Systems-based approach for optimization of a scalable bacterial ST mapping

assembly-free algorithm

Natasha Pavlovikj[1]¶, Joao Carlos Gomes-Neto[2,3]¶, Jitender S. Deogun[1], Andrew

K. Benson[2,3]*

[1] Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Nebraska-

Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska, United States of America

[2] Department of Food Science and Technology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln,

Lincoln, Nebraska, United States of America

[3] Nebraska Food for Health Center, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln,

Nebraska, United States of America

* Corresponding Author:

E-mail: abenson1@unl.edu (AKB)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Epidemiological surveillance of bacterial pathogens requires real-time data analysis with a fast turn-around, while aiming at generating two main outcomes: 1) Species level identification; and 2) Variant mapping at different levels of genotypic resolution for population-based tracking, in addition to predicting traits such as antimicrobial resistance (AMR). With the recent advances and continual dissemination of whole-genome sequencing technologies, large-scale population-based genotyping of bacterial pathogens has become possible. Since bacterial populations often present a high degree of clonality in the genomic backbone (i.e., low genetic diversity), the choice of genotyping scheme can even facilitate the understanding of ancestral relationships and can be used for prediction of co-inherited traits such as AMR. Multi-locus sequence typing (MLST) fits that purpose and can identify sequence types (ST) based on seven ubiquitous genome-scattered loci that aid in genotyping isolates beneath the species level. ST-based mapping also standardizes genotyping across laboratories and is used by laboratories worldwide. However, algorithms for inferring ST from Illumina paired-end sequencing data typically rely on genome assembly prior to classification. Genome assembly is computationally intensive and is a bottleneck for speed and scalability, which are important aspects of genomic epidemiology. The stringMLST program uses an assembly-free, kmer-based algorithm for inferring STs, which can overcome the speed and scalability bottlenecks. Here we have systematically studied the accuracy and scalability of stringMLST relative to the standard MLST program across a wide array of phylogenetically divergent

Public Health-relevant bacterial pathogens. Our data shows that optimal kmer length for stringMLST is species-specific and that genome-intrinsic and -extrinsic features can affect performance and accuracy of the program. While suitable parameters could be identified for most organisms, there were a few instances where this program may not be directly deployable in its current format. More importantly, we integrated stringMLST into our freely available and scalable hierarchical-based population genomics platform, ProkEvo, and further demonstrated how the implementation facilitates automated, reproducible bacterial population analysis. The ProkEvo implementation provides a rapidly deployable genomic epidemiology tool for ST mapping along with other pan-genomic data mining strategies, while providing specific guidance on how to optimize stringMLST performance for a wide variety of bacterial pathogens.

Introduction

Modern epidemiological investigation of bacterial pathogens relies on rapid genomic characterization of new isolates routinely received by Public Health laboratories, along with bioinformatics programs for classification/comparison of genomic data from new isolates to existing data from many thousands of isolates [1][2]. While surveillance, source-tracking, and attribution are primary goals for use of whole-genome sequencing (WGS) data by Public Health agencies, there is growing interest in using the WGS data from thousands to hundreds of thousands of isolates of a given pathogen to study hierarchical genotypic classification at different levels of resolution, and prediction of population-specific traits

contributing to virulence, ecological fitness, or antimicrobial resistance (AMR)

[3].

Evolutionarily-related bacterial populations (e.g., species and subtypes of a

species) share common genotypic backbones and the degree of clonality of a

population provides a context for studying co-inheritance of core- and accessory-

genes [4][5][6][7]. Core loci are shared by at least 99% of the genomes, whereas

accessory loci represent a sparse ensemble that are not shared by all variants of a

population, but jointly, the core and accessory genomic content form a given

species forms its pan-genome [66]. Population genetic analysis of bacterial

species using multi-locus methods have shown that multiple types of genotyping

schemes can provide sufficient resolution for classifying populations based on

genotypes beneath the species level [8][22][79][80][81], and the genetic

relationships between different populations reveal the pattern of population

diversification and structuring. This optimal level of genotypic resolution can be

considered an informative genotypic unit that facilitates both ecological and

epidemiological inquiries [57][82][83].

Multi-locus sequence typing (MLST) is a well-established and widely used

genotyping technique that classifies bacterial genomes into sequence types (ST)

[8][81]. ST classification based on traditional MLST is usually inferred from

seven loci that are found ubiquitously in the species and are scattered around the

genome. Highly curated, species-specific databases of allelic variation at MLST

loci and distributions of STs are publicly available [27][30][67]. Historically,

sequences for MLST loci were generated from locus-specific polymerase chain

reaction (PCR) assays, but now are typically inferred from assembled WGS data

[8][9][44].

ST-based classification provides useful and relevant genotypic units for

epidemiological surveillance, population genetic analysis, and evolutionary

inference. Relative to surveillance, ST-based genotyping standardizes the

nomenclature for intra- and inter-laboratorial diagnostics and epidemiological

inquiries worldwide [9][10][11]. With respect to evolutionary inference, isolates

sharing alleles at five or more loci are more likely to be ancestrally related and are

commonly classified as members of a clonal complex (i.e., group of STs that have

shared a common ancestor very recently) [8][9][28][44]. The ST and clonal

complexes provide a point of reference for genetic analysis (e.g., Linkage

Disequilibrium - LD) to track inheritance/co-variance of accessory loci among

different STs or clonal complexes. For example, LD analyses of pan-genomic

content can inform phenotypic predictions for inheritance of unique traits in an ST

related to virulence, environmental stability, or AMR [12][13][14].

Recent studies have shown that LD between specific sets of accessory genes

such as AMR genes is an intrinsic property of some STs of specific bacterial

pathogens, and rapid identification of a given ST from WGS data can quickly

provide accurate prediction of AMR profiles [14][15]. There are important

applications of this innovative strategy for treatment of patients and there is

growing interest in defining LD relationships of AMR genes and virulence-

associated genes with STs. A limiting factor in ST-based classification from WGS

data, however, is the dependence of on genome assembly, most often from

Illumina-based short-read data [27][30][67]. This bottleneck can also hinder ST-

based surveillance efforts when many thousands of genomes are involved in a

real-time analysis [16][21]. One approach to overcome the computational

bottleneck is to use kmer-based ST classification directly from Illumina paired-

end raw reads (assembly-free). The stringMLST algorithm was recently

developed for this purpose and shown to provide computationally efficient,

assembly-free ST classifications [17]. However, stringMLST has not been

broadly evaluated across data from multiple Public Health-related bacterial

pathogenic species. Given the remarkable variation in the intrinsic features of

genomes from different species (e.g., compositional features, abundances of

repetitive sequences, mutation rates, and rates of recombination); it is likely that

parameters for assembly-free algorithms, such as stringMLST, will need to be

empirically optimized for genetically diverse species and even subtypes (e.g.,

serotypes) of pathogens.

To test this hypothesis, we systematically examined the performance of

stringMLST across a phylogenetically diverse set of bacterial pathogens that are

of primary interest to Public Health. Our systematic approach compared accuracy

of classifications using the standard MLST program vs. stringMLST at varying

kmer lengths across many thousands of genomes from 15 different pathogenic

species from three highly divergent phyla. Performance was first evaluated across

a broad spectrum of phylogenetic diversity using genomes from isolates of

*Acinetobacter baumannii (*Phylum: Proteobacteria)*, Clostridium difficile*

*(*Phylum: Firmicutes)*, Enterococcus faecium (*Phylum: Firmicutes)*, Escherichia*

*coli (*Phylum: Proteobacteria)*, Haemophilus influenzae (*Phylum: Proteobacteria)*,*

*Helicobacter pylori (*Phylum: Proteobacteria)*, Klebsiella pneumoniae (*Phylum:

Proteobacteria)*, Mycobacterium tuberculosis (*Phylum: Actinobacteria)*, Neisseria*

*gonorrhoeae (*Phylum: Proteobacteria)*, Pseudomonas aeruginosa (*Phylum:

Proteobacteria)*, Streptococcus pneumoniae (*Phylum: Firmicutes)*, Campylobacter*

jejuni (Phylum: Proteobacteria), *Listeria monocytogenes (*Phylum: Firmicutes),

Salmonella enterica (Phylum: Proteobacteria), and *Staphylococcus aureus*

(Phylum: Firmicutes). To evaluate performance within diverse populations of a

single species, we also measured performance of different kmer lengths across 23

of the most relevant serovars of *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* lineage I (*S.*

enterica). Our results show that optimal performance of stringMLST can, for

some species, be achieved with a single kmer length. However, several different

bacterial species, and even different serovars of *S. enterica,* require species or

serovar-specific kmer lengths for accurate ST classifications. Based on these

findings, we further implemented stringMLST into the scalable ProkEvo platform

[21], which produces hierarchical genotypic classifications from raw WGS data,

and demonstrated how use of species-specific kmer settings for stringMLST

enhances computational performance of the platform.

[4][5][6][7][66][8][27][30][67][8][9][44] [14][15][27][30][67][16][21][17]   [21]

Materials and methods

This systems-based comparison between mlst and stringMLST was centered at

capturing their differences in computational and statistical performances, and was

accomplished through the following steps: 1) Narrow-scope comparative analysis

across four phylogenetic distinct pathogens species; 2) Further examination of

algorithmic performance within a single ecologically diverse bacterial species;

and 3) Wide-scope comparison between phylogenetic divergent pathogenic

species with Public Health relevance and with databases available on pubMLST

(https://pubmlst.org/) for direct contrast between stringMLST and mlst.

Datasets used for narrow-scope analysis

WGS data from four major bacterial pathogens, including *Campylobacter jejuni*,

Listeria monocytogenes, *Salmonella enterica* subps. *enterica* lineage I (*S.*

enterica) and *Staphylococcus aureus,* were selected to be used in this first part of

the study. Our basis for that choice was due to three *a priori* defined criteria: 1)

Select bacterial species from two main phylogenetic divergent Phyla: Firmicutes

(*L. monocytogenes* and *S. aureus*) and Proteobacteria (*C. jejuni* and *S. enterica*);

2) Select zoonotic pathogens that continually cause human illnesses worldwide

[18]; and 3) Consider their epidemiological relevance according to the Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [19]. Specifically for *S. enterica*, 20 of the

CDC most investigated serovars were represented in the dataset, which includes:

S. Agona, *S.* Anatum, *S.* Braenderup, *S.* Derby, *S.* Dublin, *S.* Enteritidis, *S.* Hadar,

S. Heidelberg, *S.* Infantis, *S.* Javiana, *S.* Johannesburg, *S.* Kentucky, *S.* Mbandaka,

S. Montevideo, *S.* Muenchen, *S.* Newport, *S.* Schwarzengrund, *S.* Senftenberg, *S.*

Thompson, and *S.* Typhimurium [20]. All publicly available raw paired-end

Illumina reads for these organisms were downloaded from NCBI using parallel-

fastq-dump [58]. Genomes used for all analyses were randomly selected from a

previously downloaded samples of isolates containing *C. jejuni* (n = 21,919

genomes), *L. monocytogenes* (n = 19,633 genomes), *S. enterica* (n = 25,284

genomes), and *S. aureus* (n = 11,990 genomes) that were processed through the

computational platform ProkEvo [21]. Specifically, our study design was

comprised of random sampling of 600 genomes from each species, except for *S.*

enterica for which 600 genomes were randomly drawn per serovar (list of all 20

serovars is shown in S1 Table). For each species and all *S. enterica* serovars, all

~600 genomes were randomly split into three independent batches, with ~200

genomes each. The batches were created to measure the degree of variation in

classification accuracy when comparing the two ST-based genotyping programs.

While for the majority of *S. enterica* serovars there were a total of 600 genomes

available, the total number of raw reads publicly available on NCBI and

ultimately used for the analyses for *S.* Agona, *S.* Derby, *S.* Johannesburg, *S.*

Mbandaka and *S.* Senftenberg was 565, 590, 534, 535 and 563 respectively. The

final total number of genomes used per species was *C. jejuni* (n = 600), *L.*

monocytogenes (n = 600), *S. enterica* (n = 11,787), and *S. aureus* (n = 600). Text

file containing all genome NCBI-SRA identifications is available here,

https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/_/16735411.

