Dynamics of CRISPR-mediated virus-host interactions in the human gut microbiome

Adrián López-Beltrán[1], João Botelho[1], Jaime Iranzo[1,2,3]

[1] Centro de Biotecnología y Genómica de Plantas, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (UPM) -

Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Tecnología Agraria y Alimentaria (INIA-CSIC), Madrid,

Spain

[2] Centro de Astrobiología (CAB), CSIC-INTA, Madrid, Spain

[3] Institute for Biocomputation and Physics of Complex Systems (BIFI), University of Zaragoza,

Zaragoza, Spain

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Abstract

Arms races between mobile genetic elements and prokaryotic hosts are major drivers of

ecological and evolutionary change in microbial communities. Prokaryotic defense systems

such as CRISPR-Cas have the potential to regulate microbiome composition by modifying the

interactions among bacteria, plasmids, and phages. Here, we used longitudinal metagenomic

data from 130 healthy and diseased individuals to study how the interplay of genetic parasites

and CRISPR-Cas immunity reflects on the dynamics and composition of the human gut

microbiome. Based on the coordinated study of 80,000 CRISPR-Cas loci and their targets, we

show that CRISPR-Cas immunity effectively modulates bacteriophage abundances in the gut.

Acquisition of CRISPR-Cas immunity typically leads to a decrease in the abundance of lytic

phages, but does not necessarily cause their complete disappearance. Much smaller effects

are observed for lysogenic phages and plasmids. Conversely, phage-CRISPR interactions shape

bacterial microdiversity by producing weak selective sweeps that benefit immune host

lineages. Interestingly, distal (and chronologically older) regions of CRISPR arrays are enriched

in spacers that are potentially functional and target local prophages. This suggests that

exposure to reactivated prophages and other endemic viruses is a major selective pressure in

the gut microbiome that drives the maintenance of long-lasting immune memory.

Keywords: microbial community, virome, metagenomics, CRISPR, gut microbiome…

Introduction

Virus-host interactions are major determinants of community dynamics, composition, and

evolution in microbial ecosystems (1-5). In two classic (and somewhat antagonistic) examples,

phage outbreaks can produce the collapse of aquatic bacterial populations and cholera

epidemics (6, 7), whereas sustained rates of phage-induced lysis positively affect ocean and

soil communities by facilitating carbon and nitrogen cycling (8, 9). More recent studies have

highlighted the potential of bacteriophages to shape host-associated microbiomes both

directly, through phage-driven selective pressures, and indirectly, through the alteration of the

host's immune response (10-13).

Prokaryotes have developed a diverse repertoire of specialized defense mechanisms against

viruses and other mobile genetic elements (MGE), such as plasmids and integrative and

conjugative/mobilizable elements (ICE/IME), many of which have only recently started to be

uncovered (14, 15). Among them, CRISPR-Cas systems are of particular interest as they provide

their bearers with adaptive immunity (16-18) The adaptive nature of CRISPR-Cas systems is

based on the acquisition of short DNA fragments from previously encountered MGE at the

leader end of the CRISPR array. Such fragments, called spacers, serve as highly specific probes

for the detection of the targeted MGE upon subsequent encounters. From a researcher's

perspective, CRISPR spacers constitute an ordered record that allow tracking virus-host

interactions through time (19, 20).

Despite experimental studies in the laboratory have provided a general understanding of how

CRISPR-Cas systems work, there are still many unknowns about their functioning in natural

ecosystems (21). The most prominent question regards the actual effect that CRISPR-based

immunity exerts on the composition and dynamics of microbial communities, both at the level

of the virome and the bacterial or archaeal host population. Studies in free-living model

ecosystems, such as hot springs, hypersaline lakes, and wastewater treatment plants, have

demonstrated that CRISPR-Cas contributes to shaping a highly dynamic network of interactions

among MGE and their prokaryotic hosts (19, 22-26). However, the paucity of appropriate

datasets has hampered the application of similar methods to complex host-associated

microbiomes. Some recurrent findings of previous studies are: (i) long-term coexistence of

MGE with a polymorphic population of hosts that includes immune and sensitive lineages; (ii)

high levels of local adaptation in the host CRISPR arrays; and (iii) high frequency of mutations

in regions of MGE targeted by CRISPR spacers. Coexistence of MGE and host lineages is

generally interpreted in terms of the diversity-promoting effects of clonal interference and

herd immunity (27-31), whereas coevolution of CRISPR and MGE suggests that CRISPR-Cas is

functional and the selective pressure that it imposes on MGE is strong enough to fuel

mutational escape (32, 33). Interestingly, these conclusions may not extend to host-associated

microbiomes. For example, single-sample measurements of *Prevotella* strains in the human gut

and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in the lung display complete immunodominance of a single host

lineage, possibly underscoring the occurrence of strong selective sweeps (34, 35).

A second major gap in our understanding of CRISPR-Cas systems concerns the time span of the

immune memory, which results from the interplay of spacer gain and loss within the CRISPR

array, mutation of the target MGE, and replacement of immune lineages in the population of

hosts. Mathematical models predict that the size of CRISPR arrays is controlled by a trade-off

between maintaining a large enough immune repertoire and avoiding the dilution effect of

expressing too many spacers. Likewise, theoretical arguments suggest that the rates of spacer

gain and loss must be finely tuned to keep CRISPR arrays sufficiently updated without losing

immune memory too quickly (36, 37). These models operate on the basic assumption that

distal spacers, generally assumed to be the oldest in the array (but see (38) for

counterexamples) provide the host with long-term immune memory. However, the empirical

and experimental evidence on this issue is inconclusive. On the one hand, reduced

transcription rates (39-41) and broad conservation of distal spacers across strains (42) suggest

that those spacers do not play a relevant role in defense against local MGE. On the other hand,

distal spacers often match conserved regions of viral genomes, which supports an active role

of selection in maintaining these spacers for their higher potential in long-term immunity (43).

In this study, we leveraged a large longitudinal dataset from the integrative Human

Microbiome Project (44) to investigate the joint dynamics of MGE and CRISPR-Cas immunity in

the gut microbiome. We found evidence of effective (but incomplete) CRISPR-Cas immunity

against lytic and lysogenic phages, short- and long-term coexistence of multiple MGE and host

lineages, and selection for long-lasting immunity against endemic MGE provided by spacers

from distal regions of CRISPR arrays.

Methods

<u>Metagenomic data</u>

Metagenomic and metatranscriptomic reads, assembled contigs, and taxonomic profiles from

the Extended Human Microbiome Project – Inflammatory Bowel Disease (HMP2-IBD) were

downloaded from https://ibdmdb.org. The metagenomic dataset includes 1,638 samples from

130 individuals, collected at 2-week intervals for approximately 1 year (44). Samples from

participants with Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis were classified as dysbiotic or non-

dysbiotic by applying the same criteria as in the original study.

<u>Assembly, annotation, and clustering of CRISPR arrays</u>

For each sample of the HMP2-IBD dataset, we assembled putative CRISPR-Cas loci from

metagenomic reads with the tool CasCollect v1.0 (45). CasCollect runs VSEARCH (46) in an

iterative manner to identify reads that possibly belong to CRISPR-Cas loci and then assembles

such reads with SPAdes (47). As baits for the first iteration of VSEARCH, we used the sequences

of known CRISPR-associated genes (as provided by default by CasCollect) and an in-house

database of CRISPR repeats that combined the default list of repeats provided by CasCollect,

additional repeats from CRISPRdb (48) and Makarova et al. (49) clustered at 90% identity and

coverage, and a set of previously unreported repeats obtained by running CRISPRCasTyper

v1.8 (50) on the publicly available, preassembled contigs from the HMP2-IBD study. CasCollect

was run with options --meta --noannotate --nucl. Putative CRISPR-Cas loci assembled by

CasCollect were quality-filtered and annotated with CRISPRCasTyper v1.8, obtaining 79,475

high-confidence CRISPR arrays of which 4,282 (representing around 5% of the total arrays)

included a Cas operon in their neighborhood. Spacers and repeats from high-confidence

CRISPR arrays were dereplicated using CD-Hit-Est v4.8.1 (51) with a 100% identity and

coverage threshold and option -*g* 1 (slow and accurate mode), resulting in a total of 11,373

different repeats and 153,745 different spacers. The directionality of transcription in a subset

of 4,054 arrays with adjacent Cas genes and >5 spacers was predicted with Cas Orientation

(52), CRISPRLoci v1.0 (53), and CRISPRDirection v2.0 (54). Among these three prediction tools,

Cas Orientation showed the best agreement with the expected drop in transcription for middle

and distal spacers and was applicable to a larger fraction of arrays (Suppl. Fig. S1). Therefore,

we chose Cas Orientation as the default method to present the results in the text and main

figures. To explore the distribution of the number of spacers per array, we used the 'powerlaw'

python package (55).

