Making a pathogen? Evaluating the impact of protist predation on the evolution of virulence in *Serratia marcescens*

Heather A. Hopkins[1,2], Christian Lopezguerra[1,2], Meng-Jia Lau[1], Kasie Raymann[1,2]*

1. Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, North Carolina State University
2. Department of Biology, University of North Carolina Greensboro

*Kasie Raymann

Email: ktrayman@ncsu.edu

Keywords: evolution, exaptation, virulence, predation, bacteria, opportunistic pathogen

Abstract

Opportunistic pathogens are environmental microbes that are generally harmless and only

occasionally cause disease. Unlike obligate pathogens, the growth and survival of opportunistic

pathogens does not rely on host infection or transmission. Their versatile lifestyles make it challenging

to decipher how and why virulence has evolved in opportunistic pathogens. The Coincidental Evolution

Hypothesis (CEH) postulates that virulence results from exaptation or pleiotropy, i.e., traits evolved for

adaptation to living in one environment that have a different function in another. In particular, adaptation

to avoid or survive protist predation has been suggested to contribute to the evolution of bacterial

virulence (the training grounds hypothesis). Here we used experimental evolution to determine how the

selective pressure imposed by a protist predator impacts the virulence and fitness of a ubiquitous

environmental opportunistic bacterial pathogen that has acquired multi-drug resistance: *Serratia*

marcescens. To this aim, we evolved *S. marcescens* in the presence or absence of generalist protist

predator, *Tetrahymena thermophila*. After 60 days of evolution, we evaluated genotypic and phenotypic

changes by comparing evolved *S. marcescens* to the ancestral strain. Whole genome shotgun (WGS)

sequencing of the entire evolved populations and individual isolates revealed numerous cases of

parallel evolution, many more than statistically expected by chance, in genes associated with virulence.

Our phenotypic assays suggested that evolution in the presence of a predator maintained virulence,

whereas evolution in the absence of a predator resulted in attenuated virulence. We also found a

significant correlation between virulence, biofilm formation, and grazing resistance. Overall, our results

provide evidence that bacterial virulence and virulence related traits are maintained by selective

pressures imposed by protist predation.

Introduction

Opportunistic pathogens are environmental bacteria that typically coexist peacefully alongside hosts and only sometimes cause disease, e.g., in hosts with immunodeficiency or microbiome imbalance (1). Opportunistic pathogens are intriguing because they have diverse lifestyles and experience strong tradeoffs between adaptation to life in the environment versus life inside of a host (1–3). Opportunistic pathogens are also conceptually challenging because, unlike obligate pathogens, their survival does not depend on their ability to infect a host: they are fully capable of reproducing and living in the environment (1, 4). Thus, the factors driving virulence in opportunistic pathogens remain largely enigmatic from an evolutionary standpoint. Several hypotheses have been put forth, proposing that virulence is selected for, or maintained by, interactions that occur outside a host. The Coincidental Evolution Hypothesis (CEH) postulates that virulence evolves indirectly due to selection that occurs in non-host environments (5, 6), and protists have been proposed to act as "Trojan Horses" (7) or training grounds (8) for the evolution of bacterial pathogens. These hypotheses stem from the fact that bacterial defense mechanisms against environmental predators (e.g., protists) such as adherence, biofilm formation, grazing resistance, intracellular toxin production, and outer-membrane structures also play a role in host infection (1, 9, 10). Additionally, several studies have shown that pathogens challenged with microbial predators exhibited increased host virulence (11–16).

Experimental evolution can help reveal how different environmental pressures impact the evolution of bacteria and which genes are involved in specific phenotypic traits (17–19). In recent years, experimental evolution has been used to investigate if eukaryotic predation increases the virulence of opportunistic bacterial pathogens, but results have been conflicting (20–26). One major limitation of many previous studies has been the lack of thorough phenotypic and genotypic characterization. Not all populations will follow the same evolutionary trajectory (27–31). Therefore, evaluating and comparing genotype and multiple phenotypes in experimental evolution studies is critical. For example, even if predation generally selects for the maintenance or enhancement of pathogen virulence, it is possible that some traits that are adaptive for defense against predators have no impact on virulence or even result in attenuation of pathogenicity within hosts. Nevertheless, experimental evolution can be used to answer many questions about fundamental evolutionary processes (17–19) and help reveal genes and mechanisms associated with virulence and other phenotypes. Thus, the goal of this study was to experimentally evolve the opportunistic bacterial pathogen *Serratia marcescens* in the presence or absence of an environmental protist predator and characterize both the genotypes and phenotypes of

the evolved bacteria to elucidate how predation, or the lack thereof, impacts opportunistic pathogen

evolution. We hypothesized that virulence would be increased or at least maintained in the presence of

a predator.

S. marcescens is an opportunistic pathogen that ubiquitously occurs in soil and water (32) and

has been used for several bacteria-predator experimental evolution studies (20, 21, 23). It is a host

generalist that can colonize many different organisms, where it can be pathogenic and/or commensal

(32). In humans, *S. marcescens* is a common enteric bacterium that is generally harmless in the

gastrointestinal tract (33). However, it was recently found to be capable of damaging gut epithelial cells

in vitro (34) and is responsible for causing dangerous nosocomial infections worldwide, notably in the

respiratory and urinary tracts (35, 36). In the last few decades, the frequency of nosocomial infections

caused by *S. marcescens* has increased, several hospital-wide outbreaks have been reported, and

most strains have acquired multidrug resistance (35–37). Additionally, *S. marcescens* has been

recognized as an opportunistic pathogen of many plants and other animals (32). Thus, understanding

the evolution of virulence in *S. marcescens* is important for the health of a wide range of organisms. In

this study, we used *S. marcescens* KZ19 (38), which was isolated from the gut of a honey bee (*Apis*

mellifera) and is pathogenic to honey bees following microbiome disruption (39–42) or if administered

orally to bees at high doses (38). This strain of *S. marcescens* resides in a monophyletic clade with

human and plant isolates, with the closest sequenced relative being a nosocomial strain BIDMC 50

(38).

Here, we serially passaged *S. marcescens* KZ19 every day for 60 days in the presence or

absence of a generalist protist predator, *Tetrahymena thermophila* (Figure 1). Following 60 days of

evolution, we performed whole genome shotgun (WGS) metagenomic sequencing on the entire *S.*

marcescens evolved populations, sequenced individual evolved isolates, and characterized the

mutations present in both evolved isolates and populations. We observed multiple cases of parallel

evolution which, when combined with phenotypic assays of isolates, enabled us to predict genes and

pathways involved in virulence-related phenotypes. Although all populations did not follow the same

evolutionary trajectories, in general, we found that virulence and grazing resistance was attenuated in

the absence of a predator and predation resulted in increased biofilm production and slightly elevated

virulence. Additionally, we found strong correlations between predation (grazing) resistance, biofilm

production, and pathogenicity (in honey bees), lending support to the hypothesis that predation

resistance and virulence are often governed by the same mechanisms. In conclusion, our study

provides evidence that experimental evolution can be used to help elucidate how exposure to non-host

environments impacts opportunistic pathogen evolution.

Results

We confirmed that *T. thermophila* grazes on the ancestral bacterial strain by visualizing a 24h

co-culture of *T. thermophila* and a transconjugant *S. marcescens* KZ19 containing an E2 crimson

fluorescent protein (38, 43) via fluorescent microscopy (Figure 1). We then created six media-evolved

(ME) and six predator-evolved (PE) replicate Lines (populations). We minimized predator/prey co-

evolution by passaging evolved *S. marcescens* to new axenic *T. thermophila* cultures each day. The

same concentration of *S. marcescens* was transferred for each passage, and we confirmed successful

passaging via plating on LB agar every day. Viability and population size of *T. thermophila* was

evaluated before every passage via light microscopy. Following 60 days of evolution the entire PE

(*n*=6) and ME populations (*n*=6) were sequenced using WGS metagenomic sequencing. The ancestor

(*n*=1) and individual isolates from the three ME (Lines 1-3) and six PE (Lines 1-6) populations were

sequenced using WGS sequencing (Table S1). We then performed phenotypic assays on the evolved

isolates (ME=3 and PE=6) in order to associate mutations with phenotypes.

Figure 1. Confirmation of grazing activity. A) Phase contrast image of *T. thermophila* after 24h co-culture with fluorescently
labeled *S. marcescens* KZ19 in Neff media with 180 ug/ml spectinomycin, B) Cy5 filter image showing the E2 crimson labeled
S. marcescens KZ19 cells inside *T. thermophila*, and C) composite overlay of the phase contrast and fluorescent images.
Images were taken at 20X on a Keyence BZ-X700 Series All-In-One Fluorescence Microscope and overlayed in ImageJ.

