Novel insights into phage biology of the pathogen *Clostridioides difficile* based on the active virome

Miriam A. Schüler, Rolf Daniel, Anja Poehlein[*]

Genomic and Applied Microbiology and Göttingen Genomics Laboratory, Institute of Microbiology and Genetics, Georg-August-University Göttingen, Germany

*Corresponding author: E-mail: apoehle3@gwdg.de

Abstract

The global pathogen *Clostridioides difficile* is a well-studied organism, and researchers work on unravelling its fundamental virulence mechanisms and biology. Prophages have been demonstrated to influence *C. difficile* toxin expression and contribute to the distribution of advantageous genes. All this underlines the importance of prophages in *C. difficile* virulence. Although several *C. difficile* prophages were sequenced and characterized, investigations on the entire active virome of a strain are still missing. Phages were mainly isolated after mitomycin C-induction, which does not resemble natural stressor for *C. difficile*. We examined active prophages from different *C. difficile* strains after cultivation in the absence of mitomycin C by sequencing and characterization of particle-protected DNA. Phage particles were collected after standard cultivation, or after cultivation in the presence of the secondary bile salt deoxycholate (DCA). DCA is a natural stressor for *C. difficile* and a potential prophage-inducing agent. We also investigated differences in prophage activity between clinical and non-clinical *C. difficile* strains. Our experiments demonstrated that spontaneous prophage release is common in *C. difficile*, and that DCA presence induces prophages. Fourteen different, active phages were identified by this experimental procedure. We could not identify a definitive connection between clinical background and phage activity. However, one phage exhibited distinctively higher activity upon DCA-induction in the clinical strain than in the corresponding non-clinical strain, although the phage is identical in both strains. We recorded that enveloped DNA mapped to genome regions with characteristics of mobile genetic elements other than prophages. This pointed to mechanisms of DNA mobility that are not well-studied in *C. difficile* so far. We also detected phage-mediated lateral transduction of bacterial DNA, which is the first described case in *C. difficile*. This study significantly contributes to our knowledge on prophage activity in *C. difficile* and revealed novel aspects on *C. difficile* (phage) biology.

Introduction

The pathogen *Clostridioides difficile* significantly contributes to nosocomial infections worldwide (1). A *C. difficile* infection mainly establishes after antibiotic treatment due to diverse resistances in *C. difficile* strains combined with the disturbed intestinal microflora (2). An intact microbiome usually provides resistance to *C. difficile* colonization and disease manifestation by producing different secondary bile salts such as lithocholate and deoxycholate (3). These compounds impede *C. difficile* spore germination and cell growth (4). Symptoms of an established *C. difficile* infection are caused by its toxins, predominantly toxin A and B, which are encoded in the pathogenicity locus (5). Symptom severity ranges from mild to severe manifestation, which also could include death of the infected individual (1). The personal health condition significantly affects resistance against a *C. difficile* infection, but the infecting strain is of relevance as well (6). Different *C. difficile* strains are linked to divergent virulence, and various aspects such as toxin production levels or secondary bile salt resistance were shown to correlate with disease severity (7,8). However, these studies also partially contradict in the concluded relevance of specific features on virulence. In addition to general virulence factors, mobile genetic elements (MGE) also contribute to *C. difficile* virulence (9–12). Those elements play a key role in fast adaptation to environmental conditions via horizontal gene transfer (HGT) (13). *C. difficile* genomes harbor various MGEs, including prophages (14). Prophages are widespread among the species *C. difficile*, and multiple prophages can exist within the same host (15). Primarily, prophages were assumed to affect *C. difficile* virulence solely by encoding advantageous traits such as antibiotic resistances, which was demonstrated by phage-mediated transduction of an erythromycin resistance (10).Phages can influence toxin production in *C. difficile* strains (11,12). These findings drew further attention to the influence of phages on *C. difficile* virulence. Phage research commonly works with prophage induction by introducing stressors such as UV radiation or mitomycin C. Meanwhile, studies confirmed spontaneous

prophage release from *C. difficile* isolates, and clinically relevant antibiotics were also investigated for their phage-inducing effect (16,17). All experiments on *C. difficile* phages however worked with cultivation conditions that do not represent the actual habitat. Some components of the intestinal environment are stressful for *C. difficile*, such as the secondary bile salts. One of the prominent secondary bile salts is deoxycholate (DCA), which can promote biofilm formation in *C. difficile* (18). It was further demonstrated that DCA induces the bacterial SOS response (19). Activation of the SOS response in turn induces prophages and lead to phage particle production and release via host cell lysis (20). It is therefore likely that DCA induces prophages as well, which would be a critical aspect in *C. difficile* biology and shed new light on genetic transfer *in vivo*.

In this work, we examined prophage activity in different *C. difficile* strains under spontaneous conditions and in the presence of DCA. The analyzed *C. difficile* strains were of non-clinical and clinical origin and corresponded pairwise to each other based on their sequence type (ST). Active prophage regions in these strains were identified by sequencing of particle-protected DNA, analyzed for DCA-induced activity and for possible differences between clinical and non-clinical strains that could contribute to virulence. The sequencing approach is more sensitive than electron microscopy or plaque assays, the commonly used detection methods for active *C. difficile* phages. We could therefore detect active prophages that might otherwise be missed due to insufficient activity, but could contribute to HGT.

Methods

Strains and cultivation conditions

The *C. difficile* strains used in this study were of clinical or non-clinical clinical background (personal communication), with four pairs of clinical and non-clinical strains corresponding in ST, and one additional non-clinical strain (Table 1). Strains were routinely cultivated under

anaerobic conditions in supplemented Brain Heart Infusion Broth (BHIS; supplemented with

0.5% yeast extract, 0.05% L-cystein, 0.0001% Na-resazurin, purged with nitrogen) at 37°C.

Putative prophage regions of the strains were predicted with PHASTEST (21).

Table 1. *C. difficile* strains used in this study. Strain information on ST (Clade), profile of

toxins A. B, and CDT, clinical or non-clinical background, and GenBank accession of the

genome is listed.

Strain	ST (Clade)	Toxin profile	Background	GenBank accession
TS3_3	1 (2)	$A^+B^+CDT^+$	Non-clinical	CP134872
DSM 28196	1 (2)	$A^+B^+CDT^+$	Clinical	CP012320.1
B1_2	3 (1)	$A^+B^+CDT^-$	Non-clinical	CP132141-43
SC084-01-01	3 (1)	$A^+B^+CDT^-$	Clinical	CP132146-48
J2_1	8 (1)	$A^+B^+CDT^-$	Non-clinical	CP134690-1
SC083-01-01	8 (1)	$A^+B^+CDT^-$	Clinical	CP132144-45
MA_1	11 (5)	$A^+B^+CDT^+$	Non-clinical	CP132139-40
DSM 29747	11 (5)	$A^+B^+CDT^+$	Clinical	CP019864.1
MA_2	340 (C-III)	$A^-B^-CDT^-$	Non-clinical	CP129431-32

DCA tolerance assessment

The stress effect of DCA on the various strains was assessed via a minimum inhibitory

concentration (MIC) assay and relative growth determinations at different concentrations.

Cultivation was performed in cell culture plates (24 well for suspension cells, Sartorius AG,

Göttingen, Germany) in an anaerobic tent (Coy Laboratory, Grass Lake, USA). Overnight

cultures of *C. difficile* strains were cultivated as described above and used to inoculate two ml

medium to a final OD_{600} of 0.05, with either BHIS medium alone or supplemented with DCA

(sodium deoxycholate, Sigma-Aldrich Chemie Gmbh, Taufkirchen, Germany) in

concentrations ranging from 0.255 mM to 1.2 mM, which cover the physiological concentration

range in humans (22). Culture plates were incubated at 37°C for 22 hrs and kept anaerobic

during the OD_{600} measurement in a Synergy 2 Plate Reader (Biotek Agilent Technologies

Deutschland GmbH, Böblingen, Germany). Relative growth in the presence of DCA was

calculated in relation to the untreated cultures. Each experiment was performed in triplicates.

Relative growth was visualized with ggplot2 (v3.4.2) (23) in RStudio (v2022.06.0) (24) and

significance determined with the Tukey's 'Honest Significant Difference' method implemented

in the stats package (v4.2.0) (25).

Prophage induction and phage particle isolation

Phage particles were isolated from untreated and DCA-induced cultures. Two pre-warmed

flasks of 55 ml BHIS for each isolate were inoculated 1:100 from an overnight culture and

incubated at 37°C. Growth was monitored via OD_{600} measurements until an OD of ~0.6 (0.5-

0.7). One culture for each isolate was induced with 0.255 mM (0.01%) DCA final

concentration. The physiological concentration of DCA varies between individuals (22). We

therefore used this concentration that is within the physiological range and was also used in

various *C. difficile* studies regarding growth behavior or spore germination (7,26). The DCA

solution was freshly prepared under anaerobic conditions, with DCA suspended in distilled

water so that 100 µl inducing solution was required per 10 ml culture. The solution was

sterilized by filtration (Filtropur S 0.2 µm, Sarstedt AG & Co. KG, Nürnbrecht, Germany) and

anaerobically added to the induction cultures. The second culture was not induced for analysis

of spontaneous phage activity. Induced and non-induced cultures were further incubated until

22 hrs total incubation. The final OD_{600} of each culture was determined before isolating phage

particles.

