BRIEF COMMUNICATION

Title

Transcriptomic profiling reveals host-specific evolutionary pathways promoting

enhanced fitness in the broad host range pathogen *Ralstonia*

pseudosolanacearum

Running Title

Transcriptomic variation and host adaptation in *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*

Authors

Rekha Gopalan-Nair[1], Françoise Jardinaud[1], Ludovic Legrand[1], Céline Lopez-Roques[2], Olivier

Bouchez[2], Stéphane Genin*[,1] and Alice Guidot*[,1]

Addresses

[1]LIPME, Université de Toulouse, INRAE, CNRS, Castanet-Tolosan, France

[2]INRAE, GeT-PlaGe, Genotoul, Castanet-Tolosan, France (DOI : 10.17180/nvxj-5333)

*Corresponding authors:

E-mails:

stephane.genin@inrae.fr

alice.guidot@inrae.fr

Abstract

The impact of host diversity on the genotypic and phenotypic evolution of broad-spectrum pathogens is a remaining issue. Here, we used populations of the plant pathogen *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* that were experimentally evolved on five types of host plants, either belonging to different botanical families or differing in their susceptibility or resistance to the pathogen. We investigated whether changes in transcriptomic profiles dissociated from genetic changes could occur during the process of host adaptation, and whether transcriptomic reprogramming was dependent on host type. Genomic and transcriptomic variations were established for 31 evolved clones that showed a better fitness in their experimental host than the ancestral clone. Few genomic polymorphisms were detected in these clones, but significant transcriptomic variations were observed, with a high number of differentially expressed genes (DEGs). In a very clear way, a group of genes belonging to the network of regulation of the bacterial virulence such as *efpR*, *efpH* or *hrpB*, among others, were deregulated in several independent evolutionary lineages and appeared to play a key role in the transcriptomic rewiring observed in evolved clones. A double hierarchical clustering based on the 400 top DEGs for each clone revealed two major patterns of gene deregulation that depend on host genotype, but not on host susceptibility or resistance to the pathogen. This work therefore highlights the existence of two major evolutionary paths that result in a significant reorganization of gene expression during adaptive evolution and underscore clusters of co-regulated genes associated to bacterial adaptation on different host lines.

Main body of text

Several studies have demonstrated the undeniable role of adaptive mutation fixation across generations to explain adaptation to changing environments or, in the case of pathogens, to new hosts [1, 2]. In a previous work, we conducted an experimental evolution of the plant pathogen *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* strain GMI1000 through serial passage experiment (SPE) into the stem of various plants during 300 bacterial generations [3]. Five biological SPE replicates were generated in parallel for each plant species thus generating five lineages of evolved clones per plant species. For each evolved clone, the adaptive advantage was compared to the ancestral clone through the measure of their Competitive Index during *in planta* in competition assays [3, 4]. The vast majority of the clones we obtained had significantly higher fitness gains than the ancestral clone. We then performed transcriptomic analyses of 10 clones evolved in the resistant tomato Hawaii 7996, which revealed a convergence towards a global rewiring of the virulence regulatory network [4]. As the evolution experiment was performed on several plant species [3], we sought to determine to what extent the transcriptional profiles mobilized for adaptation to tomato Hawaii were conserved for adaptation to other plants. We thus investigated genomic and transcriptomic variations in 21 additional clones obtained by experimental evolution of strain GMI1000 in either susceptible (tomato var. Marmande, eggplant var. Zebrina) and tolerant (bean var. blanc précoce, cabbage var. Bartolo) hosts.

We first investigated the genomic variations in the 21 clones compared to their ancestor by whole genome sequencing (Table 1). Both Illumina and Pacbio sequencing technologies were used for the detection of SNPs (Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms) or small InDels (Insertion-Deletion) and for the detection of large genomic rearrangements, respectively. These analyses revealed between zero and three genomic polymorphisms per

clone compared to the ancestor and included either SNPs, Indels, duplication, IS (Insertion

sequence) insertion or large deletion (Table 1). All these genomic polymorphisms were

confirmed by PCR amplification followed by Sanger sequencing or gel electrophoresis.