Mutations in the predator- and media-evolved populations

All evolved populations were compared to the ancestral genome to identify mutations. First, the

ancestral genome was re-sequenced using both long (Nanopore) and short (Illumina) read sequencing

technologies and assembled using SPades v3.15.3 (44) to generate a consensus ancestral genome

(Table S1). We then corrected for false positives (i.e., sequencing errors) by mapping all the short

reads (244X coverage) of the ancestral strain back to the new consensus ancestral genome using

BreSeq v0.38.2 (45). All mutations predicted via BreSeq (45) when the ancestral reads were mapped to

the ancestral consensus genome were considered false positives if detected in the evolved populations

(i.e., they most likely correspond to sequencing or assembly issues in the ancestral genome).

We first analyzed the mutation patterns across each population. The total number of mutations

identified in each evolved population (ME$_p$ n=6; PE$_p$ n=6) ranged from 6 to 106 (minimum frequency

cutoff of 0.05) with an average of 44 mutations per population (Supplemental Dataset 1). The

population with the lowest mutations identified was ME$_p$3 and the two with the largest number of

mutations were PE$_p$3 and ME$_p$2. However, the number of mutations present in a population was

negatively correlated to the average genome coverage (P= 0.0001, R^2=0.7805; Figure S1). A negative

correlation between the number of mutations and genome coverage indicates that our sequencing

depth was sufficient to characterize the mutations present in the populations.

In all evolved populations we identified nonsynonymous, synonymous, and intergenic mutations

(Figure 2A, Supplemental Dataset 1). To determine the percentage of nonsynonymous, synonymous,

intergenic, non-sense, and RNA mutations expected at random, we simulated independent mutations in

the ancestral *S. marcescens* KZ19 genome by performing 10,000 independent simulations using a

Jukes & Cantor model (47). We found that the percentage of nonsynonymous mutations detected in our

populations (49-68%) was between 4-23% less than the random expectation of 71.5% (Figure 2A),

indicating that overall, both environments imposed negative (purifying) selective pressure on *S.*

marcescens (i.e., deleterious mutations are being purged).

Figure 2. Characterization of the mutations present in the evolved populations **A)** Percentage of nonsynonymous, synonymous, intergenic, non-sense, and RNA mutations detected in each evolved population (ME1-6 and PE1-6) and compared to the percentage of each mutation type expected at random (Expected). **B)** Number of observed parallel (*gene-* and *site-specific*) mutation events observed in ME, PE, and in both ME and PE (ME-PE) populations compared to random expectation (expected vs. observed). Significantly more *gene-specific* and *site-specific* parallel mutations were observed than would be expected to occur by chance (Chi-squared test, *P*<0.0001). **C)** the KEGG (46) functional annotations of the genes in which parallel events occurred.

In addition to purifying selection, we also found evidence that our populations were undergoing positive selection based on the identification of numerous mutations either in the exact same position (*site-specific* parallel evolution) or in the same gene (*gene-specific* parallel evolution) across populations (Figure 2B, Supplemental Dataset 1). Parallel evolution events were considered if a mutation was found in the same position or gene in independently evolved populations (ME_p, PE_p, or both). None of the parallel evolution events occurred across all populations, confirming that they were not present in the ancestral population. We observed a total of 118 parallel mutations; 57 (nine *same-site*) were shared between the ME_p and PE_p populations, 29 (11 *same-site*) were unique to PE_p populations, and 32 (six *same-site*) were unique to ME_p populations (Figure 2B, Supplemental Dataset 1).

To determine the number of parallel mutations expected to occur by chance we simulated independent mutations in the ancestral *S. marcescens* KZ19 genome by performing 10,000 independent simulations using a Jukes & Cantor model (47). The number of *site-specific* parallel mutations expected to occur by chance within or across all our evolved populations was less than one, indicating that we found overwhelmingly more site-specific parallel mutations than random expectation (Figure 2B, ME_p *P*=2.2e-16, PE_p *P*= 2.2e-16 , ME_p-PE_p P= 2.2e-16, Chi-squared test). The number of *gene-specific* parallel mutations observed across the ME_p and PE_p populations was also four times more frequent than expected at random (Figure 2B, ME_p *P*= 8.7e-25, PE_p *P*= 6.2e-05, ME_p-PE_p P= 6.4e-10, Chi-squared test). The presence of excessive convergent parallel mutations provides strong evidence that positive selection occurred in all populations to adapt to their respective environments (the media and the presence of a predator).

Parallel evolution events occurred in 32 different genes and eight different promoter regions. Of the 32 genes in which we identified parallel evolution events, 70% could be functionally classified (Figure 2C). Although parallel evolution events arose across and within predator (PE_p) and media (ME_p) evolved populations, both Lines were impacted in different types of genes. A large portion of the parallel mutations that occurred across only ME_p populations were in genes involved in environmental information processing, while the parallel evolution events unique to PE populations were concentrated in genes involved in signaling and cellular processes. Overall, parallel mutations were identified in genes involved in genetic information and processing (PE_p=17%, ME_p=0%, PE_p+ME_p=6%), signaling

and cellular processes (PE$_p$=33%, ME$_p$=11%, PE$_p$+ME$_p$=6%), environmental information processing

(PE$_p$=0%, ME$_p$=44%, PE$_p$+ME$_p$=12%), and metabolism (PE$_p$=33%, ME$_p$=11%, and PE$_p$+ME$_p$=18%),

and unclassified genes (PE$_p$=17%, ME$_p$=33%, PE$_p$+ME$_p$=59%). Parallel mutations present in only ME

or shared between PE and ME populations are likely conferring adaptation to the Neff media, whereas

parallel mutations only present in the PE populations suggest that they are important for fitness in the

presence of a predator. Since most of the genes in which we identified mutations have not been

functionally confirmed in *S. marcescens*, all gene names and predicted functions discussed hereafter

must be considered candidate genes/functions.

We plotted all the mutations identified in each ME$_p$ and PE$_p$ population and their observed

frequencies and found that several parallel mutations were fixed within the populations (Figure 3A).

Interestingly, most of the fixed parallel mutations occurred in genes within the same protein-protein

interaction network predicted via STRING v12 (48) in close relatives of *S. marcescens*, such as *S.*

rubidaea and *Yersina enterocolitica* (Figure 3B). This protein network contains the BarA-UvrY two

component regulatory system and the three core proteins of the Rcs phosphorelay system, (*rcsC*, *rcsD*,

and *rcsB*). Both BarA-UvrY and the Rcs regulatory systems have been shown to play a major role in

environmental adaptation and the regulation of virulence in *S. marcescens* (49–51) or related

enterobacteria (52–56). Mutations in the histidine kinase *barA* were found in multiple PE$_p$ (3/6) and ME$_p$

populations (5/6), whereas mutations in the response regulator *uvrY* were mostly restricted to ME$_p$

populations (Figure 3C). Mutations in the response regulator of the Rcs system, *rcsB*, were identified at

high frequency in virtually all ME$_p$ populations (5/6) but never in the PE$_p$ populations (Figure 3C). One

ME$_p$ population (ME$_p$6) contained a fixed mutation in the transmembrane hybrid kinase *rcsC* and one

PE$_p$ population (PE$_p$3) also had a mutation in *rcsC* but at very low (<10%) frequency (Figure 3C).

Within this network, fixed (100 percent frequency) *site-specific* parallel mutations unique to ME$_p$

populations (ME$_p$2-6) were identified in a promoter region upstream of a gene annotated as the biofilm

dispersion protein *bdlA* (Figure 3C). Four of the six PE$_p$ populations (PE$_p$2, PE$_p$4, PE$_p$5, and PE$_p$6)

contained mutations in a gene annotated as the diguanylate cyclase *yfiN*, and of these four populations,

three (PE$_p$4-6) also contained mutations in a promoter upstream of a gene annotated as the outer

membrane protein *ompC* (Figure 3C). The genes *bdlA*, *yfiN*, and *ompC* have all been implicated in

biofilm formation in other *Enterobacteriaceae* species (57–62). It is important to note that the six PE$_p$

(Lines 1-6) and three ME$_p$ (Lines 1-3) populations were evolved at the same time, but three of the ME$_p$

(Lines 4-6) populations were started over one year later, demonstrating the reproducibility of our

results.

Figure 3. Frequency of mutations present in the evolved populations. **A)** Plot of all the detected mutations and their
frequencies in each population highlighting the parallel and/or "fixed" mutations. Cases of parallel mutation events are
highlighted in green (PE only mutations), purple (ME only mutations), and blue (ME-PE). **B)** STRING v12 (48) predicted
protein-protein interaction network containing seven genes in which we identified multiple parallel mutations. **C)** Heatmap
showing the frequency of mutations in or adjacent (indicated by *) to the seven genes from the same protein-interaction
network within each evolved population.

