the hyperplane normal vector $w*$ in the formula (1)) were accessed through the

attribute sklearn.model_selection.GridSearchCV.best_estimator.coef_. The values were

sorted from highest to lowest and used to decide the relevance of each unitig sequence

(associated with each weight value) during the model prediction (104, 105). It is worth

mentioning that in our study, sequence unitigs were used as features in the models. The

positive sign of a feature weight value indicates that the feature contributes to *A.*

baumannii GC1 class prediction (represented by the value 1) and the negative sign

indicates that the feature contributes to *A. baumannii* non-GC1 class (represented by the

value -1) prediction (106). Considering the above mentioned, 100 unitig sequences with

the highest weight values were selected to be analyzed as putative biomarkers of *A.*

baumannii GC1 genomes.

Machine learning performance metrics. The performance of the SVM and SCM models

was evaluated in terms of sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, precision, and F1-score. They

were defined as: sensitivity = TP/(TP + FN), specificity = TN/(TN + FP), accuracy = (TP +

TN)/(TP + FP + TN + FN), precision = TP/ (TP + FP) and F1 score = 2 * (precision *

sensitivity)/(precision + sensitivity). Where TP (true positives) was the number of *A.*

baumannii GC1 strains predicted to be *A. baumannii* GC1, TN (true negatives) was the

number of *A. baumannii* non-GC1 strains predicted to be *A. baumannii* non-GC1, FP (false

positives) was the number of *A. baumannii* non-GC1 strains predicted to be *A. baumannii*

GC1, and FN (false negatives) was the number of *A. baumannii* GC1 strains predicted to be

A. baumannii non-GC1.

Blastn searches. Blastn searches (107) were done using the Dataset 1 and Dataset 2 as

subjects, and unitigs/k-mers that contributed most to *A. baumannii* GC1 genome

prediction according to the SVM/SCM models were used as queries. We identified

whether unitigs/k-mers matched known genes or intergenic regions and provide their

putative function when possible. AYE (AN: CU459141.1) and ACICU (CP000863.1) genomes

were used as a reference to annotate the genome location and gene product related to *A.*

baumannii GC1 and non-GC1 genomes, respectively. In case the unitig was not found in

the AYE genome, AB0057 (CP001182.2) genome was used instead. Also, we counted the

number of *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes matched by each unitig. We

considered a cut-off E-value of E^{-10}, 100% of identity, and 100% of query cover. To analyze

the target of the primers designed below, Blastn searches (107) were done by using

primer's sequence as query and the Nucleotide collection (nr/nt) database of GenBank, or

the Dataset 1 and Dataset 2 as the subject. Finally, Blastn searches (107) were also done

by using the fragment of the U1 genomic biomarker of *A. baumannii* GC1 amplified with

those primers (excluding the sequence of the primers) as query, and the Dataset 1 and

Dataset 2 as the subject.

Primer design. The primers to amplify the U1 genomic biomarker of *A. baumannii* GC1

were designed by using the Oligo primer analysis software version 6.22 (108, 109).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplemental material is available online only.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS The authors' work was supported by the grant PUE 2522 from

CONICET given to IMPaM.

We are grateful to the technical assistance of Dr. Gabriela Camicia and Nicolás Donis from

CONICET.

DC, VA, and PQ contributed to the conception and design of the study. VA performed the

script development. VA and PQ analyzed the results. DC and VA structured the work,

wrote, and coordinated the drafts of the manuscript and did the final edition. VA wrote

the results section. All authors contributed to the manuscript revision, read, and approved

the submitted version.

REFERENCES

1. Álvarez VE, Quiroga MP, Galán AV, Vilacoba E, Quiroga C, Ramírez MS, Centrón D.

2020. Crucial Role of the Accessory Genome in the Evolutionary Trajectory of

Acinetobacter baumannii Global Clone 1. Front Microbiol 11.

2. Douraghi, Masoumeh, Johanna, J, Aris, Parisa, Asadian, Mahla, Ghourchian,

Sedighe, Ghourchian, Hamidian M. 2020. Accumulation of Antibiotic Resistance

Genes in Carbapenem- Resistant Acinetobacter baumannii Isolates Belonging to.

mSphere 5:e00164-20.

3. Hamidian M, Nigro SJ. 2019. Emergence, molecular mechanisms and global spread

603 of carbapenem-resistant acinetobacter baumannii. Microb Genomics. Microbiology

604 Society.

605 4. Yakkala H, Samantarrai D, Gribskov M, Siddavattam D. 2019. Comparative genome

606 analysis reveals niche-specific genome expansion in Acinetobacter baumannii

607 strains. PLoS One 14:e0218204.

608 5. Holt K, Kenyon JJ, Hamidian M, Schultz MB, Pickard DJ, Dougan G, Hall R. 2016. Five

609 decades of genome evolution in the globally distributed, extensively antibiotic-

610 resistant Acinetobacter baumannii global clone 1. Microb Genomics 2:e000052.

611 6. Zarrilli R, Pournaras S, Giannouli M, Tsakris A. 2013. Global evolution of multidrug-

612 resistant Acinetobacter baumannii clonal lineages. Int J Antimicrob Agents 41:11–

613 19.

614 7. Hamidian M, Wynn M, Holt KE, Pickard D, Dougan G, Hall RM. 2014. Identification

615 of a marker for two lineages within the GC1 clone of Acinetobacter baumannii. J

616 Antimicrob Chemother 69:557–558.

617 8. Provasi Cardoso J, Cayô R, Girardello R, Gales AC. 2016. Diversity of mechanisms

618 conferring resistance to β-lactams among OXA-23-producing Acinetobacter

619 baumannii clones. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 85:90–97.

620 9. Rodríguez C, Nastro M, A. Flores S, Rodriguez M, Spinozzi M, Bruni G, L. López A,

621 David V, S. Aiassa M, A. Marqués I, R. Navarro O, Paniccia L, Famiglietti A, Grupo

622 colaborativo Acinetobacter Argentina. 2018. Epidemiología molecular de aislados

623 de Acinetobacter baumannii resistentes a carbapenems en Argentina. Rev Argent

Microbiol https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ram.2017.12.004.

10.   Hamed SM, Hussein AFA, Al-Agamy MH, Radwan HH, Zafer MM. 2022. Genetic

Configuration of Genomic Resistance Islands in Acinetobacter baumannii Clinical

Isolates From Egypt. Front Microbiol 13:2601.

11.   Koong J, Johnson C, Rafei R, Hamze M, Myers GSA, Kenyon JJ, Lopatkin AJ, Hamidian

M. 2021. Phylogenomics of two ST1 antibiotic-susceptible non-clinical

Acinetobacter baumannii strains reveals multiple lineages and complex

evolutionary history in global clone 1. Microb Genomics 7.

12.   Dijkshoorn L, Nemec A, Seifert H. 2007. An increasing threat in hospitals: Multidrug-

resistant Acinetobacter baumannii. Nat Rev Microbiol 5:939–951.

13.   Bouvet PJM, Grimont PAD. 1986. Taxonomy of the genus Acinetobacter with the

recognition of Acinetobacter baumannii sp. nov., Acinetobacter haemolyticus sp.

nov., Acinetobacter johnsonii sp. nov., and Acinetobacter junii sp. nov. and

emended descriptions of Acinetobacter calcoaceticus and Acinetobacter lwoffii. Int

J Syst Bacteriol 36:228–240.

