Operational Gene Clusters and intrinsic uncertainty in pangenome analyses

Saioa Manzano-Morales[1,4,*], Yang Liu[1,2,*], Jaime Huerta-Cepas[1,†], Jaime Iranzo[1,3,†]

[1] Centro de Biotecnología y Genómica de Plantas, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (UPM) -
Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Tecnología Agraria y Alimentaria (INIA-CSIC), Madrid, Spain.

[2] Guangdong Province Key Laboratory of Microbial Signals and Disease Control, Integrative
Microbiology Research Centre, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou, China.

[3] Institute for Biocomputation and Physics of Complex Systems (BIFI), University of Zaragoza,
Zaragoza, Spain.

[4] Current address: Barcelona Supercomputing Centre (BSC-CNS) - Institute for Research in
Biomedicine (IRB Barcelona), The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain.

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

† Corresponding authors: Jaime Iranzo (jaime.iranzo@upm.es); Jaime Huerta-Cepas
(j.huerta@csic.es)

Abstract

A key step for comparative genomics is to group open reading frames into functionally and evolutionarily meaningful gene clusters. Such clustering is complicated by intraspecific gene duplications and horizontal gene transfers, that are frequent in prokaryotes. In consequence, gene clustering methods must deal with a trade-off between identifying vertically transmitted representatives of multi-copy gene families (recognizable by synteny conservation) and retrieving complete sets of species-level orthologs. We studied the conceptual and practical implications of adopting homology, orthology, or synteny conservation as formal criteria for gene clustering by performing comparative analyses of 125 prokaryotic pangenomes. We found that clustering criteria affect pangenome functional characterization, core genome inference, and reconstruction of ancestral gene content to different extents. Pangenome and core genome sizes are affected by the same multiplicative factor in all species, which allows for robust across-species comparisons regardless of the clustering criterion. However, across-species comparisons of pangenome diversity, gene fluxes, and functional profiles are substantially affected by inconsistencies among clustering criteria. Such inconsistencies are driven not only by mobile genetic elements, but also by genes involved in defense, secondary metabolism, and other functions overrepresented in the accessory genome. In the case of pangenome diversity, the variability that can be attributed to methodological inconsistencies can exceed the effect sizes of ecological and phylogenetic variables. Our results emphasize the need to consider conceptual adequacy, not just computational performance, when designing workflows for pangenome analysis. We also provide a benchmarking dataset to assess the robustness and across-method reproducibility of future comparative studies.

Introduction

Recent advances in sequencing have revolutionized the study of microbial ecology and evolution by providing access to thousands of high-quality genomic sequences. A major consequence of the surge in microbial genomic data has been the introduction of the concept of pangenome to denote the set of all genes found in the genomes of a taxonomic group, typically defined at the species level (Tettelin et al. 2005), (Vernikos et al. 2015). Pangenomes have quickly gained importance in eco-evolutionary research because they provide valuable information about the set of functional capabilities accessible to the strains of the same species and their propensity to gain and lose genes. Therefore, the study of pangenomes can shed light on the interactions among genome plasticity, niche diversity, and adaptability to environmental changes (Shapiro 2017; Maistrenko et al. 2020; Liao et al. 2021; Whelan et al. 2021). Moreover, identifying the set of genes present in all the genomes of a species (the core genes) has proved helpful to delineate core functions and build high-resolution species trees (Lerat et al. 2003; Wu et al. 2013; Kapli et al. 2020)

Pangenome studies rely on a precise delineation of clusters of equivalent genes that represent meaningful units for functional and evolutionary analyses. The simplest class of equivalence is homology, defined for a set of genes as the property of sharing common ancestry. Beyond this qualitative definition, different types of homology can be established based on the evolutionary history of each gene. Because most gene families have experienced duplications throughout evolution, it is usual to find homologous genes with multiple representatives per genome, termed paralogs. Paralogs often display functional divergence and accelerated evolutionary rates (Petitjean

et al. 2017). As a result, homology alone does not guarantee functional and evolutionary homogeneity of gene clusters. Instead, for most purposes, it is desirable to subdivide homologous groups into a higher-resolution and more homogeneous class of equivalence, defined by orthology (Fitch 2000)(Gabaldón and Koonin 2013). Orthologs are genes that share a single common ancestor at the time of speciation (Fitch 2000; Koonin 2005). As a result, the orthology criterion can discriminate paralogs that duplicated before the last speciation event (Fig. 1), Because of the connection between orthology and speciation, orthology is the most natural grouping criterion for across-strain comparative genomics and phylogenomic analyses. In practice, however, it is challenging to apply a strict orthology criterion to pangenome studies due to the high computational burden of building thousands of phylogenetic trees including all candidate homologs and the difficulty to obtain accurate reference species trees. To circumvent these difficulties, heuristic algorithms and reference databases of orthologous genes have been developed over the last decade (Kristensen et al. 2011; Huerta-Cepas et al. 2017; Galperin et al. 2019). Together with homology and orthology, a third criterion to further refine equivalence among genes is synteny conservation. According to the synteny criterion, two genes (typically orthologs) are grouped together if they share the same gene neighborhood in different genomes. Notably, synteny conservation can help discriminate between vertically and horizontally transmitted copies of a gene, or between multiple orthologs resulting from within-species duplication (Fig. 1).

It is widely accepted that the quantitative results obtained in single-species pangenome analyses depend on the method (and parameters) used to build the pangenome. Such dependency can be traced back to the strategy adopted to identify gene clusters. As intuitively expected, the size of the pangenome increases and the size of the core genome decreases as the sequence similarity thresholds used to define homology become more and more stringent (Bayliss et al. 2019; Sitto and Battistuzzi 2020; Tonkin-Hill et al. 2020). However, comparative studies implicitly assume that qualitative trends and order relationships are robust with respect to the choice of a particular criterion. The existence of such qualitative robustness merits a critical evaluation, given the deep conceptual differences among homology, orthology, and synteny conservation, the heterogeneity of evolutionary rates across genes and species, and the high rates of horizontal gene transfer (HGT) observed in some genomes (Hao and Golding 2006; Puigbò et al. 2014), (Treangen and Rocha 2011).

The possibility that homology, orthology, and synteny-based gene clustering produce incongruent results in comparative pangenome studies is not just a technical caveat. Instead, intraspecific HGT and gene duplications raise the fundamental question of what equivalence class (homology, orthology, synteny, or something else) best captures the essentially dynamic nature of pangenome evolution (Cummins et al. 2022). This conceptual conundrum is especially clear in what concerns the splitting of multicopy orthologs based on their gene neighborhoods. Let us consider, for example, a gene that has experienced recent duplications or intra-specific HGT among some strains of the same species. For what purposes should all copies be included in the same group, following the standard orthology criterion? For what other purposes should the duplicated or horizontally transferred copy be assigned to a new cluster, based on synteny considerations? The orthology criterion appears better to assess pangenome diversity, for which it is not desirable to count a recently duplicated gene twice (Lees et al. 2019), or to study gene duplication and intraspecific HGT, which first requires classifying multicopy genes as members of the same group (Csurös 2010). In contrast, the synteny

criterion would be more appropriate to select marker genes for phylogenomic analyses or identify
vertically transmitted members of mobile gene families.

In this study, we show that the choice of a particular clustering criterion can have notable
consequences on downstream comparative analyses. To stress the fact that the optimal criterion is
somewhat arbitrary and dependent on the main research goal, we adopt the method-agnostic term
Operational Gene Cluster (OGC) as an umbrella that includes homologs, classical orthologs (possibly
inferred through different methods), and vertically transmitted subsets of orthologs with conserved
synteny. Depending on the particular choice, OGC may imply different degrees of functional
equivalence and shared ancestry.

