Inferring strain-level mutational drivers of phage-bacteria interaction phenotypes

Adriana Lucia-Sanz[1,^], Shengyun Peng[2,#,^], Chung Yin (Joey) Leung[3,#], Animesh Gupta[4], Justin R. Meyer[5] and Joshua S. Weitz[6,7,8,#,*]

[1] School of Biological Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

[2] Adobe Inc., Palo Alto, California, USA

[3] GSK, Stevenage, Herts, United Kingdom

[4] Department of Physics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

[5] Department of Ecology, Behavior and Evolution, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

[6] Department of Biology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

[7] Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

[8] Institut d'Biologie, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, France

^ Equal contributions

Former address: School of Biological Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

* Corresponding author, E-mail: jsweitz@umd.edu (JSW)

Abstract

The enormous diversity of bacteriophages and their bacterial hosts presents a significant challenge to predict which phages infect a focal set of bacteria. Infection is largely determined by complementary -and largely uncharacterized- genetics of adsorption, injection, and cell take-over. Here we present a machine learning (ML) approach to predict phage-bacteria interactions trained on genome sequences of and phenotypic interactions amongst 51 *Escherichia coli* strains and 45 phage λ strains that coevolved in laboratory conditions for 37 days. Leveraging multiple inference strategies and without *a priori* knowledge of driver mutations, this framework predicts both who infects whom and the quantitative levels of infections across a suite of 2,295 potential interactions. The most effective ML approach inferred interaction phenotypes from independent contributions from phage and bacteria mutations, predicting phage host range with 86% mean classification accuracy while reducing the relative error in the estimated strength of the infection phenotype by 40%. Further, transparent feature selection in the predictive model revealed 18 of 176 phage λ and 6 of 18 *E. coli* mutations that have a significant influence on the outcome of phage-bacteria interactions, corroborating sites previously known to affect phage λ infections, as well as identifying mutations in genes of unknown function not previously shown to influence bacterial resistance. While the genetic variation studied was limited to a focal, coevolved phage-bacteria system, the method's success at recapitulating strain-level infection outcomes provides a path forward towards developing strategies for inferring interactions in non-model systems, including those of therapeutic significance.

Introduction

Next-generation sequencing technology has revealed widespread diversity in microbial and viral communities [(Aylward FO, 2017), (Munson-McGee JH, 2018), (Breitbart, 2018), (Guillermo Dominguez-Huerta, 2022), (Sunagawa S., 2015) , (Nayfach, 2021), (Sunagawa, 2020)]. In parallel, the development of analytical tools to characterize species interaction networks from co-occurrence and/or time series data has led to a better understanding of microbial community structure and function [(Faust K, 2012) (Flannick J, 2006), (Stein RR, 2013), (Berry D, 2014), (Liao C., 2020), (Jiliang Hu J., 2022), (Shaer Tamar E, 2022)]. In principle, it should be possible to infer microbial interaction networks directly from genotypes and the environmental context [(Manrubia S, 2021)]. Such inference is predicated on a simple principle: adsorption is required for a bacteriophage (phage) to infect a focal bacterial strain [(Neurath AR, 1986) (Wang J H. M., 2000) (Chatterjee S, 2012), (Gaborieau B, 2023)]; such adsorption requires expression of specific cell-surface receptors (e.g., protein, lipid, carbohydrate), although in many cases the specific receptor remains unknown or modulated by poorly characterized biosynthetic pathways [(Tetz, 2022)]]. However, even if a phage adsorbs to a bacteria, there are many intracellular resistance mechanisms that could assist or inactivate phage infection altogether [(Zborowsky S., 2019), (Koonin, 2020), (Gao Z., 2023)]. Categorizing effective, extracellular adsorption and intracellular replication remains challenging. Hence, despite significant progress in linking microbial genotype to phenotype, less progress has been made with understanding the genetics of traits that influence microbial species interactions (including virus and host pairs) given the additional complication that the phenotypic output of an association may depend on the joint effects of

two separate genomes [(Bajic D, 2018), (de Jonge PA, 2019) (Buckling A, 2002) (Elena SF, 2003)

(Koskella B, 2014) (Poullain V, 2008) (Kaltz O, 2002) (Beckett SJ, 2013) (Weitz JS, 2013) (Gurney J,

2017)].

The problem of understanding the genetic basis of interactions requires the development

of new computational approaches to construct genotype-to-phenotype maps. Conventional

approaches try to correlate phenotypic differences with genetic variation (e.g., this is true for the

broad scope of work in genome-wide associated studies [(Horton MW, 2014) (D, 2016) (Power

RA, 2017)]). The challenge for inferring interaction-associated phenotypes is that such

interactions arise due to the combination of multiple genotypes (e.g., phage and host genotypes)

leading to new combinatorial challenges. Initial steps towards interaction inference have been

made through mutation-based association approaches that have successfully uncovered

combinations of virus and host mutations that correlate with successful virus-host interactions

[(MacPherson A, 2018) (Jallow M, 2009) (Scanlan PD, 2011), (Shaer Tamar E, 2022), (Borin JM L.

J.-S., 2023)]. Conceptually, the challenge of uncovering interaction phenotypes is similar to

attempts to tackle the problem of studying complex traits where gene-by-gene (G x G)

interactions or gene-by-environment (G x E) interactions shape phenotypes [(Wei WH, 2014),

(An P, 2009), (G, 2015) (Gupta A Z. L., 2022)].

In the case of virus-microbe systems, efforts to predict interaction phenotypes require

leveraging specific system features and may depend on taxonomic scales. For example,

computational approaches are increasingly used to predict the host range of viruses in a broad

taxonomic sense, e.g., leveraging tetranucleotide frequencies and other sequence-specific

information [(Edwards RA, 2016) (Dutilh BE, 2017)]). However, predicting strain-specific

interactions remains a difficult task, particularly because taxonomic markers are known to be a

poor proxy for infection profiles [(Sullivan NJ, 2003), (Kauffman KM, 2022)]. Recent studies have

shown some improvement in resolving strain-specific interaction phenotypes, e.g., by using

CRISPR spacers and metagenomic data to identify recent phage infection[(Simon Roux, 2021),

(Szabo RE., 2022), (George, 2023)] or by co-clustering phage and bacteria mutations, respectively,

amongst strains that tend to interact as a means to identify associated gene or sequence

differences [(Kauffman KM, 2022)].