Software tools

mlst

mlst is a standard approach for scanning genome assemblies against traditional

PubMLST typing schemes [22]. The genome assemblies can be in

FASTA/GenBank/EMBL formats [22]. mlst (version 2.16.2) was installed using

Anaconda, a package and environment manager that supports maintaining and

installing various open-source conda packages [26]. mlst uses genome assemblies

as an input. In order to generate assemblies from the raw Illumina paired-end

reads, multiple pre-processing steps were performed. Quality trimming and

adapter clipping were performed using Trimmomatic [50], while FastQC was

used to check and verify the quality of the trimmed reads [51]. The paired-end

reads were assembled *de novo* into contigs using SPAdes with the default

parameters [52]. The quality of the assemblies was evaluated using QUAST [53].

The information obtained from QUAST was used to discard assemblies with 0 or

more than 300 contigs, or assemblies with N50 value of less than 25,000 [21].

Finally, the assemblies that passed the quality control were used with mlst, where

they are categorized into specific variants based on the allele combinations from

seven ubiquitous, house-keeping genes [22]. A list of the exact versions of the

bioinformatics tools used for generating assemblies for mlst are shown on S2

Table. We used mlst with the default options (e.g., *mlst --legacy --scheme*

<scheme> --csv <assembly.fasta> > <output>) and the following schemes:

"senterica" (for *S. enterica*), "campylobacter" (for *C. jejuni)*, "lmonocytogenes"

(for *L. monocytogenes*), "saureus" (for *S. aureus*). The distribution of mlst comes

with set of pre-downloaded ST schemes. More details about these MLST

schemes, such as the number of alleles in the seven genes and the number of ST

classifications available are shown on S3 Table. To obtain the ST classifications

of all datasets, mlst was run as part of the computational platform ProkEvo [21].

Additionally, a separate run of the mlst program was used to conduct a pairwise

comparison between the computational performance (runtime and memory usage)

of mlst and stringMLST. The used mlst script can be found here,

https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/blob/main/scripts/ml

st.submit.

stringMLST

stringMLST is an assembly- and alignment-free rapid tool for ST-based

classification of Illumina paired-end raw reads based on kmers [17]. For the

analyses performed in this paper, we used stringMLST version 0.6.3. stringMLST

was installed using Anaconda [26]. The first step of using stringMLST was to

download the respective MLST scheme from PubMLST. In order to do this, a

species name and a kmer length were needed. The default kmer length used and

suggested by the developers of stringMLST for reads with lengths between 55 and

150 base pairs or nucleotides is 35 (common read length for Illumina paired-end

reads) [17]. We used stringMLST with the default options (e.g., *stringMLST.py --*

getMLST --species=<species_name> -P <output_prefix> -k <kmer>) and the

following species names, "Salmonella enterica", "Campylobacter jejuni",

"Listeria monocytogenes", "Staphylococcus aureus", and kmer lengths of 10, 20,

30, 35, 45, 55, 65, 70, 80, 90 independently

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/blob/main/scripts/str

ingMLST_dbs.submit). More details about the downloaded MLST schemes, such

as the number of alleles in the seven genes and the number of ST classifications

available are shown on S3 Table. After the MLST scheme was downloaded and

prepared, the final step was to run "stringMLT.py –predict" for the ST

classification. For this, we ran stringMLST with the databases *a priori* created and

the respective paired-end raw reads and kmer lengths of 10, 20, 30, 35, 45, 55, 65,

70, 80, 90 independently (e.g., *stringMLST.py --predict -d*

<directory_raw_reads> -p -r -t -x -P <database_prefix> -k <kmer> -o

<output>)

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/blob/main/scripts/str

ingMLST.submit). Our choice of using an increasing gradient of kmer lengths

was to evaluate whether the kmer length parameter could be optimized to enhance

ST-based classification accuracy across bacterial species. Lastly, stringMLST was

also integrated as part of the computational platform ProkEvo for a rapid ST-

based genotyping as part of a hierarchical genotypic scheme [21][57]. This

implementation can be found here,

https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/tree/main/Prokevo_st

ringMLST.

ProkEvo-based MLST classifications

In order to compare the ST-based classification accuracy and conduct other

statistical analysis (e.g., identifying major contributing factors influencing ST-

based classifications) between mlst version 2.16.2 (assembly-dependent) and

stringMLST version 0.6.3 (assembly-independent), all initial ST calls for all

selected genomes, across all four species (*C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, *S. aureus*

and *S.* Typhimurium), were done using mlst [22] through the computational

platform ProkEvo [21]. In brief, ProkEvo uses bacterial Illumina raw paired-end

sequences as an input, and the following steps are sequentially done prior to ST-

based genotyping using mlst: Trimmomatic for sequence trimming [50], FastQC

for quality control of the trimmed reads [51], SPAdes for *de novo* genome

assembly [52], and QUAST for quality assessment of the genome assemblies

[53]. More information on how to install and use ProkEvo for hierarchical

bacterial population genomic analyses can be found here,

https://github.com/npavlovikj/prokevo.

Genome-intrinsic and –extrinsic factors that can

influence algorithmic performance

Both genome-intrinsic and –extrinsic factors were considered to determine their

contribution on the accuracy of ST classifications when comparing mlst vs.

stringMLST. The genome-intrinsic variables considered in these analyses were:

number of contigs per genome, total number of nucleotides per genome (genome

length), GC% content per genome, and dinucleotide composition of genomes. The

number of contigs per genome, as well as the genome length, were calculated

using the assembled contigs from SPAdes [52]. The number of contigs was

calculated for each genome using the Linux "grep" utility (e.g., *grep ">"*

assembly.fasta | wc -l). The total number of nucleotides per genome was

calculated using the "getlengths" function from the AMOS package [54]. For this

analysis, we used AMOS v3.1. "getlengths" provides the length for each contig,

and a custom Bash script was used to summarize these values per genome. The

GC% content was calculated using the program FastQC [51]. FastQC is used to

check and verify the quality of the raw Illumina paired-end raw reads. With each

pair of raw reads from all datasets, FastQC v0.11 was used. One of the statistics

checked for read quality is GC% and this value was extracted with custom Bash

script from the file "fastqc_data.txt" once the FastQC output was generated. Since

FastQC outputs the GC% per read, the average of both reads was calculated as the

final read GC%. The dinucleotide composition of the genomes was calculated

with the function "compseq" from the EMBOSS package [55]. "compseq"

calculates the frequency of words of a specific length (e.g., length is 2 in the case

of dinucleotides) from given input genome sequences. For these analyses we used

EMBOSS v6.6 with the command "*compseq -word 2 -outfile <output>*

assembly.fasta" for all datasets and genomes *a priori* assembled with SPAdes

[52]. Next, a customized Bash script was used to count the total number of

occurrences of each dinucleotide for each genome across all bacterial species.

Finally, all these outputs were merged per genome using custom Python script to

facilitate statistical analyses and data visualization. The used scripts can be found

here,

https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/tree/main/scripts.

The genome-extrinsic variables used in the analyses presented in this paper

were the total count of unique STs per database and the total count of unique

alleles across all seven loci used for ST classification across all bacterial species.

These genome-extrinsic variables were extracted from the PubMLST databases

for both stringMLST and mlst using custom Bash scripts. While the first step of

stringMLST is to download the most up-to-date available MLST scheme from

PubMLST, the distributed version of mlst comes with set of pre-downloaded ST

and allelic schemes. For each MLST scheme, the mlst distribution has a separate

directory with 8 files - seven are ".tfa" files with the fasta sequences of the alleles

for each locus, and one file (e.g., senterica.txt) contains the ST information (i.e.,

the total number of STs mapped including their specific allelic composition across

all seven loci for that given species). To calculate the total number of unique STs,

we used the Linux utility "wc" with the text file with ST information (e.g., *wc -l*

senterica.txt). To calculate the total count of unique alleles across the seven loci,

the "grep" Linux utility was used with the seven ".tfa" files (e.g., *grep ">" *.tfa |*

wc -l). All calculations were done per bacterial species. The downloaded MLST

scheme with stringMLST is in a separate directory for each organism and used

kmer length. This directory had 12 files - seven are ".tfa" files with fasta

sequences for all alleles across all seven loci, and one file has the ST profiles

(e.g., Salmonella_enterica_profile.txt), while the remaining files contained

information about the extracted kmers and additional config and log information.

Similarly, the total number of unique STs for stringMLST was counted using the

Linux utility "wc" with the text file with ST profile information (e.g., *wc -l*

Salmonella_enterica_profile.txt), and the total count of unique alleles per loci was

extracted using the "grep" Linux utility with the seven ".tfa" files (e.g., *grep ">"*

*.tfa | wc -l). Similarly, all ST and allelic counts were carried out per bacterial

species. With stringMLST, the MLST schemes are downloaded and prepared

separately for each different kmer length used. However, the kmer length did not

affect the number of STs and unique alleles per organism. Thus, these values

remained the same across organisms and kmer lengths for stringMLST.

Kmer-based distribution across ST programs

In order to assess the potential impact of random mapping or occurrence of kmers

of different lengths across different bacterial species, we randomly chose 100 raw

Illumina paired-end reads from the initial *C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, *S. aureus*

and *S*. Typhimurium (major representative zoonotic serovar of *S. enterica*)

isolates. For each read, we extracted all unique kmers of length 10, 20, 30, 35, 45,

55, 65, 70, 80 and 90 respectively, and counted their occurrence in the

corresponding raw reads. This was done using DSK v2.2.0 [56]

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/blob/main/scripts/ds

k.submit). Next, the total number of kmer frequency was summarized per

organism and kmer length, and the mean value was calculated to examine the

distribution of different kmers across the raw reads. For each database created

with stringMLST, a file with the kmer frequency for the used ST scheme was

generated. Using the kmers generated from the raw reads and the stringMLST

database, a relative frequency of the common kmers was calculated (calculated as

a ratio between the common kmers and the unique kmers from all the kmers

generated between the raw reads and the stringMLST database, e.g.,

(common_kmers/unique_total_observations)*100). The code used for this can be

found in our GitHub repository

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/tree/main/figures_c

ode).

Agreement in ST classification between programs

In order to assess the overall accuracy of stringMLST compared to the standard

mlst approach for ST calls, a percentage of agreement in ST classification was

calculated. For this, the initial dataset composed of 600 genomes from either *C.*

jejuni, or *L. monocytogenes*, or *S. aureus* was selected, in addition to a total of

11,787 genomes across twenty zoonotic serovars of *S. enterica* (~600 genomes

per serovar, S1 Table). The program stringMLST was run with increasing kmer

lengths ranging from 10 to 90 nucleotides. If both stringMLST and mlst produced

identical ST calls, either "good" or "bad" ones, the call was a match. A "good"

and "bad" call represent ST with a number or a missing/blank value, respectively.

The remaining combinations were classified as a mismatch. Next, the percentage

of agreement (concordance) was calculated with custom R base script

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/tree/main/figures_c

ode).

Computational platforms

All computational analyses performed for this paper were done on Crane - one of
the high-performance computing clusters at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Holland Computing Center [23]. Crane is Linux cluster, having 548 Intel Xeon
nodes with RAM ranging from 64 GB to 1.5 TB. The scalability of ProkEvo with
stringMLST was tested on the Open Science Grid (OSG), a distributed, high-
throughput computational platform for large-scale scientific research [24][25].
OSG is a national consortium of more than 100 academic institutions and
laboratories that provide storage and tens of thousands of resources to OSG users.
These sites share their idle resources via OSG for opportunistic usage. The OSG
resources are Linux-based, and due to the different sites involved, the hardware
specifications of the resources are different and vary.

Computational performance

To evaluate the computational performance of stringMLST in comparison to the
mlst program, we assessed the runtime and memory usage of both programs. For
this, we chose four different datasets, *C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, *S. aureus* and
S. Typhimurium (major representative zoonotic serovar of *S. enterica*), with three
different batches of 200 genomes each, with a total of 600 genomes each. We ran
mlst with all required steps, such as quality trimming and adapter clipping, *de*
novo assembly, and assembly discarding on each dataset (see Section Software
tools: mlst for more detailed description). Separately, we ran stringMLST with a

range of 10 different kmer lengths (10, 20, 30, 35, 45, 55, 65, 70, 80, 90) on each

dataset. For each organism, the runtime was calculated as an average of all 200

genomes per batch. In general, the runtime depends on multiple factors, such as

the specification and capabilities of the used computational platform. Since the

runtime can vary depending on these various factors, average statistics were used

to show the central tendency of the runtime when comparing stringMLST vs.

mlst. The runtime was calculated using the "date" command integrated in the

Unix operating systems (e.g., *t=`date +%s`; mlst --legacy --scheme senterica --*

csv assembly.fasta > <output>; tt=`date +%s`; total_time=$((tt-t))). For each

organism, the memory was calculated as the maximum memory recorded from all

200 genomes per batch, since all genomes were analyzed separately and

concurrently. In the case of mlst, the recorded memory was the maximum

memory of all the steps ran prior to mlst, such as trimming, *de novo* assembly,

quality checking, filtering, and ST typing. The memory used for these steps

considerably varies from a few MBs to a few GBs (e.g., filtering vs. *de novo*

assembly), and since the memory is a physical limitation of the computational

platform, the maximum used memory was calculated for each organism and

batch. The memory used was calculated using the "cgget" command that tracks

various parameters from the Linux Control Groups (cgroups) per running job

(e.g., *mlst --legacy --scheme senterica --csv assembly.fasta > <output>; r=`cgget*

-r memory.usage_in_bytes /slurm/uid_${UID}/job_${SLURM_JOBID}/`;

mem=`echo $r | awk -F: '{print $3}'`).