Genotype and phenotype of predator- and media-evolved isolates

To attempt to link specific mutations with phenotypes, a total of three MEi and six PEi isolates

were sequenced from the evolved populations and compared to the ancestral genome to identify

mutations (Figure 4A, Table S2). At least one mutation was detected in each isolate, with a maximum

of four and an average of two mutations per isolate (Figure 4A). We identified a total of 24 mutations

within or in upstream promoters of 14 genes and 70% of these mutations (17/24) were present at a

frequency of >90% in their respective population (Table S2). Additionally, the isolates possessed all the

fixed (100% frequency) mutations present within the population from which they were isolated (Figure

3A, Supplemental Dataset 1).

Figure 4. Genotypes and phenotypes of evolved isolates. **A)** Mutations present in each isolate grouped by nonsynonymous (NS), synonymous (S), promoter (intergenic mutation in a promotor region) and indicating the mutation type (single nucleotide variant (SNV), nonsense mutation, duplication, or deletion) and the gene (or gene upstream) affected. **B)** Mean biofilm formation of ME_i and PE_i isolates and the ancestral strain based on 590nm OD readings after 24h of growth in Neff media. Four assays were performed in triplicate and each point represents a biological replicate. **C)** Mean grazing (predation) resistance of PE_i and ME_i isolates and the ancestral strain based on 600nm OD readings of bacterial filtrate after 48h in co-culture with *T. thermophila*. Two assays were performed in triplicate and each point represents a biological replicate. **D)** Percent death of honey bees five days after exposure to the ancestral, ME_i, and PE_i isolates (control group average percent death = 2.3%; see Figure S4). Three replicate assays were performed with five replicates of 20 bees each per isolate per assay (15 replicates total per isolate). Each data point represents a biological replicate of 20 bees. **E)** Percent cytotoxicity of the ancestor, ME_i, and PE_i isolates to murine macrophages (RAW264.7) based on LDH release. **B-E)** Each data point represents a biological replicate (n=6). All box plots show the mean standard deviation. Significance was tested by comparing each evolved isolate to the others and the ancestor using one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparisons test. * = $P<0.01$, **= $P<0.001$, ***= $P<0.0001$. Dashed lines represent the overall mean when combining all ME_i (purple line) or PE_i (green line) isolates, respectively.

We identified three instances of *site-specific* parallel evolution and three cases of *gene-specific*

parallel evolution across the isolates (Figure 4A), all of which occurred within coding regions or

promoters upstream of genes within the same BarA-UvrY Rcs protein-protein interaction network

(Figure 3B). Two of the three *site-specific* parallel mutations were unique to ME_i isolates: a 66bp

deletion in rcsB (ME_i1 and ME_i3) and an intergenic SNV in a promoter upstream of a gene annotated

as bdlA (ME_i2 and ME_i3; Figure 4A). The third *site-specific* mutation was unique to PE_i isolates: an

intergenic SNV in a promoter upstream of *ompC* (PE_i4 and PE_i6; Figure 4A). Two of the *gene-specific*

parallel evolution events occurred in both ME and PE isolates: *barA* (ME_i2, $MEv3$, $PEv2$, and $PEv4$)

and *uvrY* (ME_i1 and PE_i5). The third case of *gene-specific* parallel evolution arose in a gene annotated

as the inner membrane protein *yfiN* in all PE$_i$ isolates except PE$_i$1 and PE$_i$3 (Figure 4A). Overall, most

of the mutations present in the isolates likely represent adaptive mutations as they were fixed in their

respective populations.

To evaluate the phenotypes of the PE$_i$ and ME$_i$ isolates, we performed growth, biofilm

production, predation resistance (population size after growth in the presence of *T. thermophila*), and

virulence (mortality of honey bees and death of murine macrophage) assays. We chose to specifically

analyze isolates, rather than populations, in order to correlate fixed mutations with phenotypic

characteristics. To compare growth between the ancestral and evolved strains, we monitored optical

density (OD) in spent Neff media (filtered media that had supported *T. thermophila* growth for 48h),

fresh Neff media, and LB media every hour for 24 hours. None of the ME$_i$ and PE$_i$ isolates significantly

differed in growth in either media type when compared to the ancestor (Figure S2). Because biofilm

formation is a strategy for resistance to predation and is also associated with virulence, we measured

biofilm production in our ME$_i$ and PE$_i$ isolates compared to the ancestor (Figure 4B). None of the ME$_i$

isolates significantly differed in biofilm production when compared to the ancestor, whereas five of the

six PE isolates produced significantly more biofilms than the ancestor (Figure 4B; PE$_i$1 *P*=0.017, PE$_i$3

P=0.003, PE$_i$4 *P*=0.0001, PE$_i$5 *P*<0.0001, PE$_i$6 *P*=0.035, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple

comparison test). Overall, when considered together, mean biofilm production of the PE$_i$ isolates was

significantly higher than the mean of the ME$_i$ isolates and the ancestor (Figure S3A, P<0.01, with one-

way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison test).

In order to determine if exposure to a predator resulted in increased predation resistance, we

evaluated grazing resistance (i.e., ability to proliferate in co-culture with a predator) of the ME$_i$ and PE$_i$

isolates. Each isolate was grown with *T. thermophila* for 48h and then the population density of the

bacteria was measured. All ME$_i$ isolates were found to be significantly more susceptible to predation

than the ancestor (Figure 4C; *P*< 0.0001, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison test). In

contrast, none of the PE$_i$ isolates significantly differed in resistance to predation relative to the ancestor.

However, the mean grazing resistance of all PEi isolates combined was significantly higher than the

mean of the ME$_i$ isolates (Figure S3B, P<0.01, with one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple

comparison test).

We further determined how evolution under predation pressure impacts the virulence of *S.*

marcescens KZ19 by performing survival assays in a natural host, the honey bee. Honey bees were

orally exposed to each individual isolate, the ancestral strain, or sucrose solution only (controls) and monitored every day for five days (Figure S3). We evaluated the percentage of death, five days post-exposure and found that two of the three ME isolates (ME_i1 and ME_i3) displayed significantly attenuated virulence when compared to the ancestral strain (Figure 4D; ME1 $P=0.001$, ME3 $P<0.0001$, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison test). Conversely, none of the PE_i isolates significantly differed from the ancestor in terms of virulence (Figure 4D). Based on probability of survival using a Kaplan-Meier method, we obtained the same results, with only ME_i1 and ME_i3 displaying significantly decreased virulence when compared to the ancestor (Figure S4, $P<0.05$, Mantel-Cox Log-rank test with Bonferroni correction). However, when comparing the mean percent death five days post-exposure by combining all ME_i and PE_i isolates, the ME_i isolates displayed significant attenuation of virulence when compared to the ancestor and PE_i isolates, and the PE_i isolates were significantly more virulent than the ancestor and the ME_i isolates (Figure 3SC, $P<0.01$, with one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison test).

Several clinical *S. marcescens* isolates have been shown to be cytotoxic to macrophages (63–65). Although *S. marcescens* KZ19 was isolated from the gut of a honey bee, we found that it is capable of killing RAW 264.7 murine macrophages (Figure 4E). Thus, we evaluated the percent of murine macrophage killing by the ancestor and compared it to the ME_i and PE_i isolates based on the release of lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) after two hours of co-culture (MOI 10:1). None of the ME_i isolates differed from the ancestor in terms of cytotoxicity to macrophages. Conversely, three of the PE_i isolates displayed significantly less cytotoxicity to macrophage when compared to the ancestral strain (Figure 4E; PE_i1 $P= 0.0009$, PE_i5 $P=0.03$, PE_i6 $P<0.0001$, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison test). When all ME_i and PE_i isolates were combined, no difference was observed between the ME_i isolates and the ancestor or the PE_i and ME_i isolates, but the PE_i isolates were significantly less cytotoxic to macrophage cells than the ancestor (Figure 3SD). However, macrophage killing appears to be time and density dependent. In a separate timeseries experiment with a different starting ratio (MOI 1:10), we found that all evolved isolates (ME_i and PE_i) displayed overall less cytotoxicity to macrophage than the ancestor at hours 2-5 post exposure, but after six hours they converged in their level of cytotoxicity with all macrophages being killed (lysed) by all isolates and the ancestral strain (Figure S4). Therefore, macrophage cytotoxicity may not be an informative metric for gauging virulence in *S. marcescens* KZ19.

Finally, we tested whether there was a direct link between pathogenicity in honey bees,

cytotoxicity to murine macrophage, biofilm production, and grazing resistance (Figure 5). Despite our

relatively small sample size, we found a significant positive correlation between biofilm production and

grazing resistance (Figure 5A; r^2=0.56 , P=0.01 , Pearson correlation) as well as between virulence and

biofilm production (Figure 5B; r^2=0.5, P=0.02, Pearson correlation) and virulence and grazing

resistance (Figure 5C; r^2=0.68, P=0.003, Pearson correlation coefficient). No significant correlations

were observed between cytotoxicity to macrophage and any of the other tested phenotypes (Figure 5

D-F).

