1 **Large-scale duplication events underpin population-level flexibility**
2 **in bacterial tRNA gene copy number**

3 Zahra Khomarbaghi, Gökçe B. Ayan, Wing Y. Ngan, Gunda Dechow-Seligmann, Pabitra Nandy,
4 Jenna Gallie[*]

5
6 Department of Evolutionary Theory, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, Plön, 24306,
7 Germany
8

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: gallie@evolbio.mpg.de

Present Address: Zahra Khomarbaghi, School of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine
and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PT, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The complement of tRNA genes within the genome is typically regarded as a stable characteristic of
an organism. Here we demonstrate that bacterial tRNA gene set composition can be more flexible
than previously appreciated, particularly regarding tRNA gene copy number. We report the
spontaneous, high-rate occurrence of large-scale, tandem duplication events in laboratory populations
of the bacterium *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25. The identified duplication fragments are up to 1
Mb in size (~15 % of the wildtype genome) and are predicted to change the copy number of up to 917
genes, including several tRNA genes. The observed duplication fragments are inherently unstable:
they occur, and are subsequently lost, at extremely high rates. We propose that this unusually plastic
type of mutation provides a mechanism that rapidly generates tRNA gene set diversity, while
simultaneously preserving the underlying tRNA gene set in the absence of continued selection. That
is, if a tRNA set variant provides no fitness advantage, then the high-rate segregation of the
duplication fragment ensures the maintenance of the original tRNA gene set. However, if a tRNA
gene set variant is selectively beneficial, the underlying duplication fragments persist and provide the
raw material for further, more stable, evolutionary changes.

INTRODUCTION

The complement of tRNA genes encoded by an organism (the 'tRNA gene set') is an important
determinant of translational efficiency (1, 2) and disease trajectories (3–5). In bacteria, tRNA gene set
composition varies considerably, yet the tRNA gene set of any given bacterial strain is typically
treated as a stable entity. For example, the tRNA gene sets of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strains
SBW25 and Pf0-1 are reported to respectively contain 66 and 73 tRNA genes, encoding 39 and 40
different types of mature tRNA (tRNA 'isotypes') (6–8). In this work we highlight that, at the population

level, tRNA gene set of a given bacterial strain can be more flexible than previously appreciated,

particularly with regard to the number of gene copies encoding each tRNA isotype.

The composition of tRNA gene sets differs across the bacterial phylogeny; extant bacterial

tRNA gene sets differ in both the isotypes that they encode (isotype patterns) and in the number of

gene copies coding for each isotype (7, 9–15). Variations in isotype patterns are possible because of

wobble base pairing, the process by which some isotypes can – either naturally (16) or through post-

transcriptional modifications (17, 18) – translate multiple codons. Ultimately, wobble base pairing

allows all 62 codons (61 sense codons plus the AUG initiator codon) to be translated by far fewer than

62 directly corresponding tRNA types, with most bacteria encoding between 25 and 46 isotypes (7, 9,

19). In contrast to the reductionist strategy observed for isotype patterns, many tRNA types are

encoded by multiple, often identical, gene copies; tRNA gene copy numbers differ widely both

between and within bacterial genomes, with most isotypes being encoded by between one and eight

gene copies (7, 10).

The content of a tRNA gene set has a strong influence on the composition of the mature

tRNA pool, which in turn is a major determinant of the speed and accuracy of translation (1, 2, 20).

The capacity of a tRNA set for efficient translation depends on a number of additional factors, many of

which co-evolve with tRNA set composition. Prominent examples include (i) which post-transcriptional

tRNA modification enzymes are present (affecting anticodon-codon matching patterns) (15, 18, 21,

22), (ii) codon usage (which influences isotype demand) (23–29), and (iii) environmental conditions

that affect anticodon-codon base pairing properties (*e.g.*, pH, temperature) (30, 31). Evolutionary

optimization of translation efficiency is expected to shape the evolution of each of these factors,

particularly under conditions where efficient translation is most important (*e.g.*, during rapid bacterial

growth) (32–35). For example, bacteria with faster growth rates tend to carry tRNA gene sets with

fewer isotypes, encoded by higher gene copy numbers (11). Empirically, multiple copies of several

Escherichia coli tRNA genes have been demonstrated to be advantageous only under conditions that

support rapid growth (and hence, rapid translation) (36).

The molecular mechanisms by which tRNA genes are gained and lost from tRNA gene sets

have been inferred by phylogenetic analyses. Such computational studies have provided evidence for

the evolution of extant bacterial tRNA gene sets via a number of routes, including: (i) mutation of

tRNA genes to encode new isotypes ('anticodon switching'), (ii) loss of tRNA genes by deletion, and

(iii) acquisition of new tRNA genes, either by within-genome duplication events, or by horizontal gene

transfer (10, 12–14, 37–39). In addition, we recently provided an empirical example of a bacterial

tRNA gene set undergoing adaptive evolution; an engineered, deleterious change in the isotype

pattern of the fast-growing, model bacterium *P. fluorescens* SBW25 was compensated by within-

genome duplication events that served to increase the copy number of a remaining tRNA gene

(*serTGA*) (6). Others have reported that translational challenges imposed by (i) novel codon usage

patterns, or (ii) the fitness costs associated with antibiotic resistance mutations can be readily

alleviated by similar duplication (and, sometimes, downstream amplification) events that affect the

copy numbers of remaining tRNA genes (40, 41). Together, these studies demonstrate a considerable

degree of evolutionary flexibility in the composition of bacterial tRNA gene sets.

In the above-mentioned *P. fluorescens* SBW25 tRNA gene study (6), the adaptive increase in *serTGA* copy number was shown to be mediated through the tandem duplication of large sections of the *P. fluorescens* SBW25 chromosome (ranging in size from ~45 kb to 290 kb). In addition to the 91-bp target *serTGA* gene, these duplication events affect the dosage of up to 278 other genes, and generate considerable alterations in chromosome size and architecture. Similar types of large-scale, tandem duplications are a pervasive phenomenon in bacterial genomes (42–46) and – despite their large size and widespread gene dosage effects – can provide a net selective advantage in response to a range of selective pressures (47–53). Notably, these types of mutations have been reported to arise spontaneously, and at extremely high rates; estimates range from frequencies of 10^{-1} to 10^{-5} duplications *per* cell *per* generation (43, 54–57), several orders of magnitude higher than those expected for single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) (58). Given their pervasiveness and ease of occurrence, such large-scale, tandem duplications challenge the prevailing view of fixed, stable tRNA gene sets, particularly in large, rapidly growing bacterial populations.

In this work, we firstly show that large-scale, tandem duplication events affecting the *P. fluorescens* SBW25 tRNA gene content are not limited to the genomic region surrounding *serTGA* (located at ~4.16 Mb on the SBW25 chromosome). Specifically, we demonstrate that a fitness defect caused by deleting two of three *glyGCC* tRNA gene copies is repeatedly and rapidly compensated by large-scale, tandem duplication events encompassing the remaining *glyGCC* gene (at genomic position ~2.38 Mb). The identified duplication fragments are several times larger than those reported for *serTGA*; they are up to~ 1 Mb in size, and encompass up to 917 genes. Secondly, we provide empirical evidence that these duplication fragments arise, and are lost, spontaneously and at very high frequencies; we show that in each independently evolving *glyGCC*-deficient population, multiple distinct duplication fragments (and hence, tRNA gene sets) arise rapidly and compete for dominance. We present evidence of duplication events occurring in evolving wildtype populations (i.e., in the absence of positive selection). Our results demonstrate that large-scale, tandem duplication events can rapidly generate population-level diversity in bacterial tRNA gene set composition, providing variation upon which natural selection can act.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strains and growth conditions. A list of strains is provided in Supplementary Table S1, and construction details are provided in Supplementary Text S1. Unless otherwise stated, *P. fluorescens* SBW25 cultures were grown in King's Medium B (KB) (59) for ~16 hours at 28˚C with shaking. For growth curves, strains were grown in either liquid KB, or minimal-M9 medium (60) supplemented with 4 % (w/v) glucose. During engineering procedures *E. coli* strains were grown in Lysogeny broth (LB) for 16-18 hours at 37˚C with shaking.

Photography. Colonies were grown for the time indicated, at room temperature (~20-22˚C) or 28˚C, on KB agar. Colonies were visualized under a Leica MS5 dissection microscope and photographed with a VisiCam® 1.3 (VWR International). Photographs were cropped and, where noted in figure legends, the exposure and/or brightness uniformly altered in Preview (v11.0) to improve visibility.

Growth curves and analysis. Seven colonies *per* genotype were inoculated into individual wells of a 96-well plate (each containing 200 μL KB), and grown overnight (28°C, 200 rpm). From each well, 2 μL of grown culture was transferred into 198 μL fresh KB, covered with a Breathe-Easy® membrane, and grown at 28°C in an Epoch 2 Microplate Spectrophotometer (BioTek). Absorbance at 600nm (OD_{600}) was measured at five-minute intervals, with 5 seconds of 3 mm orbital shaking preceding each read. Average maximum growth rates (V_{max}, reported as change in mOD min^{-1}) and lag times were calculated using a sliding window of six time points during rapid growth (between 1 and 8 hours in KB, and between 1 and 10 hours in M9) using Gen5 Software version 3.00.19. Where assumptions were satisfied, a parametric one-way ANOVA was used to test for differences in the mean maximum growth rate between pairs of genotypes. Where the assumptions were violated, a non-parametric Dunn's test, followed by the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to correct for multiple comparisons, was used to test for differences in the median lag time between pairs of genotypes.