Incorporating stringMLST in ProkEvo

ProkEvo is a freely available and scalable computational platform capable of

facilitating bacterial population genomics analyses while combining various

independent algorithms in a portable pipeline [21]. One of the advantages of

ProkEvo is its ability to facilitate the addition and removal of new steps and

programs without disrupting its workflow. For instance, more details about adding

new programs to ProkEvo are given here

https://github.com/npavlovikj/ProkEvo/wiki/4.1.-Add-new-bioinformatics-tool-

to-ProkEvo. By following these instructions, we were able to successfully add

stringMLST to the current ProkEvo platform. The ultimate description of how

stringMLST was integrated into ProkEvo can be found here,

https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/tree/main/Prokevo_st

ringMLST.

Comparison between mlst and stringMLST performance

using ProkEvo

In order to compare the performance/accuracy of MLST and stringMLST as part

of the ProkEvo platform, two subsets of the *C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, *S.*

Typhimurium and *S. aureus* datasets used in this paper were selected. One subset

was composed of 100 randomly selected genomes, while the second one

contained 1,000. The subsets were randomly selected from the original datasets

used in this paper. As part of ProkEvo, stringMLST was run with the default kmer

length of 35. The ProkEvo workflows with mlst and stringMLST and the two

datasets were individually run on Crane - one of the high-performance computing

clusters at the Holland Computing Center. Once the four workflows finished, the

performance of ProkEvo with mlst and stringMLST and the datasets with 100 and

1,000 genomes, respectively, was compared using: i) the total running time; ii) the

percentage of non-classified STs; and iii) the percentage of agreement between

programs. Since ProkEvo is an automated platform, a list of NCBI-SRA

identifications was provided with the ProkEvo implementations with both mlst

and stringMLST. In brief, ProkEvo manages all the dependencies and

intermediate steps, and produces the final ST classification as an output.

stringMLST-based kmer length optimization across

phylogenetic divergent bacterial pathogens

To identify the optimal species-specific kmer length that minimizes the frequency

of ST miscalls, we ran stringMLST with a range of different kmer lengths across

phylogenetic divergent pathogenic species. First, we chose twenty-three *S.*

enterica serovars (*S.* Agona, *S.* Anatum, *S.* Braenderup, *S.* Derby, *S.* Dublin, *S.*

Enteritidis, *S.* Hadar, *S.* Heidelberg, *S.* Infantis, *S.* Javiana, *S.* Johannesburg, *S.*

Kentucky, *S.* Mbandaka, *S.* Montevideo, *S.* Muenchen, *S.* Newport, *S.*

Oranienburg, *S.* Poona, *S.* Saintpaul, *S.* Schwarzengrund, *S.* Senftenberg, *S.*

Thompson, *S.* Typhimurium), and for each dataset we randomly selected 100

paired-end Illumina reads from NCBI-SRA. Second, for each dataset we ran mlst

and stringMLST with kmer lengths ranging from 20, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60,

65, 70, 80, 90. The kmer length of 10 was excluded due to its poor performance in

previous analyses. Additionally, we use data from fourteen pathogens with Public

Health relevance and with available MLST schemes, to widen the scope of the

analysis and assess the necessity of fine-tunning the kmer length on a more

broadly selected collection of species. In particular, we chose the following

pathogens: *Acinetobacter baumannii, Clostridioides difficile, Enterococcus*

faecium, Escherichia coli, Haemophilus influenzae, Helicobacter pylori,

Klebsiella pneumoniae, Mycobacterium tuberculosis, Neisseria gonorrhoeae,

Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Streptococcus pneumoniae, Campylobacter jejuni,

Listeria monocytogenes, and *Staphylococcus aureus*. For each pathogen, we

randomly selected and downloaded 1,000 paired-end reads from NCBI-SRA and

processed these reads separately with mlst and stringMLST. stringMLST was run

with kmer lengths ranging from 20, 30, 35, 45, 55, 65, 70, 80, 90 and different

schemes for the different pathogens. Similar to the *S. enterica* datasets, the kmer

length of 10 was excluded from the analysis.

Across all datasets, the percentage of ST miscalls was calculated for

stringMLST for each kmer length, whereby miscalls were defined as "bad" ST

calls - calls with a missing or blank values. Next, for each dataset, the kmer length

that equated with the lowest percentage of ST miscalls was recorded. For some

datasets, multiple kmer lengths generated an identical lowest percentage for ST

miscalls. In this case, we applied a two-folded approach to select the most optimal

kmer length: 1) if kmer of length 35 was part of the array of kmer lengths that

showed the most optimal results, we recorded kmer 35 as the optimal kmer length

since that is the default and recommended value for stringMLST (parsimonious

approach); or 2) if kmer of length 35 was not part of the kmer lengths that showed

the most optimal results, we recorded the kmer with the highest value as the most

optimal one, since in general our analysis showed that longer kmers consumed

less computational resources and speed up the entire analysis. Ultimately, the

optimal kmer length and the percentage of ST miscalls were visualized onto a

core-genome phylogeny generated for all twenty-three *S. enterica* serovars, as

well as for all fourteen pathogens including all twenty-three *S. enterica* serovars

which jointly totaled fifteen pathogens (total of 37 genomes, one per species

including one per serovar of *S. enterica*, were used to construct the 16S rRNA-

based phylogeny for visualization purposes). The core-genome alignment for the

twenty-three *S. enterica* serovars was generated using Roary with this set of

parameters, "*roary -s -e --mafft -p 8 -cd 99 -i 95 ./prokka_output/*.gff -f*

roary_output" and the phylogenetic tree was produced using FastTree [76]. The

phylogenetic tree for the fifteen pathogens was generated using CLUSTALW

(https://www.genome.jp/tools-bin/clustalw) with the 16S rRNA sequences of the

selected 37 genomes generated by Prokka [78]. All phylogeny-based

visualizations were done using iTOL [77], and the recorded and overlaid statistics

were extracted with custom R scripts

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/blob/main/figures_c

ode/figures_code.Rmd).

In addition to calculating the percentage of ST miscalls for different kmer

lengths with stringMLST, for each dataset we calculated the percentage of

agreement (concordance) between mlst and stringMLST on ST calls ("good" or

"bad"), as previously described here. Of note, when the stringMLST and mlst

results were combined, the number of returned ST calls was not always 1,000 (the

original size of the used datasets). If 1,000 reads are used with stringMLST,

stringMLST generates ST calls for all 1,000 reads. On the other hand, when using

mlst, a set of steps are used before mlst, including filtering, and a fraction of

assemblies were disregarded due to poor quality. Thus, only genome sequences

that passed through the mlst program and yielded a "good" or "bad" call were

ultimately used to compare with stringMLST. The number of raw reads for each

dataset, as well as the number of final reads from mlst used for these analyses are

shown on S4 Table.

Statistical analyses

To compare the overall performance and accuracy of mlst vs. stringMLST on ST-

based classifications, the following statistics were used across all bacterial species

datasets: 1) ST richness; 2) Simpson's D index $(1 - D)$ of diversity using ST

counts as input data; 3) Proportion of non-classified STs (missing values or blank

calls); and 4) Standard deviation of the proportion of non-classified STs. These

statistics were calculated to evaluate the algorithmic performance on ST-based

classification accuracy within and between bacterial species selected to be used in

the narrow scope analysis (*C. jejuni*, *S. aureus*, *L. monocytogenes*, and *S.*

enterica). ST richness was calculated by identifying the number of distinct STs

present in each species. The Simpson's D index of diversity $(1 - D)$ was used to

calculate the degree of genotypic diversity across species, using the diversity()

function available in the vegan (version 2.5-6) R library [29]. The proportion of

non-classified STs was calculated using the counts of isolates or genomes that

were not assigned a ST number after each run of either mlst or stringMLST. The

standard deviation of the proportion of non-classified STs was calculated using

the sd() function which is derived from an unbiased estimate of the sample

variance corrected by $n - 1$ (n for number of observations). The frequency of

genomes used for all analyses was calculated per batch and program across all

species, including across serovars for *S. enterica*. The relative frequency of the

most dominant ST lineages was also assessed across bacterial species.

PERMANOVA univariate or multivariate models were used to assess the

significance ($p < 0.05$) and the degree of association between the genome-intrinsic

and –extrinsic factors with the following dependent variables: ST richness,

Simpson's D index of diversity, or proportion of non-classified STs. Statistical

models were built for each of the dependent variables separately. Multivariate

models included either the combination of bacterial species and program, or

serovars in the case of *S. enterica* and program. These multivariate models were

stated to calculate the main and synergistic effects of the explanatory variables

(e.g., species*program or serovar*program). Univariate models were also

assessed for each of the dependent variables, using one of the following

independent/explanatory variables: 1) Genome-intrinsic variables: median number

of contigs, mean of the total count of nucleotides per genome, mean of the

average GC% content per genome, standard deviation of the number of contigs,

standard deviation of the total count of nucleotides per genome, and standard

deviation of the average GC% content per genome; 2) Genome-extrinsic

variables: species, serovar of *S. enterica*, program (mlst vs. stringMLST with

kmer lengths of 10, 20, 30, 35, 45, 55, 65, 70, 80, 90), mean of the total count of

unique STs per program, mean of the total count of unique alleles across all genes

per program, and the Simpson's D index of diversity per species. Statistical

significance and strength of association between the dependent and independent

variables were measured with *p*-values ($p < 0.05$) and *R*-squared, respectively. In

the case of contig size (median), total number of nucleotides per genome (mean),

and GC% content per genome, summary statistic values (median or mean) were

calculated grouped by species and batch (there was a total of three batches per

bacterial species or serovar). For the total count of STs and total number of alleles

in the database, summary statistic values (mean) were calculated grouped by

species, batch, and program. Lastly, the standard deviation of number of contigs,

total count of nucleotides per genome, or GC% content per genome were

calculated grouped by species. PERMANOVA models were run using the

adonis() function with 1,000 permutations using the vegan (version 2.5-6) R

library [29]. Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to analyze the

dinucleotide distribution across species and across serovars for *S. enterica* with

two dimensions using the prcomp() function. The PCA calculations and the

selection of the number of PCs were done using the factoextra (version 1.0.7)

library. Bar-plots, box-and-whiskers plots, and bivariate/trivariate scatter plots

were used to assess and visualize the distribution and associations within and

between dependent and independent/explanatory variables. The R software

(version 4.0.3) and R libraries such as Tidyverse (version 1.3.0) were used to

conduct all statistical analyses, and all R scripts are available here

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/tree/main/figures_c

ode). Data quality control was achieved with R base functions, in addition to the

following packages: skimr (version 2.1.3) and visdat (version 0.5.3). Graphical

visualizations were achieved using ggplot2 (version 3.3.2), GGally (version

2.1.2), and plotly (version 4.9.4.1). R code integrity was checked using the

assertive (version 0.3-6) package.