Figure 5. Correlations between mean **A)** biofilm production and grazing resistance, **B)** biofilm production and virulence in
bees, **C)** grazing resistance and virulence in bees, **D)** biofilm production and macrophage cytotoxicity, **E)** grazing resistance
and macrophage cytotoxicity, and **F)** virulence in bees and macrophage cytotoxicity. Dashed lines represent a simple linear
regression, and the correlation strength and significance were tested using the Pearson correlation coefficient.

Discussion

Here we revealed that only 60 days of experimental evolution in the presence or absence of a

predator resulted in overall consistent genotypic changes in *S. marcescens*, indicated by numerous

parallel evolution events. The lower-than-expected number of nonsynonymous mutations coupled with

the higher-than-expected number of parallel evolution events suggests that all evolved populations

underwent both positive and purifying selection. We also found evidence of positive selection based on

the presence of fixed mutations (sweeps) within the same genes, and sometimes in the same exact

site, across populations. This is noteworthy as bottlenecks are inherent in experimental evolution and

could result in the fixation of random mutations due to drift (66–68). The presence of fixed mutations in

the same genes and positions strongly indicate that drift was not the main driver of the sweeps

observed in our populations. Although parallel evolution events and sweeps suggest the genes

impacted are adaptive, it is possible that some of the observed high frequency mutations are the result

of hitchhiking.

Despite overall variation in the types of genes impacted, virtually all the fixed mutations within

and across PE_p and ME_p populations occurred in genes that are part of the same predicted protein-

protein interaction network. Within this protein-protein interaction network, several of the proteins are

key components in gene regulatory systems. For example, BarA and UvrY make up a two-component

regulatory system (49) and RcsB and RcsC are two of the three major components in the modified two

component Rcs phosphorelay system (69), both of which have been shown to regulate the expression

of numerous genes in *S. marcescens* (49, 69, 70) and have also been implicated in virulence

mechanisms in multiple species of *Enterobacteriaceae* (52–56, 71–73). Thus, mutations in these genes

likely have major impacts on multiple other genes by upregulating, downregulating, or stopping

expression, resulting in strong selective pressure to maintain beneficial mutations and purge

"deleterious" mutations. We hypothesize that mutations that were fixed within one or more genes in this

pathway directed the evolutionary trajectories thereafter possibly due to epistatic interactions. However,

further studies are needed to validate this hypothesis.

In order to link specific mutations with phenotypic characteristics, we randomly chose a single

isolate from each population. It is important to note that for the ME_p populations we only evaluated

isolates from Lines 1-3 because when we originally started this experiment, we only evolved three ME

populations. We later realized the importance of having more "control" populations and subsequently

evolved three more ME_p Lines, which were only analyzed at the population level in this study. However,

we would like to point out that the three ME_p Lines (ME_p4-6) that were evolved over a year after ME_p

Lines 1-3 presented mutations in many of the same genes, including several of the fixed mutations that

were observed in the first three ME_p populations. This finding underlines the reproducibility of our

results and eliminates the probability that contamination could explain the parallel evolution events

observed across populations. The genotypic analysis of our three ME_i isolates from Lines 1-3 and six

PE_i isolates (one from each evolved population) revealed that all isolates contained the fixed mutations

present in their respective population. However, some isolates also contained mutations that were not

fixed in the population. Moreover, only two isolates (PE$_i$1 and PE$_i$3) contained a single mutation, limiting

our ability to directly correlate individual mutations with phenotypes. Based on our results, we predict

that the sole mutations present in PE$_i$1 and PE$_i$3 in promoter regions upstream of the genes annotated

as *pdeH* and a hypothetical protein, respectively, are responsible for the increased biofilm production

observed in these two isolates. We also speculate that the large 66bp deletion in *rcsB* present in the

ME$_i$ isolates contributed to the attenuated virulence in bees, as seen in ME$_i$1 and ME$_i$3 isolates.

Furthermore, based on a previous study that demonstrated a role of the BarA-UvrY two component

system in controlling the carbon storage regulatory system in *E. coli* (52), it is probable that the

mutations we detected in *barA* and *uvrY* in the ME$_i$ and PE$_i$ isolates are the result of adaptation to the

Neff media, which contains five percent glucose. We caution that these are only speculations that

require further investigation to be validated.

The five phenotypes that we evaluated were growth in media, biofilm production, grazing

resistance, virulence in honey bees, and cytotoxicity to murine macrophages. We found no change in

population density (growth) of any of the isolates when compared to the ancestor in the three media

types tested, but we did find changes in biofilm production. Specifically, all PE$_i$ isolates displayed

increased biofilm production on average when compared to the ancestor, although PE$_i$2 was not found

to significantly produce more biofilm. The ME$_i$ isolates produced less biofilms than the PE$_i$ and ancestor

on average, but individually none of them significantly produced less biofilm than the ancestor. As

biofilm production is a natural defense mechanism against predators (74–76), increasing biofilm

production could be beneficial in the constant presence of a predator, whereas it is likely not essential

in a nutrient rich mono-culture. Although we did not see a significant increase in grazing resistance in

any of the PE$_i$ isolates, we did observe a decrease in all three ME$_i$ isolates when compared to the

ancestor. It is important to note that in order to maintain *T. thermophia* in co-culture with KZ19 for 24h

at the start of the experiment we had to start with a ratio of only 10:1 (bacteria:protist) cell ratio,

suggesting the ancestral strain already possessed mechanisms to resist grazing and/or survive

phagocytosis. Thus, it is possible that in addition to the pressure to survive predation, competition for

resources was a major force impacting the evolution of *S. marcescens* in the presence of *T.*

thermophila in our experiments. In fact, although we found a strong positive correlation between biofilm

production and grazing resistance, increased biofilm formation did appear to increase grazing

resistance. Taken together, our results indicate that biofilm production promotes grazing resistance in

S. marcescens KZ19 but also suggest that increasing biofilm production could be providing other

functions in the presence of a predator aside from protection, such as the ability to better compete for

resources (77, 78).

We found that both biofilm production and grazing resistance were positively correlated with

virulence in a natural host (the honey bee). The correlation between grazing resistance and bee

pathogenicity was particularly strong, especially given our sample size, providing support for the idea

that predation can indirectly select for host virulence (5–8). Conversely, we found no correlation

between cytotoxicity to murine macrophage cells (RAW 264.7) and biofilm production, grazing

resistance, or virulence in bees. In fact, three of the PE isolates were significantly less toxic to

macrophage after 2h of exposure, with PE$_i$5 displaying virtually no cytotoxicity in this assay. Based on

our time series experiment, we found that cytotoxicity to RAW 264.7 macrophages is highly time and

density dependent. After 6h of co-culture, all isolates and the ancestral strain converged towards high

cytotoxicity and had killed all macrophages in the culture. Other strains of *S. marcescens* have been

shown to be highly toxic to macrophages (63–65), and our findings confirm this result for *S.*

marcescens KZ19. However, the lack of correlation between macrophage toxicity and all the other

phenotypes we tested suggests that the mutations present in our isolates have no impact on their ability

to kill murine macrophage RAW 264.7 cells, and in some rare cases, might render them less toxic.

These results indicate that, although evolution in the presence of a predator may increase bacterial

virulence, the increase in virulence could be host specific, likely due to the diversity of mechanisms

involved in virulence. This underlines the importance of testing the virulence of predator-evolved

bacteria in multiple systems.

A few other studies have used experimental evolution to directly test how predation by *T.*

thermophila impacts the virulence of *S. marcescens* (20, 21, 23). Contradictory to our findings, all these

studies found that predation attenuated virulence. Some reasons for inconsistencies between our study

and previous studies could be due to 1) the use of different *S. marcescens* strains with different life

histories, 2) co-evolving *S. marcescens* and *T. thermophila* together (20, 21, 23) rather than preventing

the evolution of the predator (this study), 3) using different hosts to test virulence, and 4) differences in

the methods used to evaluate virulence. Virulence of the predator-evolved *S. marcescens* in previous

studies was evaluated based on either testing entire populations (20) or individual isolates that were

then pooled to evaluate virulence (21, 23). By testing a mixture of evolved isolates, it is likely that one

will outcompete the others (and that the "winner" will be different depending on the environment).

Combining or comparing data from assays performed with different isolates could strongly impact the

results since each isolate might genotypically and phenotypically differ (as we observed here) and be

more or less fit depending on the context. Moreover, none of these studied evaluated the genotypes of

the evolved populations, limiting their ability to fully evaluate how predation impacts the evolution of *S.*

marcescens. Thus, we believe that the differences in experimental design between the previous

predator *S. marcescens* evolution studies and ours likely explains the discrepancy in the results.

