Title: Strain variation in *Clostridioides difficile* toxin activity associated with genomic variation

at both PaLoc and non-PaLoc loci

Running title: *C. difficile* toxin GWAS & evolution

Katie Saund,[a] Ali Pirani, [a,b] D. Borden Lacy[c,d], Philip C. Hanna[a], Evan Snitkin[a,b#]

[a]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan,

USA

[b]Department of Internal Medicine/Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Michigan, Ann

Arbor, Michigan, USA

[c]Department of Pathology, Microbiology and Immunology, Vanderbilt University School of

Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee, USA

[d]The Veterans Affairs Tennessee Valley Healthcare System, Nashville, Tennessee, USA

#Address correspondence to Evan Snitkin, esnitkin@med.umich.edu

Abstract word count:

Manuscript word count:

ABSTRACT

Clinical disease from *Clostridioides difficile* infection can be mediated by two toxins and their

neighboring regulatory genes encoded within the five-gene pathogenicity locus (PaLoc). We

provide several lines of evidence that the toxin activity of *C. difficile* may be modulated by

genomic variants outside of the PaLoc. We used a phylogenetic tree-based approach to

demonstrate discordance between toxin activity and PaLoc evolutionary history, an elastic net

method to show the insufficiency of PaLoc variants alone to model toxin activity, and a

convergence-based bacterial genome-wide association study (GWAS) to identify correlations

between non-PaLoc loci with changes in toxin activity. Combined, these data support a model of

C. difficile disease wherein toxin activity may be strongly affected by many non-PaLoc loci.

Additionally, we characterize multiple other *in vitro* phenotypes relevant to human infections

including germination and sporulation. These phenotypes vary greatly in their clonality,

variability, convergence, and concordance with genomic variation. Lastly, we highlight the

intersection of loci identified by GWAS for different phenotypes and clinical severity. This

strategy to identify the overlapping loci can facilitate the identification of genetic variation

linking phenotypic variation to clinical outcomes.

IMPORTANCE

Clostridioides difficile has two major disease mediating toxins, A and B, encoded within the

pathogenicity locus (PaLoc). In this study we demonstrate via multiple approaches that genomic

variants outside of the PaLoc are associated with changes in toxin activity. These genomic

variants may provide new avenues of exploration in the hunt for novel disease modifying

interventions. Additionally, we provide insight into the evolution of several additional

phenotypes also critical to clinical infection such as sporulation, germination, and growth rate.

These *in vitro* phenotypes display a range of responses to evolutionary pressures and as such

vary in their appropriateness for certain bacterial genome wide association study approaches. We

used a convergence-based association method to identify the genomic variants most correlated

with both changes in these phenotypes and disease severity. These overlapping loci may be

important to both bacterial function and human clinical disease.

INTRODUCTION

Clostridioides difficile is a toxin-producing, healthcare-associated bacterial pathogen. It exhibits

extensive genetic variation due to its highly mobile genome, a large pangenome, and a most

recent common ancestor for clades C1-5 dating back approximately 3.89 million years (1, 2).

Such genomic variability has enabled *C. difficile* adaptation to multiple host species and to

spread among humans in both nosocomial and community contexts (3). Underlying this genetic

variation, is phenotypic variation in many traits including toxin production, sporulation,

germination, growth, and virulence (4). This genetic and phenotypic variation has led many to

ask whether different genetic backgrounds of *C. difficile* may differ in their propensity to cause

severe infections. To this end, many studies have sought to identify key genetic traits harbored

by putative hypervirulent strains, such as Ribotype 027 (RT027). Despite this interest and

intense study, the genetic basis for variation in phenotypes relevant to the *C. difficile* infection

lifecycle remains limited.

Disease during *C. difficile* infection is mediated by extracellular toxins, primarily Toxins

A (TcdA) and B (TcdB), which damage the cytoskeletons of intestinal cells leading to cell death

and gut inflammation. These two toxins are large proteins with four domains:

glucosyltransferase, autoprotease, pore-forming, and C-terminal combined repetitive

oligopeptides (CROPs) (5). Toxins A and B are both located within the pathogenicity locus

(PaLoc) with three other genes: *tcdR*, *tcdC*, and *tcdE*. *tcdR* is a positive regulator of *tcdA* and

tcdB and encodes an RNA polymerase factor (6). *tcdC* may be a negative regulator of *tcdR* (6).

tcdE encodes a holin-like protein and may contribute to toxin secretion (7). Many factors and

systems are implicated in PaLoc regulation including growth phase, access to specific

metabolites, sporulation, quorum sensing, and some flagellar proteins (8). In addition to toxin

production, other phenotypes may influence *C. difficile* disease severity or transmission,

including sporulation, germination, and growth (9–11).