Results

The computational and analytical approaches used in this paper are shown on Fig

1. Our analytical approach was sub-divided into a narrow- and wide-scope

analysis aiming at accomplishing two goals: 1) Comparing the computational

performance and accuracy of MLST vs. stringMLST; 2) Optimizing the use of

stringMLST for a wide range of bacterial species; and 3) Implementing

stringMLST as part of the ProkEvo computational genomics platform. We

initially used publicly available raw Illumina paired-end sequence data from *C.*

jejuni, *L. monocytogenes*, *S. enterica* and *S. aureus*, to run stringMLST and mlst

independently in order to compare the accuracy in ST-based classifications and

assess the computational needs and performance in the overall analysis (narrow-

scope step). For this narrow-scope analysis, we performed a detailed comparative

analysis between these two programs including: i) analyses of computational

performance and resources needed (e.g., average runtime per genome and

maximum memory needed to analyze all genomes), and ii) statistical analyses to

determine the accuracy of classifications (e.g., ST richness, Simpson's D index of

ST-based diversity, proportion of miscalls, and percentage of agreement or

concordance between programs). For the wide-scope step of the analysis, we

systematically evaluated the accuracy and concordance between mlst and

stringMLST across a broader array of phylogenetic divergent pathogens with

direct implication for Public Health (*A. baumannii, C. difficile, E. faecium, E.*

coli, H. influenzae, H. pylori, K. pneumoniae, M. tuberculosis, N. gonorrhoeae, P.

aeruginosa, S. pneumoniae, C. jejuni, L. monocytogenes, S. enterica and *S.*

aureus). Combined with the intra-species analysis done across 23 serovars of *S.*

enterica, our assessment aimed at revealing the optimized kmer length to be used

with stringMLST in order to: i) minimize the percentage of ST miscalls, and ii)

maximize the use of computational resources by speeding up the analysis. Lastly,

we provided an implementation of stringMLST within ProkEvo - a freely

available and scalable computational platform that facilitates hierarchical

genotyping of bacterial populations including pan-genomic mapping [21].

Computational performance

The computational performance between stringMLST and mlst was measured

using two metrics: 1) The average computational runtime per genome; and 2) The

maximum memory used per dataset. The average runtime in minutes per genome

per batch between mlst and stringMLST with different kmer lengths, for *C. jejuni*,

L. monocytogenes, *S. aureus*, and *S.* Typhimurium (major representative of *S.*

enterica), is shown on Fig 2. While the runtime of mlst varies between 20 and 80

minutes per genome depending on the dataset used, all stringMLST runs with

different kmers finished within a few minutes (ranging from ~1-16 minutes when

kmer 10 was included and ~1-5 minutes when kmer 10 was excluded). Apart from

stringMLST with kmer 10, all other kmer lengths showed a uniform runtime. The

longer runtime observed with kmer 10 can be partially explained by the higher

number of kmers that were generated and used for mapping (S1 Fig). The

obtained results show that ST-based classifications are accomplished considerably

more rapidly when carried out using stringMLST compared to the standard MLST

program.

Additionally, a comparison of maximum memory used when both stringMLST

and mlst were run for *C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, *S. aureus*, and *S.* Typhimurium

(major representative of *S. enterica*) is shown on S2 Fig. Across all species, the

range of maximum memory usage for mlst and stringMLST (across all kmers)

was ~2-16GBs and ~3-30GBs respectively. Although the memory used across

datasets is variable, none of the analyses we ran exceeded 30GBs of RAM. Since

most high-performance computers can consistently provide resources from 32GBs

to a few TBs of RAM, the memory available should not be considered a

bottleneck for running either program.

Factors that can influence ST-based classification

First, we describe the characteristics and composition of the data utilized for

comparison between programs regarding ST-based classification in the narrow-

scope approach (utilization of fewer phylogenetic diverse pathogen datasets). The

frequency of genomes utilized per species and across programs is shown on S3A-

D Fig. The frequency of *S. enterica* genomes was higher than other species

because an equal sample of ~600 genomes was taken from 20 representative

zoonotic serovars (S4A-D Fig). An assessment of the proportion of the most

dominant STs across species (proportion ≥ 2% - S5A-D Fig) or serovars of *S.*

enterica (proportion ≥ 15% - S4N Fig) initially revealed a similar ST-based

distribution across programs. Furthermore, genome-intrinsic and -extrinsic factors

that could potentially impact the mlst vs. stringMLST algorithmic comparison and

performance were *a priori* determined in the analysis. Among the genome-

intrinsic factors considered across species were the number of contigs per genome

(Fig 3A), the total number of nucleotides per genome (Fig 3B), GC% content per

genome (Fig 3C), and the distribution and composition of dinucleotides per

species (Fig 3D and S3E-F Fig). Similarly, the distribution of the genome-

intrinsic factors was analyzed across all twenty serovars of *S. enterica* (S4G-L

Fig). A correlogram (pairwise correlation analysis) was also used to assess the

bivariate correlation (Pearson's correlation coefficient) across genome-intrinsic

variables, for either all four bacterial species (S3G Fig) or serovars across *S.*

enterica (S4M Fig). At large, the differences observed in the distribution of

genomic-intrinsic variables were species driven, with a strong uniformity found

across serovars of *S. enterica*.

As for the genome-extrinsic variables, the total count of unique STs (for

species - Fig 3E) and unique number of alleles across all seven loci (for species -

Fig 3F), and across all batches were selected as factors that could influence the

comparative analysis between mlst and stringMLST. Similarly, the genome-

extrinsic variables were analyzed across all twenty serovars of *S. enterica* (S4E-F

Fig). Of note, database size differences (number of STs and alleles) may directly

influence the number of miscalls since it is expected that the larger the database

is, the more likely STs are to be classified, or to find a match, and not be

miscalled [30]. Considering the differences in genome-intrinsic and -extrinsic

variable distribution across species, such factors were further utilized for

assessing their statistical contribution in the accuracy of ST-based classification

between mlst and stringMLST.

696 Assessing the contribution of genome-intrinsic and –

697 extrinsic variables

In order to assess the statistical association and contribution of each genomic-

intrinsic and -extrinsic variable onto the accuracy of mlst vs. stringMLST on ST

calls (narrow-scope analysis since it only included four bacterial species, *C.*

jejuni, *S. aureus*, *L. monocytogenes*, and *S. enterica*), the following dependent

variables (outcomes) were used in the PERMANOVA models: 1) ST richness

(Fig 4A); 2) Simpson's D index of ST diversity (Fig 4B); and 3) Proportion of

non-classified STs (Fig 4C). Additionally, the standard deviation of the proportion

of non-classified STs was measured as an auxiliary metric for accuracy (Fig 4D).

At the species level, a multivariate model approach was used to examine the

interaction of species and program (mlst vs. stringMLST), whereas all remaining

analyses were done using univariate models containing each genome-intrinsic and

-extrinsic variable for all three outcomes (S6A-L Fig, S7A-K Fig, S8A-L Fig).

For each variable, the significance and strength of association were assessed by

jointly examining the p-value ($p < 0.05$) and R-squared, respectively. For both ST

richness (Fig 4A) and the Simpson's D index of diversity (Fig 4B), the difference

between species explained most of the variation with ~98.3% and ~99%,

respectively. As expected, based on the phylogenetic divergence of the four

chosen pathogens, differences across species could largely be explained by

genome-intrinsic variables associated with genome composition, such as: GC%

content (p ~0.0009, R-squared ~44%) for ST richness, and the number of contigs

per genome (p ~0.0009, R-squared ~39.5%) for the Simpson's D index of

diversity (Fig 4A-B). Notably, for both ST richness and the Simpson's D index of

diversity most of the differences between species could be explained by variation

in genome composition (Fig 4A-B). Not surprisingly, co-linearity was observed

between ST richness and the Simpson's D index of diversity across species (Fig

4A). In the case of the proportion of non-classified STs (ST miscalls) (Fig 4C),

most of the variation was explained by inter-species differences (p ~0.0009, R-

squared ~33%), with the number of contigs per genome being the most important

genome-intrinsic contributing factor (p ~0.0009, R- squared ~27%). As for the

kmer length parameter used by stringMLST, results for ST richness and the

Simpson's D index of diversity were uniform across all lengths (Fig 4A-B).

However, when examining the proportion of miscalls (Fig 4C) and the standard

deviation of that proportion (Fig 4D), the data pointed toward the optimal kmer

length being between 35 and 65 across all four species due to the intrinsic

variance within the *S. enterica* data (narrow scope analysis). Specifically, this

kmer length range was defined based on two criteria: i) minimization of the

proportion of miscalls; and ii) less variation (standard deviation) around the

average of ST-based miscalls. Of note, mlst demonstrated the highest proportion

of miscalls and standard deviation of that proportion for both *L. monocytogenes*

and *C. jejuni* (Fig 4C-D), and the kmer length 10 for stringMLST yielded very

low accuracy and null results for ST richness and Simpson's D index of diversity

(Fig 4A-D). Differences between species across ST richness, Simpson's D index

of diversity, and proportion of ST miscalls along with all genome-intrinsic and -

extrinsic variables across programs (mlst vs. stringMLST) were further examined

here (Fig 5A-D, S9A-O Fig). In general, differences in ST-based calls across

programs were largely influenced by the bacterial species dataset.

Given the complexity and diversity of the *S. enterica* population structure [12],

the stringMLST performance was analyzed across twenty zoonotic serovars

(S4O-R Fig), and resulted in a significant and predominant contribution of the

"serovar groupings" across all outcomes and PERMANOVA models (S10A-L

Fig, S11A-K Fig, S12A-L Fig): ST richness (p ~0.0009, R-squared ~75.4%),

Simpson's D index of diversity (p ~0.0009, R-squared ~88%), and proportion of

ST miscalls (p ~0.0009, R- squared ~35.4%). By assessing the distribution of the

model outcomes, along with PERMANOVA model results and bivariate

association between dependent and explanatory variables (S13A-R Fig), the

results recapitulated the species-level results with the optimal kmer length for

stringMLST being around 35 and 65, but also revealed the need to consider

difference across *S. enterica* serovars prior to implementation. Combined, these

accuracy-based results suggest that: i) stringMLST minimizes the ST miscalls

compared to mlst in a species-specific fashion, and by consequence the optimal

kmer length for stringMLST ranged from 35 to 65 overall; ii) the performance

and accuracy of stringMLST can vary across species and serovars of *S. enterica*

allowing for data-driven fine-tunning of the kmer length; and iii) the use of

sequence platform with longer reads, which would maximize the number of

contigs per genome, could directly alter both mlst and stringMLST accuracy in

ST calls across species.

Concordance between programs

Concordance between programs was calculated as the percentage of cases in

which outputs from both mlst vs. stringmlst agreed in the call ("good" or "bad").

Results demonstrating the percentage agreement in ST calls between mlst and

stringMLST with different kmer lengths are shown on Fig 6. Apart from kmer 10,

across all species, the percentage of agreement between mlst and stringMLST

varies between ~81% and 97%. In the case of *L. monocytogenes*, *C. jejuni*, and *S.*

aureus, the kmer length of 35 appears to be the optimal value to reach the same

accuracy as mlst, which matches the original default and recommended parameter

value for stringMLST [17]. However, for *S. enterica*, a higher percentage of

agreement with MLST was achieved for kmer lengths of 55 and 65 (Fig 6). This

S. enterica-related observation recapitulated the initial findings of decreased

proportion of ST miscalls with higher kmer lengths (Fig 4C). Of note, our finding

collectively showed that the kmer length of 10 yielded low accuracy when

compared to mlst and other stringMLST kmer lengths. The most likely

explanation for lower accuracy generated by kmer 10 is that shorter kmers are

more likely to map unambiguously onto a genome when compared to other

lengths. That high frequency of kmer length 10 on a given dataset reflects their

higher likelihood of mapping to multiple regions of a genome (S1 Fig, S14A-B

Fig). Overall, stringMLST is a rapidly deployable and optimizable ST-based

genotyping algorithm that in this narrow-scope analysis proved to be applicable to

four phylogenetic distinct pathogens.

788 Optimization of stringMLST kmer length across

789 phylogenetic divergent species

Here, we systematically investigated what kmer length would give the fewest ST

miscalls (optimized length) with stringMLST across a broader array of

phylogenetic divergent pathogens. Given our previous results, we first fine-tunned

our investigation into the *S. enterica* population given the genetic and ecological

diversity across serovars. For that, we selected data from twenty-three *S. enterica*

zoonotic serovars and ran stringMLST with wide range of kmer lengths (20, 30,

35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 80, 90). Fig 7A shows the core-genome phylogeny

mapping of the optimized kmer length across all twenty-three serovars along with

their corresponding percentage of ST miscalls. More detailed information on the

distribution of the percentage of ST miscalls for all used kmer lengths (20, 30, 35,

40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 80, 90) is shown on S15A Fig. As it can be seen on Fig

7A, many serovars (*S*. Anatum, *S*. Braenderup, *S*. Javiana, *S*. Mbandaka, *S*.

Montevideo, *S*. Oranienburg, *S*. Poona, *S*. Schwarzengrund, *S*. Senftenberg, *S*.

Typhimurium) have 0% of miscalls when the default kmer length 35 was used. *S*.