Competition assays. One-to-one competition experiments were used to determine the relative fitness of nine genotype pairs under conditions similar to those of a single growth cycle of the evolution experiment (see below). Competitions were performed in two blocks, with between 5 and 8 replicates *per* pair of genotypes. Single colonies of each genotype were grown on KB agar (48 hours, room temperature) and, for each competition replicate, a single colony of each competitor was inoculated into an overnight culture (4 mL KB, 28°C, 200 rpm). Once grown, the two competitors for each competition were mixed in a ~1:1 ratio. Ten μL of each mixture was used to inoculate 10 mL KB in a 50 ml Falcon tube, and grown for 24 hours (28°C, 200 rpm). Cell samples taken from each competition tube at the start (T_0) and end (T_{24}) of the incubation period were serially diluted and plated on LB agar containing 60 μg mL^{-1} X-gal (48 hours, room temperature). The number of colonies *per* competitor were recorded at T_0 and T_{24}, where differentiation between competing genotypes was achieved through distinct colony morphologies and/or colours (in competitions including neutrally marked SBW25-*lacZ* (61)). The change in the ratio of the two competitors was calculated, and relative fitness of the two competitors determined (62). Parametric one-sample *t*-tests or, where normality assumptions were violated, non-parametric Wilcoxon rank sum tests, were used detect statistical differences in the mean relative fitness of genotype pairs. The Bonferroni procedure was subsequently used to correct for multiple comparisons.

Evolution experiment. SBW25 (wildtype) and ΔEGEG (quadruple tRNA gene deletion mutant) were streaked from glycerol stocks onto KB agar and grown (48 hours, 28°C). Five single colonies *per* genotype were grown overnight (4 mL KB; 28°C, 200 rpm). Grown cultures ("day 0") were vortexed and 100 μL of each used to inoculate 9.9 ml KB in a 50 ml Falcon tube (28°C, shaking, 24 hours). Every 24 hours thereafter, 1 % (100 μL) of each culture was transferred to a fresh 9.9 mL KB, and a sample of the population frozen in glycerol saline at -80°C. The experiment was continued until day 28. An additional, medium control lineage – containing no initial inoculum – was also transferred daily.

Whole genome re-sequencing. Six isolates were purified from day 21 of the evolution experiment (W1-1, M1-1, M2-1, M3-1, M4-1, M5-1), and stored at -80°C. Genomic DNA was isolated from 1 mL of

overnight culture of each isolate (DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit; Qiagen). Paired-end, 250 bp reads were generated with an Illumina MiSeq instrument at The Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology (Ploen, Germany), according to standard procedures. Raw reads are available at NCBI Sequence Read Archive (SRA accession number: PRJNA790786) (63). A minimum of 1.08 million raw reads *per* strain were obtained and aligned to the SBW25 reference genome sequence (NC_012660.1) (8) using *breseq* (64–66) and Geneious (v11.1.4). A minimum mean coverage of 36.4 reads *per* base pair was obtained. Where appropriate, predicted mutations were confirmed by standard PCR or duplication junction PCR (see below), followed by Sanger sequencing (see Supplementary Text S2). A detailed list of final mutation predictions is provided in Supplementary Table S2, and the genes contained in each duplication fragment are listed in Supplementary Table S3.

Mature tRNA pool sequencing (YAMAT-seq). Three independent replicates of eight genotypes (*i.e.*, 24 samples) were used for YAMAT-seq (67) according to the method described in (6). Briefly, (i) per sample, a single colony was chosen from KB agar (in the case of genotypes carrying duplication fragments, rapidly-growing colonies were chosen in an attempt to mitigate the inherent instability of the duplication fragment; see **Stability test** method below), grown in overnight KB culture, diluted 1/10 in fresh KB, and grown to mid-exponential phase, (ii) total RNA was isolated from each rapidly-growing liquid culture using a TRIzol Max Bacterial RNA isolation kit, (iii) amino acids were removed from mature tRNAs by deacylation treatment with 20 mM Tris-HCl, (iv) Y-shaped, DNA/RNA hybrid adapters (Eurofins) were annealed to the conserved, exposed 5'-NCCA-3' and 3'-inorganic phosphate-5' ends of non-acylated tRNAs, and ligated T4 RNA ligase 2, (v) ligation products were reverse-transcribed into cDNA using SuperScript^{TM} III reverse transcriptase, (vi) cDNA products were amplified, and a unique barcode added, with eleven cycles of PCR using Phusion^{TM}, (vii) products were quantified using a Bioanalyzer and fluorescent Nanodrop, and mixed in equimolar amounts, (viii) the mixed sample was run on a 5 % polyacrylamide gel, the bands between ~210 bp and ~280 bp (tRNAs plus adapters and barcodes) cut out and extracted overnight in deionized water, (ix) the purified product was quantified and subjected to deep sequencing at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology (Ploen, Germany). Single-end, 150 bp reads were generated with a NextSeq 550 Output v2.5 kit (Illumina), and are available at NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO accession number GSE196705) (68).

YAMAT-seq analysis. The raw YAMAT-seq sequencing reads were split into 24 samples by extracting exact matches to each unique, 6 bp Illumina index. The resulting 24 set of raw reads, each containing a minimum of 1,470,795 reads, were analysed using Geneious (version 11.1.4). Reads of the expected length (80 bp - 151 bp) were extracted (resulting in at least 99.8 % read retention *per* sample). The extracted reads were assembled to a set of 42 reference tRNA sequences from SBW25 (6, 7) (Supplementary Text S3). During assembly, up to 10 % mismatches, gaps of <3 bp, and up to five ambiguities were allowed *per* read. Reads that aligned equally well to more than one reference sequence were discarded in order to minimize misallocation of reads to similar reference sequences. The unused reads for each sample were *de novo* aligned, and the resulting contigs were checked to ensure that none contained substantial numbers of tRNA reads. The within-sample proportion of

reads aligned to each tRNA isotype was calculated. Next, mean mature tRNA proportions were

calculated for each strain across the three replicates (Supplementary Table S4). DESeq2 (69) was

used in R (version 3.6.0) to detect tRNA expression differences between pairs of strains

(Supplementary Table S5). DESeq2 corrects for multiple testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg

procedure (70).

Stability test. Genotype stability was estimated using colony morphology stability tests, according to

the method detailed in (71). Briefly, 10 genotypes (WT, rWT, ∆EGEG, ∆*glyGCC*, W1-1, M1-1, M2-1,

M3-1, M4-1, and M5-1) were streaked from glycerol stocks onto KB agar plates and grown (48 hours,

28˚C). Five colonies *per* genotype were used to inoculate 4 ml KB cultures (28˚C, 200 rpm, overnight).

Grown cultures were dilution plated on KB agar (48 hours, room temperature), and the number of

large and small colonies *per* plate was enumerated. Between 41 and 295 colonies were recorded *per*

replicate, with no more than 200 colonies counted on any given plate. For each replicate, the

proportion of small colonies was calculated. A non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was used to test for

evidence of a difference in the median of at least one founder (p=6.25e-07). To determine which

strains showed a different median rate of small colony enumeration as compared with SBW25

(wildtype), Dunn's test was used with Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to adjust for multiple

comparisons. A Welch non-parametric two-sample *t*-test was used to test for a difference in the mean

proportion in small colonies arising from the genotype carrying the small duplication fragment (M3-1),

and those carrying a large duplication fragment (M1-1, M2-1, M4-1, M5-1).

Duplication junction PCR and estimating duplication fragment frequencies. Large-scale, tandem

duplication events result in the emergence of a unique piece of DNA (the 'duplication junction'), which

can be amplified by PCR specifically in isolates (or populations) carrying the relevant junction.

Primers targeting each of the five identified duplication junctions were used for duplication junction

PCRs on isolates and/or populations. PCR templates were prepared by (i) growing isolates or

populations in overnight KB culture, (ii) pelleting by centrifugation, and (iii) re-suspending in twice the

volume of sterile, deionized water. PCRs were performed with GoTaq Flexi (Promega) for 30 cycles of:

15 sec at 94˚C, 15 sec at 58˚C or 59˚C, 72˚C for 1 min *per* kb of expected product (see

Supplementary Text S2 for full details). Five µl of each PCR product was mixed with loading dye and

run on a 1 % agarose gel (SYBR Safe; Life Technologies) at 90 V for ~45 min, against 1 kb DNA

ladder (Promega) and photographed under UV illumination. To improve visibility of low intensity bands,

the colour of gel images was subsequently inverted in Preview (version 11.0) or ImageJ (version 1.53)

(72). Where indicated, the relative densities (*i.e.*, intensities) of duplication junction bands from a

single gel image were quantified using ImageJ (see Supplementary Table S6). Intensities were

converted to a percentage of a positive control from the same image, and relative intensities were

plotted using the pheatmap package (version 1.0.12) in R (version 3.6.0). Gel images are provided on

Zenodo (https://zenodo.org/record/7276661#.Y3JJHYKZONh).

