Pseudogenes in plasmid genomes reveal past transitions in plasmid mobility

Dustin M. Hanke[1*], Yiqing Wang[1], Tal Dagan[1]

[1]Institute of General Microbiology, Kiel University, Kiel, Germany

[*]Corresponding author e-mail: dhanke@ifam.uni-kiel.de

Abstract

Evidence for gene non-functionalization due to mutational processes is found in genomes in the form of pseudogenes. Pseudogenes are known to be rare in prokaryote chromosomes, with the exception of lineages that underwent an extreme genome reduction (e.g., obligatory pathogens). Much less is known about the frequency of pseudogenes in prokaryotic plasmids; those are genetic elements that can transfer between cells and may encode beneficial traits for their host. Non-functionalization of plasmid-encoded genes may alter the plasmid characteristics, e.g., mobility, or their effect on the host. Analyzing 10,832 prokaryotic genomes, we find that plasmid genomes are characterized by threefold-higher pseudogene density compared to chromosomes. The majority of plasmid pseudogenes correspond to deteriorated transposable elements. A detailed analysis of enterobacterial plasmids furthermore reveals frequent gene non-functionalization events associated with the loss of plasmid self-transmissibility. Reconstructing the evolution of closely related plasmids revealed that non-functionalization of the conjugation machinery led to the emergence of non-mobilizable plasmid types. Examples are virulence plasmids in *Escherichia* and *Salmonella*. Our study highlights non-functionalization of core plasmid mobility functions as one route for the evolution of domesticated plasmids. Pseudogenes in plasmids supply insights into past transitions in plasmid mobility that are akin to transitions in bacterial lifestyle.

Keywords: Phylogenomics, Plasmid evolution, Structural variants, pO157, pSENV, pSLT

Introduction

Pseudogenes are gene copies that have been rendered non-functional due to mutations that disrupt their expression and/or function. Non-functionalization events that generate unitary pseudogenes, which lack a functional homolog in the genome are rather rare (e.g., (1)). In eukaryotes, pseudogenes frequently originate from non-functionalization of gene copies following gene duplication (2). In prokaryotes, protein family diversification is more often mediated by horizontal gene transfer (HGT) that introduces xenologs in the genome, compared to gene duplication (i.e., paralogs) (3, 4). Nonetheless, acquired genes may become non-functional upon the integration into the genome (5), e.g., due to incompatibility with the transcriptional or regulatory network of the recipient organism. Gene families of transposable elements (TEs) (e.g., transposases and site-specific recombinases) are characterized by a high frequency of pseudogenes, indicating that transposition and translocation play a major role in the evolution of pseudogenes (6). Pseudogenes correspond to molecular fossil record of past genes; the sequence similarity between pseudogenes and their functional homolog is expected to decay due to neutral mutational processes over time (7).

The frequency of pseudogenes in prokaryotic genomes is lower compared to eukaryotes, with several exceptions, including the genome *Mycobacterium leprea*, *Rickettsia prowazekii* (8), and *Salmonella enterica* serovars Typhi and Paratyphi A (9). It has been previously suggested that non-functional DNA in prokaryotes is rapidly eliminated by deletions due to the energetic cost of gene expression (10). The prevalence of pseudogenes in prokaryotes may be furthermore associated with bacterial lifestyles. Genomes of facultative pathogens are characterized by a high pseudogene frequency compared to free-living bacteria (11, 12), which may correspond to an initial step in the evolution of genome reduction that is common in the adaptation to an obligate host-associated lifestyle (13).

Plasmids are extrachromosomal elements that play an important role in prokaryote evolution (14). The evolution of plasmids differs from that of bacterial chromosomes due to their relatively small genome size, variable copy number in the cell, and their ability to horizontally transfer between cells. Plasmids can be either self-transmissible (i.e., conjugative), mobilizable, or non-mobilizable, and this property can be inferred from their gene content. Plasmids having the complete set of genetic features required for conjugation, e.g., genes encoding the mating pair formation (MPF) machinery, are classified as self-transmissible; a plasmid is classified as mobilizable, if it encodes an *oriT* binding site or relaxase genes, but lacks the MPF machinery gene markers (e.g., (15)). Mobilizable plasmids are able to hijack the conjugation machinery of

other plasmids for horizontal transfer (reviewed in (16)). Plasmids lacking an *oriT* and a relaxase

gene are typically classified as non-mobilizable (e.g., (15)). Nonetheless, it has been suggested

that plasmids classified as non-mobilizable with unidentified *oriT* might utilize relaxases of

conjugative or mobilizable plasmids for transfer (17). Plasmid mobility is an evolvable property,

for example, an evolution experiment of plasmid persistence in *Escherichia coli* under strong

selection exemplified a loss of plasmid self-transmissibility due to a large deletion of genes

required for conjugation (18). Indeed, a recent large-scale study of plasmid genomes suggested

that conjugative plasmids frequently lose their self-transmissibility, with consequent changes in

the plasmid genetic repertoire due to gene non-functionalization and gene loss (19). Hence,

plasmids that harbor conjugative origins of transfer but lacking a relaxase and MPF machinery

may evolved from ancestral conjugative plasmids (17).

Here we study the extent of gene non-functionalization in plasmid genomes. For that

purpose, we compare the prevalence of pseudogenes between plasmids and chromosomes using

a large-scale analysis of 10,832 publicly available genomes of 738 prokaryote genera. We further

study the evolutionary history of plasmid-encoded pseudogenes in 2,442 *Enterobacteriaceae*

isolates including the genera *Klebsiella*, *Escherichia*, and *Salmonella*. Comparing homologous

plasmids, we further reconstruct the origin of pseudogenes in the context of transitions in plasmid

mobility.

Results

Higher density of pseudogenes in plasmids compared to chromosomes

To examine the presence of pseudogenes in plasmids and chromosomes we surveyed 10,832

genome annotation from the Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline of NCBI's RefSeq dataset

(20). Pseudogenes were annotated in 21,564 (74%) plasmids and 10,832 (100%) chromosomes.

Our results reveal that plasmids are characterized by a higher pseudogene density (pseudogene

per CDS) compared to chromosomes (Fig. 1A), with a median of 0.070 pseudogenes per coding

sequence (CDS) for plasmids and 0.024 for chromosomes (P < 0.001, using Wilcoxon test). This

equates to approximately 14 CDS per pseudogene for plasmids and 42 CDS per pseudogene for

chromosomes. Thus, the genomic composition of plasmids is enriched by a 3-fold higher

pseudogene density compared to chromosomes.

The size difference between plasmids and chromosomes raises the question of whether

replicon size may explain the different pseudogene densities. To test the impact of replicon size

differences, we constructed a dataset comprising chromosomes and plasmids with similar size

distributions (Supplementary Fig. S1). Comparing the pseudogene density between plasmids and

chromosomes in that set showed that, also for plasmids and chromosomes of similar size,
plasmids have a significantly higher pseudogene density compared to chromosomes (P < 0.001,
using permutation test, median$_{plasmid}$=0.06, median$_{chromosome}$=0.03). Hence, the smaller plasmid
genome size cannot alone explain the high pseudogene density in plasmids.

To test if the high pseudogene density in plasmids is a general phenomenon, we
compared the pseudogene density between plasmids and chromosomes within different genera.
Our results show that the pseudogene density was consistently higher in plasmids compared to
chromosomes for all taxa, except *Shigella* (P < 0.001, using Wilcoxon test with FDR correction,
Supplementary Fig. S2). The high frequency of gene non-functionalization in *Shigella* has been
previously associated with adaptation of a host-associated lifestyle in this genus (11, 21). Hence,
the elevated occurrence of pseudogenes in plasmids is common to most taxonomic groups.