Infantis and *S*. Derby show the lowest percentage of ST miscalls (3% and 2%

respectively) with higher value of kmer, e.g., 90. Interestingly, *S*. Saintpaul

showed the highest percentage of ST miscalls when only considering the range of

kmer lengths used for the initial analyses (10-90). To investigate this further, we

ran stringMLST for *S*. Saintpaul with kmer lengths up to 240 (240 was chosen

because the maximum read length for the *S*. Saintpaul dataset is 250 base pairs or

nucleotides) (S15C-D Fig). As it can be seen on S15C Fig, the fewest ST miscalls

for *S*. Saintpaul were produced when kmer of length 140 was used (22%). When

comparing the percentage of ST miscalls between mlst and stringMLST, mlst

outperformed stringMLST for the used datasets and range of kmer lengths (the

percentage of miscalls for mlst ranged from ~0-1% across all serovars, while the

percentage of miscalls for stringMLST ranged from ~0-85% depending on the

serovar and kmer length used, with 2% being the median across all combinations

of serovar and kmer length for stringMLST). In addition to the percentage of ST

miscalls, we calculated the percentage of ST agreement between mlst and

stringMLST with the range of kmer lengths (S15B Fig). While for some serovars

this percentage is the highest when kmer with length 35 is used (e.g., *S.* Anatum,

S. Braenderup, *S.* Javiana, *S.* Mbandaka, *S.* Montevideo, *S.* Oranienburg, *S.*

Poona, *S.* Schwarzengrund, *S.* Senftenberg, *S.* Typhimurium), for other serovars

(e.g., *S.* Derby, *S.* Dublin, *S.* Enteritidis, *S.* Hadar, *S.* Heidelberg, *S.* Infantis, *S.*

Kentucky, *S.* Saintpaul) the percentage of ST agreement between the two

programs was higher with higher kmer lengths (the percentage of ST agreement

varied from ~14-100% depending on the serovar and kmer length used, with 97%

being the median across all combinations of serovar and kmer length).

In order to widen the scope of our phylogenetic-based analysis, we assessed the

percentage of ST miscalls across varying kmer lengths for divergent bacterial

pathogens with Public Health relevance. We selected 14 distinct organisms and

ran stringMLST with wide range of kmer lengths (20, 30, 35, 45, 55, 65, 70, 80,

90). Fig 7B depicts the 16S rRNA-based phylogeny overlaid with the optimal

kmer length that minimized the percentage of ST miscalls. Of note, the phylogeny

contained fourteen distinct pathogens and twenty-three genomes across each

serovar of *S. enterica.* The distribution of the percentage of ST miscalls for all

used kmer lengths (20, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 80, 90) is shown on

S15E Fig. While the percentage of ST miscalls varied between 0% and 22%

across the *S. enterica* serovars as shown in Fig 7A, the percentage of miscalls was

expectedly more variable for the fourteen bacterial pathogens, ranging from 1.2%

to 74.9%. The datasets for *A. baumannii*, *C. jejuni*, *H. influenzae*, *K. pneumoniae*,

L. monocytogenes, *N. gonorrhoeae*, *S. aureus* and *S. pneumoniae* showed the

lowest percentage of ST calls with the default kmer length of 35. *C. difficile* and

M. tuberculosis had minimized ST miscalls with kmer lengths of 20 and 30

respectively, while *P. aeruginosa* with kmer length of 65. Interestingly, for *E.*

faecium and *H. pylori*, the optimal kmer lengths were 35 and 20, even though the

percentage of miscalls was high (74.9% and 67.6%). To further investigate this,

we ran stringMLST for *E. faecium* and *H. pylori* with kmer lengths up to 140 (140

was chosen because the maximum read length for the two datasets is 150 base

pairs or nucleotides) (S15G-H Fig, S15K-L Fig). As can be seen on the Figures,

the percentage of miscalls was higher with higher kmer lengths, and the lower

kmer lengths yielded fewer miscalls, albeit this number was still considerably

high. Additionally, we ran stringMLST on another set of randomly selected 100

paired-end reads for *E. faecium* (S15M-N Fig), *H. pylori* (S15I-J Fig) and

Enterococcus faecalis (S15O-P Fig). These 100 reads were not part of the initial

datasets and were chosen to validate that the initial random data selection was not

completely biased. We also added *E. faecalis* here due to its close phylogenetic

association with *E. faecium*. For *E. faecium* and *H. pylori* we observed the same

pattern with 100 reads as with 1,000 reads. On the other hand, the pattern for *E.*

faecalis was quite opposite with lowest percentage of ST miscalls of 5.43% for

kmer 35. When comparing the percentage of ST miscalls between mlst and

stringMLST, for some datasets, such as *C. jejuni*, *H. pylori*, *L. monocytogenes*, *M.*

tuberculosis, *N. gonorrhoeae*, *S. aureus*, mlst performed worse than stringMLST

(with increase in percentage of miscalls by ~48%, 13%, 11%, 50%, 9%, 45%

respectively). In addition to the percentage of ST miscalls, we calculated the

percentage of ST agreement between mlst and stringMLST with the range of

kmer lengths (S15F Fig). Of note, in the case of stringMLST, when the optimal

kmer length was above the default parameter of 35, the ultimately selected kmer

length was picked based on our empirical evidence for longer kmers being

capable of speeding up the computational analysis.

In summary, while the default kmer length of 35 used by stringMLST performs

accurately across many organisms, our systems-based approach encompassed the

analysis of a broad array of phylogenetic divergent organisms revealed: i) intra-

and inter-species variation in the percentage of ST miscalls requires fine-tunning

of the kmer length parameter; ii) lack of association between taxonomy or

phylogenetic placement of organisms and the optimal kmer length; and iii) unique

species behave as outliers for which stringMLST cannot be directly applied with

the default settings.

Incorporating stringMLST in ProkEvo

ProkEvo was recently developed as an automated and scalable computational

platform for bacterial population genomics analyses that uses the Pegasus

Workflow Management System (WMS) [31]. In particular, ProkEvo facilitates

the use of a hierarchical approach for population stratification with different

layers of genotypic resolution. MLST-based classification of genomes into STs is

part of this hierarchical approach that has been proven to be predictive of

ecological traits such as AMR in *S. enterica* lineages [57]. However, ProkEvo

currently only uses the standard mlst algorithm for ST calls [21]. As part of this

paper, the stringMLST program was incorporated into ProkEvo without any

disruption in its workflow. The workflow design of ProkEvo with both mlst and

stringMLST is shown on S16 Fig.

In order to compare the performance of ProkEvo with mlst and stringMLST,

randomly shuffled subsets derived from the original datasets used for *C. jejuni*, *L.*

monocytogenes, *S.* Typhimurium, and *S. aureus* were used. One random subset

contained 100 genomes, while the second one had 1,000 genomes. ProkEvo was

run using either mlst or stringMLST on Crane, one of the high-performance

computing clusters at the Holland Computing Center [23]. For mlst, the pipeline

used was previously established and included a few required steps, such as quality

trimming and adapter clipping, *de novo* assembly and assembly discarding prior

to the ST mapping [21]. Based on the inter-species results shown here (Fig 6), the

default kmer length of 35 was used with stringMLST for this comparison. The

outcomes measured for this analysis were: i) total running time (Fig 8A); ii) the

percentage of non-classified STs (Fig 8B); and iii) the percentage of agreement

between programs (Fig 8C).

While the runtime of using ProkEvo with mlst varied from ~8 to 34 hours for

the subset containing 100 genomes, the runtime of ProkEvo with stringMLST

varied from ~25 minutes to 3 hours (Fig 8A). Similarly, for the larger datasets

containing 1,000 genomes, the runtime of ProkEvo with mlst varied from ~17 to

39 hours, while the runtime of ProkEvo with stringMLST varied from ~4 to 8

hours. Regardless of the pathogen species tested, stringMLST speeded up the

analyses ~4 times when utilizing 1,000 genomes across species.

In terms of accuracy in ST classifications, the use of stringMLST considerably

decreased the number of non-classified STs, regardless of the dataset size (100 or

1,000 genomes) and bacterial species (Fig 8B). In accordance, stringMLST

resulted in a higher frequency of genomes classified as novel STs (ST numbers

that were not classified by mlst) (S17 Fig). Additionally, the overall concordance

between mlst and stringMLST varies from 82% to 100% across all datasets. The

percentage of agreement is the lowest for *S.* Typhimurium, while it is the highest

for *S. aureus* (Fig 8C). The lower proportion of ST miscalls and high percentage

of agreement between programs for *S. aureus*, compared to other species, is

associated with its higher degree of genetic homogeneity (fewer dominant STs)

(S5 Fig). This difference in miscalls and concordance between programs may be

further explained by the variation in database sizes, since the PubMLST schemes

used for mlst have fewer alleles across all seven loci which results in fewer STs

compared to stringMLST as shown on S3 Table.

Previously, the scalability of ProkEvo was assessed by a comparative analysis

of its computational performance on Crane and OSG, using two datasets with

2,392 and 23,045 genomes each (10 X difference), and the standard mlst approach

for ST calling [21]. To further demonstrate the gain in computational runtime

obtained with the use of stringMLST within ProkEvo, the complete *S.*

Typhimurium dataset containing 23,045 genomes was run on OSG. While

ProkEvo with mlst finished all ST calls in 26 days and 6 hours when OSG was

used as a computational platform [21], ProkEvo with stringMLST completed the

task in 3 days and 6 hours. Altogether, stringMLST provides fine-tunable and

rapid alternative to mlst for scalable ST genotyping that is portable to be

implemented in any high-performance and high-throughput platform, with its use

being further facilitated by its implementation in ProkEvo.

Discussion

The incorporation of WGS technology has advanced the study of bacterial

populations, enabling new strategies of inferring traits associated with populations

at different scales of resolution that may be contributing to important ecological

characteristics and/or epidemiological patterns [21][32][33][34][35][36][37][38].

In particular, the use of a hierarchical population structure analysis permits

inference into ancestral vs. recent evolutionary relationships and consequently,

the patterns of genomic and phenotypic diversification among genotypic units can

be studied within these evolutionary contexts [21][39][40][41][12][42][43].

ST-based classification is an integral part of the hierarchical genotyping

approach [21][27]. ST lineages are inferred from the patterns of allelic variation at

a relatively small (typically seven) set of conserved loci [8][9][44] and remain a

very useful context in which to study bacterial populations. However, as the field

transitions to WGS data, the ability to infer STs is bottlenecked by the

computationally intensive step of genome assembly. Thus, there is a great need

for algorithms that can efficiently infer STs from large WGS-based datasets.

[21][27][8][9][44]There are multiple tools available for MLST classification,

such as mlst [22], ARIBA **Error! Reference source not found.**, stringMLST

[17], MentaLiST **Error! Reference source not found.**, STing **Error! Reference**

source not found.. In general, the available tools can be categorized based on the

input data they use - some tools use raw Illumina paired-end sequence data, while

others use *de novo* assemblies [16]. Using raw sequence data for ST-based

classification has a tremendous advantage especially in pathogen surveillance,

since all the computationally demanding steps prior to the *de novo* assembly are

bypassed and the STs calls are made as the sequence reads are generated.

Specifically, mlst uses *de novo* genome assemblies as an input and performs

mapping in order to align sequences to pre-downloaded allelic files across all

target loci. ARIBA identifies AMR-associated genes, single nucleotide

polymorphisms, and ST calls using Illumina paired-end raw sequencing reads.

ARIBA clusters the raw reads by mapping them to genes, and then performs local

assembly within clusters to identify AMR genes and ST calls. On the other hand,

stringMLST and MentaLiST rely on kmer matching between raw sequence reads

and available ST schemes that allows for fast mapping and ST-based typing. In a

narrow setting with few bacterial species, both tools are shown to be accurate and

fast for standard MLST classification, while providing comparable accuracy with

MentaLiST albeit using less computational resources **Error! Reference source**

not found.. STing is the successor of stringMLST - it uses the same algorithmic

approach with additional computational applications for large MLST schemes

such as ribosomal MLST (rMLST) and core-genome MLST (cgMLST) **Error!**

Reference source not found.. All these tools have integrated ST schemes and/or

provide utilities for downloading the available PubMLST databases. There are a

few available comparisons of assembly-free tools for ST classification, and the

published studies are primarily focused on the computational resources used and

the percentage of correctly classified STs in relatively small data sets

[16][63][64]. When tools were tested with real outbreak datasets (*L.*

monocytogenes, *E. coli*, *C. jejuni*, *S. enterica*) comprising 85 samples,

stringMLST showed the fastest running time of 80.8 minutes and high accuracy in

ST calls (100%) [16]. While MentaLiST does not scale well when reads with high

coverage are used, it performs well on MLST schemes with up to a few thousand

genes and alleles, such as cgMLST (~3,000 genes) [63]. While most ST tools

perform satisfactorily, there are some relevant bottlenecks to be considered. For

example, some tools use out-of-date MLST databases that require manual

curation, and can directly affect the accuracy of ST calls, especially when mixed

and low coverage samples are used [16]. ST tools that are assembly and alignment

free, such as stringMLST, STing and MentaLiST, show quite a few advantages in

term of accuracy and efficiency that make them applicable for real-time molecular

epidemiology and surveillance. Thus, we chose stringMLST as a representative of

the kmer-based ST tools to perform a systems-based comparative analysis that

assess the computational and statistical efficacy of ST calls across divergent

pathogens in contrast to the legacy MLST approach.