14.   Gerner-Smidt P, Tjernberg I, Ursing J. 1991. Reliability of phenotypic tests for

identification of Acinetobacter species. J Clin Microbiol 29:277–282.

15.   Bouvet PJM, Grimont PAD. 1987. Identification and biotyping of clinical isolates of

Acinetobacter. Ann Inst Pasteur Microbiol 138:569–578.

16.   Bartual SG, Seifert H, Hippler C, Luzon MAD, Wisplinghoff H, Rodríguez-Valera F.

2005. Development of a multilocus sequence typing scheme for characterization of

clinical isolates of Acinetobacter baumannii. J Clin Microbiol 43:4382–4390.

17. Gozalan A, Unaldı O, Guldemir D, Aydogan S, Kuzucu C, Cakirlar FK, Açıkgoz ZC,

Durmaz R. 2020. Molecular Characterization of Carbapenem-Resistant

Acinetobacter baumannii blood culture isolates from three hospitals in Turkey. Jpn J

Infect Dis https://doi.org/10.7883/yoken.jjid.2020.478.

18. Li L-H, Yang Y-S, Sun J-R, Huang T-W, Huang W-C, Chen F-J, Wang Y-C, Kuo T-H, Kuo

S-C, Chen T-L, Lee Y-T, Chang Y-Y, Yang Y-S, Liu Y-M, Kuo S-C, Liu C-P, Chen T-L, Lee

Y-T, Chang Y-Y, Yang Y-S, Liu Y-M, Kuo S-C, Liu C-P, Chen T-L, Lee Y-T. 2020. Clinical

and molecular characterization of Acinetobacter seifertii in Taiwan. J Antimicrob

Chemother https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkaa432.

19. Turton JF, Gabriel SN, Valderrey C, Kaufmann ME, Pitt TL. 2007. Use of sequence-

based typing and multiplex PCR to identify clonal lineages of outbreak strains of

Acinetobacter baumannii. Clin Microbiol Infect 13:807–815.

20. Evans BA, Hamouda A, Towner KJ, Amyes SGB. 2008. OXA-51-like β-lactamases and

their association with particular epidemic lineages of Acinetobacter baumannii. Clin

Microbiol Infect 14:268–275.

21. Hamouda A, Evans BA, Towner KJ, Amyes SGB. 2010. Characterization of

epidemiologically unrelated Acinetobacter baumannii isolates from four continents

by use of multilocus sequence typing, pulsed-field gel electrophoresis, and

sequence-based typing of blaOXA-51-like genes. J Clin Microbiol 48:2476–2483.

22.   Hamidian M, Wynn M, Holt KE, Pickard D, Dougan G, Hall RM. 2014. Identification

of a marker for two lineages within the GC1 clone of Acinetobacter baumannii. J

Antimicrob Chemother 69:557–558.

23.   Michalowitz A, Yang J, Castaneda P, Litrenta J. 2020. Existing and emerging methods

of diagnosis and monitoring of pediatric musculoskeletal infection. Injury. Elsevier

Ltd.

24.   Lupolova N, Lycett SJ, Gally DL. 2019. A guide to machine learning for bacterial host

attribution using genome sequence data. Microb Genomics 5.

25.   Holt KE, Wertheim H, Zadoks RN, Baker S, Whitehouse CA, Dance D, Jenney A,

Connor TR, Hsu LY, Severin J, Brisse S, Cao H, Wilksch J, Gorrie C, Schultz MB,

Edwards DJ, Nguyen K Van, Nguyen TV, Dao TT, Mensink M, Minh V Le, Nhu NTK,

Schultsz C, Kuntaman K, Newton PN, Moore CE, Strugnell RA, Thomson NR. 2015.

Genomic analysis of diversity, population structure, virulence, and antimicrobial

resistance in Klebsiella pneumoniae , an urgent threat to public health . Proc Natl

Acad Sci 112:E3574–E3581.

26.   Ezewudo M, Borens A, Chiner-Oms Á, Miotto P, Chindelevitch L, Starks AM, Hanna

D, Liwski R, Zignol M, Gilpin C, Niemann S, Kohl TA, Warren RM, Crook D, Gagneux

S, Hoffner S, Rodrigues C, Comas I, Engelthaler DM, Alland D, Rigouts L, Lange C,

Dheda K, Hasan R, McNerney R, Cirillo DM, Schito M, Rodwell TC, Posey J. 2018.

Integrating standardized whole genome sequence analysis with a global

Mycobacterium tuberculosis antibiotic resistance knowledgebase. Sci Rep 8.

27.   Cario CL, Chen E, Leong L, Emami NC, Lopez K, Tenggara I, Simko JP, Friedlander TW,

687   Li PS, Paris PL, Carroll PR, Witte JS. 2020. A machine learning approach to optimizing

688   cell-free DNA sequencing panels: With an application to prostate cancer. BMC

689   Cancer 20.

690   28.   Ransom EM, Potter RF, Dantas G, Burnham CAD. 2020. Genomic Prediction of

691   Antimicrobial Resistance: Ready or Not, Here It Comes! Clin Chem 66:1278–1289.

692   29.   Hernández M, Quijada NM, Rodríguez-Lázaro D, Eiros JM. 2020. Bioinformatics of

693   next generation sequencing in clinical microbiology diagnosis. Rev Argent Microbiol

694   52:150–161.

695   30.   Drouin A, Giguère S, Déraspe M, Marchand M, Tyers M, Loo VG, Bourgault A-M,

696   Laviolette F, Corbeil J. 2016. Predictive computational phenotyping and biomarker

697   discovery using reference-free genome comparisons. BMC Genomics 17:754.

698   31.   Lees JA, T. M, Tien B, Corander J. 2020. Improved Prediction of Bacterial Genotype-

699   Phenotype Associations Using Interpretable Pangenome-Spanning Regressions

700   11:1–22.

701   32.   Khaledi A, Weimann A, Schniederjans M, Asgari E, Kuo T, Oliver A, Cabot G, Kola A,

702   Gastmeier P, Hogardt M, Jonas D, Mofrad MR, Bremges A, McHardy AC, Häussler S.

703   2020. Predicting antimicrobial resistance in Pseudomonas aeruginosa with machine

704   learning-enabled molecular diagnostics . EMBO Mol Med 12.

705   33.   Hyun JC, Kavvas ES, Monk JM, Palsson BO. 2020. Machine learning with random

706   subspace ensembles identifies antimicrobial resistance determinants from pan-

genomes of three pathogens. PLoS Comput Biol 16.

34.   Van Camp PJ, Haslam DB, Porollo A. 2020. Prediction of Antimicrobial Resistance in

Gram-Negative Bacteria From Whole-Genome Sequencing Data. Front Microbiol

11:1–13.

35.   Aytan-Aktug D, Clausen PTLC, Bortolaia V, Aarestrup FM, Lund O. 2020. Prediction

of Acquired Antimicrobial Resistance for Multiple Bacterial Species Using Neural

Networks. mSystems 5.

36.   Lakin SM, Kuhnle A, Alipanahi B, Noyes NR, Dean C, Muggli M, Raymond R, Abdo Z,

Prosperi M, Belk KE, Morley PS, Boucher C. 2019. Hierarchical Hidden Markov

models enable accurate and diverse detection of antimicrobial resistance

sequences. Commun Biol 2.