We then investigated the transcriptomic variations in the 21 evolved clones compared

to their ancestor by RNA-sequencing approach using Illumina technology. RNA were extracted

from bacterial cultures in MP medium supplemented with 10 mM glutamine and collected at

the beginning of stationary phase, in similar conditions as for Hawaii clones [4]. Three

biological replicates were conducted for each of the 21 clones and the GMI1000 ancestor

strain. Analysis of RNA-seq data revealed that all samples rendered between 0.7 and 1.3

million of GMI1000-mapped reads. Differentially expressed genes (DEGs) between the

evolved clones and the ancestral clone were considered as those presenting an FDR-adjusted

p-value (padj,FDR) < 0.05 (Table 1 and Supplementary Table S1). In the 21 new investigated

clones, when considering a log-fold change of expression I logFC I > 1, the number of DEGs

varied between 25 and 2368 and was not correlated to the number of mutations (Table 1). A

high number of DEGs was detected in the three clones evolved in eggplant Zebrina despite no

detected genetic alteration, confirming a previous observation that some transcriptomic

variations may be dependent on epigenetic modifications [4].

By looking more precisely at the DEGs, it appeared that there were groups of genes

that were deregulated frequently, even recurrently, in several independent evolutionary

lineages and regardless of the host considered (Table 1). In agreement with what was

observed for the Hawaii clones, we detected a significant down-regulation for the virulence

gene regulators *efpR, hrpB* and *prhP* [4] in 5, 2 and 4 of the newly 21 investigated clones,

respectively. In addition, we observed a significant up-regulation for the *efpH* gene, a virulence

regulatory gene homologous to *efpR* [5], but exclusively in clones evolved in tomato

Marmande and in cabbage. We also observed significant variations in the expression pattern

of genes involved in quorum-sensing-dependent virulence signaling pathways such as

solI/solR [6] in 14 clones; *rasI/rasR* [7] in 24 clones; as well as the lectin encoding genes *lecM*

and *rsl2* [8] in 21 clones. Genes involved in the denitrification pathway such as *narJ/narK1* and

nosZ [9] were exclusively up-regulated in the tomato Marmande and cabbage clones and *nasF*,

a nitrate transporter protein, was found up-regulated in 23 clones.

To go further in the analysis and increase its significance, we focused on the 400 top

DEGs for each clone (200 most up-regulated and 200 most down-regulated). The comparison

of these DEGs using a double hierarchical clustering is presented in Figure 1. This clustering

showed that the evolved clones can be separated into two groups according to the host on

which they have evolved, with two main branches clearly distinguishing the clones evolved on

tomato Marmande and cabbage on the one hand and the clones evolved on tomato Hawaii,

eggplant and bean on the other. This observation suggests that there are at least two major

patterns of gene deregulation associated with strain GMI1000 adaptation to its hosts, and that

these patterns is associated to the host genotype but not to the host susceptibility to bacterial

wilt disease. In terms of discriminating genes, it appears that the Tomato Marmande /

cabbage branch is associated with an upregulated expression of cluster (1) (Fig.1 and

Supplementary Table S1), which includes 180 genes, among which *efpH*, *narJ* and *nosZ*. The

analysis also confirmed down-regulation of part of the *hrpB* regulon (cluster 4) in several

clones evolved on Tomato Hawaii, eggplant and Bean, showing significant differences in

expression of several genes encoding type 3 effectors in Hawaii evolved clones [4].

Altogether, these data highlight a significant reorganization of gene expression

associated to adaptation of *R. pseudosolanacearum* to multihost species, which converged

toward two major patterns of gene deregulation according to the host genotype. In all cases,

a relatively small number of genes (including several transcriptional regulators such as *efpR*,

efpH, *hrpB*, *rasI/R*, *solI/R*, *rsl2*) seem to play a key role in these transcriptomic rewiring. The

distribution of these regulatory genes in different clusters of co-regulated genes opens

avenues for further characterization of these regulons and possible cross-regulations

associated to adaptive process to host plants.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the French National Research Agency (grant number ANR-17-

CE20-0005-01) and the "Laboratoires d'Excellence (LABEX)" TULIP (ANR-10-LABX-41)" and the

"École Universitaire de Recherche (EUR)" TULIP-GS (ANR-18-EURE-0019). R.G.N was funded

by a PhD fellowship from the French Laboratory of Excellence project "TULIP" (grant number

ANR-10-LABX-41; ANR-11-IDEX-0002-02).