Here, we link whole genome-wide changes in phage and bacteria with observed changes

in interaction phenotypes using a machine learning inference framework. We do so by leveraging

emergent genotype and phenotype changes in coevolving populations of *Escherichia coli* B strain

REL606 and bacteriophage λ strain cI26 during a 37-day experiment [(Gupta A P. S., 2022)]. The

key idea is to recapitulate infection phenotypes from an interaction network through a

hierarchical regression approach without *a priori* assumptions about driver mutations or the

nature of genetic interactions. In contrast, prior work on microevolutionary changes in infectivity

have focused on changes to genes or proteins with known functions in model organisms [(Meyer

JR D. D., 2012) (Lobo FP, 2009) (Modi SR, 2013), (Gaborieau B, 2023)]. Such approaches are

dependent on the existing annotation of genes or mutations, and thus are limited by both the

quality and quantity of annotations. Our regression framework predicts a substantial portion of

phage-host infection phenotypes, including: i) who infects whom and ii) with what efficiency. In

doing so, we identify prioritized phage and bacterial mutations underlying changes in infection

phenotypes and reveal that additive effects of phage and host mutations can be sufficient to

predict interaction phenotypes. As we explain, this finding suggests a route to generate testable

hypotheses for phage and genome sites underlying interactions that could also become priority

targets for modification in environmental inference and the development of phage therapeutics.

Results

The mutation and cross-infection matrices for phage and bacteria

From a previous study [(Gupta A P. S., 2022)], we analyzed genome sequences of 50 bacterial

host (descended from E. *coli* B strain REL606) and 44 phage (descended from λ strain cI26) strains

isolated at varying time points during a 37-day coevolution experiment. For the observed

genotypes, the mutation profiles of the host and phage revealed many changes in their genomes,

including 18 and 176 unique mutations for the host and phage, respectively (Table S1). The

interactions of all phage-bacterial pairs including the ancestors were measured, yielding a 51 by

45 cross-infection matrix. Interaction strength was estimated by the efficiency that a phage

infected a given host compared to its ability to infect the sensitive ancestor (referred to as the

efficiency of plating or EOP). Additional details of the EOP calculations are described in (Gupta A

P. S., 2022) and Methods section "Experimental setup and data collection". At the beginning of

the experiment, the isogenic host strain was susceptible to all phage strains, and by the end of

the experiment on day 37, most of the host isolates had evolved resistance to all phage strains.

A summary of the mutation profiles and the EOP matrix showing the complexity of the observed

phenotypes is shown in Fig 1. Based on the measurement of 2295 phage-host pairwise

interactions, we found 913 successful (EOP > 0) and 1382 unsuccessful (EOP = 0) phage infections.

The distribution of EOP values was skewed, with 95% of values ranging from 0 to 1.5, and

presented a long tail with a significant variability in the observed phenotypes (S1 Fig). The co-

occurrence of mutations in different genomic contexts (S2 Fig) suggested it might be feasible to

infer host and phage mutations that disproportionately impact the interaction phenotype.

Model for predicting the phage-bacteria interaction network

Initially, we developed a framework for predicting the effect that mutational profiles have on the

host-phage cross-infection network irrespective of the interaction strengths (e.g. EOP>0,

presence of infection; EOP=0, absence of infection; illustrated in Fig 2a). The underlying

framework utilizes a logistic regression approach to predict the presence or absence of infection

phenotype (referred to here as POA) from mutational 'features' (see Materials and Methods

corresponding section). We evaluate different models based on distinct sets of mutations that

support infection predictions. These include models relying solely on a linear combination of

mutations, either from the host or phage mutational profiles (referred to as H and P individual

models), as well as a model that incorporates the additive effects of phage and host mutational

features in a linear combination (linear model). Additionally, we consider the possibility that

combinations of mutations in phage and host act in combination to impact the cross-infection

matrix. Therefore, we incorporate a set of mutational features that account for joint effects

between phage and host mutations (the nonlinear model) and a model that includes both 'first-

order' (additive phage and host mutations) and 'second-order' (nonlinear combination of phage

and host mutations) effects (the mixed model). A comprehensive description of how each feature

is constructed is provided in the Methods section "Feature construction".

By comparing the performance of the logistic regression models built based on the

different sets of features, we find that all three models that contain both phage and bacteria

mutations predict the original POA phenotypes significantly better than a null model. In addition,

the linear model outperforms all other models in the validation step (P < 9.44e-5) with a mean

classification accuracy of ~86% (Fig 2a). This suggests that the linear model in principle contains

the best set of features for predicting the POA phenotype for a given phage-host pair in this

dataset. We further compared predictions of POA, and the mutational features predicted to have

the largest effects on the POA for the linear, nonlinear, and mixed models (Fig 3). The results

show that a linear combination of phage and host mutations can recapitulate the POA matrix

without explicit inclusion of interaction effects. Mutational features identified via this method

with a positive coefficient increase the probability of infection, and the opposite is true for

negative coefficients. Notably, we observe that bacterial mutations are more likely to have a

negative effect due to the evolution of host resistance, whereas phage mutations tend to have a

positive effect, indicating selection for counter-defense traits that expand host range (see (Gupta

A P. S., 2022)). Feature importance analysis (detailed in the Methods section) reveals 5 host

mutations and 32 phage mutations that have a positive effect on predicting phage-host

interaction network, compared with 7 host mutations and 15 phage mutations that have a

negative effect (Fig 5a, S2 Table).

Model for predicting the efficiency of infection

We extended the prediction framework described in the prior section to identify phage and host

mutations that have large impacts on the efficiency of phage infection (referred to as the EFF

model) in the existing cross-infection network (see Methods for a detailed explanation). We used

log-transformed EOP values of individual infection pairs (Shapiro-Wilk test P = 3.283e-8, S3 Fig)

as a proxy of EFF phenotypes, while keeping the cross-interaction network fixed (Fig 4a). We

performed a linear regression model to quantify the impact that different sets of mutation

features have on EFF phenotypes. Model performances were compared based on the validation

mean absolute error (MAE). As in the analysis of EOP, including both phage and host mutation

features led to the highest performing model predictions. The linear regression model with the

additive feature set gives the lowest validation MAE (P < 3.95e-14) with ~40% reduction of the

mean error compared to the null model (Fig 2b). Next, we built linear models based on all three

phage and host combinations of mutational features to predict EFF phenotypes to identify

corresponding mutational features that have the largest impact in the predictions (Fig 4). The EFF

phenotypes are best predicted by a linear combination of phage and host mutation profiles.

Mutational features predicted by this method impact the EOP profile of the phage-host

interaction network (principally affecting positively or negatively the efficiency of infection).

Feature importance analysis identified 8 host mutations and 25 phage mutations that promote

the efficiency of phage infection, compared with 6 host mutations and 28 phage mutations that

reduce the efficiency of phage infection (Fig 5b, S3 Table).

Molecular mechanism behind driver mutational features

Several putatively important mutations are revealed by the feature analysis using final predictive models of POA (Fig 5a, S2 Table) and EFF (Fig 5b, S3 Table) phenotypes. We found 3 phage mutations and 1 bacterial mutation that show a significant positive effect for the POA model. For phage, these mutations include 2 nonsynonymous mutations in genes *S* and *J* and a synonymous mutation in gene *J* and for the bacteria we identified a nonsynonymous mutation in the *ccmA* gene. We also found 3 mutations in the host and 1 in the phage that have a significant negative effect in the POA model. For the bacteria, these include a nonsynonymous mutation in *ompF* and two deletions Δ777bp in *insB* and Δ141bp in *malT*; whereas for phage we identified a nonsynonymous mutation in *J* (Fig 5a).