RESULTS

Reducing the gene copy number of essential tRNA types slows SBW25 growth

The *P. fluorescens* SBW25 genome is predicted to contain 66 canonical tRNA genes encoding 39 isotypes, 14 of which are coded for by multiple (between two and five) gene copies (Figure 1A) (6, 8, 73). Here, we focus on one such multicopy isotype: tRNA-Gly(GCC), which is encoded by three identical *glyGCC* gene copies. One copy occurs as a lone tRNA gene at chromosomal position ~2.38 Mb, and two copies are located in a four-gene tRNA locus (*gluTTC-glyGCC-gluTTC-glyGCC*, hereafter referred to as "*EGEG*") at ~2.03 Mb (Figure 1A-B). Given that tRNA-Gly(GCC) is predicted to be the sole decoder of codons 5'-GGC-3' (cognate match) and 5'-GGU-3' (G_{34}:U_3 wobble match), at least one functional *glyGCC* gene copy is required for translation and growth (Figure 1C). With this in mind, two genotypes were constructed in which the SBW25 *glyGCC* gene copy number was sequentially reduced: (i) Δ*glyGCC*, in which the lone *glyGCC* copy was removed from SBW25 (leaving two copies of *glyGCC*), and (ii) ΔEGEG, in which the entire *EGEG* locus was removed from SBW25 (leaving only a single copy of *glyGCC*) (Figure 1D; Supplementary Text S1). In addition to changes in *glyGCC* copy number, ΔEGEG carries a reduction in *gluTTC* copy number (from four to two). The remaining two *gluTTC* copies were not manipulated because they are interspersed with other tRNA genes that are expected to be essential for survival (the only two copies of *alaGGC*, encoding essential isotype tRNA-Ala(GGC)) (Figure 1A).

Growth assays showed that the deletion of one *glyGCC* copy had no detectable effect on growth in a rich, undefined medium (KB) or a minimal, defined medium (M9+glucose), while the elimination of two *glyGCC* copies resulted in an immediately obvious growth defect in both media (particularly in KB). Specifically, compared with SBW25, ΔEGEG forms smaller colonies on KB and M9 agar plates, and grows more slowly in liquid culture (Figure 2). Re-introduction of *EGEG* into ΔEGEG – generating the reconstructed wildtype (rWT) – restores wildtype-like growth. These results demonstrate a degree of redundancy in SBW25 *glyGCC* gene copy number; at least one of the three *glyGCC* copies can be lost without significantly impacting growth rate. This observation is consistent with earlier reports that multiple copies of various *E. coli* tRNA genes (including *glyGCC*) show a degree of redundancy that is most beneficial when nutrients are plentiful (36).

The ΔEGEG growth defect is rapidly compensated by evolution

To determine whether the ΔEGEG growth defect can be genetically compensated, a serial transfer evolution experiment was performed. Ten independent lineages were passaged through repeated cycles of growth and dilution in shaken rich medium (KB), for 28 days (a total of ~200 generations over 28 days; 1 % daily bottleneck). Five evolutionary lineages were founded by ΔEGEG (lineages M1-M5), and five by the wildtype (control lineages W1-W5). Within 21 days (~150 generations) each of the five mutant lineages showed visibly improved growth. Isolates were purified from day 21 of each mutant lineage (giving M1-1, M2-1, M3-1, M4-1, and M5-1). All five isolates showed improved growth on agar plates and in liquid culture, with the growth profile of one isolate (M3-1) approximating that of the wildtype (Figure 3A-D). A control isolate from day 21 of the wildtype lineage W1 (W1-1) showed a growth profile comparable to that of SBW25 (Figure 3A-D).

Three of the evolved isolates from mutant lineages (M1-1, M3-1, and M5-1) were chosen for

direct, 1:1 competition experiments with ΔEGEG and a neutrally marked wildtype strain (SBW25-*lacZ*).

Each of the three evolved isolates outperformed ΔEGEG (two-tailed one-sample *t*-tests $p<0.0006$),

but were themselves outperformed by SBW25-*lacZ* (two-tailed one-sample *t*-tests $p<0.05$) (Figure 3E).

Together, these results demonstrate that the growth defect caused by *EGEG* elimination can be

readily compensated – at least in part – by evolution.

Compensation of *EGEG* loss occurs via large-scale, tandem duplications spanning *glyGCC*

To identify the mutations behind compensation, whole genome re-sequencing (Illumina) was

performed on each of six isolates from day 21 of the evolution experiment: one isolate from each of

five independent mutant lineages (M1-1, M2-1, M3-1, M4-1, and M5-1), plus a control isolate from

wildtype lineage W1 (W1-1). *Per* sample, over one million, 250-bp long raw sequencing reads were

aligned to the SBW25 reference genome (8), resulting in a minimum mean coverage of 36.4 reads

per genomic base. A full list of predicted mutations per isolate is provided in Supplementary Table S2.

In each mutant lineage isolate, a large, direct, tandem duplication was identified at around

~2.38 Mb of the SBW25 chromosome (Figure 4A-C). In addition, in isolate M5-1, a non-synonymous

point mutation was identified in *rplC* (located outside of the duplicated region; see Figure 4B). While

the *rplC* mutation affects the translational apparatus (via amino acid change T43I in the 50S

ribosomal protein L3), no evidence was found for a role in the compensated phenotype of M5-1; in the

absence of the accompanying duplication fragment, the *rplC* mutation did not significantly improve the

growth of ΔEGEG (see Supplementary Figure S1). No evidence of any mutations was found in the

wildtype control isolate (W1-1).

The duplicated region in each mutant lineage isolate was more precisely defined using

computational analyses, PCR, and Sanger sequencing (Table 1, Supplementary Text S2). The

duplication fragments fall into two classes: large (~1 Mb) and smaller (~0.49 Mb) duplication

fragments. Large duplication fragments were identified in four isolates (M1-1, M2-1, M4-1, and M5-1).

This class of fragments occurs between long stretches of repetitive DNA (intergenic repeats and/or

rhs genes) at ~1.85, Mb and ~2.86 Mb of the SBW25 chromosome, and encompasses over 900

putative genes. The smaller duplication fragment was identified in only one isolate, M3-1, between

regions with no obvious homology at ~2.3 Mb and ~2.8 Mb of the SBW25 chromosome. This smaller

fragment encompasses a predicted 426 genes (see Supplementary Table S3). Notably, each class of

fragment contains a different set of tRNA genes: the large duplication fragments encompass seven

tRNA (giving a total of 69 tRNA genes), while the smaller fragment contains one tRNA gene (63 tRNA

genes) (Figure 4D).

To identify which part of the duplicated region compensates for loss of the *EGEG* locus, we

focused on the smaller duplication fragment because (i) this smaller region is duplicated in all five

evolved genotypes (see Figure 4B), and (ii) it affords the greatest growth advantage of all observed

duplication fragments (see Figure 3B). Of the 426 putative genes in this 0.49 Mb fragment, only one

has an obvious role in translation: tRNA gene *glyGCC*. Importantly, this is the sole remaining gene

copy encoding one of the tRNA isotypes targeted by the original engineering process (see Figure 1).

These results suggest that the observed fitness changes are primarily caused by differences in

glyGCC gene copy number: the ΔEGEG growth defect likely results from a reduction in *glyGCC*

copies (from three to one copy), while the regain in fitness by the evolved strains is most likely the

result of a (partial) recovery in *glyGCC* copy number (from one to two copies).

tRNA gene set changes affect the proportional contribution of tRNA-Gly(GCC) to the mature

tRNA pool

We sought to test whether the above tRNA gene set changes are reflected in mature tRNA pools

using YAMAT-seq, a deep-sequencing technique that quantifies the relative proportions of tRNA

isotypes in the mature tRNA pool (6, 67). YAMAT-seq was performed on 24 samples, including three

replicates of each of eight genotypes: wildtype SBW25, two *glyGCC* deletion genotypes (Δ*glyGCC*,

ΔEGEG), three evolved genotypes containing compensatory duplication fragments (M1-1, M3-1, and

M5-1), and two control genotypes (engineering control rWT, evolution control W1-1). Illumina

sequencing resulted in a minimum of 1.47 million raw reads *per* sample; these were aligned to a set

of reference sequences, consisting of all unique tRNA gene sequences predicted in SBW25 (6, 7)

(see Supplementary Text S3). Each of the expected 39 tRNA isotypes was detected in every sample,

in varying proportions (Supplementary Table S4; see Figure 5A for a representation of the wildtype

tRNA pool). Notably, tRNA-Gly(GCC) – encoded by the three *glyGCC* genes of interest – is the most

highly represented of all isotypes in the wildtype, accounting for 11.0 ± 1.0 % (mean $\pm$ SE) of the

mature tRNA pool (Figure 5A). Four isotypes (tRNA-Ile(CAU), tRNA-Phe(GAA), tRNA-Thr(CGU), and

tRNA-Glu(UUC)) were detected only at very low levels (<0.1 % of the pool). It is probable that various

post-transcriptional modifications present in these tRNA isotypes reduced the efficacy of the

YAMAT-seq protocol (specifically, the reverse transcription reaction; see Methods) (6, 67, 74). Due to

unreliably low read numbers, these four isotypes were removed from downstream statistical analyses.