State-of-the-art methods for OGC construction implement different strategies to deal with
sensitivity-vs-specificity trade-offs at manageable computational cost. The simplest approaches
(e.g., MMseqs2 (Steinegger and Söding 2017) which is the OGC inference tool used by the
pangenome analysis suite PanACoTA (Perrin and Rocha 2021)), build groups of homologous genes
by applying a pre-defined similarity threshold to the amino acid sequences encoded by a set of open
reading frames (ORFs). More sophisticated tools include additional steps to discriminate true
orthology from other ways of homology. Such discrimination can be attained through two major
strategies: (a) by building gene-level phylogenetic trees or sequence similarity networks, on which
some heuristic rules are applied to resolve subsets of genes with shared ancestry (Altenhoff and
Dessimoz 2012); and (b) by subclustering homologous groups based on their gene neighborhoods,
under the assumption that synteny is locally conserved at the evolutionary timescales that are
relevant to within-species diversification. By design, the former approach, which is adopted by
reference databases like COG (Galperin et al. 2019), eggNOG (Huerta-Cepas et al. 2017), and the
pangenome analysis tool panX (Ding et al. 2018), is better suited to assess true orthology in gene
families affected by intraspecific duplications and HGT. However, its high computational burden
makes it inefficient to deal with large genomic datasets. On the other side, synteny-based
approaches (such as the one implemented by the popular pangenome analysis tools Roary (Page et
al. 2015) and PanOCT (Fouts et al. 2012)) are faster and less resource intensive, although their
results may deviate from the classical concept of orthology (by missing true orthologs) when applied
to highly dynamical genomes or regions of the genome with poor synteny conservation. Phylogeny-
aware and synteny-based methods are not mutually exclusive, although they are rarely performed
together due to computational constraints.

Despite their distinct conceptual underpinnings, different types of OGC are sometimes just viewed
as exchangeable heuristic approaches that approximate the concept of orthology in a
computationally tractable manner. We tested to what extent such an assumption is true and found
that some properties of the pangenome, mostly concerning its size and the identity of the core
genome, are indeed robust. However, pangenome properties that are related to its fluidity can be
greatly affected, leading to relatively poor correlation in the results of comparative genomic
analyses conducted with different methods. Interestingly, this does not only affect mobile genetic
elements, but also genes involved in non-selfish functions.

Results

<u>Method-dependent variation and intrinsic uncertainty in pangenome size and diversity</u>

We investigated 3 major methods for *de novo* species-wise OGC construction that qualitatively differ
in the strategies for gene clustering and paralog discrimination (Table 1). All *de novo* methods start
from a collection of open reading frames (ORF) and cluster them according to a predefined identity
threshold that can be set to include more or less distant homologs. The resulting clusters are then
processed to split paralogs into separate OGC. The three methods included in this study represent
three alternative approaches implemented by some of the most popular tools for pangenome
analysis: orthology-based clustering (implemented by panX), synteny-based clustering
(implemented by Roary), and homology-based clustering (implemented by MMseqs2, which is the
OGC construction module used by PanACoTA). For the latter two, we also explored the effect of
introducing two different identity thresholds for the initial clustering.

In addition, we considered a fast orthology prediction method (eggNOG-mapper) based on mapping
ORF to a reference database of orthologous groups. This reference-based method was not originally
intended for pangenome analysis and has some important limitations. First, because the eggNOG
database was built using only one representative genome per species, it does not account for
variability across strains. Second, because orthologous groups in the eggNOG database were
required to contain sequences from at least 3 species, mapping ORF to eggNOG automatically
excludes sequences without known homologs and sets a hard limit for OGC taxonomic resolution at
the genus level. Still, reference-based orthology assignments are nowadays highly efficient and
scalable to large (meta)genomic datasets. Therefore, we included eggNOG-mapper in this study to
assess its performance compared to *sensu stricto* pangenome reconstruction methods.

By applying these methods, we obtained 6 alternative sets of species-wise OGC for 124 bacterial
and 1 archaeal species (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7093014). These species, defined according to the
phylogenetically consistent classification scheme established by the Genome Taxonomy Database
(GTDB) (Parks et al. 2018), were selected to cover every genus in the GTDB, with the condition that
there were at least 15 high-quality genomes available per species. We quantified the discordance
between the OGC produced by each pair of methods by means of the normalized variation of
information, a measure that takes values between 0, if the two sets of OGC display a one-to-one
correspondence, and 1, if they are completely independent. The hierarchical clustering of methods
based on this measure reveals that the discordances, although small, are reproducible across
species (Fig. 2a). The most notable differences arise between reference-based and *de novo* OGC.
Among the latter, the strategy for paralog discrimination determines the resulting OGC to a greater
extent than the identity threshold, at least for the relatively permissive thresholds implemented in
the study.

Based on the previous finding, we restricted our analysis to a single identity threshold (80%) and
investigated how paralog discrimination affects the properties of the inferred prokaryotic
pangenomes. To that end, we selected 10 non-redundant quantitative features that represent
different aspects of pangenome size and diversity. All *de novo* methods supported clustering these
features in 4 groups (Fig. 2b) that can be interpreted in terms of (i) pangenome size, (ii) genome
(and core genome) size, (iii) gene content diversity, and (iv) nucleotide diversity (evaluated in the
core genes). As expected, reference-based OGC systematically produced the smallest estimates of

pangenome size and gene content diversity, whereas *de novo* synteny- and homology-based OGC
produced the largest estimates for those traits (Fig. 2c).

Although the differences in some estimates (especially those involving singletons) are substantial,
their practical impact on comparative analyses does not so much depend on their median
magnitude, but on the extent to which they generate unexplained variation across species. More
precisely, method-dependent variation appears if the choice of a particular set of OGC over another
does not affect all species by the same factor. Because there is no ground truth for the "correct" set
of OGC, method-dependent across-species variation constitutes an unavoidable source of
uncertainty in comparative pangenome analyses that only becomes visible when considering
multiple OGC construction methods. We assessed such uncertainty for 10 selected pangenome
features by pairing sets of OGC (corresponding to different strategies for paralog discrimination)
and quantifying the fraction of the total variance in the feature of interest obtained with one set
that remains unexplained after controlling for the values obtained with the other set. This measure
also serves as a proxy for the methodological inconsistency in the estimation of pangenome
properties. As shown in Fig. 2c-d (see also Suppl. Fig S1 and S2), core genome and pangenome sizes
are generally consistent across methods; that is, using one method or another affects all species by
the same factor. In consequence, methodological choices are not expected to affect relative
comparisons of core genome and pangenome sizes across species. In contrast, estimates of gene
content diversity display higher levels of inconsistency, with method-dependent uncertainty
accounting for roughly 20% of the total across-species variance (and up to 40% if using reference-
based OGC). The inconsistencies in genome fluidity are especially high in the case of Proteobacteria,
reaching around 50% of the total across-species variance.

A major limitation of reference-based approaches to OGC construction is that they are constrained
by the limited diversity of the reference database. Indeed, in most species, 5-10% of the ORF could
not be mapped to the eggNOG database and therefore were not assigned to any reference-based
OGC (Suppl Fig. S3). The fraction of missing ORF is larger in some taxa that are underrepresented or
absent from the reference database. The most extreme case, with >30% unmapped genes,
corresponds to *B. burgdorferi*, the causal agent of Lyme's disease. The poor performance of
reference database mapping in *B. burgdorferi* is explained by the unique structure of its genome,
which consists of a linear chromosome and >20 linear and circular plasmids without homologs in
other species (Fraser et al. 1997; Casjens et al. 2012). Despite these limitations, reference-based
OGC provide reasonably good estimates for the number of core genes per genome and allow
retrieving 85-90% of the single-copy core gene families identified by *de novo* approaches.