Approaches for uncovering the genomic determinants of bacterial phenotypes, such as

toxin activity, include *in vitro* assays, comparative genomics, and bacterial genome-wide

association studies (bGWAS). An advantage of bGWAS is the ability to sift through existing

genetic variation in bacterial populations to identify variants associated with natural phenotypic

variation. In this way, bGWAS can provide insight into phenotypic evolution, and enable the

identification of variants of interest that mediate modulation of clinically relevant phenotypes,

such as virulence (12). Here, we capitalized on a diverse collection of over 100 *C. difficile*

isolates for which multiple phenotypes had previously been characterized (4). We performed

whole genome sequencing and used bGWAS to uncover novel genotype-phenotype associations.

We explore these genotype-phenotype associations and describe the phenotype variation through

phylogenetic and evolutionary analyses. Our analyses reveal the influence of genetic variation on

phenotypic variation and help illuminate factors that may be influencing clinical disease.

FIG 1 Clinical *C. difficile* sample phenotypes aligned with the phylogenetic tree. Color indicates

ribotype. ND = No data. *In vitro* phenotypes were log transformed. Infections were classified as

severe or not severe.

RESULTS

Distinct evolutionary trajectories of clinically relevant *C. difficile* phenotypes.

To improve our understanding of the evolution of phenotypic diversity in *C. difficile* we

performed whole-genome sequencing on a clinical isolate collection that had previously been

assayed for toxin activity, two measures of germination, two measures of sporulation, and

growth rate (4, 10). Overlaying these phenotypes on a whole-genome phylogeny revealed

distinct patterns for each phenotype (Fig. 1). Toxin activity and germination in Tc and Gly are

clonal phenotypes that show stable inheritance within lineages, as evidenced by high

phylogenetic signal (Fig. 2A). For example, toxin activity displays clonal lineages with

uniformly high (e.g. RT027) and low (e.g. RT014) toxin activity (Fig. 1). In contrast,

germination in Tc and growth rate are less clonal, with extensive variation even within clonal

lineages (Fig. 1,2A). Finally, the two sporulation phenotypes show the least clonality, with

virtually no clustering on the phylogeny (Fig. 1,2A). Overall, the range in clonality and

phylogenetic signal observed for these phenotypes suggests that despite all being central to the

C. difficile life cycle, that they are shaped by different evolutionary pressures.

FIG 2 Phenotype phylogenetic signal and genomic model. (A) The phylogenetic signal of each

phenotype (black) and its negative controls (grey). WN = white noise. BM = Brownian motion.

(B) Elastic nets modeling each phenotype, with high R^2 values indicating that the phenotype is

strongly predicted by genetic variation in SNPs. Synonymous SNPs were excluded from this

analysis.

In addition to varying in their clonality, the six phenotypes show distinct differences in

their overall degree of variation (Table 1). Toxin activity had the largest dispersion with a

geometric coefficient of variation of 5.4. The combination of high clonality and high dispersion

in toxin activity suggests that *C. difficile* may have evolved multiple successful toxin strategies

or have different evolutionary trajectories that are difficult to escape once begun. In contrast, the

near uniformity observed in germination in Tc and Gly, could indicate either strong stabilizing

selection or inadequate precision of the assay.

122   **TABLE 1** Dispersion (geometric coefficient of variation) and convergence (ratio metric of

123   convergence) of the log transformed phenotypes.

	Germination in Tc	Germination in Tc & Gly	Growth rate	Total spores	Viable spores	Toxin activity
Geometric coefficient of variation	2.8	0.4	0.5	2.2	0.6	5.4
Ratio metric of convergence	46.8	18.0	43.0	38.7	27.3	33.0

Phenotypes vary with respect to their association with genetic variation.

Next, we sought to understand the degree to which phenotypic variability in this dataset

is genetically encoded. The phenotype best modeled by genomic variants is toxin activity with

$R^2 = 0.90$ (Fig. 2B). Growth rate, both sporulation phenotypes, and gemination in Tc and Gly

have much lower R^2 values, all $R^2 < 0.50$. Germination in Tc has a high R^2 value, $R^2 = 0.99$, but

this finding appears to be spurious as two of the three negative controls using randomly

permuted data have similarly high R^2: 0.00, 0.91, and 1.00. The germination and number of

spores phenotypes are so poorly encoded by genomic variation that it is suggestive that the

assays may lack sufficient precision to capture relevant strain variation, while toxin activity

appears far more genetically deterministic.

Phenotypes show a range in their level of phylogenetic convergence

A striking feature observed when overlaying the phenotype panel on the whole-genome

phylogeny was variation in the frequency of convergence of high or low phenotype values.

Convergence, the independent evolution of a trait, may imply the existence of environmental

pressures that select towards a specific value or constrain the phenotype's value. To quantify

convergence of the different phenotypes we employed the ratio metric, where a higher ratio

metric value suggests more episodes of convergence. Germination in Tc has the most

convergence, 46.8. The germination in Tc and Gly and spore viability phenotypes have the least

convergence, 18.0 and 27.3 respectively. These low values may be driven in part by the lack of

dispersion in the phenotype values. The remaining phenotypes demonstrate intermediate levels

of phylogenetic convergence. Below we seek to exploit the high level of convergence in certain

phenotypes to identify genetic drivers of their variation.