To study plasmid gene non-functionalization in detail, we focused on plasmids residing in
2,442 *Klebsiella*, *Escherichia*, and *Salmonella* (KES) isolates. These three enterobacterial taxa
have been extensively sampled for sequencing and plasmids in these taxa include diverse
plasmid types (22, 23). The density of pseudogenes in KES plasmids is significantly higher
compared to chromosomes (P < 0.001, using Wilcoxon test, Fig. 1A). This reflects an observed
4-fold increase in pseudogene density in plasmids compared to chromosomes and equates to
approximately 9 CDS per pseudogene in plasmids and 40 CDS per pseudogene in chromosomes.
Hence, enterobacterial genomes within the KES dataset capture the trend of increased
pseudogene density in plasmids compared to chromosomes that we observed within the
taxonomically diverse RefSeq dataset.

Pseudogenes having a functional homolog in the isolate genome, including the
chromosome and extra-chromosomal elements, may have evolved from gene non-
functionalization following a gene duplication (either within the same replicon, or via translocation
of duplicates between replicons). Pseudogenes that do not have a functional homolog within the
same isolate may have evolved either from non-functionalization of a single-copy gene, or
alternatively, non-functionalization of a horizontally acquired gene upon arrival. The comparison
of pseudogenes with their functional homologs showed that most pseudogenes are truncated
(480,349, 71%). Recent studies suggest that early stop codons in many truncated pseudogenes
correspond to nonsense mutations (24), or transient alleles that may be reversed under purifying
selection (25). Comparing the evolutionary rates of truncated and non-truncated pseudogenes we
find that truncated pseudogenes are characterized by higher dN and dS, as well as higher dN/dS
compared to non-truncated pseudogenes (Supplementary Figure S3), as is expected for DNA
evolution following a relaxation of selection pressure (i.e., gene non-functionalization).

Furthermore, the divergence of pseudogenes in plasmids and chromosomes compared to their
closest homologous gene had similar characteristics (Supplementary Fig. S3), hence the high
density of pseudogenes in plasmids cannot be explained by a bias in the genome annotation
pipeline.

Pseudogenes were further classified into two groups: unitary and non-unitary
pseudogenes, based on whether a functional homolog to the pseudogene was present within the
same isolate. Our results show that the proportion of pseudogenes that are accompanied by a
homologous gene on the same replicon is lower for plasmid pseudogenes (Fig. 1B). The
proportion of unitary pseudogenes at the isolate level is comparable between plasmids and
chromosomes. Plasmid-encoded pseudogenes may furthermore have a homologous gene
encoded either in the chromosome (19%) or in another plasmid (10%) within the same isolate.
Chromosome-encoded pseudogenes having a plasmid-encoded homologous gene are rather
rare (2%). Plasmid-encoded pseudogenes are thus more likely to have a homologous gene
encoded on a different replicon within the isolate genome compared to chromosome-encoded
pseudogenes. Accordingly, we conclude that gene non-functionalization in plasmids frequently
entails the loss of redundant functions at the level of the whole isolate genome.

The majority of pseudogenes in plasmids correspond to deteriorated IS-elements
Which genes are frequently non-functionalized? In plasmids, gene families comprising
transposition-related gene functions such as IS*1*, Tn*3*, and IS*3* are characterized by the highest
frequency of pseudogenes (Fig. 1C). Similarly, transposases such as those encoded by IS*1*,
IS*256*, and IS*3*, are frequently non-functionalized in chromosomes (Fig. 1C). Non-functional IS
elements accounted for a substantial portion of pseudogenes in our dataset with 88,107 (13%)
pseudogene instances. For example, the IS*1* family transposase alone comprised approximately
every 20th pseudogene (5.85%), with an average of 33 pseudogenes per gene. Furthermore,
pseudogenes in the IS*1* family transposases are the most abundant in the data and occur in 72%
of the chromosomes (Supplementary Fig. S4). Our results are thus in agreement with previous
reports on frequent non-functionalization of TEs in prokaryote genomes (6) and furthermore show
a similar trend in plasmid genomes.

Figure 1. Evolution of gene non-functionalization in plasmids compared to chromosomes.
(A) Distribution of pseudogene density (pseudogene per CDS) per plasmid and chromosome for the RefSeq and KES datasets. The graph includes plasmids and chromosomes with pseudogene content (RefSeq dataset: 21,564 (74%) plasmids and 10,832 (100%) chromosomes; KES dataset: 5,573 (82%) plasmids and 2,442 (100%) chromosomes. **(B)** Proportions of pseudogenes according to the location of the closest related homologous CDSs in plasmids and chromosomes. **(C)** Non-functional to functional ratio per gene family in plasmids and chromosomes. Each dot corresponds to a gene family (green). Transposase gene families are distinguished (purple). **(D)** Ratio of pseudogene per CDS in plasmids (x-axis) to pseudogene per CDS in chromosomes (y-axis) for 6,396 gene families that occur on both plasmids and chromosomes. Gene functions with a significant enrichment for pseudogenes are highlighted for plasmids (orange, n=840) and chromosomes (purple, n=221) ($P < 0.001$, using Fisher's exact test). Infinite (Inf) values correspond to gene families lacking pseudogenes (i.e., divisions by zero). **(E)** Example gene families that are enriched for pseudogenes. Names of listed gene families (C, D, E) have been validated with Pfam (26) and TnCentral (27) databases using sequence search with the most frequent sequence variant of the gene families.

The comparison between plasmids and chromosomes further reveals that the propensity for non-

functionalization may be different depending on the replicon type. We identified 221 (0.64%)

plasmid-encoded gene families that are significantly enriched for pseudogenes in the

chromosome (Fig. 1D, Supplementary Table 1). These families often correspond to plasmid-

encoded genes, such as mobilization genes (*mobA*), toxin-antitoxin systems (*relE*/*parE*), and viral

helicases (Fig. 1E). Additionally, we identified 840 (2.4%) chromosome-encoded gene families

that are significantly enriched for pseudogenes in plasmids (Fig. 1D, Supplementary Table 1).

These families include genes such as LysR-type transcriptional regulators (*lysR*), LacI-related

transcriptional regulators (*lacI*), and creatininase (*crnA*), that are specifically encoded on the

chromosome (Fig. 1E). We hypothesize that these gene families correspond to replicon-specific

genes that underwent non-functionalization upon translocation to the other replicon, rendering

them essentially dead-on-arrival. Barriers for gene transfer from chromosomes to plasmids have

been previously shown, for example due to dose effect (28). Our results suggest the presence of

similar barriers in gene transfer from plasmids to chromosomes.

Frequent pseudogenes in large mobilizable and non-mobilizable plasmids

Which plasmid types are most associated with a high frequency of pseudogenes? Initially we

focus on two prominent plasmid characteristics: plasmid size and mobility class. The small

plasmid types in the KES dataset mostly correspond to ColE1-like plasmids; accordingly, here we

consider plasmids of <19Kb as small (23). Our analysis shows that most of the large plasmid

types (4,659; 97%) and about half of the small plasmid types (1,045; 54%) contain pseudogenes.

The pseudogene density is highest in small non-mobilizable plasmids (small plasmid types with

pseudogenes: $\text{median}_{\text{small mobilizable}}=0.2$, $\text{median}_{\text{small non-mobilizable}}=0.33$) compared to large plasmid

types and chromosomes, but that property is tightly linked to their small size encoding only few

genes. Among the large plasmids, pseudogene density is highest in mobilizable plasmids followed

by non-mobilizable plasmids (P < 0.05, using Wilcoxon test with FDR correction, $\text{median}_{\text{large}}$

$_{\text{mobilizable}}=0.27$, $\text{median}_{\text{large non-mobilizable}}=0.15$, $\text{median}_{\text{large conjugative}}=0.1$, Fig. 2A). Thus, approximately

every fourth gene is non-functionalized in some mobilizable plasmids. Taken together, our results

point towards an association between increased pseudogene densities in large plasmids and a

lack of plasmid mobility.

