Timescales and genetic linkage explain the variable impact of defense systems on horizontal gene transfer

Yang Liu[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

Prokaryotes have evolved a wide repertoire of defense systems to prevent invasion by mobile genetic elements (MGE). However, because MGE are vehicles for the exchange of beneficial accessory genes, defense systems could consequently impede rapid adaptation in microbial populations. Here, we study how defense systems impact horizontal gene transfer (HGT) in the short and long terms. By combining comparative genomics and phylogeny-aware statistical methods, we quantified the association between the presence of 7 widespread defense systems and the abundance of MGE in the genomes of 196 bacterial and 1 archaeal species. We also calculated the differences in the rates of gene gain and loss between lineages that possess and lack each defense system. Our results show that the impact of defense systems on HGT is highly species- and system-dependent. CRISPR-Cas stands out as the defense system that most often associates with a decrease in the number of MGE and reduced gene acquisition. Timescale analysis reveals that defense systems must persist in a lineage for a relatively long time in order exert an appreciable

negative impact on HGT. In contrast, at short evolutionary times, defense systems,

MGE, and gene gain rates tend to be positively correlated. Based on these results

and given the high turnover rates experienced by defense systems, we propose that

the inhibitory effect of most defense systems on HGT is masked by recent co-

transfer events involving MGE.

Keywords: defense system, horizontal gene transfer, mobile genetic element,

CRISPR-Cas, phage, plasmid, comparative genomics.

Introduction

Gene exchange plays a key role in the adaption of microbes to changing

environments, facilitating the spread of antibiotic resistance, pathogenicity factors,

metabolic genes, and other accessory functions (1). Over the last decade, there has

been an increasing interest in assessing the ecological and genetic factors that

control horizontal gene transfer (HGT) and determine the outcome of newly

acquired genes in microbial populations (2-4). HGT is often mediated by mobile

genetic elements (MGE), such as phages, integrative and conjugative elements, and

plasmids, against which bacteria have evolved an elaborate repertoire of defense

systems (5-9). As a result, large-scale patterns of HGT are shaped by an interplay of

ecological and genetic variables that underlie cross-strain and cross-species

differences in susceptibility to MGE (10).

Recent studies have highlighted the role of CRISPR-Cas as widespread adaptive

immunity systems that protect archaea and bacteria against viruses and other MGE

(11, 12). While in vitro experiments have provided supportive evidence for this

function (13-15), questions remain about the extent to which CRISPR-Cas systems

constrain gene exchange in nature (16-21). More generally, there is a paucity of

research on how other defense systems, such as restriction-modification (RM),

abortive infection (Abi), and an expansive repertoire of recently identified gene

systems (e.g., DRT, BASS, and Gabija) affect HGT in prokaryotes.

At odds with the naïve expectation that defense systems should reduce the rates of HGT by interfering with the propagation of MGE, several empirical and theoretical observations suggest that the relation between defense systems and HGT might be more complex. First, the selection pressure to maintain defense systems in a population (and consequently their prevalence) generally increases with the exposure to MGE (22). Second, defense systems are mobilized by MGE, which could lead to a trivial positive association with HGT rates. In a less trivial manner, whole defense systems or parts of them are often encoded by MGE (23-25), turning the latter into addictive modules with beneficial side-effects in cellular defense (26, 27).

Here, we applied a phylogeny-aware statistical framework to 19,323 high-quality genomes from 197 species, revealing a species- and time-dependent pattern of positive and negative associations between 7 widespread defense systems (RM, CRISPR-Cas, CBASS, DMS, DRT, Gabija, and Abi) and HGT rates. Comparative data analysis singles out CRISPR-Cas as the system that most often presents a negative impact on MGE abundance and gene exchange. Our results shed light on the nuanced consequences of the interplay between defense systems and MGE on bacterial evolution across time scales.

Results

Association between defense systems and MGE abundance is MGE- and species-dependent

We used species-wise phylogenetic generalized mixed-effect models (PGMM) to study the association between the 7 most prevalent defense systems in the dataset (RM, DMS, Abi, CRISPR-Cas, Gabija, DRT, and CBASS), genome size, and the number of MGE per genome (Fig. 1). Notably, the sign and magnitude of the associations are strongly species-, system-, and MGE-dependent. Out of 197 species included in the analysis, around 20-30 (depending on the defense system) displayed a statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) positive association between the presence of the defense system and genome size. In contrast, statistically significant negative associations

were only observed in 5-15 species. Because differences in the number of genomes

per species could bias comparisons based on p-values, we also explored an

alternative criterion based on effect sizes to determine the number of positive and

negative associations (see Methods). Regardless of the criterion, CRISPR-Cas stood

out as the defense system that most often displays negative associations with

genome size. Other defense systems do not show a clear trend or, in the case of

CBASS and DRT, positively correlate with larger genomes in most of the species. The

analysis also reveals differences regarding the association between defense systems

and distinct types of MGE. In all defense systems, negative associations with

prophages are more frequent than negative associations with plasmids. Once again,

the clearest trend corresponds to CRISPR-Cas, whose presence tends to correlate

with a reduction in the number of prophages, but with higher numbers of

transposable elements and plasmids.