Identifying genetic variation associated with phenotypic variation through genome-wide

association study

Having observed differences in the evolutionary patterns of different phenotypes, we next

sought to identify the specific genetic variation that may be underlying phenotypic variation by

performing a genome-wide association study (GWAS) for each phenotype. Due to the high

convergence in several of the phenotypes (Table 1) and extensive genetic variation in our isolate

collection, we opted for a convergence-based GWAS approach that could identify variants of

interest by their non-random co-convergence with a phenotype. The genotypes tested included

approximately 69,600 SNPs, 8,400 indels, and 7,500 accessory genes. Significantly associated

variants were identified for growth rate, number of spores, toxin activity, germination in Tc, and

severity.

FIG 3 Overlapping GWAS results. (A) Heatmap indicates the number of shared GWAS results

with significant *P*-values and high levels of convergence in the Continuous Test (continuous

phenotypes) or Synchronous Test (Severity). Asterisks indicate significantly more overlapping

results than expected by chance (*P* < 0.05). The two phenotypes lacking any GWAS results with

significant *P*-values and high levels of convergence were excluded. (B) Shared hits between the

toxin activity and severe infection GWAS. Top: phenotype. Center: heatmap indicating the

presence of loci with both significant *P*-values and high levels of convergence in both toxin

activity and severity GWAS results. Bottom: phylogenetic tree labeled by ribotype.

Overlapping GWAS results. Despite the phenotypes showing distinct evolutionary

patterns, we first explored whether there was evidence of overlap in the genetic circuits

modulating the different traits. We cataloged the extent of this overlap by counting the number of

intersecting genomic loci with both high significance and convergence in each pair of GWAS

results. Three of the four phenotypes shared more hits with the severe infection GWAS results

than expected by chance via a permutation test (Fig. 3A). Toxin activity and severe infection

have the most overlap with 7 shared loci. These shared loci include six accessory genes and a

frameshift mutation at Glycine 209 in flagellar hook-associated protein 2 (*fliD)* (Fig. 3B). The

fliD finding is consistent with known co-regulation that occurs between flagellar and toxin

systems in *C. difficile* that is mediated in part by SigD, a sigma factor that binds to a *tcdR*

promoter region and positively regulates *tcdR* (13).

FIG 4 Genome-wide association study identified genomic variants associated with toxin activity

variation. (A) GWAS results. Tested loci are either accessory genes (blue; N=4,352), SNPs

(pink; N=12,167), or indels (green; N=1,843). The red horizontal line indicates a False

Discovery Rate of 15%. The red vertical line separates low vs high convergence. (B)

Significantly associated loci from GWAS located in the PaLoc. Of the 633 PaLoc variants (SNP

N=563, Indel N=70) tested by GWAS only the variants significantly associated are plotted as

vertical bars (SNP N=71, Indel N=16). Top annotation: toxin protein domains in *tcdB*. Center

annotation: gene. Bottom annotation: promoter locations. (C) Left: phylogenetic tree labeled by

ribotype. Center: heatmap indicating the presence of loci significantly associated with toxin

activity and with high convergence. Right: toxin activity.

Genetic variation associated with modulation of toxin activity

For the remainder of our analysis, we focused on understanding genetic variation associated with

variation in toxin activity. In addition to the central role of toxin in *C. difficile* disease, our

decision to focus on toxin was motivated by it being the phenotype being best explained by

genetic variation in sequenced strains (Figure 2B). In the following sections we examine variants

playing a key role in modulating toxin activity.

The toxin activity GWAS identified many genomic variants both significantly associated

with toxin activity changes and had high levels of convergence (Fig. 4A). As the PaLoc encodes

toxin genes and regulators we expected that variants located within the PaLoc would be

significantly associated with toxin activity and used this as a positive control for our analysis.

Consistent with this, we observed PaLoc variants in the pool of significant results associated

with toxin activity. Eighty-seven of the 220 loci significantly associated with toxin activity occur

in the PaLoc. Given that the toxin activity assay used is a measure of Toxin B activity it is

particularly reassuring that these 87 PaLoc loci include 75 *tcdB* variants and 2 *tcdR-tcdB*

intergenic region variants (Fig. 4B). Indeed, these variants are a significant enrichment compared

to the number of variants within or flanking *tcdB* that are expected by chance using a

permutation approach, $P = 0.0001$ (median = 1; range = 0-10). *tcdB* variants were found in all

four protein domains, but the significantly associated variants are mostly found within the

glucosyltransferase and autoprotease domains (Fig. 4B). Certain significant missense variants

within *tcdB* have plausible functional impacts on Toxin B such as an adenosine to cytosine

transversion at position 1967 which changes an aspartic acid to alanine; this mutation occurs near

the zinc binding site and could theoretically affect toxin autoprocessing within the host cell. Of

the 15 tested variants that occur within the *tcdR-tcdB* intergenic region, 5 were significantly

associated with toxin activity. Three of these variants occur within a *tcdB* promoter suggesting a

potential role in modulating sigma factor binding and therefore altering *tcdB* transcription. A

notable lack of association was observed between an adenosine deletion at nucleotide 117 in

tcdC that has been suggested to cause increased toxin production in RT027 (14). This deletion

was found in all 26 RT027 samples as well as in 3 additional samples ("Other" ribotype) but did

not reach significance in the GWAS, $P=0.95$.