Fundamentally, our study demonstrates the efficacy of using experimental evolution to identify

genes and pathways involved in virulence-associated phenotypes, even over short evolutionary

timescales. Despite some variability in the evolutionary outcomes in our experiment, our results provide

overall support for the hypotheses (i.e., CEH and the training grounds) that propose bacterial virulence

is selected for or maintained by predation. Performing longer evolutionary experiments under different

scenarios and with different opportunistic bacterial strains and species will provide a more accurate

picture of the forces that drive the evolution of opportunistic pathogens and the mechanisms

responsible for their virulence. Identifying virulence mechanisms and understanding how virulence

evolves can help guide the development of more effective treatment strategies for combating bacterial

infections.

Materials and Methods

Grazing confirmation

To confirm that *T. thermophila* grazes on *S. marcescens* KZ19, we utilized transconjugant KZ19

containing an E2 crimson fluorescent protein with spectinomycin resistance (38, 43). The

transconjugant KZ19 strain was inoculated into 3mL of LB broth containing 180ug/mL spectinomycin

and incubated at 30°C for 24h. After 24h, 1OD of the transconjugant KZ19 was resuspended in fresh

Neff media and 1mL was pipetted into 3mL of Neff media containing *T. thermophila* and 180ug/mL

spectinomycin. The culture was incubated for 24h at 30°C. One mL of the 24h co-culture was then

centrifuged at 2000g for 10m to collect the *T. thermophila* cells, the supernatant containing bacteria

was discarded, and the *T. thermophila* were resuspended in 1mL of axenic Neff media. The *T.*

thermophila cells were then pipetted onto a microscope slide that was washed with 60% EtOH (which

immobilizes the cells without immediately lysing them), covered with a glass cover slip, and imaged on

a Keyence BZ-X700 Series All-In-One Fluorescence Microscope in brightfield and with a Cy5 filter.

Experimental evolution

Serratia marcescens strain KZ19 was evolved either in media alone (media-evolved) or with the

predator *T. thermophila* strain SB210 (predator-evolved). *T. thermophila* strain SB210 was purchased

from the Tetrayhema Stock Center located at Cornell University. The media-evolved (ME) experiment

included three replicate Lines and the predator-evolved (PE) experiment included six replicate Lines.

First, *T. thermophila* and the ancestral *S. marcescens* KZ19 were cultured individually for 72h and 24h,

respectively, at 30°C in Neff media. To start each evolved Line, 1OD of the overnight KZ19 culture was

resuspended in fresh Neff media and 1mL was added to either 3mL of Neff media alone (ME$_p$ Lines) or

3mL Neff media containing *T. thermophila* culture (PE$_p$ Lines) at a ratio of 10:1 cells

(bacteria:protist).The starting ratio of *S. marcescens*:*T. thermophila* was based on preliminary trials

starting with various concentrations of *S. marcescens* and *T. thermophila* co-inoculated in Neff media to

determine the ratio that would allow both organisms to remain in co-culture for 24h.

The 3mL experimental cultures were incubated at 30°C without shaking. Every 24h for 60 days

the cultures were vortexed and 1% of each culture was sampled from the flasks and added to 3mL of

either 1) fresh Neff media or 2) new axenic cultures of *T. thermophila* in Neff media. Every day, prior to

passaging, the cultures were checked for *T. thermophila* viability and density via microscopy and the

successful passaging and growth of *S. marcescens* presence was evaluated by plating on Luria-Bertani

(LB) agar. Every day over the course of the 60-day evolution experiment, *T. thermophila* and *S.*

marcescens were always detected. Although population size was not directly measured at every

passage, based on daily plating (*S. marcescens*) and light microscopy (*T. thermophila*), we never

observed a noticeable difference in population size. The number of generations reached for each *S.*

marcescens evolved population over the course of 60 days is estimated to be approximately 396.

On day 60, six LB agar plates were streak inoculated from the culture flasks and incubated for

24h at 30°C. One bacterial colony was randomly selected from each of the six the PE populations

(PE1-6) and three of the ME populations (ME1-3).Pure cultures of each isolate were created by

inoculating in 3mL LB broth with 24h incubation at 30°C. Samples (200 µL from each pure culture) were

then frozen at -80°C in 20% glycerol. These nine isolates were sequenced, analyzed, and used for

phenotypic analysis (i.e., virulence in bees, growth in media, biofilm production, macrophage

cytotoxicity, and grazing resistance).

DNA Extraction and Sequencing

Cultures of the evolved populations (ME n=6, PE n=6), evolved isolates (ME n=3, PE n=6) and the

ancestor were diluted to 1 OD. DNA extractions were performed using the Zymo Quick-DNA

Fungal/Bacterial Miniprep Kit (D6005). DNA was prepped for sequencing using the Oxford Nanopore

Rapid Barcoding Sequencing gDNA Kit (SQK-RBK004) for long read sequencing and the Illumina

Nextera DNA Flex Library Prep Kit (20018704) for short read sequencing. The ancestral genome was

sequenced via long (Oxford Nanopore Minion) and short (Illumina iSeq100) read technologies. The

evolved populations and isolates were sequenced via short read technology on an Illumina iSeq100

with 2x150 paired end reads. See Table S1 for sequencing depth details.

Genome Assembly and Analysis

The Illumina and Nanopore reads of the ancestral genome were then used to generate a hybrid

assembly using hybridSPAdes v3.15.3 (79). Assembled scaffolds were annotated using Prokka v1.14.5

(80) on the Department of Energy Systems Biology Knowledgebase (KBase) platform (81). We also

mapped all short reads of the ancestral strain back to the consensus ancestral genome using BreSeq

v0.38.1 (45). Any mutations predicted by BreSeq when the ancestral reads were mapped to the

ancestral consensus genome were considered sequencing or assembly issues in the ancestral genome

and removed as candidate mutations in the evolved populations and isolates.

The sequencing reads of the evolved populations and isolates were trimmed using Trimmomatic

v0.40 (82). The trimmed reads were then mapped to the newly assembled ancestral genome using

BreSeq v0.37.0 (45) with a base-quality-cutoff PHRED score of 30 and minimum frequency cutoff of

0.05 to identify mutations. Promoters were predicted using iProEP (83). Functional characterization of

genes (Figure 2- Table Supplement 2) was predicted using KOALA KEGG Orthology And Links

Annotation (46, 84). Protein-protein interaction network prediction was determined using the STRING

v12 database (48) using *S. marcescens*, *S. rubidaea* and *Y. enterocolitica* as reference organisms.

Simulations to determine the percent mutations expected at random across intergenic, synonymous

and non-synonymous positions and the probability of *gene-* and *site-specific* parallel mutations based

on random expectation were conducted with a custom Python script: we conducted 10,000 independent

simulations where one mutation was introduced at random under a Jukes & Cantor model in the

reference genome of *S. marcescens* KZ19 (GCA_002915435.1). The annotations of the genome were

used to infer whether the mutation was intergenic or not. Mutations affecting coding sequences were

inferred as synonymous or non-synonymous by translating the gene *in silico* before and after

introducing the mutation.

Growth assay

Growth assays were performed in triplicate in both LB broth, fresh Neff media, and spent Neff media

with *T. thermophila* filtered out (i.e., *T. thermophila* were grown in the media for 48h before filtering).

Pure 1OD cultures of the evolved isolates and the ancestor were diluted to 10^{-5} and 5µL of the culture

was pipetted into 200µL of media in a 96-well microplate. Absorbance detection was performed at an

OD of 600nm at 30°C with shaking every hour for 24h on a BioTek Synergy™ 2 plate reader.

Biofilm assay

Biofilm assays were performed in triplicate for each isolate. Pure 1OD cultures of the evolved isolates

and the ancestor were diluted to 10^{-5} and 5µL of the culture was pipetted into 200µL of media in a 96-

well microplate. The covered plate was incubated for 36h at 30°C without shaking. After 36h, the

supernatant was poured off, the wells were washed twice with 200µL of sterile ddH$_2$O, and the cells

were stained with 150µL of 0.04% crystal violet for 10 minutes. After 10 minutes, the excess crystal

violet was removed, the wells were washed again and stained once more for 10 minutes. The crystal

violet was poured off and cells were solubilized with 150µL of 95% ethanol. OD readings were taken at

absorbance reading 560nm on the BioTek Synergy™ 2 plate reader. A total of four assays were

performed, each in triplicate.