37.   Saravanan R, Sujatha P. 2019. A State of Art Techniques on Machine Learning

Algorithms: A Perspective of Supervised Learning Approaches in Data Classification,

p. 945–949. *In* Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Intelligent

Computing and Control Systems, ICICCS 2018. Institute of Electrical and Electronics

Engineers Inc.

38.   Macesic N, Polubriaginof F, Tatonetti NP. 2017. Machine learning: Novel

bioinformatics approaches for combating antimicrobial resistance. Curr Opin Infect

Dis 30:511–517.

39.   González L, Angulo C, Velasco F, Català A. 2005. Unified dual for bi-class SVM

approaches. Pattern Recognit 38:1772–1774.

40.   Scholkopf B, Smola A. 2001. Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines,

Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond. Cambridge, MA MIT Press

https://doi.org/10.1109/tnn.2005.848998.

41.   Boser BE, Guyon IM, Vapnik VN. 1992. Training algorithm for optimal margin

classifiers, p. 144–152. *In* Proceedings of the Fifth Annual ACM Workshop on

Computational Learning Theory. Publ by ACM, New York, New York, USA.

42.   Marchand M, Shawe-Taylor J. 2000. The Set Covering Machine. CrossRef List

Deleted DOIs 1:723–746.

43.   Ivanenkov YA, Zhavoronkov A, Yamidanov RS, Osterman IA, Sergiev P V., Aladinskiy

VA, Aladinskaya A V., Terentiev VA, Veselov MS, Ayginin AA, Kartsev VG, Skvortsov

DA, Chemeris A V., Baimiev AK, Sofronova AA, Malyshev AS, Filkov GI, Bezrukov DS,

Zagribelnyy BA, Putin EO, Puchinina MM, Dontsova OA. 2019. Identification of

Novel Antibacterials Using Machine Learning Techniques. Front Pharmacol 10:1–15.

44.   Kouchaki S, Yang YY, Walker TM, Walker AS, Wilson DJ, Peto TEA, Crook DW, Clifton

DA, Hoosdally SJ, Gibertoni Cruz AL, Carter J, Grazian C, Kouchaki S, Walker TM,

Fowler PW, Clifton DA, Iqbal Z, Hunt M, Smith EG, Rathod P, Jarrett L, Matias D,

Cirillo DM, Borroni E, Battaglia S, Ghodousi A, Spitaleri A, Cabibbe A, Tahseen S,

Nilgiriwala K, Shah S, Rodrigues C, Kambli P, Surve U, Khot R, Niemann S, Kohl T,

Merker M, Hoffmann H, Molodtsov N, Plesnik S, Ismail N, Omar SV, Joseph L,

Marubini E, Thwaites G, Thuong TNT, Ngoc NH, Srinivasan V, Moore D, Coronel J,

Solano W, Gao GF, He G, Zhao Y, Ma A, Liu C, Zhu B, Laurenson I, Claxton P,

Wilkinson RJ, Lalvani A, Posey J, Gardy J, Werngren J, Paton N, Jou R, Wu MH, Lin

WH, Ferrazoli L, De Oliveira RS, Arandjelovic I, Comas I, Drobniewski F, Gao Q,

Sintchenko V, Supply P, Van Soolingen D. 2019. Application of machine learning

techniques to tuberculosis drug resistance analysis. Bioinformatics 35:2276–2282.

45.   Her HL, Wu YW. 2018. A pan-genome-based machine learning approach for

predicting antimicrobial resistance activities of the Escherichia coli strains.

Bioinformatics 34:i89–i95.

46.   Yang Y, Niehaus KE, Walker TM, Iqbal Z, Walker AS, Wilson DJ, Peto TEA, Crook DW,

Smith EG, Zhu T, Clifton DA. 2018. Machine learning for classifying tuberculosis

drug-resistance from DNA sequencing data. Bioinformatics 34:1666–1671.

47.   Zvezdanova ME, Arroyo MJ, Méndez G, Guinea J, Mancera L, Muñoz P, Rodríguez-

Sánchez B, Escribano P. 2020. Implementation of maldi-tof mass spectrometry and

peak analysis: Application to the discrimination of cryptococcus neoformans species

complex and their interspecies hybrids. J Fungi 6:1–12.

48.   Lorenz B, Ali N, Bocklitz T, Rösch P, Popp J. 2020. Discrimination between

pathogenic and non-pathogenic E. coli strains by means of Raman

microspectroscopy. Anal Bioanal Chem 412:8241–8247.

49.   Uysal Ciloglu F, Saridag AM, Kilic IH, Tokmakci M, Kahraman M, Aydin O. 2020.

Identification of methicillin-resistant: Staphylococcus aureus bacteria using surface-

enhanced Raman spectroscopy and machine learning techniques. Analyst

145:7559–7570.

50.   Guyon I, Weston J, Barnhill S, Labs T, Bank R. 2013. Gene Selection for Cancer

771   Classification using Support Vector Machines. Biotechnol Bioeng 110:fmvi-fmvi.

772   51.   Henneges C, Bullinger D, Fux R, Friese N, Seeger H, Neubauer H, Laufer S, Gleiter

773   CH, Schwab M, Zell A, Kammerer B. 2009. Prediction of breast cancer by profiling of

774   urinary RNA metabolites using Support Vector Machine-based feature selection.

775   BMC Cancer 9:1–11.

776   52.   Aswathy MA, Jagannath M. 2021. An SVM approach towards breast cancer

777   classification from H&E-stained histopathology images based on integrated

778   features. Med Biol Eng Comput https://doi.org/10.1007/s11517-021-02403-0.

779   53.   Xu H, Park S, Hwang TH. 2020. Computerized Classification of Prostate Cancer

780   Gleason Scores from Whole Slide Images. IEEE/ACM Trans Comput Biol Bioinforma

781   17:1871–1882.

782   54.   Liu Z, Deng D, Lu H, Sun J, Lv L, Li S, Peng G, Ma X, Li J, Li Z, Rong T, Wang G. 2020.

783   Evaluation of Machine Learning Models for Predicting Antimicrobial Resistance of

784   Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae From Whole Genome Sequences. Front Microbiol

785   11.

786   55.   Li Y, Kong Y, Zhang M, Yan A, Liu Z. 2016. Using Support Vector Machine (SVM) for

787   Classification of Selectivity of H1N1 Neuraminidase Inhibitors. Mol Inform 35:116–

788   124.

789   56.   Hicks AL, Wheeler N, Sánchez-Busó L, Rakeman JL, Harris SR, Grad YH. 2019.

790   Evaluation of parameters affecting performance and reliability of machine learning-

based antibiotic susceptibility testing from whole genome sequencing data. PLoS

Comput Biol 15:1–21.

57. Bron EE, Smits M, Niessen WJ, Klein S. 2015. Feature Selection Based on the SVM

Weight Vector for Classification of Dementia. IEEE J Biomed Heal Informatics

19:1617–1626.

58. Kolisetty VV, Rajput DS. 2020. A review on the significance of machine learning for

data analysis in big data. Jordanian J Comput Inf Technol 6:41–57.

59. Diancourt L, Passet V, Nemec A, Dijkshoorn L, Brisse S. 2010. The population

structure of Acinetobacter baumannii: expanding multiresistant clones from an

ancestral susceptible genetic pool. PLoS One 5:e10034.

60. Karah N, Wai SN, Uhlin BE. 2021. CRISPR-based subtyping to track the evolutionary

history of a global clone of Acinetobacter baumannii. Infect Genet Evol 90:104774.