A more detailed analysis at the level of functional categories reveals that the

presence of defense systems is most often associated with changes in the number of

genes from COG categories X (mobilome), L (replication, recombination and repair),

U (intracellular trafficking and secretion), K (transcription), D (cell cycle control, cell

division and chromosome partitioning), and V (defense) (Fig. 1 and S1). Genes from

these functional categories are typically present in MGE, suggesting that correlations

(both positive and negative) between defense systems and genome size are

primarily due to differences in the abundance of MGE. We confirmed that by

masking genomic regions that correspond to MGE and rerunning the statistical

analysis. As expected, 82% of the significant associations disappeared after masking

MGE (Fig S2). Although a few significant associations persisted, a closer inspection

revealed that those were often related to genes from prophages and other MGE

(such as phage satellites) that had not been originally identified as such and

remained unmasked.

The sign of the association between defense systems and MGE does not follow a

clear taxonomic trend (Fig. 2, S3 and S4), with opposite signs sometimes found in

closely related species (see, for example, the differences for CRISPR-Cas in

Phocaeicola vulgatus and *P. dorei*). Moreover, the same species often display opposite trends for different defense systems. For example, in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, genomes with CRISPR-Cas contain fewer MGE, whereas genomes with CBASS, Gabija, and RM systems are significantly enriched in MGE. Negative associations between CRISPR-Cas and MGE are more abundant in the genus *Acinetobacter* (5 out of 8 species), the phylum Bacteriodetes (negative association in 8 species, positive association in a single species) and the class Clostridia, the latter especially affecting prophages (negative association in 11 species, positive association in 2 species; Fig. S4). The genus *Acinetobacter* is also enriched in negative associations involving Abi (5 species) and CBASS (4 species). Furthermore, three almost non-overlapping groups of streptococci display negative associations for different defense systems. These encompass *S. pyogenes*, *S. gordonii*, *S. anginosus*, *S. mutans*, and *S. salivarius* in the case of CRISPR-Cas; *S. anginosus*, *S. oralis*, *S. intermedius*, and *S. suis* in the case of RM and DMS; and *S. pyogenes*, *S. dysgalactiae*, *S. equi*, and *S. uberis* in the case of Gabija.

<u>Associations between defense systems and MGE arise from differences in the rate of gene acquisition</u>

To investigate if correlations between defense systems and MGE involve cross-strain differences in genome plasticity, we built high-resolution strain trees and identified clades that contain defense systems (DEF$^+$). Then, we inferred the rates of gene gain and loss associated with different classes of MGE in DEF$^+$ clades and in their respective sister groups lacking the defense system (DEF$^-$) using the phylogenomic reconstruction tool GLOOME. We quantified the relative differences in gene gain and loss by dividing the rates observed in DEF$^+$ clades by those from sister DEF$^-$ clades. Finally, we compared the resulting DEF$^+$/DEF$^-$ gain and loss ratios between species in which MGE abundances and defense systems are positively and negatively correlated. We found that DEF$^+$ and DEF$^-$ clades often differ in their gain rates but not in their loss rates (Fig. 3). Specifically, in species in which defense systems are associated with increased MGE abundance, gene gain rates are typically higher in

clades that contain the defense system. The opposite (that is, a reduction of gene gain rates in DEF$^+$ clades) is observed in species in which defense systems are associated with lower MGE abundance. Among the latter, the biggest reductions in plasmid acquisition occur in association with RM, DRT, DMS and Abi, whereas significant drops in prophage gain are observed for DRT, CBASS and CRISPR-Cas. Taken together, these results confirm that correlations between defense systems and MGE arise from cross-strain differences in gene gain rather than loss, as expected given the role of MGE as facilitators of horizontal gene transfer.

Timescales and linkage determine the sign of associations between defense systems and HGT

Because prokaryotic defense systems are often located within or adjacent to MGE, we hypothesized that positive associations between defense systems and MGE abundance could be explained, at least in part, by recent co-transfer events (henceforth, we term this the "linkage hypothesis"). As a result, the negative effects of defense systems on HGT should be easier to detect at longer timescales or under evolutionary conditions that weakened the physical linkage of defense systems and MGE.