<u>Within-species paralogy and inference of core genomes</u>

Among the pangenome features considered in this work, the size of the core genome is the least
affected by the gene clustering criterion. However, a closer inspection of core gene families (defined
in a strict sense, given the high completeness of the genomes included in the study) reveals
differences in the mean copy number across methods (Fig. 3a). Almost all the core gene families
obtained by the synteny-based approach are single-copy, whereas those obtained by other methods
can sometimes harbor >1 copy per genome. Thus, the fraction of core gene families that appear as
single-copy ranges from 80% in reference-based to >99% in synteny-based OGC. In the case of
reference-based and *de novo* homology-based OGC, the distribution of the mean copy number per

core gene family per genome displays clear peaks at integer values, indicating the existence of
complete sets of duplicated paralogs that were not resolved by these methods.

We next focused on single-copy core (s.c.c.) genes, which are of greater practical interest as they
are often used to infer high-resolution phylogenies. Synteny-based methods systematically produce
5-10% more s.c.c. OGC than orthology-based methods (Fig. 3b). Typically, synteny-supported s.c.c.
genes belong to orthologous OGC that are core but not necessarily single-copy (Fig 3c). Therefore,
it appears that synteny criteria are effective in resolving single-copy representatives of core gene
families affected by within-species duplications or HGT. On the other side, s.c.c. OGC that are
orthologous but not supported by synteny tend to either contain incomplete ORFs (that could not
be processed by the synteny-based workflow) or split among 2 or more synteny-supported
accessory OGC (Fig. 3d). Such lack of synteny conservation could be a sign of non-vertical
transmission in s.c.c. genes exclusively detected through orthology criteria. However, given the
small fraction of these OGC in most species (<1% of all orthology-based s.c.c. OGC), the overall effect
of such potential non-vertical contamination in downstream analyses is possibly modest. The only
exception occurs in Mycoplasmatales, in which the relative contribution of non-synteny-supported
OGC is amplified by their small genome sizes.

Single-copy core genes supported by a single criterion (either synteny or orthology) are significantly
less conserved in terms of their average identity than those detected by both criteria (Fig. 3e);
Kruskal-Wallis omnibus test $p < 10^{-20}$). Among the s.c.c. genes that are method-exclusive, those
based on orthology are significantly less conserved than those based on synteny ($p < 10^{-8}$ for all
Mann-Whitney post-hoc tests with Tuckey's HSD correction). There are also significant differences
in the functional profiles of s.c.c. genes that are supported by only one or both criteria (Fig. 3f), with
overrepresentation of genes associated with mobile genetic elements, cell motility, and secondary
metabolism, and underrepresentation of genes involved in translation among method-exclusive
single-copy core genes (linear mixed effects model for isometric log-ratios; $F(2,248) > 190$, $q < 10^{-20}$
in all cases).

Systematic and species-specific biases in functional profiles

Estimates of genome content diversity are strongly affected by the choice of orthology- or synteny-
based strategies to discriminate paralogs when building *de novo* OGC. To better understand the
causes and implications of these differences, we classified ORF and OGC into 21 coarse-grained
functional categories that are representative of the main molecular and cellular processes that take
place in prokaryotic cells. For each functional category, we studied the agreement between
orthology- and synteny-based OGC by calculating the normalized variation of information, the
fraction of fully equivalent OGC (that is, OGC that contain exactly the same ORF regardless of the
strategy for paralog discrimination), and the fraction of ORF assigned to fully equivalent OGC (Fig.
4a and Suppl. Fig. S4). By far, the highest inconsistency occurs for mobile genetic elements, for which
only 25% of the OGC (encompassing 25% of the ORF) are equivalent. Besides mobile genetic
elements, moderate degrees of inconsistency are observed for defense systems, intracellular
trafficking/secretion, and replication/recombination/repair. On the other end, central cellular
functions, such as translation, transcription, nucleotide metabolism, and coenzyme metabolism
show the highest agreement, with 64-70% of the OGC (encompassing 77-84% of the ORF) being fully
equivalent. These trends are also manifest when looking at the absolute and relative numbers of

OGC per category (Fig. 4b), with synteny-based paralog discrimination producing a disproportional
excess of OGC associated with the mobilome. The fraction of OGC that contain ORF from more than
one functional category is consistently larger in the case of orthology-based OGC, although the
absolute differences are modest (around 0.5-1% in most categories; Suppl. Fig S4). Functionally
heterogeneous OGC are most often associated with signal transduction, cell cycle control/cell
division, mobile genetic elements, and unknown or poorly characterized functions.

Compositional analysis of functional profiles controlling for across-species variability confirms that
synteny-based paralog discrimination leads to a significant increase in the fraction of OGC
associated with mobile genetic elements (Fig. 4c; linear mixed effects model for isometric log-ratios;
ILR-balance difference = 0.49, $F(2,124) = 189$, $q < 10^{-20}$). Functional profiles derived from synteny
and orthology-based OGC also differ in the balance between central cellular functions (transcription,
translation, cell cycle, nucleotide and coenzyme metabolism) and other functional categories (ILR-
balance difference = -0.11, $F(2,124) = 132$, $q < 10^{-20}$); and between a set of functions including
secondary metabolism, carbohydrate metabolism, secretion, defense and recombination, and the
remaining functional categories (ILR-balance difference = 0.08, $F(2,124) = 62$, $q < 10^{-10}$). Apart from
these general trends, other significant differences between synteny- and orthology-based functional
profiles are restricted to specific categories in one or a few particular species (Fig. 4d), such as
defense in *Legionella pneumophila* (Z = 5.9, $q < 10^{-5}$), *Borreliella burgdorferi* (Z = 5.4, $q = 5 \times 10^{-5}$) and
Bordetella pertussis (Z = 4.4, $q = 0.002$), secondary metabolism in *Bacillus anthracis* (Z = 4.0, $q = 0.008$), and signal transduction in *Brachyspira hyodysenteriae* (Z = 3.8, $q = 0.019$).
0.008), and signal transduction in *Brachyspira hyodysenteriae* (Z = 3.8, $q = 0.019$).

<u>Variability of gene flux estimates</u>

To assess whether method-dependent variation in pangenome composition propagates to
downstream analyses, we investigated the effect of synteny- and orthology-based paralog
discrimination on a quantitative study of genome dynamics. To that purpose, we used the software
Gloome, that infers events of gene gain and loss along a lineage taking as inputs the strain-level
phylogenetic tree and a binary matrix with the presence and absence profiles of each OGC. As shown
in Fig. 5a, using synteny-based instead of orthology-based OGC leads to a 60% increase in the
estimated number of gene gains and losses per lineage. Genome vs gene change ratios, measured
as the number of expected gains and losses per gene per core nucleotide substitution are also higher
(40% increase) when using synteny-based OGC. In contrast, the ratio between gene gains and losses,
that determines the short-term dynamics of genome size (Sela et al. 2016), displays a more complex
response, with synteny-based OGC producing lower or higher estimates than those obtained with
orthology-based OGC depending on whether a species is dominated by gains or losses. Method-
dependent uncertainties account for 15%, 18%, and 30% of the across-species variability in the total
flux, the genome vs gene change ratio, and the gain vs loss ratio, respectively. These results indicate
that comparative analyses of short-term genome dynamics are highly sensitive to methodological
choices for paralog discrimination, especially when it comes to evaluate the balance between gene
gain and loss.

A deeper analysis of gene flux by functional categories reveals that inconsistencies between gene
clustering criteria (quantified as one minus the squared rank correlation of species-wise estimates
to account for the numerous outliers) are stronger among mobile genetic elements and genes
involved in secondary metabolism and inorganic ion transport (Fig. 4b). Although high

inconsistencies are also observed in central functional categories, such as translation, the practical
relevance of those is lesser due to the relatively low fluxes associated with those categories. If all
species are jointly considered by calculating their median, flux estimates obtained from synteny
OGC display a systematic deviation of >1 additional event per gene in all functional categories, which
is evenly distributed between gains and losses (Fig. 4c).