Plasmids in the different plasmid size and mobility categories are typically different in their

composition. We therefor compared the propensity of gene non-functionalization among the

plasmid size and mobility groups. Only seven gene families were enriched for pseudogenes in

the small plasmid types including antibiotic resistance genes (Supplementary Fig. S5). A total of

488 gene families were enriched for pseudogenes in at least one of the large plasmid mobility

classes (Fig. 2B). The comparison between large plasmids in different mobility classes revealed
a significant enrichment for pseudogenes in gene families encoding for plasmid transfer
mechanisms including *traI*, *nikB*, and *traV* (Fig. 2B; Supplementary Table S3). Consequently, we
hypothesized that the origin of these pseudogenes is gene non-functionalization following loss of
self-transmissibility of conjugative plasmids.

To gain further understanding of gene non-functionalization events in the context of large
plasmid types, we compared the pseudogene density among plasmids in different plasmid
taxonomic units (PTUs) (29). PTUs that comprise a high pseudogene density typically include a
high proportion of mobilizable and non-mobilizable plasmid types (Fig. 2C). Gene deletions and
changes in genetic repertoire of plasmids may lead to a transition of plasmid mobility, which may
lead to PTU divergence and the evolution of novel PTUs in the long-term (17, 19). Indeed, here
we observe several PTUs where transfer-related gene families frequently occur as pseudogenes;
these PTUs are highlighted as putative plasmid types where transitions in plasmid mobility may
have occurred (red labeled PTUs in Fig. 2C). Transfer-related pseudogenes thus correspond to
molecular fossils of lost mobility mechanisms in plasmid genomes.

Vertical inheritance of pseudogenes in evolutionary-related plasmid clusters
Pseudogenes observed within the same gene family may have originated either from multiple
independent gene non-functionalization events, or alternatively, from few non-functionalization
events in ancestral plasmids followed by vertical inheritance during plasmid diversification. If
vertical inheritance of pseudogenes is common in plasmid evolution, then the number of observed
pseudogenes supplies an overestimation for the frequency of gene non-functionalization events.
To evaluate the role of vertical inheritance in pseudogene evolution, we compared shared gene
and pseudogene content among closely related plasmids. For that purpose, we clustered all
plasmids into clusters of homologous plasmids based on shared gene content. We obtained 353
clusters comprising 85% large plasmids and 206 clusters comprising 89% of the small plasmids;
these clusters largely correspond to the PTUs (see Supplementary Fig. S6). A visual inspection
of the shared genes matrices suggests that pseudogenes tend to be shared among plasmids that
also share genes (i.e., clusters of closely related plasmid) (Fig. 3AB). Indeed, the proportion of
shared genes and shared pseudogenes between plasmid pairs are positively correlated ($r_s = 0.47$,
$P < 0.001$, using Spearman's correlation), suggesting frequent vertical inheritance (e.g., closely
related plasmids and loss if plasmids are restructured (e.g., distantly related-plasmids) in the
evolution of plasmid-encoded pseudogenes.

Figure 2. Pseudogene density and gene function in large (≥19Kb) plasmid types. (A) Ratio of pseudogene per CDS shown for large plasmid types (≥19Kb) and chromosomes (pseudogene-less replicons were excluded). **(B)** Enrichment for pseudogenes in gene families significantly depends on the plasmid mobility types in large plasmids (P < 0.05, using Fisher's exact test with FDR correction). First mentioned plasmid mobility type indicates in which type the enrichment of pseudogenes for gene functions has been statistically observed. The second mentioned plasmid mobility type indicates the type from which the frequencies of pseudogenes and CDSs were used for the statistical comparison. **(C)** Distribution of pseudogene per CDS ratio for plasmid taxonomic units (PTUs) of large plasmid type (only frequent (n_{PTU}≥30) PTUs are shown). Stacked bar plots show proportions of plasmid mobility type and the host taxonomy per PTU. Labels besides the boxplot report PTU-specific non-functionalized gene families corresponding to transfer-related (*tra*) functions (P < 0.05, using Fisher's exact test with FDR correction). PTUs highlighted in red are characterized by multiple plasmid mobility types (where the main plasmid mobility type < 95%).

The observation of shared pseudogenes in plasmids may be either due to retention of non-
functional DNA or because non-functionalization occurs in a narrow range of gene family
functions. In the letter case, even if these non-functionalization events emerged independently, it
would generate a signal of shared pseudogenes that are not vertically inherited. The strongest
patterns of shared pseudogenes in our dataset are mostly restricted to closely related plasmid
clusters. A total of 874 (10.1%) gene families comprising pseudogenes are plasmid cluster-
specific (P < 0.05, using Fisher's exact test with FDR correction). Hence, pseudogene sharing
between plasmids clusters, is expected to correspond to diverse non-functional categories. A total
of 356 (4.4%) gene families correspond to frequent, non-functional transposase-related functions
such as IS*1*, Tn*3*, and IS*26*. Additionally, gene family size and the frequency of non cluster-
specific pseudogenes are significantly correlated (r_s = 0.58, P < 0.001, using Spearman's
correlation). Shared pseudogene content between plasmid clusters thus corresponds either to
horizontal gene transfer or commonly non-functionalized gene families.

Figure 3. Shared gene and pseudogene content are similar in enterobacterial plasmids. (A, B) Pairwise shared gene (red) and pseudogene (blue) matrices of large plasmid types (A) and small plasmid types (B) among the KES dataset. The matrices were sorted using hierarchical clustering of shared gene content. **(C)** Shared genes and pseudogenes of adjacent plasmid clusters (FS$_A$, FS$_B$, FE, and E5) in the hierarchically clustered shared gene content matrix. Labeled plasmid clusters are based on the Markov Cluster Algorithm (MCL) using pairs of plasmids sharing $\geq$ 60% gene content (see methods).

Non-functionalization following segmental deletion is a signature for the loss of self-transmissibility

To gain a better understanding on the evolutionary events at the basis of pseudogene vertical inheritance, we reconstructed the evolution of closely related plasmid clusters. For that purpose, we selected two clusters of *Salmonella* plasmids that share a high proportion of their genes and correspond mostly to PTU-FS (Supplementary Table S4, Supplementary Fig. S6). The shared gene content within the selected clusters FS_A and FS_B is 92% and 86%, respectively, with an average of 50% shared genes among plasmids in both clusters (Fig. 3C). Plasmids of cluster FS_A are homologous to plasmid pSLT (NC_003277.2) of *S. enterica* serovar Typhimurium and plasmids of cluster FS_B are homologous to plasmid pSENV (NZ_CP063701.1) of *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovar Enteritidis. Cluster FS_A comprises only 83 conjugative plasmids and cluster FS_B includes mostly (46; 92%) non-mobilizable plasmids, in addition to four conjugative plasmids. The average shared pseudogene content among plasmids within the clusters is 67% or 65% for clusters FS_A and FS_B, respectively. The shared pseudogene content among plasmids from different clusters was only 9%, on average, thus plasmids in the two clusters are diverged in their pseudogene content. The high proportion of shared gene (and pseudogene) content among plasmids in the two PTU-FS clusters supports the notion that these plasmids are of common ancestry, i.e., they are homologs, albeit with alterations in their mobility class.