61. Hamidian M, Hall RM. 2018. The AbaR antibiotic resistance islands found in

Acinetobacter baumannii global clone 1 – Structure, origin and evolution. Drug

Resist Updat 41:26–39.

62. Hamidian M, Hall RM. 2021. Dissemination of novel Tn7 family transposons carrying

genes for synthesis and uptake of fimsbactin siderophores among Acinetobacter

baumannii isolates. Microb Genomics 7.

63. Jaillard M, Lima L, Tournoud M, Mahé P, van Belkum A, Lacroix V, Jacob L. 2018. A

fast and agnostic method for bacterial genome-wide association studies: Bridging

the gap between k-mers and genetic events. PLoS Genet 14:1–28.

64. Wuebbens MM, Liu MTW, Rajagopalan K V., Schindelin H. 2000. Insight into

molybdenum cofactor deficiency provided by the crystal structure of the

molybdenum cofactor biosynthesis protein MoaC. Structure 8:709–718.

65. Winter SE, Thiennimitr P, Winter MG, Butler BP, Huseby DL, Crawford RW, Russell

JM, Bevins CL, Adams LG, Tsolis RM, Roth JR, Bäumler AJ. 2010. Gut inflammation

provides a respiratory electron acceptor for Salmonella. Nature 467:426–429.

66. Winter SE, Winter MG, Xavier MN, Thiennimitr P, Poon V, Keestra AM, Laughlin RC,

Gomez G, Wu J, Lawhon SD, Popova IE, Parikh SJ, Adams LG, Tsolis RM, Stewart VJ,

Bäumler AJ. 2013. Host-derived nitrate boosts growth of E. coli in the inflamed gut.

Science (80-) 339:708–711.

67. Denkel LA, Rhen M, Bange FC. 2013. Biotin sulfoxide reductase contributes to

oxidative stress tolerance and virulence in Salmonella enterica serovar

Typhimurium. Microbiol (United Kingdom) 159:1447–1458.

68. Williams M, Mizrahi V, Kana BD. 2014. Molybdenum cofactor: A key component of

Mycobacterium tuberculosis pathogenesis? Crit Rev Microbiol. Taylor & Francis.

69. Vilacoba E, Déraspe M, Traglia GM, Roy PH, Ramírez S. 2014. Draft Genome

Sequence of an International Clonal Lineage 1 Acinetobacter baumannii Strain from

Argentina 2:13–14.

70. Arivett BA, Fiester SE, Ream DC, Centrón D, Ramírez MS, Tolmasky ME, Actis LA.

2015. Draft Genome of the Multidrug-Resistant Acinetobacter baumannii Strain

A155 Clinical Isolate. Genome Announc 3:e00212-15.

71.   Navon-Venezia S, Kondratyeva K, Carattoli A. 2017. Klebsiella pneumoniae: A major

worldwide source and shuttle for antibiotic resistance. FEMS Microbiol Rev. Oxford

University Press.

72.   Mathers A, Peirano G, Mathers AJ, Peirano G, Pitout DD. 2015. The Role of Epidemic

Resistance Plasmids and International High-Risk Clones in the Spread of Multidrug-

Resistant ... The Role of Epidemic Resistance Plasmids and International High- Risk

Clones   in   the   Spread   of   Multidrug-Resistant   Enterobacteriaceae

https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00116-14.

73.   Abdouchakour F, Aujoulat F, Licznar-Fajardo P, Marchandin H, Toubiana M, Parer S,

Lotthé A, Jumas-Bilak E. 2018. Intraclonal variations of resistance and phenotype in

Pseudomonas aeruginosa epidemic high-risk clone ST308: A key to success within a

hospital? Int J Med Microbiol 308:279–289.

74.   Villa L, Feudi C, Fortini D, Brisse S, Passet V, Bonura C, Endimiani A, Mammina C,

Ocampo AM, Jimenez JN, Doumith M, Woodford N, Hopkins K, Carattoli A. 2017.

Diversity, virulence, and antimicrobial resistance of the KPCproducing klebsiella

pneumoniae ST307 clone. Microb Genomics 3.

75.   Oteo J, Pérez-Vázquez M, Bautista V, Ortega A, Zamarrón P, Saez D, Lara N, Ramiro

R, Aracil B, Campos J. 2016. The spread of KPC-producing Enterobacteriaceae in

Spain: WGS analysis of the emerging high-risk clones of Klebsiella pneumoniae

852   ST11/KPC-2, ST101/KPC-2 and ST512/KPC-3. J Antimicrob Chemother 71:3392–

853   3399.

854 76. Cao H, Xia T, Li Y, Xu Z, Bougouffa S, Lo YK, Bajic VB, Luo H, Woo PCY, Yana A. 2019.

855   Uncoupled Quorum Sensing Modulates the Interplay of Virulence and Resistance in

856   a Multidrug-Resistant Clinical Pseudomonas aeruginosa Isolate Belonging to the

857   MLST550 Clonal Complex. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 63.

858 77. Heiden SE, Hübner NO, Bohnert JA, Heidecke CD, Kramer A, Balau V, Gierer W,

859   Schaefer S, Eckmanns T, Gatermann S, Eger E, Guenther S, Becker K, Schaufler K.

860   2020. A Klebsiella pneumoniae ST307 outbreak clone from Germany demonstrates

861   features of extensive drug resistance, hypermucoviscosity, and enhanced iron

862   acquisition. Genome Med 12.

863 78. Gato E, Vázquez-Ucha JC, Rumbo-Feal S, Álvarez-Fraga L, Vallejo JA, Martínez-

864   Guitián M, Beceiro A, Vivas JR, Sola Campoy PJ, Pérez-Vázquez M, Iglesias JO,

865   Rodiño-Janeiro BK, Romero A, Poza M, Bou G, Pérez A. 2020. Kpi, a chaperone-

866   usher pili system associated with the worldwide-disseminated high-risk clone

867   Klebsiella pneumoniae ST-15. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 117:17249–17259.

868 79. de Lagarde M, Vanier G, Arsenault J, Fairbrother JM. 2021. High risk clone: A

869   proposal of criteria adapted to the one health context with application to

870   enterotoxigenic escherichia coli in the pig population. Antibiotics 10:1–19.

871 80. Zhong Q, Kobe B, Kappler U. 2020. Molybdenum Enzymes and How They Support

872   Virulence in Pathogenic Bacteria. Front Microbiol 11:1–23.

873   81.   Contreras I, Toro CS, Troncoso G, Mora GC. 1997. Salmonella typhi mutants

874   defective in anaerobic respiration are impaired in their ability to replicate within

875   epithelial cells. Microbiology 143:2665–2672.

876   82.   Rosas-Magallanes V, Stadthagen-Gomez G, Rauzier J, Barreiro LB, Tailleux L, Boudou

877   F, Griffin R, Nigou J, Jackson M, Gicquel B, Neyrolles O. 2007. Signature-tagged

878   transposon mutagenesis identifies novel Mycobacterium tuberculosis genes

879   involved in the parasitism of human macrophages. Infect Immun 75:504–507.