Discussion

Orthology is generally considered the optimal criterion for clustering gene sequences for
comparative genomics (Gabaldón and Koonin 2013). Because orthologs tend to conserve their
function and evolve consistently with speciation patterns, they are, at least in theory, the most
fitting choice for functional and phylogenomic studies. In practice, however, the use of orthology as
a gold standard for pangenome analysis faces technical and conceptual challenges. On the technical
side, distinguishing orthologs from paralogs is computationally costly. Therefore, to deal with large
(meta)genomic datasets, orthology prediction tools often resort to heuristic algorithms that risk
missing true orthologs or including out-paralogs (paralogs that duplicated before the last common
ancestor of the clade of interest). On the conceptual side, intra-species gene duplication and
horizontal gene transfer generate multi-copy gene lineages that, despite not violating the orthology
criterion at the species level, may confound downstream analyses that assume vertical transmission.
In those cases, a stricter criterion that only clusters together vertically transmitted members of a
gene family may be more desirable.

Motivated by these caveats, we introduced the general term "operational gene cluster" (OGC) to
denote meaningful units for pangenome reconstruction in a manner that is agnostic of the clustering
criterion. The term OGC highlights the operational nature of gene clusters generated by pangenome
analysis tools, which, despite being inspired in many cases by the concept of orthology, do not
necessarily produce orthologs in a strict sense. Different clustering tools use different formal criteria
and heuristics to generate OGC. The purpose of this study was to assess how three major clustering
criteria (homology, orthology, and synteny) implemented by popular pangenome analysis tools
affect pangenome reconstructions and downstream phylogenomic analyses. Despite we did not
conduct a comprehensive comparison of heuristic implementations, we tested several identity
thresholds for the initial clustering step and found that, as long as they are relatively permissive,
their impact on the results is minor compared to that of the subsequent paralog discrimination step.
Therefore, it appears that the underlying formal criterion for paralog discrimination (shared
ancestry at speciation for orthology, conserved gene neighborhood for synteny), rather than the
actual implementation, is what drives qualitative differences across methods.

Consistent with previous works, we observed that single-species estimates of pangenome size and
diversity strongly depend on the method used to build OGC (Bayliss et al. 2019; Sitto and Battistuzzi
2020; Tonkin-Hill et al. 2020). However, when conducting comparative analyses, inconsistencies in
trends and relative estimates across species are of much greater concern than absolute differences
in species-level estimates. In that regard, trends involving pangenome and core genome sizes are
generally robust across methods. More precisely, choosing one or another method affects all
species-wise size estimates by the same constant multiplicative factor. In contrast, across-species

comparisons of genome plasticity and pangenome diversity are highly sensitive with respect to the clustering criterion, in a way that cannot be explained by any linear or nonlinear data transformation. Such inconsistencies in pangenome diversity, that reach up to 50% of the total across-species variance in Proteobacteria, should be a major source of concern for studies aimed at understanding the forces that shape microbial pangenomes. For comparison, it has been estimated that habitat and phylogeny contribute to explain approximately 20% of the across-species variance in pangenome diversity (Maistrenko et al. 2020). The contribution of a particular gene clustering method to pangenome variability can only be assessed by comparison with other methods, which is often unfeasible in large datasets. As a result, methodological "noise" remains unnoticed, potentially contributing a relevant fraction of the unexplained variance or, in the worst-case scenario, acting as a confounding factor if method-dependent biases in OGC correlate with the biological variables of interest.

The identification of single-copy core genes is one of the main outcomes of pangenome reconstruction (Harris et al. 2021). Single-copy core genes allow building high-resolution strain trees that can be very robust to the effects of unbiased homologous recombination (Stott and Bobay 2020) . However, to obtain accurate trees, it is fundamental that the OGC that correspond to single-copy core genes are not contaminated by HGT (Kapli et al. 2020). As expected, synteny is the most sensitive criterion to discriminate single-copy representatives among gene families affected by paralogy and intra-species duplications. Nevertheless, *de novo* homology- and orthology-based methods retrieve most (90-95%) synteny-supported single-copy core OGC with low (<1%) potential contamination, which makes them good alternatives for many practical applications.

Differences in gene clustering criteria translate to downstream phylogenomic analyses involving functional profiles and gene flux estimation. In particular, synteny-based OGC display substantial fragmentation of non-core gene families, including not only mobile genetic elements, but also genes involved in defense, secondary metabolism, signal transduction, and secretion, among others. The fact that gene family fragmentation is not homogeneous across taxa and functional categories implies that the choice of an inadequate criterion can bias comparative studies of pangenome function and dynamics. That said, regardless of the method used to discriminate paralogs, the lowest gene fluxes are always observed in categories associated with central cell functions, whereas the highest fluxes correspond to mobile genetic elements and defense systems. Therefore, the inverse association between gene flux and essentiality described by previous studies (Cohen and Pupko 2010; Puigbò et al. 2014; Iranzo et al. 2017) appears as a robust feature of genome plasticity.

As a fast alternative to *de novo* clustering methods, we evaluated the performance of OGC built by annotating gene sequences with the eggNOG reference database. Although reference-based OGC deviate from *de novo* OGC in many aspects, they are a reasonable option to identify single-copy core genes and generate functional profiles in well-studied genera, especially if paralogs and rare genes can be disregarded. In contrast, eggNOG-based OGC can miss a significant portion of species-specific core genes in poorly sampled taxa, do not discriminate paralogs below the genus level, and filter out gene families with narrow taxonomic distribution. Accordingly, pangenome analyses using reference-based OGC should justify their conclusions accounting for these limitations. Possibly, the most interesting application of reference-based OGC is found in large-scale comparative studies that require tracking OGC across species. That can be achieved thanks to the hierarchical structure of the

eggNOG database, that allows annotating orthologs at multiple taxonomic levels without additional
computational cost**.**

Our findings stress that, as long as choosing an operational definition of gene cluster remains
arbitrary, pangenome properties affected by method-dependent variability will be subject to
intrinsic uncertainty. To minimize such uncertainty, methodological choices for OGC construction
should be guided by the nature of the research goals and their conceptual underpinnings, rather
than by computational considerations alone. A careful selection of clustering criteria is especially
required in studies that involve comparison of functional profiles or inference of gene fluxes within
and across pangenomes. Furthermore, future studies aimed at exploring the role of adaptive and
non-adaptive processes in pangenome evolution should explicitly discuss how methodological
choices affect the interpretation of their results. For example, choosing synteny over classical
orthology as the clustering criterion may inflate the proportion of mobile genetic elements in the
pangenome, altering the balance between selfish and potentially beneficial accessory genes. In turn,
measures of genome plasticity based on binary (presence or absence) phyletic profiles will
underestimate the contribution of intra-species paralogs to the total gene flux unless synteny is
used to build the OGC.

Reusability and meta-analysis of pangenome datasets is currently hindered by the incompatibility
of OGC obtained by different methods. To address that limitation and foster future research, it is
critical to come to a consensus on a set of methods that cover the most relevant criteria for paralog
discrimination. A first step in that direction would be to establish multi-method databases that
facilitate assessing the robustness of pangenome analyses with respect to methodological choices.
We expect that the datasets generated in this study (publicly available in DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.7093014), though relatively limited in the number of species, will contribute to
achieving such a goal.