A strict nesting criterion was applied to identify groups (or lineages) of highly similar CRISPR

arrays present within and across samples of the same individual. A CRISPR array was

considered nested within another CRISPR array if both shared the same or highly similar

repeats (>90% identity and coverage, clustered using CD-HIT-Est with option -*g* 1) and all the

spacers of the former were also harbored by the latter. Group-representative arrays were

identified as those that were not nested within any other array. Finally, clusters of CRISPR

arrays were built by considering all the arrays nested within the same group representative.

This algorithm allowed us to retrieve clusters of highly similar CRISPR arrays while accounting

for incomplete assemblies and spacer gain and loss over time. Because of that, we refer to

these clusters as CRISPR lineages or lineages of arrays.

<u>Search for CRISPR targets in the local microbiome</u>

Protospacers in the local microbiome were identified by running nucleotide BLAST against

metagenomic contigs previously assembled by HMP2-IBD, with spacers as queries, options "-

dust no -word_size 8", and a 95% identity and coverage thresholds. We discarded hits to

known CRISPR arrays (identified with CRISPRCasTyper) and hits located within a 100bp

neighborhood of known CRISPR repeats (found with nucleotide BLAST, options "-dust no -

word_size 8", 95% identity and coverage).

One spacer in the dataset produced an extremely high number of hits to the local

metagenome (16,327 hits, while the second largest number was 121). Closer inspection

revealed that the spacer was highly similar to a transposase sequence found in bacterial

chromosomes and prophages. To avoid biases in downstream analyses, the spacer was

removed from the dataset.

<u>Identification of spacer targets</u>

The targets of CRISPR of spacers were inferred by performing a nucleotide BLAST search of all

spacers against a merged database of mobile genetic elements (MGEdb), setting BLAST

parameters for short queries (-dust no -word_size 8) and keeping all hits with >95% identity

and coverage. The merged MGEdb included 198,607 complete viral genomes from the NCBI

Genome database (downloaded on 27/01/2021 from ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genomes/Viruses/)

and the NCBI Virus database (downloaded in interactive mode on 27/01/2021 from

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/virus/vssi/#/virus?SeqType_s=Nucleotide&Completeness_

s=complete), a set of 1,887 gut phages recently identified by Benler et al. (56), a set of 13,274

ICE/IME from Botelho (57), and all sequences from mMGE v1.0 (58) (494,835 phages and

92,493 plasmids), ImmeDb (59) (201 phages and 4,727 ICE/IME, transposable elements, and

other unclassified MGE), ICEberg3 (60) (4,461 ICE/IME and other chromosomally integrated

elements), and IMG/PR (61) (699,973 plasmids). Based on the BLAST results, we classified

spacers according to their most likely target (virus, plasmid, or other mobile genetic elements).

Spacers with inconsistent target predictions were classified as "ambiguous". Spacer-target

assignments were annotated according to the accuracy of the match as identical (100%

identity and coverage) or highly similar (identity and coverage above 95% but below 100%).

Moreover, viral targets were taxonomically annotated according to the information in MGEdb.

To infer the target of spacers that did not match any sequence in MGEdb but had protospacers

in the local microbiome, we extracted 15 kb neighborhoods (7.5 kb upstream and downstream

from the protospacer) from the HMP2-IBD contigs and ran a nucleotide BLAST search against

MGEdb (default options) setting an e-value threshold of 10^{-8}. For each spacer, we predicted

the target based on all hits with scores greater than 0.9 times the highest score. Spacer whose

target remained unclassified after this second step were labeled as "unknown".

<u>Prediction of lytic or lysogenic phage lifestyle</u>

Phages targeted by CRISPR spacers were classified as lytic or lysogenic based on the presence

of integrases in phage genomes. To that end, we extracted 49,645 phage genomes from

MGEdb and 110,712 metagenome-assembled contigs from HMP2-IBD that contained

protospacers. Then, we ran Prodigal v2.6.3 (62) with the option -*p meta* to identify open

reading frames and searched for hits to viral integrases using the *hmmersearch* command of

the HMMER v3.3.2 suite. We included the following PFAM profiles for integrases: PF00239,

PF00589, PF02899, PF07508, PF12482, PF12834, PF13009, PF13102, PF13495, PF14659,

PF16795, and PF18644. The search returned 11,631 viral sequences with putative integrases

(e-value <10^{-8}) that also contained protospacers. The corresponding spacers (27,868 in total)

were regarded as targeting lysogenic phages.

<u>Prevalence and abundance of CRISPR targets in the local microbiome</u>

To study the quantitative dynamics of CRISPR targets in the microbiome, we focused on

spacer-protospacer pairs present in samples from the same individual (possibly at different

times) that fulfil the following conditions: (1) the first appearance of the spacer occurs later

than the first appearance of the CRISPR lineage with which the spacer is associated; and (2)

spacers are present in at least 2 samples. These two conditions allowed us to compare target

abundances before and after the first appearance of the spacer, while controlling for the

intermittent prevalence of hosts (using CRISPR lineages as proxies for the latter). For the same

reason, we excluded from these analyses all samples in which the CRISPR lineage was not

detected. After applying these filters, 1540 spacer-protospacer pairs remained, all of them

involving phages as targets.

To estimate the prevalence of targets, we counted the number of samples that contain the

protospacer before, at, and after the first appearance of the spacer, pooled these counts for all

spacer-protospacer pairs, and normalized them by the number of samples in each group.

Confidence intervals were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson method as implemented in

the *statsmodels* Python library. To quantify target abundances, we extracted 4kb

neighborhoods (2kb upstream and downstream) of protospacers from HMP2-IBD contigs and

mapped metagenomic reads to those neighborhoods with CoverM v0.6.1. Sample-wise

relative abundances were calculated as the number of mapped reads divided by the length of

the mapped sequence (generally 4kb, except for protospacers located near contig ends) and by

the total number of reads in the sample. The sample-wise abundance in samples in which the

target was not detected was set to 0. Finally, to facilitate the comparison of trends across

targets, we normalized the sample-wise abundances of each target by the maximum

abundance observed for that target in the whole time series.

<u>Taxonomic assignation of CRISPR-Cas systems</u>

To assign a taxonomic origin to CRISPR arrays, we leveraged the fact that CRISPR repeats are

taxon-specific (although the taxonomic level of such specificity varies among repeats) (63).

First, we ran CRISPRCasTyper on the preassembled HMP2-IBD metagenomic contigs to predict

CRISPR arrays. Then, we used CD-HIT to identify contigs from HMP2-IBD that contain CRISPR

arrays with the same repeats (90% identity and coverage) as those assembled by CasCollect.

Those contigs were provided as inputs to the program CAT/BAT v5.2.3 (64) for taxonomical

assignment at the lowest non-ambiguous available level. For CRISPR arrays whose repeats

could not be mapped to any HMP2-IBD contig, we directly ran CAT/BAT on the contigs

obtained with CasCollect. (Note, however, that the level of resolution obtained with CasCollect

contigs was generally lower due to their shorter length.) Finally, all CRISPR arrays that

remained unassigned and were part of a lineage with one or more assigned members were

given the same taxonomical origin as the other members of the lineage, as long as no

inconsistencies were found.