Next, we sought to generate hypotheses about new associations between genomic

variants and toxin activity that reside outside of the PaLoc. The variants that were significant and

had high ε, a metric of shared genotype-phenotype convergence, are cataloged in File S1 and

plotted in Fig. 4C (15). A single ε value captures the number of tree edges where both a genotype

is mutated and the toxin activity value has a large change. ε values close to zero suggest that the

genotype mutates on very few edges where the toxin activity changes drastically. The loci

associated with changes in toxin activity are present in multiple, independent lineages (Fig. 4C).

The previously mentioned frameshift mutation in *fliD* is the variant most strongly associated

with changes in toxin activity when ranked by ε then *P*-value. The next most strongly associated

variant maps to CD630_02364 which is annotated as a putative signaling protein in the reference

genome CD630. The other most strongly associated variants are poorly annotated accessory

genes. The significant accessory genes identified by this analysis may yield profitable results in

mechanistic studies dissecting *C*. *difficile* toxin activity and could be prioritized for further

characterization.

FIG 5 *tcdB* variation does not fully model toxin activity. (A) Elastic net model performance of

toxin activity. Models were built from *tcdB* variants, PaLoc variants, or whole genome (WG)

variants. Toxin activity with a tree built from (B) the whole genome or (C) just *tcdB*.

Genetic variation at PaLoc accounts for only half of phenotypic variation in toxin activity.

The GWAS identified both PaLoc and non-PaLoc loci correlated with variation in toxin

activity. To understand the relative contribution of genetic variation in the PaLoc to variation in

toxin activity we employed an elastic net approach. Models of toxin activity constructed with

different subsets of variants found that PaLoc variants and *tcdB* variants have similar abilities to

model toxin activity, $R^2 = 0.48$ and $R^2 = 0.46$ respectively (Fig. 5A). However, variants from the

whole genome build a more accurate model of toxin activity, $R^2 = 0.90$ (Fig. 5A). Of the 634

variants in the PaLoc, 404 (64%) occur in *tcdB* or in its flanking intergenic regions; in the best

performing elastic net model derived from PaLoc variants, 34/61 (56%) of the variants are

mutations in *tcdB* or its flanking regions. In the whole genome model only 17/1795 (1%) of

variants occur in *tcdB* or its flanking regions.

To assess the predictive capacity of PaLoc variation in a different way, we compared

phylogenetic trees built from whole genome variants and the *tcdB* gene. As there is far less

variation in *tcdB* than the whole genome, we observe many polytomies in the *tcdB* gene tree and

none in the whole genome tree (Fig 5B,C). While the *tcdB* gene tree's toxin activity is better

modeled by Brownian motion, $\lambda = 0.94$, than in the whole genome tree, $\lambda = 0.75$ (Fig. 2A), there

remains much toxin activity variation unexplained by tree structure. Given the unexplained toxin

activity variation on the *tcdB* gene tree and variation not captured in the toxin activity elastic net

model, we conclude that while *tcdB* gene variation is likely an important mediator in the

evolution of toxin activity, other loci play a key role as well. Finally, the whole genome model

suggests that many loci besides *tcdB* may affect *C. difficile* toxicity and therefore a wider lens for

examining genetic influences on toxicity will be fruitful.

DISCUSSION

C. difficile is a genetically diverse pathogen, with extensive variation in both its core and

accessory genome. Currently, we have a limited understanding of the functional impact of most

of this variation and how it relates to *C. difficile* infection. Here, we attempted to improve our

understanding of the genotype to phenotype map in *C. difficile* by analyzing variation in

clinically relevant phenotypes in the context of *C. difficile* genomic variants. We observe that

despite their central role to the *C. difficile* transmission and infection cycle sporulation,

germination, growth and toxin activity show distinct evolutionary trajectories. Focusing on the

phenotype thought to be most closely linked to virulence, we observe that toxin activity is highly

clonal, with lineages tending to either possess high or low toxin activity. Consistent with prior

reports we find that variation in toxin activity can be modulated by variants in the PaLoc,

however we find that more than 50% of phenotypic variation is associated with genetic variation

outside of the PaLoc.