332   DESeq2 analyses were used to detect differences in the relative proportions of all 39 tRNA

isotypes between genotype pairs of interest (Figure 5B-D, Supplementary Table S5) (6, 36, 69). The

predominant – and in many cases, only statistically significant – effect of the engineering and

evolution experiments was on isotype tRNA-Gly(GCC) (Figure 5B-E). Deletion of either *glyGCC* or the

EGEG locus (see Figure 1B) saw a reduction in the relative contribution of tRNA-Gly(GCC) to the

mature tRNA pool. Specifically, compared with 11.0 ± 1.0 % of the wildtype tRNA pool,

tRNA-Gly(GCC) accounts for only 6.9 ± 0.43 % and 3.6 ± 0.34 % of the Δ*glyGCC* and ΔEGEG mature

tRNA pools, respectively. The severe reduction in tRNA-Gly(GCC) in ΔEGEG was partially reversed

by adaptive evolution; isolates M1-1, M3-1, and M5-1 show tRNA-Gly(GCC) levels of 5.1 ± 0.34 %,

6.3 ± 0.30 %, and 5.8 ± 0.42 %, respectively. No such changes were observed in the tRNA pools of

the engineering or evolution controls (rWT, W1-1) (Figure 5B-E). Unfortunately, due to the unreliably

low read numbers obtained for tRNA-Glu(UUC) (see above), we are unable to comment on the effect

of *EGEG* deletion on this isotype.

345   In addition to tRNA-Gly(GCC), the 1 Mb duplication carried by isolates M1-1 and M5-1

changes the number of genes coding for a further four tRNA isotypes: tRNA-Ala(UGC) (from five to

six gene copies), tRNA-Asp(GUC) (from four to six gene copies), tRNA-Ile(GAU) (from five to six gene

copies), and tRNA-Val(UAC) (from three to five gene copies). While the large, 1 Mb duplication

fragment increases the contribution of each of these isotypes to the mature tRNA pool, these changes

are less pronounced than those observed for tRNA-Gly(GCC) (and very few are statistically significant)

(Figures 5C & 5F). One reason for these weaker effects is that each of the additional four isotypes is

encoded by multiple, dispersed tRNA genes, only some of which lie within the duplicated region.

Finally, we note that in addition to incurring no detectable growth or fitness effects (see

Supplementary Figure S1), the *rplC* mutation had no major effects on the composition of the mature

tRNA pool under the tested conditions; no statistically significant differences were detected between

isolates M1-1 (1 Mb duplication) and M5-1 (1 Mb duplication + *rplC* mutation) (Figure 5D).

Results thus far show that changes in *glyGCC* gene copy number are mirrored by changes in

the proportional contribution of tRNA-Gly(GCC) to the mature tRNA pool. Specifically, reductions in

glyGCC gene copy number result in progressively lower proportions of tRNA-Gly(GCC), which

eventually manifest as a reduction in growth rate. Growth rate is subsequently restored by large-scale,

tandem duplication events that likely serve to elevate *glyGCC* gene copy number, thereby partially

reinstating tRNA-Gly(GCC) levels.

Duplication fragments are unstable, leading to genetically mixed populations

Large-scale, tandem duplications are typically highly unstable; they are known to be lost at high rates

via homologous recombination events during DNA replication (often leaving no trace in the segregant

genome) (55, 75, 76). The duplication fragments observed in this work are no exception. When grown

in overnight culture and plated on agar plates, each of the duplication-carrying strains repeatedly

gives rise to colonies of two distinct types: (i) a majority of larger, wildtype-like colonies that retain the

duplication fragment, and (ii) a sizeable minority of smaller, ΔEGEG-like colonies in which the initial

duplication fragment has been lost (Figure 6A-B).

The degree of duplication fragment loss was quantified using a stability test, in which the

proportion of small colonies (*i.e.*, segregants) arising from independent cultures founded by each

duplication-carrying strain was determined. Between 3 % and 34 % of colonies arising from

duplication genotype cultures showed the small, ΔEGEG-like phenotype (Figure 6C). The proportion

of small colonies observed was dependent on the size of the initial duplication fragment, with small

and large duplication fragments giving rise to respective averages of 5.0 % ± 1.0% and 18 % ± 1.5 %

segregants (mean ± se; non-parametric two sample *t*-test for difference between means *p*=3.5e-07***).

The higher proportion of segregants in populations founded by duplication strains carrying the larger

fragment results from (i) a higher number of recombination events occurring across the more

extensive region of homology, and (ii) the lesser fitness advantage afforded by the 1 Mb duplication

fragment (see Figure 3).

The stability test outlined above demonstrates that any sufficiently large population founded

by any of the five duplication-carrying strains will contain not only the duplication strain, but also a

variable – and sometimes considerable – fraction of segregants. This includes populations grown

during the phenotypic and genotypic assays in the earlier sections of this work (*e.g.*, cultures from

which DNA was extracted for genome sequencing; cultures from which RNA was extracted for

YAMAT-seq). We note here that loss of the duplication fragment by some population members only

dilutes its effect(s), and hence any significant differences reported between a duplication-carrying

strain and ΔEGEG will hold regardless of any segregants that may have been present in the

duplication genotype cultures. For example, the proportional increase in tRNA-Gly(GCC) in the

mature tRNA pools of cells carrying the duplication fragments (see Figure 5) would be expected to

increase in the absence of segregation effects.

The results in this section demonstrate that the adaptive duplication events are inherently

unstable; they, along with their compensatory tRNA gene copies, are lost at high rates. In growing

populations founded by duplication-carrying strains, this high rate of loss leads to the presence of at

least two genetically distinct sub-populations of cells: (i) those carrying the initial duplication fragment,

and (ii) those in which the fragment has been lost (*i.e.*, ΔEGEG) (Figure 6D).

Multiple duplication fragments rapidly arise and compete within evolving populations

The ease with which duplications fragments arise and are subsequently lost suggests complex,

rapidly changing evolutionary dynamics within the evolving mutant lineages. In particular, the

repeated and rapid generation of ΔEGEG-like genotypes from duplication genotypes provides the

opportunity for distinct duplication fragments to arise independently and then compete. To investigate,

we quantified duplication fragments of interest across our evolving populations. Duplication junction

PCRs – each of which has the potential to capture a range of similar duplication fragments with subtly

different endpoints – were performed on population samples taken at 48-hour intervals across each

28-day lineage, and the intensity of the resulting bands were measured relative to a positive control

(see Supplementary Table S6).

Initially, we followed the dynamics of four duplication fragments (M2f, M3f, M4f, and M5f) in

the mutant lineages in which they were initially identified (M2, M3, M4, and M5, respectively) (Figure

7A; Supplementary Figure S2). Each of the three large duplication fragments (M2f, M4f, and M5f; ~1

Mb) was first detected early in the course of its respective lineage (between days 4 and 6). The

fragments then rose in frequency before beginning to wane at around day 16, with two of the three

(M4f, M5f) dropping below the limit of detection before the end of the experiment. In comparison, the

smaller duplication fragment (M3f; ~0.49 Mb) was first detected slightly later (day 8) and, following an

initial sweep, was maintained at relatively high levels.

While the above results demonstrate that duplication fragments readily arise and spread, it is

notable that none of the observed duplication fragments appears to have fixed at any point in its

respective lineage; the highest estimated frequency was ~82 % (M2f in lineage M2, on days 14 and

18; see Supplementary Table S6). In addition to reflecting the inherent instability of the large-scale

duplication fragments (see Figure 6), this lack of fixation suggests that multiple duplication fragments

may arise and compete within each lineage. To investigate, each lineage was tested for the co-

existence of large and small duplication fragments; duplication junction PCRs to detect M5f (large

fragment) and M3f (smaller fragment) were performed on population samples from days 8, 14, and 28

of all five mutant lineages (M1-M5) and a wildtype control lineage (W1) (Figure 7B; Supplementary

Figure S3).

These experiments provide three lines of evidence for complex dynamics between large-scale

duplication fragments in the evolving populations: (i) both the large and smaller duplication fragments

are detected simultaneously in the earlier stages of adaptation (*i.e.*, days 8 and 14) in all mutant

lineages, (ii) multiple subtypes of the smaller duplication fragments – with subtly different endpoints,

and hence variably sized duplication junction PCR products (see Supplementary Figure S3B) – exist

within all mutant lineages, and (iii) mutations other than the identified large and smaller duplication

fragments are likely to exist in the adapted mutant populations (because the sum of the estimated

frequencies of the large and small fragments is still far below 1 in the majority of day 14 and day 28

populations). Importantly, there is also evidence that the large-scale, tandem duplication fragments

can exist, but not sweep, in the absence of selection; a small duplication fragment was detected at

low levels (~1 %) on day 8 and day 14 of the wildtype control lineage W1 (Figure 7B; Supplementary

Figure S3B).

DISCUSSION

Various studies have reported adaptive changes in tRNA gene copy number in laboratory populations

of bacteria, in response to changing translational requirements (6, 40, 41). In these studies, changes

in gene copy number were underpinned by large-scale, tandem duplication (6, 41) or amplification (40)

events. Large-scale, tandem duplications (and/or amplifications) are a class of mutation that is both

pervasive and mechanistically reversible: large-scale duplications typically arise, and are lost,

extremely rapidly (43, 44, 75, 77, 78), in a manner reminiscent of contingency loci (79, 80). Their

transient nature means that their contributions to population diversity, and downstream effects on

evolution, can be underappreciated (44). In this work, we demonstrate the contribution of large-scale

duplications to the initial stages of bacterial adaptation to novel translational requirements,

highlighting that tRNA gene copy number is more fluid than previously appreciated (particularly in

large populations of rapidly growing bacteria).