Materials and Methods

Genomic sequences

We parsed the metadata files of the Genome Taxonomy Database (GTDB) release 95 (Parks et al. 2020) to identify all the species (sensu GTDB) for which there were at least 15 high-quality available genomes. High-quality genomes were defined according to the MIMAG criteria (Bowers et al. 2017) plus the following more stringent filters: completeness >99% and contamination <1%, both assessed through CheckM (Parks et al. 2015), mean contig length >5kb, and contig count <500. Metagenome-assembled genomes (MAG) and single-amplified genomes (SAG) were not included in the analysis. After applying these filters, we recovered 321 bacterial and 1 archaeal species, belonging to 125 different genera (sensu GTDB). To minimize possible taxonomical biases, only one representative species per genus was selected for subsequent analyses. For those genera with >1 suitable species, we kept the species with the highest number of high-quality genomes, as they presumably were the most informative for pangenome studies.

To keep our analyses within a manageable computational cost, species with >100 high-quality genomes were subsampled to keep at most 100 genomes per species. To that end, we separately aligned the amino acid sequences of 120 nearly universal marker genes employed by the GTDB with MAFFT (Katoh and Standley 2013), concatenated the alignments, and ran IQ-Tree (Nguyen et al. 2015) to obtain phylogenetic trees including all the strains of the same species. Then, we applied a heuristic subsampling strategy that maximized the diversity of the subsampled genomes whilst accurately reflecting the topology of the strain trees.

The final dataset comprised 6,796 bacterial genomes belonging to 124 species and 55 archaeal genomes belonging to 1 species. The genomes were downloaded from the NCBI FTP site. Open reading frames (ORF) were predicted with Prodigal v2.6.3 (Hyatt et al. 2010), using the "single" mode that is recommended for finished genomes and quality draft genomes. All runs used the bacterial, archaeal and plant plastid code 11 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Taxonomy/Utils/wprintgc.cgi), which maps UAA, UGA, and UAG to stop codons, except for *Mycoplasmopsis bovis PG45* (GCF_000183385.1) and *Mycoplasma pneumoniae FH* (GCF_001272835.1), which used code 4 and translate UGA to tryptophan.

De novo OGC construction

We generated five sets of *de novo* species-level OGC, each one representing an alternative approach to identify homologous genes and discriminate within-species paralogs (Table 1). To facilitate comparison among methods, we started in all cases from the same predicted ORF previously obtained with Prodigal, overriding any optional ORF prediction step provided by the OGC construction software.

Two sets of homology-based OGC were built with the sequence clustering tool MMseqs2 (Steinegger and Söding 2017), setting the minimum identity threshold to 50% and 80% (additional options 'easy-cluster' for cascaded clustering and --cluster-mode 1 to define clusters based on connected components). MMseqs2 does not perform any kind of paralog splitting; therefore, the resolution of the resulting OGC only depends on the similarity threshold used for clustering.

Two sets of synteny-based OGC were built with the software Roary (Page et al. 2015) , setting the
minimum identity threshold to 80% and 95%. The Roary algorithm starts by pre-clustering highly-
similar protein sequences with CD-HIT (Fu et al. 2012) to obtain a smaller set of representative
sequences. Roary then conducts an all-against-all comparison with BLAST and filters the hits based
on the user-provided identity threshold. Based on the network of hits, representative sequences are
clustered with MCL (Enright et al. 2002) and the resulting clusters are merged with the pre-clusters.
As a final step, Roary uses conserved gene neighborhood information to split homologous groups
containing paralogs into groups of synteny-supported OGC.

One set of orthology-based OGC was built with the software panX (Ding et al. 2018). The panX
algorithm clusters sequences in orthologous groups by performing an all-against-all similarity search
with DIAMOND (Buchfink et al. 2021) and posterior clustering with MCL. The hits retrieved by
DIAMOND are filtered only in terms of statistical significance, regardless of sequence identity, which
allows recovering relatively divergent homologs. The sequences of these initial clusters are aligned
with MAFFT (Katoh and Standley 2013) and cluster-level phylogenetic trees are built with FastTree
(Price et al. 2010). Finally, panX obtains orthology-supported OGC by examining the resulting trees
and applying a set of heuristic rules to split paralogs from true species-level orthologs.

<u>OGC construction by reference database mapping</u>

Reference-based OGC were built by mapping translated ORF to the eggNOG (evolutionary genealogy
of genes: Non-supervised Orthologous Groups) database version 5.0 (Huerta-Cepas et al. 2019). For
that purpose, we ran eggNOG-mapper v2 (Cantalapiedra et al. 2021) with command line options "-
m diamond --tax_scope_mode narrowest" to search queries against eggNOG sequences with
DIAMOND and transfer orthologous group annotations at the highest possible taxonomic resolution
(which typically corresponds to the genus level).

<u>Pangenome features</u>

OGC presence-absence matrices (sometimes known as phyletic profiles) and gene-to-OCG
relationships were used to estimate a set of pangenome features that intend to capture both the
size and the diversity of the pangenome.

Pangenome size was calculated as the total number of OGC retrieved for each species. Because this
measure is positively correlated with the number of genomes sampled, an unbiased estimate was
obtained by randomly subsampling sets of 14 genomes and taking the average over 100 realizations
(we refer to this and other pangenome features obtained with the same procedure as "14-mean").
To ensure that the results obtained with these two measures were sufficiently representative, we
calculated three additional measures of pangenome size: Chao's lower bound (Chao 1987); the
normalized pangenome size, obtained by dividing the pangenome size (P_{tot}) by the sum of the
harmonic series of the number of genomes (n), such that $P_{norm} = \frac{P_{tot}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} 1/i}$ (Bobay and Ochman
2018); and the pangenome size of the 15 most dissimilar genomes in terms of genome content.
After verifying that all those metrics were highly correlated across species (R>0.95), we proceeded
with the uncorrected and 14-mean pangenome sizes, which are simpler and more easily
interpretable.

We defined the core genome as the set of OGC contained in all the genomes of a species. This strict
definition is appropriate given the almost full (>99%) completeness filter imposed on high-quality
genomes. Pangenomes were also characterized in terms of the absolute number of single-copy core
OGC, accessory OGC (those that are not core), and singleton OGC (those encompassing a single
ORF). As measures of genome content diversity, we computed the fraction of a genome's OGC that
are accessory and singleton, averaged over 100 random subsamples of 14 genomes per species. In
addition, a measure of genomic fluidity that quantifies the average dissimilarity in gene content of
randomly sampled pairs of genomes (Kislyuk et al. 2011) was obtained with the 'fluidity' function of
the R package micropan, setting the option 'n.sim = 500' (Snipen and Liland 2015).

The species-wise core gene alignment similarity (CGAS) was calculated using ORFs that belong to
single-copy core OGC. Pairwise global alignments of all the ORFs assigned to the same OGC were
performed with the Needleman-Wunsch algorithm as implemented by the *needleall* program of the
EMBOSS suite (Madeira et al. 2019). After removing all self-alignments (alignments of ORFs with
themselves), the average identity of each pair of genomes was calculated as $(\sum m_i)/(\sum L_i)$, where
m_i and L_i represent the number of matches and total alignment length for the pair of sequences
from the i-th OGC and the sum extends over all single-copy core OGC. The species-wise CGAS was
obtained as the average over all pairs of genomes of the same species. The nucleotide sequence
divergence in single-copy core genes was defined as one minus the species-wise CGAS. Given the
high computational cost of this procedure, calculation of CGAS and core gene divergences was
restricted to reference-, synteny-, and orthology-based OGC.

<u>High-resolution species trees and inference of gene gains and losses</u>

High resolution trees were obtained for each species using concatenated alignments of all single-
copy core OGC obtained by Roary. Amino acid sequences for each single-copy core OGC were
aligned with mafft-linsi (L-INS-I Algorithm, default options) (Katoh and Standley 2013) and back-
translated to nucleotide alignments with the program pal2nal.pl using codon table 11 (except for
species of the order Mycoplasmatales, which use codon table 4) (Suyama et al. 2006). The
nucleotide alignments were concatenated and used as input for the tree construction program
FastTree (command line options -gtr -nt -gamma -nosupport -mlacc 2 -slownni) (Price et al. 2010).
The preliminary tree produced by FastTree was subsequently provided to RAxML for branch length
optimization (options -f e -c 25 -m GTRGAMMA) (Stamatakis 2014). The package ETE3 (Huerta-Cepas
et al. 2016) was used for mid-point rooting and visualization.