Our exploration of these *C. difficile* phenotypes revealed a broad range of clonality,

dispersion, association with genomic variation, and convergence. As such, each phenotype

appears to be shaped by different selection forces. The existence of phenotypes that show no

association with the recombination filtered phylogeny could indicate either a lack of precision in

the laboratory assay or a strong role for recombinant genomic regions in shaping these

phenotypes. We focused our analysis on toxin activity, in part, because of the precision of the *in*

vitro assay results and its high degree of genetic determinism. Regardless of the basis for the lack

of phylogenetic signal in some of the non-toxin phenotypes, these results show how overlaying

phenotypic variation on whole-genome phylogenies provides useful context for interpreting and

scrutinizing experimental measurements, and in this case clearly demonstrates the rich and

varied patterns of evolution among *C. difficile* strains.

Toxigenic bacterial species that require live transmission may undergo strong selective

pressure to promote host survival and therefore bias towards lower toxin activity (16). In

contrast, sporogenic *C. difficile* can survive and transmit even after the host dies; this may reduce

the strength of selection on toxin activity and therefore many different toxin strategies are

successful. Indeed, there are prolific toxigenic and non-toxigenic strains of *C. difficile*.

Additionally, the species has had multiple independent losses of the PaLoc (17), with our results

indicating that even strains harboring an intact PaLoc may evolve to have decreased toxin

activity. The *C. difficile* strains with high toxin activity may have success by shaping a hostile

metabolic state in the host gut that these bacteria are able to uniquely exploit (18) or its more

severe, inflammatory infection which results in diarrhea and therefore increased transmission.

This then raises the question of what the selective pressure for lower toxin activity may be. One

possibility is that toxin activity itself may not be the most critical aspect of the toxin upon which

evolution is acting, with other aspects such as toxin immunogenicity potentially evoking a

stronger selection pressure. Toxin that evades immune recognition could lead to longer

infections and therefore increased transmission, so the strongest selective pressure may be at the

surface domains of the toxin proteins rather than on regulators of toxin activity (19). For

example, we observed multiple missense variants on the surface of tcdB in this isolate collection,

including a glutamic acid 329 to glycine missense variant and threonine 430 to alanine.

Our study has several important limitations. First, the limited sample size of this *C.*

difficile collection could lead to underreporting of clonality of some phenotypes for

underrepresented ribotypes and limits power to detect variation with smaller phenotypic impacts.

Second, many genomic features such as copy number variants, large structural variants, and

plasmids were not included in our GWAS or elastic net models, therefore these analyses are

missing some genome encoded information. Similarly, we did not consider the complexity of

epistatic interactions between genomic variants on phenotypes.

A replication study in a second *C. difficile* cohort in which the toxin activity assay and

GWAS is repeated could help prioritize the genomic variants more likely to be causal of changes

in toxin activity. The loci identified in both this study and the proposed study would be higher

confidence candidates for experiments that examine the effect of those potential variants on toxin

activity. Additional studies investigating *C. difficile in vitro* phenotypes from an evolutionary

perspective would help to prioritize the phenotypes that may offer the most insight into the

success and regulation of certain strains.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study population and *in vitro* characterization. The University of Michigan Institutional

Review Board approved all sample and clinical data collection protocols used in this study

(HUM00034766). Where applicable, written, informed consent was received from all patients

prior to inclusion in this study. Stool samples were collected from a cohort of 106 Michigan

Medicine patients with *C. difficile* infection from 2010-2011, which included all severe cases

during the study period (4, 10). Cases were classified as severe if the infection required ICU

admission or interventional surgery, or if the patient died within 30 days of infection diagnosis.

A clonal spore stock from each patient was used for ribotyping and *in vitro* studies. Previous

experiments characterized the germination in taurocholate (TC; %), and germination in Tc and

glycine (Gly; %), maximum growth rates (OD_{600}/hour), total spore production (heat resistant

colon forming units per ml), viable spores (%), and equivalent toxin B activity (ng/ml) (4, 10).

Taurocholate is a physiologic bile salt known to cause *C. difficile* germination; glycine can

increase germination with taurocholate (20). Samples were classified as severe infections if they

were collected from a patient whose *C. difficile* infection required ICU admission or

interventional surgery, or if the patient died within 30 days of infection diagnosis (4, 10).

Genomic analysis. The spore stocks were grown in an anaerobic chamber overnight on

taurocholate-coition-cycloserine-fructose agar plates. The next day a single colony of each

sample was picked and grown in Brain Heart Infusion medium with yeast extract liquid culture

media overnight. The vegetative *C. difficile* cells were pelleted by centrifugation, washed, and

then total genomic DNA was extracted. Genomic DNA extracted with the MoBio PowerMag

Microbial DNA Isolation Kit (Qiagen) from *C. difficile* isolates (N=108) was prepared for

sequencing using the Illumina Nextera DNA Flex Library Preparation Kit. Sequencing was

performed on either an Illumina HiSeq 4000 System at the University of Michigan Advanced

Genomics Core or an Illumina MiSeq System at the University of Michigan Microbial Systems

Molecular Biology Laboratories. Quality of reads was assessed with FastQC v0.11.9 (21).