Grazing resistance assay

Grazing resistance assays were performed in triplicate for each isolate. Cultures of the evolved isolates

and the ancestor were grown overnight, normalized the 1OD, and 1mL was added to a culture flask

containing *T. thermophila* in 3mL Neff media (10:1 ration of bacteria to protist cells). *T. thermophila*

alone in 3mL Neff media served as the negative control. Experimental culture flasks were incubated at

30°C for 48h. After 48h, the cultures were mixed thoroughly and 1mL was sampled and centrifuged at

5,000 rpm for 10 minutes. The supernatant was discarded, pellets were resuspended in 1mL 1X PBS,

and the solution was filtered through 5.0 µm MilliporeSigma™ Millex™-SV Sterile PVDF syringe filters

to remove the *T. thermophila* cells. OD readings were taken of filtrates at 600nm after blanking with the

negative control filtrate. A total of two assays were performed, each in triplicate.

Virulence assay

Pure 1OD cultures of the evolved isolates and the ancestor were pelleted via centrifugation and

resuspended in a 1:1 sterile sugar syrup solution (SSS). Conventional adult honey bee workers (*Apis*

mellifera) were sampled from a single hive located on the Gateway North Research Campus in Browns

Summit, North Carolina. Bees were immobilized at 4°C, randomly distributed into groups, and exposed

via the immersion method (38) to ~10 µL of one of three treatments: 1) sterile SSS only, 2) the ancestor

in sterile SSS, or 3) each evolved isolate in sterile SSS. Bees were kept in cup cages (20 bees/cup;

100 bees/treatment) under hive conditions: 35°C and 95% humidity. Mortality between the treatments

was noted every day for 5 days. A total of three assays were performed with five replicates per assay

equaling 300 bees tested in total per isolate. A survival curve (Kaplan-Meier) was created in GraphPad

Prism v9.1.0.

Macrophage cytotoxicity assay

Murine macrophage cells (Raw 264.7) were maintained in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium

(DMEM, ATCC: 30-2002) with 10% Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS, ATCC: 30-2020) at 37°C with 5% CO_2.

After reaching 90% confluency, cells were harvested, resuspended in 500uL of DMEM media in a

Corning™ Costar™ 24-well Clear TC-treated well plate (Fisher Scientific: 09-761-146), and incubated

overnight at 37°C with 5% CO_2. After overnight incubation, the old DMEM media was discarded, the

macrophage cells were washed with 1X PBS, and 500µL of fresh DMEM media was added to each

well. Overnight cultures of each bacterial isolate were normalized to 1 OD prior to the experiment and

ten microliters of each 1 OD bacterial culture (MOI 10:1) was added into a separate well containing

macrophage and incubated at 37°C with 5% CO_2. For control wells (macrophage spontaneous

release), 10µL of 1X PBS was added instead of bacteria. The cytotoxicity was measured after two

hours using the CytoTox 96® Non-Radioactive Cytotoxicity Assay. In brief, two hours after co-culturing,

the media from each well (including controls) was mixed two times and 60µL was pipetted into a 1.7mL

tube and centrifuged at 10,000 rpm for two minutes to pellet bacterial cells. After centrifuging, 50µL of

the supernatant was transferred into a new 96-well plate (Fisher Scientific: 07-200-90) to measure

lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) release (OD_{490}). For control wells, the macrophage lysis buffer release

was measured by adding 50µL 10X lysis buffer to macrophage samples 45 minutes prior to LDH

measurement, and the negative control was measured without adding lysis buffer. The percent

cytotoxicity was calculated using the equation below. The ratio of 55/51 was used to correct the volume

change caused by the lysis buffer. A single assay was performed with six replicates.

$$556 \qquad Percent\ cytotoxicity\ =\ 100\ \times\ \frac{Experimental\ treatment\ release - mean\ (macrophage\ spontaneous\ release)}{\frac{55}{51}(mean(macrophage\ lysis\ buffer\ Release) - mean\ (macrophage\ spontaneous\ release))}$$

Since virtually all isolates were highly cytotoxic to macrophage after two hours at MOI of 10:1

cells (bacteria:macrophage), we performed a time series experiment to determine if macrophage

cytotoxicity is time and density dependent. The Raw 264.7 macrophages and bacterial cultures were

prepared as described above, except this time the assay started with a ratio of 1:10 (MOI) bacteria to

macrophage cells and cytotoxicity via LDH release (CytoTox 96® Non-Radioactive Cytotoxicity Assay)

was measured at five timepoints following co-culture (2h, 3h, 4h, 5h, and 6h). Cytotoxicity in this assay

was based on optical density at OD490 rather than percent cytotoxicity. At 6h, all macrophages co-

cultured with the ancestral and evolved isolates were dead as indicated by cell lysis observed under an

inverted light microscope. One assay was performed in triplicate.

Materials availability

All raw sequencing data has been deposited on NCBI under BioProject PRJNA838621.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. Carlos Goller for assistance with the Nanopore sequencing. We also want to

thank Dr. Louis-Marie Bobay for helping with the simulations and providing constructive and helpful

feedback on the manuscript. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant

DEB- 2344788 (to K.R.), the National Institutes of Health under grant 7R01GM145747-02 (to K.R.), the

University of North Carolina Greensboro (UNCG) College of Arts and Sciences Faculty First Award (to

K.R.), and UNCG Department of Biology Graduate Student Support grants (to H.A.H and C.L.).

Author Contributions

H.A.H., C.L. and M-J.L. performed the experiments and collected the data. K.R. designed and funded

the research. All authors contributed data analysis and manuscript writing and editing.

Competing Interest Statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Brown SP, Cornforth DM, Mideo N. 2012. Evolution of virulence in opportunistic pathogens: generalism, plasticity, and control. Trends in Microbiology 20:336–342.

2. Sokurenko EV, Gomulkiewicz R, Dykhuizen DE. 2006. Source–sink dynamics of virulence evolution. Nat Rev Microbiol 4:548–555.

3. Pandey A, Mideo N, Platt TG. 2022. Virulence evolution of pathogens that can grow in reservoir environments. The American Naturalist 199:141–158.

4. Casadevall A, Pirofski L. 2007. Accidental virulence, cryptic pathogenesis, martians, lost hosts, and the pathogenicity of environmental microbes. Eukaryot Cell 6:2169–2174.

5. Levin BR, Edén CS. 1990. Selection and evolution of virulence in bacteria: an ecumenical excursion and modest suggestion. Parasitology 100:S103–S115.

6. Levin B. 1996. The evolution and maintenance of virulence in microparasites. Emerg Infect Dis 2:93–102.

7. Barker J, Brown MR. 1994. Trojan horses of the microbial world: protozoa and the survival of bacterial pathogens in the environment. Microbiology 140 (Pt 6):1253–1259.

8. Molmeret M, Horn M, Wagner M, Santic M, Abu Kwaik Y. 2005. Amoebae as training grounds for intracellular bacterial pathogens. Appl Environ Microbiol 71:20–28.

9. Erken M, Lutz C, McDougald D. 2013. The rise of pathogens: Predation as a factor driving the evolution of human pathogens in the environment. Microb Ecol 65:860–868.

10. Amaro F, Martín-González A. 2021. Microbial warfare in the wild—the impact of protists on the evolution and virulence of bacterial pathogens. Int Microbiol 24:559–571.

11. Cirillo JD, Cirillo SLG, Yan L, Bermudez LE, Falkow S, Tompkins LS. 1999. Intracellular growth in *Acanthamoeba castellanii* affects monocyte entry mechanisms and enhances virulence of *Legionella pneumophila*. Infect Immun 67:4427–4434.

12. Rasmussen MA, Carlson SA, Franklin SK, McCuddin ZP, Wu MT, Sharma VK. 2005. Exposure to rumen protozoa leads to enhancement of pathogenicity of and invasion by multiple-antibiotic-resistant *Salmonella enterica* Bearing SGI1. Infect Immun 73:4668–4675.

13. Adiba S, Nizak C, van Baalen M, Denamur E, Depaulis F. 2010. From grazing resistance to pathogenesis: The coincidental evolution of virulence factors. PLoS ONE 5:e11882.

14. Coombes BK, Gilmour MW, Goodman CD. 2011. The evolution of virulence in non-O157 Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli. Front Microbio 2.

15. Rehfuss MYM, Parker CT, Brandl MT. 2011. Salmonella transcriptional signature in Tetrahymena phagosomes and role of acid tolerance in passage through the protist. ISME J 5:262–273.

16. Hosseinidoust Z, van de Ven TGM, Tufenkji N. 2013. Evolution of Pseudomonas aeruginosa virulence as a result of phage predation. Appl Environ Microbiol 79:6110–6116.

17. Lenski RE. 2017. Experimental evolution and the dynamics of adaptation and genome evolution in microbial populations. ISME J 11:2181–2194.

18. Cooper VS. 2018. Experimental evolution as a high-throughput screen for genetic adaptations. mSphere 3:e00121-18.

19. McDonald MJ. 2019. Microbial experimental evolution – a proving ground for evolutionary theory
and a tool for discovery. EMBO Rep 20:e46992.