Gene gains and losses along each species tree were inferred with the phylogenomic reconstruction
software Gloome (Cohen et al. 2010). As the input for Gloome, we used the phyletic profiles for the
presence or absence of each OGC and the high-resolution species trees; options were set to optimize
the tree branch lengths under a genome evolution model with 4 categories of gamma-distributed
gain and loss rates and stationary frequencies at the root. To compare among OGC generation
methods, we varied the input phyletic profiles according to the desired method while keeping the
species trees unchanged. The Gloome optimization algorithm did not converge for *Enterobacter*
himalayensis and *Chlamydia muridarum*; therefore, those species were excluded from all the
analyses involving gene gains and losses.

<u>Functional annotation and statistical analysis of functional profiles</u>

Functional annotation at the gene level was done by mapping individual genes to custom-made
HMM profiles of the 2020 release of the COG database (Galperin et al. 2021). Functional annotation
at the OGC level was done by applying the majority rule to gene-level annotations. Coarse-grained
pangenome functional profiles were built by counting the number of OGC assigned to each of the
21 major prokaryotic functional categories defined in the COG database.

The statistical analysis of functional profiles was conducted by applying the phylofactorization
framework (Washburne et al. 2017). First, to account for the constant-sum constraint that
complicates the statistical analysis of compositional data, we applied the isometric log-ratio (ILR)
transform to the species-wise functional profiles. Informative ILR balances were defined following a
guide tree that was obtained by calculating the mean differences between synteny and orthology
OGC for each functional category and performing hierarchical clustering of the functional categories
based on such differences. Then, linear mixed effects models were set out for each of the 20 ILR
balances, with OGC clustering criteria as fixed effects and species as random effects. Model fitting
was performed with the R package lmerTest (Kuznetsova et al. 2017) and contrasts among balances
were conducted with the R package phylofactor (https://github.com/reptalex/phylofactor) , which
ranks the balances based on the fraction of the total variance that is explained by the model.
Statistical significance was calculated by using Satterthwaite's approach to estimate the degrees of
freedom of the F-statistic and applying Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

Acknowledgements

The work of Y.L. was supported by the China Scholarship Council (CSC Grant No. 202008440425). J.I. is supported by the Ramón y Cajal Programme of the Spanish Ministry of Science (Grant No. RYC-2017-22524), the Agencia Estatal de Investigación of Spain (Grant No. PID2019-106618GA-I00), the Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D of the Agencia Estatal de Investigación of Spain (Grant No. SEV-2016-0672 (2017–2021) to the CBGP), the Comunidad de Madrid (through the call Research Grants for Young Investigators from Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Grant No. M190020074JIIS); and the National Programme for Fostering Excellence in Scientific and Technical Research (grant No. PGC2018-098073-A-I00 MCIU/AEI/FEDER, UE; to J.H-C.)

Data Availability

The data underlying this article are available in Zenodo, at https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7093014

Figure legends

Figure 1: Homology, species-level orthology, and synteny conservation. The phylogeny of a gene
family that has experienced intra-species duplication (†), intra-species HGT (*), and inter-species
HGT (**) is superimposed on a species tree (colored ribbons). In the species tree, speciation is
followed by diversification into two strains (blue), and a sister species is represented in green. Gene
neighborhoods are displayed at the leaves of the gene tree.

Figure 2: Method-dependent variation and uncertainty in pangenome features. (a) Consensus
similarity tree of OGC building methods based on the species-wise normalized variation of
information for the assignation of ORF to OGC. Labels indicate the number of species (out of 125)
that support each branch. (b) Consensus similarity tree of different pangenome features based on
pairwise, unsigned correlations. Labels indicate the number of OGC building methods (out of 4) that
support each branch (values <3 are not shown). In all cases when the support is not complete,
reference database mapping is the method that disagrees. (c) Quantitative comparison of
pangenome estimates among methods. Left: relative differences in pangenome estimates; right:
relative contribution of methodological choices to across-species variance. Note the different color
scale for Proteobacteria. Highlighted cells correspond to the features shown in (d). (d) Species-wise
comparison of selected pangenome features (pangenome size, number of single-copy core OGC,
fluidity, and nucleotide sequence diversity in core genes) inferred from orthology- and synteny-
based OGC. Black lines show the orthogonal least squares fit; gray lines indicate the 1:1 trend. Each
point corresponds to the pangenome of one species, colored according to its phylum.

Figure 3: Comparison of core gene sets obtained from different OGC building methods. (a)
Distribution of the mean copy number per core OGC per genome. (b) Fraction of all single-copy core
(scc) gene families that are exclusively recovered through orthology- or synteny-based paralog
splitting. (c) Distribution of synteny-exclusive, single-copy core OGC among orthology-based OGC.
The large bar at "1" implies that most synteny-exclusive single-copy core OGC are subsets of larger
orthology-based OGC that are core but not single-copy. (d) Distribution of orthology-exclusive,
single-core OGC among synteny-based OGC. Most of the single-copy core OGC exclusively supported
by orthology combine 2 accessory synteny-based OGC. In (c) and (d), gray bars denote method-
exclusive single-copy core OGC that include sequences that could not be processed by the other
method. (e) Nucleotide sequence divergence in single-copy core OGC exclusively supported by
orthology, synteny, or both criteria. To account for across-species differences in evolutionary rates
and phylogenetic tree spans, values were normalized by the species-level mean divergence
(calculated from all single-copy core OGC that were supported by both synteny and orthology).
Vertical lines indicate the distribution means for each group of single-copy core OGC. (f) Functional
differences among single-copy core OGC supported by different criteria. Each set of box plots
represents the balance (measured as the isometric log-ratio) between the relative frequencies of a
given functional category (x-axis) and the remaining categories not considered in previous sets (e.g.,
the second set of box plots corresponds to the balance between functional category N and all the
rest except X). The figure shows the 4 ILR balances with the greatest variation across methods.
Abbreviations of functional categories, X: mobilome; N: cell motility; Q: 2º metabolites biosynthesis,
transport and catabolism; J: translation, ribosomal structure and biogenesis. In (b) and (f), each data
point corresponds to one species; boxes span the 25-75 percentiles; the central line indicates the

median; whiskers extend to the most extreme data points that are not outliers; isolated points
denote outliers; notches (only in f) show the 95% confidence interval of the median.

Figure 4: Systematic and specific biases in functional profiles associated with paralog splitting
criteria. (a) Inconsistency of ORF assignations into OGC (normalized variation of information, top),
and fraction of OGC that exactly contain the same ORFs (bottom) under synteny and orthology
splitting criteria, stratified by functional category. (b) Absolute number (top) and relative fraction
(bottom) of synteny- and orthology-based OGC associated with each functional category. (c)
Balances (quantified as isometric log-ratios) for the functional categories that show the greatest
systematic variation between paralog splitting criteria. Each set of boxplots represents the balance
between the relative abundances of a group of functional categories (shown below) and all the
remaining categories not considered in previous sets. Each data point corresponds to the
pangenome of one species; boxes span the 25-75 percentiles; the central line indicates the median;
whiskers extend to the most extreme data points that are not outliers; isolated points denote
outliers. (d) Standardized residuals (Z-scores) of the linear mixed effects model used to infer the
systematic differences shown in (c). Each row corresponds to the pangenome of one species, sorted
according to the GDTB species tree (Parks et al. 2022) (phyla colored as in Fig 1). Colored cells
indicate a significant excess of synteny- (green) or orthology-based (purple) OGC from a given
category in a specific pangenome that is not explained by the general trends in (c). Abbreviations of
functional categories, C: energy production and conversion; D: cell cycle control, cell division,
chromosome partitioning; E: amino acid transport and metabolism; F: nucleotide transport and
metabolism; G: carbohydrate transport and metabolism; H: coenzyme transport and metabolism; I:
lipid transport and metabolism; J: translation, ribosomal structure and biogenesis; K: transcription;
L: replication, recombination and repair; M: cell wall/membrane/envelope biogenesis; N: cell
motility; O: posttranslational modification, protein turnover, chaperones; P: inorganic ion transport
and metabolism; Q: secondary metabolites biosynthesis, transport and catabolism; R: general
function prediction only; S: function unknown; T: signal transduction mechanisms; U: intracellular
trafficking, secretion, and vesicular transport; V: defense mechanisms; X: mobilome: prophages,
transposons.