Adapter sequences and low-quality bases were removed with Trimmomatic v0.36 (22). Variants

were identified by mapping filtered reads to the CD630 reference genome (GenBank accession

number AM180355.1) using bwa v0.7.17 (23), removing polymerase chain reaction duplicates

with Picard 2.21.7 (24), removing clipped alignments using Samclip 0.4.0 (25), and calling

variants with SAMtools v1.11and bcftools (26). Variants were filtered from raw results using

GATK's VariantFiltration v3.8 (QUAL, >100; MQ, >50; >=10 reads supporting variant; and FQ,

<0.025) (27). SNPs and indels were referenced to the ancestral allele using snitkitr v0.0.0.9000

(28). Pangenome analysis was performed with roary (29). Accessory genes annotations were

assigned by prokka v1.14.5 (30).

Data availability. Sequence data are available under Bioproject PRJNA594943. Details

on sequenced strains are available in File S2. Sequences for genes identified by roary are

available in File S3.

Phylogenetic analysis. Consensus files generated during variant calling were

recombination filtered using Gubbins v3.0.0 (31). The alleles at each position that passed

filtering were concatenated to generate a non-core variant alignment relative to the CD630

reference genome. Alleles that did not pass filtering were considered unknown (denoted as N in

the alignment). Variant positions in the alignment were used to reconstruct a maximum

likelihood phylogeny with IQ-TREE v1.5.5 using ultrafast bootstrap with 1,000 replicates (32,

33). ModelFinder limited to ascertainment bias-corrected models was used to identify the best

nucleotide substitution model (34). The tree was midpoint rooted. The *tcdB* multiple sequence

alignment was built by PRANK v.170427 using only the *tcdB* gene and the resulting tree was

midpoint rooted (35). The trees are available in Files S4 and S5.

Genome-wide association studies. GWAS were performed with hogwash v1.2.4 (15).

Phenotype data were natural log transformed. Hogwash settings: bootstrap threshold=0.95,

permutations=10,000, false discovery rate=15%. The analysis included SNPs, indels, and

accessory genes. The intersection of hogwash results was restricted to results with $\varepsilon > 0.15$ and

P-value < 0.15. Only SNPs classified as having "Moderate", "High", or "Modifier" impact by

SnpEff v4.3.1 were included (36).

Data analysis. Data analysis with R v3.6.2 (37) was performed with following packages:

ape v5.3 (38), aplot v0.0.6 (39), data.table v1.12.8 (40), ggtree v2.0.4 (41), ggpubr v0.4.0 (42),

pheatmap v1.0.12 (43), phytools v0.6-99 (44), tidyverse v1.3.0 (45). Conda v4.9.2 was used to

maintain working environments (46). Analysis code is available at

https://github.com/katiesaund/cdifficile_gwas.

Permutation testing. The empirical *P*-value for enrichment of toxin variants in the

significant GWAS results and shared results in the overlapping GWAS section were generated

via permutation testing. This approach generates a *P*-value by comparing the observed number of

events in the data to a distribution of the number of events simulated under the null hypothesis.

The null distribution was generated from random sampling without replacement repeated in

10,000 trials (toxin variants) or 1,000 trials (overlapping hits). Multiple testing correction was

applied to the overlapping hits analysis using Bonferroni correction.

Convergence analysis. We calculated the degree of convergence of each phenotype

using the ratio method (47), which is the ratio of two sample's pairwise patristic distance divided

by their pairwise phenotypic distance. We report the average of the scaled pairwise branch length

distance (patristic distance) divided by scaled pairwise phenotypic distance for each phenotype.

A high value suggests an episode of convergence.

Geometric coefficient of variance. We calculated the dispersion of each phenotype as

defined by the geometric coefficient of variance: $\sqrt{e^{\sigma^2} - 1}$ where σ is the standard deviation of

the log transformed data.

Phylogenetic signal. Phylogenetic signal is a metric that captures the tendency for

closely related samples on a tree to be more similar to each other than they are to random

samples on the tree. We calculated phylogenetic signal for each continuous phenotype using

Pagel's λ (48). Note that a phenotype that is modeled well by Brownian motion has a λ near 1

while a white noise phenotype has a λ near 0 (48). Negative controls for the phenotypes were

created by randomly redistributing each phenotype on the tree.

Elastic net modeling. We calculated the degree of genetic encoding of each phenotype

by modeling a phenotype from genomic variants using elastic net regularization as implemented

by pyseer. Pyseer v1.3 command line arguments: --wg enet --n-fold 10 (49). SNPs, indels and

accessory genes were all used to model all continuous phenotypes. For all elastic net models only

SNPs classified as having "Moderate", "High", or "Modifier" impact by SnpEff were included

(36). Toxin activity was additionally modeled by 1) a model built from just PaLoc SNPs and

indels and 2) a model built from just *tcdB* SNPs and indels. To determine the value of α, a

parameter which controls the ratio of L1 and L2 regularization in the model, five α values were

tested for each model: $0.01, 0.245, 0.500, 0.745$, and 0.990. The model results with the highest

R^2 value were reported. The best α for models of germination in Tc, germination in Tc and Gly,

total spores, and toxin activity (all variants) is 0.01. The best α for models of viable spores and

growth rate is 0.245. The best α to model toxin activity (*tcdB*) is 0.500. The best α to model

toxin activity (PaLoc) is 0.745. Negative controls for the phenotypes were created by randomly

redistributing each phenotype on the tree.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

File S1: Toxin GWAS results. A table with variant name, p-value, and epsilon value.