This work was performed in collaboration with the GeT core facility, Toulouse, France

(http://get.genotoul.fr), and was supported by France Génomique National infrastructure,

funded as part of "Investissement d'avenir" program managed by the French National

Research Agency (grant number ANR-10-INBS-09) and by the GET-PACBIO program («

Programme operationnel FEDER-FSE MIDI-PYRENEES ET GARONNE 2014-2020 »).

References

1.   Donegan MA, Coletta-Filho HD, Almeida RPP. Parallel host shifts in a bacterial plant

pathogen suggest independent genetic solutions. *Mol Plant Pathol* 2023.

2.   Longdon B, Brockhurst MA, Russell CA, Welch JJ, Jiggins FM. The evolution and genetics

of virus host shifts. *PLoS Pathog* 2014; **10**: e1004395.

3.   Guidot A, Jiang W, Ferdy J-B, Thébaud C, Barberis P, Gouzy J, et al. Multihost

Experimental Evolution of the Pathogen Ralstonia solanacearum Unveils Genes Involved

in Adaptation to Plants. *Mol Biol Evol* 2014; **31**: 2913–2928.

4.   Gopalan-Nair R, Jardinaud M-F, Legrand L, Landry D, Barlet X, Lopez-Roques C, et al.

Convergent Rewiring of the Virulence Regulatory Network Promotes Adaptation of

Ralstonia solanacearum on Resistant Tomato. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 2020.

5.   Perrier A, Barlet X, Rengel D, Prior P, Poussier S, Genin S, et al. Spontaneous mutations in

a regulatory gene induce phenotypic heterogeneity and adaptation of Ralstonia

solanacearum to changing environments. *Environmental Microbiology* 2019; **21**: 3140–

3152.

6.   Flavier AB, Ganova-Raeva LM, Schell MA, Denny TP. Hierarchical autoinduction in

Ralstonia solanacearum: control of acyl-homoserine lactone production by a novel

autoregulatory system responsive to 3-hydroxypalmitic acid methyl ester. *J Bacteriol*

1997; **179**: 7089–7097.

7.   Yan J, Li P, Wang X, Zhu M, Shi H, Yu G, et al. RasI/R Quorum Sensing System Controls the

Virulence of Ralstonia solanacearum Strain EP1. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2022; **88**:

e0032522.

8.   Hayashi K, Kai K, Mori Y, Ishikawa S, Ujita Y, Ohnishi K, et al. Contribution of a lectin,

LecM, to the quorum sensing signalling pathway of Ralstonia solanacearum strain OE1-1.

Mol Plant Pathol 2019; **20**: 334–345.

9.   Truchon AN, Dalsing BL, Khokhani D, MacIntyre A, McDonald BR, Ailloud F, et al. Plant-

Pathogenic Ralstonia Phylotypes Evolved Divergent Respiratory Strategies and Behaviors

To Thrive in Xylem. *mBio* 2023; **14**: e0318822.

Figure legend

Figure 1 Double hierarchical clustering analysis of the 400 top Differentially Expressed Genes

(DEGs) in 31 evolved clones of *R. pseudosolanacearum*.

The 400 top DEGs (FDR<0.05) (200 most up-regulated and 200 most down-regulated) were

selected for each clone. Down- and up-regulated genes were binary coded, respectively -1

(blue) and 1(orange). The hclust function from the stats R package (R Development Core

Team, 2012) computed Euclidean distances between clone profiles. Clustering was computed

with Ward's D2 method and a heat map was generated with the gplots R package

Supplementary material

Supplementary Table S1 RNAseq raw data and analysis for all wild-type (wt) GMI1000 strain

and all 31 experimentally evolved clones transcripts detected in minimal medium

supplemented with 10mM glutamine. The 400 top DEGs identified for each clone and used for

the double hierarchical clustering analysis are indicated by a cross in the 'Top DEGs' column.

For each clone, the top DEGs are encoded -1.00 for the down-regulated genes, 1.00 for the

up-regulated genes and 0.00 for the genes not differentially regulated compared to the wt

strain. The gene cluster to which the 400 top DEGs in each 31 evolved clone belong is given in

the 'cluster (k=9)' column. RNAseq data analysis for the Zeb26c2 and Zeb26c4 clones are given

in grey at the end of the table. The number of DEGs for these two clones were not sufficient

to be included in the double hierarchical clustering analysis.