20. Friman V-P, Lindstedt C, Hiltunen T, Laakso J, Mappes J. 2009. Predation on multiple trophic
levels shapes the evolution of pathogen virulence. PLoS ONE 4:e6761.

21. Mikonranta L, Friman V-P, Laakso J. 2012. Life history trade-offs and relaxed selection can
decrease bacterial virulence in environmental reservoirs. PLoS ONE 7:e43801.

22. Friman V-P, Buckling A. 2014. Phages can constrain protist predation-driven attenuation of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa virulence in multienemy communities. ISME J 8:1820–1830.

23. Zhang J, Ketola T, Örmälä-Odegrip A-M, Mappes J, Laakso J. 2014. Coincidental loss of bacterial
virulence in multi-enemy microbial communities. PLoS ONE 9:e111871.

24. Leong W, Poh WH, Williams J, Lutz C, Hoque MM, Poh YH, Yee BYK, Chua C, Givskov M,
Sanderson-Smith M, Rice SA, McDougald D. 2022. Adaptation to an amoeba host leads to
Pseudomonas aeruginosa isolates with attenuated virulence. Appl Environ Microbiol 88:e02322-
21.

25. Hoque MM, Noorian P, Espinoza-Vergara G, Manuneedhi Cholan P, Kim M, Rahman MH,
Labbate M, Rice SA, Pernice M, Oehlers SH, McDougald D. 2022. Adaptation to an amoeba host
drives selection of virulence-associated traits in Vibrio cholerae. ISME J 16:856–867.

26. Nair RR, Vasse M, Wielgoss S, Sun L, Yu Y-TN, Velicer GJ. 2019. Bacterial predator-prey
coevolution accelerates genome evolution and selects on virulence-associated prey defences. Nat
Commun 10:4301.

27. Santos-Lopez A, Marshall CW, Scribner MR, Snyder DJ, Cooper VS. Evolutionary pathways to
antibiotic resistance are dependent upon environmental structure and bacterial lifestyle. eLife
8:e47612.

28. Santos-Lopez A, Marshall CW, Haas AL, Turner C, Rasero J, Cooper VS. 2021. The roles of
history, chance, and natural selection in the evolution of antibiotic resistance. eLife 10:e70676.

29. Rodríguez-Verdugo A, Carrillo-Cisneros D, González-González A, Gaut BS, Bennett AF. 2014.
Different tradeoffs result from alternate genetic adaptations to a common environment.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 111:12121–12126.

30. Tenaillon O, Rodríguez-Verdugo A, Gaut RL, McDonald P, Bennett AF, Long AD, Gaut BS. 2012.
The molecular diversity of adaptive convergence. Science 335:457–461.

31. Blount ZD, Borland CZ, Lenski RE. 2008. Historical contingency and the evolution of a key
innovation in an experimental population of Escherichia coli. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 105:7899–
7906.

32. Grimont PAD, Grimont F. 1978. The genus Serratia. Annu Rev Microbiol 32:221–248.

33. Almuneef MA, Baltimore RS, Farrel PA, Reagan-Cirincione P, Dembry LM. 2001. Molecular typing
demonstrating transmission of gram-negative rods in a neonatal intensive care unit in the absence
of a recognized epidemic. Clinical Infectious Diseases 32:220–227.

34. Ochieng JB, Boisen N, Lindsay B, Santiago A, Ouma C, Ombok M, Fields B, Stine OC, Nataro JP.
2014. *Serratia marcescens* is injurious to intestinal epithelial cells. Gut Microbes 5:729–736.

35. Hejazi A, Falkiner FR. 1997. Serratia marcescens. Journal of Medical Microbiology 46:903–912.

36. Khanna A. 2013. Serratia Marcescens - A rare opportunistic nosocomial pathogen and measures
to limit its spread in hospitalized patients. JCDR https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2013/5010.2737.

37. Montagnani C, Cocchi P, Lega L, Campana S, Biermann KP, Braggion C, Pecile P, Chiappini E,
de Martino M, Galli L. 2015. Serratia marcescens outbreak in a neonatal intensive care unit:
crucial role of implementing hand hygiene among external consultants. BMC Infectious Diseases
15:11.

38. Raymann K, Coon KL, Shaffer Z, Salisbury S, Moran NA. 2018. Pathogenicity of Serratia
marcescens strains in honey bees. mBio 9.

39. Raymann K, Shaffer Z, Moran NA. 2017. Antibiotic exposure perturbs the gut microbiota and
elevates mortality in honeybees. PLoS Biol 15:e2001861.

40. Motta EVS, Raymann K, Moran NA. 2018. Glyphosate perturbs the gut microbiota of honey bees.
Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 115:10305–10310.

41. Steele MI, Motta EVS, Gattu T, Martinez D, Moran NA. 2021. The gut microbiota protects bees
from invasion by a bacterial pathogen. Microbiol Spectr 9:e00394-21.

42. Powell JE, Carver Z, Leonard SP, Moran NA. 2021. Field-realistic tylosin exposure impacts honey
bee microbiota and pathogen susceptibility, Which Is Ameliorated by Native Gut Probiotics.
Microbiol Spectr 9.

43. Leonard SP, Perutka J, Powell JE, Geng P, Richhart DD, Byrom M, Kar S, Davies BW, Ellington
AD, Moran NA, Barrick JE. 2018. Genetic engineering of bee gut microbiome bacteria with a
toolkit for modular assembly of broad-host-range plasmids. ACS Synth Biol 7:1279–1290.

44. Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Dvorkin M, Kulikov AS, Lesin VM, Nikolenko SI,
Pham S, Prjibelski AD, Pyshkin AV, Sirotkin AV, Vyahhi N, Tesler G, Alekseyev MA, Pevzner PA.
SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. J
Comput Biol. 2012 May;19(5):455-77.

45. Deatherage DE, Barrick JE. 2014. Identification of mutations in laboratory-evolved microbes from
next-generation sequencing data using breseq, p. 165–188. *In* Sun, L, Shou, W (eds.),
Engineering and Analyzing Multicellular Systems. Springer New York, New York, NY.

46. Kanehisa M, Goto S. 2000. KEGG: kyoto encyclopedia of genes and genomes. Nucleic Acids Res
28:27–30.

47. Jukes T. H., Cantor C. R. 1969. Evolution of protein molecules, in Mammalian Protein Metabolism.
New York, NY: Academic Press, 21–132

48. Szklarczyk D, Kirsch R, Koutrouli M, Nastou K, Mehryary F, Hachilif R, Gable AL, Fang T,
Doncheva NT, Pyysalo S, Bork P, Jensen LJ, von Mering C. 2023. The STRING database in
2023: protein-protein association networks and functional enrichment analyses for any sequenced
genome of interest. Nucleic Acids Res 51:D638–D646.

49. Liu X, Xu D, Wu D, Xu M, Wang Y, Wang W, Ran T. 2023. BarA/UvrY differentially regulates
prodigiosin biosynthesis and swarming motility in Serratia marcescens FS14. Res Microbiol
174:104010.

50. Romanowski EG, Stella NA, Romanowski JE, Yates KA, Dhaliwal DK, St. Leger AJ, Shanks RMQ.
The Rcs stress response system regulator GumB modulates Serratia marcescens-induced

inflammation and bacterial proliferation in a rabbit keratitis model and cytotoxicity in vitro. Infect Immun 89:e00111-21.

51. Di Venanzio G, Stepanenko TM, García Véscovi E. 2014. Serratia marcescens ShlA pore-forming toxin is responsible for early induction of autophagy in host cells and is transcriptionally regulated by RcsB. Infect Immun 82:3542–3554.

52. Pernestig A-K, Georgellis D, Romeo T, Suzuki K, Tomenius H, Normark S, Melefors Ö. 2003. The *Escherichia coli* BarA-UvrY two-component system is needed for efficient switching between glycolytic and gluconeogenic carbon sources. J Bacteriol 185:843–853.

53. Teplitski M, Goodier RI, Ahmer BMM. 2003. Pathways leading from BarA/SirA to motility and virulence gene expression in *Salmonella*. J Bacteriol 185:7257–7265.

54. Herren CD, Mitra A, Palaniyandi SK, Coleman A, Elankumaran S, Mukhopadhyay S. 2006. The BarA-UvrY two-component system regulates virulence in avian pathogenic *Escherichia coli* O78:K80:H9. Infect Immun 74:4900–4909.

55. Palaniyandi S, Mitra A, Herren CD, Lockatell CV, Johnson DE, Zhu X, Mukhopadhyay S. 2012. BarA-UvrY two-component system regulates virulence of uropathogenic E. coli CFT073. PLoS One 7:e31348.

56. Tomenius H, Pernestig A-K, Jonas K, Georgellis D, Möllby R, Normark S, Melefors Ö. 2006. The Escherichia coli BarA-UvrY two-component system is a virulence determinant in the urinary tract. BMC Microbiol 6:27.