Adaptive changes in bacterial tRNA gene copy number and their effect on mature tRNA pools

In the first part of our work, we provide an example of tRNA gene content of a bacterium adapting by

large-scale duplication events. Specifically, deletion of *P. fluorescens* SBW25 tRNA gene locus

gluTTC-glyGCC-gluTTC-glyGCC (*EGEG*) leads to a drop in the proportional contribution of

tRNA-Gly(GCC) – a high-use, essential tRNA isotype – to the mature tRNA pool. The accompanying

translational defect is repeatedly compensated by readily-occurring, large-scale, tandem duplications

that encompass up to 1 Mb (~15 %) of the wildtype chromosome. These duplication events affect the

copy number of hundreds of genes, including those encoding several tRNA isotypes. Despite their

large size, the proposed compensatory element of each duplication fragment is predicted to be only a

single, 76-bp *glyGCC* gene (and promoter). Indeed, the duplication fragments lead to partial

restoration of tRNA-Gly(GCC) levels and, in the case of the smaller (~0.49 Mb) duplication fragment,

growth patterns that approximate those of the wildtype. Presumably, the higher degree of

compensation observed in M3-1 is directly related to the smaller size of the M3-1 duplication fragment;

once generated, smaller duplication fragments surrounding *glyGCC* are logically expected to provide

greater net fitness (as a result of carrying less surplus DNA, altering the dosages of fewer additional

genes, and/or incurring smaller effects on chromosomal architecture).

Compensation of translational defects by large-scale, tandem duplications is not limited to the
SBW25 *glyGCC* gene. We previously reported similar large-scale duplications (up to ~290 kb) in a
distinct region of the SBW25 chromosome (depicted in Figure 4B) (6). In this earlier case, the
duplication fragments served to increase the gene copy number of *serTGA* – and hence
tRNA-Ser(UGA) levels – in response to elimination of tRNA-Ser(CGA), a non-essential but relatively
high-use tRNA isotype. Furthermore, similar large-scale duplications that change tRNA gene copy
number have been observed throughout the *E. coli* chromosome, and postulated to compensate for
changes in codon use incurred by horizontal gene transfer events (41). These experiments
demonstrate that large-scale duplication events can underpin adaptive gene copy number changes
for various tRNA isotypes, in different areas of the genome, across species. Taken together with their
pervasive nature and high rate of occurrence, such mutations may play a widespread role in bacterial
adaption to novel translational requirements.

Rapid, spontaneous duplication events generate diversity in the population tRNA gene set
As outlined in the introduction, large-scale duplications typically arise spontaneously (during DNA
replication), at high rates (43, 46, 54–57). For instance, it has been reported that – without invoking
any growth advantage – around 10 % of cells in an overnight *Salmonella* culture carry a large
duplication of some region of the chromosome, with between 0.005 % and 3 % of cells carrying a
duplication of a given locus (42, 43, 55). Notably, our experiment also captures evidence of a large-
scale duplication arising in the absence of positive selection: a duplication fragment was detected at
low frequency in evolving wildtype population W1, on days 8 and 14 (see Figure 7B). This duplication
fragment likely provided no (or negligible) selective advantage in the wildtype background, and did not
spread through the population (instead dropping below the limit of detection by day 28). Similar
duplication fragments were first detected in the ΔEGEG lineages between days 4 and 6, where they
provided a fitness advantage and hence rose in frequency.
In addition to revealing that duplication fragments occurred in the early stages of the evolution
experiment, the population-level duplication junction PCRs demonstrate the co-existence of multiple
distinct types of duplication fragment in all five mutant lineages (see Figure 7B). More specifically, at
least two distinct types of duplication fragments – with different tRNA gene contents (see Figure 4D) –
were present in each mutant lineage on days 8 and 14. These data are consistent with the hypothesis
that large-scale duplication fragments arise spontaneously, at high rates, thus generating population-
level diversity in chromosomal content and tRNA gene copy numbers.
While multiple distinct duplication fragments were identified during this work, it is notable that
three of the five compensated isolates carry a very similar ~1 Mb duplication fragment with endpoints
pflu1686 and *pflu2597* (see Table 1). This fragment does not confer a particularly high degree of
compensation (see Figure 3B), suggesting that its prevalence is instead due to an especially high rate
of occurrence (81). Consistent with this hypothesis, the 1 Mb fragment endpoint often occur within two
rhs genes that share a long stretch (~3 kb) of near-perfect homology, and hence provide ample
opportunity for duplications to form by RecA-mediated unequal recombination events during DNA
replication (43, 76). While duplications can form by mechanisms that do not require homology or
RecA, these typically occur at much lower frequencies (45, 76, 78, 82). Similar, lower-rate

mechanisms are presumed to have underpinned the emergence of the less prevalent, yet higher

effect, duplication fragment in isolate M3-1 (0.49 Mb in size, with no obvious endpoint homology).

Unstable duplications are an evolutionary stepping stone

Large-scale, tandem duplication fragments are inherently unstable; they are prone to loss through

RecA-mediated recombination during DNA replication (55, 76). The duplication fragments described

in this work are similarly unstable – the stability test showed that, despite the net fitness advantage

that they provide, duplication fragments are lost by between 3 and 34 % of cells in overnight culture

(see Figure 6). The rate of loss was higher for strains carrying the larger (~1 Mb) versus the smaller

(~0.49 Mb) duplication fragments (median loss rates of 19 % and 5 %, respectively). This was

presumably a result of the larger duplication fragment (i) carrying twice the length of homologous DNA

for recombination (*i.e.*, the duplication fragment), and (ii) conferring a lesser fitness advantage (44).

Our large-scale duplications are inherently unstable and are therefore unlikely to represent a

long-term evolutionary solution, despite providing a fitness advantage. That is, if the serial transfer

evolution experiment were to be continued, it is expected that the characterized duplication fragments

would eventually be displaced by a more stable type of mutation. Evidence to this effect is already

visible in the duplication junction PCRs across the five mutant lineages (see Figure 7). As described

above, all five mutant lineages contain both the larger (1 Mb) and smaller (0.49 Mb) class of

duplication fragment on days 8 and 14 of the evolution experiment. However, by day 28 the larger

(and also less fit/stable) duplication fragment drops below the limit of detection in three (of five)

mutant lineages (M3, M4, and M5). Furthermore, in two of the five lineages (M3 and M5), the

frequency of both the larger and smaller duplication fragments shows a large reduction at some point

between days 14 and 28, strongly suggesting the presence of at least one other adaptive mutation in

the later stages of these lineages (see Figure 7B). The observed duplication junction PCR patterns

support the hypothesis that such alternative mutations occur at lower rates, and hence take longer to

arise (on average), than the characterized duplication fragments. However, once present, these

alternative mutations presumably afford greater fitness, leading to displacement of the characterized

duplication fragments in the population.

The alternative mutation(s) described above currently remain unidentified. However, they

could conceivably be SNPs (*e.g.*, in the promoter of a compensatory tRNA gene, or a post-

transcriptional tRNA modification gene), and/or progressively smaller (and hence, more stable and

more advantageous), duplication fragments. Such smaller duplication fragments could potentially

arise directly from ΔEGEG (through lower-rate recombination events between chromosomal regions

with low or no homology (76)), or from duplication-carrying strains (through the partial segregation of

a duplication fragment). Indeed, an example of the latter was recently reported in an experiment

examining the fate of an advantageous, large-scale (~1.66 Mb), tandem duplication fragment in

Salmonella; during 2,000 generations of positive selection, the initial duplication fragment repeatedly

shrank to ~0.66 Mb, via the loss of an internal ~1 Mb segment (83, 84).

Both types of alternative mutation listed above (SNPs and smaller duplication fragments)

represent distinct mechanisms of adaptation to changing translational requirements: SNPs are

expected to affect the mature tRNA pool without changing the underlying tRNA gene content of the organism, while adaptive duplication fragments contain tRNA genes and hence change tRNA gene set composition. Presumably, the smallest possible adaptive duplication fragment is approximately ~150-200 bp (encompassing merely the compensatory tRNA gene and promoter), and would endow a new, comparatively stable tRNA gene set on the adapted strain. The long(er) term evolutionary fate of the duplication fragments, and hence the new tRNA gene copies, remains to be seen, and this information will provide insight into the extent to which within-genome duplication events contribute to the evolution of extant bacterial tRNA gene sets.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Whole genome sequencing data has been deposited with NCBI Short Read Archive (SRA) under accession number PRJNA790786.

YAMAT-seq data has been deposited with NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) under accession number GSE196705.

The remaining raw data relating to this project have been deposited on Zenodo and are accessible at: https://zenodo.org/record/7276661#.Y3JJHYKZONh

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary Data are available at NAR online.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank Frederic Bertels for useful comments on the manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) [AOBJ:679030 to JG], the Max Planck Society [all authors], and the International Max Planck Research School for Evolutionary Biology [ZK and WYN]. Funding for open access charge: The Max Planck Society.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceived and designed the experiments: GBA, JG, ZK. Performed the experiments: all authors. Analyzed the data: all authors. Wrote the paper: JG. Commented on the paper: all authors. Conceived the research: JG.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest exists.

REFERENCES

1. Gingold,H. and Pilpel,Y. (2011) Determinants of translation efficiency and accuracy. *Mol Syst Biol*,
7, 481.

2. Rak,R., Dahan,O. and Pilpel,Y. (2018) Repertoires of tRNAs: The couplers of genomics and
proteomics. *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol*, **34**, 239–264.

3. Abbott,J.A., Francklyn,C.S. and Robey-Bond,S.M. (2014) Transfer RNA and human disease. *Front*
Genet, **5**, 158.

4. Lant,J.T., Berg,M.D., Heinemann,I.U., Brandl,C.J. and O'Donoghue,P. (2019) Pathways to disease
from natural variations in human cytoplasmic tRNAs. *J Biol Chem*, **294**, 5294–5308.