880   83.   Brodin P, Poquet Y, Levillain F, Peguillet I, Larrouy-Maumus G, Gilleron M, Ewann F,

881   Christophe T, Fenistein D, Jang J, Jang M-S, Park S-J, Rauzier J, Carralot J-P,

882   Shrimpton R, Genovesio A, Gonzalo-Asensio JA, Puzo G, Martin C, Brosch R, Stewart

883   GR, Gicquel B, Neyrolles O. 2010. High Content Phenotypic Cell-Based Visual Screen

884   Identifies   Mycobacterium   tuberculosis   Acyltrehalose-Containing   Glycolipids

885   Involved in Phagosome Remodeling. PLoS Pathog 6:e1001100.

886   84.   Dutta NK, Mehra S, Didier PJ, Roy CJ, Doyle LA, Alvarez X, Ratterree M, Be NA,

887   Lamichhane G, Jain SK, Lacey MR, Lackner AA, Kaushal D. 2010. Genetic

888   Requirements for the Survival of Tubercle Bacilli in Primates. J Infect Dis 201:1743–

889   1752.

890   85.   Levillain F, Poquet Y, Mallet L, Mazères S, Marceau M, Brosch R, Bange F-C, Supply

891   P, Magalon A, Neyrolles O. 2017. Horizontal acquisition of a hypoxia-responsive

892   molybdenum   cofactor   biosynthesis   pathway   contributed   to   Mycobacterium

893   tuberculosis pathoadaptation. PLOS Pathog 13:e1006752.

86. Macesic N, Bear Don't Walk OJ, Pe'er I, Tatonetti NP, Peleg AY, Uhlemann A-C.

2020. Predicting Phenotypic Polymyxin Resistance in Klebsiella pneumoniae

through Machine Learning Analysis of Genomic Data. mSystems 5.

87. Deelder W, Christakoudi S, Phelan J, Benavente ED, Campino S, McNerney R, Palla L,

Clark TG. 2019. Machine learning predicts accurately mycobacterium tuberculosis

drug resistance from whole genome sequencing data. Front Genet 10.

88. Mahé P, Tournoud M. 2018. Predicting bacterial resistance from whole-genome

sequences using k-mers and stability selection. BMC Bioinformatics 19:383.

89. Leski TA, Bangura U, Jimmy DH, Ansumana R, Lizewski SE, Li RW, Stenger DA, Taitt

CR, Vora GJ. 2013. Identification of blaOXA-51-like, blaOXA-58, bla DIM-1, and

blaVIM carbapenemase genes in hospital Enterobacteriaceae isolates from Sierra

Leone. J Clin Microbiol 51:2435–2438.

90. Lee YT, Kuo SC, Chiang MC, Yang SP, Chen CP, Chen TL, Fung CP. 2012. Emergence

of carbapenem-resistant non-baumannii species of Acinetobacter harboring a

blaOXA-51-like gene that is intrinsic to A. baumannii. Antimicrob Agents Chemother

56:1124–1127.

91. Lee YT, Turton JF, Chen TL, Wu RCC, Chang WC, Fung CP, Chen CP, Cho WL, Huang

LY, Siu LK. 2009. First identification of blaOXA-51-like in non-baumannii

acinetobacter spp. J Chemother 21:514–520.

92. Mahé P, Tournoud M. 2018. Predicting bacterial resistance from whole-genome

sequences using k-mers and stability selection. BMC Bioinformatics 19:383.

93. Jaillard M, Tournoud M, Lima L, Lacroix V, Veyrieras JB, Jacob L. 2017. Representing

Genetic Determinants in Bacterial GWAS with Compacted De Bruijn Graphs. bioRxiv

1–24.

94. Ajiboye AR, Abdullah-Arshah R, Qin H, Isah-Kebbe H. 2015. Evaluating the Effect of

Dataset Size on Predictive Model Using. Int J Softw Eng Comput Sci 1:75–84.

95. Zhang Y, Ling C. 2018. A strategy to apply machine learning to small datasets in

materials science. npj Comput Mater 4:28–33.

96. Schmidt J, Marques MRG, Botti S, Marques MAL. 2019. Recent advances and

applications of machine learning in solid-state materials science. npj Comput Mater

5.

97. Rizk G, Lavenier D, Chikhi R. 2013. DSK: k-mer counting with very low memory

usage. Bioinformatics 29:652–653.

98. Drouin A, Letarte G, Raymond F, Marchand M, Corbeil J, Laviolette F. 2019.

Interpretable genotype-to-phenotype classifiers with performance guarantees. Sci

Rep 9:1–13.

99. Vapnik VN. 2000. The Nature of Statistical LearningTheoryThe Nature of Statistical

Learning Theory. Springer New York.

100. Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, Blondel M,

Prettenhofer P, Weiss R, Dubourg V, Vanderplas J, Passos A, Cournapeau D, Brucher

M, Perrot M, Duchesnay É. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. J Mach

935  Learn Res 12:2825–2830.

936 101. Drouin A, Giguère S, Déraspe M, Marchand M, Tyers M, Loo VG, Bourgault A-M,

937  Laviolette F, Corbeil J. 2016. Aditional File of Predictive computational phenotyping

938  and biomarker discovery using reference-free genome comparisons. BMC Genomics

939  17:754.

940 102. Boisvert S, Raymond F, Godzaridis É, Laviolette F, Corbeil J. 2012. Ray Meta:

941  Scalable de novo metagenome assembly and profiling. Genome Biol 13.

942 103. Miller JR, Koren S, Sutton G. 2010. Assembly algorithms for next-generation

943  sequencing data. Genomics. NIH Public Access.

944 104. Guyon I, Weston J, Barnhill S, Vapnik V. 2002. Gene selection for cancer

945  classification using support vector machines. Mach Learn 46:389–422.

946 105. Chang Y, Lin C. 2008. Feature Ranking Using Linear SVM. Featur Rank Using Linear

947  SVM 53–64.

948 106. Zisserman A. 2013. Lecture 2 : The SVM classifier. C19 Mach Learn Lect Hilar 2015,

949  Oxford Univ 40.

950 107. Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment

951  search tool. J Mol Biol 215:403–410.

952 108. Rychlik W, Rhoads RE. 1989. A computer program for choosing optimal

953  oligonudeotides for filter hybridization, sequencing and in vitro amplification of

954  DNA. Nucleic Acids Res 17:8543–8551.

109. Rychlik W, Spencer WJ, Rhoads RE. 1990. Optimization of the annealing temperature for DNA amplification in vitro; Nucleic Acids Res 18:6409–6412.

TABLES

Table 1. Putative *A. baumannii* GC1 biomarkers obtained by SVM. The table details the unitig ID, unitig sequence, unitig length, the location where the unitig sequence matched in *A. baumannii* AYE genome (AN:CU459141.1) or *A. baumannii* AB0057 genome (AN: CP001182.2), and the gene name corresponding to the genome region matched and the gene product of the first 10 unitigs that contributed most to *A. baumannii* GC1 genome prediction according to the values of the features weight vector. *A. baumannii* AYE strain genome was used as *A. baumannii* GC1 reference to locate the unitigs sequences. However, when the unitig was not found in *A. baumannii* AYE genome, *A. baumannii* AB0057 strain genome was used instead. The prefix "REGION" was used when the match occurred either in an intergenic region or in a combination of intergenic region and a gene. The complete list of the 100 unitigs predicted by SVM is detailed in Supplementary Table S3.