Table 1 List of evolved clones with their genomic polymorphisms and transcriptomic variations of known virulence determinants

Experimental host	Lineage	Evolved clone	Mean CI	Mutations	no. of DEGs ($|logFC| > 1$; p-value FDR <0.05)	efpR	efpH	hrpB	prhP	solI	solR	rasI	rasR	rsl2	lecM	narJ	narK1	nasF	nosZ	Reference
Tomato var. Marmande (suceptible host)	A	Mar26a1[a]	5.6	$RSc2508^{IS,\,-1}$; $tktA^{R326G}$ $RSp0128\text{-}0154^{Del\,33kb}$	1390		Up (4.43)			Down (-2.75)	Down (-2.92)	Up (2.07)		Down (-8.50)		Up (3.03)	Up (2.99)	Up (3.19)	Up (3.24)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	A	Mar26a2	5.4	$RSc2508^{IS,\,-120}$	1424		Up (4.38)			Down (-3.22)	Down (-3.21)	Up (2.20)		Down (-9.28)		Up (2.98)	Up (2.73)	Up (3.20)	Up (3.08)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	B	Mar26b2[a]	3.9	$phcS^{T26M}$	2368		Up (4.10)			Down (-2.40)		Up (2.05)		Down (-2.79)	Down (-4.45)	Up (1.92)	Up (2.81)	Up (3.18)	Up (4.96)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	D	Mar26d2	5.7	$RSc2508^{IS,\,-120}$	1387	Down (-2.24)	Up (4.00)							Down (-9.57)		Up (2.69)	Up (2.43)	Up (2.87)	Up (2.59)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	E	Mar26e1[a]	3.4	$RSc2508^{IS,\,-120}$	2174	Down (-2.35)	Up (3.66)		Down (-2.25)	Down (-2.56)	Down (-4.32)	Up (1.97)		Down (-10.6)	Down (-2.13)	Up (2.58)		Up (2.43)	Up (1.87)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	E	Mar26e3	6.3	$RSc2508^{IS,\,-1}$; $RSp1466^{In\,8\,nt,\,-256}$	1371		Up (4.10)			Down (-2.54)	Down (-3.75)	Up (2.20)		Down (-9.16)		Up (2.92)	Up (2.55)	Up (2.98)	Up (2.85)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
Eggplant var. Zebrina (suceptible host)	B	Zeb26b1	2.7	$RSp0083^{IS,\,1}$	332							Up (1.88)								Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	B	Zeb26b5	3.7		239	Down (-1.30)								Down (-1.56)				Up (1.41)		Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	C	Zeb26c2	2.1	$RSp0127^{F91L}$	92															Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	C	Zeb26c3	1.6	$RSp0127^{F91L}$	335		Down (-1.06)							Down (-1.00)				Up (1.27)		Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	C	Zeb26c4	2.1	dld^{R135S}	25															Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	D	Zeb26d1	0.9[ns]		353			Down (-1.00)												Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	E	Zeb26e1	3.6		515					Down (-1.28)	Down (-2.97)	Down (-3.65)	Up (1.46)	Down (-11.3)						Guidot et al. 2014; this study
Bean var. Blanc Précoce (tolerant host)	A	Bean26a4	6.1	$RSc2508^{A394}$; $rpoB^{D428Y}$	1952					Down (-3.53)	Down (-4.43)		Up (2.38)	Down (-10.5)	Down (-2.59)					Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	A	Bean26a5	6.5	$RSc2508^{A394(-)*}$	1940					Down (-3.53)	Down (-5.06)		Up (2.44)	Down (-10.8)	Down (-2.59)					Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	C	Bean26c1[a]	6.6	$efpR^{P93Q}$ $purF^{G-88A}$	897	Down (-5.95)							Up (2.20)	Down (-3.67)	Down (-3,34)					Guidot et al. 2014; this study