For the EFF model, 16 mutations are predicted to have a significant effect (7 positive and 9 negative) and the majority are in phage. Of the 7 positive predicted features, only 1 is bacterial, a nonsynonymous mutation in *uup* gene. For phage, we identify 2 insertions, 1 deletion, and 1 synonymous mutation in *J* gene that should increase infectivity, another synonymous mutation in *bor* gene and a nonsynonymous mutation in the *lom* gene that increase the efficiency of infection. Whereas synonymous mutations are not expected to influence phage's ability to infect, and insertions and deletions in the *J* coding region are anticipated to have detrimental effects overall, we identified these mutations as influential to increase EFF prediction accuracy, corroborating prior work that demonstrated the impact of these mutations arising through recombination on phage fitness [(Borin JM A. S., 2021)]. Of the 9 negative predicted features, 1 is in the bacteria and 8 are in phage. The only bacterial mutation that negatively affects the EFF

was already identified by the POA model: the Δ777bp deletion in *insB*. For the phage we identify

2 different intergenic mutations with significant negative effects downstream of *lambdap79* gene;

3 nonsynonymous, 1 synonymous (that was positive for POA and also reported in [(Borin JM A.

S., 2021)]) and Δ1bp deletion mutations in *J* gene and 1 intergenic mutation between *Rz* and *bor*

genes (Fig 5b).

Our inference framework was able to recapitulate known biology without *a priori*

knowledge of driver mutations. We find mutations in the bacterial *malT* gene, a trans positive

regulator of LamB [(Debarbouille M, 1978), (Blanche S, 2013), (Maynard ND, 2010), (Banzhaf,

2020)], and several mutations located in the phage *J* gene region that were important for both

POA and EFF phenotype predictions. The *J* gene encodes the tail fiber of phage λ which is critical

to the process of injecting phage DNA into the host via LamB [(Wang J H. M., 2000), (Werts C,

1994), (Wang J M. V., 1998) (Maddamsetti R, 2018)]. Therefore, mutations in both *malT* and *J*

gene region are expected to impact the phage-host interaction network and the quantitative

efficiency of infection – consistent with our model predicting the mutations to be important for

both POA and EFF. A nonsynonymous mutation in the outer membrane porin OmpF, is the most

important feature for predicting a decrease in POA, but was not found to be important for

predicting EFF. This mutation is shared by 10 host strains, 2 of which were sampled from day 28

and 8 were from day 37. These 10 host strains were super-resistant, that is, they were resistant

to the ancestral phage λ strain, and all the phage isolates from the coevolution experiment.

Previous studies on this bacterial population showed that phage λ evolves to use OmpF as a

second receptor after *E. coli* evolves to down-regulate LamB [(Meyer JR D. D., 2012)]. Therefore,

this OmpF mutation is expected to confer resistance to these evolved phage λ strains and so

affects the POA (host-range), but not the EFF (efficiency of infection). Similar OmpF mutations

have been described to provide resistance to a related phage, phi21, after it similarly evolved to

use OmpF [(Borin JM L. J.-S., 2023)]. Each model also identified mutations in *manY* which is an

inner membrane transporter that enables phage λ to inject its DNA into the cytoplasm. Mutations

in this protein or others in the ManXYZ complex are known to confer resistance to λ [(Erni B,

1987), (Burmeister AR, 2021), (Borin JM L. J., 2023)] and all of them impacted negatively both

POA and EFF phenotypes. Most interestingly, both models were able to uncover the importance

of Δ777bp deletion in *insB* by an IS element from *E. coli* which affects genes not previously

identified to interact with phage λ [(Maynard ND, 2010), (Blanche S, 2013)], but was recently

identified to confer resistance through epistasis with other resistance mutation in *malT* through

an unknown mechanism [(Gupta A P. S., 2022)]. This illustrates the capability of our machine

learning approach to identify candidate, pivotal genes involved in phage-host interactions.

Discussion

In this study, we developed a machine learning framework leveraging hierarchical logistic

regression to predict the network and efficiency of phage-bacteria interactions by linking

infection phenotypes with genetic mutation profiles of both phage and bacterial host. The basis

for our inference was an assumption that mutations can contribute directly or via gene-gene

interactions to changes in the infection phenotype. Our comparative analysis revealed that a

model that incorporates additive mutational effects of phage and host separately had the highest

predictive value in inferring phenotype from genotype. In doing so, the framework identified

gene regions already recognized in mediating the efficiency of infection for bacteriophage λ and

E. coli [(Meyer JR D. D., 2012) (Blanche S, 2013), (Burmeister AR, 2021), (Gupta A Z. L., 2022)]

and predicted mutations that conferred a resistant phenotype in bacteria through epistasis with

other mutations (Gupta et al., 2022). The model also identified features that were located in

phage gene *J* region, including a number of synonymous mutations as well as insertions and

deletions that in principle should be detrimental, but have been shown to modulate host-range

expansion and counter-defense through recombination [(Borin JM A. S., 2021)]. Hence, the

framework has the potential to identify novel genes and mutations that modulate both

qualitative and quantitative features of virus-microbe interactions while being cognizant of the

potential for the framework to erroneously also identify hitchhiking mutations as driver

mutations when they are likely proxies for adjacent driver mutants linked via recombination.

Based on the feature importance analysis, we identified one mutation located in the

phage *S* gene region that is found to be uniquely important for predicting the presence (or

absence) of infection. This gene encodes the holin which is a small inner membrane protein

required for phage-induced host lysis [(Chang CY, 1995)]. Notably, the phage-host interaction

network observed in our experiment is based on the quantitative plaque assay, in which clearings

(plaques) would appear where bacterial cells were infected and lysed by the phage [(Anderson

B, 2011), (Sambrook J, 2006)]. Thus, we interpret the feature analysis to imply that a mutation in

the S gene has a direct impact on the lysis of the host cells, which would then have an impact on

the final observed phenotype. Similar mutations were uncovered via experimental evolution to

counteract a gene deletion in the host that helps facilitate phage DNA replication [(Gupta A S.

A., 2020)]. This mutation may extend the infection process and allow the phage more time to

initiate DNA replication in the debilitated host, increasing the chance of a successful infection.

We hypothesize that this mutation may have a similar function to counteract host mutations that

interfere with λ's lytic life cycle. Another mutation identified by our method in the phage *lom*

gene region was exclusively important in positively modulating infection efficiency but not the

interaction itself; we note that this site was previously reported to increase phage resistance

through an unknown mechanism [(Borin JM A. S., 2021)].