<u>Spacer location bias and asymmetry</u>

We studied the relative position of spacers that target phages from the local metagenome

(henceforth "locally adapted spacers") in a subset of 4,054 oriented arrays with >5 spacers,

separately considering identical and highly-similar hits (CRISPR-Cas subtypes with <25 valid

arrays were not included in this analysis). To avoid artifacts associated with finite-size effects in

small arrays, we used a sliding-window approach to estimate the density of active spacers

along the array. We set a window width equal to 12% of the total length of the array

(equivalent to 2/3 of the inverse of the median number of spacers) and a step equal to 1.5% of

the total length of the array (1/8 of the window width).

<u>Quantification of transcription levels along CRISPR arrays</u>

For 753 samples from HMP2-IBD with available metatranscriptomes, we mapped

metatranscriptomic reads to CRISPR assemblies obtained from the same samples with

minimap2 v2.24, setting the option '-x sr' for short reads (65). To improve specificity towards

spacers in CRISPR arrays, we also included contigs with protospacers in the reference genomic

dataset and removed all mapped reads with aligned lengths below 70 nucleotides using the

command FilterSamReads from gatk 4.1.2.0 (66). This 70-nucleotide threshold was chosen to

ensure that alignments covered the equivalent of one spacer and one repeat (the average

spacer and repeat lengths in our dataset are 34 and 31, respectively). The coverage per

position was calculated with the command genomeCoverageBed from BEDTools 2.28.0 (67).

<u>Clustering and classification of CRISPR-spacer-target dynamics</u>

To study the temporal dynamics of CRISPR lineages, spacers, and targets, we first identified all

the spacers that were observed for the first time later than their corresponding CRISPR

lineage. Then, we codified the time series associated with those spacers as strings of

characters, with letters A-F indicating all possible combinations for the presence or absence of

the spacer, its target, and its corresponding CRISPR lineage. "Empty" states (that is, those

characterized by the absence of spacer, CRISPR lineage, and target) were removed from both

ends of the string and collapsed to a single instance if appearing more than once between non-

empty states. We performed pairwise alignments of all strings with the Biopython command

pairwise2.align.globalms (68) using the following scores: 2 per match, -4 per mismatch, -4 per

gap opening, and -2 per gap extension. After normalizing the scores by the length of the

longest member of each pair and discarding pairs with negative scores, we built a time-series

similarity network using normalized scores are weights. Time series were then clustered with

Infomap v0.21.0 (69), with options -2 -u -N 200 (two-level partition assuming undirected links

and selecting the best of 200 trials).

Results and discussion

<u>Assembly and characterization of CRISPR arrays in the human gut microbiome</u>

We combined state-of-the-art methods to assemble CRISPR arrays from the gut microbiomes

of 130 individuals, recurrently sampled every 2 weeks over a 1-year period as part of the

integrative Human Microbiome Project (Figure 1a). After curation and removal of low-quality

arrays, we obtained a set of 79,475 CRISPR arrays, encompassing 11,373 unique repeats and

153,745 unique spacers. Of those, around 4,300 arrays were adjacent to a Cas operon, what

allowed us to predict the direction of transcription by applying three alternative criteria (see

Methods). We identified CRISPR arrays in 36 out of the 40 most abundant bacterial genera in

all gut samples, which collectively account for 94% of bacterial abundance (Suppl. Table S1).

The number of unique CRISPR arrays per sample broadly varies through time and across

microbiomes, with significantly lower numbers in microbiomes obtained from patients with

Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis (Figure 1b-c). Such lower numbers are consistent with the

reduced microbial diversity associated with dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel diseases (44).

The CRISPR array sizes follow a heavy-tailed distribution that is well-fit by a truncated power

law with exponent close to -2 and a cutoff at around 100 spacers (Figure 1d). Similar

distributions, although with higher cutoffs, have been reported for CRISPR arrays from

complete genomes (70, 71). Thus, the high heterogeneity of array lengths observed in this

dataset likely reflects a true property of CRISPR systems in the gut microbiome, rather than an

excess of fragmentary or poorly-assembled arrays.

We applied a strict nesting criterion to group CRISPR arrays into 41,742 clusters, of which

9,870 contain >1 array (Figure 1e). These clusters represent lineages of arrays from the same

microbiome (possibly sampled at different times) that are likely related by sequential gain and

loss of spacers. Array lineages serve a triple purpose in this study. First, lineages are pivotal to

assess the consistency of CRISPR assemblies by comparing spacer order and orientation in

arrays from the same lineage. Second, lineages permit a robust characterization of CRISPR

diversity by minimizing the impact of incomplete arrays and abundance biases. Third, lineages

constitute a convenient proxy for the presence of subpopulations of hosts in the microbial

community.

Within-lineage comparisons show that spacer order and orientation are highly consistent

across pairs of related arrays (Figure 1f). Such high consistencies are not a by-product of the

method used to group arrays into lineages, which was solely based on spacer presence or

absence and did not discriminate between spacers and their reverse complements. Overall,

internal rearrangements only affect 3.6% of all array pairs, whereas spacer inversions are

virtually inexistent (<0.01%). Predicted array orientations are also generally consistent with

respect to spacer order, with inconsistencies observed in <1% of the pairs. Because lineages

include arrays separately assembled in different samples, within-lineage consistency strongly

suggests that CRISPR assemblies are reliable in terms of spacer order and orientation.

The most abundant CRISPR-Cas systems in the human gut microbiome belong to subtypes I-B,

I-C, I-E, and II-C (Figure 2). Subtypes I-B, I-C, and II-C are most often associated with Firmicutes

and Bacteroidetes, whereas subtype I-E is observed in Firmicutes and Proteobacteria.

Alterations in the composition of the microbiome significantly affect the profile of CRISPR

subtypes in Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis (Figure 2 and Suppl. Table S1). In agreement

with previous studies (44, 72), dysbiosis leads to a decrease in the relative proportion of

subtypes I-B, I-C, I-E, and II-C that can be attributed to the depletion of *Faecalibacterium*

prausnitzii (I-C and I-E) and several groups of Bacteroidetes (I-B, I-C, and II-C). Among the less

abundant subtypes, IV-A (typically carried by large conjugative plasmids (73)) stands out for its

strong association with normal (that is, no dysbiotic) samples.

<u>Selection promotes long-term immunity against endemic MGE</u>

To identify the potential targets of CRISPR immunity, we mapped the spacers in CRISPR arrays

to a large collection of phages, plasmids, and other MGE obtained from state-of-the-art

(meta)genomic databases (see Methods). Overall, 41% of the spacers show high similarity

(zero or one mismatch) to known phages and only 4% map to plasmids and other MGE (Figure

3a). These values are notably higher than those reported by global surveys of CRISPR spacers

from complete prokaryotic genomes (74, 75) but close to those obtained for gut bacteria (43,

76), probably reflecting the higher coverage of MGE from the human gut in public databases.

Around 6% of the spacers target sequences from the local microbiome (defined as the union of

all samples collected from the same individual). We refer to these spacers as "locally adapted"

because they can provide immunity against MGE that are locally observed in the 1-year period

covered by the dataset. The most frequent targets of locally adapted spacers are lysogenic

phages (43%), followed by lytic and other non-lysogenic phages (28%), plasmids (16%), and

other MGE (1%). Around 10% of the spacers (labeled as "ambiguous" in Figure 3a-b) match

sequences found in multiple classes of MGE. All in all, we could assign a unique or ambiguous

origin to 99% of all locally adapted spacers. Therefore, the disproportionate number of hits to

phages and plasmids compared to other MGE is probably genuine, despite the admittedly

biased representation of different classes of MGE in public databases. Comparing among

CRISPR subtypes (Figure 3b), local adaptation is more frequent in subtypes I-C and II-C (7.7-

8.5% of spacers are locally adapted, compared to 2.5-4.2% in other subtypes; χ^2 test $p < 10^{-10}$).