To test this hypothesis, we studied how relative differences in the rates of overall gene gain between DEF$^+$ and DEF$^-$ clades depend on the depth of their last common ancestor in the strain tree (note that the depth of the last common ancestor serves as an upper limit for the time that the defense system has been retained in a lineage). As predicted, positive outliers (with much higher gene gain rate in the DEF$^+$ clade than in the DEF$^-$ clade) almost invariably correspond to very recent lineages ($< 10^{-5}$ substitutions per bp in nearly universal core genes), indicating a very recent acquisition of the defense system (Fig. 4a). In contrast, negative outliers (with much lower gene gain rate in the DEF$^+$ clade than in the DEF$^-$ clade) generally correspond to deeper lineages (> 0.001 substitutions per bp). We quantified these trends by calculating the skewness of the distribution of DEF$^+$/DEF$^-$ log-transformed gain ratios

in very recent and older lineages (Fig. 4b and Table S1). All the distributions show
significant positive skewness in recent lineages and significant negative skewness in
older lineages (all $p < 0.001$ except recent RM lineages, with $p = 0.023$; d'Agostino
test for skewness). This quantitative analysis confirms that differences in timescale
affect all defense systems, with positive associations between defense systems and
gene gain being dominant in the short term and negative associations becoming
more frequent in the long term.

A second prediction of the linkage hypothesis is that the net effect of defense
systems on HGT is not only species, but also lineage specific. That is, defense systems
may display positive, zero, or negative association with HGT in different lineages
depending on when the defense system was acquired and how tight is the linkage to
MGE. A more detailed study of gene gain rates in individual species confirms that the
effect of CRISPR-Cas is, indeed, lineage-specific, with the same species encompassing
recent CRISPR-Cas$^+$ lineages that display increased gene gain rates and older CRISPR-
Cas$^+$ lineages with reduced gene gain rates (Fig. 4c). This observation, combined with
the very recent acquisition of CRISPR-Cas in most lineages, could explain why many
species show non-significant or positive associations between CRISPR-Cas and MGE
abundances. Indeed, of the 6 representative species shown in Fig. 4c, only
Streptococcus anginosus and *Acinetobacter radioresistens* show a net negative
association between CRISPR-Cas and MGE abundance in the PGLMM analysis.

The findings described so far indicate that, of the 7 defense systems considered in
this study, CRISPR-Cas is the one that most often induces a net reduction in HGT
rates. According to the linkage hypothesis, this could be due to a comparatively
weaker physical association between CRISPR-Cas and MGE. To evaluate that
possibility, we calculated the percentage of genes from CRISPR-Cas located inside
MGE and compared that to other defense systems. Consistent with the linkage
hypothesis, CRISPR-Cas is the defense system that is least often encoded by MGE,
followed by Gabija and DMS (Fig. 4d). (4.97% vs 8.12%, $p < 10^{-8}$, chi-squared test).

Anti-CRISPR proteins modulate associations between CRISPR-Cas and HGT

Anti-CRISPR proteins (Acr) have the potential to suppress the possible negative effect of CRISPR-Cas on MGE-driven gene transfer (28). This, in turn, could contribute to explaining the sign of the association between CRISPR-Cas and MGE in different lineages. To assess that possibility, we searched all the genomes in the dataset for known Acr, finding 16,058 proteins. Then, we compared the prevalence of Acr in species in which the presence of CRISPR-Cas is positively or negatively correlated with the MGE content, separately considering genomes that do and do not harbor CRISPR-Cas. Because Acr are generally encoded by MGE (29) and the prevalence of MGE systematically varies across groups acting as a confounding factor, we restricted our comparisons to genomes that contain at least one prophage. Our results indicate that genomes with and without CRISPR-Cas differ in the prevalence of Acr (Fig. S5). More importantly, these differences have opposite directions in species in which CRISPR-Cas is positively and negatively associated with MGE abundance. In the former, Acr are more prevalent in genomes that contain CRISPR-Cas ($p = 0.0012$, chi-squared test). In the latter, Acr are less prevalent in genomes with CRISPR-Cas ($p < 10^{-6}$, chi-squared test). Interestingly, the prevalence of Acr in genomes without CRISPR-Cas is similar in both groups. These results suggest that negative associations between CRISPR-Cas and HGT could be dependent on (or at least facilitated by) low prevalence of Acr in the genome.

Discussion

Defense systems could have a significant impact on microbial evolution by effectively blocking the transfer of MGE, reducing gene flow and limiting the spread of accessory genes. However, because defense systems are often carried by MGE and these are the main vehicles of HGT, a net positive association between defense systems and gene exchange cannot be ruled out *a priori*. We assessed the relative weight of these two opposite scenarios by quantifying the association between

defense systems, MGE abundance, and gene acquisition rates in a phylogeny-aware
comparative study of 197 prokaryotic species.