File S2: Bioproject details for the sequenced strains.

File S3: Sequences of the genes identified by roary.

File S4: Phylogenetic tree.

File S5: *tcdB* gene phylogenetic tree.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

K. S. was supported by the National Institutes of Health (T32GM007544). E. S. S. and A. P. were supported by the National Institutes of Health (1U01Al124255). Work in the Lacy lab is supported by NIH AI095755 and VA BX002943.

REFERENCES

1. Mullany P, Allan E, Roberts AP. 2015. Mobile genetic elements in Clostridium difficile and their role in genome function. Res Microbiol 166:361–367.

2. Knight DR, Imwattana K, Kullin B, Guerrero-Araya E, Paredes-Sabja D, Didelot X, Dingle KE, Eyre DW, Rodríguez C, Riley T V. 2021. Major genetic discontinuity and novel toxigenic species in Clostridioides difficile taxonomy. Elife 10:1–25.

3. Knight DR, Elliott B, Chang BJ, Perkins TT, Riley T V. 2015. Diversity and evolution in the genome of Clostridium difficile. Clin Microbiol Rev 28:721–741.

4. Carlson PE, Walk ST, Bourgis AET, Liu MW, Kopliku F, Lo E, Young VB, Aronoff DM, Hanna PC. 2013. The relationship between phenotype, ribotype, and clinical disease in human Clostridium difficile isolates. Anaerobe 24:109–116.

5. Pruitt RN, Lacy DB. 2012. Toward a structural understanding of Clostridium difficile toxins A and B. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 2:28.

6. Monot M, Eckert C, Lemire A, Hamiot A, Dubois T, Tessier C, Dumoulard B, Hamel B, Petit A, Lalande V, Ma L, Bouchier C, Barbut F, Dupuy B. 2015. Clostridium difficile: New Insights into the Evolution of the Pathogenicity Locus. Sci Rep 5.

7. Govind R, Dupuy B. 2012. Secretion of Clostridium difficile Toxins A and B Requires the Holin-like Protein TcdE. PLoS Pathog 8:e1002727.

8. Martin-Verstraete I, Peltier J, Dupuy B. 2016. The regulatory networks that control

Clostridium difficile toxin synthesis. Toxins (Basel). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing

Institute.

9.   Burns DA, Minton NP. 2011. Sporulation studies in Clostridium difficile. J Microbiol

Methods 87:133–138.

10.   Carlson PE, Kaiser AM, Mccolm SA, Bauer JM, Young VB, Aronoff DM, Hanna PC.

2015. Variation in germination of Clostridium difficile clinical isolates correlates to

disease severity. Anaerobe 33:64–70.

11.   Tschudin-Sutter S, Braissant O, Erb S, Stranden A, Bonkat G, Frei R, Widmer AF. 2016.

Growth Patterns of Clostridium difficile - Correlations with Strains, Binary Toxin and

Disease Severity: A Prospective Cohort Study. PLoS One 11:e0161711.

12.   Laabei M, Recker M, Rudkin JK, Aldeljawi M, Gulay Z, Sloan TJ, Williams P, Endres JL,

Bayles KW, Fey PD, Yajjala VK, Widhelm T, Hawkins E, Lewis K, Parfett S, Scowen L,

Peacock SJ, Holden M, Wilson D, Read TD, Van Den Elsen J, Priest NK, Feil EJ, Hurst

LD, Josefsson E, Massey RC. 2014. Predicting the virulence of MRSA from its genome

sequence. Genome Res 24:839–849.

13.   El Meouche I, Peltier J, Monot M, Soutourina O, Pestel-Caron M, Dupuy B, Pons JL.

2013. Characterization of the SigD regulon of C. difficile and its positive control of toxin

production through the regulation of tcdR. PLoS One 8:1–17.

14.   Warny M, Pepin J, Fang A, Killgore G, Thompson A, Brazier J, Frost E, McDonald LC.

2005. Toxin production by an emerging strain of Clostridium difficile associated with

outbreaks of severe disease in North America and Europe. Lancet 366:1079–1084.

15.   Saund K, Snitkin ES. 2020. Hogwash: three methods for genome-wide association studies

in bacteria. Microb Genomics https://doi.org/10.1099/mgen.0.000469.

16.   Rudkin JK, McLoughlin RM, Preston A, Massey RC. 2017. Bacterial toxins: Offensive,

defensive, or something else altogether? PLoS Pathog 13:1–12.