Unitig ID	Sequence	Length	Match Location	Gene Name	Gene Product
U1	TTATTCATAGCCTCCTGGATGCGGTAAAT CACGGCAAACATCAAAAATATGGACTAA TGCGGGTAAAATAGCGGCCATTGATTCG CTTGCTCCACCACGGCTTCCCGGTAACGT CACTACTAACGAACGGTCAATAAACCCT GCTACTCCGCGTGACATAGCAGCATATG GCGTGCGTTTTTGTCCAAATGAGCGAGC AGCTTCCATTAAGCCATCTAATTTACGTT CTAAAAGAGGCTCTAGCGTATCAACTGT AATGTCACGCTTACCAATTCCTGTCCCAC CCACGGTCATAATGCAAGCATATGATTT GCTCAACTCAAGCACTAAGTTTTTCAAAG TATCCGCTTCATCTGGCAAAATTTGG	367	ABAYE1552:5 58..924	*moaCB*	Bifunctional protein [Includes: molybdenum cofactor biosynthesis protein C; molybdenum cofactor biosynthesis protein B]

U2	ACCGGCAAAAATTGCAACCCCAATAAAACCGTTCACCCAACCGTTCATAAACTTTTGCATA	61	ABAYE1557:1..61	-	Putative permease (drug/metabolite transporter)
U3	ACGTAAGCCATATTGAGAGGCTGCAAGTTCGACACGAGCAACATCACCCAATCGGGTAACC	61	ABAYE1173:777..837	-	Putative Multidrug/solvent efflux pump membrane transporter
U4	AAACACTGGGAAATATACTTGAAAAATATCAACAACCCCGAACGTATGCGGGTTGCTCAGT	61	ABAYE3468:844..904	-	Conserved hypothetical protein; putative exported protein
U5	GTATATCTGGCACAAAGCAAAAGGCTTTCATGCCTTACAACATCAACAAACCCGTAAA	58	ABAYE1549:957..1014	*moaA*	Molybdopterin biosynthesis, protein A
U6	CATAACCCCTAAAGTACGATGGCTTGATACGGCATCCCACATTGTTAAGCTA	52	ABAYE1636:975..1026	*cydB*	Cytochrome d terminal oxidase polypeptide subunit II
U7	GAACTATGGCAATACCGATCAGTAAAGATAGAAGTACCTGCCAG	44	ABAYE2207:192..235	-	Putative permease
U8	TCCTTTAGAAAATTTGGTGGGACAAGAAGGCGAAGGTTATA	41	ABAYE1412:651..691	-	Putative acyl-CoA dehydrogenase protein (*acdB*-like)
U9	TCATGTCGAGCTAAGCCAGTACCAGCAAAAGCTGAAG	37	ABAYE1194:1095..1131	-	Putative two-component system sensor histidine kinase
U10	CCCCCCGAACTACATCAATATGATCATATAAGGCC	35	ABAYE1494:441..475	-	Putative outer membrane porin, receptor for Fe(III)-coprogen, Fe(III)-ferrioxamine B and Fe(III)-rhodotrulic acid uptake (FhuE)

Table 2. Analysis of putative *A. baumannii* GC1 biomarkers obtained by SVM matches within the Dataset 1 and 2. The table details the unitig ID of the first 10 unitigs that contributed most to *A. baumannii* GC1 genome prediction according to the values of the features weight vector, the number of *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes typified by MLST that matched the unitig within the Dataset 1 and 2 using blastn and the p-values

976   of Fisher's exact test using a significance level of 0.05. Fisher's exact test was calculated in

977   R considering the nominal variables "Dataset Source" (Dataset 1 or Dataset 2) and

978   "Matched" (Yes or No). The total number of *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes that

979   matched / not matched the unitigs in each dataset was used for calculation. Total data of

980   the 100 unitigs predicted by SVM is detailed in Supplementary Table S4.

	Dataset 1		Dataset 2			
Unitig ID	Number of GC1 genomes matching the unitig	Number of non-GC1 genomes matching the unitig	Number of GC1 genomes matching the unitig	Number of non-GC1 genomes matching the unitig	P-value (proportion of GC1 genome matches in the Dataset 1 not differs from proportion of GC1 matches in the Dataset 2)	P-value (proportion of non-GC1 genome matches in the Dataset 1 not differs from proportion of non-GC1 matches in the Dataset 2)
U1	200/200	0/300	312/312	0/4487	P = 1	P = 1
U2	200/200	0/300	311/312	0/4487	P = 1	P = 1
U3	200/200	0/300	311/312	3/4487	P = 1	P = 1
U4	200/200	0/300	310/312	43/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.1106
U5	200/200	0/300	311/312	0/4487	P = 1	P = 1
U6	200/200	0/300	306/312	1/4487	P = 0.0862	P = 1
U7	200/200	0/300	309/312	2/4487	P = 0.2845	P = 1
U8	200/200	0/300	312/312	1/4487	P = 1	P = 1
U9	200/200	0/300	309/312	5/4487	P = 0.2845	P = 1
U10	200/200	0/300	311/312	0/4487	P = 1	P = 1

Table 3. Rules obtained by the SCM models. The table details the rule ID, the rule output

from the SCM model, k-mer length and the location where the rule sequence matched in

A. baumannii AYE genome (AN:CU459141.1) or *A. baumannii* ACICU genome (AN:

CP000863.1), and the gene name corresponding to the genome region matched and the

gene product of the 10 larger k-mer sequences targeted by the SCM rules. *A. baumannii*

AYE and ACICU genomes were used as *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 references,

respectively, to locate the k-mer sequences. The prefix "REGION" was used when the

match occurred either in an intergenic region or in a combination of intergenic region and

a gene. The complete list of the 49 rules obtained by the SCM models is detailed in

Supplementary Table S5.

Rule ID	Rule	Length	Match Location	Gene Name	Gene Product
R127	Presence(AAAAAAGCATGTTTGAAACATGCTTTTTTATTTTATGGCGTTAAACCAACAGGATTGCGATACCAGCTCTGAATTAGCAAAGCCGCGGCAAAACTATCGGCTGACAACTTCTTGGCACGGCCTTGTT)	127	AYE(CU459141.1):REGION:3509175..3509301	-	Putative Holliday junction resolvase
R125	Absence(AATGATTAACAGTACAGGGAAACTAGCAATGAGAAGTTGCATCAAAATGCCTTGACGTTGTGGTGCTGTGCCCTCTACAACAACATTTTGCTTGTTTAAGCTTGGCATAAGTTCAGTGTCTTCAA)	125	ACICU_02924: 125..249	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease
R123	Absence(AATGATTAACAGTACAGGGAAACTAGCAATGAGAAGTTGCATCAAAATGCCTTGACGTTGTGGTGCTGTGCCCTCTACAACAACATTTTGCTTGTTTAAGCTTGGCATAAGTTCAGTGTCTTC)	123	ACICU_02924: 127..249	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease
R121	Absence(AATGATTAACAGTACAGGGAAACTAGCAATGAGAAGTTGCATCAAAATGCCTTGACGTTGTGGTGCTGTGCCCTCTACAACAACATTTTGCTTGTTTAAGCTTGGCATAAGTTCAGTGTCT)	121	ACICU_02924: 129..249	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease
R119	Absence(AATGATTAACAGTACAGGGAAACTAGCAATGAGAAGTTGCATCAAAATGCCTTGACGTTGTGGTGCTGTGCCCTCTACAACAACATTTTGCTTGTTTAAGCTTGGCATAAGTTCAGTGT)	119	ACICU_02924: 131..249	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease
R117	Absence(AACAGTACAGGGAAACTAGCAATGAGAAGTTGCATCAAAATGCCTTGACGTTGTGGTGCTGTGCCCTCTACAACAACATTTTGCTTGTTTAAGCTTGGCATAAGTTCAGTGTCTTCA)	117	ACICU_02924: 126..242	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease

R115	Absence(AACAGTACAGGGAAACTAGCA ATGAGAAGTTGCATCAAAATGCCTTGAC GTTGTGGTGCTGTGCCCTCTACAACAAC ATTTTGCTTGTTTAAGCTTGGCATAAGTT CAGTGTCTT)	115	ACICU_02924: 128..242	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease
R113	Absence(AACAGTACAGGGAAACTAGCA ATGAGAAGTTGCATCAAAATGCCTTGAC GTTGTGGTGCTGTGCCCTCTACAACAAC ATTTTGCTTGTTTAAGCTTGGCATAAGTT CAGTGTC)	113	ACICU_02924: 130..242	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease
R111	Absence(AAGACACTGAACTTATGCCAA GCTTAAACAAGCAAAATGTTGTTGTAGA GGGCACAGCACCACAACGTCAAGGCATT TTGATGCAACTTCTCATTGCTAGTTTCCC TGTAC)	111	ACICU_02924: 128..238	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease
R109	Absence(AAGACACTGAACTTATGCCAA GCTTAAACAAGCAAAATGTTGTTGTAGA GGGCACAGCACCACAACGTCAAGGCATT TTGATGCAACTTCTCATTGCTAGTTTCCC TGT)	109	ACICU_02924: 128..236	-	ATP-dependent Zn protease

Table 4. Analysis of the SCM rules matches within the Dataset 1 and 2. The table details

the rule ID of the 10 larger k-mer sequences targeted by the SCM rules, the number of *A.*

baumannii GC1 and non-GC1 genomes typified by MLST that matched the rule within the

Datasets 1 and 2 using blastn and the p-values of Fisher's exact test using a significance

level of 0.05. Fisher's exact test was calculated in R considering the nominal variables

"Dataset Source" (Dataset 1 or Dataset 2) and "Matched" (Yes or No). The total number of

A. baumannii GC1 and non-GC1 genomes that matched / not matched the rules in each

dataset was used for calculation. Total data of the 49 SCM rules is detailed in

Supplementary Table S6.

1004

1005

1006

	Dataset 1		Dataset 2		P-value (proportion of *A. baumannii* GC1 genome matches in the Dataset 1 not differs from proportion of GC1 matches in the Dataset 2)	P-value (proportion of *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genome matches in the Dataset 1 not differs from proportion of non-GC1 matches in the Dataset 2)
Rule ID	Number of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes matching the rule	Number of *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes matching the rule	Number of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes matching the rule	Number of *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes matching the rule		
R127	200/200	4/300	310/312	166/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.03405
R125	200/200	1/300	310/312	13/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5964
R123	200/200	1/300	310/312	13/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5964
R121	200/200	1/300	310/312	13/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5964
R119	200/200	1/300	310/312	13/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5964
R117	200/200	1/300	310/312	12/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5693
R115	200/200	1/300	310/312	12/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5693
R113	200/200	1/300	310/312	12/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5693
R111	200/200	1/300	310/312	12/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5693
R109	200/200	1/300	310/312	12/4487	P = 0.523	P = 0.5693

1007

Table 5. Prediction metrics on test dataset partitions from the Dataset 1 using the best

performing SVM model. Correlation between MLST typing and model prediction was

calculated using Fisher's exact test in R level using a significance level of 0.05. The nominal

variables "MLST Typing" and "Prediction" were considered during Fisher's exact test

calculation. The variable "MLST Typing" represented the genomes typed as *A. baumannii*

GC1 (positive label) or non-GC1 (negative label) by MLST technique (true class). On the

other hand, the variable "Prediction" represented the genomes predicted to be *A.*

baumannii GC1 or non-GC1 by the SVM model (predicted class). We used the number of

True Positives (TP), False Positives (FP), False Negatives (FN) and True Negatives (TN) in

2x2 contingency table. Null hypothesis used to evaluate the correlation between MLST

typing and model prediction was: "True class (MLST Typing) and Predicted class are

independent, knowing the value of one variable does not help to predict the value of the

other variable".

									Number of isolates typified by MLST		
ACC	SENS	SPE	PRE	F1	TP	TN	FP	FN	GC1	non-GC1	Correlation of MLST typing to the model prediction
1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	52	48	0	0	52	48	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$

ACC: Accuracy; SENS: Sensitivity; SPE: Specificity; PRE: Precision; F1: F1-Score; TP: True Positives, TN: True Negatives; FP: False Positives;

FN: False Negatives.

Table 6. Prediction metrics on test dataset partitions from the Dataset 1 using the best

performing SCM models. Correlation between MLST typing and model prediction was

calculated using Fisher's exact test in R using a significance level of 0.05. The nominal

variables "MLST Typing" and "Prediction" were considered during Fisher's exact test

calculation. The variable "MLST Typing" represented the genomes typed as *A. baumannii*

GC1 (positive label) or *A. baumannii* non-GC1 (negative label) by MLST technique (true

class). On the other hand, the variable "Prediction" represented the genomes predicted to

be *A. baumannii* GC1 or non-GC1 by the SCM model (predicted class). We used the

number of True Positives (TP), False Positives (FP), False Negatives (FN) and True

Negatives (TN) in 2x2 contingency table. Null hypothesis used to evaluate the correlation

between MLST typing and model prediction was: "True class (MLST Typing) and Predicted

class are independent, knowing the value of one variable does not help to predict the

value of the other variable". Total metrics of the 49 rules obtained by the SCM models is

detailed in Supplementary Table S7.

1037

Rule ID	SENS	SPE	PRE	ACC	F1	TP	TN	FP	FN	Number of isolates typified by MLST		Correlation of MLST typing to the model prediction
										GC1	non-GC1	
R127	1.00	0.96	0.95	0.98	0.97	72	91	4	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R125	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R123	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R121	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R119	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R117	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R115	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R113	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R111	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$
R109	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	72	94	1	0	72	95	$P < 2.2e^{-16}$

ACC: Accuracy; SENS: Sensitivity; SPE: Specificity; PRE: Precision; F1: F1-Score; TP: True Positives, TN: True Negatives; FP: False Positives;

FN: False Negatives.

FIGURES LEGENDS

Figure 1. Diagram of the workflow for *A. baumannii* GC1 biomarker discovery using

machine learning. The diagram indicates the steps we followed during the present work

related to genomes collections used, dataset preparation, ML analysis and the design of a

method for *A. baumannii* GC1 strain identification.

Figure 2. Percentage of genomes in the Dataset 1 and Dataset 2 matching unitig

sequences U1 to U12. (A) *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes, **(B)** *A. baumannii* non-GC1

genomes.

Figure 3. Percentage of genomes in the Dataset 1 and Dataset 2 matching the SCM rules.

(A) *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes, **(B)** *A. baumannii* non-GC1 genomes. We observed that

within the 43 rules which targeted 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes from the Dataset

1, two set of rules targeted only 1 non-GC1 from the same dataset. Rules R125, R123,

R121, R119, R117, R115, R113, R111, R109, R107, R105, R103, R101, R99, R97, R95, R89,

R83, R81, R79, R77, R73, R69, R63, R39 and, R35 targeted genome with AN:

GCF_000248195.1 (ST 69) and R49 targeted genome with AN: GCF_000453745.1 (ST 2).