Our results shed light on previous, apparently contradictory findings concerning the
effect of CRISPR-Cas on genome evolution and diversification (16-20). A pioneering
study conducted in 2015 found no evidence to support an overall association
between CRISPR-Cas activity and reduced gene acquisition via HGT at evolutionary
time scales (16). Such lack of association was explained by several factors, including
the high mobility of CRISPR-Cas systems, that limits their long-term impact on host
genomes, and the possibility that HGT is mediated by MGE that escape (or are not
targeted by) CRISPR-Cas immunity.

Our analyses support the general conclusion that CRISPR-Cas and other defense
systems have little overall impact on HGT in most bacterial species. Specifically,
differences in the rates of gene acquisition in lineages that do and do not harbor
defense systems are centered around zero. That said, we identified significant
opposite trends at very short and intermediate evolutionary time scales. In
particular, positive associations between defense systems and HGT are more
frequent at very short time scales, whereas negative associations become dominant
at longer time scales. These opposite trends suggest that the actual effects of
defense systems on gene exchange may be obscured by recent co-transfer events
involving MGE. As a result, the possible negative effects of defense systems on HGT
only become detectable if the defense system is maintained for long enough periods
of time.

Besides this general picture, we identified some species in which the presence of
defense systems (especially CRISPR-Cas) significantly correlates with smaller genome
sizes and MGE abundances. Some of those associations had been previously
described in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (9, 20). And yet,
these species represent special cases rather than the rule, even in the context of
host-associated bacteria. In fact, our results underline that the association between
defense systems and HGT is strongly system- and species-dependent. This conclusion
confirms and extends previous findings that showed that the impact of CRISPR-Cas

on the spread of antibiotic resistance is highly variable across species and its sign
cannot be easily explained by simple ecological, environmental, or genomic
variables(19).

Among the 7 defense systems included in this study, CRISPR-Cas stands out for being
the most recurrently associated with reduced genome sizes and lower MGE
(especially prophage) abundances. In contrast, DMS, Abi, DRT, and CBASS are more
often associated with higher numbers of MGE and accessory genes. This finding is
fully consistent with a recent study that compared 73 defense systems in 12
bacterial species (30). We propose that what makes CRISPR-Cas systems different is
their weaker (though still substantial) linkage with MGE. Compared to fully
functional CRISPR-Cas systems, other defense systems like Abi, Gabija, CBASS, DMS,
and RM are more frequently located within or next to MGE (23, 24, 31, 32) and may
have alternative functions related to MGE propagation. For example, Abi systems
have been identified in PICIs as accessory genes that facilitate their parasitic lifecycle
(33). The narrow specificity of some defense systems may be another reason why
those systems do not significantly interfere with HGT. For instance, the GmrSD type
IV RM system selectively targets phages with glucosylated hydroxymethylcytosine
(34) and the Thoeris defense system only appears to be effective against myoviruses
(6). Although selective targeting is often viewed as an outcome of phage-host
coevolution, it is tempting to speculate that it could have been evolutionarily
favored by the need to fight harmful genetic parasites while maintaining sufficiently
high rates of HGT to prevent population-level gene loss (35).

All in all, we showed that some defense systems, especially CRISPR-Cas, can
significantly reduce HGT, although the effect is often masked by the fact that these
systems travel together with MGE. Beyond the possible functional connections
briefly discussed above, the linkage between defense systems and MGE is a
fundamental consequence of the arms race between parasites and hosts. Indeed,
because defense systems are costly and their efficacy drops as parasites evolve, they
are subject to rapid turnover and must rely on HGT for long-term persistence in
microbial populations (36-39). As a result, it is extremely challenging to disentangle

the impact of defense systems on gene flow from the causes that lead to their
presence or absence, especially at short evolutionary time scales. We expect that
future research on defense systems and MGE, fueled by the unprecedented
availability of genomic and metagenomic data, will help overcome these difficulties
by producing precise quantitative estimates of their linkage and better null models
for testing their role in microbial adaptation at different time scales.

Methods

Genome collection and identification of defense systems

We parsed the Genome Taxonomy Database (GTDB) release 202 (40) to identify all
high-quality genomes (according to the MIMAG criteria (41)) with completeness
>99%, contamination <1%, and contig count <500. The 82,595 genomes that passed
these filters were downloaded from the NCBI FTP site. CRISPR-Cas systems were
identified with CRISPRCasTyper v1.2.4 (42) using default parameters. We classified a
genome as CRISPR-Cas$^+$ if it contains at least one high-confidence Cas operon and
CRISPR-Cas$^-$ otherwise. Only the species with >10 genomes and at least 5 CRISPR-
Cas$^+$ genomes were further considered. To reduce the computational cost, we only
considered a maximum of 500 genomes per species. Species with >500 genomes
were randomly subsampled to keep at most 350 CRISPR-Cas$^+$ and 150 CRISPR-Cas$^-$
genomes. Other defense systems were identified with Padloc v1.1.0 (db v1.4.0) (43).
Our analysis focused on the most prevalent defense systems: restriction-
modification (RM), DMS, Abi, CRISPR-Cas, Gabija, DRT, and CBASS.