Moreover, subtypes II-A, II-C, and III-A target a higher proportion of plasmids than class I

systems (12% in I-C vs 25% in II-C; Fisher's exact test $p < 10^{-10}$).

Locally adapted spacers are not uniformly distributed along the CRISPR array (Figure 3c). On

the contrary, they tend to concentrate near both ends of the array. The enrichment at the

leader (or proximal) end is consistent with recent spacer acquisitions targeting MGE from the

local microbiome. However, the excess of locally adapted spacers near the trailer (or distal)

end, especially evident in subtypes I-C and I-E, is somewhat paradoxical. In fact, distal spacers

are generally the oldest in the array and their role in immunity is a matter of debate (77, 78).

Three lines of evidence reject the possibility that locally adapted spacers near the distal end

represent a technical artifact. First, array orientation and spacer order are highly consistent

across arrays from the same lineage, despite the arrays being independently assembled from

different samples. Second, the same trend is observed when the orientation of the arrays is

inferred with three independent methods (Cas Orientation, CRISPRDirection, and CRISPRLoci;

Suppl. Fig. S1). Third, in most subtypes, mismatches between the spacer and target sequences

become more frequent towards the trailer end, as expected for correctly assembled arrays.

We conceive two possible biological explanations for the observed trend in the distribution of

locally adapted spacers. The first is that CRISPR-based immunity leads to the complete

elimination of MGE that are targeted by spacers in the middle section of the array, whereas

MGE targeted by distal, less efficient spacers can persist in the microbiome. In this scenario,

most middle spacers would not be identified as "locally adapted" simply because they

succeeded in eliminating their targets. Although CRISPR immunity can effectively prevent MGE

proliferation in culture (79, 80), it is less likely that complete elimination of MGE occurs in

complex, spatially extended microbial communities (26, 81) (and the human gut virome

appears indeed highly stable over time (82)). More generally, this scenario does not account

for the possibility that the same MGE is targeted by multiple spacers located at different

positions in different arrays, which would effectively decouple within-array spacer positions

and population-level MGE abundances.

The second (and more likely) explanation is that locally adapted spacers near the trailing end

are a consequence of sustained selection for long-term immunity against endemic MGE. It is

widely accepted that intense selection and frequent spacer loss via homologous recombination

shape the composition of CRISPR arrays in natural populations, promoting the maintenance of

functional spacers (42). Therefore, if endemic MGE impose a sustained burden on the

population, it can be expected that older spacers providing with effective long-term immunity

against such MGE accumulate at the distal part of the array. This phenomenon has been

observed in *Leptospirillum* strains from an acid mine drainage where the same phage

population persisted for at least 5 years (23, 83). We propose a similar explanation in the case

of the adult human gut, where bacteria coexist with a very stable virome dominated by crass-

like phages (82, 84-86) and exposed to continuous (but low-intensity) induction of prophages

(87, 88). In support of the long-term memory role of distal CRISPR spacers, we found that the

fraction of spacers targeting lysogenic phages systematically increases from the leading to the

trailing end of the array (Figure 3d). Considering the high rates of lytic activity and CRISPR

spacer turnover that characterize the infant gut, and the possible contribution of early phage-

bacteria interactions to shaping the adult gut microbiome (13, 89-91), an intriguing possibility

might be that long-term memory spacers were selected during the consolidation of a

coexisting community of MGE and bacteria in the first years of age.

To provide efficient long-term immune memory, spacers near the trailing end of the array

must be expressed at sufficient levels to form effector complexes. Indeed, lack of expression

due to early termination of transcription limits the functionality of distal spacers in

experimental conditions (39-41). By analyzing metatranscriptomes, we found that distal

spacers are moderately expressed, with transcript abundances around 30-40% of those

observed for spacers near the leading end (Figure S2). Distal spacers may also contribute to

long-term immunity through primed adaptation, that is, by promoting the acquisition of

additional spacers from cognate MGE (92). Primed adaptation is widespread in type I and II

CRISPR systems (93, 94) and operates for spacers that do not exactly match their target (95) or

are expressed at low levels (96). Because spacers acquired through this mechanism are often

biased in terms of genomic location and strand specificity, indirect evidence for primed

adaptation can be obtained by testing for non-random patterns in the relative location of

protospacers within the target genome. Following that strategy, we identified several

instances of MGE targeted by >1 spacer from the same array, which could correspond to

primed adaptation. However, the number of instances observed was insufficient for statistical

confirmation.

<u>CRISPR-Cas immunity modulates microbiome composition</u>

The longitudinal nature of the HMP2-IBD metagenomic survey allowed us to investigate how

CRISPR immunity affects the dynamics of MGE and bacterial hosts in the gut microbiome. We

first studied if the appearance of a new spacer in a preexisting CRISPR lineage (possibly

implying a spacer acquisition event) was associated with changes in the prevalence and

abundance of the target MGE (Figure 4a). Consistent with the expectation that exposure to

MGE induces immune adaptation, we found that putative spacer acquisitions occur in samples

in which the abundance of the target MGE is higher than average. In sharp contrast,

subsequent observations of the spacer are associated with significantly decreased MGE

abundances. Notably, such decrease is not observed in populations that have seemingly lost

the spacer but in which the CRISPR lineage (and therefore the host) is still detected. As

expected, these trends are strongest in the case of lytic and lysogenic phages, but also

significant for plasmids. Despite its quantitative effect on MGE abundance, CRISPR-Cas

immunity does not generally lead to the complete elimination of its targets. Indeed, around

50% of lytic and lysogenic phages targeted by CRISPR-Cas can still be detected following the

acquisition of a cognate spacer in the population (Figure 4b). In the case of plasmids,

acquisition of cognate spacers does not produce any significant drop in prevalence. All in all,

these observations imply that CRISPR-Cas immunity modulates phage and plasmid abundances

in the human gut, while not compromising their long-term persistence. This conclusion is

consistent with previous observations from free-living communities and with the theoretical

prediction that CRISPR-Cas immunity can stabilize complex phage-host populations through

eco-evolutionary feedback (28, 97-99).

We then investigated if the interplay of CRISPR immunity and phage predation affects host

diversity at the population level. To that end, we divided CRISPR lineages into those that are

possibly involved in effective immune interactions (by harboring at least one locally adapted

spacer) and those that do not show any evidence of local adaptation. The former tend to be

more diverse, that is, they encompass more array variants per lineage, likely reflecting higher

rates of spacer acquisition and loss (Figure 4c). Moreover, the diversity of CRISPR arrays in

these lineages is lower in samples in which targeted phages are present (Figure 4d). This

observation underscores the occurrence of weak MGE-induced selective sweeps in the host

population, that transiently favor those hosts bearing CRISPR arrays with cognate spacers

(Figure 4e). The weakness of these selective sweeps could in part be explained by clonal

interference among multiple immune lineages, as previously suggested for hot spring

communities (27), and by the spatially structured nature of the gut microbiome.