For phage particle isolation, cells were pelleted via centrifugation at 4°C and 3,000 x *g* for

15 minutes. Remaining cells were removed by filtration of the supernatant with a 0.45 µm

Filtropur S filter (Sarstedt). Phage particles were pelleted via centrifugation at 8°C and

20,000 x *g* for 1 h. The pellet was suspended in 1 ml SM buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, 100 mM

NaCl, 8 mM $MgSO_4 \cdot 7 H_2O$, pH 7.4) supplemented with 0.5 mM $CaCl_2$ (supporting phage

stability and upcoming DNase treatment) and let soak overnight at 4°C. Particle suspension was

further supported the next day by shaking at 150 rpm (LT-V Lab-Shaker, Adolf Kühner AG,

Birsfelden, Germany) at room temperature for 2 hrs. Suspended samples were finally

transferred to 2 ml DNA LowBind micro tubes (Sarstedt) for following treatments using cut

filter tips to reduce possible shearing. Samples were stored at 4°C.

Isolation of particle-protected DNA from phage samples

Phage DNA was isolated using the MasterPure Gram Positive DNA Purification Kit (Epicentre,

Madison, WI, USA) with modifications. Prior to the phage DNA isolation, phage samples were

supplemented with 2 µl of 100 mg/ml lysozyme solution (lysozyme from chicken egg white

177,000 U/mg; Serva, Heidelberg, Germany) suspended in SM buffer to remove remaining host

cell debris, and with 50 µg/ml final concentration RNase A (Biozym Scientific GmbH, Hess.

Oldendorf, Germany) and 10 U Baseline-ZERO DNase (Biozym Scientific GmbH) to digest

host nucleic acids. Samples were incubated at 37°C for 6 hrs with gentle inversion every

30 minutes. Fragments of host nucleic acids resulting from the digestion were removed by

phage particle pelleting via centrifugation at 4°C and 20,000 x g for 1 hour. The recovered pellet

was suspended in 150 µl SM buffer. Suspension was supported by shaking at 150 rpm (LT-V

Lab-Shaker) at room temperature for 10 minutes and slight flicking. EDTA (0.5 M, pH 8.0)

was added to 10 mM final concentration for complete DNase inhibition.

Phage particles were lysed by adding 1% SDS (10% solution) and 2 µl Proteinase K (50 µg/µl;

Biozym Scientific GmbH), incubation at 56°C for 1.5 hrs and gentle inversion every

30 minutes. Subsequently, samples were completely cooled down on ice before addition of

130 µl MPC Protein Precipitation Reagent (pre-cooled to -20°C). After mixing by gentle

inversion, proteins were pelleted via centrifugation at 4°C and 10,000 x g for 10 minutes. The

DNA-containing supernatant was transferred to 1.5 ml DNA LowBind micro tubes (Sarstedt).

DNA was precipitated by addition of 0.3 M Na-acetate (3 M, pH 5.2), 10 mM $MgCl_2$ (2 M),

and 0.8 volume isopropanol at room temperature. Samples were inverted 40 times and

incubated at room temperature for 10 minutes before centrifugation at 4°C and 15,000 x *g* for

30 minutes. The supernatant was removed carefully and the DNA pellet washed twice with

150 µl 70% ethanol (pre-cooled to -20°C) and centrifugation at 4°C and 15,000 x *g* for 5 to

10 minutes. The supernatant was removed and the sample briefly centrifuged again to collect

all residual ethanol for final removal. DNA pellets were air-dried under a sterile bench and

immediately suspended in 20 µl TE buffer. Complete DNA elution was supported by brief

storage at 4°C and slight flicking, before final storage at -20°C. DNA concentration was

assessed with the Qubit 3.0 Fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) using

the HS dsDNA assay kit.

Phage DNA sequencing and sequencing read processing

Phage DNA was subjected to Illumina sequencing for dsDNA by paired-end library preparation

with the Nextera XT DNA Library Preparation Kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) as

recommended by the manufacturer. Libraries were sequenced using an Illumina MiSeq system

and MiSeq Reagent Kit version 3 (2 × 300 bp, 600 cycles) as recommended by the

manufacturer.

All following software was used in default mode. Sequencing raw reads were quality processed

with fastp (v0.23.4) (27) before removing the sequencing adapters with Trimmomatic (v0.39)

(28). Processed reads were mapped onto the corresponding host genome using bowtie2 (v2.5.0),

and the resulting SAM file was converted to a TDS file for bioinformatics analysis with the

TraV software (29).

Data analysis of phage sequencing reads

TDS files of processed reads for the same isolate were together inspected in TraV (29) for read

coverage, and reads were normalized by calculation of nucleotide activity per kilobase of exon

model per million mapped reads (NPKM). This results in a value for each CDS corresponding

to its read coverage in reference to the overall read amount. NPKM values were further

normalized to account for the differing growth behavior under the induction conditions by

transforming values to an OD_{600} of 2.0. In this way, NPKM values reflected phage abundance

under the different conditions at same cell density, which allows a better qualitative estimation

of phage activity. OD normalization and visualization of NPKMs values were done in Rstudio

(v2022.06.0) (24) using the packages tidyverse (v2.0.0) (30), ggforce (v0.4.1) (31), and ggplot2

(v3.4.2) (23). NPKM values were plotted against the host genome with regard to sequence start

of the corresponding CDS, and original and normalized NPKM values were plotted together to

visualize the effect of OD normalization. Phage regions predicted with PHASTEST (21) were

also implemented.

Phage genome annotation and gene content analysis

Active regions identified via sequence read mapping were extracted for anew genome

annotation. Sequence ranges were thereby adopted from PHASTEST (21) predictions or

selected based on read mapping in TraV (29), if the predicted prophage region did not cover

the entire mapped region. Annotation was customized for phage genomes using Pharokka

(v1.3.2) (32) in default mode with sequence re-orientation to the large terminase subunit. If the

large terminase subunit was not annotated automatically, it was determined via BLAST analysis

(33) and manually annotated. For specific genes and their encoded protein, additional analyses

with protein BLAST (33) and InterProScan (v5.63-95.0) (34) were performed.

Phage genome-based classifications

Genome-based classifications were done with different bioinformatic analysis tools. An

average nucleotide identity analysis (ANI) with pyani (v0.2.12) (35) and MUMmer3 alignment

(36) (ANIm) was used in default mode to compare the phages amongst each other. Assessment

of the DNA-packaging strategy was performed based on the study of Rashid et al. (37). The

large terminase subunit was aligned at protein sequence level with ClustalW and a Maximum-

Likelihood phylogenetic tree was constructed with the Whelan and Goldman (WAG)

substitution model and otherwise default parameter with the software MEGA (v11.0.13) (38).

Branches were collapsed in MEGA (38) if none of our phages clustered within and final

modifications for visualization were done in Inkscape (v0.48; https://inkscape.org/de/). A

nucleotide BLAST analysis (33) with default parameters was performed to check for similarity

to already known phage genomes and for the prevalence in genomes of other *C. difficile* strains.

BLAST results were ordered based on query coverage and hits with a query coverage below

10% were neglected, unless relevant matches with higher coverages were not obtained. For

assigning the phages to a morphological family of the order *Caudovirales*, phage genomes were

inspected for the presence of baseplate proteins and sequence length of the tail length tape

measure protein (39). If the tail length tape measure protein was not annotated, it was identified

via protein BLAST analysis (33) and manually curated in the genome.

Data availability

The sequencing raw data is deposited at the NIH short read archive (SRA) under accessions

listed in Table 2.

Table 2. SRA accessions of sequencing raw data.

Strain	Spontaneous	DCA-induced
TS3_3	SRR26060497	SRR26060498
DSM 28196	SRR26060430	SRR26060431
B1_2	SRR26060462	SRR26060463
SC084-01-01	SRR26064407	SRR26064408
J2_1	SRR26060485	SRR26060486
SC083-01-01	SRR26060487	SRR26060488
MA_1	SRR26060489	SRR26060490
MA_2	SRR26064320	SRR26064321

Results and discussion

DCA-tolerance is linked to the genetic but not clinical strain background

Before investigating the effect of the secondary bile salt DCA on prophage activity in *C. difficile*, individual DCA tolerance of the various strains was assessed in form of a MIC assay with relative growth determinations (Fig 1). DCA concentrations ranged from 0.255 mM to 1.2 mM, thereby comprising the physiological human concentration of DCA (22). All strains already exhibited reduced growth at the lowest concentration, which further decreased with increasing concentration. At all concentrations, strains of the same ST showed no significant difference in DCA tolerance, which implied comparable stress levels. Similar stress levels in turn might imply similar DCA-induced prophage activity. In contrast, ST-specific tolerance differences were apparent across the DCA concentration range, with ST1 exhibiting highest tolerance, followed by ST8, ST11, ST3, and lastly ST340, which was the most susceptible ST. Consequently, DCA tolerance correlated with the ST but not with the clinical background. Tolerance difference between the STs was most distinct at the lowest concentration, which was also used in the prophage induction experiments. Determined MICs ranged from 1 mM (ST11 and ST340) to 1.2 mM (ST1, ST3, ST8).