The model selection procedure identified an additive model as the best predictor of

interaction phenotype from phage and bacterial genotype. In the additive model, individual

phage and bacterial mutations act independently, rather than synergistically (whether positively

or negatively), to determine infection outcome. Hence complex interaction networks may be

(partially) predictable based on direct effects rather than relying on direct inference of complex

interactive effects that are more challenging to measure [(Shaer Tamar E, 2022)]. Nonetheless,

it is important to note that this result may reflect the nature of our training and test sets, and

might be limited by sampling, and does not exclude the possibility that higher order gene-gene

interactions affect infection phenotypes. The number of phage-host mutation pairs scales as the

product of the number of phage and host mutations in higher order models (nonlinear and mixed

models), but most of these combinations were not observed in our strains. In essence, fitting

higher order models leads to underdetermined systems even with the introduction of

regularization terms meant to limit the number of weak contributions from mutations – whether

direct or in combination. Future work would have to significantly scale-up genotyped

combinations of overlapping mutations in different contexts to robustly infer phage-bacteria

interaction mutational pairs.

Our inference framework was able to detect the importance of previously identified

adaptive mutations that modify phage-host interactions. Although false positives and false

negatives are possible, we note that evolutionary effects including genetic hitchhiking and

recombination may move adaptive mutations onto different backgrounds, improving detection

of driver mutations of infection. We did not expect the identification of adaptive mutations to be

comprehensive. Instead, by linking genotype to phenotypic changes as measured by a subset of

phage and host isolates that arose via coevolution, we can identify mutations of potential

relevance to infection (and fitness) in an ecologically relevant context even if significant regimes

of mutational space are left unexplored.

In summary, we have developed a framework for predicting genotypic drivers of both the

qualitative and quantitative nature of host-pathogen interactions. In doing so, we recapitulated

the finding of mutations known to influence infection outcome as well as identified novel sites.

Moving forward, this framework could help prioritize research on identifying novel drivers of

infection, focusing efforts on mutations with highest absolute values and those most likely to

alter the phenotype (primarily nonsynonymous mutations). Although we applied this framework

in the context of experimental phage-bacteria coevolution and with relatively low genetic

diversity, this data-driven approach does not require *a priori* knowledge of driver genes and

mutations and could be applied to other, even poorly characterized, phage-bacteria systems. As

such, we expect this approach will be relevant in improving understanding of interactions in

natural systems as well as for phages that target bacterial pathogens.

Materials and Methods

Experimental setup and data collection

298 We analyzed data from Gupta et al., 2022 where *E. coli* B strain REL606 and phage λ strain cI26

299 were cocultured for a 37-day period. Samples were taken on checkpoint days for pairwise

300 quantitative plaque assays as described in (Gupta A P. S., 2022). The EOP value measures the

301 efficiency of a phage infecting a derived host strain relative to that for infecting the ancestral

302 strain. The EOP value for a phage, j, infecting a host, i, is computed as

303
$$e_{ij} = \frac{q_{(i,j)}}{q_{(anc,j)}} \times d^{s_{(i,j)} - s_{(anc,j)}}, \quad (1)$$

where $q_{(i,j)}$ is the number of plaques for phage j against host i, $q_{(anc,j)}$ is the number of plaques

for phage j against the ancestral host strain, $s_{(i,j)}$ is the number of dilutions performed to

observe distinguishable and countable clear plaques for phage j against host i, $s_{(anc,j)}$ is the

number of dilutions performed to observe distinguishable and countable clear plaques for phage

j against the ancestral host strain and d is the dilution ratio which is 5 in our experiment. A

positive EOP value from the cross-infection plaque assay indicates a successful infection event

for a given phage-host pair. In contrast, a zero EOP value indicates the phage has no capacity to

infect. A larger EOP value from the cross-infection plaque assay indicates that the phage can

infect a given host more efficiently than the ancestral host strain.

For each phage and host samples taken from each checkpoint, the DNA extraction, library

preparation and sequencing experiment was performed as described in (Gupta A P. S., 2022).

Mutation profiles based on the genome sequencing data were constructed using *breseq* as

described in (Gupta A P. S., 2022). In addition to the mutations revealed by *breseq* results, for

both host and phage we created an artificial mutation as the indicator for the ancestral strain to

add the ancestral strain into the mutation profile table. For this artificial mutation, only the

ancestral strain is indicated to have this mutation. All other strains were shown to not have this

mutation in the mutation profile table.

Feature construction

For a total number of U host samples and V phage samples, we denote the EOP value for the i-th

host against j-th phage as e_{ij} where $i \in [1, U]$ and $j \in [1, V]$. Let N be the total number of

unique mutations observed for the host and M be the total number of unique mutations

observed for the phage, the host mutation profile H is a matrix of dimension U by N, and the

phage mutation profile P is a matrix of dimension V by M. Let h_{il} be an element from H, then

$h_{il} = 1$ corresponds to the presence of the l-th mutation in the i-th host whereas $h_{il} = 0$

corresponds to the absence of the l-th mutation in the ith host. Similarly, let p_{jk} be an element

from P, then $p_{jk} = 1$ corresponds to the presence of the k-th mutation in j-th phage whereas

$p_{jk} = 0$ corresponds to the absence of the k-th mutation in the j-th phage.

Five sets of features were constructed based on the mutation profiles of the host and

phage. The H-only model is constructed based on a linear combination of 'host only' mutation

profiles. The H-only model, denoted as $\phi_{ij}^{(1)}$, can be represented as:

335
$$\phi_{ij}^{(1)} = \gamma_1 + \sum_{l=1}^{N} \alpha_l h_{il} , \qquad (2)$$

336   where γ_1 represents a scalar of the bias term and α_l is the coefficient for the l-th host mutation.

337   γ_1 and α_l will be learned from the model. The H-only model can also be represented in matrix

338   form as:

339
$$\Phi^{(1)} = \Gamma_1 + H \cdot R_\alpha, \qquad (3)$$

340   where Γ_1 is a U by V matrix by repeating γ_1, i.e. $\Gamma_1 = [\gamma_1]_{U \times V}$, R_α is a N by V matrix by stacking

341   the same coefficient vector α horizontally, i.e. $[\alpha|\alpha|\cdots|\alpha|\alpha]_{N \times V}$.

342   The P-only model is constructed based on a linear combination of 'phage only'

343   mutational profiles. The P-only model, denoted as $\phi_{ij}^{(2)}$, can be represented as:

344
$$\phi_{ij}^{(2)} = \gamma_2 + \sum_{k=1}^{M} \tilde{\alpha}_k p_{jk}, \qquad (4)$$

345   where γ_2 represents a scalar of the bias term and $\tilde{\alpha}_k$ is the coefficient for the k-th phage

346   mutation. γ_2 and $\tilde{\alpha}_k$ will be learned from the model. This model can also be represented in

347   matrix form as:

348
$$\Phi^{(2)} = \Gamma_2 + [P \cdot R_{\tilde{\alpha}}]^T , \qquad (5)$$

where Γ_2 is a U by V matrix by repeating γ_2 and $R_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ is a M by U matrix by stacking the same

coefficient vector $\tilde{\alpha}$ horizontally, i.e. $[\tilde{\alpha}|\tilde{\alpha}|\cdots|\tilde{\alpha}|\tilde{\alpha}]_{M \times U}$.