57. Katharios-Lanwermeyer S, Koval SA, Barrack KE, O'Toole GA. The diguanylate cyclase yfiN of Pseudomonas aeruginosa regulates biofilm maintenance in response to peroxide. J Bacteriol 204:e00396-21.

58. Sanchez-Torres V, Hu H, Wood TK. 2011. GGDEF proteins YeaI, YedQ, and YfiN reduce early biofilm formation and swimming motility in Escherichia coli. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 90:651–658.

59. Huertas MG, Zárate L, Acosta IC, Posada L, Cruz DP, Lozano M, Zambrano MM. 2014. Klebsiella pneumoniae yfiRNB operon affects biofilm formation, polysaccharide production and drug susceptibility. Microbiology (Reading) 160:2595–2606.

60. Morgan R, Kohn S, Hwang S-H, Hassett DJ, Sauer K. 2006. BdlA, a chemotaxis regulator essential for biofilm dispersion in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Bacteriol 188:7335–7343.

61. Petrova OE, Sauer K. 2012. Dispersion by Pseudomonas aeruginosa requires an unusual posttranslational modification of BdlA. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 109:16690–16695.

62. Yeom J, Lee Y, Park W. 2012. Effects of non-ionic solute stresses on biofilm formation and lipopolysaccharide production in *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. Research in Microbiology 163:258–267.

63. Ishii K, Adachi T, Imamura K, Takano S, Usui K, Suzuki K, Hamamoto H, Watanabe T, Sekimizu K. 2012. Serratia marcescens induces apoptotic cell death in host immune cells via a lipopolysaccharide- and flagella-dependent mechanism. J Biol Chem 287:36582–36592.

64. Krzymińska S, Ochocka K, Kaznowski A. 2012. Apoptosis of epithelial cells and macrophages due to nonpigmented Serratia marcescens strains. ScientificWorldJournal 2012:679639.

65. Krzymińska S, Raczkowska M, Kaznowski A. 2010. Cytotoxic activity of Serratia marcescens
clinical isolates. Pol J Microbiol 59:201–205.

66. Gamblin J, Gandon S, Blanquart F, Lambert A. 2023. Bottlenecks can constrain and channel
evolutionary paths. Genetics 224:iyad001.

67. Mahrt N, Tietze A, Künzel S, Franzenburg S, Barbosa C, Jansen G, Schulenburg H. 2021.
Bottleneck size and selection level reproducibly impact evolution of antibiotic resistance. 9. Nat
Ecol Evol 5:1233–1242.

68. Wahl LM, Gerrish PJ, Saika-Voivod I. 2002. Evaluating the impact of population bottlenecks in
experimental evolution. Genetics 162:961–971.

69. Pan X, Tang M, You J, Liu F, Sun C, Osire T, Fu W, Yi G, Yang T, Yang S-T, Rao Z. 2021.
Regulator RcsB controls prodigiosin synthesis and various cellular processes in Serratia
marcescens JNB5-1. Appl Environ Microbiol 87:e02052-20.

70. Trouillon J, Attrée I, Elsen S. 2023. The regulation of bacterial two-partner secretion systems.
Molecular Microbiology 120:159–177.

71. Meng J, Young G, Chen J. 2021. The Rcs System in Enterobacteriaceae: Envelope stress
responses and virulence regulation. Front Microbiol 12:627104.

72. Heeb S, Haas D. 2001. Regulatory roles of the GacS/GacA two-component system in plant-
associated and other gram-negative bacteria. Mol Plant Microbe Interact 14:1351–1363.

73. Huang Y-H, Ferrières L, Clarke DJ. 2006. The role of the Rcs phosphorelay in
Enterobacteriaceae. Res Microbiol 157:206–212.

74. Flemming H-C, Wingender J. 2010. The biofilm matrix. Nat Rev Microbiol 8:623–633.

75. Hoque MM, Espinoza-Vergara G, McDougald D. 2023. Protozoan predation as a driver of diversity
and virulence in bacterial biofilms. FEMS Microbiol Rev 47:fuad040.

76. Wucher BR, Elsayed M, Adelman JS, Kadouri DE, Nadell CD. 2021. Bacterial predation
transforms the landscape and community assembly of biofilms. Curr Biol 31:2643-2651.e3.

77. Oliveira NM, Martinez-Garcia E, Xavier J, Durham WM, Kolter R, Kim W, Foster KR. 2015. Biofilm
formation as a response to ecological competition. PLoS Biol 13:e1002191.

78. Rendueles O, Ghigo J-M. 2015. Mechanisms of competition in biofilm communities. Microbiol
Spectrum 3:10.1128/microbiolspec.mb-0009–2014.

79. Antipov D, Korobeynikov A, McLean JS, Pevzner PA. 2016. hybridSPAdes: an algorithm for hybrid
assembly of short and long reads. Bioinformatics 32:1009–1015.

80. Seemann T. 2014. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics 30:2068–2069.

81. Arkin AP, Cottingham RW, Henry CS, Harris NL, Stevens RL, Maslov S, Dehal P, Ware D, Perez
F, Canon S, Sneddon MW, Henderson ML, Riehl WJ, Murphy-Olson D, Chan SY, Kamimura RT,
Kumari S, Drake MM, Brettin TS, Glass EM, Chivian D, Gunter D, Weston DJ, Allen BH, Baumohl
J, Best AA, Bowen B, Brenner SE, Bun CC, Chandonia J-M, Chia J-M, Colasanti R, Conrad N,
Davis JJ, Davison BH, DeJongh M, Devoid S, Dietrich E, Dubchak I, Edirisinghe JN, Fang G,
Faria JP, Frybarger PM, Gerlach W, Gerstein M, Greiner A, Gurtowski J, Haun HL, He F, Jain R,
Joachimiak MP, Keegan KP, Kondo S, Kumar V, Land ML, Meyer F, Mills M, Novichkov PS, Oh T,
Olsen GJ, Olson R, Parrello B, Pasternak S, Pearson E, Poon SS, Price GA, Ramakrishnan S,

Ranjan P, Ronald PC, Schatz MC, Seaver SMD, Shukla M, Sutormin RA, Syed MH, Thomason J,
Tintle NL, Wang D, Xia F, Yoo H, Yoo S, Yu D. 2018. KBase: The United States Department of
Energy Systems Biology Knowledgebase. Nat Biotechnol 36:566–569.

82. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.
Bioinformatics 30:2114–2120.

83. Lai H-Y, Zhang Z-Y, Su Z-D, Su W, Ding H, Chen W, Lin H. 2019. iProEP: A computational
predictor for predicting promoter. Molecular Therapy - Nucleic Acids 17:337–346.

84. Kanehisa M, Sato Y, Morishima K. 2016. BlastKOALA and GhostKOALA: KEGG tools for
functional characterization of genome and metagenome sequences. J Mol Biol 428:726–731.

Supporting Material

795 **Figure S1.** Comparison of the average genome coverage and the number of mutations detected. Dashed lines represent a
796 simple linear regression, and the correlation strength and significance were tested using the Pearson correlation coefficient.

800 **Figure S2.** Mean growth rate of each variant based on 600nm OD readings every hour for 24h of ME (purple circles) and PE
801 (green circles) isolates in LB broth (left) or fresh Neff media (right) compared to the ancestral strain (black circles). Significance
802 was tested using Friedman One-Way ANOVA Repeated Measure Analysis with Dunnett's multiple comparisons test.
803

805
806
807 **Figure S3.** Mean A) biofilm production, B) grazing resistance, C) virulence in bees, and D) cytotoxicity to macrophage based
808 on combining all ME and PE isolates. Significance was tested by comparing each evolved isolate to the others and the
809 ancestor using one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparisons test.
810

812 **Figure S4**. Kaplan-Meier curve showing the probability of survival of honey bees exposed to the ancestral strain (black and
813 gray) and the **A)** ME isolates (purple) and **B)** PE isolates (green). Control bees were given sterile sugar water only (white
814 squares). Mortality was recorded each day for 5 days. Graphs are based on three replicate assays per isolate (n=300 bees per
815 isolate). * = $P<0.05$, *** = $P<0.0005$; Mantel-Cox Log-rank test with Bonferroni correction.
816

Figure S5. Cytotoxicity of MEi and PEi isolates and the ancestral strain to murine macrophage at an MOI of 1:10
(bacteria:macrophage) based on LDH release measured at OD490 after 2h, 3h, 4h, 5h, and 6h co-culture. The assay was
done in triplicate. At 6h, death of all macrophage cells (lysis) was observed via microscopy by all evolved isolates as well as
the ancestor.

Table S1. Total reads, number of mapped reads, and average genome coverage for each population and isolate.

Table S2. List of all the mutations identified in the evolved isolates and their frequency in the populations.

Dataset S1. List of all the mutations identified in the evolved populations and their frequencies.