<u>Temporal dynamics of MGE and CRISPR arrays</u>

To better understand the interplay between CRISPR-Cas immunity and the dynamics of MGE

and hosts, we selected 1,769 time series for single spacer-target pairs whose dynamics are

compatible with possible spacer acquisition events at the population level. Then, we applied

an unsupervised clustering algorithm to group similar trajectories based on the temporal

patterns of presence or absence of spacers, targets, and CRISPR lineages (the latter serving as

proxies for host subpopulations). Despite the potentially combinatorial diversity of individual

trajectories, we found that 40% of them belonged to one of the 10 largest clusters. The

inspection of such representative clusters reveals qualitative differences across MGE in their

temporal dynamics (Figure 5). Phages are preferentially associated with episodic dynamics (TC-

1, 3, 5, and 7), whereas plasmids display recurrency (TC-13 and 14). The most frequent

trajectory in the data set (TC-1) corresponds to a single observation of a CRISPR lineage

followed by a simultaneous observation of a new spacer and the cognate phage, in what might

represent a spacer acquisition event. Other representative trajectories involve variations of

the same theme, with loss of the phage following spacer acquisition (TC-5) or missing the

intermediate acquisition event (TC-2 and 3). In contrast, the most frequent trajectories

associated with plasmids represent two alternative scenarios, one dominated by the plasmid

(TC-13) and the other characterized by the stable coexistence of plasmid-bearing and plasmid-

resistant host subpopulations (TC-14). The latter is reminiscent of the global population

structure of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, in which spacers from active CRISPR-Cas systems target

MGE integrated in closely related genomes that lack CRISPR (100), and in hot spring

populations of *Hydrogenobacter sp.*, where the spacers of single-cell assembled genomes

target MGE found in other cells from the same population (101). Our results suggest that

crosstalk between CRISPR-Cas systems and plasmids that coexist in the host population is also

widespread in the human gut.

Conclusions

By analyzing a large metagenomic dataset encompassing 130 individual gut microbiomes

periodically sampled for up to 1 year, we found that the interaction of phages and CRISPR-Cas

immunity quantitatively affects the composition of the human gut microbiome. Phage and

plasmid abundances tend to decrease after the first appearance of cognate CRISPR spacers in

the microbiome, although such decrease does not generally lead to their complete elimination.

On the other side, in the presence of MGE, bacterial populations experience weak and

incomplete selective sweeps favoring immune lineages. The coexistence of phages and diverse

host lineages despite effective CRISPR-Cas immunity suggests that spatial heterogeneity, clonal

interference, and fluctuating selection could have a major role in explaining phage-bacteria

interaction dynamics in the gut. Disentangling the contribution of these mechanisms warrants

further investigation, as they may differentially affect the efficacy of phage therapy and other

intervention strategies aimed at controlling the gut microbiome.

A second major finding of this study was the high relative abundance of locally adapted

spacers located in the distal region of CRISPR arrays and targeting lysogenic phages. This

finding strongly suggests that selection promotes the maintenance of long-term memory

spacers against endemic MGE, and that periodic reactivation of prophages is an important

stressor for the human gut microbiome. Interestingly, leader and trailer regions of CRISPR

arrays appear to be specialized in short- and long-term memory, respectively. We expect that

selection for long-lasting immunity and polar allocation of long-term memory spacers are not

unique to the human gut microbiome, but general features of microbial communities with

stable viromes. Testing such prediction constitutes an interesting subject of future research.

Acknowledgements

A.L-B. is supported by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación of Spain (Grant No. PRE2020-

092935). J.B. is supported by the Maria Zambrano grant of the Spanish Ministry of Universities

(Grant No. UP2021-035), and the Severo Ochoa Program for Centres of Excellence in R&D of

the Agencia Estatal de Investigación of Spain (Grant No. CEX2020-000999-S (2022–2025) to the

CBGP). J.I is supported by the Ramón y Cajal Programme of the Spanish Ministry of Science

(Grant No. RYC-2017–22524); the Agencia Estatal de Investigación of Spain (Grant No.

PID2019-106618GA-I00), the Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D of the

Agencia Estatal de Investigación of Spain (Grant No. SEV-2016–0672 (2017–2021) to the

CBGP); and the Comunidad de Madrid (through the call Research Grants for Young

Investigators from Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Grant No. M190020074JIIS).

Data availability

All relevant data produced in this study have been deposited in the Zenodo repository (DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.10555110) and are freely available.

References

1.   Diaz-Munoz SL, Koskella B. Bacteria-phage interactions in natural environments. Adv

Appl Microbiol. 2014;89:135-83.

2.   Fernandez L, Rodriguez A, Garcia P. Phage or foe: an insight into the impact of viral

predation on microbial communities. The ISME journal. 2018;12(5):1171-9.

3.   Chevallereau A, Pons BJ, van Houte S, Westra ER. Interactions between bacterial and

phage communities in natural environments. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2022;20(1):49-62.

4.   Brown TL, Charity OJ, Adriaenssens EM. Ecological and functional roles of

bacteriophages in contrasting environments: marine, terrestrial and human gut. Curr Opin

Microbiol. 2022;70:102229.

5.   Koskella B, Brockhurst MA. Bacteria-phage coevolution as a driver of ecological and

evolutionary processes in microbial communities. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2014;38(5):916-31.

6.   Rodriguez-Brito B, Li L, Wegley L, Furlan M, Angly F, Breitbart M, et al. Viral and

microbial community dynamics in four aquatic environments. The ISME journal. 2010;4(6):739-

51.

7.   Faruque SM, Islam MJ, Ahmad QS, Faruque AS, Sack DA, Nair GB, et al. Self-limiting

nature of seasonal cholera epidemics: Role of host-mediated amplification of phage.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.

2005;102(17):6119-24.

8.   Suttle CA. Marine viruses--major players in the global ecosystem. Nat Rev Microbiol.

2007;5(10):801-12.

9.   Braga LPP, Spor A, Kot W, Breuil MC, Hansen LH, Setubal JC, et al. Impact of phages on

soil bacterial communities and nitrogen availability under different assembly scenarios.

Microbiome. 2020;8(1):52.

10. Koskella B. Phage-mediated selection on microbiota of a long-lived host. Curr Biol.

2013;23(13):1256-60.

11. Manrique P, Dills M, Young MJ. The Human Gut Phage Community and Its Implications

for Health and Disease. Viruses. 2017;9(6).

12. Gogokhia L, Buhrke K, Bell R, Hoffman B, Brown DG, Hanke-Gogokhia C, et al.

Expansion of Bacteriophages Is Linked to Aggravated Intestinal Inflammation and Colitis. Cell

Host Microbe. 2019;25(2):285-99 e8.

13. Shamash M, Maurice CF. Phages in the infant gut: a framework for virome

development during early life. The ISME journal. 2022;16(2):323-30.

14. Millman A, Melamed S, Leavitt A, Doron S, Bernheim A, Hor J, et al. An expanded

arsenal of immune systems that protect bacteria from phages. Cell Host Microbe.

2022;30(11):1556-69 e5.

15. Georjon H, Bernheim A. The highly diverse antiphage defence systems of bacteria. Nat

Rev Microbiol. 2023;21(10):686-700.

16. Watson BNJ, Steens JA, Staals RHJ, Westra ER, van Houte S. Coevolution between

bacterial CRISPR-Cas systems and their bacteriophages. Cell Host Microbe. 2021;29(5):715-25.

17. Meaden S, Biswas A, Arkhipova K, Morales SE, Dutilh BE, Westra ER, et al. High viral

abundance and low diversity are associated with increased CRISPR-Cas prevalence across

microbial ecosystems. Curr Biol. 2022;32(1):220-7 e5.

18. Chabas H, Muller V, Bonhoeffer S, Regoes RR. Epidemiological and evolutionary

consequences of different types of CRISPR-Cas systems. PLoS computational biology.

2022;18(7):e1010329.

19. Martinez Arbas S, Narayanasamy S, Herold M, Lebrun LA, Hoopmann MR, Li S, et al.

Roles of bacteriophages, plasmids and CRISPR immunity in microbial community dynamics

revealed using time-series integrated meta-omics. Nature microbiology. 2021;6(1):123-35.

20. Cornuault JK, Moncaut E, Loux V, Mathieu A, Sokol H, Petit MA, et al. The enemy from

within: a prophage of Roseburia intestinalis systematically turns lytic in the mouse gut, driving

bacterial adaptation by CRISPR spacer acquisition. The ISME journal. 2020;14(3):771-87.

21. Westra ER, van Houte S, Gandon S, Whitaker R. The ecology and evolution of microbial

CRISPR-Cas adaptive immune systems. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.