Figure 4. Phylogenetic relationship of self-transmissible and non-mobilizable plasmid clusters and their hosts. (A, B) Phylogenetic networks including 11 single-copy genes of plasmid clusters FS_A and FS_B (PTU-FS) and 10 single-copy genes of plasmid clusters FE (PTU-FE) and E5 (PTU-E5) (see Supplementary Table S7 & S8). Three plasmids (ca. 2%) and 40 plasmids (ca. 11%) were excluded from the phylogenetic reconstruction of (A) and (B), respectively, to increase the number of complete single-copy gene families and hence the robustness of the phylogenetic inference. Arrows indicate inferred root positions resulting from root neighborhood inference. Branches are colored according to plasmid assignment into plasmid clusters. The black dot in (B) labels a mobilizable plasmid that deviates from the main mobility class of cluster FE (PTU-FE, conjugative). **(C)** Host phylogenetic tree based on 133 chromosomal single-copy genes. The tree was rooted using midpoint rooting. **(D, E)** Presence Absence Pattern (PAP) of pseudogenes (purple) and functional genes (green) for plasmid clusters FS_A/FS_B (D) and plasmid clusters FE/E5 (E). The PAPs are sorted using hierarchical clustering on shared gene content. The arrow depicts the closest plasmid to cluster FS_B (non-mobilizable) of cluster FS_A (conjugative), which bears transfer-related genes that are absent in cluster FS_B (genomic arrangement shown below).

To examine the evolution of PTU-FS plasmids, we reconstructed the plasmid phylogeny based
on eleven single-copy gene families present in 122 (92%) plasmids. The phylogeny reveals a
clear split between plasmid clusters FS_A and FS_B (Fig. 4A). To reconstruct the ancestral mobility
state of PTU-FS plasmids, we inferred the root of PTU-FS using a phylogenomic rooting approach
(30). The phylogenetic inference revealed a root neighborhood in the deepest split between
plasmid clusters FS_A and FS_B that includes branches leading to several conjugating plasmids of
cluster FS_A (Fig. 4A). This root position implies that the ancestor of PTU-FS plasmids was
conjugative and the non-mobilizable plasmids in cluster FS_B are derived plasmids (Fig. 4A).
Notably, the plasmid genome size differs significantly between the non-mobilizable cluster FS_B
plasmids and the conjugative FS_A plasmids, with the non-mobilizable plasmids having a smaller
genome   size   (P   <   0.001,   using   Wilcoxon   test, $median_{non-mobilizable}$=59,372   bp,
$median_{conjugative}$=93,865 bp). Further comparison of the gene content among the PTU-FS reveals
a high conservation of plasmid gene order, except for the absence of transfer (*tra*) genes in the
non-mobilizable FS_B plasmids (Fig. 4D, Supplementary Fig. S10A).
The loss of the conjugation machinery genes may have followed two alternative scenarios:
gradual non-functionalization and gene loss, or a large-scale deletion followed by non-
functionalization of functionally-related genes. Since the absent genes are consecutively
arranged in the ancestral plasmid (Fig. 4D), we infer that a large segmental deletion of transfer-
related genes occurred in the ancestor of cluster FS_B non-mobilizable plasmids (Supplementary
Fig. S7). The transfer-related genes *traV* and *FinO* (a repressor of conjugative transfer in F-like
plasmids) correspond to the boundaries of the deleted transfer-related gene arrangement in the
ancestor and are found as pseudogenes in derived plasmids. Notably, the *Salmonella* host
phylogeny shows that plasmid clusters FS_A and FS_B reside in distinct groups of *Salmonella*
isolates where hosts of the conjugative FS_A plasmids appear as more distantly related in
comparison to hosts of the non-mobilizable FS_B plasmids (Fig. 4C, Supplementary Fig. S9). Taken
together, our results reveal a transition in plasmid mobility from self-transmissible to non-
mobilizable plasmids within *Salmonella* PTU-FS plasmids due to large segmental deletion
followed by gene non-functionalization events.
To examine further scenarios for gene non-functionalization in plasmid genomes, we
investigated two additional adjacent plasmid clusters in the shared gene matrix where the pattern
of gene and pseudogene sharing indicates that they are closely related (Fig. 3C). The plasmids
in these clusters correspond to the evolutionary related PTUs FE and E5 (19). Most (167; 87%)
of the plasmids in cluster FE were assigned to the conjugative PTU-FE, with the remaining
plasmids being unassigned (Supplementary Table S4, Supplementary Fig. S6). All 164 plasmids

348 in cluster E5 were classified into the non-mobilizable PTU-E5 (Supplementary Table S4,

349 Supplementary Fig. S6), which correspond to homologs of pO157 in *E. coli* strain O157:H7 and

350 are known to be non-transmissible (17, 31). Plasmids in cluster FE share, on average, 53% of

351 their genes and 12% of their pseudogenes. In comparison, gene sharing among plasmids in

352 cluster E5 shows a higher shared content with 90% of the genes and 80% of the pseudogenes

353 shared, on average. Plasmids in FE and E5 clusters share, on average, 18% gene content and

354 5% pseudogene content. The shared gene content among plasmids in the two clusters reflects

355 evolutionary relationships where the different plasmid mobility types may be explained by the

356 differential gene content.

357  To examine the evolutionary history of plasmids in clusters FE and E5, we reconstructed the

358 plasmid backbone phylogeny using ten single-copy gene families present in 316 (89%) plasmids.

359 The phylogeny revealed a clear split between the plasmid clusters (Fig. 4B). The topology of

360 cluster E5 plasmids reveal two main plasmid lineages of closely related plasmids. In contrast, the

361 phyletic pattern of cluster FE conjugative plasmids revealed a high divergence among the

362 plasmids (Fig. 4B). The inferred root position is located in a branch leading to two conjugative

363 cluster FE plasmids. Notably, two plasmids in cluster E5 encode a partial repertoire of the

364 conjugation machinery and they were accordingly predicted as conjugative; these plasmids

365 branch closely to the split with cluster FE plasmids (Supplementary Fig. S8) and their syntenic

366 gene order reveals differential loss of transfer-related genes (Supplementary Fig. S8). Comparing

367 the sequences of the conjugative plasmids of cluster E5 to their closest non-mobilizable neighbor

368 plasmid revealed evidence for loss of plasmid mobility genes and shared genomic arrangements

369 in the non-mobilizable cluster E5 plasmids (Fig. 4B, Supplementary Fig. S10B). The phylogenetic

370 reconstruction suggests that the ancestral plasmid of cluster E5 plasmids (or PTU-E5) was

371 conjugative and the plasmid mobility was lost due to a segmental deletion of the *tra* genes (Fig.

372 4B, Supplementary Fig. S8). Plasmids in cluster E5 share 80% of their pseudogenes, including

373 transposases such as IS*3* (508), IS*1* (336), and IS*91* (320), as well as transfer-related gene

374 families *traI* (164) and *nikB* (164) that are non-functionalized in 164 (98%) of the cluster E5

375 plasmids. Plasmids in cluster FE reside in a diverse set of hosts including *Klebsiella*, *Escherichia*,

376 and *Salmonella*. In contrary, plasmids in cluster E5 are only hosted by closely related *Escherichia*

377 isolates including strain O157:H7 (Fig. 4C); these plasmids are homologs of plasmid pO157 that

378 is non-mobilizable (e.g., NZ_CP017435.1). Note that the hosts of cluster E5 plasmids are

379 diverged, i.e., they do not correspond to isogenic strains (Supplementary Fig. S9). Hence the

380 topology of cluster E5 phylogeny likely corresponds to within-host evolution via vertical

381 inheritance. Notably, cluster E5 plasmids are characterized by significantly larger plasmid genome

size, but a smaller number of CDSs compared to the conjugative cluster FE plasmids, which is
well explained by the frequent pseudogenes in cluster E5 plasmids (P < 0.001, using Wilcoxon
test, median$_{Cluster\ E5}$=78 CDS, 19 pseudogenes, 93,179 bp; median$_{Cluster\ FE}$=86 CDS, 9
pseudogenes, 74,922.5 bp). Hence pseudogenes may be retained as non-coding DNA in the
evolution of the non-mobilizable plasmids after the loss of self-transmissibility. Our results thus
reveal that plasmid divergence events may give rise to new integral replicons within their host
lineage.