5. Knight,J.R.P., Garland,G., Poyry,T., Mead,E., Vlahov,N., Sfakianos,A., Grosso,S., De-Lima-
Hedayioglu,F., Mallucci,G.R., Von Der Haar,T., *et al.* (2020) Control of translation elongation
in health and disease. *Dis Model Mech*, **13**, dmm043208.

6. Ayan,G.B., Park,H.J. and Gallie,J. (2020) The birth of a bacterial tRNA gene by large-scale,
tandem duplication events. *eLife*, **9**, e57947.

7. Chan,P.P. and Lowe,T.M. (2016) GtRNAdb 2.0: An expanded database of transfer RNA genes
identified in complete and draft genomes. *Nucl Acids Res*, **44**, D184-189.

8. Silby,M.W., Cerdeño-Tárraga,A.M., Vernikos,G.S., Giddens,S.R., Jackson,R.W., Preston,G.M.,
Zhang,X.X., Moon,C.D., Gehrig,S.M., Godfrey,S.A.C., *et al.* (2009) Genomic and genetic
analyses of diversity and plant interactions of *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. *Genome Biol*, **10**,
R51.

9. Ikemura,T. and Ozeki,H. (1983) Codon usage and transfer RNA contents: Organism-specific
codon-choice patterns in reference to the isoacceptor contents. *Cold Spring Harb Symp*
Quant Biol, **47**, 1087–1097.

10. Marck,C. and Grosjean,H. (2002) tRNomics: Analysis of tRNA genes from 50 genomes of
Eukarya, Archaea, and Bacteria reveals anticodon-sparing strategies and domain-specific
features. *RNA*, **8**, 1189–1232.

11. Rocha,E.P.C. (2004) Codon usage bias from tRNA's point of view: Redundancy, specialization,
and efficient decoding for translation optimization. *Genome Res*, **14**, 2279–2286.

12. Withers,M., Wernisch,L. and Dos Reis,M. (2006) Archaeology and evolution of transfer RNA
genes in the *Escherichia coli* genome. *RNA*, **12**, 933–942.

13. Wald,N. and Margalit,H. (2014) Auxiliary tRNAs: Large-scale analysis of tRNA genes reveals
patterns of tRNA repertoire dynamics. *Nucl Acids Res*, **42**, 6552–6566.

14. Tremblay-Savard,O., Benzaid,B., Lang,B.F. and El-Mabrouk,N. (2015) Evolution of tRNA
repertoires in *Bacillus* inferred with OrthoAlign. *Mol Biol Evol*, **32**, 1643–1656.

15. Diwan,G.D. and Agashe,D. (2018) Wobbling forth and drifting back: The evolutionary history and
impact of bacterial tRNA modifications. *Mol Biol Evol*, **35**, 2046–2059.

16. Crick,F.H.C. (1966) Codon-anticodon pairing: The wobble hypothesis. *J Mol Biol*, **19**, 548–555.

17. Shepherd,J. and Ibba,M. (2015) Bacterial transfer RNAs. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*, **39**, 280–
300.

18. Agris,P.F., Eruysal,E.R., Narendran,A., Väre,V.Y.P., Vangaveti,S. and Ranganathan,S.V. (2018)
Celebrating wobble decoding: Half a century and still much is new. *RNA Biol*, **15**, 537–553.

19. Alkatib,S., Scharff,L.B., Rogalski,M., Fleischmann,T.T., Matthes,A., Seeger,S., Schöttler,M.A.,
Ruf,S. and Bock,R. (2012) The contributions of wobbling and superwobbling to the reading of
the genetic code. *PLoS Genet*, **8**, e1003076.

20. Varenne,S., Buc,J., Lloubes,R. and Lazdunski,C. (1984) Translation is a non-uniform process.
Effect of tRNA availability on the rate of elongation of nascent polypeptide chains. **180**, 549–
576.

21. Ran,W. and Higgs,P.G. (2010) The influence of anticodon-codon interactions and modified bases
on codon usage bias in bacteria. *Mol Biol Evol*, **27**, 2129–2140.

22. Novoa,E.M., Pavon-Eternod,M., Pan,T. and Ribas De Pouplana,L. (2012) A role for tRNA
modifications in genome structure and codon usage. *Cell*, **149**, 202–213.

23. Ikemura,T. (1981) Correlation between the abundance of *Escherichia coli* transfer RNAs and the
occurrence of the respective codons in its protein genes: A proposal for a synonymous codon
choice that is optimal for the *E. coli* translational system. *J Mol Biol*, **151**, 389–409.

24. Ikemura,T. (1985) Codon usage and tRNA content in unicellular and multicellular organisms. *Mol
Biol Evol*, **2**, 13–34.

25. Dong,H., Nilsson,L. and Kurland,C.G. (1996) Co-variation of tRNA abundance and codon usage
in *Escherichia coli* at different growth rates. *J Mol Biol*, **260**, 649–663.

26. Sharp,P.M., Bailes,E., Grocock,R.J., Peden,J.F. and Sockett,R.E. (2005) Variation in the strength
of selected codon usage bias among bacteria. *Nucl Acids Res*, **33**, 1141–1153.

27. Higgs,P.G. and Ran,W. (2008) Coevolution of codon usage and tRNA genes leads to alternative
stable states of biased codon usage. *Mol Biol Evol*, **25**, 2279–2291.

28. Plotkin,J.B. and Kudla,G. (2011) Synonymous but not the same: The causes and consequences
of codon bias. *Nat Rev Genet*, **12**, 32–42.

29. Novoa,E.M. and Ribas de Pouplana,L. (2012) Speeding with control: Codon usage, tRNAs, and
ribosomes. *Trends Genet*, **28**, 574–581.

30. Serra,M.J., Baird,J.D., Dale,T., Fey,B.L., Retatagos,K. and Westhof,E. (2002) Effects of
magnesium ions on the stabilization of RNA oligomers of defined structures. *RNA*, **8**, 307–323.

31. Nikolova,E.N. and Al-Hashimi,H.M. (2010) Thermodynamics of RNA melting, one base pair at a
time. *RNA*, **16**, 1687–1691.

32. Kurland,C.G. and Ehrenberg,M. (1987) Growth-optimizing accuracy of gene expression. *Ann Rev
Biophys Chem*, **16**, 291–317.

33. Emilsson,V. and Kurland,C.G. (1990) Growth rate dependence of transfer RNA abundance in
Escherichia coli. *EMBO J*, **9**, 4359–4366.

34. Kurland,C.G., Hughes,D. and Ehrenberg,M. (1996) Limitations of translational accuracy. In
Neidhardt,F.C. (ed), *Escherichia coli and Salmonella: Cellular and Molecular Biology*. ASM
Press, Washington, D.C, Vol. 1, pp. 979–1004.

35. Sharp,P.M., Emery,L.R. and Zeng,K. (2010) Forces that influence the evolution of codon bias.
Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci, **365**, 1203–1212.

36. Raval,P.K., Ngan,W.Y., Gallie,J. and Agashe,D. (2022) The layered costs and benefits of
translational redundancy. 10.1101/2022.06.16.495782.

37. Saks,M.E., Sampson,J.R. and Abelson,J. (1998) Evolution of a transfer RNA gene through a point
mutation in the anticodon. *Science*, **279**, 1665–1670.

38. McDonald,M.J., Chou,C.H., Swamy,K.B.S., Huang,H.D. and Leu,J.Y. (2015) The evolutionary
dynamics of tRNA-gene copy number and codon-use in *E. coli*. *BMC Evol Biol*, **15**, 163.

39. Callens,M., Scornavacca,C. and Bedhomme,S. (2021) Evolutionary responses to codon usage of
horizontally transferred genes in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: gene retention, amelioration and
compensatory evolution. *Microb Genom*, **7**.

40. Nilsson,A.I., Zorzet,A., Kanth,A., Dahlström,S., Berg,O.G. and Andersson,D.I. (2006) Reducing
the fitness cost of antibiotic resistance by amplification of initiator tRNA genes. *Proc Natl Acad
Sci USA*, **103**, 6976–6981.

41. Bedhomme,S., Amorós-Moya,D., Valero,L.M., Bonifaci,N., Pujana,M.-À. and Bravo,I.G. (2019)
Evolutionary changes after translational challenges imposed by horizontal gene transfer.
Genome Biol Evol, **11**, 814–831.

42. Anderson,R.P. and Roth,J.R. (1977) Tandem genetic duplications in phage and bacteria. *Annu
Rev Microbiol*, **31**, 473–505.

43. Anderson,P. and Roth,J. (1981) Spontaneous tandem genetic duplications in *Salmonella
typhimurium* arise by unequal recombination between rRNA (*rrn*) cistrons. *Proc Natl Acad Sci
USA*, **78**, 3113–3117.

44. Andersson,D.I. and Hughes,D. (2009) Gene amplification and adaptive evolution in Bacteria.
Annu Rev Genet, **43**, 167–195.

45. Elliott,K.T., Cuff,L.E. and Neidle,E.L. (2013) Copy number change: Evolving views on gene
amplification. *Future Microbiol*, **8**, 887–899.

46. Tomanek,I., Grah,R., Lagator,M., Andersson,A.M.C., Bollback,J.P., Tkačik,G. and Guet,C.C.
(2020) Gene amplification as a form of population-level gene expression regulation. *Nat Ecol
Evol*, **4**, 612–625.