As shown in our studies, the accuracy of stringMLST is affected by the species

being tested without any specific phylogenetic patterns. In particular, the choice

of kmer length used directly impacts the proportion of ST miscalls across species,

and in certain cases it may not be applied as designed even after parameter

tunning. It is likely that the varying accuracy reflects the different levels of

population structuring, patterns of genome diversification, degree of repetitive

sequences, degree of horizontal gene transfer (HGT), and relative abundances of

mobile elements such as prophages and insertion sequences, etc.

[12][41][68][69][70][71][72][73]. A clear example in our study was *S. enterica*,

for which the accuracy of stringMLST at different kmer lengths varied across

ecologically distinct serovars that are known to have unique pan-genomic

composition such as prophage content [12][71][74][75]. To the best of our

knowledge, the currently available comparisons between ST tools have not

considered any systematic approach for parameter tunning across phylogenetic

divergent species known to vary in population structure [21][27][67].

In evaluating genome-intrinsic and -extrinsic variables that could contribute to

differences in accuracy between mlst and stringMLST, we found that species

level variation in accuracy was mostly explained by the uniqueness of their

genomic composition and number of contigs per genome. As genomic

composition is an inheritable property of the bacterial species, subtype, and

evolutionary history of specific populations, the association with algorithmic

performance was somewhat expected [46][47]. However, the contribution of the

number of contigs to performance implies that data from long-read sequencing

platforms such as PacBio and Oxford Nanopore Technologies (ONT) may have a

considerable effect on accuracy of programs such as stringMLST because these

technologies produce reads with lower accuracy (~80-90%) that may inflate the

number of false allelic calls at MLST loci, with the effect of artificially splitting

major STs into multiple sub-populations [48]**Error! Reference source not**

found.Error! Reference source not found.. Therefore, while more work is

needed in this field, current studies using hybrid assembly approaches of both

Illumina short reads and ONT long reads **Error! Reference source not found.**, as

well as only polished ONT reads **Error! Reference source not found.** for

performing ST-based classification may lead to promising, cost-effective results

from these types of platforms. Hence, we expect that a combination of hybrid

sequencing strategies with species and even subtype-specific tuning of programs

such as stringMLST and STing, will facilitate real-time surveillance, prediction of

STs and prediction of traits such as AMR that are found to associated with

specific STs [14][49].

While the kmer length of 35 is currently recommended as a default value of

stringMLST, our systems-based approach demonstrated that for specific bacterial

species it will result in increasing the frequency of ST miscalls which in turn may

hinder epidemiological investigations. Across phylogenetic divergent pathogenic

bacterial species, the optimal kmer length ranged from 20 to 140, regardless of

their ancestral relationship or speciation pattern. The varying population structure,

the pattern of genome diversification and architecture (e.g., impact of HGT), as

well as sequence coverage may be some of the reasons underlying the observed

statistics [12][41][68][69][70][71][72][73]. Although we hypothesize that longer

sequence reads will help overcome this limitation, there is still a context-

dependent consideration for parameter tunning and overall algorithmic

implementation. Therefore, in the case of stringMLST, we suggest the following

actionable strategies to maximize its utilization, including: i) developers to

consider implementing a pre-step that heuristically searches for the optimal kmer

length (minimizes ST miscalls) in dataset-dependent fashion (sampling from the

testing data), perhaps even by comparing with the standard MLST program as

positive controls; and/or ii) researchers to run wide range of kmer lengths on a

subset of the dataset in order to select the optimal kmer length that minimizes the

percentage of ST miscalls. Given the speed and scalability of stringMLST, using

multiple kmer lengths is not likely to add much overhead to the analyses, and this

provides an empirical statistical approach for kmer selection and optimization of

ST classifications. With this data-driven fine-tunning of the kmer length,

stringMLST is a powerful program that can be efficiently and effectively used in

microbiological and epidemiological laboratories.

We recently developed ProkEvo, a freely available scalable platform for

performing hierarchical-based bacterial population genomics analyses [21].

ProkEvo: 1) uses the Pegasus Workflow Management System to ensure

reproducibility, scalability, and modularity; 2) uses high-performance and high-

throughput computational platforms; 3) automates and scales multitude of

computational analyses of a few to tens of thousands of bacterial genomes; 4) can

run many thousands of analyses concurrently if the computational resources are

available; 5) is easily modifiable and expandable platform that can incorporate

additional algorithmic steps and custom scripts. The initial implementation of ST-

based classifications through ProkEvo, as part of a hierarchical genotyping

strategy to map and track populations, was done using the assembly-dependent

MLST program [21][22]. Running mlst inside ProkEvo allows for parallelization

of the genome assemblies (run per isolate or genome) which enhances scalability

and facilitates the optimal use of computation resources. Theoretically, if there

are *n* isolates and *n* cores available on the computational platform, ProkEvo can

linearly utilize all resources and run all *n* independent tasks simultaneously.

Typically, ST-based classifications are time consuming because the mapping

process is run sequentially in a set of genomes instead of running them

independently. Thus, using modular and distributed platforms such

as ProkEvo for performing ST-based genotyping provides great benefit, especially

if additional features such as other hierarchical genotypes and pan-genomic

mapping tools are part of the same platform [21]. As part of this work, we

modified ProkEvo to not only offer the standard assembly-dependent MLST

mapping approach, but it now contains stringMLST, and our tests showed a

significant speed-up in runtime for datasets ranging from a few hundreds to tens

of thousands of genomes. Moreover, we additionally added STing to ProkEvo, as

an efficient successor of stringMLST

(https://github.com/npavlovikj/MLST_stringMLST_analyses/tree/main/Prokevo_

STing). To use ProkEvo with stringMLST or STing, the researcher only needs to

provide a list of SRA identifications and run the submit script without any

advanced experience in high-performance or high-throughput computing.

Depending on the configuration set, ProkEvo can use locally downloaded

sequence data or download the data from NCBI directly. The Pegasus Workflow

Managements System that is used by ProkEvo automatically handles the

dependencies, as well as all the intermediate and final files. Thus, using platforms

such as ProkEvo with fast tool for hierarchical genotyping, such as stringMLST,

allows for robust and efficient population-based genomics analyses that facilitate:

i) mapping and tracking of variants or lineages for epidemiological inquiries; ii)

population structure analysis; and iii) ecological trait prediction using pan-

genomic mapping to specific genotypes.

1100

Conclusion
1101

In conclusion, stringMLST largely proved to be an accurate, rapid, and scalable

tool for ST-based classifications that could be deployed in microbiological

laboratories and epidemiological agencies. However, our work clearly illustrates

the need to optimize stringMLST across phylogenetic divergent species and

populations of bacterial pathogens. Based on our results, we propose that the kmer

length should be optimized in two ways on a case-by-case basis: 1) intrinsically

by implementing a pre-step inside the algorithm to sample from the target data

and select the optimal kmer length; or 2) by the user through a heuristic data

mining approach to select the optimal kmer length prior to finalizing the ST calls.

Also, by assessing genome-intrinsic and -extrinsic factors that could affect the

stringMLST performance, our work suggests that longer sequence reads have the

potential to improve its accuracy for specific bacterial species. Furthermore, the

integration of stringMLST into ProkEvo allows users to take advantage of other

hierarchical genotyping strategies, including pan-genomic mapping, which

reproducibly facilitates ecological and epidemiological inquiries at scale.

Ultimately, this work emphasizes the importance of developing robust algorithmic

tools for mining WGS data that can have direct implications for mapping and

tracking of bacterial populations.

1120

Acknowledgements

This work was completed by utilizing the Holland Computing Center of the

University of Nebraska, which receives support from the Nebraska Research

Initiative, and using resources provided by the Open Science Grid, which is

supported by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of

Energy's Office of Science. This research used the Pegasus Workflow

Management Software funded by the National Science Foundation under grant

#1664162. This publication made use of the PubMLST website

(https://pubmlst.org/) developed by Keith Jolley (Jolley & Maiden 2010, BMC

Bioinformatics, 11:595) and sited at the University of Oxford. The development

of that website was funded by the Wellcome Trust. We would like to greatly

thank Mats Rynge for his extensive assistance and valuable suggestions while

setting up and running ProkEvo on the Open Science Grid. We also thank Dr.

Derek Weitzel and Karan Vahi for their technical support.

1135

References

[1] Bedford J, Farrar J, Ihekweazu C, Kang G, Koopmans M, Nkengasong J. A new twenty-first century science for effective epidemic response. Nature. 2019 Nov;575(7781):130-6.

[2] Lewnard JA, Reingold AL. Emerging challenges and opportunities in infectious disease epidemiology. American journal of epidemiology. 2019 May 1;188(5):873-82.

[3] Armstrong GL, MacCannell DR, Taylor J, Carleton HA, Neuhaus EB, Bradbury RS, Posey JE, Gwinn M. Pathogen genomics in public health. New England Journal of Medicine. 2019 Dec 26;381(26):2569-80.

[4] Achtman M. How old are bacterial pathogens?. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2016 Aug 17;283(1836):20160990.

[5] Selander RK, Musser JM, Caugant DA, Gilmour MN, Whittam TS. Population genetics of pathogenic bacteria. Microbial pathogenesis. 1987 Jul 1;3(1):1-7.

[6] Shapiro BJ. How clonal are bacteria over time?. Current opinion in microbiology. 2016 Jun 1;31:116-23.

[7] Smith JM, Smith NH, O'Rourke M, Spratt BG. How clonal are bacteria?. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 1993 May 15;90(10):4384-8.

[8] Maiden MC, Bygraves JA, Feil E, Morelli G, Russell JE, Urwin R, Zhang Q, Zhou J, Zurth K, Caugant DA, Feavers IM. Multilocus sequence typing: a portable approach to the identification of clones within

populations of pathogenic microorganisms. Proceedings of the National

Academy of Sciences. 1998 Mar 17;95(6):3140-5.

[9]   Maiden MC. Multilocus sequence typing of bacteria. Annu. Rev.

Microbiol.. 2006 Oct 13;60:561-88.

[10]   Feil EJ, Li BC, Aanensen DM, Hanage WP, Spratt BG. eBURST:

inferring patterns of evolutionary descent among clusters of related

bacterial genotypes from multilocus sequence typing data. Journal of

bacteriology. 2004 Mar 1;186(5):1518-30.

[11]   Croucher NJ, Harris SR, Grad YH, Hanage WP. Bacterial genomes in

epidemiology—present and future. Philosophical Transactions of the

Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2013 Mar 19;368(1614):20120202.

[12]   Alikhan NF, Zhou Z, Sergeant MJ, Achtman M. A genomic overview of

the population structure of Salmonella. PLoS genetics. 2018 Apr

5;14(4):e1007261.

[13]   Achtman M, Wain J, Weill FX, Nair S, Zhou Z, Sangal V, Krauland MG,

Hale JL, Harbottle H, Uesbeck A, Dougan G. Multilocus sequence typing

as a replacement for serotyping in Salmonella enterica. PLoS Pathog. 2012

Jun 21;8(6):e1002776.

[14]   Břinda K, Callendrello A, Ma KC, MacFadden DR, Charalampous T, Lee

RS, Cowley L, Wadsworth CB, Grad YH, Kucherov G, O'Grady J. Rapid

inference of antibiotic resistance and susceptibility by genomic neighbour

typing. Nature microbiology. 2020 Mar;5(3):455-64.

[15] MacFadden DR, Coburn B, Břinda K, Corbeil A, Daneman N, Fisman D,

Lee RS, Lipsitch M, McGeer A, Melano RG, Mubareka S. Using genetic

distance from archived samples for the prediction of antibiotic resistance

in Escherichia coli. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2020 Mar

9;64(5):e02417-19.