Fig 1. DCA tolerance at various concentrations. Tolerance of the strains to DCA was determined as relative growth compared to the reference culture (regarded as 100%) and MIC assay at concentrations from 0.255 mM to 1.2 mM. Strains of the same ST are depicted next to each other. No significant tolerance differences were observed within an ST at all concentrations.

Sequencing-based assessments of prophage activity

Prophage prediction of all analyzed genomes exhibited various putative prophage regions, often with multiple incomplete and intact predicted regions in one genome (Table S1). Active prophages were determined by sequencing of particle-protected DNA. Sequencing reads were mapped to the corresponding host genome. Normalized read coverage (NPKM values) represented phage abundance as a relative measure indicative for phage activity (40). In the following, the term phage activity describes the production and resulting abundance of DNA-containing particles, and mentioned NPKM values refer to the OD-normalized data. Sequencing of phage DNA libraries was successful for all samples except for strain DSM 29747, which was the only strain without a predicted intact prophage genomic region (Table S1). This strain was therefore missing in further analyses.

Mapping of phage DNA sequencing reads onto respective host genomes is depicted in Figs 2 - 6. Overall examination of the mapping results revealed distinct activity of at least one region in all strains and under both induction conditions. This demonstrated spontaneous phage activity in all strains, and simultaneous activity of multiple phages within the same host. Almost all regions matched well with predicted and intact prophage regions. All these regions are summarized in Table 3 for name assignment to facilitate following descriptions. As apparent in Table 3, regions with positive prophage prediction accorded in size with typical genome sizes of *C. difficile* phages (41), while those without were significantly smaller.

273 **Table 3. Overview of active regions in all strains.** All active regions identified based on

274 sequencing read coverage (Fig 2 - 6) were renamed according to a numbered scheme

275 (strain_phiX). Regions were validated for certain (✓) or uncertain (~) activity based on

276 coverage signal strength. Additionally, prophage prediction with PHASTEST (21) is included

277 by stating positive (✓) or negative (—) prediction, and region size in bp is stated as well.

Strain	Location	Region name	Activity certain	Phage predicted	Size (bp)
TS3_3	Chromosome	TS3_3_phi	✓	✓	55,976
DSM 28196	Chr. region 1	DSM28196_phi1	✓	✓	55,976
	Chr. region 2	DSM28196_phi2	✓	—	5,484
B1_2	Chr. region 1	B1_2_phi1	~	✓	54,334
	Chr. region 2	B1_2_phi2	✓	✓	57,163
	ECE1	B1_2_phi3	✓	✓	42,358
	ECE2	B1_2_phi4		—	7,624
SC084-01-01	Chromosome	SC084-01-01_phi1	~	✓	69,503
	ECE1	SC084-01-01_phi2	~	✓	47,363
	ECE2	SC084-01-01_phi3	✓	✓	130,799
J2_1	Chromosome	J2_1_phi1	✓	✓	55,958
	ECE	J2_1_phi2	✓	✓	46,261
SC083-01-01	Chr. region 1	SC083-01-01_phi1	✓	✓	56,419
	ECE	SC083-01-01_phi2	✓	✓	45,313
MA_1	ECE	MA_1_phi	✓	✓	33,670
MA_2	Chr. region 1	MA_2_phi1	✓	✓	42,327
	Chr. region 2	MA_2_phi2	✓	✓	46,234
	Chr. region 3	MA_2_phi3	✓	—	16,820
	ECE	MA_2_phi4	✓	—	10,144

Comparison of corresponding strains showed no apparent differences in carriage or location of

active phages. Correspondingly, a correlation to the clinical background of a strain was not

detected. As active prophages of corresponding strains resided at corresponding genome

positions, we performed an ANIm analysis on extracted sequences of all active regions to assess

their similarity amongst each other (Fig S1). This confirmed identical sequences of the

analogous phages TS3_3_phi/DSM28196_phi1 of ST1-strains, and high similarity of both

phages J2_1_phi1/SC083-01-01_phi1 and J2_1_phi2/SC083-01-01_phi2 among the ST8-

strains, while the other phages exhibited only little or no similarity to the others.

All regions (Table 3) were further closely inspected their activities under DCA-induction.

Overall NPKM-transformation to an OD of 2 revealed distinctly higher signals under DCA-

induction in most active regions and all strains. This verified the phage-inducing effect of DCA,

which varied apparently between the different regions even within the same host and thereby

implied phage-dependency.

The genomes of both ST1-strains carried an identical phage (Fig S1) (TS3_3_phi/

DSM28196_phi1) as determined by ANIm analysis (Fig S1) and similar genome position. The

analogous phages showed distinct spontaneous activity with approximate magnitude, but their

DCA-induced activity differed substantially. Phage DSM28196_phi1 (Fig 2B) exhibited ~3.5x

higher signal increase under DCA than TS3_3_phi in the non-clinical strain (Fig 2A). Since the

phages were identical, the differing reactions seemed to be host-related. The genome of strain

DSM 28196 possessed another active region DSM28196_phi2, which showed minor activity

under both conditions, and was phage-atypical by comprising only four genes and missing a

prophage prediction (Fig 2 B).

Fig 2. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST1-strains TS3_3 and DSM 28196.

Sequencing reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release

of strains (A) TS3_3 and (B) DSM 28196 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV

(29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before

plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb) of the respective strain. Active regions were

magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted by PHASTEST (21) were

highlighted in the background (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

The genomes of ST3-strains possessed several active regions (Fig 3), which were not similar to

each other (Fig S1). In the genome of the non-clinical strain B1_2 (Fig 3A), two of the four

active regions comprised the two ECEs. B1_2_phi4 on ECE2 exhibited the highest NPKM

values under DCA-induction. Remarkably, B1_2_phi4 is another phage-atypical but active

region without corresponding prophage prediction, as previously detected for DSM28196_phi2

(Fig 2B). B1_2_phi3 on ECE1 also showed increased activity under DCA, but both spontaneous

and induced activity were not particularly high. B1_2_phi2 on the chromosome showed

spontaneous activity and a substantial increase in DCA-induced activity. B1_2_phi1 on the

chromosome exhibited almost no signal under spontaneous conditions, which slightly increased

upon DCA-induction. This might indicate true DCA-induction of this phage without prior

spontaneous activity. In contrast to strain B1_2, the corresponding clinical strain SC084-01-01

possessed no prominently active region on the chromosome (Fig 3B). Activity could be

observed within the region SC084-01-01_phi1, but NPKM values were very low under both

conditions and signals did not cover the whole phage region. Abundancy of this phage was

probably insufficient to capture distinct activity by the sequencing approach. Similar activity

was observed for SC084-01-01_phi2 on ECE1 of SC084-01-01. SC084-01-01_phi3 on ECE2

was the only region in SC084-01-01 with prominent activity under spontaneous conditions, and

activity further increased apparently under DCA-induction.

Fig 3. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST3-strains B1_2 and SC084-01-01.

Sequencing reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release

of strains (A) B1_2 and (B) SC084-01-01 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV

(29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before

plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb) and ECE (position in kb) of the respective

strain. Active regions were magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted by

PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

The genomes of both ST8-strains exhibited activity for their analogous chromosomal and extrachromosomal regions (Fig 4), which were similar phages according to ANIm analysis (Fig S1) and similar genomic location. J2_1_phi2 on the ECE of strain J2_1 showed distinct spontaneous activity and a DCA-induced activity increase (Fig 4A), whereas SC083-01-01_phi1 on the ECE of SC083-01-01 was only slightly active under spontaneous conditions, and signal increase upon DCA-induction was only little. The activity of the chromosomal phages differed apparently as well. J2_1_phi1 on the J2_1 chromosome was spontaneously active and showed increased activity under DCA-induction (Fig 4A). The left part of the prophage region started with minor activity, which drastically increased at the terminase genes. Strikingly, the left part of the prophage region started with minor activity, which drastically increased at the terminase genes. Further remarkable, sequencing reads mapped beyond the predicted prophage region and spread upstream (~30 kb) and downstream (~135 kb). The downstream region adjoined the phage activity with similar NPKM values that gradually decreased over the entire section. The chromosomal phage SC083-01-01_phi1 of the corresponding clinical ST8-strain SC083-01-01 did not exhibit these peculiarities (Fig 4B). It was spontaneously active, and activity increased substantially under DCA treatment. This increase was strikingly twice as high as observed for the analogous phage J2_1_phi1 (Fig 4A), despite their similarity (Fig S1). Such dissimilar activity increase among analogous phages was already observed in the ST1 strains (Fig 2). In both ST8- and ST1-pairs, a distinctly stronger increase upon DCA-induction was connected to the clinical background of the strains. Since DCA-stress levels did not significantly differ between corresponding clinical and non-clinical strains (Fig 1) and thereby suggested similar induction levels, the question for the underlying mechanism of these diverging activities in analogous phages arose. This prompted to an undefined regulation of phage induction involved in the clinical strains.