Discussion

Gene non-functionalization is considered a common event following gene duplication and gene
acquisition via lateral gene transfer. Previous studies suggested that bacterial genomes are often
devoid of pseudogenes due to purifying selection (8). This implies that pseudogenes in bacterial
genomes should be considered as 'garbage DNA', that is, non-functional DNA that may have an
effect on the organism fitness, rather than 'Junk DNA' (see (32) for definitions). Our results show
that pseudogenes are found in bacterial genomes and their density is highest in plasmids. We
identify two main processes in plasmid evolution that are accompanied by frequent gene non-
functionalization: proliferation of mobile genetic elements (MGEs) and reductive evolution of self-
transmissible plasmids.

Mobile genetic elements, including transposons and integrons, are known to translocate
or proliferate within and between genomes (33), thus, facilitating gene transfer, as well as
genomic rearrangements (reviewed in (34)). At the same time, the integration of MGEs in bacterial
genomes may lead to gene non-functionalization at the insertion locus, e.g., due to disruption of
an open reading frame (e.g., (35)). The high frequency of MGE pseudogenes in plasmids reported
here conforms previous studies highlighting the role of failed transposition events in the
generation of pseudogenes in bacterial genomes (e.g., (6)). We observed that most pseudogenes
are due to truncations and that pseudogenes in plasmids are more deteriorated. Indeed, site-
specific recombination of transposable elements generates genomic hotspots for their insertion,
where repeating insertion at the same locus may lead to gene truncations (reviewed in (36)). That
being said, recent studies suggest that many pseudogenes are transcribed, and sometime even
translated (37). Pseudogenes of MGE origin may thus correspond to proto-genes and a source
for genetic innovation during MGE diversification (25). This suggestion is in line with recent
studies that report pseudogene resurrection under strong selective conditions for the lost gene

function. Examples include the resurrection of iron uptake in *E. coli* (38) and the resurrection of
CO_2 assimilation in *Brucella* spp. (39).

Our analysis furthermore reveals that the propensity for specific gene non-
functionalization depends on the replicon type, i.e., plasmid or chromosome. This observation
may be explained by selection against the presence of essential (chromosomal) genes in
plasmids, e.g., due to unreliable plasmid inheritance (40) or deleterious effects of gene duplication
(28). Thus, the higher pseudogene density in plasmids compared to chromosomes may be
explained by the propensity of plasmid gene content to include accessory and dispensable genes.
We note however, that the classification of genes into core and accessory may vary depending
on the bacterial taxon, and that has an effect on the evolution of plasmid gene content in different
bacterial taxa (e.g., in the context of antibiotic resistance plasmids; (41)). We hypothesize that the
horizontal transfer (or translocation) of chromosomal genes into plasmids (and *vice versa*) is
bound to yield effectively 'dead-on-arrival' pseudogenes.

Inferring rooted plasmid phylogenies that comprise related non-mobilizable and
conjugative plasmid enabled us to infer the ancestral and derived plasmid variants in plasmid
evolution. According to our inference, non-functionalized copies of transfer-related genes in large
non-mobilizable and mobilizable plasmids are molecular fossils underlining a self-transmissible
plasmid origin. The loss of plasmid self-transmissibility may lead to plasmid 'domestication' in the
host lineage (or plasmid 'fixation' in the host pangenome). Domesticated plasmids are
characterized by a stable vertical inheritance within the lineage that can be considered as
ancestral states of chromids (42). Examples for the evolution of chromids from essential plasmids
are found in plant-associated bacteria such as *Sinorhizobium meliloti* harboring a chromid,
pSYMB, that encodes essential genes (43). Nonetheless, evolution of domesticated plasmids
following the acquisition of essential genes was so far not considered in *Enterobacteriaceae* (28,
40). Previous studies reported a stable inheritance of plasmids pO157 in *Escherichia* and pSLT
in *Salmonella* (44–46). Although, pSLT is self-transmissible, it was shown that most *Salmonella*
virulence plasmids are rather vertically inherited except for pSENV of *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica*
serovar Enteritidis (47). Plasmids of *S. enteritidis* bear incomplete *tra* regions (48) and virulence
plasmids of serovars Enteritidis and Typhimurium are not mobilizable by other F-like plasmids
even in the presence of an *oriT* region (49). The results of our analysis support the view that
pSENV plasmid homologs were acquired by horizontal transfer subsequent to a segmental
deletion of transfer-related gene (the evolution of serovar specific virulence plasmids reviewed in
(50)). Furthermore, the phylogeny of isolates hosting pO157- and pSENV-like plasmids indicates

that these plasmids were fixed in those lineages following the loss of self-transmissibility (Fig.
4C), hence they are better considered as domesticated plasmids (see also (51)).

The pseudogene repertoire and order in large non-mobilizable plasmids indicate that
segmental deletions within the conjugation machinery play a major role in the initial steps of
transitions in plasmid mobility. Such events may be caused, for example, by a transposon-
mediated segmental deletion, as observed in an experimental evolution study of plasmid pKP33
adaptation to a naïve *E. coli* host under selection for the plasmid-encoded antibiotic resistance
(18). Such a change in the plasmid genomic composition that leads to the loss of self-
transmissibility is likely to trigger a 'domino effect' of sequential non-functionalization events of
other transfer-related genes. Similar dynamics of gene non-functionalization have been
previously suggested for the evolution of pseudogene content in obligatory symbionts (52). The
loss of self-transmissibility may be deleterious for plasmids due to the inevitable the restriction in
the host range. Nonetheless, plasmids encoding a trait that is essential for the host will be
maintained in the population, also if their inheritance is unstable due to selection acting at the
level of host (e.g., (53)). Overtime, the co-adaptation of the plasmid and host can lead to the
evolution of stable plasmid inheritance (18, 54, 55). Notably, the genomes of facultative
pathogens are also characterized by a high frequency of MGEs and pseudogenes that likely play
a role in the evolution of genome miniaturization (13). The effect of selection at multiple levels
during plasmid evolution is thus akin to the evolution of obligatory symbionts and the mechanisms
involved in these processes – transposable element proliferation and gradual gene non-
functionalization – are likely similar.

Materials & Methods

Data
Genomes of isolates comprising plasmids were downloaded from the NCBI RefSeq database
(version 8/2022). Genome assemblies containing replicons labeled other than chromosomes or
plasmids were excluded from the analysis. Only genomes with a single chromosome were
retained. Contigs suspected to be erroneously annotated chromosomes were discarded
according to their size using a threshold of <550 kb. Here we used *Mycoplasma genitalium*
(chromosome size ca. 580 kb) as reference for the minimal chromosome size (56). The curated
data consisted 10,832 genome assemblies from 738 prokaryotic genera (Supplementary Table
S5). For detailed genome analysis, enterobacterial genomes from the NCBI RefSeq database
(KES dataset; version 01/2021) were used (as previously reported (23)). The KES dataset
includes 1,115 chromosomes and 3,098 plasmids from *Escherichia*; 755 chromosomes and 2,693

plasmids from *Klebsiella*; 572 chromosomes and 993 plasmids from *Salmonella* (Supplementary
Table S6).