17.   Mansfield MJ, Tremblay BJM, Zeng J, Wei X, Hodgins H, Worley J, Bry L, Dong M,

Doxey AC. 2020. Phylogenomics of 8,839 Clostridioides difficile genomes reveals

recombination-driven evolution and diversification of toxin A and B. PLoS Pathog 16:1–

24.

18.   Fletcher JR, Pike CM, Parsons RJ, Rivera AJ, Foley MH, McLaren MR, Montgomery SA,

Theriot CM. 2021. Clostridioides difficile exploits toxin-mediated inflammation to alter

the host nutritional landscape and exclude competitors from the gut microbiota. Nat

Commun 12:1–14.

19.   Mansfield MJ, Tremblay BJ-M, Zeng J, Wei X, Hodgins H, Worley J, Bry L, Dong M,

Doxey AC. 2020. Phylogenomics of 8,839 Clostridioides difficile genomes reveals

recombination-driven evolution and diversification of toxin A and B. Biorvix.

20.   Sorg JA, Sonenshein AL. 2008. Bile salts and glycine as cogerminants for Clostridium

difficile spores. J Bacteriol 190:2505–2512.

21.   Andrews Si. 2010. FastQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence data.

22.   Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. Bioinformatics 30:2114–2120.

23.   Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler

transform. Bioinformatics 25:1754–1760.

24.   Broad Institute. Picard Tools.

25.   Seemann T. samclip.

26.   Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G,

Durbin R. 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics

25:2078–2079.

27.   McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E, Sivachenko A, Cibulskis K, Kernytsky A, Garimella K,

Altshuler D, Gabriel S, Daly M, DePristo MA. 2010. The Genome Analysis Toolkit: A

MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. Genome Res

20:1297–1303.

28.   Saund K, Lapp Z, Thiede SN. snitkitr.

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

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

Bioinformatics 31:3691–3693.

30.   Seemann T. 2014. Prokka: Rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics

30:2068–2069.

31.   Croucher NJ, Page AJ, Connor TR, Delaney AJ, Keane JA, Bentley SD, Parkhill J, Harris

SR. 2015. Rapid phylogenetic analysis of large samples of recombinant bacterial whole

genome sequences using Gubbins. Nucleic Acids Res 43:e15.

32.   Nguyen LT, Schmidt HA, Von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2015. IQ-TREE: A fast and

effective stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies. Mol Biol

Evol 32:268–274.

33.   Thi Hoang D, Chernomor O, von Haeseler A, Quang Minh B, Sy Vinh L, Rosenberg MS.

2017. UFBoot2: Improving the Ultrafast Bootstrap Approximation. Mol Biol Evol

35:518–522.

34.   Kalyaanamoorthy S, Minh BQ, Wong TKF, Von Haeseler A, Jermiin LS. 2017.

ModelFinder: Fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. Nat Methods

14:587–589.

35.   Löytynoja A. 2014. Phylogeny-aware alignment with PRANK. Methods Mol Biol

1079:155–170.

36.   Cingolani P, Platts A, Wang LL, Coon M, Nguyen T, Wang L, Land SJ, Lu X, Ruden

DM. 2012. A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide

polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of Drosophila melanogaster strain w1118;

iso-2; iso-3. Fly (Austin) 6:80–92.

37.   R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 3.5.0. R

Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

38.   Paradis E, Schliep K. 2019. Ape 5.0: An environment for modern phylogenetics and

evolutionary analyses in R. Bioinformatics 35:526–528.

39.   Yu G. 2020. aplot: Decorate a "ggplot" with Associated Information. 0.0.6.

40.   Dowle M, Srinivasan A. 2020. data.table: Extension of 'data.frame'. 1.12.8.

41.   Yu G, Smith DK, Zhu H, Guan Y, Lam TTY. 2017. Ggtree: an R Package for

Visualization and Annotation of Phylogenetic Trees With Their Covariates and Other

Associated Data. Methods Ecol Evol 8:28–36.

42.   Kassambara A. 2020. ggpubr: "ggplot2" Based Publication Ready Plots. 0.4.0.

43.   Kolde R. 2019. pheatmap: Pretty Heatmaps. 1.0.12.

44.   Revell LJ. 2012. phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other

things). Methods Ecol Evol 3:217–223.

45.   Wickham H. 2017. tidyverse: Easily Install and Load the "Tidyverse." R package version

1.2.1.

46.   2016. Anaconda Software Distribution. 2-2.4.0.

47.   Stayton CT. 2008. Is convergence surprising? An examination of the frequency of

543   convergence in simulated datasets. J Theor Biol 252:1–14.

544   48.   Pagel M. 1997. Inferring evolutionary processes from phylogenies. Zool Scr 26:331–348.

545   49.   Lees JA, Galardini M, Bentley SD, Weiser JN, Corander J. 2018. pyseer: a comprehensive

546   tool for microbial pangenome-wide association studies. Bioinformatics

547   https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty539.

549