[16] Page AJ, Alikhan NF, Carleton HA, Seemann T, Keane JA, Katz LS.

Comparison of classical multi-locus sequence typing software for next-

generation sequencing data. Microbial genomics. 2017 Aug;3(8).

[17] Gupta A, Jordan IK, Rishishwar L. stringMLST: a fast kmer based tool for

multilocus sequence typing. Bioinformatics. 2017 Jan 1;33(1):119-21.

[18] Abebe E, Gugsa G, Ahmed M. Review on major food-borne zoonotic

bacterial pathogens. Journal of tropical medicine. 2020 Jun 29;2020.

[19] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Foodborne germs and

illnesses. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www. cdc.

gov/foodsafety/foodborne-germs. html. 2016.

[20] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Individual Salmonella

serotypes reports. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

https://www.cdc.gov/salmonella/reportspubs/salmonella-atlas/serotype-

reports.html. 2020.

[21] Pavlovikj N, Gomes-Neto JC, Deogun JS, Benson AK. ProkEvo: an

automated, reproducible, and scalable framework for high-throughput

bacterial population genomics analyses. PeerJ. 2021 May 21;9:e11376.

[22] Seemann T, mlst Github https://github.com/tseemann/mlst.

[23]   HCC. 2008. Holland computing center | Nebraska.

[24]   Pordes R, Petravick D, Kramer B, Olson D, Livny M, Roy A, Avery P,

1206   Blackburn K, Wenaus T, Würthwein F+6 more. 2007. The open science

1207   grid. Journal of Physics: Conference Series 78:12057

1208   [25]   Sfiligoi I, Bradley DC, Holzman B, Mhashilkar P, Padhi S, Wurthwein F.

1209   2009. The pilot way to grid resources using glideinWMS.

1210   [26]   Anaconda. 2012. Anaconda | The World's Most Popular Data Science

1211   Platform.

1212   [27]   Zhou Z, Alikhan NF, Mohamed K, Achtman M, Agama Study Group. The

1213   user's guide to comparative genomics with EnteroBase. Three case

1214   studies: micro-clades within Salmonella enterica serovar Agama, ancient

1215   and modern populations of Yersinia pestis, and core genomic diversity of

1216   all Escherichia. Biorxiv. 2019 Jan 1:613554.

1217   [28]   Feil EJ, Cooper JE, Grundmann H, Robinson DA, Enright MC, Berendt T,

1218   Peacock SJ, Smith JM, Murphy M, Spratt BG, Moore CE. How clonal is

1219   Staphylococcus aureus?. Journal of bacteriology. 2003 Jun

1220   1;185(11):3307-16.

1221   [29]   Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'hara RB,

1222   Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MH, Wagner H, Oksanen MJ. Package

1223   'vegan'. Community ecology package, version. 2013 Dec 12;2(9):1-295.

1224   [30]   Jolley KA, Bray JE, Maiden MC. Open-access bacterial population

1225   genomics: BIGSdb software, the PubMLST. org website and their

1226   applications. Wellcome open research. 2018;3.

[31] Deelman E, Singh G, Su MH, Blythe J, Gil Y, Kesselman C, Mehta G,

Vahi K, Berriman GB, Good J, Laity A. Pegasus: A framework for

mapping complex scientific workflows onto distributed systems. Scientific

Programming. 2005 Jan 1;13(3):219-37.

[32] Burnett E, Ishida M, De Janon S, Naushad S, Duceppe MO, Gao R,

Jardim A, Chen JC, Tagg KA, Ogunremi D, Vinueza-Burgos C. Whole-

genome sequencing reveals the presence of the blactx-m-65 gene in

extended-spectrum β-lactamase-producing and multi-drug-resistant clones

of salmonella serovar infantis isolated from broiler chicken environments

in the Galapagos Islands. Antibiotics. 2021 Mar;10(3):267.

[33] Cooper AL, Low AJ, Koziol AG, Thomas MC, Leclair D, Tamber S,

Wong A, Blais BW, Carrillo CD. Systematic evaluation of whole genome

sequence-based predictions of Salmonella serotype and antimicrobial

resistance. Frontiers in microbiology. 2020 Apr 3;11:549.

[34] Dallman TJ, Byrne L, Ashton PM, Cowley LA, Perry NT, Adak G,

Petrovska L, Ellis RJ, Elson R, Underwood A, Green J. Whole-genome

sequencing for national surveillance of Shiga toxin–producing Escherichia

coli O157. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2015 Aug 1;61(3):305-12.

[35] Pightling AW, Pettengill JB, Luo Y, Baugher JD, Rand H, Strain E.

Interpreting whole-genome sequence analyses of foodborne bacteria for

regulatory applications and outbreak investigations. Frontiers in

microbiology. 2018 Jul 10;9:1482.

[36]   Sheppard SK, Jolley KA, Maiden MC. A gene-by-gene approach to

1250   bacterial population genomics: whole genome MLST of Campylobacter.

1251   Genes. 2012 Jun;3(2):261-77.

1252   [37]   Sheppard SK, Didelot X, Meric G, Torralbo A, Jolley KA, Kelly DJ,

1253   Bentley SD, Maiden MC, Parkhill J, Falush D. Genome-wide association

1254   study identifies vitamin B5 biosynthesis as a host specificity factor in

1255   Campylobacter. Proceedings of the national academy of sciences. 2013 Jul

1256   16;110(29):11923-7.

1257   [38]   Alba P, Leekitcharoenphon P, Carfora V, Amoruso R, Cordaro G, Di

1258   Matteo P, Ianzano A, Iurescia M, Diaconu EL, Pedersen SK, Guerra B.

1259   Molecular epidemiology of Salmonella Infantis in Europe: insights into

1260   the success of the bacterial host and its parasitic pESI-like megaplasmid.

1261   Microbial genomics. 2020 May;6(5).

1262   [39]   Cheng L, Connor TR, Sirén J, Aanensen DM, Corander J. Hierarchical

1263   and spatially explicit clustering of DNA sequences with BAPS software.

1264   Molecular biology and evolution. 2013 Feb 13;30(5):1224-8.

1265   [40]   Tonkin-Hill G, Lees JA, Bentley SD, Frost SD, Corander J. Fast

1266   hierarchical Bayesian analysis of population structure. Nucleic Acids

1267   Research. 2019 Jun 20;47(11):5539-49.

1268   [41]   Didelot X, Bowden R, Street T, Golubchik T, Spencer C, McVean G,

1269   Sangal V, Anjum MF, Achtman M, Falush D, Donnelly P. Recombination

1270   and population structure in Salmonella enterica. PLoS genetics. 2011 Jul

1271   28;7(7):e1002191.

[42] Gymoese P, Kiil K, Torpdahl M, Østerlund MT, Sørensen G, Olsen JE,

Nielsen EM, Litrup E. WGS based study of the population structure of

Salmonella enterica serovar Infantis. BMC genomics. 2019 Dec;20(1):1-1.

[43] Liao J, Orsi RH, Carroll LM, Wiedmann M. Comparative genomics

reveals different population structures associated with host and geographic

origin in antimicrobial-resistant Salmonella enterica. Environmental

microbiology. 2020 Jul;22(7):2811-28.

[44] Maiden MC, Van Rensburg MJ, Bray JE, Earle SG, Ford SA, Jolley KA,

McCarthy ND. MLST revisited: the gene-by-gene approach to bacterial

genomics. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2013 Oct;11(10):728-36.

[45] Spratt BG, Hanage WP, Li B, Aanensen DM, Feil EJ. Displaying the

relatedness among isolates of bacterial species–the eBURST approach.

FEMS microbiology letters. 2004 Dec 1;241(2):129-34.

[46] Bobay LM, Ochman H. Impact of recombination on the base composition

of bacteria and archaea. Molecular biology and evolution. 2017 Oct

1;34(10):2627-36.

[47] Raghavan R, Kelkar YD, Ochman H. A selective force favoring increased

G+ C content in bacterial genes. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences. 2012 Sep 4;109(36):14504-7.

[48] De Maio N, Shaw LP, Hubbard A, George S, Sanderson ND, Swann J,

Wick R, AbuOun M, Stubberfield E, Hoosdally SJ, Crook DW.

Comparison of long-read sequencing technologies in the hybrid assembly

of complex bacterial genomes. Microbial genomics. 2019 Sep;5(9).

[49]   Page AJ, Keane JA. Rapid multi-locus sequence typing direct from

uncorrected long reads using Krocus. PeerJ. 2018 Jul 31;6:e5233.

[50]   Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for

Illumina sequence data. Bioinformatics. 2014 Aug 1;30(15):2114-20.

[51]   Andrews S. FASTQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence

data. Available at

http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/. 2010.

[52]   Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Dvorkin M, Kulikov AS,

Lesin VM, Nikolenko SI, Pham S, Prjibelski AD, Pyshkin AV. SPAdes: a

new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell

sequencing. Journal of computational biology. 2012 May 1;19(5):455-77.

[53]   Gurevich A, Saveliev V, Vyahhi N, Tesler G. QUAST: quality assessment

tool for genome assemblies. Bioinformatics. 2013 Apr 15;29(8):1072-5.

[54]   Treangen TJ, Sommer DD, Angly FE, Koren S, Pop M. Next generation

sequence assembly with AMOS. Current Protocols in Bioinformatics.

2011 Mar;33(1):11-8.

[55]   Rice P, Longden I, Bleasby A. EMBOSS: the European molecular biology

open software suite. Trends in genetics. 2000 Jun 1;16(6):276-7.

[56]   Rizk G, Lavenier D, Chikhi R. DSK: k-mer counting with very low

memory usage. Bioinformatics. 2013 Mar 1;29(5):652-3.

[57]   Gomes-Neto JC, Pavlovikj N, Cano C, Abdalhamid B, Al-Ghalith GA,

Loy JD, Knights D, Iwen PC, Chaves BD, Benson AK. Heuristic and

hierarchical-based population mining of Salmonella enterica lineage I pan-

genomes as a platform to enhance food safety. Front. Sustain. Food Syst.

5:725791. doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2021.725791.

[58] Valieris R. Parallel-fastq-dump. GitHub. Available at

https://github.com/rvalieris/parallelfastq-dump. 2020.

[59] Rang FJ, Kloosterman WP, de Ridder J. From squiggle to basepair:

computational approaches for improving nanopore sequencing read

accuracy. Genome biology. 2018 Dec;19(1):1-1.

[60] Rhoads A, Au KF. PacBio sequencing and its applications. Genomics,

proteomics & bioinformatics. 2015 Oct 1;13(5):278-89.

[61] Chen Z, Erickson DL, Meng J. Benchmarking hybrid assembly

approaches for genomic analyses of bacterial pathogens using Illumina

and Oxford Nanopore sequencing. BMC genomics. 2020 Dec;21(1):1-21.

[62] Liou CH, Wu HC, Liao YC, Lauderdale TL, Huang IW, Chen FJ.

nanoMLST: accurate multilocus sequence typing using Oxford Nanopore

Technologies MinION with a dual-barcode approach to multiplex large

numbers of samples. Microbial genomics. 2020 Mar;6(3).

[63] Feijao P, Yao HT, Fornika D, Gardy J, Hsiao W, Chauve C, Chindelevitch

L. MentaLiST–A fast MLST caller for large MLST schemes. Microbial

genomics. 2018 Feb;4(2).

[64] Espitia-Navarro HF, Chande AT, Nagar SD, Smith H, Jordan IK,

Rishishwar L. STing: accurate and ultrafast genomic profiling with exact

sequence matches. Nucleic acids research. 2020 Aug 20;48(14):7681-9.

[65]   Hunt M, Mather AE, Sánchez-Busó L, Page AJ, Parkhill J, Keane JA,

Harris SR. ARIBA: rapid antimicrobial resistance genotyping directly

from sequencing reads. Microbial genomics. 2017 Oct;3(10).

[66]   Page AJ, Cummins CA, Hunt M, Wong VK, Reuter S, Holden MT,

Fookes M, Falush D, Keane JA, Parkhill J. Roary: rapid large-scale

prokaryote pan genome analysis. Bioinformatics. 2015 Nov

15;31(22):3691-3.

[67]   Zhou Z, Alikhan NF, Mohamed K, Fan Y, Achtman M, Brown D,

Chattaway M, Dallman T, Delahay R, Kornschober C, Pietzka A. The

EnteroBase user's guide, with case studies on Salmonella transmissions,

Yersinia pestis phylogeny, and Escherichia core genomic diversity.