Construction of gene and pseudogene families

Protein coding genes in the KES genomes set were clustered into gene families previously
described in (23). Briefly, reciprocal best hits (RBHs) of protein sequences between all replicon
pairs were identified using MMseqs2 ((57), v.13.45111, with module easy-rbh applying a threshold
of E-value ≤ 1 × 10^{-10}). RBHs were further compared by global alignment using parasail-python
((58), v. 1.2.4, with the Needleman-Wunsch algorithm). Sequence pairs with ≥30% identical amino
acids were clustered into protein families using a high-performance parallel implementation of the
Markov clustering algorithm ((59), HipMCL with parameter --abc -I 2.0). Pseudogene nucleotide
sequences were extracted from genome assemblies using their genomic coordinates annotated
by the Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline (20). Proteins and pseudogenes of the KES
dataset have been aligned using MMseqs2 ((57), v.13.45111, with module search applying a
threshold of E-value ≤ 1 × 10^{-10}). Afterwards, pseudogenes have been assigned to a gene family,
if the gene family revealed the highest number of significantly aligned proteins to the pseudogene.
The final KES dataset encompassed 34,416 gene families consisting of 17,182,509 protein coding
genes and 658,133 (97%) pseudogenes in 13,375 (38%) gene families. Specific gene families
discussed in detail in the text were validated using sequence searches of TnCentral (27) and
Pfam (26) with the most frequent sequence variant of the gene families. Pseudogenes in one
relaxase/nuclease domain-containing gene family were suspected as erroneously classified as
such, and were excluded from the analysis of ColE1-like plasmids. The pseudogene had a highly
conserved synteny within mobilization related functions such as *mobC*, *mbeB,* and *mbeD*. In
addition, ORFs homologous to *mbeA* proteins were identified at the same genomic location
supporting the classification of that locus as a gene rather than pseudogene.

Inference of dN and dS distances

As a first step, the closest gene sequence to the pseudogene was identified. For that, pseudogene
nucleotide sequences were translated into amino acid sequences using transeq from EMBOSS
((60, 61), v.6.6.0.0, with parameters -frame 6 and -table 11). Translated pseudogenes were
searched against the KES protein sequences using blastp ((62), v. 2.14.0+). The best hit was
used for further comparison. A pairwise alignment between the translated pseudogene and the
best matching amino acid sequence was inferred using clustalo ((63), v.1.2.4, --outfmt=clu).
Codon alignment was calculated using pal2nal ((64), v.14.1, with parameters -output paml and -
codontable 11). The dN and dS distances were calculated using codeml from PAML ((65), v.4.9,

with runmode = -2). Additionally, the maximum truncation size of pseudogenes compared to their

homologous genes was determined by calculating the leading and trailing truncations between

the pseudogene and the best matching homologous gene.

Inference of unitary and non-unitary pseudogenes

Homologous genes of pseudogenes in the KES dataset have been determined using MMseqs2

((57), v.13.45111, with module search applying thresholds of E-value≤ 1×10^{-10} and sequence

identity $\geq$ 30%). Thereby, four scenarios (categories) of the homologous gene locus were

examined in the following hierarchical order: (I) on the same replicon, (II) on the same replicon

type, (III) on a different replicon type, and (IV) unitary pseudogene (see illustration of Fig. 1B). In

detail, in the example of plasmid pseudogenes, this analysis determined homologous protein-

coding sequences from the same plasmid, other plasmids of the same isolate, or the chromosome

of the same isolate. Following this procedure, the locations of closest related homologous coding-

sequences of pseudogenes were identified, which classified pseudogenes. If no homolog was

found in the same bacterial isolate, the pseudogene was classified as unitary. The same

procedure was applied for chromosomal pseudogenes identifying homologous protein-coding

sequences on the same chromosome or plasmids within the same bacterial isolate.

Plasmid typing and clustering of homologous plasmids

Plasmid mobility type was identified using MOB-suite ((15), v.3.0.3). Plasmids were assigned to

plasmid taxonomic units (PTUs) using COPLA supplying taxonomic information of residing hosts

((29), see Supplementary Table S4). Additionally, plasmids were clustered into clusters of

homologous plasmids based on shared gene content. Pairwise shared gene and pseudogene

content of plasmids was calculated with the Jaccard similarity index from the gene and

pseudogene families. The shared gene and pseudogene content was visualized with hierarchical

clustering using pheatmap (v.1.0.12). Plasmid pairs sharing $\geq$ 60% of their genes were filtered to

construct plasmid clusters using the mcl algorithm ((66), v.12-135, parameter --abc -I 2.0).

Phylogenetic analysis

Plasmid and host phylogenies were constructed from complete single copy gene families for the

analyzed set of plasmids or chromosomes. Sequences were aligned using MAFFT ((67), v.7.520,

with parameter --maxiterate 1000 --localpair). Host phylogeny using 133 universal chromosomal

genes was reconstructed using IQ-TREE 2 ((68), v.2.2.2.7) with Le and Cascuel (LG) model

based on amino acid sequences (with parameter -m LG -B 1000, (69)). The host phylogeny was

rooted at midpoint using iTOL ((70), v.6.8). The reconstruction of the phylogenetic trees for

plasmids was based on nucleotide sequences of complete single-copy genes (see

Supplementary Table S7 & S8) applying IQ-TREE 2 ((68), v.2.2.2.7) with a transition model (with

parameter -m TIM -B 1000, (69)). A rooting position for the plasmid trees was inferred by applying

phylogenomic rooting using nucleotide sequences from plasmid cluster gene families ((30),

Supplementary Table S7 & S8). Obtained phylogenetic trees were visualized and annotated using

iTOL ((70), v.6.8) or SplitsTree4 ((71), v.4.17.0).

Statistics

551 All statistics were performed using R (v.4.0.3).

Data accessibility

553 The data are provided in electronic supplementary material.

Author contributions

555 D.M.H. and T.D. conceived the study. D.M.H. designed and performed the data analysis and

556 visualizations. Y.W. prepared and provided complementary data. D.M.H. and T.D. interpreted the

557 results and wrote the manuscript with comments and additions from Y.W.

Competing interests

559 The authors declare no competing interests.

Funding

561 This work was supported by the German Science Foundation (RTG2501 (TransEvo), grant

562 number: 456882089), the Leibniz Science Campus EvoLUNG, the European Research Council

563 (pMolEvol, grant gumber: 101043835), and the China Scholarship Council (CSC scholarship to

564 Y.W.).

Acknowledgements

566 We thank Nils Hülter, Devani Picazo, Fabian Nies, Lisa Hartmann, Johannes Effe, Ishan Bhatt,

567 and Mario Santer for critical comments on the manuscript. This research was supported in part

568 through high-performance computing resources available at the Kiel University Computing

569 Centre.

References

1. Zhao,H., Yang,J.-R., Xu,H. and Zhang,J. (2010) Pseudogenization of the umami taste receptor
gene *Tas1r1* in the giant panda coincided with its dietary switch to bamboo. *Mol. Biol.*
Evol., **27**, 2669–2673.

2. Ohno,S. (1972) An argument for the genetic simplicity of man and other mammals. *J. Hum.*
Evol., **1**, 651–662.

3. Treangen,T.J. and Rocha,E.P.C. (2011) Horizontal transfer, not duplication, drives the
expansion of protein families in prokaryotes. *PLoS Genet.*, **7**, e1001284.

4. Tria,F.D.K. and Martin,W.F. (2021) Gene duplications are at least 50 times less frequent than
gene transfers in prokaryotic genomes. *Genome Biol. Evol.*, **13**, evab224.

5. van Passel,M.W.J., Marri,P.R. and Ochman,H. (2008) The emergence and fate of horizontally
acquired genes in *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, **4**, e1000059.