Figure 5: Effect of paralog splitting criteria on the inference of gene flux. (a) Species-wise
comparison of the total gene flux (gains and losses along the species tree, left), genomic content vs
gene sequence evolution ratio (middle), and total gain vs loss ratio (right) inferred from synteny-
and orthology-based OGC. The method-dependent uncertainty is equal to $1 - R^2$. (b) Flux per gene
per functional category inferred from orthology- (top) and synteny-based (middle) OGC. Each data
point corresponds to one species; boxes span the 25-75 percentiles; the central line indicates the
median; whiskers extend to the most extreme data points that are not outliers; isolated points
denote outliers. The bar plot at the bottom shows the inconsistency between methods, quantified
as one minus the squared rank correlation. Abbreviations of functional categories as in Fig. 2. (c)
Median flux per gene per category, calculated over all the species, for orthology-based (x-axis) and
synteny-based (y-axis) OGC. Similar trends are observed for gains, losses, and the combination of
both.

Table 1: OGC generation strategies and tools used in this study.

Clustering	Paralog splitting	Identity threshold	Software	Ref.
de novo	orthology-based	none (e-val < 0.001)	panX	Ding et al. (2018)
de novo	synteny-based	80%, 95%	roary	Page et al. (2015); Ding et al. (2018)
de novo	none	50%, 80%	MMseqs2, PanACoTA	Steinegger and Söding (2017); Perrin and Rocha (2021)
reference db	n.a.	none (e-val < 0.001)	eggNOG-mapper	Cantalapiedra et al. (2021)

References

Altenhoff AM, Dessimoz C. 2012. Inferring orthology and paralogy. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 855:259–
279. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-61779-582-4_9

Bayliss SC, Thorpe HA, Coyle NM, Sheppard SK, Feil EJ. 2019. PIRATE: A fast and scalable
pangenomics toolbox for clustering diverged orthologues in bacteria. *Gigascience* 8. Available
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz119

Bobay L-M, Ochman H. 2018. Factors driving effective population size and pan-genome evolution
in bacteria. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 18:153. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12862-018-
1272-4

Bowers RM, Kyrpides NC, Stepanauskas R, Harmon-Smith M, Doud D, Reddy TBK, Schulz F, Jarett J,
Rivers AR, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, et al. 2017. Minimum information about a single amplified
genome (MISAG) and a metagenome-assembled genome (MIMAG) of bacteria and archaea.
Nat. Biotechnol. 35:725–731. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3893

Buchfink B, Reuter K, Drost H-G. 2021. Sensitive protein alignments at tree-of-life scale using
DIAMOND. *Nat. Methods* 18:366–368. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41592-
021-01101-x

Cantalapiedra CP, Hernández-Plaza A, Letunic I, Bork P, Huerta-Cepas J. 2021. eggNOG-mapper v2:
Functional Annotation, Orthology Assignments, and Domain Prediction at the Metagenomic
Scale. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 38:5825–5829. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msab293

Casjens SR, Mongodin EF, Qiu W-G, Luft BJ, Schutzer SE, Gilcrease EB, Huang WM, Vujadinovic M,
Aron JK, Vargas LC, et al. 2012. Genome stability of Lyme disease spirochetes: comparative
genomics of Borrelia burgdorferi plasmids. *PLoS One* 7:e33280. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0033280

Chao A. 1987. Estimating the population size for capture-recapture data with unequal catchability.
Biometrics 43. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3427163/

Cohen O, Ashkenazy H, Belinky F, Huchon D, Pupko T. 2010. GLOOME: gain loss mapping engine.
Bioinformatics 26:2914–2915. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq549

Cohen O, Pupko T. 2010. Inference and characterization of horizontally transferred gene families
using stochastic mapping. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 27:703–713. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msp240

Csurös M. 2010. Count: evolutionary analysis of phylogenetic profiles with parsimony and
likelihood. *Bioinformatics* 26:1910–1912. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq315

Cummins EA, Hall RJ, McInerney JO, McNally A. 2022. Prokaryote pangenomes are dynamic
entities. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* 66:73–78. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2022.01.005

Ding W, Baumdicker F, Neher RA. 2018. panX: pan-genome analysis and exploration. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. 46:e5. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx977

Enright AJ, Van Dongen S, Ouzounis CA. 2002. An efficient algorithm for large-scale detection of
protein families. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 30. Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11917018/

Fitch WM. 2000. Homology a personal view on some of the problems. *Trends Genet.* 16:227–231.
Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0168-9525(00)02005-9

Fouts DE, Brinkac L, Beck E, Inman J, Sutton G. 2012. PanOCT: automated clustering of orthologs
using conserved gene neighborhood for pan-genomic analysis of bacterial strains and closely
related species. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 40:e172. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks757

Fraser CM, Casjens S, Huang WM, Sutton GG, Clayton R, Lathigra R, White O, Ketchum KA, Dodson
R, Hickey EK, et al. 1997. Genomic sequence of a Lyme disease spirochaete, Borrelia
burgdorferi. *Nature* 390:580–586. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/37551

Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z, Wu S, Li W. 2012. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-generation
sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 28:3150–3152. Available from:
https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article-pdf/28/23/3150/18529929/bts565.pdf

Gabaldón T, Koonin EV. 2013. Functional and evolutionary implications of gene orthology. *Nat.*
Rev. Genet. 14:360–366. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrg3456

Galperin MY, Kristensen DM, Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. 2019. Microbial genome analysis:
the COG approach. *Brief. Bioinform.* 20:1063–1070. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbx117

Galperin MY, Wolf YI, Makarova KS, Vera Alvarez R, Landsman D, Koonin EV. 2021. COG database
update: focus on microbial diversity, model organisms, and widespread pathogens. *Nucleic*
Acids Res. 49:D274–D281. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkaa1018

Hao W, Golding GB. 2006. The fate of laterally transferred genes: life in the fast lane to adaptation
or death. *Genome Res.* 16:636–643. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/gr.4746406

Harris CD, Torrance EL, Raymann K, Bobay L-M. 2021. CoreCruncher: Fast and Robust Construction
of Core Genomes in Large Prokaryotic Data Sets. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 38:727–734. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msaa224

Huerta-Cepas J, Forslund K, Coelho LP, Szklarczyk D, Jensen LJ, von Mering C, Bork P. 2017. Fast
Genome-Wide Functional Annotation through Orthology Assignment by eggNOG-Mapper.
Mol. Biol. Evol. 34:2115–2122. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msx148

Huerta-Cepas J, Serra F, Bork P. 2016. ETE 3: Reconstruction, Analysis, and Visualization of
Phylogenomic Data. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 33:1635–1638. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msw046

Huerta-Cepas J, Szklarczyk D, Heller D, Hernández-Plaza A, Forslund SK, Cook H, Mende DR, Letunic