The linear model, denoted as $\phi_{ij}^{(3)}$, utilizes a linear combination of phage and host

mutational features and can be represented as:

$$\phi_{ij}^{(3)} = \gamma_3 + \sum_{l=1}^{N} \alpha_l h_{il} + \sum_{k=1}^{M} \tilde{\alpha}_k p_{jk}, \qquad (6)$$

where γ_3 represents a scalar of the bias term, α_l is the coefficient for the l-th host mutation and

$\tilde{\alpha}_k$ is the coefficient for the k-th phage mutation. γ_3, α_l and $\tilde{\alpha}_k$ will be learned from the model.

The linear model can also be represented in matrix form as:

$$\Phi^{(3)} = \Gamma_3 + H \cdot R_\alpha + [P \cdot R_{\tilde{\alpha}}]^T , \qquad (7)$$

where Γ_3 is a U by V matrix by repeating γ_3, i.e. $\Gamma_3 = [\gamma_3]_{U \times V}$, R_α is a N by V matrix by stacking

the same coefficient vector α horizontally, i.e. $[\alpha|\alpha| \cdots |\alpha|\alpha]_{N \times V}$ and $R_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ is a M by U matrix by

stacking the same coefficient vector $\tilde{\alpha}$ horizontally, i.e. $[\tilde{\alpha}|\tilde{\alpha}| \cdots |\tilde{\alpha}|\tilde{\alpha}]_{M \times U}$. The assumption for

the linear model is that the impact of mutations from both the phage and host have additive

effects on the observed outcome.

The nonlinear model, denoted as $\phi_{ij}^{(4)}$, utilizes nonlinear combination of phage and host

mutational features as the input and can be represented as:

$$\phi_{ij}^{(4)} = \gamma_4 + \sum_{l=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \beta_{lk} h_{il} p_{jk} , \qquad (8)$$

where γ_4 represents a scalar of the bias term, β_{lk} denotes the coefficient for the l-th host

mutation and k-th phage mutation in the corresponding i-th host and j-th phage pair. γ_4 and β_{lk}

will be learned from the model. This nonlinear model can also be represented in the matrix form

as:

$$\Phi^{(4)} = \Gamma_4 + H \cdot B \cdot P^T , \qquad (9)$$

where Γ_4 is a U by V matrix by repeating γ_4, i.e. $\Gamma_4 = [\gamma_4]_{U \times V}$, B is the N by M coefficient matrix.

The assumption for the nonlinear model is that the impact of the genetic mutations on the

observed outcome comes from the additive effects of co-occurring phage-host mutation pairs.

In other words, $h_{il}p_{jk} = 1$ only when both the host i has mutation l and phage j has mutation

k.

Based on the formulation of the linear and nonlinear models, it is natural to combine both

effects to get a more sophisticated input feature, by adding up both effects. The mixed model,

denoted as $\phi_{ij}^{(5)}$, utilizes a mixed combination of linear and nonlinear effects of host and phage

mutation features and can be represented as:

380
$$\phi_{ij}^{(5)} = \gamma_5 + \sum_{l=1}^{N} \alpha_l h_{il} + \sum_{k=1}^{M} \tilde{\alpha}_k p_{jk} + \sum_{l=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \beta_{lk} h_{il} p_{jk} \ . \qquad (10)$$

381 The matrix form of the mixed model is:

382
$$\Phi^{(5)} = \Gamma_5 + H \cdot R_\alpha + [P \cdot R_{\tilde{\alpha}}]^T + H \cdot B \cdot P^T \ , \qquad (11)$$

where Γ_5 is a U by V matrix by repeating γ_5, i.e. $\Gamma_5 = [\gamma_5]_{U \times V}$.

Framework design

We designed a framework comprised of two types of predictions. First, we designed a framework

that predicts the phage-host cross interaction network (i.e., the phage host range). This model

tries to find the set of features that can best distinguish between successful (EOP > 0) and

unsuccessful (EOP = 0) infections using classification models. Second, we built a framework to

predict the strength of the interaction of the subset of phage-ho pairs where the host is

susceptible to the phage (EOP > 0). This model of our framework is designed to evaluate the

potential impact of the genotype on this observed phenotype by modeling the efficiency of the

phage in infecting a host.

Model for predicting phage host cross-infection network (POA)

In order to determine the presence or absence of a successful infection event for a phage-host

pair, we binarized the EOP values e_{ij} into 0 and 1, i.e.

$$d_{ij} = 1_{\{e_{ij}>0\}}, \qquad (12)$$

where $d_{ij} = 0$ indicates a failure of the infection and $d_{ij} = 1$ indicates success. Here we used

logistic regression to model the relationship between mutation profiles and the existence of

successful infection in phage-host pairs, that is:

$$\phi_{ij}^{(\cdot)} = ln\left(\frac{d_{ij}}{1-d_{ij}}\right). \qquad (13)$$

Each of the five sets of features, namely H-only, P-only, linear, nonlinear and mixed, were used

as the input features for the models $\phi_{ij}^{(1)}$, $\phi_{ij}^{(2)}$, $\phi_{ij}^{(3)}$, $\phi_{ij}^{(4)}$ and $\phi_{ij}^{(5)}$ respectively. In practice, we

used LASSO for feature selection and regularization. The penalty term parameter for LASSO was

determined by using 10-fold cross-validation on the training data. The prediction classification

error, $\frac{FalsePositives+FasleNegatives}{TestSamples}$, was used to assess the performance for this model. The mean

classification error was calculated by taking the mean of classification error from 200 runs.

Model for predicting infection efficiency (EFF)

411   We applied a log transformation on the positive EOP values to normalize the distribution. For a

412   given phage-host pair where a successful infection event is present, that is $e_{ij} > 0$, we denote

413   the natural log transformed EOP value as:

414
$$e'_{ij} = ln\left(e_{ij}\right). \quad (14)$$

415   Shapiro-Wilk test was performed to check the normality of the distribution of e'_{ij}.

416   Linear regression was used to model the relationship between mutation profiles and the

417   intensity of successful infections in phage-host pairs, that is:

418
$$\phi^{(\cdot)}_{ij} = e'_{ij}. \quad (15)$$

Each of the five sets of features, namely H-only, P-only, linear, nonlinear and mixed, were used

as the input features for the models $\phi^{(1)}_{ij}$, $\phi^{(2)}_{ij}$, $\phi^{(3)}_{ij}$, $\phi^{(4)}_{ij}$ and $\phi^{(5)}_{ij}$ respectively. For the linear

model, we also used LASSO for feature selection and regularization. The penalty term parameter

for LASSO was determined by using 10-fold cross-validation on the training data. Finally, the MAE

was used to evaluate the performance of the model.