Fig 4. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST8-strains J2_1 and SC083-01-01.
Sequencing reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release
of strains (A) J2_1 and (B) SC083-01-01 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV
(29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before
plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb) and ECE (position in kb) of the respective
strain. Active regions were magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted by
PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

Strain MA_1 could not be compared to its corresponding clinical strain DSM 29747, but distinct
spontaneous activity was visible for MA_1_phi on the ECE, which increased under DCA
treatment (Fig 5).

Fig 5. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST11-strain MA_1. Sequencing reads of
phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release of strain MA_1 were
normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV (29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-
normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb)
of MA_1. Active regions were magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted
by PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

Strain MA_2 is to our knowledge the first cryptic *C. difficile* strain with detailed phage
examination. This strain possessed four active regions (Fig 6). MA_2_phi2 on the chromosome
and MA_2_phi4 on the ECE both showed prominent activity under spontaneous conditions and
a distinct activity increase upon DCA-induction. Interestingly, MA_2_phi4 was another active
region without phage prediction, as observed previously for DSM28196_phi2 (Fig 2B) and

B1_2_phi4 (Fig 3A). This was also true for MA_2_phi3 on the chromosomal, where activity

was however very low under spontaneous conditions. Activity of this region increased upon

DCA-induction. Chromosomal region MA_2_phi1 exhibited least activity in this genome even

under DCA treatment. Read mapping for MA_2_phi1 and MA_2_phi2 did not cover the entire

predicted prophage regions, but sections without read coverage contained only bacterial genes

and were therefore evidently mis-predicted.

Fig 6. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of cryptic ST340-strain MA_2. Sequencing

reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release of strain

MA_2 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV (29), and NPKM values were

additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before plotted against the chromosome

(position in Mb) and ECE (position in kb) of MA_2. Active regions were magnified for better

visualization. Prophage regions predicted by PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green,

incomplete = pink).

Almost all identified active prophage regions could be induced by the secondary bile salt DCA.

Mentionable, assessed phage activity after DCA treatment might be influenced by a direct effect

of DCA on the phage. A study on different bacteriophages in *Escherichia coli* investigated the

effect of bile salts on the host-phage interaction and observed varying survival rates of the

phages (42).

Moreover, almost all ECEs were detected as active phages. Although extrachromosomal

prophages have already been described in *C. difficile* strains (43,44), only a few of these were

isolated and characterized so far (41).

Phage genome annotation and gene content analysis

Phage genomes harbor virulence-relevant genes

All active regions identified via sequence read mapping (Figs 2 – 6, Table 3) were inspected after anew annotation with Pharokka (32) for genes that might increase virulence of the host (genomic information in supplementary data file S1). All of them exhibited characteristic phage genes in a modular organization according to the different encoded functions, as typically seen in *C. difficile* phages (16,43,45). In some genomes, proteins characteristic for plasmids were found, such as genes encoding partition proteins and replication initiation factors (46). Genes encoding plasmid-related proteins besides phage-typical ones are common in a certain type of MGE, so-called phage-plasmids (47). These phage-plasmid features were especially recorded for extrachromosomal prophages, but were also present on the chromosomally integrated prophage MA_2_phi1. Further frequently observed genes in the phage genomes encoded proteins with potential involvement in cellular metabolism and growth, such as metallo-proteases, kinases, a phosphatase, and most of all putative rhodanese-related sulfurtransferases. These genes might be advantageous for the bacterial fitness, thereby indirectly contributing to host virulence. Two phage genomes (B1_2_phi1 and SC084-01-01_phi1) carried genes encoding hemolysin XhlA, an established virulence factor in other bacterial species (48), capable of lysing mammalian erythrocytes (49). In the opportunistic pathogen *Mannheimia haemolytica*, temperate phages were induced that encoded hemolysin XhlA and discussed to contribute to bacterial pathogenicity and transfer of this virulence factor (50). Hemolysis in *C. difficile* is not commonly known, but few studies demonstrated its hemolytic capability (51). However, XhlA is also present in other prophage genomes as part of the lysis module (52). Indeed, the gene encoding XhlA was found next to the lysis-relevant genes encoding holin and endolysin in phages B1_2_phi1 and SC084-01-01_phi1. Thus, the actual role of hemolysin XhlA in these phages and its potential impact on host virulence remains unclear. Phage SC084-

01-01_phi1 possessed a gene encoding an ABC-transporter, which might contribute to

antibiotic resistance of the host (53). Phage SC084-01-01_phi3 harbored a putative spore

protease, which could influence the bacterial sporulation or germination ability and, as a

consequence, alter bacterial fitness (43). Other genes conferring antibiotic resistances or

encoding known virulence factors were not identified in the active phage genomes. Six phages

(TS3_3_phi, DSM28196_phi1, B1_2_phi2, J2_1_phi1, SC083-01-01_phi, MA_2_phi2)

carried arrays of clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR), which is

similar to other *C. difficile* phages with described CRISPRs (37,43,54). Temperate phages

carrying CRISPR arrays increase host immunity against other invading phages (55). The

corresponding host genomes were verified to encode Cas proteins required for CRISPR-Cas-

mediated phage immunity (56). CRISPRs in prophages represent horizontally transferrable

immunity against phages, which is specifically relevant in the context of phage therapy, an

alternative treatment approach for bacterial infections with growing importance in view of

increasing multidrug-resistances (57).

Active non-phage elements likely belong to so far undescribed HGT

mechanisms in *C. difficile*

The regions without corresponding prophage prediction (Table 3) did not possess a phage-

typical genome accordingly. Therefore, further gene analysis of these non-phage elements were

performed based on the original genome annotation with Prokka (58) (genomic information in

supplementary data file S1). No proteins involved in capsid or tail production, DNA packaging

or host lysis were present. The lack of structural proteins was striking, since these DNA

elements were enveloped according to the DNA isolation procedure. This indicated the

involvement of unrelated particles. Even additional analysis of hypothetical proteins with

InterProScan (34) and BLASTp (33) could not identify further functions. All other proteins

were assigned to functions with DNA-binding activity, like helicases, integrases, relaxases, and

transcriptional regulators. These genes are typical for phage genomes but also for MGEs like transposons as Integrative and Conjugative or Mobilizable Elements (ICE / IME) (59). Screening for these MGEs with ICEscreen (60) validated DSM28196_phi2 as complete IME, while MA_2_phi3 was detected as invalid ICE. Interestingly, the peculiar upstream-region of J2_1_phi1 (Fig 4A) was also identified as an ICE, although being incomplete. These integrative MGEs do not encode proteins for production of particles that carry the respective mobile sequence (59). Interestingly, transposons were found to hitchhike co-residing phages in several bacteria such as *Staphylococcus aureus* (61), *Vibrio cholerae* (62), and *Enterococcus faecalis* (63), enabling the phage-mediated transduction of virulence-relevant genes. This type of transduction was demonstrated once in *C. difficile* with the transfer of a conjugative transposon carrying an antibiotic resistance gene (10). Transduction can be either generalized, specialized or lateral (64). They all imply the "headful" DNA-packaging, in which the terminase starts DNA packaging at a bacterial homologue to the phage packaging site until the capsid is full, which consequently implies that transduced DNA is at least of similar phage genome size (64). The transduction mechanisms differ in transduced DNA and frequency (65). Specialized and lateral transduction involve host DNA adjacent to the prophage, while random host DNA is packaged in generalized transduction (65). Generalized and specialized transduction are processes of erroneous DNA-packaging, which results in low transduction frequency detectable by sequencing read coverage (64,65). In contrast, lateral transduction results in high sequencing read coverage comparable to actual phage activity, as this mechanism is assumed as natural phage trait instead of mistaken processes (64,65). This trait comprises phage genome replication and simultaneous DNA-packaging before excision from the chromosome, whereby a substantial amount of adjacent host DNA is packaged as well (66,67). All these characteristics of lateral transduction accorded with the observed mapped region downstream of phage J2_1_phi1 (Fig 4A), which indicated involvement of this DNA segment in phage-mediated lateral transduction.