2019;374(1772):20190101.

22. Emerson JB, Andrade K, Thomas BC, Norman A, Allen EE, Heidelberg KB, et al. Virus-

host and CRISPR dynamics in Archaea-dominated hypersaline Lake Tyrrell, Victoria, Australia.

Archaea. 2013;2013:370871.

23. Sun CL, Thomas BC, Barrangou R, Banfield JF. Metagenomic reconstructions of

bacterial CRISPR loci constrain population histories. The ISME journal. 2016;10(4):858-70.

24. Pauly MD, Bautista MA, Black JA, Whitaker RJ. Diversified local CRISPR-Cas immunity to

viruses of Sulfolobus islandicus. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2019;374(1772):20180093.

25. Medvedeva S, Liu Y, Koonin EV, Severinov K, Prangishvili D, Krupovic M. Virus-borne

mini-CRISPR arrays are involved in interviral conflicts. Nature communications.

2019;10(1):5204.

26. Guerrero LD, Perez MV, Orellana E, Piuri M, Quiroga C, Erijman L. Long-run bacteria-

phage coexistence dynamics under natural habitat conditions in an environmental

biotechnology system. The ISME journal. 2021;15(3):636-48.

27. Held NL, Herrera A, Cadillo-Quiroz H, Whitaker RJ. CRISPR associated diversity within a

population of Sulfolobus islandicus. PLoS One. 2010;5(9).

28. Iranzo J, Lobkovsky AE, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. Evolutionary dynamics of the prokaryotic

adaptive immunity system CRISPR-Cas in an explicit ecological context. Journal of bacteriology.

2013;195(17):3834-44.

29.   Iranzo J, Lobkovsky AE, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. Immunity, suicide or both? Ecological

determinants for the combined evolution of anti-pathogen defense systems. BMC evolutionary

biology. 2015;15:43.

30.   Payne P, Geyrhofer L, Barton NH, Bollback JP. CRISPR-based herd immunity can limit

phage epidemics in bacterial populations. Elife. 2018;7.

31.   Iranzo J, Faure G, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. Game-Theoretical Modeling of Interviral Conflicts

Mediated by Mini-CRISPR Arrays. Front Microbiol. 2020;11:381.

32.   Andersson AF, Banfield JF. Virus population dynamics and acquired virus resistance in

natural microbial communities. Science. 2008;320(5879):1047-50.

33.   Kosmopoulos JC, Campbell DE, Whitaker RJ, Wilbanks EG. Horizontal Gene Transfer

and CRISPR Targeting Drive Phage-Bacterial Host Interactions and Coevolution in "Pink Berry"

Marine Microbial Aggregates. Applied and environmental microbiology. 2023;89(7):e0017723.

34.   England WE, Kim T, Whitaker RJ. Metapopulation Structure of CRISPR-Cas Immunity in

Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Its Viruses. mSystems. 2018;3(5).

35.   Devoto AE, Santini JM, Olm MR, Anantharaman K, Munk P, Tung J, et al. Megaphages

infect Prevotella and variants are widespread in gut microbiomes. Nature microbiology.

2019;4(4):693-700.

36.   Bradde S, Nourmohammad A, Goyal S, Balasubramanian V. The size of the immune

repertoire of bacteria. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America. 2020;117(10):5144-51.

37.   Weissman JL, Fagan WF, Johnson PLF. Selective Maintenance of Multiple CRISPR Arrays

Across Prokaryotes. CRISPR J. 2018;1(6):405-13.

38.   Ou Y, McInerney JO. High Frequency of Dynamic Rearrangements In Crispr loci.

bioRxiv. 2022:2022.05.19.492656.

39.   Richter H, Zoephel J, Schermuly J, Maticzka D, Backofen R, Randau L. Characterization

of CRISPR RNA processing in Clostridium thermocellum and Methanococcus maripaludis.

Nucleic acids research. 2012;40(19):9887-96.

40.   Elmore JR, Yokooji Y, Sato T, Olson S, Glover CV, 3rd, Graveley BR, et al. Programmable

plasmid interference by the CRISPR-Cas system in Thermococcus kodakarensis. RNA Biol.

2013;10(5):828-40.

41.   Nickel L, Weidenbach K, Jager D, Backofen R, Lange SJ, Heidrich N, et al. Two CRISPR-

Cas systems in Methanosarcina mazei strain Go1 display common processing features despite

belonging to different types I and III. RNA Biol. 2013;10(5):779-91.

42.   Garrett SC. Pruning and Tending Immune Memories: Spacer Dynamics in the CRISPR

Array. Front Microbiol. 2021;12:664299.

43.   Stern A, Mick E, Tirosh I, Sagy O, Sorek R. CRISPR targeting reveals a reservoir of

common phages associated with the human gut microbiome. Genome research.

2012;22(10):1985-94.

44.   Lloyd-Price J, Arze C, Ananthakrishnan AN, Schirmer M, Avila-Pacheco J, Poon TW, et

al. Multi-omics of the gut microbial ecosystem in inflammatory bowel diseases. Nature.

2019;569(7758):655-62.

45.   Podlevsky JD, Hudson CM, Timlin JA, Williams KP. CasCollect: targeted assembly of

CRISPR-associated operons from high-throughput sequencing data. NAR genomics and

bioinformatics. 2020;2(3):lqaa063.

46.   Rognes T, Flouri T, Nichols B, Quince C, Mahe F. VSEARCH: a versatile open source tool

for metagenomics. PeerJ. 2016;4:e2584.

47.   Prjibelski A, Antipov D, Meleshko D, Lapidus A, Korobeynikov A. Using SPAdes De Novo

Assembler. Current protocols in bioinformatics. 2020;70(1):e102.

48.   Grissa I, Vergnaud G, Pourcel C. The CRISPRdb database and tools to display CRISPRs

and to generate dictionaries of spacers and repeats. BMC Bioinformatics. 2007;8:172.

49. Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Iranzo J, Shmakov SA, Alkhnbashi OS, Brouns SJJ, et al.

Evolutionary classification of CRISPR-Cas systems: a burst of class 2 and derived variants. Nat

Rev Microbiol. 2020;18(2):67-83.

50. Russel J, Pinilla-Redondo R, Mayo-Munoz D, Shah SA, Sorensen SJ. CRISPRCasTyper:

Automated Identification, Annotation, and Classification of CRISPR-Cas Loci. The CRISPR

journal. 2020;3(6):462-9.

51. Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z, Wu S, Li W. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-generation

sequencing data. Bioinformatics. 2012;28(23):3150-2.

52. Milicevic O, Repac J, Bozic B, Djordjevic M, Djordjevic M. A Simple Criterion for

Inferring CRISPR Array Direction. Frontiers in microbiology. 2019;10:2054.

53. Alkhnbashi OS, Mitrofanov A, Bonidia R, Raden M, Tran VD, Eggenhofer F, et al.

CRISPRloci: comprehensive and accurate annotation of CRISPR-Cas systems. Nucleic acids

research. 2021;49(W1):W125-W30.

54. Biswas A, Fineran PC, Brown CM. Accurate computational prediction of the transcribed

strand of CRISPR non-coding RNAs. Bioinformatics. 2014;30(13):1805-13.

55. Alstott J, Bullmore E, Plenz D. Powerlaw: a Python package for analysis of heavy-tailed

distributions. PLoS One. 2014;9(1):e85777.

56. Benler S, Yutin N, Antipov D, Rayko M, Shmakov S, Gussow AB, et al. Thousands of

previously unknown phages discovered in whole-community human gut metagenomes.

Microbiome. 2021;9(1):78.

57. Botelho J. Defense systems are pervasive across chromosomally integrated mobile

genetic elements and are inversely correlated to virulence and antimicrobial resistance.

Nucleic acids research. 2023;51(9):4385-97.

58. Lai S, Jia L, Subramanian B, Pan S, Zhang J, Dong Y, et al. mMGE: a database for human

metagenomic extrachromosomal mobile genetic elements. Nucleic acids research.