Train-validation split and feature evaluation

To assess the performance of different features for the logistic regression model, we performed

200 bootstrap runs to predict the existence of phage infection. Specifically, in each run the

training set was generated by randomly select $U \times V$ samples from the entire dataset with

replacement. The d_{ij} values that were not selected as training samples form the validation set.

As a control, for each run, a null model was built to predict the outcomes by randomly sample

d_{ij} values from a Bernoulli distribution $Bern(\hat{p})$ where $\hat{p}$ is the maximum likelihood estimator

(MLE) of the proportion of successful infection from the training set of that run. After the 200

runs, the training and validation prediction error were compared between pairs of the models

including the null model and models based on phage and host mutations only and linear,

nonlinear, and mixed combinations of phage and host mutational features.

Similarly, we also performed 200 bootstrap runs for the linear model to predict the

infection efficiency. Specifically, in each run the training set was generated by randomly sample

e'_{ij} with replacement. The size of e'_{ij} sampled as the training set in each run matches the total

number of the e'_{ij}. The e'_{ij} that were not selected in the training set forms the validation set. As

a control, for each run, a null model was built by always predicting the efficiency of infection as

the mean e'_{ij} of the training set for that run. After the 200 runs, the training and validation MAEs

were compared between pairs of the models including the null model and every feature model

set.

Final predictions and feature important analysis

After comparing the training and validation performance of models based on the different

mutational sets with 200 bootstrap runs, a final model, that integrates predictions of POA and

EFF was constructed. The penalty term parameter for each of the prediction frameworks was

chosen as the mean of the best penalty term parameter from each of the 200 bootstrap runs.

After model fitting, the predicted outcome $\tilde{d}_{ij}$ for step 1 and $\tilde{e}'_{ij}$ for step 2．For each step of

the final models, the importance of feature was measured by the absolute value of coefficients

learned from each step.

　　　23

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: JSW, CYL & JRM

Methodology: ALS, SP, CYL & JSW

Investigation: ALS, SP, CYL, AG

Visualization: ALS, SP

Writing – original draft: ALS, SP & JSW

Writing – review & editing: ALS, SP, CYL, AG, JRM, JSW

Software Availability

https://github.com/aluciasanz/genotype_to_phenotype_inference model.

Acknowledgments

JSW - Army Research Office (W911NF1910384), NIH (R01-AI146592-01), Simons Foundation

(930283), Chaires Blaise Pascal of the Île-de-France region.

JRM - Howard Hughes Medical Institute Emerging Pathogens Initiative grant 7012574.

References

An P, M. O. (2009). The challenge of detecting epistasis (G x G interactions): Genetic Analysis Workshop 16. *Genet Epidemiol. 2009;*, 33 Suppl 1:S58-67. doi: 10.1002/gepi.20474.

Anderson B, R. M. (2011). Enumeration of bacteriophage particles: Comparative analysis of the traditional plaque assay and real-time QPCR- and nanosight-based assays. *Bacteriophage*, 1(2):86-93.

Aylward FO, B. D.-C. (2017). Diel cycling and long-term persistence of viruses in the ocean's euphotic zone. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 114(43):11446-51. Epub 2017/10/27. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1714821114. P.

Bajic D, V. J. (2018). On the deformability of an empirical fitness landscape by microbial evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 115(44): 11286-11291. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1808485115.

Banzhaf, W. C. (2020). Subtle Environmental Differences have Cascading Effects on the Ecology and Evolution of a Model Microbial Community. In W. C. Banzhaf, *Evolution in Action: Past, Present and Future: A Festschrift in Honor of Erik D. Goodman* (pp. 273 – 288). Springer International Publishing.

Beckett SJ, W. H. (2013). . Coevolutionary diversification creates nested-modular structure in phage-bacteria interaction networks. *Interface Focus*, 3(6):20130033. doi: 10.1098/rsfs.2013.0033.

Berry D, W. S. (2014). Deciphering microbial interactions and detecting keystone species with co-occurrence networks. *Front Microbiol*, ;5:219. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2014.00219.

Blanche S, W. S. (2013). The Protein Interaction Network of Bacteriophage lambda with its Host Escherichia coli. *J Virol*, 87(23), https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.02495-13.

Borin JM, A. S. (2021). Coevolutionary phage training leads to greater bacterial suppression and delays the evolution of phage resistance. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*, 118 (23): e2104592118.

Borin JM, L. J. (2023). Comparison of bacterial suppression by phage cocktails, dual-receptor generalists, and coevolutionarily trained phages. *Evolutionary Applications*, 16, 152–162.

Borin JM, L. J.-S. (2023). Rapid bacteria-phage coevolution drives the emergence of multi-scale networks. *Science*, 382,674-678.

Breitbart, M. B. (2018). Phage puppet masters of the marine microbial realm. *Nature Microbiology 3*, 754–766.

Buckling A, R. P. (2002). Antagonistic coevolution between a bacterium and a bacteriophage. *Proc Biol Sci*, 269(1494):931-6. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2001.1945.

Burmeister AR, S. R. (2021). Sustained coevolution of phage lambda and Escherichia coli involves inner-as well as outer-membrane defences and counter-defences. *Microbiology*, 167:001063. doi: 10.1099/mic.0.001063.

Chang CY, N. K. (1995). S gene expression and the timing of lysis by bacteriophage lambda. . *J Bacteriol*, 177(11):3283-94.

Chatterjee S, R. E. (2012). Interaction of bacteriophage lambda with its E. coli receptor, LamB.
Viruses, 4(11):3162-78. Epub 2012/12/04. doi: 10.3390/v4113162.

D, F. (2016). Bacterial genomics: Microbial GWAS coming of age. *Nat Microbiol*, 1:16059. doi:
10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.59.

de Jonge PA, N. F. (2019). Molecular and Evolutionary Determinants of Bacteriophage Host
Range. *Trends Microbiol*, 27(1):51-63 doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2018.08.006.

Debarbouille M, S. H. (1978). Dominant constitutive mutations in malT, the positive regulator
gene of the maltose regulon in Escherichia coli. *J Mol Biol*, 124: 359–371.

Dutilh BE, R. A. (2017). Virus Discovery by Metagenomics: The (Im)possibilities. *Front Microbiol*,
8:1710. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2017.01710.

Edwards RA, M. K. (2016). Computational approaches to predict bacteriophage-host
relationships. *FEMS Microbiol Rev*, ;40(2):258-72. doi: 10.1093/femsre/fuv048.

Elena SF, L. R. (2003). Evolution experiments with microorganisms: the dynamics and genetic
bases of adaptation . *Nat Rev Genet*, 4(6):457-69. doi: 10.1038/nrg1088.

Erni B, Z. B. (1987). he mannose permease of Escherichia coli consists of three different
proteins. Amino acid sequence and function in sugar transport, sugar phosphorylation,
and penetration of phage lambda DNA. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 262 (11): 5238 -
5247.

Faust K, R. J. (2012). Microbial interactions: from networks to models. *Nat Rev Microbiol.*,
10(8):538-50. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro2832. PubMed PMID: 22796884.