The downstream region of J2_1_phi1 (Fig 4A) did not comprise characteristic genes for MGEs.

Instead, several genes encoded proteins with potential relevance for strain virulence, such as

genes for ABC-transporters, a multidrug efflux system ATP-binding protein, stress-related

proteins, proteins involved in resistance to vancomycin and daunorubicin, and the putative

virulence factor BrkB. Therefore, mobilization and transfer of this region is critical regarding

the spread of antibiotic resistances or virulence-related genes. The drastic NPKM difference

within the genome phage J2_1_phi1 (Fig 4A) might also result from the process of lateral

transduction, as inaccurate excision of the phage genome after *in situ* replication leads to phage

genome truncation.

Since no evidence for lateral transduction was observed for phage J2_1_phi1's analogue

SC083-01-01_phi1 (Fig 4B) despite their high similarity (Fig S1), the question about

underlying differences arose. Direct phage genome comparison revealed diverging excisionases

and integrases as well as four additional amino acids in the large terminase protein of

J2_1_phi1. All these proteins perform activities destining for lateral transduction (64).

The extrachromosomal non-phage elements were significantly smaller than the co-existing

phages (Table 3), which is in contrast with the headful packaging mechanism required in

transduction. This indicate a form of DNA-protecting particle other than phages, such as gene

transfer agents (GTA). These phage-like particles carry DNA between 4 to 14 kb (68), which

is similar to the sizes of the detected non-phage elements (Table 3). However, GTAs package

bacterial DNA randomly (68), which does not fit to the detected distinct activity of specific

regions, making GTAs unlikely as mode of action. Extracellular vesicles are known in various

bacteria and described to carry and transfer genetic content, e.g. plasmids, between cells (69–

71). This type of alternative HGT is not well characterized so far, but was demonstrated to allow

interspecies gene transfer (71), which underlines the importance of vesicle-mediated DNA

exchange. Noteworthy, vesicle-driven HGT in *C. difficile* has not been described so far.

Classification of the active phages

Terminase-based determination of the phage DNA-packaging strategy

Assessment of the phage-DNA packaging mechanisms was performed to validate the above hypothesized transduction events. The large terminase subunit was analyzed via protein sequence alignment and phylogenetic tree construction referring to Rashid et al. (37). This assigned the phages to different phage DNA-packaging mechanisms (Fig 7). All our phages were assigned to clusters comprising other *C. difficile* phages, which predominantly represented the P22-like headful packaging mechanism, followed by the 3'-extended COS ends and an unknown strategy. Consequently, most of the phages were predicted to utilize the headful packaging mechanism and would, thus, be indeed capable of transducing host DNA. The mechanism "P22-like headful" originates from the packaging strategy employed by phage P22 of *Salmonella enterica*. Phage P22 was originally described to perform generalized transduction (72), but recent evidence demonstrated also specialized as well as lateral transduction activity (67). These terminase analysis results supported the assumption of lateral transduction of the phage J2_1_phi1 downstream region, which is by that the first described case in *C. difficile*.

Fig 7. Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of large terminase protein sequences. The large terminase of the active phages (highlighted in bold and italic) were aligned on protein level to the reference sequences from Rashid et al. (37). Branches of the different DNA-packaging strategies were colored according to Rashid et al. (37), and branches were collapsed for better visualization if none of our phages was included.

Nucleotide BLAST analyses assess phage prevalence and novelty

A nucleotide BLAST analysis (33) was performed on all active regions in Table 3 to check for similar phages and elements, and to assess prevalence among *C. difficile* strains. The results are

available in supplementary data file S2 and summarized in Table 4. Most of the phages matched against *C. difficile* phages with query coverages between 4% and 90% and percent identities between 86.26% and 99.86%. This confirmed that our phages are indeed similar to known phages but still represent novel types, which underlines the contribution of this work to the general knowledge on *C. difficile* phages. Further, chromosomal phages also matched against a multitude of *C. difficile* chromosomes, while the extrachromosomal phages often corresponded to *C. difficile* plasmids and few chromosomes. This demonstrated the prevalence of the identified phages in other *C. difficile* strains. The non-phage elements B1_2_phi4 and MA_2_phi4 yielded no significant BLAST hit against a phage, but matched against *C. difficile* plasmids. Both matching plasmids belong to classes of *C. difficile* plasmids with similar organization that are present in diverse *C. difficile* strains (73,74). All these plasmids might therefore likewise be inducible and particle-protected, which implies a different mechanism of HGT than currently assumed.

Table 4. Nucleotide BLAST results of the identified active regions. Results were summarized regarding the first phage-related *C. difficile* BLAST hit by stating its description, query coverage, percent identity, and number of pre- and succeeding chromosome/plasmid entries. The few hits of metagenome-assembled phages were not listed. If available, information on the phage family of the respective hit is indicated (M – *Myoviridae*, S – *Siphoviridae*).

Phage	Entry	Query cover %	Percent identity %	*C. difficile* matches preceding / succeeding	Family
				First best *C. difficile*-phage BLAST hit	
TS3_3_phi	CD2301	36	91.64	98 chromosomes / 32 chromosomes/assemblies 5 phages	M (75)
DSM28196_phi1	phiC2	36	91.64	98 chromosomes / 32 chromosomes/assemblies 5 phages	M (76)
DSM28196_phi2	–	< 79	< 92.44	Only chromosomes	–
B1_2_phi1	CDMH1	60	88.33	35 chromosomes / 102 chromosomes 13 phages	M (77)
B1_2_phi2	phiC2	43	97.80	80 chromosomes / 55 chromosomes 3 phages	M (76)
B1_2_phi3	phiCD111	84	95.62	0 / 3 chromosomes 9 plasmids 16 phages	S (78)
B1_2_phi4	plasmid pJMR5-4[a]	9	86.26	0 / 2 chromosomes 1 plasmid	–
SC084-01-01_phi1	phiCD418	54	92.42	29 chromosomes / 137 chromosomes 8 phages	M (75)
SC084-01-01_phi2	HGP05	45	93.09	20 plasmids, 2 chromosomes / 145 chromosomes 14 phages	–
SC084-01-01_phi3	phiCD211	89	99.86	0 / 10 plasmids 6 phages	S (43)
J2_1_phi1	phiC2	37	92.19	112 chromosomes / 27 chromosomes 3 phages	M (76)
J2_1_phi2	HGP05	46	91.63	20 plasmids, 2 chromosomes / 93 chromosomes 8 phages	–
SC083-01-01_phi1	phiC2	37	92.19	98 chromosomes / 43 chromosomes 4 phages	M (76)

560 **Table 4 continued.**

Phage	Entry	Query cover %	Percent identity %	*C. difficile* matches preceding / succeeding	Family
			First best *C. difficile*-phage BLAST hit		
SC083-01-01_phi2	HGP05	47	91.64	20 plasmids, 2 chromosomes / 140 chromosomes 8 phages	–
MA_1_phi	phiCD506	90	99.60	2 plasmids / 172 chromosomes 27 plasmids 20 phages	M (78)
MA_2_phi1	phiCD24-1	4	88.74	17 chromosomes or genome assemblies / 0	S (79)
MA_2_phi2	phiCDKH01	74	94.21	1 chromosome / 89 chromosomes 1 phage	S (80)
MA_2_phi3	–	< 44	< 97.72	Only chromosomes	–
MA_2_phi4	plasmid pCD-WTSI1[a]	76	91.95	0 / 25 plasmids	–

561 [a]since ECEs B1_2_phi4 and MA_2_phi4 identified to be no phage, BLAST results were

562 checked for *C. difficile* plasmids instead.

Genome-based phage assignment to *Myoviridae* and *Siphoviridae*

565 We lastly classified our phages morphologically. All known *C. difficile* phages so far belong to

566 the *Caudovirales* family of *Myoviridae* or *Siphoviridae*, which distinguish by tail appearance

567 (41). Genome inspection for the presence of baseplate proteins characteristic for *Myoviridae*

568 and the length of the tail length tape measure protein as indicator for *Siphoviridae* could assign

569 eleven phages to *Myoviridae* and four phages to *Siphoviridae* (Table S2).