Regarding the Dataset 2, rules R93, R91, R87, R85, R75, R61, 211 R59, R57, R55, R53, R49

and R31 targeted 100% of *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes but also targeted several *A.*

baumannii non-GC1 genomes from the Dataset 2 (66/4487, 28/4487, 28/4487, 28/4487,

213 28/4487, 26/4487, 26/4487, 14/4487, 27/4487, 26/4487, 13/4487, 42/4487 genomes,

respectively).

Figure 4. Mean Accuracy of the SVM and SCM models. Bars with blue color show the

mean accuracy for the models on the training dataset. Bars with green color are the

accuracy of the models on the test dataset. The models were run with the best

hyperparameters selected from the 5-fold cross-validation. The error bars are standard

deviations. **(A)** SVM model, **(B)** SCM models.

SUPPLEMENTAL FIGURES LEGENDS.

Figure S1. *A. baumannii* GC1 biomarker identification by PCR. PCR amplification of

several *A. baumannii* strains is shown. Samples order at the upper wells correspond to

Ladder, A144 ST1, A155 ST1, HAX19AbA ST1, HAX26Aba ST2, HAX28Aba ST2, A118 ST404,

A110 ST1, A185 ST1, A325 ST119, A376 ST119, A103 ST119, ladder. Samples order at the

lower wells correspond to Ladder, HAX22Aba ST1, HAX25Aba ST1, HAX27Aba ST1,

Ab33405 ST79, Ab66 ST79, 186 ST79, F33943 ST79, A171 ST79, A177 ST79, A182 ST79,

A384 ST79, negative control, ladder. Agarose gel 1.5%, electrophoresis in TAE buffer at

80V during 45 min. 1 Kbp DNA ladder (#K0178, Inbio Highway, Argentina).

Figure S2. Alignment of the DNA sequence of U1 identified in *A. baumannii* strains

tested by PCR. The primers pair used in the PCR are shown, which targets coordinates 559

to 914 from ABAYE1552 locus tag representing positions 2 to 357 of the 367 bp length U1

sequence identified in *A. baumannii* GC1 amplified by PCR. Sequence type (ST) according

to Pasteur's MLST schemes and Global Clones (GCs) are indicated in brackets. *The ST

does not belong to a GC.

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES LEGENDS.

Table S1. *A. baumannii* genomes used as input dataset for SVM algorithm within the

Dataset 1 genome collection. GenBank accession number and classification of the 500

genomes in ML analysis. Genomes were classified as *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1

according MLST Pasteur scheme.

Table S2. *A. baumannii* genomes used as input dataset for SVM algorithm within the

Dataset 2 genome collection. Genomes were classified as *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1

according MLST Pasteur scheme. ST Pasteur column with "-" value indicates that the

genome does not yet have a ST assigned in the PubMLST database.

Table S3. Putative GC1 biomarkers obtained by SVM. The table details the unitig ID,

unitig sequence, unitig length, the location where the unitig sequence matched in *A.*

baumannii AYE genome (AN:CU459141.1) or *A. baumannii* AB0057 genome (AN:

CP001182.2) and the gene name corresponding to the genome region matched and the

gene product. *A. baumannii* AYE strain genome was used as *A. baumannii* GC1 reference

to locate the unitigs sequences. However, when the unitig was not found in the AYE

genome, *A. baumannii* AB0057 strain genome was used instead. The prefix "REGION" was

used when the match occurred either in an intergenic region or in a combination of

intergenic region and a gene.

Table S4. Analysis of putative GC1 biomarkers obtained by SVM matches within the

Dataset 1 and 2. The table details the unitig ID of the first 100 unitigs that contributed

most to *A. baumannii* GC1 genome prediction according to the values of the features

weight vector, the number of *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes typified by MLST

that matched the unitig within the Dataset 1 and 2 using blastn and the p-values of

Fisher's exact test using a significance level of 0.05. Fisher's exact test was calculated in R

considering the nominal variables "Dataset Source" (Dataset 1 or Dataset 2) and

"Matched" (Yes or No). The total number of *A. baumannii* GC1 and non-GC1 genomes that

matched / not matched the unitigs in each dataset was used for calculation.

Table S5. Rules obtained by the SCM models. The table details the rule ID, the rule output

from the SCM models, k-mer length and the location where the rule sequence matched in

A. baumannii AYE genome (AN:CU459141.1) or *A. baumannii* ACICU genome (AN:

CP000863.1) and the gene name corresponding to the genome region matched and the

gene product. *A. baumannii* AYE and ACICU genomes were used as *A. baumannii* GC1 and

non-GC1 references, respectively, to locate the k-mer sequences. The prefix "REGION" was

used when the match occurred either in an intergenic region or in a combination of

intergenic region and a gene.

Table S6. Analysis of the SCM rules matches within the Dataset 1 and 2. The table details

the rule ID of the 100 larger k-mer sequences targeted by the SCM rules, the number of *A.*

baumannii GC1 and non-GC1 genomes typified by MLST that matched the rule within the

Datasets 1 and 2 using blastn and the p-values of Fisher's exact test using a significance

level of 0.05. Fisher's exact test was calculated in R considering the nominal variables

"Dataset Source" (Dataset 1 or Dataset 2) and "Matched" (Yes or No). The total number of

A. baumannii GC1 and non-GC1 genomes that matched / not matched the rules in each

dataset was used for calculation.

Table S7. Prediction metrics on test dataset partitions from the Dataset 1 using the best

performing SCM models. Correlation between MLST typing and model prediction was

calculated using Fisher's exact test in R using a significance level of 0.05. The nominal

variables "MLST Typing" and "Prediction" were considered during Fisher's exact test

calculation. The variable "MLST Typing" represented the genomes typed as *A. baumannii*

GC1 (positive label) or *A. baumannii* non-GC1 (negative label) by MLST technique (true

class). On the other hand, the variable "Prediction" represented the genomes predicted to

be *A. baumannii* GC1 or non-GC1 by the SCM model (predicted class). We used the

number of True Positives (TP), False Positives (FP), False Negatives (FN) and True

Negatives (TN) in 2x2 contingency table. Null hypothesis used to evaluate the correlation

between MLST typing and model prediction was: "True class (MLST Typing) and Predicted

class are independent, knowing the value of one variable does not help to predict the

value of the other variable".

INPUT
A. baumannii GC1 AND
A. baumannii NON-GC1 GENOMES
FROM DATASET 1

SVM   **SCM**

DATASET PREPARATION

- Split Dataset 1 genomes in unitigs
- Generate gene variant matrix
- Create binary matrix
- Create genome metadata matrix

- Split Dataset 1 genomes in k-mers
- Generate k-mer matrix
- Create genome metadata TSV file

ML ANALYSIS

MODEL TRAINING

- 5-fold cross-validation
- Hyperparameter tuning using GridSearchCV method
- Train the model. Calculate AUC

For each k-mer size (31 to 127):
- Split the dataset using a train size of 66,6%
- 5-fold cross-validation.
- Train the model using a conjunction (logical-AND) / disjunction (logical-OR) model type. Calculate AUC.

MODEL EVALUATION

- Calculate sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, precision and F1-score performance metrics

PREDICTION AND RESULT VALIDATION

- Find the sequences that best predict *A. baumannii* GC1 genomes
- Validate predictions using blastn searches over Dataset 2

***A. baumannii* GC1 IDENTIFICATION**

- Discover *A. baumannii* GC1 biomarkers
- Design molecular method for *A. baumannii* GC1 clonal typing directly from clinical samples