47. Andersson,D.I., Susan Slechta,E. and Roth,J.R. (1998) Evidence that gene amplification underlies
adaptive mutability of the bacterial *lac* operon. *Science*, **282**, 1133–1135.

48. Riehle,M.M., Bennett,A.F. and Long,A.D. (2001) Genetic architecture of thermal adaptation in
Escherichia coli. **98**, 525–530.

49. Lind,P.A., Tobin,C., Berg,O.G., Kurland,C.G. and Andersson,D.I. (2010) Compensatory gene
amplification restores fitness after inter-species gene replacements. *Mol Microbiol*, **75**, 1078–
1089.

50. Paulander,W., Andersson,D.I. and Maisnier-Patin,S. (2010) Amplification of the gene for isoleucyl-
tRNA synthetase facilitates adaptation to the fitness cost of mupirocin resistance in
Salmonella enterica. *Genetics*, **185**, 305–312.

51. Wannarat,W., Wannarat,W., Motoyama,S., Masuda,K., Kawamura,F. and Inaoka,T. (2014)
Tetracycline tolerance mediated by gene amplification in Bacillus subtilis. **160**, 2474–2480.

52. Toussaint,J.P., Farrell-Sherman,A., Feldman,T.P., Smalley,N.E., Schaefer,A.L., Greenberg,E.P.
and Dandekar,A.A. (2017) Gene duplication in Pseudomonas aeruginosa improves growth on
adenosine. *J Bacteriol*, **199**, e00261-17.

53. Blount,Z.D., Maddamsetti,R., Grant,N.A., Ahmed,S.T., Jagdish,T., Baxter,J.A., Sommerfeld,B.A.,
Tillman,A., Moore,J., Slonczewski,J.L., *et al.* (2020) Genomic and phenotypic evolution of
Escherichia coli in a novel citrate-only resource environment. *eLife*, **9**, e55414.

54. Straus,D.S. and Straus,L.D.A. (1976) Large overlapping tandem genetic duplications in
Salmonella typhimurium. *J Mol Biol*, **103**, 143–153.

55. Reams,A.B., Kofoid,E., Savageau,M. and Roth,J.R. (2010) Duplication frequency in a population
of *Salmonella enterica* rapidly approaches steady state with or without recombination.
Genetics, **184**, 1077–1094.

56. Sun,S., Ke,R., Hughes,D., Nilsson,M. and Andersson,D.I. (2012) Genome-wide detection of
spontaneous chromosomal rearrangements in Bacteria. *PLoS ONE*, **7**, e42639.

57. Reams,A.B., Kofoid,E., Duleba,N. and Roth,J.R. (2014) Recombination and annealing pathways
compete for substrates in making *rrn* duplications in *Salmonella enterica*. *Genetics*, **196**, 119–
135.

58. Westra,E.R., Sünderhauf,D., Landsberger,M. and Buckling,A. (2017) Mechanisms and
consequences of diversity-generating immune strategies. *Nat Rev Immunol*, **17**, 719–728.

59. King,E.O., Ward,M.K. and Raney,D.E. (1954) Two simple media for the demonstration of
pyocyanin and fluorescin. *J Lab Clin Med*, **44**, 301–307.

60. Sambrook,J., Fritsch,E.F. and Maniatis,T. (1989) Molecular cloning: a laboratory manual 2nd. ed.
Cold Spring Harbor laboratory press, Cold Spring Harbor.

61. Zhang,X.X. and Rainey,P.B. (2007) Construction and validation of a neutrally-marked strain of
Pseudomonas fluorescens SBW25. *J Microbiol Methods*, **71**, 78–81.

62. Lenski,R.E., Rose,M.R., Simpson,S.C. and Tadler,S.C. (1991) Long-term experimental evolution
in *Escherichia coli*. I. Adaptation and divergence during 2000 generations. *Evolution*, **138**,
1315–1341.

63. Leinonen,R., Sugawara,H. and Shumway,M. (2011) The Sequence Read Archive. *Nucl Acids Res*,
39, D19–D21.

64. Deatherage,D.E. and Barrick,J.E. (2014) Identification of mutations in laboratory-evolved
microbes from next-generation sequencing data using *breseq*. *Methods Mol Biol*, **1151**, 165–
188.

65. Deatherage,D.E., Traverse,C.C., Wolf,L.N. and Barrick,J.E. (2015) Detecting rare structural
variation in evolving microbial populations from new sequence junctions using *breseq*. *Front
Genet*, **5**, 468.

66. Barrick,J.E., Colburn,G., Deatherage,D.E., Traverse,C.C., Strand,M.D., Borges,J.J.,
Knoester,D.B., Reba,A. and Meyer,A.G. (2014) Identifying structural variation in haploid
microbial genomes from short-read resequencing data using *breseq*. *BMC Genomics*, **15**,
1039.

67. Shigematsu,M., Honda,S., Loher,P., Telonis,A.G., Rigoutsos,I. and Kirino,Y. (2017) YAMAT-seq:
An efficient method for high-throughput sequencing of mature transfer RNAs. *Nucl Acids Res*,
45, e70.

68. Edgar,R., Domrachev,M. and Lash,A.E. (2002) Gene Expression Omnibus: NCBI gene
expression and hybridization array data repository. *Nucl Acids Res*, **30**, 207–210.

69. Love,M.I., Huber,W. and Anders,S. (2014) Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for
RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol*, **15**, 550.

70. Anders,S. and Huber,W. (2010) Differential expression analysis for sequence count data.
Genome Biol, **11**, R106.

71. Mukherjee,A., Dechow-Seligmann,G. and Gallie,J. (2022) Evolutionary flexibility in routes to mat
formation by *Pseudomonas*. *Mol Microbiol*, **117**, 394–410.

72. Schneider,C.A., Rasband,W.S. and Eliceiri,K.W. (2012) NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image
analysis. *Nat Methods*, **9**, 671–675.

73. Chan,P.P., Lin,B.Y., Mak,A.J. and Lowe,T.M. (2021) tRNAscan-SE 2.0: improved detection and
functional classification of transfer RNA genes. *Nucl Acids Res*, **49**, 9077–9096.

74. Warren,J.M., Salinas-Giegé,T., Hummel,G., Coots,N.L., Svendsen,J.M., Brown,K.C., Drouard,L.
and Sloan,D.B. (2021) Combining tRNA sequencing methods to characterize plant tRNA
expression and post-transcriptional modification. *RNA Biol*, **18**, 64–78.

75. Adler,M., Anjum,M., Berg,O.G., Andersson,D.I. and Sandegren,L. (2014) High fitness costs and
instability of gene duplications reduce rates of evolution of new genes by duplication-
divergence mechanisms. *Mol Biol Evol*, **31**, 1526–1535.

76. Reams,A.B. and Roth,J.R. (2015) Mechanisms of gene duplication and amplification. *Cold Spring
Harb Perspect Biol*, **7**, a016592.

77. Anderson,R.P. and Roth,J.R. (1979) Gene duplication in Bacteria: Alteration of gene dosage by
sister-chromosome exchanges. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol*, **43**, 1083–1087.

78. Hastings,P.J., Lupski,J.R., Rosenberg,S.M. and Ira,G. (2009) Mechanisms of change in gene
copy number. *Nat Rev Genet*, **10**, 551–564.

79. Moxon,E.R. and Thaler,D.S. (1997) The tinkerer's evolving tool-box. *Nature*, **387**, 659–662.

80. Moxon,E.R., Rainey,P.B., Nowak,M.A. and Lenski,R.E. (1994) Adaptive evolution of highly
mutable loci in pathogenic bacteria. *Curr Biol*, **4**, 24–33.

81. Yampolsky,L.Y. and Stoltzfus,A. (2001) Bias in the introduction of variation as an orienting factor
in evolution. *Evol Dev*, **3**, 73–83.

82. Reams,A.B., Kofoid,E., Kugelberg,E. and Roth,J.R. (2012) Multiple pathways of duplication
formation with and without recombination (RecA) in *Salmonella enterica*. *Genetics*, **192**, 397–
415.

83. Brandis,G. and Hughes,D. (2020) The SNAP hypothesis: Chromosomal rearrangements could
emerge from positive selection during niche adaptation. *PLoS Genet*, **16**, e1008615.

84. Cao,S., Brandis,G., Huseby,D.L. and Hughes,D. (2022) Positive selection during niche adaptation
results in large-scale and irreversible rearrangement of chromosomal gene order in Bacteria.
Mol Biol Evol, **39**, msac069.

 TABLES AND FIGURES

Strain	Dup. size (bp)	# Genes	#tRNA genes	Junct. name	Junction side 1		Junction side 2	
					Base	**Locus**	**Base**	**Locus**
M1-1	1,016,166	917	69	M1junct	2,864,810	*pflu2597 (rhs)*	1,848,645	Intergenic (no repeat)
M2-1	1,012,338	911	69	M2junct	2,865,243– 2,865,277	*pflu2597 (rhs)*	1,852,904– 1,853,090	*pflu1686 (rhs)*
M3-1	489,709	426	63	M3junct	2,786,207	*pflu2547* (no repeat)	2,296,499	Intergenic (repeat)
M4-1	~1,012,00 0	911	69	M4junct	~2,865,500	*pflu2597 (rhs)*	~1,853,600	*pflu1686 (rhs)*
M5-1	1,012,339	911	69	M5junct	2,866,737– 2,866,785	*pflu2597 (rhs)*	1,854,339– 1,854,447	*pflu1686 (rhs)*

Table 1. Details of duplication fragments identified in five compensated isolates. Base positions

refer to the SBW25 wildtype genome sequence (NCBI accession number: NC_012660.1). For a

detailed list of the genes contained within each duplication fragment, see Supplementary Table S3.