Genome research. 2020 Jan 1;30(1):138-52.

[68]   Sheppard SK, Colles FM, McCARTHY ND, Strachan NJ, Ogden ID,

Forbes KJ, Dallas JF, Maiden MC. Niche segregation and genetic

structure of Campylobacter jejuni populations from wild and agricultural

host species. Molecular ecology. 2011 Aug;20(16):3484-90.

[69]   Sheppard SK, Cheng L, Méric G, De Haan CP, Llarena AK, Marttinen P,

Vidal A, Ridley A, Clifton-Hadley F, Connor TR, Strachan NJ. Cryptic

ecology among host generalist Campylobacter jejuni in domestic animals.

Molecular ecology. 2014 May;23(10):2442-51.

[70]   Yahara K, Didelot X, Ansari MA, Sheppard SK, Falush D. Efficient

inference of recombination hot regions in bacterial genomes. Molecular

biology and evolution. 2014 Jun 1;31(6):1593-605.

[71]   Mottawea W, Duceppe MO, Dupras AA, Usongo V, Jeukens J, Freschi L,

Emond-Rheault JG, Hamel J, Kukavica-Ibrulj I, Boyle B, Gill A.

Salmonella enterica prophage sequence profiles reflect genome diversity

and can be used for high discrimination subtyping. Frontiers in

microbiology. 2018 May 4;9:836.

[72]   den Bakker HC, Desjardins CA, Griggs AD, Peters JE, Zeng Q, Young

SK, Kodira CD, Yandava C, Hepburn TA, Haas BJ, Birren BW.

Evolutionary dynamics of the accessory genome of Listeria

monocytogenes. PLoS One. 2013 Jun 25;8(6):e67511.

[73]   Castillo-Ramírez S, Corander J, Marttinen P, Aldeljawi M, Hanage WP,

Westh H, Boye K, Gulay Z, Bentley SD, Parkhill J, Holden MT.

Phylogeographic variation in recombination rates within a global clone of

methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. Genome biology. 2012

Dec;13(12):1-3.

[74]   Laing CR, Whiteside MD, Gannon VP. Pan-genome analyses of the

species Salmonella enterica, and identification of genomic markers

predictive for species, subspecies, and serovar. Frontiers in microbiology.

2017 Jul 31;8:1345.

[75]   Ferrari RG, Rosario DK, Cunha-Neto A, Mano SB, Figueiredo EE, Conte-

Junior CA. Worldwide epidemiology of Salmonella serovars in animal-

based foods: a meta-analysis. Applied and environmental microbiology.

2019 Jul 1;85(14):e00591-19.

[76] Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. FastTree: computing large minimum

evolution trees with profiles instead of a distance matrix. Molecular

biology and evolution. 2009 Jul 1;26(7):1641-50.

[77] Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for

phylogenetic tree display and annotation. Nucleic acids research. 2021 Jul

2;49(W1):W293-6.

[78] Seemann T. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics.

2014 Jul 15;30(14):2068-9.

[79] Selander RK, Caugant DA, Ochman H, Musser JM, Gilmour MN,

Whittam TS. Methods of multilocus enzyme electrophoresis for bacterial

population genetics and systematics. Applied and environmental

microbiology. 1986 May;51(5):873-84.

[80] Maslow JN, Whittam TS, Gilks CF, Wilson RA, Mulligan ME, Adams

KS, Arbeit RD. Clonal relationships among bloodstream isolates of

Escherichia coli. Infection and Immunity. 1995 Jul;63(7):2409-17.

[81] Turner KM, Hanage WP, Fraser C, Connor TR, Spratt BG. Assessing the

reliability of eBURST using simulated populations with known ancestry.

BMC microbiology. 2007 Dec;7(1):1-4.

[82] Chang Q, Abuelaish I, Biber A, Jaber H, Callendrello A, Andam CP,

Regev-Yochay G, Hanage WP, PICR Study Group. Genomic

epidemiology of meticillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus ST22

widespread in communities of the Gaza Strip, 2009. Eurosurveillance.

2018 Aug 23;23(34):1700592.

[83]　Chang Q, Stevenson AE, Croucher NJ, Lee GM, Pelton SI, Lipsitch M,

Finkelstein JA, Hanage WP. Stability of the pneumococcal population

structure in Massachusetts as PCV13 was introduced. BMC infectious

diseases. 2015 Dec;15(1):1-7.

Fig 1. Computational workflow describing the analytical steps for a comparative analysis of two algorithms used for ST-based classification.

From top-down, the first step (narrow-scope) of the analytical approach entailed the acquisition and processing of Illumina paired-end raw reads from four distinct pathogens (*C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, *S. enterica* and *S. aureus*), through an assembly-dependent (mlst) or assembly-free (stringMLST) approach for ST-based classification. Next, a set of comparative analyses encompassing measuring the computational performance, statistical metrics, and modeling were used to assess the accuracy and efficiency of mlst vs. stringMLST. Additionally, the contribution of genome-intrinsic and –extrinsic variables were used to identify explanatory factors that could impact the algorithmic efficiency across phylogenetic divergent species. Upon identification of inter-species differences in the performance of stringMLST, a wide-scope analysis was done to assess its accuracy across an array of fifteen phylogenetic divergent pathogenic species of bacteria with Public Health relevance. Ultimately, stringMLST was added to the computational platform ProkEvo to facilitate ST-based classification at scale, as part of a hierarchical-based approach for population genomic analyses.

Fig 2. Box-and-whiskers plot showing the comparison of the average runtime per genome per batch (in minutes) needed by mlst and stringMLST for ST classification of genomes across four distinct bacterial species.

In order to compare the average runtime used by mlst and stringMLST with different kmer lenghts, we chose four different datasets, including four phylogenetic divergent bacterial pathogenic species: *C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, one major serovar of *S. enterica* (*S.* Typhimurium) and *S. aureus* - using 600 randomly selected genomes for each species. These 600 genomes were randomly split into three batches with 200 genomes each. We then ran mlst with all required steps, such as quality trimming and adapter clipping, *de novo* assembly and assembly discarding, on each batch and dataset. Separately, we ran stringMLST with a range of 10 different kmer values (10, 20, 30, 35, 45, 55, 65, 70, 80, 90) on each dataset, including the default length of 35 (y-axis). For each organism, the runtime was calculated as an average of 200 genomes per batch - since there were three batches, three datapoints were used to depict the distribution of runtime in minutes (x-axis).

Fig 3. Genome-intrinsic and –extrinsic variables that can impact the accuracy of ST-based classification using either mlst (MLST-based genotyping) or stringMLST algorithmic approaches.

Box-and-whiskers plot showing genome-intrinsic variables, varying in distribution according to the bacterial species (A-C as y-axis), that may affect ST-based classification, include: (A) Number of contigs per genome (x-axis); (B) Total number of nucleotides per genome (x-axis); (C) GC% content per genome (x-axis); and (D) Dinucleotide composition of genomes. (D) Inter-species PCA using the relative frequency of all pairs of dinucleotides (16 pairs) present in the genome as input data. Only two PCs are shown, and the percentage of variance explained by either PC is depicted in parenthesis. Bar plots showing genome-extrinsic variables that may influence the performance of mlst vs. stringMLST across species include but are not limited to: (E) Total count of unique STs per database (ST richness in the database used for mapping of raw reads or assemblies) (x-axis); and (F) Total count of unique alleles across all seven loci used for ST classification (x-axis). Specifically, the differences in ST richness and allelic composition in the databases reflect difference between mlst vs. stringMLST, and were not impacted by the kmer length (E-F, y-axis).

Fig 4. Statistical analysis of ST-based classification outcomes for comparison between mlst and stringMLST performance across bacterial species.

(A-C) Box-and-whiskers plots A-C demonstrate the relationship between ST richness (x-axis), Simpson's index of diversity $(1 – D)$ based on ST composition (x-axis), or the proportion of non-classified STs (x-axis) across bacterial species (color-coded differently) and programs (y-axis), respectively. Along with plots A-C are depicted all PERMANOVA results including p-values ($p < 0.05$) and the univariate or synergistic contribution of factors measured by R-squared. PERMANOVA modeling was done in two specific ways: 1) A model including species, program, and their interaction, considering that those were the main variables of interest; and 2) All other results were calculated using univariate models and included modeling using genome-intrinsic (number of contigs per genome, total number of nucleotides per genome, and average GC% content) and – extrinsic (Simpson's D index of diversity, ST and allelic counts per database) variables. (D) Bar plot depicting the distribution of the standard deviation (SD, y-axis) for the proportion of non-classified STs based on species (color-coded differently) and programs (y-axis).

Fig 5. Multi-dimensional analysis of ST-based classification outcomes across different species using mlst vs. stringMLST.
(A) Tri-dimensional scatter plot demonstrating species grouping based on the outcomes calculated using the ST classification across programs, including: 1) Simpson's index of diversity ($1 - D$, Simpson's index); 2) ST richness; and 3) proportion of non-classified STs. (B-D) Biplots demonstrating groupings formed across species and programs based on the same outcomes. Scatter plot B depicts groupings produced based on the relationship between Simpson's index of diversity vs. ST richness (Richness); whereas scatter plot C shows the relationship between the Simpson's index of diversity and the proportion of non-classified STs; and lastly, scatter plot D depicts the relationship between ST richness (Richness) and the proportion of non-classified STs.

Fig 6. Box-and-whiskers plot depicting the concordance between mlst and stringMLST in ST calls.

Four different datasets belonging to four phylogenetic distinct bacterial pathogens, including *C. jejuni* (600 genomes), *L. monocytogenes* (600 genomes), *S. enterica* (11,787 genomes from 20 different serovars) and *S. aureus* (600 genomes) were run with mlst and stringMLST for ST-based classification. In the case of stringMLST, kmer lengths varied from 10 to 90 to identify the optimal value (highest percentage of agreement with the standard MLST approach), across all four species (y-axis). If both programs outputted identical ST calls (either number of missing/blank value), the call was defined as a match; otherwise, it was identified as a mismatch, and the percentage of agreement (x-axis, concordance) was calculated accordingly. The dashed line on the x-axis represents the percentage agreement for the kmer value of 35 which is used as a default parameter by stringMLST.

Fig 7. Phylogeny-guided display of optimal kmer length and algorithmic performance when using stringMLST for ST mapping across bacterial species. (A) Core-genome based phylogenetic display of stringMLST results across the twenty-three zoonotic serovars of *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* lineage I (*S. enterica*). The branches are colored based on the optimal kmer length which gives the lowest percentage of ST miscalls (ST calls that returned missing/blank values for stringMLST). The outer ring present in the phylogeny is colored based on the corresponding ST miscall percentages associated with each optimal kmer length. The dataset used to identify the optimal kmer length and percentage of ST miscalls

was composed of 2,300 genomes (100 genomes per serovar) and the phylogenetic tree was generated using twenty-three core-genome sequences (one of each serovar to facilitate data visualization); (B) Single locus-based (i.e., 16S rRNA gene) phylogenetic display of stringMLST results across fourteen divergent bacterial pathogens, including twenty-three representative genomes across each zoonotic serovar of the *S. enterica* species. The tree branches are colored based on the optimal kmer length which minimizes the percentage of ST miscalls (ST calls that returned missing/blank values for stringMLST). The outer ring present in the phylogeny corresponds to ST miscall percentage associated with each optimal kmer length. The dataset used to identify the optimal kmer length and percentage of ST miscalls was composed of 14,000 genomes (1,000 genomes for each bacterial pathogen) and 2,300 *Salmonella* genomes (100 genomes per serovar). The phylogeny (B) was generated using the 16S rRNA representative sequences across 37 bacterial species (one for each species was used to facilitate visualization). All phylogeny-based visualization were generated using iTOL version 6.4.

Fig 8. Comparison between the computational and statistical performance of mlst and stringMLST when using ProkEvo to run both programs.

Two subsets, one with 100 and the second one with 1,000 randomly chosen genomes, were selected from *C. jejuni*, *L. monocytogenes*, one major serovar of *S. enterica* (*S.* Typhimurium) and *S. aureus* to compare the performance of running mlst or stringMLST through ProkEvo. The performance and statistical metrics used for comparison were: (A) Total runtime of individual workflow in minutes; (B) Percentage of non-classified STs (ST calls that returned missing/blank values); and (C) Percentage of agreement (concordance) between programs ("good" or "bad" ST calls that matched between mlst and stringMLST).