Conclusion

We aimed to investigate prophage activity in different clinical and non-clinical *C. difficile*

strains and unravelling potential relationships between phage activity and clinical background

of the strain. Our investigations did not find specific connections to the clinical background,

although we observed stronger DCA-related activity with clinical background for phages that

were similar between clinical and non-clinical strains. We further revealed several interesting

findings with relevance for future *C. difficile* phage research. We identified and characterized

several active prophages in various *C. difficile* strains with a sequencing-based approach. This

sensitive approach allowed detecting multiple co-existing prophages with diverse activity. Most

of these phages were distinctly active without specific induction, but they showed increased

activity when induced with the secondary bile salt DCA. This proved that spontaneous activity

is common in *C. difficile* prophages, and that the natural stressor DCA triggers prophage

induction. These findings are crucial for investigating *C. difficile* biology, since phages

evidently affect *C. difficile* fitness and virulence by influencing toxin production or

participating in the exchange of clinically relevant genes. We also found such genes with

potential connection to virulence in some phage genomes. In this context, research on actual *in*

vivo phage mobility should increasingly resemble *C. difficile*'s natural habitat. The sequencing

approach further revealed active regions without phage identity. Based on genomic

examinations, these regions were identified as another form of MGE, in most cases possibly

integrative elements. These elements apparently participated in a strategy of mobilization that

involves some kind of DNA envelopment, which pointed to phage particles or bacterial

vesicles. This phenomenon was observed in several of the analyzed strains, which indicated

that this type of DNA mobilization might be a frequent mechanism in *C. difficile* and should be

further investigated. We also observed transduced bacterial DNA that was likely the result of

lateral transduction employed by one phage, which has not been described so far in *C. difficile*

and opens up new perspective on *C. difficile* phage research.

Acknowledgements

We thank Melanie Heinemann for technical assistance. This work was funded by the Federal State of Lower Saxony, Niedersächsisches Vorab CDiff and CDInfect projects (VWZN2889/3215/3266). We acknowledge support by the Open Access Publication Funds of the Göttingen University. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

1.   Balsells E, Shi T, Leese C, Lyell I, Burrows J, Wiuff C, et al. Global burden of *Clostridium difficile* infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Glob Health [Internet]. 2019 Jun;9(1):010407. Available from: http://jogh.org/documents/issue201901/jogh-09-010407.pdf

2.   Spigaglia P. Recent advances in the understanding of antibiotic resistance in *Clostridium difficile* infection. Ther Adv Infect Dis [Internet]. 2016 Feb 23;3(1):23–42. Available from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2049936115622891

3.   Sorg JA, Sonenshein AL. Bile Salts and Glycine as Cogerminants for *Clostridium difficile* Spores. J Bacteriol [Internet]. 2008 Apr;190(7):2505–12. Available from: https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/JB.01765-07

4.   Thanissery R, Winston JA, Theriot CM. Inhibition of spore germination, growth, and toxin activity of clinically relevant *C. difficile* strains by gut microbiota derived secondary bile acids. Anaerobe [Internet]. 2017 Jun;45:86–100. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1075996417300471

5.   Chandrasekaran R, Lacy DB. The role of toxins in *Clostridium difficile* infection. FEMS Microbiol Rev [Internet]. 2017 Nov 1;41(6):723–50. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/femsre/article/41/6/723/4557158

6.   Czepiel J, Dróżdż M, Pituch H, Kuijper EJ, Perucki W, Mielimonka A, et al.

Clostridium difficile infection: review. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis [Internet]. 2019

Jul 3;38(7):1211–21. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/00013542-201807000-

00001

7.   Lewis BB, Carter RA, Ling L, Leiner I, Taur Y, Kamboj M, et al. Pathogenicity Locus,

Core Genome, and Accessory Gene Contributions to *Clostridium difficile* Virulence.

Ballard JD, editor. MBio [Internet]. 2017 Sep 6;8(4):e00885-17. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mBio.00885-17

8.   Alonso CD, Kelly CP, Garey KW, Gonzales-Luna AJ, Williams D, Daugherty K, et al.

Ultrasensitive and Quantitative Toxin Measurement Correlates With Baseline Severity,

Severe Outcomes, and Recurrence Among Hospitalized Patients With *Clostridioides*

difficile Infection. Clin Infect Dis [Internet]. 2022 Jul 6;74(12):2142–9. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/74/12/2142/6372425

9.   Smits WK, Roseboom AM, Corver J. Plasmids of *Clostridioides difficile*. Curr Opin

Microbiol [Internet]. 2022 Feb;65:87–94. Available from:

https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1369527421001521

10. Goh S, Hussain H, Chang BJ, Emmett W, Riley T V., Mullany P. Phage φC2 Mediates

Transduction of Tn *6215*, Encoding Erythromycin Resistance, between *Clostridium*

difficile Strains. Onderdonk AB, editor. MBio [Internet]. 2013 Dec 31;4(6):1–7.

Available from: https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mBio.00840-13

11. Sekulovic O, Meessen-Pinard M, Fortier L-C. Prophage-Stimulated Toxin Production

in *Clostridium difficile* NAP1/027 Lysogens. J Bacteriol [Internet]. 2011

Jun;193(11):2726–34. Available from: https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/JB.00787-

10

12. Govind R, Vediyappan G, Rolfe RD, Dupuy B, Fralick JA. Bacteriophage-Mediated

Toxin Gene Regulation in *Clostridium difficile*. J Virol [Internet]. 2009

Dec;83(23):12037–45. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/JVI.01256-09

13. de la Cruz F, Davies J. Horizontal gene transfer and the origin of species: lessons from

bacteria. Trends Microbiol [Internet]. 2000 Mar;8(3):128–33. Available from:

https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0966842X00017030

14. Sebaihia M, Wren BW, Mullany P, Fairweather NF, Minton N, Stabler R, et al. The

multidrug-resistant human pathogen *Clostridium difficile* has a highly mobile, mosaic

genome. Nat Genet [Internet]. 2006 Jul 25;38(7):779–86. Available from:

https://www.nature.com/articles/ng1830

15. Fortier L-C. Bacteriophages Contribute to Shaping *Clostridioides (Clostridium)*

difficile Species. Front Microbiol [Internet]. 2018 Aug 31;9:2033. Available from:

https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2018.02033/full

16. Meessen-Pinard M, Sekulovic O, Fortier L-C. Evidence of *In Vivo* Prophage Induction

during *Clostridium difficile* Infection. Appl Environ Microbiol [Internet]. 2012

Nov;78(21):7662–70. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AEM.02275-12

17. Nale JY, Shan J, Hickenbotham PT, Fawley WN, Wilcox MH, Clokie MRJ. Diverse

Temperate Bacteriophage Carriage in *Clostridium difficile* 027 Strains. Popoff MR,

editor. PLoS One [Internet]. 2012 May 18;7(5):e37263. Available from:

https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0037263

18. Dubois T, Tremblay YDN, Hamiot A, Martin-Verstraete I, Deschamps J, Monot M, et

al. A microbiota-generated bile salt induces biofilm formation in *Clostridium difficile*.

npj Biofilms Microbiomes [Internet]. 2019 May 9;5(1):14. Available from:

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41522-019-0087-4

19. Kandell RL, Bernstein C. Bile salt/acid induction of DNA damage in bacterial and

mammalian cells: Implications for colon cancer. Nutr Cancer [Internet]. 1991

Jan;16(3–4):227–38. Available from:

http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01635589109514161

20.   Hu J, Ye H, Wang S, Wang J, Han D. Prophage Activation in the Intestine: Insights

Into Functions and Possible Applications. Front Microbiol [Internet]. 2021 Dec

13;12:785634. Available from:

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2021.785634/full

21.   Wishart DS, Han S, Saha S, Oler E, Peters H, Grant JR, et al. PHASTEST: faster than

PHASTER, better than PHAST. Nucleic Acids Res [Internet]. 2023 Jul

5;51(W1):W443–50. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/nar/article/51/W1/W443/7167344

22.   Hamilton JP, Xie G, Raufman J-P, Hogan S, Griffin TL, Packard CA, et al. Human

cecal bile acids: concentration and spectrum. Am J Physiol Liver Physiol [Internet].

2007 Jul;293(1):G256–63. Available from:

https://www.physiology.org/doi/10.1152/ajpgi.00027.2007

23.   Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis [Internet]. Springer-Verlag

New York; 2016. 1–260 p. Available from: https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

24.   RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R [Internet]. 2020.

Available from: http://www.rstudio.com/

25.   Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet].

Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2013. Available from:

http://www.r-project.org/

26.   Theriot CM, Bowman AA, Young VB. Antibiotic-Induced Alterations of the Gut

Microbiota Alter Secondary Bile Acid Production and Allow for *Clostridium difficile*

Spore Germination and Outgrowth in the Large Intestine. Ellermeier CD, editor.

mSphere [Internet]. 2016 Feb 25;1(1):e00045-15. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mSphere.00045-15

27. Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Gu J. fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor.

Bioinformatics [Internet]. 2018 Sep 1;34(17):i884–90. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/34/17/i884/5093234

28. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. Bioinformatics [Internet]. 2014 Aug 1;30(15):2114–20. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/30/15/2114/2390096

29. Dietrich S, Wiegand S, Liesegang H. TraV: A Genome Context Sensitive

Transcriptome Browser. Scaria V, editor. PLoS One [Internet]. 2014 Apr

7;9(4):e93677. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0093677

30. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome

to the Tidyverse. J Open Source Softw [Internet]. 2019 Nov 21;4(43):1686. Available

from: https://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.01686

31. Pedersen TL. ggforce: Accelerating "ggplot2" Title [Internet]. 2022. Available from:

https://github.com/thomasp85/ggforce

32. Bouras G, Nepal R, Houtak G, Psaltis AJ, Wormald P-J, Vreugde S. Pharokka: a fast

scalable bacteriophage annotation tool. Marschall T, editor. Bioinformatics [Internet].