Figure 1. Translation of glycine (G) and glutamic acid (E) in *P. fluorescens* SBW25. (**A**) Cartoon

of the SBW25 chromosome depicting loci predicted by GtRNAdb2.0 to encode canonical tRNAs. Grey

lines=tRNA loci (each representing between one and four tRNA genes); black arrow=*gluTTC-glyGCC-*

gluTTC-glyGCC ("*EGEG*") tRNA locus deleted by genetic engineering; white arrow=*glyGCC* lone

tRNA locus (encoding the remaining copy of *glyGCC*); grey arrow=*gluTTC-alaGGC-gluTTC-alaGGC*

tRNA locus (encoding the remaining two copies of *gluTTC*). (**B**) Details of the *EGEG* tRNA locus

indicated by the black arrow in panel A. (**C**) Putative translational relationships between anticodons

and codons for glycine (top) and glutamic acid (bottom) (6). Codons are listed with their cognate

anticodons (black=isotype encoded in genome; grey=not encoded). Predicted anticodon-codon

matching patterns are indicated by joining lines (black=cognate match; grey=wobble match).

Percentage contribution of each codon to (i) the relevant amino acid (% aa), and (ii) all amino acids, is

provided to 1 d.p. from GtRNAdb2.0 (7). (**D**) Details of the tRNA gene sets carried by engineered

genotypes.

Figure 2. Deletion of the four-gene tRNA locus *EGEG* reduces SBW25 growth in rich,

undefined (KB) and poorer, defined (M9+glucose) media. (**A**-**B**) Colonies of SBW25,

reconstructed wildtype (the engineering control, rWT), and the two engineered genotypes Δ*glyGCC*

and ΔEGEG at room temperature for 30 hours on KB agar, or 72 hours on M9 agar. Scale bar applies

to all four images in each panel. (**C**-**D**) Growth (measured as absorbance at 600 nm) of the same

strains in liquid KB for 8 hours, or M9 for 16 hours. Lines show the mean of 7 replicates at 5-minute

intervals; error bars are +/- 1 SE. (**E-H**) Maximum growth rates (change in absorbance; mOD min^{-1})

and lag times of growth profiles in panel C (KB; using a sliding window of 6 points between 1 h and 10

h), and panel D (M9; using a sliding window of six points between 1 h and 8 h). In all four panels, red

and blue lines are the medians of SBW25 and ΔEGEG, respectively. Non-parametric Dunn's tests,

followed by the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to correct for multiple comparisons, were used to test

for a difference in medians between pairs of strains in each panel. Stars indicate statistically

significant *p*-values for a difference from SBW25 (red stars) or ΔEGEG (blue stars).

Figure 3. The growth defect caused by deleting four-gene tRNA locus *gluTTC-glyGCC-gluTTC-*

***glyGCC* (*EGEG*) undergoes repeated compensation during a serial transfer experiment.** (**A**)

Colonies of founders SBW25, ΔEGEG, and 6 isolates from day 21 of the serial transfer evolution

experiment, grown on KB agar for 30 h at room temperature. Scale bar applies to all images. (**B**)

Growth in liquid KB culture. Lines show the mean of 7 replicates at 5-minute intervals; error bars are

+/- 1 SE. (**C**,**D**) Maximum growth rate (change in absorbance; mOD min^{-1}) and lag time for each

growth profile in panel B, using a sliding window of 6 points during rapid growth (1 h - 8 h). In both

panels, red and blue lines are the medians of SBW25 and ΔEGEG, respectively. Non-parametric

Dunn's tests, followed by the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to correct for multiple comparisons,

were used to test for a difference in medians between pairs of strains. Stars indicate statistically

significant *p*-values for a difference from SBW25 (red stars) or ΔEGEG (blue stars). Data for SBW25,

rWT and ΔEGEG also appears in Figure 2. (**E**) Box plots of the relative fitness of competitor 1 (*x*-axis)

and competitor 2 (horizontal bars at top). Direct, 1:1 competitions were performed in liquid KB for 24

hours (28˚C, shaking). Between 5 and 8 replicate competitions were performed for each genotype

pair. Relative fitness >1 means that the first competitor wins, <1 means that the second competitor

wins. Statistically significant deviations of relative fitness from 1 were determined using either one-

tailed one-sample *t*-tests, followed by a Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparisons. Data

points from all replicates are overlaid on boxplots, and ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05.

Figure 4. Large-scale, tandem duplications compensate for deletion of _EGEG_. (A) Number of raw sequencing reads covering 1.8 - 3.0 Mb of the reference genome. A jump to two-fold coverage is evident in mutant lineage isolates (M1-1 to M5-1), and not in the control isolate (W1-1). The ~0.49 Mb region of double coverage shared by all mutants is highlighted in green; tRNA genes are shown by dotted lines. (**B**) Cartoon depicting the positions of duplicated regions on the SBW25 genome. Black arc=~1 Mb duplication fragment (in M1-1, M2-1, M4-1, M5-1); green arc=~0.49 Mb duplication fragment (in M3-1); grey arc=distinct ~0.4 Mb region in which duplication fragments have previously been reported (6). Duplicated tRNA genes are marked by dotted lines; deleted tRNA genes are marked with a cross. Image drawn using BioRender.com. (**C**) Depiction of the duplication event in M3-1, resulting in an additional 0.49 Mb of DNA and double copies of all genes in the duplicated region. Thick black line=duplication junction, which can be amplified using a duplication junction PCR (primer positions in black; see Supplementary Text S2). (**D**) Heatmap showing differences in the gene copy numbers coding for 39 isotypes between wildtype (wt), engineered (eng.), and evolved (evol.) genotypes. Open/closed circles=isotypes whose gene copy number changed by engineering/evolution.

Figure 5. *glyGCC* gene copy number changes are mirrored in the mature tRNA pool. (A)
Proportions of 39 isotypes in the SBW25 mature tRNA pool (highest to lowest). Light grey=excluded
isotypes. Open/closed circles=isotypes whose gene copy number (GCN) changes by
engineering/evolution in downstream experiments. (**B-D**) Heatmaps of differences in isotype
proportions (expressed as log2-fold change(strain1/strain2); see Supplementary Table S5) between
genotype pairs, to detect the effect of engineering (panel A) and evolution (panels C-D). Box outlines
indicate statistical significance (DESeq2 adjusted p-values; thin line *p*>0.01; thick grey line
0.01<*p*>0.001; thick black line *p*<0.001). (**E**) Bar graph of tRNA-Gly(GCC) proportions by genotype.
Bars=means of 3 replicates +/- 1 SE. DESeq2 adjusted *p*-values show tRNA-Gly(GCC) differences
between genotypes pairs. (**F**) Scatter plot of mean proportions +/- 1 SE of 7 isotypes, by genotype.
GCN for first 5 isotypes varies by engineering and/or evolution (indicated by point size), while the final
2 isotypes are controls (constant GCN). *rrn*=isotypes whose genes co-localize with rRNA operons.

Figure 6. The large-scale, tandem duplication fragments are rapidly lost in overnight culture.
(**A**) Two colony morphologies – large and small – are observed when plating from overnight cultures
of duplication fragment-carrying strains (colonies from duplication genotypes M3-1 and M5-1
presented here). All images taken under the same magnification after ~48 hours' incubation on KB
agar at room temperature (~21˚C). Scale bar applies to all images in panel. (**B**) Small colonies no
longer amplify the unique junction introduced by the relevant duplication fragment (illustrated by the
thick black lines in M3-1 cartoon of panel D). (**C**) Duplication fragment loss was quantified as the
proportion of small colonies when plating from an overnight culture. Five replicates were included per
genotype, and at least 41 colonies were counted per replicate. Boxplots summarize the data
(medians), and grey dots are individual replicates. Statistical significance of a difference in the median
proportion of small colonies compared to SBW25 (wildtype) was calculated using a Dunn test (with
Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparisons). Significance levels: no stars (*p*>0.05),
*0.05<*p*<0.001, **0.01<*p*<0.001, ***p*<0.001. (**C**) **D**) Cartoon depicting the gain and loss of duplication
fragments leading to a mixed population of duplication strain (here, M3-1) and ∆EGEG.

Figure 7. The complex evolutionary dynamics of the large-scale duplication fragments in

evolving populations. Heatmaps showing the estimated proportion of individuals carrying large-

scale duplication fragments of interest in evolving populations. Proportions were estimated from the

intensity of duplication junction PCR bands on an agarose gel, relative to a positive control (using

ImageJ; intensity measures are provided in Supplementary Table S6). Darker squares indicate higher

proportions of individuals carrying the duplication fragment. (**A**) The dynamics of three large

duplication fragments (M2f, M4f, and M5f; all ~1 Mb) and the smaller duplication fragment (M3f; ~0.49

Mb) across the mutant lineages in which they were initially identified (see Table 1). White crosses

mark the peak frequency of each fragment. Gel images are provided in Supplementary Figure S2. (**B**)

The dynamics of large (M5f; ~1 Mb) and smaller (M3f; ~0.49 Mb) duplication fragments in all evolving

populations. 'Total' row provides the sum of M5f and M3f; thick black rectangles indicate the lineage

in which the duplication fragment was initially identified; black circles mark populations in which both

large and smaller duplication fragments were detected. Gel images are provided in Supplementary

Figure S3.