After applying these criteria, 19,323 genomes belonging to 196 bacterial and 1
archaeal species (*sensu* GTDB) were included in the analysis. Of those, 2,964
correspond to complete genomes and the rest to high-quality, nearly complete ones.

Gene prediction and annotation.

Open reading frames (ORF) were predicted with Prodigal v2.6.3, using codon table
11 (prokaryotic genetic code) and "single" mode, as recommended for finished and

draft quality genomes (44). Orthologous ORF were then separately clustered for

each species with Roary v3.13.0 (45) setting an 80% identity threshold for initial

clustering followed by synteny-based refinement (options '-t 11 -i 80'). The resulting

gene clusters were functionally annotated by selecting a representative sequence,

arbitrarily chosen among those with length between 0.95 and 1.05 times the average

length of all sequences in the cluster. Representative sequences were functionally

annotated by mapping them to in-house profiles of the Clusters of Orthologous

Genes (COG) database (2020 release) (46) with HMMER v3.1b2 (e-value < 0.001)

(http://hmmer.org). The 26 major prokaryotic functional categories defined in the

COG database were assigned to the annotated genes. Some functional categories (A,

RNA processing and modification; B, chromatin structure and dynamics; W,

extracellular structures; T, signal transduction; and Z, cytoskeleton) were excluded

since they rarely or never occur in prokaryotic genomes. The case-insensitive

keywords "phage", "plasmid" and "transpos*" in the COG gene annotations were

used to identify genes associated with prophages, plasmids, and transposons,

respectively, and the resulting gene lists were manually curated to minimize false

assignments. Anti-defense proteins, including anti-CRISPR, were identified by

running HMMER v3.1b2 (e-value < 10^{-10}) against the dbAPIS database (47).

Identification of genomic regions containing mobile genetic elements

Prophages were detected with Phispy v4.2.21 using default options (48). Short

transposons were identified based on the presence of isolated or paired genes

annotated as transposases. In the latter case, we allowed for up to one additional

gene between two transposon-related genes to account for the genetic architecture

of some insertion sequences (49). Due to the inherent difficulty to discriminate

among plasmids, ICE, and IME (9), we restricted the search for these elements to

complete genomes. Plasmids were identified as extra-chromosomal replicons that

contain the "plasmid" label in their NCBI description lines. After removing those

replicons, ICEfinder (50) was used to identify ICE and IME. Finally, we ran Phispy

v4.2.21 with option '-phage_genes 0' to identify any other MGE, integrons,

pathogenicity islands, and fragments of MGE that could have been missed by the

previous approaches.

<u>Species trees</u>

Phylogenetic trees were separately built for each species based on the set of 120

prokaryotic marker genes (122 in the case of Archaea) proposed by the GTDB r202.

For each species, only those marker genes with prevalence >80% were used for

phylogenetic reconstruction. We aligned the amino acid sequences of each marker

gene with mafft-linsi (L-INS-I algorithm, default options, MAFFT v7.475) (51) and

back-translated the amino acid alignments to nucleotide alignments with pal2nal.pl

v14 (52) using codon table 11. After concatenating all nucleotide alignments, we

built preliminary trees with FastTree v2.1.10 (options '-gtr -nt -gamma -nosupport -

mlacc 2 -slownni') (53). The tree topologies produced by FastTree were subsequently

provided to RaxML v8.2.12 (54) for branch length optimization (raxmlHPC with

options '-f e -m GTRGAMMA').

To visualize trends across species (Fig. 2, S3, and S4), we used the online tool iTOL

(55) and the multispecies tree from GTDB r202.

<u>Phylogenetic generalized linear mixed models (PGLMM)</u>

For each species, we collected the total genome size, the number of genes belonging

to each functional category, and the number of genes associated with prophages,

plasmids, and transposons, in genomes that do and do not harbor the defense

system of interest. Genes that belong to the defense system of interest were not

counted in any of the groups. For each variable, we fitted a PGLMM with Poisson

distribution and canonical link function, with the presence or absence of the defense

system as the predictor, the number of genes as the response variable, and the

corresponding species tree as the guide to generate the covariance matrix. The

PGLMM were fit with the function pglmm_compare() from the R package phyr v1.1.0

(56).