Experimental host	Lineage	Evolved clone	Mean CI	Mutations	no. of DEGs (|logFC| > 1; p-value FDR <0.05)	efpR	efpH	hrpB	prhP	solI	solR	rasI	rasR	rsl2	lecM	narJ	narK1	nasF	nosZ	Reference
Cabbage var. Bartolo (tolerant host)	B	Cab36b1	4.1	RSp0955 $^{IS,-1i}$ flhB $^{Dup\ 21\ nt,\ 1129}$	1494	Down (-2.47)	Up (4.44)		Down (-2.36)		Down (-2.06)	Up (2.23)		Down (-6.37)		Up (2.13)	Up (2.24)	Up (3.22)	Up (3.58)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	B	Cab36b2	4.9	RSc2508 ^{IS,76i} RSp0955 $^{IS,·}$ flhB $^{Dup\ 21\ nt,\ 1129}$	2038		Up (4.26)		Down (-2.12)	Down (-2.87)	Down (-3.75)	Up (2.67)		Down (-8.91)		Up (2.79)	Up (2.14)	Up (2.84)	Up (2.45)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	C	Cab36c2	8.8	spoT ^{A219P} RSc2428 $^{C-2}$ RSc2573-2622 $^{Del\ 44.4kb}$	1740		Up (4.34)					Up (2.32)				Up (2.84)	Up (2.57)	Up (2.92)	Up (3.30)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	D	Cab36d1	3.5	phcS ^{Y106C} flgB $^{Del\ 12\ nt,4}$ RSc2573-2622 $^{Del\ 44.4kb}$	2309		Up (4.94)			Down (-2.38)	Down (-2,64)			Down (-8.35)	Down (-4.43)	Up (2.33)	Up (2.82)	Up (3.64)	Up (4.41)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
	E	Cab36e3	9.4	RSc2573-2622 $^{Del\ 44.4kb}$	1515		Up (4.31)			Down (-2.34)	Down (-3.59)	Up (2.69)		Down (-9.43)		Up (2.59)	Up (2.73)	Up (2.83)	Up (3.20)	Guidot et al. 2014; this study
Tomato var. Hawaii (resistant host)	A	Haw35a1	8.6	soxA1 ^{C639R}	1227	Down (-3,65)				Down (-1.28)	Down (-2.49)	Up (1.87)		Down (-4.46)	Down (-3.42)			Up (1.52)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	A	Haw35a4	7.2		187							Up (1.38)						Up (1.08)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	B	Haw35b1	6.5	RSp1574 ^{V95L}	478							Up (2.17)		Down (-2.44)	Down (-1.58)		Up (1.56)	Up (1.60)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	B	Haw35b4	12.9	RSp1574 ^{V95L} prhP $^{IS,-6}$	503					Down (-1.38)	Down (-6.36)	Up (2.26)		Down (-1.80)				Up (1.59)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	C	Haw35c1	4.2		902	Down (-1,91)			Down (-1.68)	Down (-1.62)	Down (-1.12)	Up (2.21)		Down (-4.86)	Down (-1.01)		Up (1.52)	Up (1.16)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	C	Haw35c2	4.0		272				Down (-1.56)			Up (2.13)						Up (1.41)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	D	Haw35d3	5.4		125							Up (1.57)						Up (1.30)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	D	Haw35d5	4.1		269							Up (1.40)		Down (-0.98)				Up (1.38)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	E	Haw35e1	3.8	RSp1136 $^{C-218A}$	245							Up (1.28)						Up (1.00)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020
	E	Haw35e3	5.4	RSp1136 $^{C-21i}$ RSc3094 ^{R162R}	212							Up (1.53)						Up (1.17)		Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020

Note - The name of the evolved clone indicates the plant species, the number of serial passages, the lineage and the number of the clone. The CI (Competitive Index) value is indicated for each evolved clone and was measured *in planta* in competition with the ancestral GMI1000 clone in our previous works (Guidot et al. 2014; Gopalan-Nair et al. 2020). In the Mutation column, the gene ID or gene name and the modification type is indicated. For SNPs inside the coding sequence, the protein modification is indicated with the original amino acid followed by the position of the SNP and by the new amino acid. For SNPs upstream the start codon of a gene, the original nucleotide is indicated followed by the position of the SNP from the start codon and by the new nucleotide. For small insertion (In), deletion (Del) and duplication (Dup), the size of the modification is indicated followed by the position of the modification. For IS insertion (IS), the position of the insertion is indicated upstream the start codon or in the coding sequence of the gene. For the varying expression of known virulence determinants, the log fold change (logFC) value is given in brackets. Genes targeted by both mutation and transcriptomic deregulation are highlighted in yellow. [a]Genomes of these clones were established with Illumina-seq technology in Guidot et al., 2014; DEGs, Differentially expressed genes; [*]Single nucleotide deletion; ns, not significantly different from the ancestral clone; nt, nuclotides.