Flannick J, N. A. (2006). Graemlin: general and robust alignment of multiple large interaction
networks. *Genome Res*, 16(9):1169-81. Epub 2006/08/11. doi: 10.1101/gr.5235706.

G, G. (2015). *A primer of human genetics.* Sinauer Associates is an imprint of Oxford Univesity
Press.

Gaborieau B, V. H. (2023). Predicting phage-bacteria interactions at the strain level from
genomes. *bioRxiv*, https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.22.567924 .

Gao Z., a. F. (2023). Bacteriophage strategies for overcoming host antiviral immunity . *Front.*
Microbiol. 14, 1211793.

George, N. H. (2023). CRISPR-resolved virus-host interactions in a municipal landfill include non-
specific viruses, hyper-targeted viral populations, and interviral conflicts. *Sci Rep* , 13,
5611. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-32078-6.

Guillermo Dominguez-Huerta, A. A. (2022). Diversity and ecological footprint of Global Ocean
RNA viruses. *Science 376,*, 1202-1208.

Gupta A, P. S. (2022). Leapfrog dynamics in phage-bacteria coevolution revealed by joint
analysis of cross-infection phenotypes and whole genome sequencing. *Ecol Lett*,
25(4):876-888. doi: 10.1111/ele.1.

Gupta A, S. A. (2020). Bacteriophage lambda overcomes a perturbation in its host–viral genetic
network through mutualism and evolution of life history traits. *Evolution*, 74 (4): 764–
774.

Gupta A, Z. L. (2022). Host-parasite coevolution promotes innovation through deformations in
fitness landscapes. *eLife*, 11:e76162.

Gurney J, A. L.-B. (2017). Network structure and local adaptation in co-evolving bacteria-phage
interactions. *Mol Ecol*, 26(7):1764-77. doi: 10.1111/mec.14008.
Horton MW, B. N. (2014). Genome-wide association study of Arabidopsis thaliana leaf microbial
community. *Nat Commun*, 5:5320. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6320.
Jallow M, T. Y. (2009). Genome-wide and fine-resolution association analysis of malaria in West
Africa. *Nat Genet*, 41(6):657-65. doi: 10.1038/ng.388.
Jiliang Hu J., A. D. (2022). Emergent phases of ecological diversity and dynamics mapped in
microcosms. *Science 378*, 85-89.
Kaltz O, S. J. (2002). Within-and among-population variation in infectivity, latency and spore
production in a host–pathogen system. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 15(5):850-60.
Kauffman KM, C. W. (2022). Resolving the structure of phage–bacteria interactions in the
context of natural diversity. *Nat Commun*, 13, 372. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-
27583-z.
Koonin, E. M. (2020). Evolutionary entanglement of mobile genetic elements and host defence
systems: guns for hire. *Nat Rev Genet 21*, 119–131.
Koskella B, B. M. (2014). Bacteria-phage coevolution as a driver of ecological and evolutionary
processes in microbial communities. *FEMS Microbiol Rev*, 38(5):916-31. doi:
10.1111/1574-6976.12072.
Liao C., W. T. (2020). Modeling microbial cross-feeding at intermediate scale portrays
community dynamics and species coexistence. *PLOS Computational Biology 16(8)*,
e1008135.
Lobo FP, M. B. (2009). Virus-host coevolution: common patterns of nucleotide motif usage in
Flaviviridae and their hosts. *PLoS One*, 4(7):e6282. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0006282.
MacPherson A, O. S. (2018). Keeping Pace with the Red Queen: Identifying the Genetic Basis of
Susceptibility to Infectious Disease. *Genetics*, 208(2):779-89. doi:
10.1534/genetics.117.300481.
Maddamsetti R, J. D. (2018). Gain-of-function experiments with bacteriophage lambda uncover
residues under diversifying selection in nature. *Evolution*, 72: 2234-2243.
Manrubia S, C. J.-U.-M. (2021). From genotypes to organisms: state-of-the-art and perspectives
of a cornerstone in evolutionary dynamics. *Phys Life Rev*, 38: 55-106. doi:
10.1016/j.plrev.2021.03.004.
Maynard ND, B. E. (2010). A Forward-Genetic Screen and Dynamic Analysis of Lambda Phage
Host-Dependencies Reveals an Extensive Interaction Network and a New Anti-Viral
Strategy. *PLOS Genetics* , 6(7): e1001017.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1001017.
Meyer JR, D. D. (2012). Repeatability and contingency in the evolution of a key innovation in
phage lambda. *Science*, 335(6067):428-32. doi: 10.1126/science.1214449.
Meyer JR, D. D. (2012). Repeatability and contingency in the evolution of a key innovation in
phage lambda . *Science*, 335 (6067): 428-432.
Modi SR, L. H. (2013). Antibiotic treatment expands the resistance reservoir and ecological
network of the phage metagenome. *Nature*, ;499(7457):219-22. doi:
10.1038/nature12212.

Munson-McGee JH, P. S. (2018). A virus or more in (nearly) every cell: ubiquitous networks of
virus-host interactions in extreme environments. *ISME J*, 12(7):1706-14. Epub
2018/02/23. doi: 10.1038/s41.
Nayfach, S. P.-E. (2021). Metagenomic compendium of 189,680 DNA viruses from the human
gut microbiome. *Nat Microbiol 6*, 960-970.
Neurath AR, K. S. (1986). Identification and chemical synthesis of a host cell receptor binding
site on hepatitis B virus. *Cell*, 46(3):429-36. Epub 1986/08/01. PubMed PMID: 3015414.
Poullain V, G. S. (2008). The evolution of specificity in evolving and coevolving antagonistic
interactions between a bacteria and its phage. *Evolution*, ;62(1):1-11. doi:
10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00.
Power RA, P. J. (2017). Microbial genome-wide association studies: lessons from human GWAS.
Nat Rev Genet, 18(1):41-50. doi: 10.1038/nrg.2016.132.
Roux S., P.-E. D. (2021). IMG/VR v3: an integrated ecological and evolutionary framework for
interrogating genomes of uncultivated viruses. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 49(1):764–775.
Sambrook J, R. D. (2006). *The Condensed Protocols from Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory*
Manual. N.Y.: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.
Scanlan PD, H. A.-P. (2011). Genetic basis of infectivity evolution in a bacteriophage. *Mol Ecol*,
20(5):981-9. Epub 2010/11/16. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04903.x.
Shaer Tamar E, K. R. (2022). Multistep diversification in spatiotemporal bacterial-phage
coevolution. *Nat Commun* , 13, 7971.
Simon Roux, D. P.-E.-M. (2021). IMG/VR v3: an integrated ecological and evolutionary
framework for interrogating genomes of uncultivated viruses. *Nucleic Acids Research*,
49(1): 764-775.
Stein RR, B. V. (2013). Ecological Modeling from Time-Series Inference: Insight into Dynamics
and Stability of Intestinal Microbiota. *PLOS Computational Biology 9 (12)*, e1003388.
Sullivan NJ, G. T. (2003). Accelerated vaccination for Ebola virus haemorrhagic fever in non-
human primates. *Nature*, 424(6949):681-4. doi: 10.1038/nature01876.
Sunagawa S., C. L. (2015). Structure and function of the global ocean microbiome. *Science, 348*,
1261359.
Sunagawa, S. A. (2020). Tara Oceans: towards global ocean ecosystems biology. *Nat Rev*
Microbiol 18, 428–445.
Szabo RE., P. S. (2022). Historical contingencies and phage induction diversify bacterioplankton
communities at the microscale. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci 119 (30)*, e211774811.
Tetz, V. T. (2022). Novel prokaryotic system employing previously unknown nucleic acids-based
receptors. *Microb Cell Fact 21*, 202.
Vica Pacheco S, G. G. (1997). The lom gene of bacteriophage lambda is involved in Escherichia
coli K12 adhesion to human buccal epithelial cells. *FEMS Microbiol Lett.* , 156(1):129-32.
Wang J, H. M. (2000). The C-terminal portion of the tail fiber protein of bacteriophage lambda is
responsible for binding to LamB, its receptor at the surface of Escherichia coli K-12. *J*
Bacteriol, 182(2):508-12.