2023 Jan 1;39(1):btac776. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/doi/10.1093/bioinformatics/btac776/68

58464

33. Johnson M, Zaretskaya I, Raytselis Y, Merezhuk Y, McGinnis S, Madden TL. NCBI

BLAST: a better web interface. Nucleic Acids Res [Internet]. 2008 May 19;36(Web

Server issue):W5–9. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/nar/article-

lookup/doi/10.1093/nar/gkn201

34. Jones P, Binns D, Chang H-Y, Fraser M, Li W, McAnulla C, et al. InterProScan 5:

genome-scale protein function classification. Bioinformatics [Internet]. 2014 May

1;30(9):1236–40. Available from:

729 https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/30/9/1236/237988

730 35. Pritchard L. PYANI script [Internet]. 2014. Available from:

731 https://github.com/widdowquinn/pyani

732 36. Kurtz S, Phillippy A, Delcher AL, Smoot M, Shumway M, Antonescu C, et al.

733 Versatile and open software for comparing large genomes. Genome Biol [Internet].

734 2004;5(2):R12. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14759262

735 37. Rashid S, Barylski J, Hargreaves K, Millard A, Vinner G, Clokie M. Two Novel

736 Myoviruses from the North of Iraq Reveal Insights into *Clostridium difficile* Phage

737 Diversity and Biology. Viruses [Internet]. 2016 Nov 16;8(11):310. Available from:

738 http://www.mdpi.com/1999-4915/8/11/310

739 38. Tamura K, Stecher G, Kumar S. MEGA11: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis

740 Version 11. Battistuzzi FU, editor. Mol Biol Evol [Internet]. 2021 Jun 25;38(7):3022–

741 7. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/mbe/article/38/7/3022/6248099

742 39. Zinke M, Schröder GF, Lange A. Major tail proteins of bacteriophages of the order

743 Caudovirales. J Biol Chem [Internet]. 2022 Jan;298(1):101472. Available from:

744 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0021925821012813

745 40. Hertel R, Rodríguez DP, Hollensteiner J, Dietrich S, Leimbach A, Hoppert M, et al.

746 Genome-Based Identification of Active Prophage Regions by Next Generation

747 Sequencing in *Bacillus licheniformis* DSM13. Schuch R, editor. PLoS One [Internet].

748 2015 Mar 26;10(3):e0120759. Available from:

749 https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0120759

750 41. Heuler J, Fortier L-C, Sun X. *Clostridioides difficile* phage biology and application.

751 FEMS Microbiol Rev [Internet]. 2021 Sep 8;45(5):fuab012. Available from:

752 https://academic.oup.com/femsre/article/doi/10.1093/femsre/fuab012/6134755

753 42. Scanlan PD, Bischofberger AM, Hall AR. Modification of *Escherichia coli* –

754 bacteriophage interactions by surfactants and antibiotics *in vitro*. Smalla K, editor.

FEMS Microbiol Ecol [Internet]. 2017 Jan;93(1):fiw211. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/femsec/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/femsec/fiw211

43. Garneau JR, Sekulovic O, Dupuy B, Soutourina O, Monot M, Fortier L-C. High

Prevalence and Genetic Diversity of Large phiCD211 (phiCDIF1296T)-Like

Prophages in *Clostridioides difficile*. Dozois CM, editor. Appl Environ Microbiol

[Internet]. 2018 Feb;84(3):e02164-17. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AEM.02164-17

44. Ramírez-Vargas G, Goh S, Rodríguez C. The Novel Phages phiCD5763 and

phiCD2955 Represent Two Groups of Big Plasmidial Siphoviridae Phages of

Clostridium difficile. Front Microbiol [Internet]. 2018 Jan 22;9:26. Available from:

http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2018.00026/full

45. Govind R, Fralick JA, Rolfe RD. Genomic organization and molecular characterization

of *Clostridium difficile* bacteriophage ΦCD119. J Bacteriol. 2006;188(7):2568–77.

46. Filutowicz M. Plasmids, Bacterial. In: Encyclopedia of Microbiology [Internet].

Elsevier; 2009. p. 644–65. Available from:

https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/B9780123739445000146

47. Pfeifer E, Moura de Sousa JA, Touchon M, Rocha EPC. Bacteria have numerous

distinctive groups of phage–plasmids with conserved phage and variable plasmid gene

repertoires. Nucleic Acids Res [Internet]. 2021 Mar 18;49(5):2655–73. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/nar/article/49/5/2655/6137301

48. Thomas P, Abdel-Glil MY, Eichhorn I, Semmler T, Werckenthin C, Baumbach C, et

al. Genome Sequence Analysis of *Clostridium chauvoei* Strains of European Origin

and Evaluation of Typing Options for Outbreak Investigations. Front Microbiol

[Internet]. 2021 Sep 29;12:.732106. Available from:

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2021.732106/full

49. Cowles KN, Goodrich-Blair H. Expression and activity of a *Xenorhabdus nematophila*

haemolysin required for full virulence towards *Manduca sexta* insects. Cell Microbiol

[Internet]. 2004 Sep 8;7(2):209–19. Available from:

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1462-5822.2004.00448.x

50. Niu YD, Cook SR, Wang J, Klima CL, Hsu Y, Kropinski AM, et al. Comparative

analysis of multiple inducible phages from *Mannheimia haemolytica*. BMC Microbiol

[Internet]. 2015 Dec 30;15(1):175. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12866-

015-0494-5

51. Alkudmani ZSB. The identification and characterization of novel haemolysin genes

from *Clostridium difficile* [Internet]. University College London; 2018. Available from:

https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10078163/7/Alkudmani_00_Thesis_edited.pdf

52. Krogh S, Jørgensen ST, Devine KM. Lysis Genes of the *Bacillus subtilis* Defective

Prophage PBSX. J Bacteriol [Internet]. 1998 Apr 15;180(8):2110–7. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/JB.180.8.2110-2117.1998

53. Orelle C, Mathieu K, Jault J-M. Multidrug ABC transporters in bacteria. Res Microbiol

[Internet]. 2019 Nov;170(8):381–91. Available from:

https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0923250819300580

54. Hargreaves KR, Flores CO, Lawley TD, Clokie MRJ. Abundant and Diverse Clustered

Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeat Spacers in *Clostridium difficile* Strains

and Prophages Target Multiple Phage Types within This Pathogen. Paul J, Azam F,

editors. MBio [Internet]. 2014 Oct 31;5(5):e01045-13. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mBio.01045-13

55. Barrangou R, Fremaux C, Deveau H, Richards M, Boyaval P, Moineau S, et al.

CRISPR Provides Acquired Resistance Against Viruses in Prokaryotes. Science (80-).

2007;315(March):1709–12.

56. Koonin E V, Makarova KS. CRISPR-Cas: an adaptive immunity system in

prokaryotes. F1000 Biol Rep [Internet]. 2009 Dec 9;1(95). Available from:

807 https://facultyopinions.com/prime/reports/b/1/95/

808 57. Gutiérrez B, Domingo-Calap P. Phage Therapy in Gastrointestinal Diseases.

809   Microorganisms [Internet]. 2020 Sep 16;8(9):1420. Available from:

810   https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/8/9/1420

811 58. Seemann T. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics [Internet].

812   2014 Jul 15;30(14):2068–9. Available from:

813   https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/30/14/2068/2390517

814 59. Bellanger X, Payot S, Leblond-Bourget N, Guédon G. Conjugative and mobilizable

815   genomic islands in bacteria: evolution and diversity. FEMS Microbiol Rev [Internet].

816   2014 Jul;38(4):720–60. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/femsre/article-

817   lookup/doi/10.1111/1574-6976.12058

818 60. Lao J, Lacroix T, Guédon G, Coluzzi C, Payot S, Leblond-Bourget N, et al. ICEscreen:

819   a tool to detect Firmicute ICEs and IMEs, isolated or enclosed in composite structures.

820   NAR Genomics Bioinforma [Internet]. 2022 Oct 6;4(4):lqac079. Available from:

821   https://academic.oup.com/nargab/article/doi/10.1093/nargab/lqac079/6765278

822 61. Lindsay JA, Ruzin A, Ross HF, Kurepina N, Novick RP. The gene for toxic shock

823   toxin is carried by a family of mobile pathogenicity islands in *Staphylococcus aureus*.