I, Rattei T, Jensen LJ, et al. 2019. eggNOG 5.0: a hierarchical, functionally and phylogenetically
annotated orthology resource based on 5090 organisms and 2502 viruses. *Nucleic Acids Res.*
47:D309–D314. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky1085

Hyatt D, Chen G-L, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. 2010. Prodigal: prokaryotic gene
recognition and translation initiation site identification. *BMC Bioinformatics* 11:119. Available
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-119

Iranzo J, Cuesta JA, Manrubia S, Katsnelson MI, Koonin EV. 2017. Disentangling the effects of
selection and loss bias on gene dynamics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 114:E5616–E5624.
Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1704925114

Kapli P, Yang Z, Telford MJ. 2020. Phylogenetic tree building in the genomic age. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*
21:428–444. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41576-020-0233-0

Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
improvements in performance and usability. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 30:772–780. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst010

Kislyuk AO, Haegeman B, Bergman NH, Weitz JS. 2011. Genomic fluidity: an integrative view of
gene diversity within microbial populations. *BMC Genomics* 12:1–10. Available from:
https://bmcgenomics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2164-12-32

Koonin EV. 2005. Orthologs, paralogs, and evolutionary genomics. *Annu. Rev. Genet.* 39:309–338.
Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.genet.39.073003.114725

Kristensen DM, Wolf YI, Mushegian AR, Koonin EV. 2011. Computational methods for Gene
Orthology inference. *Brief. Bioinform.* 12:379–391. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbr030

Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. 2017. LmerTest package: Tests in linear mixed
effects models. *J. Stat. Softw.* 82. Available from: http://www.jstatsoft.org/v82/i13/

Lees JA, Harris SR, Tonkin-Hill G, Gladstone RA, Lo SW, Weiser JN, Corander J, Bentley SD, Croucher
NJ. 2019. Fast and flexible bacterial genomic epidemiology with PopPUNK. *Genome Res.*
29:304–316. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/gr.241455.118

Lerat E, Daubin V, Moran NA. 2003. From gene trees to organismal phylogeny in prokaryotes: the
case of the gamma-Proteobacteria. *PLoS Biol.* 1:E19. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0000019

Liao J, Guo X, Weller DL, Pollak S, Buckley DH, Wiedmann M, Cordero OX. 2021. Nationwide
genomic atlas of soil-dwelling Listeria reveals effects of selection and population ecology on
pangenome evolution. *Nat Microbiol* 6:1021–1030. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41564-021-00935-7

Madeira F, Park YM, Lee J, Buso N, Gur T, Madhusoodanan N, Basutkar P, Tivey ARN, Potter SC,
Finn RD, et al. 2019. The EMBL-EBI search and sequence analysis tools APIs in 2019. *Nucleic*
Acids Res. 47:W636–W641. Available from:
https://academic.oup.com/nar/article/47/W1/W636/5446251

Maistrenko OM, Mende DR, Luetge M, Hildebrand F, Schmidt TSB, Li SS, Rodrigues JFM, von
Mering C, Pedro Coelho L, Huerta-Cepas J, et al. 2020. Disentangling the impact of
environmental and phylogenetic constraints on prokaryotic within-species diversity. *ISME J.*
14:1247–1259. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41396-020-0600-z

Nguyen L-T, 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.
Available from: https://academic.oup.com/mbe/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/molbev/msu300

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. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv421

Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Chaumeil P-A, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P. 2020. A complete
domain-to-species taxonomy for Bacteria and Archaea. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 38:1079–1086.
Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-020-0501-8

Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Chaumeil P-A, Hugenholtz P. 2022. GTDB: an ongoing
census of bacterial and archaeal diversity through a phylogenetically consistent, rank
normalized and complete genome-based taxonomy. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 50:D785–D794.
Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkab776

Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Waite DW, Rinke C, Skarshewski A, Chaumeil P-A, Hugenholtz P. 2018. A
standardized bacterial taxonomy based on genome phylogeny substantially revises the tree of
life. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 36:996–1004. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4229

Parks DH, Imelfort M, Skennerton CT, Hugenholtz P, Tyson GW. 2015. CheckM: assessing the
quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and metagenomes.
Genome Res. 25:1043–1055. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/gr.186072.114

Perrin A, Rocha EPC. 2021. PanACoTA: a modular tool for massive microbial comparative
genomics. *NAR Genom Bioinform* 3:lqaa106. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nargab/lqaa106

Petitjean C, Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. 2017. Extreme Deviations from Expected
Evolutionary Rates in Archaeal Protein Families. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 9:2791–2811. Available
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evx189

Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. 2010. FastTree 2--approximately maximum-likelihood trees for large
alignments. *PLoS One* 5. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20224823/

Puigbò P, Lobkovsky AE, Kristensen DM, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. 2014. Genomes in turmoil:
quantification of genome dynamics in prokaryote supergenomes. *BMC Biol.* 12:66. Available
from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12915-014-0066-4

Sela I, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. 2016. Theory of prokaryotic genome evolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.*
S. A. 113:11399–11407. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1614083113

Shapiro BJ. 2017. The population genetics of pangenomes. *Nat Microbiol* 2:1574. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41564-017-0066-6

Sitto F, Battistuzzi FU. 2020. Estimating Pangenomes with Roary. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 37:933–939.
Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msz284

Snipen L, Liland KH. 2015. micropan: an R-package for microbial pan-genomics. *BMC*
Bioinformatics 16:79. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12859-015-0517-0

Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large
phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* 30:1312–1313. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu033

Steinegger M, Söding J. 2017. MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching for the
analysis of massive data sets. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 35:1026–1028. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3988

Stott CM, Bobay L-M. 2020. Impact of homologous recombination on core genome phylogenies.
BMC Genomics 21:829. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12864-020-07262-x

Suyama M, Torrents D, Bork P. 2006. PAL2NAL: robust conversion of protein sequence alignments
into the corresponding codon alignments. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 34:W609–W612. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkl315

Tettelin H, Masignani V, Cieslewicz MJ, Donati C, Medini D, Ward NL, Angiuoli SV, Crabtree J, Jones
AL, Durkin AS, et al. 2005. Genome analysis of multiple pathogenic isolates of Streptococcus
agalactiae: implications for the microbial "pan-genome." *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
102:13950–13955. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0506758102

Tonkin-Hill G, MacAlasdair N, Ruis C, Weimann A, Horesh G, Lees JA, Gladstone RA, Lo S, Beaudoin
C, Floto RA, et al. 2020. Producing polished prokaryotic pangenomes with the Panaroo
pipeline. *Genome Biol.* 21:180. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13059-020-02090-
4

Treangen TJ, Rocha EPC. 2011. Horizontal transfer, not duplication, drives the expansion of protein
families in prokaryotes. *PLoS Genet.* 7:e1001284. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1001284

Vernikos G, Medini D, Riley DR, Tettelin H. 2015. Ten years of pan-genome analyses. *Curr. Opin.*
Microbiol. 23:148–154. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2014.11.016

Washburne AD, Silverman JD, Leff JW, Bennett DJ, Darcy JL, Mukherjee S, Fierer N, David LA. 2017.
Phylogenetic factorization of compositional data yields lineage-level associations in
microbiome datasets. *PeerJ* 5:e2969. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2969

Whelan FJ, Hall RJ, McInerney JO. 2021. Evidence for Selection in the Abundant Accessory Gene
Content of a Prokaryote Pangenome. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 38:3697–3708. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msab139

Wu D, Jospin G, Eisen JA. 2013. Systematic identification of gene families for use as "markers" for
phylogenetic and phylogeny-driven ecological studies of bacteria and archaea and their major
subgroups. *PLoS One* 8:e77033. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077033

Figure 1

Figure 2

 Figure 3

 Figure 4

854 **Figure 5**