We used two alternative criteria to identify species in which the presence of a

defense system is positively or negative associated with gene numbers. On the one

side, we adopted a classical criterion of statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) for the

predictor variable in the PGLMM. On the other side, we an alternative criterion

based on effect size, aimed at comparing species with different sample sizes in which

comparison of p-values could be affected by sensitivity biases. For each variable and

defense system, we jointly considered the PGLMM of all the species and determined

the effect size threshold as the smallest effect size (in absolute value) that reached

statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) in any species.

<u>Inference of gene gain and loss rates</u>

Gene gains and losses at each branch of each species tree were estimated with

Gloome (57), using as inputs the gene presence/absence matrices previously

generated by Roary and the species trees. The parameter configuration file was set

to optimize the likelihood of the observed phyletic profiles under a genome

evolution model with 4 categories of gamma-distributed gain and loss rates and

stationary frequencies at the root.

<u>Comparison of gene gain and loss rates between DEF$^+$ and DEF$^-$ clades</u>

For each species tree, we defined DEF$^+$ clades as the narrowest possible clades such

that at least 80% of the leaves contain the defense system of interest. Candidate

DEF$^-$ clades were defined in an analogous way, referring to leaves without the

defense system. Next, we identified pairs of DEF$^+$ and DEF$^-$ clades that constitute

sister groups. Sister DEF$^{+/-}$ pairs were excluded if both clades contained a single

genome. For each clade in a valid pair, we computed the overall gene gain and loss

rates as the expected number of gene gains (or losses) in that clade divided by the

total branch length. Gain and loss rates for different functional categories and MGE

we calculated in an analogous way but restricting the sum of gene gains and losses

to the genes of interest. When calculating overall and category-wise gain and loss

rates, we did not take into account the contribution of species-wise singletons

(genes without homologs in other genomes of the same species), as they may

represent false gene predictions or genes that are replaced at unusually high rates

(58). To account for the non-negative nature of gain and loss rates and their heavy-

tailed distributions, comparisons between DEF$^+$ and DEF$^-$ sister branches were done

based on log-transformed rate estimates. To calculate the skewness of the

distributions and their statistical significance, we use the method proposed by

D'Agostino (59) as implemented by the scipy.stats.skewtest() function in Python (60).

Funding

Y.L. is supported by China Scholarship Council (No.202008440425). 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).

Figure legends

Figure 1: Association between 7 widespread defense systems, genome size, and MGE abundance. The length of the bars indicates the number of species displaying positive or negative associations in a phylogenetic generalized linear mixed effects model (see Methods) according to two alternative criteria: $p < 0.05$ and absolute effect size greater than the smallest significant effect size (|ES|>SSES), separately computed for each response variable and defense system. The association with MGE was calculated based on marker genes for prophages (Ph), plasmids (Pl), and transposons (Tr). Abbreviations of functional categories: X (mobilome), L (replication, recombination and repair), U (intracellular trafficking and secretion), K

(transcription), D (cell cycle control, cell division and chromosome partitioning), and
V (defense).

Figure 2: Taxonomic distribution of species displaying positive and negative
associations between the presence of defense systems and the number of genes
from the mobilome (based on COG annotations). Taxa discussed in the text are
labeled: A, *Acinetobacter*; Pa, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*; Pv, *Phocaeicola vulgatus*;
Pd, *Phocaeicola dorei*; S1, *Streptococcus gordonii, S. anginosus, S. mutans*, and *S.*
salivarius; S2, *S. oralis, S. intermedius*, and *S. suis*; S3, *S. pyogenes, S. dysgalactiae, S.*
equi, and *S. uberis*. See figure S3 for a larger version including all species names.

Figure 3: Relative differences in the rates of gene gain and loss between sister clades
that do and do not harbor defense systems (DEF$^+$ and DEF$^-$, respectively). The
boxplots represent the distribution of the DEF$^+$/DEF$^-$ ratio of gene gain (or loss) rates
for each class of MGE, calculated for every pair of sister clades. Values greater (or
smaller) than 1 indicate increased (or reduced) gene flux in lineages that contain the
defense system. (a) Species that show a negative association between the defense
system and the number of marker genes for each class of MGE (PGLMM with
smallest significant effect size criterion). (b) Species that show a positive association
between the defense system and the number of marker genes for each class of MGE.
In the boxplots, the central line indicates the median, the box limits correspond to
the 25 and 75 percentiles, and the whiskers extend to the largest and smallest values
not classified as outliers. P-values are based on Wilcoxon test with log-ratio = 0 as
null hypothesis.