2021;49(D1):D783-D91.

59.   Jiang X, Hall AB, Xavier RJ, Alm EJ. Comprehensive analysis of chromosomal mobile
genetic elements in the gut microbiome reveals phylum-level niche-adaptive gene pools. PLoS
One. 2019;14(12):e0223680.

60.   Wang M, Liu G, Liu M, Tai C, Deng Z, Song J, et al. ICEberg 3.0: functional categorization
and analysis of the integrative and conjugative elements in bacteria. Nucleic acids research.
2024;52(D1):D732-D7.

61.   Camargo AP, Call L, Roux S, Nayfach S, Huntemann M, Palaniappan K, et al. IMG/PR: a
database of plasmids from genomes and metagenomes with rich annotations and metadata.
Nucleic acids research. 2024;52(D1):D164-D73.

62.   Hyatt D, Chen GL, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. Prodigal: prokaryotic
gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC Bioinformatics.
2010;11:119.

63.   Kunin V, Sorek R, Hugenholtz P. Evolutionary conservation of sequence and secondary
structures in CRISPR repeats. Genome biology. 2007;8(4):R61.

64.   von Meijenfeldt FAB, Arkhipova K, Cambuy DD, Coutinho FH, Dutilh BE. Robust
taxonomic classification of uncharted microbial sequences and bins with CAT and BAT.
Genome biology. 2019;20(1):217.

65.   Li H. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics.
2018;34(18):3094-100.

66.   McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E, Sivachenko A, Cibulskis K, Kernytsky A, et al. The
Genome Analysis Toolkit: a MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA
sequencing data. Genome research. 2010;20(9):1297-303.

67.   Quinlan AR, Hall IM. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
features. Bioinformatics. 2010;26(6):841-2.

68.   Cock PJ, Antao T, Chang JT, Chapman BA, Cox CJ, Dalke A, et al. Biopython: freely

available Python tools for computational molecular biology and bioinformatics. Bioinformatics.

2009;25(11):1422-3.

69.   Rosvall M, Bergstrom CT. Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal

community structure. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America. 2008;105(4):1118-23.

70.   Pavlova YS, Paez-Espino D, Morozov AY, Belalov IS. Searching for fat tails in CRISPR-Cas

systems: Data analysis and mathematical modeling. PLoS computational biology.

2021;17(3):e1008841.

71.   Toms A, Barrangou R. On the global CRISPR array behavior in class I systems. Biology

direct. 2017;12(1):20.

72.   Kostic AD, Xavier RJ, Gevers D. The microbiome in inflammatory bowel disease: current

status and the future ahead. Gastroenterology. 2014;146(6):1489-99.

73.   Pinilla-Redondo R, Mayo-Munoz D, Russel J, Garrett RA, Randau L, Sorensen SJ, et al.

Type IV CRISPR-Cas systems are highly diverse and involved in competition between plasmids.

Nucleic acids research. 2020;48(4):2000-12.

74.   Shmakov SA, Sitnik V, Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Severinov KV, Koonin EV. The CRISPR

Spacer Space Is Dominated by Sequences from Species-Specific Mobilomes. MBio. 2017;8(5).

75.   Shmakov SA, Wolf YI, Savitskaya E, Severinov KV, Koonin EV. Mapping CRISPR

spacEromes reveals vast host-specific viromes of prokaryotes. Commun Biol. 2020;3(1):321.

76.   Soto-Perez P, Bisanz JE, Berry JD, Lam KN, Bondy-Denomy J, Turnbaugh PJ. CRISPR-Cas

System of a Prevalent Human Gut Bacterium Reveals Hyper-targeting against Phages in a

Human Virome Catalog. Cell Host Microbe. 2019;26(3):325-35 e5.

77.   McGinn J, Marraffini LA. Molecular mechanisms of CRISPR-Cas spacer acquisition. Nat

Rev Microbiol. 2019;17(1):7-12.

78.   McGinn J, Marraffini LA. CRISPR-Cas Systems Optimize Their Immune Response by

Specifying the Site of Spacer Integration. Mol Cell. 2016;64(3):616-23.

79.   Marraffini LA, Sontheimer EJ. CRISPR interference limits horizontal gene transfer in

staphylococci by targeting DNA. Science. 2008;322(5909):1843-5.

80.   van Houte S, Ekroth AK, Broniewski JM, Chabas H, Ashby B, Bondy-Denomy J, et al. The

diversity-generating benefits of a prokaryotic adaptive immune system. Nature.

2016;532(7599):385-8.

81.   Watson BNJ, Capria L, Alseth EO, Pons B, Biswas A, Lenzi L, et al. CRISPR-Cas in

Pseudomonas aeruginosa provides transient population-level immunity against high phage

exposures. The ISME journal. 2024.

82.   Shkoporov AN, Clooney AG, Sutton TDS, Ryan FJ, Daly KM, Nolan JA, et al. The Human

Gut Virome Is Highly Diverse, Stable, and Individual Specific. Cell Host Microbe.

2019;26(4):527-41 e5.

83.   Weinberger AD, Sun CL, Plucinski MM, Denef VJ, Thomas BC, Horvath P, et al.

Persisting viral sequences shape microbial CRISPR-based immunity. PLoS computational

biology. 2012;8(4):e1002475.

84.   Manrique P, Bolduc B, Walk ST, van der Oost J, de Vos WM, Young MJ. Healthy human

gut phageome. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America. 2016;113(37):10400-5.

85.   Koonin EV, Dolja VV, Krupovic M. The healthy human virome: from virus-host

symbiosis to disease. Curr Opin Virol. 2021;47:86-94.

86.   Smith L, Goldobina E, Govi B, Shkoporov AN. Bacteriophages of the Order Crassvirales:

What Do We Currently Know about This Keystone Component of the Human Gut Virome?

Biomolecules. 2023;13(4).

87.   Sutcliffe SG, Reyes A, Maurice CF. Bacteriophages playing nice: Lysogenic

bacteriophage replication stable in the human gut microbiota. iScience. 2023;26(2):106007.

88.   Dion MB, Shah SA, Deng L, Thorsen J, Stokholm J, Krogfelt KA, et al. Escherichia coli

CRISPR arrays from early life fecal samples preferentially target prophages. The ISME journal.

2024.

89.   Shah SA, Deng L, Thorsen J, Pedersen AG, Dion MB, Castro-Mejia JL, et al. Expanding

known viral diversity in the healthy infant gut. Nature microbiology. 2023;8(5):986-98.

90.   Wu J, Zhang H, Gan R, Xia Y, Zhang F, Wang D, et al. CRISPR dynamics during the

interaction between bacteria and phage in the first year of life. Microb Genom. 2023;9(7).

91.   Redgwell TA, Thorsen J, Petit M-A, Deng L, Vestergaard GA, Russel J, et al. Prophages in

the infant gut are largely induced, and may be functionally relevant to their hosts. bioRxiv.

2021:2021.06.25.449885.

92.   Sternberg SH, Richter H, Charpentier E, Qimron U. Adaptation in CRISPR-Cas Systems.

Mol Cell. 2016;61(6):797-808.

93.   Nussenzweig PM, Marraffini LA. Molecular Mechanisms of CRISPR-Cas Immunity in

Bacteria. Annu Rev Genet. 2020;54:93-120.

94.   Nicholson TJ, Jackson SA, Croft BI, Staals RHJ, Fineran PC, Brown CM. Bioinformatic

evidence of widespread priming in type I and II CRISPR-Cas systems. RNA Biol. 2019;16(4):566-

76.

95.   Datsenko KA, Pougach K, Tikhonov A, Wanner BL, Severinov K, Semenova E. Molecular

memory of prior infections activates the CRISPR/Cas adaptive bacterial immunity system.

Nature communications. 2012;3:945.