6. Liu,Y., Harrison,P.M., Kunin,V. and Gerstein,M. (2004) Comprehensive analysis of
pseudogenes in prokaryotes: widespread gene decay and failure of putative horizontally
transferred genes. *Genome Biol.*, **5**, R64.

7. Li,W.-H., Gojobori,T. and Nei,M. (1981) Pseudogenes as a paradigm of neutral evolution.
Nature, **292**, 237–239.

8. Lawrence,J.G., Hendrix,R.W. and Casjens,S. (2001) Where are the pseudogenes in bacterial
genomes? *Trends in Microbiol.*, **9**, 535–540.

9. Holt,K.E., Thomson,N.R., Wain,J., Langridge,G.C., Hasan,R., Bhutta,Z.A., Quail,M.A.,
Norbertczak,H., Walker,D., Simmonds,M., *et al.* (2009) Pseudogene accumulation in the
evolutionary histories of *Salmonella enterica* serovars Paratyphi A and Typhi. *BMC*
Genom., **10**, 36.

10. Kuo,C.-H. and Ochman,H. (2010) The extinction dynamics of bacterial pseudogenes. *PLoS*
Genet., **6**, e1001050.

11. Jin,Q. (2002) Genome sequence of *Shigella flexneri* 2a: insights into pathogenicity through
comparison with genomes of *Escherichia coli* K12 and O157. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **30**,
4432–4441.

12. Moran,N.A. and Plague,G.R. (2004) Genomic changes following host restriction in bacteria.
Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev., **14**, 627–633.

13. Ochman,H. and Davalos,L.M. (2006) The nature and dynamics of bacterial genomes.
Science, **311**, 1730–1733.

14. Rodríguez-Beltrán,J., DelaFuente,J., León-Sampedro,R., MacLean,R.C. and San Millán,Á.
(2021) Beyond horizontal gene transfer: the role of plasmids in bacterial evolution. *Nat.*
Rev. Microbiol., **19**, 347–359.

15. Robertson,J. and Nash,J.H.E. (2018) MOB-suite: software tools for clustering, reconstruction
and typing of plasmids from draft assemblies. *Microb. Genom.*, **4**.

16. Ramsay,J.P. and Firth,N. (2017) Diverse mobilization strategies facilitate transfer of non-
conjugative mobile genetic elements. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.*, **38**, 1–9.

17. Ares-Arroyo,M., Coluzzi,C. and Rocha,E.P.C. (2023) Origins of transfer establish networks of
functional dependencies for plasmid transfer by conjugation. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **51**,
3001–3016.

18. Porse,A., Schønning,K., Munck,C. and Sommer,M.O.A. (2016) Survival and evolution of a
large multidrug resistance plasmid in new clinical bacterial hosts. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **33**,
2860–2873.

19. Coluzzi,C., Garcillán-Barcia,M.P., de la Cruz,F. and Rocha,E.P.C. (2022) Evolution of plasmid
mobility: origin and fate of conjugative and nonconjugative plasmids. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **39**,
msac115.

20. Li,W., O'Neill,K.R., Haft,D.H., DiCuccio,M., Chetvernin,V., Badretdin,A., Coulouris,G.,
Chitsaz,F., Derbyshire,M.K., Durkin,A.S., *et al.* (2021) RefSeq: expanding the Prokaryotic
Genome Annotation Pipeline reach with protein family model curation. *Nucleic Acids Res.*,
49, D1020–D1028.

21. Feng,Y., Chen,Z. and Liu,S.-L. (2011) Gene decay in *Shigella* as an incipient stage of host-
adaptation. *PLoS One*, **6**, e27754.

22. Redondo-Salvo,S., Fernández-López,R., Ruiz,R., Vielva,L., De Toro,M., Rocha,E.P.C.,
Garcillán-Barcia,M.P. and De La Cruz,F. (2020) Pathways for horizontal gene transfer in
bacteria revealed by a global map of their plasmids. *Nat. Commun.*, **11**, 3602.

23. Wang,Y. and Dagan,T. (2023) Interaction between mobile genetic elements and plasmids
drives the evolution of multidrug resistant bacteria. *In Revision*.

24. Belinky,F., Ganguly,I., Poliakov,E., Yurchenko,V. and Rogozin,I.B. (2021) Analysis of stop
codons within prokaryotic protein-coding genes suggests frequent readthrough events.
Int. J. Mol. Sci., **22**, 1876.

25. Feng,Y., Wang,Z., Chien,K.-Y., Chen,H.-L., Liang,Y.-H., Hua,X. and Chiu,C.-H. (2022)
"Pseudo-pseudogenes" in bacterial genomes: proteogenomics reveals a wide but low
protein expression of pseudogenes in *Salmonella enterica*. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **50**, 5158–
5170.

26. Mistry,J., Chuguransky,S., Williams,L., Qureshi,M., Salazar,G.A., Sonnhammer,E.L.L.,
Tosatto,S.C.E., Paladin,L., Raj,S., Richardson,L.J., *et al.* (2021) Pfam: The protein
families database in 2021. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **49**, D412–D419.

27. Ross,K., Varani,A.M., Snesrud,E., Huang,H., Alvarenga,D.O., Zhang,J., Wu,C., McGann,P.
and Chandler,M. (2021) TnCentral: a prokaryotic transposable element database and web
portal for transposon analysis. *Mbio*, **12**, e02060-21.

28. Wein,T., Wang,Y., Barz,M., Stücker,F.T., Hammerschmidt,K. and Dagan,T. (2021) Essential
gene acquisition destabilizes plasmid inheritance. *PLoS Genet.*, **17**, e1009656.

29. Redondo-Salvo,S., Bartomeus-Peñalver,R., Vielva,L., Tagg,K.A., Webb,H.E., Fernández-
López,R. and De La Cruz,F. (2021) COPLA, a taxonomic classifier of plasmids. *BMC
Bioinform.*, **22**, 390.

30. Tria,F.D.K., Landan,G., Picazo,D.R. and Dagan,T. (2023) Phylogenomic testing of root
hypotheses. *Genome Biol. Evol.*, **15**, evad096.

31. Lim,J.Y., Sheng,H., Seo,K.S., Park,Y.H. and Hovde,C.J. (2007) Characterization of an
Escherichia coli O157:H7 plasmid O157 deletion mutant and its survival and persistence
in cattle. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, **73**, 2037–2047.

32. Graur,D., Zheng,Y. and Azevedo,R.B.R. (2015) An evolutionary classification of genomic
function. *Genome Biol. Evol.*, **7**, 642–645.

33. Plague,G.R., Dunbar,H.E., Tran,P.L. and Moran,N.A. (2008) Extensive proliferation of
transposable elements in heritable bacterial symbionts. *J. Bacteriol.*, **190**, 777–779.

34. Gray,Y.H.M. (2000) It takes two transposons to tango:transposable-element-mediated
chromosomal rearrangements. *Trends Genet.*, **16**, 461–468.

35. Belda,E., Moya,A., Bentley,S. and Silva,F.J. (2010) Mobile genetic element proliferation and
gene inactivation impact over the genome structure and metabolic capabilities of *Sodalis*
glossinidius, the secondary endosymbiont of tsetse flies. *BMC Genom.*, **11**, 449.

36. Partridge,S.R., Kwong,S.M., Firth,N. and Jensen,S.O. (2018) Mobile genetic elements
associated with antimicrobial resistance. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.*, **31**, e00088-17.

37. Soler-Camargo,N.C., Silva-Pereira,T.T., Zimpel,C.K., Camacho,M.F., Zelanis,A., Aono,A.H.,
Patané,J.S., dos Santos,A.P. and Guimarães,A.M.S. (2022) The rate and role of
pseudogenes of the *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex. *Microb. Genom.*, **8**.