Figure 4: Association between defense systems and gene gain rates depends on the
time scale. (a) Ratio of overall gene gain rates between sister clades that do and do
not harbor defense systems (DEF$^+$ and DEF$^-$, respectively). Values greater (or smaller)
than 1 indicate increased (or reduced) gene flux in lineages that contain the defense
system. (b) Density distribution of the DEF$^+$/DEF$^-$ gain ratios, comparing clades that
represent recent acquisitions of the defense system (depth < 10^{-5} substitutions per
site in core genes) and clades that have retained the defense system for longer times
(depth > 10^{-3} substitutions per site). The probability density function (y-axis) is

represented in logarithmic scale to facilitate the visualization the tails. The skewness
of all distributions is statistically significant (see Table S1), with positive values for
recent clades and negative values for deeper clades (c) Representative examples of
gene gain ratios in shallow and deeper sister groups from the same species. (d)
Percentage of genes from different defense systems located within known MGE.
Whiskers represent 95% confidence intervals based on the binomial distribution.

Supplementary Figures

Figure S1: Association between 7 widespread defense systems and the number of
genes from different functional categories (based on COG annotations). The length
of the bars indicates the number of species displaying positive or negative
associations in a phylogenetic generalized linear mixed effects model (see Methods)
according to two alternative criteria: $p < 0.05$ and absolute effect size greater than
the smallest significant effect size (|ES|>SSES), separately computed for each
response variable and defense system. Abbreviations of functional categories, C:
energy production and conversion; D: cell cycle control, cell division, chromosome
partitioning; E: amino acid transport and metabolism; F: nucleotide transport and
metabolism; G: carbohydrate transport and metabolism; H: coenzyme transport and
metabolism; I: lipid transport and metabolism; J: translation, ribosomal structure and
biogenesis; K: transcription; L: replication, recombination and repair; M: cell
wall/membrane/envelope biogenesis; N: cell motility; O: posttranslational
modification, protein turnover, chaperones; P: inorganic ion transport and
metabolism; Q: secondary metabolites biosynthesis, transport and catabolism; R:
general function prediction only; S: function unknown; T: signal transduction
mechanisms; U: intracellular trafficking, secretion, and vesicular transport; V:
defense mechanisms; X: mobilome: prophages, transposons.

Figure S2: Association between 7 widespread defense systems and the number of
genes from different functional categories before and after masking MGE from
complete genomes. The length of the bars indicates the number of species displaying

significant ($p < 0.05$) positive or negative associations in a phylogenetic generalized linear mixed effects model. Abbreviations of functional categories: X (mobilome), L (replication, recombination and repair), U (intracellular trafficking and secretion), K (transcription), D (cell cycle control, cell division and chromosome partitioning), and V (defense).

Figure S3: Taxonomic distribution of species displaying positive or negative associations between the presence of defense systems and the number of genes from the mobilome (based on COG annotations).

Figure S4: Taxonomic distribution of species displaying positive or negative associations between the presence of defense systems and the number of genes in the genome (left) or the number of marker genes for prophages (right).

Figure S5: Prevalence of anti-CRISPR proteins (Acr) in genomes that do and do not contain CRISPR-Cas systems, separately calculated for species that display a positive or negative association between the presence of CRISPR-Cas and the number of genes from the mobilome (PGLMM, smallest significant effect size criterion). To control for the confounding effect of MGE prevalence on Acr, only genomes with prophages were considered. Whiskers represent 95% confidence intervals based on the binomial distribution.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1: Skewness and associated p-values for the distributions of DEF$^+$/DEF$^-$ log-transformed gain ratios in recent (depth $< 10^{-5}$) and deep (depth $> 10^{-3}$) lineages.

References

1.   Arnold BJ, Huang IT, Hanage WP. Horizontal gene transfer and adaptive evolution in bacteria. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2022;20(4):206-18.

2.   Soucy SM, Huang J, Gogarten JP. Horizontal gene transfer: building the web of life. Nature reviews Genetics. 2015;16(8):472-82.

3.   Hall RJ, Whelan FJ, McInerney JO, Ou Y, Domingo-Sananes MR. Horizontal
Gene Transfer as a Source of Conflict and Cooperation in Prokaryotes. Front
Microbiol. 2020;11:1569.

4.   Lee IPA, Eldakar OT, Gogarten JP, Andam CP. Bacterial cooperation through
horizontal gene transfer. Trends Ecol Evol. 2022;37(3):223-32.

5.   Georjon H, Bernheim A. The highly diverse antiphage defence systems of
bacteria. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2023;21(10):686-700.

6.   Doron S, Melamed S, Ofir G, Leavitt A, Lopatina A, Keren M, et al. Systematic
discovery of antiphage defense systems in the microbial pangenome. Science.
2018;359(6379).

7.   Shaw LP, Rocha EPC, MacLean RC. Restriction-modification systems have
shaped the evolution and distribution of plasmids across bacteria. Nucleic acids
research. 2023;51(13):6806-18.