96.   Deecker SR, Ensminger AW. Type I-F CRISPR-Cas Distribution and Array Dynamics in

Legionella pneumophila. G3. 2020;10(3):1039-50.

97.   Haerter JO, Sneppen K. Spatial structure and Lamarckian adaptation explain extreme

genetic diversity at CRISPR locus. mBio. 2012;3(4):e00126-12.

98.   Koonin EV, Wolf YI. Evolution of the CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity systems in

prokaryotes: models and observations on virus-host coevolution. Mol Biosyst. 2015;11(1):20-7.

99.   Weissman JL, Holmes R, Barrangou R, Moineau S, Fagan WF, Levin B, et al. Immune

loss as a driver of coexistence during host-phage coevolution. The ISME journal.

2018;12(2):585-97.

100.   Wheatley RM, MacLean RC. CRISPR-Cas systems restrict horizontal gene transfer in

Pseudomonas aeruginosa. The ISME journal. 2021;15(5):1420-33.

101.   Bowers RM, Nayfach S, Schulz F, Jungbluth SP, Ruhl IA, Sheremet A, et al. Dissecting

the dominant hot spring microbial populations based on community-wide sampling at single-

cell genomic resolution. The ISME journal. 2022;16(5):1337-47.

 Figure legends

 Figure 1: Assembly and quality-control of CRISPR arrays in the human gut microbiome. (a)

 Schematics of the study design based on metagenomic data from the HMP2-IBD cohort.

 CRISPR arrays were assembled de novo with CasCollect. (b) Number of CRISPR arrays per

 sample. (c) Distribution of the number of CRISPR arrays per sample in patients with Crohn's

 disease (CD), ulcerative colitis (UC), and participants with no inflammatory bowel disease

 (nonIBD). The central lines indicate the medians for each group. Kruskal-Wallis omnibus test

 for differences among groups ($\chi^2 = 148$; $p < 10^{-10}$). Mann-Whitney tests for differences between

 nonIBD and disease (Z = 10.4; $p < 10^{-10}$); and between normal and dysbiosis (Z = 6.76; $p < 10^{-10}$).

 (d) Distribution of the number of spacers per CRISPR array, in all arrays (grey) and arrays

 located in the vicinity of Cas genes (blue). The dashed line indicates the best fit to a truncated

 power-law. (e) Distribution of the number of CRISPR arrays per lineage (note the logarithmic

 scale in the y-axis, also in (d)). (f) Quantification of the number of pairs of CRISPR arrays from

 the same lineage that show inconsistencies in spacer order, spacer orientation, and array

 orientation.

 Figure 2: Distribution of CRISPR subtypes among taxa and association with dysbiosis. The area

 of each circle is proportional to the number of CRISPR lineages in the whole dataset. Colors

 indicate the relative association with dysbiosis. Subtypes with <50 CRISPR lineages are not

 represented. "Other/undetermined" includes genera (or phyla) with <50 CRISPR lineages and

 lineages with ambiguous classification at the genus (or phylum) level. CRISPR subtypes on the

 x-axis are listed from left to right based on their total abundance.

 Figure 3: Targets of CRISPR-Cas immunity in the gut microbiome. (a) Relative representation of

 different classes of mobile genetic elements among the targets of CRISPR-Cas systems. Left pie

 chart: hits to a merged database of known mobile genetic elements (MGE db). Right:

 protospacers from the local microbiome, defined as the combination of all samples obtained

from the same participant. The segment for lytic viruses also includes chronic (non-lysogenic)

viruses (b) Distribution and functional profile of CRISPR targets across CRISPR-Cas subtypes.

Locally adapted spacers (bar plot on the left) are those that target sequences from the local

microbiome. (c) Relative position of locally adapted spacers within the CRISPR array. L: leading

end; T: trailing end. (d) Fraction of spacers targeting lysogenic phages (with respect to all that

target phages) in the leading, middle, and distal sections of the array. Whiskers represent 95%

confidence intervals calculated with the Clopper-Pearson method. In (b), (c), and (d), only

those subtypes with >100 locally adapted spacers are shown. Subtype II-C was additionally

excluded from (c) and (d) due to the unavailability of accurate predictions for the orientation

of those arrays.

Figure 4: Effect of CRISPR-Cas immunity on MGE abundance and host diversity. (a) Median

normalized abundance of targeted MGE (plasmids, lytic/non-lysogenic phages, and lysogenic

phages) before the spacer was first observed in the host population ("Before"), in the sample

in which the spacer was observed for the first time ("Acquisition"), in subsequent samples in

which the spacer was present ("After – With spacer"), and in subsequent samples that

contained the same CRISPR lineage but not the spacer ("After – No spacer"). Error bars

indicate the 95% confidence intervals for the median, based on 2,000 bootstraps. All

comparisons shown above the plot are statistically significant with $p < 10^{-4}$ (Mann-Whitney

test). (b) Prevalence of targeted MGE, calculated as the fraction of samples in which the target

is detected. Error bars indicate the 95% confidence intervals (Clopper-Pearson method).

Statistical significance based on Fisher's exact test: $p < 0.05$ (*), $p < 0.01$ (**), $p < 0.001$ (***).

(c) Diversity distribution (number of distinct arrays) of CRISPR lineages that target at least one

MGE from the local microbiome ("active" lineages) and those that do not show any sign of

local adaptation ("inactive" lineages). (d) Number of arrays per lineage in the presence and

absence of MGE. For a given active lineage, samples with MGE are those that contain at least

one MGE targeted by at least one spacer from that lineage. (e) Percentage of arrays per

lineage that target MGE from the same sample, compared to the expected value for randomly

chosen arrays. The randomized set only includes active lineages and samples with MGE

targeted by those lineages. Error bars indicate the 95% confidence intervals based on 2,000

bootstraps.

Figure 5: Temporal dynamics of MGE and CRISPR arrays. (a) Network representation of 7 of the

most frequent trajectory clusters (TC) representing potential immune adaptation in the host

population. Each node represents a state, defined by the presence or absence of a spacer, its

cognate MGE, and the CRISPR lineage in which the spacer was acquired (legend in the upper

left box). Node sizes are proportional to the number of times that a state is observed in a

trajectory. Arrow widths represent transition probabilities between states and the color scale

indicates the fraction of direct vs indirect transitions (direct transitions correspond to two

consecutive samples, indirect transitions involve intermediate samples in which neither the

MGE nor the CRISPR lineage were observed). (b) Simplified representation of typical

trajectories associated with the TC in (a). (c) Relative association of lytic (or non-lysogenic)

phages, lysogenic phages, plasmids, and ambiguous MGE with each TC.

a

2-week intervals

0   1 year

130 participants

80k CRISPR arrays → >1,600 metagenomes

Local adaptation
Abundance dynamics

b

nonIBD   CD   UC

arrays per sample

Participant ID

c

***   ***

n = 427   571   373   168   73

arrays per sample

nonIBD   CD   UC   CD   UC

normal   dysbiosis

d

CRISPR array sizes

$x^{-1.8} e^{-0.026 x}$

num. arrays (log-scale)

num. spacers per array

e

CRISPR lineage sizes

num. lineages (log-scale)

num. arrays per lineage

f

inconsistency	num. pairs	
spacer order	4.9k/137k	(3.6%)
spacer orientation	10/176k	(<0.01%)
array orientation	6/704	(0.9%)

● all arrays   ● arrays with Cas genes

a CRISPR targets

Known MGE db

Local microbiome

- Lytic phage
- Lysogenic phage
- Plasmid
- Other MGE
- Ambiguous
- Unknown

153,745 spacers

8,881 spacers (6%)

b

% locally adapted   Known MGE db (%)   Local microbiome (%)

I-B
I-C
I-E
II-A
II-C
III-A

c

Local adaptation (normalized)

I-B   I-C   I-E   II-A   III-A

Position in CRISPR array

- identical
- 1 mismatch

d

Lysogenic targets (%)

leading middle distal

Position in CRISPR array