38. Anand,A., Olson,C.A., Yang,L., Sastry,A.V., Catoiu,E., Choudhary,K.S., Phaneuf,P.V.,
Sandberg,T.E., Xu,S., Hefner,Y., *et al.* (2019) Pseudogene repair driven by selection
pressure applied in experimental evolution. *Nat. Microbiol.*, **4**, 386–389.

39. Varesio,L.M., Willett,J.W., Fiebig,A. and Crosson,S. (2019) A carbonic anhydrase
pseudogene sensitizes select *Brucella* lineages to low CO_2 tension. *J. Bacteriol.*, **201**.

40. Tazzyman,S.J. and Bonhoeffer,S. (2014) Why there are no essential genes on plasmids. *Mol.*
Biol. Evol., **32**, msu293.

41. Wang,Y., Batra,A., Schulenburg,H. and Dagan,T. (2022) Gene sharing among plasmids and
chromosomes reveals barriers for antibiotic resistance gene transfer. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.*
B, **377**, 20200467.

42. Vial,L. and Hommais,F. (2020) Plasmid-chromosome cross-talks. *Environ. Microbiol.*, **22**,
540–556.

43. Galibert,F., Finan,T.M., Long,S.R., Pühler,A., Abola,P., Ampe,F., Barloy-Hubler,F.,
Barnett,M.J., Becker,A., Boistard,P., *et al.* (2001) The composite genome of the legume
symbiont *Sinorhizobium meliloti*. *Science*, **293**, 668–672.

44. Makino,K. (1998) Complete nucleotide sequences of 93-kb and 3.3-kb plasmids of an
enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 derived from Sakai outbreak. *DNA Res.*, **5**,
1–9.

45. Lim,J.Y., Yoon,J. and Hovde,C.J. (2010) A brief overview of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and its
plasmid O157. *J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*, **20**, 5–14.

46. Lobato-Márquez,D., Molina-García,L., Moreno-Córdoba,I., García-del Portillo,F. and Díaz-
Orejas,R. (2016) Stabilization of the virulence plasmid pSLT of *Salmonella* Typhimurium
by three maintenance systems and its evaluation by using a new stability test. *Front. Mol.*
Biosci., **3**.

47. Feng,Y., Liu,J., Li,Y.-G., Cao,F.-L., Johnston,R.N., Zhou,J., Liu,G.-R. and Liu,S.-L. (2012)
Inheritance of the *Salmonella* virulence plasmids: mostly vertical and rarely horizontal.
Infect. Genet. Evol., **12**, 1058–1063.

48. Rotger,R. and Casadesús,J. (1999) The virulence plasmids of *Salmonella*. *Int. Microbiol.*, **2**,
177–184.

49. Ou,J.T., Lin,M.-Y. and Chao,H.-L. (1994) Presence of F-like OriT base-pair sequence on the
virulence plasmids of *Salmonella* serovars Gallinarum, Enteritidis, and Typhimurium, but
absent in those of Choleraesuis and Dublin. *Microb. Pathog.*, **17**, 13–21.

50. Rychlik,I., Gregorova,D. and Hradecka,H. (2006) Distribution and function of plasmids in
Salmonella enterica. *Vet. Microbiol.*, **112**, 1–10.

51. Mebrhatu,M.T., Cenens,W. and Aertsen,A. (2014) An overview of the domestication and
impact of the *Salmonella* mobilome. *Crit. Rev. Microbiol.*, **40**, 63–75.

52. Dagan,T., Blekhman,R. and Graur,D. (2006) The "Domino Theory" of gene death: gradual
and mass gene extinction events in three lineages of obligate symbiotic bacterial
pathogens. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **23**, 310–316.

53. Wein,T., Wang,Y., Hülter,N.F., Hammerschmidt,K. and Dagan,T. (2020) Antibiotics interfere
with the evolution of plasmid stability. *Curr. Biol.*, **30**, 3841-3847.e4.

54. Harrison,E., Guymer,D., Spiers,A.J., Paterson,S. and Brockhurst,M.A. (2015) Parallel
compensatory evolution stabilizes plasmids across the parasitism-mutualism continuum.
Curr. Biol., **25**, 2034–2039.

55. San Millan,A., Escudero,J.A., Gifford,D.R., Mazel,D. and MacLean,R.C. (2016) Multicopy
plasmids potentiate the evolution of antibiotic resistance in bacteria. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*, **1**,
0010.

56. Glass,J.I., Assad-Garcia,N., Alperovich,N., Yooseph,S., Lewis,M.R., Maruf,M.,
Hutchison,C.A., Smith,H.O. and Venter,J.C. (2006) Essential genes of a minimal
bacterium. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, **103**, 425–430.

57. Steinegger,M. and Söding,J. (2017) MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching
for the analysis of massive data sets. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, **35**, 1026–1028.

58. Daily,J. (2016) Parasail: SIMD C library for global, semi-global, and local pairwise sequence
alignments. *BMC Bioinform.*, **17**, 81.

59. Azad,A., Pavlopoulos,G.A., Ouzounis,C.A., Kyrpides,N.C. and Buluç,A. (2018) HipMCL: a
high-performance parallel implementation of the Markov clustering algorithm for large-
scale networks. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **46**, e33–e33.

60. Rice,P., Longden,I. and Bleasby,A. (2000) EMBOSS: the European Molecular Biology Open
Software Suite. *Trends Genet.*, **16**, 276–277.

61. Goujon,M., McWilliam,H., Li,W., Valentin,F., Squizzato,S., Paern,J. and Lopez,R. (2010) A
new bioinformatics analysis tools framework at EMBL-EBI. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **38**, W695–
W699.

62. Camacho,C., Coulouris,G., Avagyan,V., Ma,N., Papadopoulos,J., Bealer,K. and Madden,T.L.
(2009) BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinform.*, **10**, 421.

63. Sievers,F., Wilm,A., Dineen,D., Gibson,T.J., Karplus,K., Li,W., Lopez,R., McWilliam,H.,
Remmert,M., Söding,J., *et al.* (2011) Fast, scalable generation of high-quality protein
multiple sequence alignments using Clustal Omega. *Mol. Syst. Biol.*, **7**, 539.

64. Suyama,M., Torrents,D. and Bork,P. (2006) PAL2NAL: robust conversion of protein sequence
alignments into the corresponding codon alignments. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **34**, W609–
W612.

65. Yang,Z. (2007) PAML 4: phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **24**,
1586–1591.

66. Van Dongen,S. (2008) Graph clustering via a discrete uncoupling process. *SIAM J. Matrix
Anal. Appl.*, **30**, 121–141.

67. Katoh,K. and Standley,D.M. (2013) MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
improvements in performance and usability. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **30**, 772–780.

68. Minh,B.Q., Schmidt,H.A., Chernomor,O., Schrempf,D., Woodhams,M.D., Von Haeseler,A.
and Lanfear,R. (2020) IQ-TREE 2: new models and efficient methods for phylogenetic
inference in the genomic era. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **37**, 1530–1534.

69. Hoang,D.T., Chernomor,O., Von Haeseler,A., Minh,B.Q. and Vinh,L.S. (2018) UFBoot2:
improving the ultrafast bootstrap approximation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, **35**, 518–522.

70. Letunic,I. and Bork,P. (2021) Interactive tree of life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for phylogenetic
tree display and annotation. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **49**, W293–W296.

71. Huson,D.H. and Bryant,D. (2006) Application of phylogenetic networks in evolutionary studies.
Mol. Biol. Evol., **23**, 254–267.