Wang J, M. V. (1998). Cloning of the J gene of bacteriophage lambda, expression and
solubilization of the J protein: first in vitro studies on the interactions between J and
LamB, its cell surface receptor. *Res Microbiol*, 149(9):611.
Wei WH, H. G. (2014). Detecting epistasis in human complex traits. *Nat Rev Genet*, 15(11):722-
33. doi: 10.1038/nrg3747.
Weitz JS, P. T. (2013). Phage-bacteria infection networks. *Trends Microbiol*, 21(2):82-91. doi:
10.1016/j.tim.2012.11.00.
Werts C, M. V. (1994). Adsorption of bacteriophage lambda on the LamB protein of Escherichia
coli K-12: point mutations in gene J of lambda responsible for extended host range. *J
Bacteriol*, 176(4):941-7.
Zborowsky S., a. D. (2019). Resistance in marine cyanobacteria differs against specialist and
generalist cyanophages . *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 116 (34)* , 16899-16908.
643

 Figures

Fig 1. Phage-bacteria cross-infection matrix and mutation profiles. (a) Cross-infection matrix,

including host and phage ancestor strains, and 50 bacteria (rows) and 44 phage (columns) strains

isolated during 37-day coevolution experiment (day of isolation indicated). Names correspond to

"day of isolation – number of isolate". Colored cells are EOP values of infection as in legend, grey

cells indicate no infection. (b-c) Mutation profiles for each isolate (positions mutated are in black

and in grey otherwise) for 18 (host) and 127 (phage) found mutations numbered in sequential

order of appearance in the corresponding genome. (b, in blue) Host isolates (rows) and mutation

profiles (columns) for 1 to 18 unique mutations found in nt position 1,003,271 to 4,228,027 of

the E. *coli* genome (c, in orange) Phage isolates (columns) and mutation profiles (rows) for 1 to

127 unique mutations found in nt position 175 to 42,491 of the λ phage genome. For the

complete list of host and phage mutations see S1 Table. Important genes for phage-host

interaction are highlighted in red and discussed in the main text.

Fig 2. Model performances for different feature sets. The lowest mean value in the validation set for POA and EFF models corresponds to the linear model. (a) Classification error distributions in the training (grey) and validation (black) sets for the predictions of the phage-host interaction network (POA) (ANOVA post hoc Tukey $p<0.01$). The lowest mean value in the validation set corresponds to the linear model (b) Mean absolute error distributions in the training (grey) and validation (black) sets for the predictions of efficiency of infection (EFF) (ANOVA post hoc Tukey $p<0.001$, comparing different mutation feature models and a null model. Boxplots contain 25th-75th percentiles, whiskers indicate minimum and maximum values, middle lines are the median (value indicated) of 200 bootstrap runs. Red dots are outliers.

Fig 3. Model for predicting phage-host interaction network. (a) Original POA matrix showing

presence (black) and absence (gray) of successful infection between phage (columns) and host

(rows) isolated pairs. (b-d) Results of the different model predictions as of the POA matrices, and

coefficient values for 176 phage and 18 host mutations plus the ancestor trait using (b) a linear

mutation set (equation [6]), (c) nonlinear mutation set (equation [8]) and (d) mixed combination

of phage and host mutation set. The color of the coefficient indicates positive (green) to negative

(red) effects of each mutation (phage: $\tilde{\alpha}_k$, host: α_l)combination of mutations, β_{lk}.

Fig 4. Model for predicting the efficiency of infection. (a) Original cross-infection matrix where colors are EOP values of infection between phage (columns) and host (rows) isolate pairs, white cells indicate no infection. (b-d) Results of the different model predictions as of the EFF matrices, and coefficient values for 176 phage and 18 host mutations plus the ancestor trait using (b) a linear mutation set (equation [6]), (c) nonlinear mutation set (equation [8]) and (d) mixed combination of phage and host mutation set (equation [10]). The color of the coefficient indicates positive (green) to negative (red) effects of each mutation (phage: $\tilde{\alpha}_k$, host: α_l) combination of mutations, β_{lk}.

Fig 5. Rank ordered (most negative-most positive) coefficients for important mutations in the

final model. The importance of features was measured by the absolute value of the coefficients

learned from each model. Error bars indicate 0.9 quantile. Labels indicate "mutation → gene"

when the 90th quantile excludes 0. Mutations in red have the highest positive (negative)

coefficients which lowest (highest) value is larger (smaller) or equal to 0 (from 200 bootstrap runs)

and are discussed in the main text. Important features for (a) the final model predicting POA

include a total of 59 non-zero coefficients, and (b) 67 non-zero coefficient values for the final

model predicting EFF. The complete lists of mean, maximum and minimum values of the

coefficients associated to mutations predicting POA and EFF are shown in S2 Table and S3 Table

respectively.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Distribution of the experimentally obtained EOP values. (A) Original distribution of the

EOP values for 2295 phage-host infection pairs. (B) Distribution of 913 positive EOP values. Bin

width=0.1.

S2 Fig. Correlations of mutational appearances in host and phage. (a) 18x18 host and (b)

176x176 phage mutation matrices representing the frequency with which pairs of mutations

simultaneously appear within the same genetic background.

S3 Fig. Log transformed positive EOP value distribution. (A) Distribution of the log positive EOP

values (B) Q-Q plot for log positive EOP values against normal quantiles (Shapiro-Wilk test P value

= 3.283e-8)

S1 Table. Mutation profile tables for host and phage.

S2 Table. Ordered features with non-zero coefficients from final model for predicting POA

based on a linear combination of phage and host mutation profiles.

S3 Table. Ordered features with non-zero coefficients from final model for predicting EFF based

on a linear combination of phage and host mutation profiles.