824   Mol Microbiol [Internet]. 1998 Jul;29(2):527–43. Available from:

825   https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1046/j.1365-2958.1998.00947.x

826 62. Seed KD, Lazinski DW, Calderwood SB, Camilli A. A bacteriophage encodes its own

827   CRISPR/Cas adaptive response to evade host innate immunity. Nature [Internet]. 2013

828   Feb 27;494(7438):489–91. Available from:

829   https://www.nature.com/articles/nature11927

830 63. Duerkop BA, Clements C V., Rollins D, Rodrigues JLM, Hooper L V. A composite

831   bacteriophage alters colonization by an intestinal commensal bacterium. Proc Natl

832   Acad Sci [Internet]. 2012 Oct 23;109(43):17621–6. Available from:

https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1206136109

64.   Borodovich T, Shkoporov AN, Ross RP, Hill C. Phage-mediated horizontal gene

transfer and its implications for the human gut microbiome. Gastroenterol Rep

[Internet]. 2022 Jan 25;10:goac012. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/gastro/article/doi/10.1093/gastro/goac012/6567682

65.   Kleiner M, Bushnell B, Sanderson KE, Hooper L V., Duerkop BA. Transductomics:

sequencing-based detection and analysis of transduced DNA in pure cultures and

microbial communities. Microbiome [Internet]. 2020 Dec 15;8(1):158. Available from:

https://microbiomejournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40168-020-00935-5

66.   Chiang YN, Penadés JR, Chen J. Genetic transduction by phages and chromosomal

islands: The new and noncanonical. Kline KA, editor. PLOS Pathog [Internet]. 2019

Aug 8;15(8):e1007878. Available from:

https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1007878

67.   Fillol-Salom A, Bacigalupe R, Humphrey S, Chiang YN, Chen J, Penadés JR. Lateral

transduction is inherent to the life cycle of the archetypical *Salmonella* phage P22. Nat

Commun [Internet]. 2021 Nov 8;12(1):6510. Available from:

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-26520-4

68.   Lang AS, Zhaxybayeva O, Beatty JT. Gene transfer agents: phage-like elements of

genetic exchange. Nat Rev Microbiol [Internet]. 2012 Jul 11;10(7):472–82. Available

from: https://www.nature.com/articles/nrmicro2802

69.   Tran F, Boedicker JQ. Genetic cargo and bacterial species set the rate of vesicle-

mediated horizontal gene transfer. Sci Rep [Internet]. 2017 Aug 18;7(1):8813.

Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-07447-7

70.   Bitto NJ, Chapman R, Pidot S, Costin A, Lo C, Choi J, et al. Bacterial membrane

vesicles transport their DNA cargo into host cells. Sci Rep [Internet]. 2017 Aug

1;7(1):7072. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-07288-4

71.   Fulsundar S, Harms K, Flaten GE, Johnsen PJ, Chopade BA, Nielsen KM. Gene

Transfer Potential of Outer Membrane Vesicles of *Acinetobacter baylyi* and Effects of

Stress on Vesiculation. Kivisaar M, editor. Appl Environ Microbiol [Internet]. 2014

Jun;80(11):3469–83. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AEM.04248-13

72.   Ebel-Tsipis J, Fox MS, Botstein D. Generalized transduction by bacteriophage P22 in

Salmonella typhimurium. J Mol Biol [Internet]. 1972 Nov;71(2):449–69. Available

from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0022283672903622

73.   Smits WK, Weese JS, Roberts AP, Harmanus C, Hornung B. A helicase-containing

module defines a family of pCD630-like plasmids in *Clostridium difficile*. Anaerobe

[Internet]. 2018 Feb;49:78–84. Available from:

https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1075996417302287

74.   Roseboom AM, Ducarmon QR, Hornung BVH, Harmanus C, Crobach MJT, Kuijper

EJ, et al. Carriage of three plasmids in a single human clinical isolate of *Clostridioides*

difficile. Plasmid [Internet]. 2023 Jan;125:102669. Available from:

https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0147619X22000531

75.   Whittle MJ, Bilverstone TW, van Esveld RJ, Lücke AC, Lister MM, Kuehne SA, et al.

A Novel Bacteriophage with Broad Host Range against *Clostridioides difficile*

Ribotype 078 Supports SlpA as the Likely Phage Receptor. Auchtung JM, editor.

Microbiol Spectr [Internet]. 2022 Feb 23;10(1):e0229521. Available from:

https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/spectrum.02295-21

76.   Goh S, Ong PF, Song KP, Riley T V, Chang BJ. The complete genome sequence of

Clostridium difficile phage ϕC2 and comparisons to ϕCD119 and inducible prophages

of CD630. Microbiology [Internet]. 2007 Mar 1;153(3):676–85. Available from:

https://www.microbiologyresearch.org/content/journal/micro/10.1099/mic.0.2006/0024

36-0

77.   Hargreaves KR, Kropinski AM, Clokie MRJ. What Does the Talking?: Quorum

886   Sensing Signalling Genes Discovered in a Bacteriophage Genome. Kaufmann GF,

887   editor. PLoS One [Internet]. 2014 Jan 24;9(1):e85131. Available from:

888   https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0085131

889   78.   Sekulovic O, Garneau JR, Néron A, Fortier L-C. Characterization of Temperate Phages

890   Infecting *Clostridium difficile* Isolates of Human and Animal Origins. Griffiths MW,

891   editor. Appl Environ Microbiol [Internet]. 2014 Apr 15;80(8):2555–63. Available

892   from: https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AEM.00237-14

893   79.   Fortier L-C, Moineau S. Morphological and Genetic Diversity of Temperate Phages in

894   *Clostridium difficile*. Appl Environ Microbiol [Internet]. 2007 Nov 15;73(22):7358–66.

895   Available from: https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AEM.00582-07

896   80.   Hinc K, Kabała M, Iwanicki A, Martirosian G, Negri A, Obuchowski M. Complete

897   genome sequence of the newly discovered temperate *Clostridioides difficile*

898   bacteriophage phiCDKH01 of the family *Siphoviridae*. Arch Virol [Internet]. 2021 Aug

899   20;166(8):2305–10. Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00705-021-

900   05092-0

Supporting information

Table S1. Detailed prophage prediction results.

Fig S1. ANIm analysis of the active regions as identified by sequencing read coverage.

Data file S1. Genomic information of the active regions. Genomic information of all phage

genomes and non-phage elements: position on host genome, CDS or repeat-region (type) with

corresponding start/stop (starting from 1 bp), strand (+/-), locus tag (phage genome specific;

host genome locus tags for non-phage elements), function as determined by Pharokka, and gene

product as determined by Pharokka for phage genomes or Prokka for non-phage elements.

Data file S2. Nucleotide BLAST analysis results of all active regions. First best *C. difficile-*

phage BLAST hits listed in Table 4 are highlighted in bold with yellow background.

Table S2. Genome-based prediction of morphological family.

Fig 8. DCA tolerance at various concentrations. Tolerance of the strains to DCA was

determined as relative growth compared to the reference culture (regarded as 100%) and MIC

assay at concentrations from 0.255 mM to 1.2 mM. Strains of the same ST are depicted next to

each other. No significant tolerance differences were observed within an ST at all

concentrations.

Fig 9. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST1-strains TS3_3 and DSM 28196.

Sequencing reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release

of strains (A) TS3_3 and (B) DSM 28196 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV

(29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before

plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb) of the respective strain. Active regions were

magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted by PHASTEST (21) were

highlighted in the background (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

Fig 10. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST3-strains B1_2 and SC084-01-01.

Sequencing reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release

of strains (A) B1_2 and (B) SC084-01-01 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV

(29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before

plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb) and ECE (position in kb) of the respective

strain. Active regions were magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted by

PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

Fig 11. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST8-strains J2_1 and SC083-01-01.

Sequencing reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release

of strains (A) J2_1 and (B) SC083-01-01 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV

(29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before

plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb) and ECE (position in kb) of the respective

strain. Active regions were magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted by

PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

Fig 12. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of ST11-strain MA_1. Sequencing reads of

phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release of strain MA_1 were

normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV (29), and NPKM values were additionally OD-

normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before plotted against the chromosome (position in Mb)

of MA_1. Active regions were magnified for better visualization. Prophage regions predicted

by PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green, incomplete = pink).

Fig 13. Coverage of phage sequencing reads of cryptic ST340-strain MA_2. Sequencing

reads of phage particles from spontaneous (black) and DCA-induced (red) release of strain

MA_2 were normalized to NPKM values (circles) with TraV (29), and NPKM values were

additionally OD-normalized to $OD_{600} = 2$ (line graphs), before plotted against the chromosome

958 (position in Mb) and ECE (position in kb) of MA_2. Active regions were magnified for better

959 visualization. Prophage regions predicted by PHASTEST (21) were highlighted (intact = green,

960 incomplete = pink).

Fig 14. Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of large terminase protein sequences. The

large terminase of the active phages (highlighted in bold and italic) were aligned on protein

level to the reference sequences from Rashid et al. (37). Branches of the different DNA-

packaging strategies were colored according to Rashid et al. (37), and branches were collapsed

for better visualization if none of our phages was included.