8.   Mayo-Munoz D, Pinilla-Redondo R, Birkholz N, Fineran PC. A host of armor:
Prokaryotic immune strategies against mobile genetic elements. Cell Rep.
2023;42(7):112672.

9.   Botelho J, Cazares A, Schulenburg H. The ESKAPE mobilome contributes to
the spread of antimicrobial resistance and CRISPR-mediated conflict between mobile
genetic elements. Nucleic acids research. 2023;51(1):236-52.

10.   Haudiquet M, de Sousa JM, Touchon M, Rocha EPC. Selfish, promiscuous and
sometimes useful: how mobile genetic elements drive horizontal gene transfer in
microbial populations. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2022;377(1861):20210234.

11.   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.

12.   van Vliet AHM, Charity OJ, Reuter M. A Campylobacter integrative and
conjugative element with a CRISPR-Cas9 system targeting competing plasmids: a
history of plasmid warfare? Microb Genom. 2021;7(11).

13.   Marraffini LA, Sontheimer EJ. CRISPR interference limits horizontal gene
transfer in staphylococci by targeting DNA. Science. 2008;322(5909):1843-5.

14.   Watson BNJ, Staals RHJ, Fineran PC. CRISPR-Cas-Mediated Phage Resistance
Enhances Horizontal Gene Transfer by Transduction. mBio. 2018;9(1).

15.   O'Hara BJ, Barth ZK, McKitterick AC, Seed KD. A highly specific phage defense
system is a conserved feature of the Vibrio cholerae mobilome. PLoS genetics.
2017;13(6):e1006838.

16.   Gophna U, Kristensen DM, Wolf YI, Popa O, Drevet C, Koonin EV. No evidence
of inhibition of horizontal gene transfer by CRISPR-Cas on evolutionary timescales.
The ISME journal. 2015;9(9):2021-7.

17.   O'Meara D, Nunney L. A phylogenetic test of the role of CRISPR-Cas in limiting
plasmid acquisition and prophage integration in bacteria. Plasmid. 2019;104:102418.

18.   Pursey E, Dimitriu T, Paganelli FL, Westra ER, van Houte S. CRISPR-Cas is
associated with fewer antibiotic resistance genes in bacterial pathogens. Philos Trans
R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2022;377(1842):20200464.

19.   Shehreen S, Chyou TY, Fineran PC, Brown CM. Genome-wide correlation
analysis suggests different roles of CRISPR-Cas systems in the acquisition of antibiotic
resistance genes in diverse species. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.
2019;374(1772):20180384.

20.   Wheatley RM, MacLean RC. CRISPR-Cas systems restrict horizontal gene
transfer in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. The ISME journal. 2021;15(5):1420-33.

21.   Westra ER, Levin BR. It is unclear how important CRISPR-Cas systems are for
protecting natural populations of bacteria against infections by mobile genetic
elements. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of
America. 2020;117(45):27777-85.

22.   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.

23.   Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Snir S, Koonin EV. Defense islands in bacterial and
archaeal genomes and prediction of novel defense systems. Journal of bacteriology.
2011;193(21):6039-56.

24.   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.

25.   Pinilla-Redondo R, Russel J, Mayo-Munoz D, Shah SA, Garrett RA, Nesme J, et
al. CRISPR-Cas systems are widespread accessory elements across bacterial and
archaeal plasmids. Nucleic acids research. 2022;50(8):4315-28.

26.   Rocha EPC, Bikard D. Microbial defenses against mobile genetic elements and
viruses: Who defends whom from what? PLoS Biol. 2022;20(1):e3001514.

27.   Koonin EV, Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Krupovic M. Evolutionary entanglement of
mobile genetic elements and host defence systems: guns for hire. Nature reviews
Genetics. 2020;21(2):119-31.

28.   Mahendra C, Christie KA, Osuna BA, Pinilla-Redondo R, Kleinstiver BP, Bondy-
Denomy J. Broad-spectrum anti-CRISPR proteins facilitate horizontal gene transfer.
Nature microbiology. 2020;5(4):620-9.

29.   Pinilla-Redondo R, Shehreen S, Marino ND, Fagerlund RD, Brown CM,
Sorensen SJ, et al. Discovery of multiple anti-CRISPRs highlights anti-defense gene
clustering in mobile genetic elements. Nature communications. 2020;11(1):5652.

30.   Kogay R, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. Defense systems and horizontal gene transfer in
bacteria. bioRxiv. 2024:2024.02.09.579689.

31.   Benler S, Faure G, Altae-Tran H, Shmakov S, Zheng F, Koonin E. Cargo Genes
of Tn7-Like Transposons Comprise an Enormous Diversity of Defense Systems,
Mobile   Genetic   Elements,   and   Antibiotic   Resistance   Genes.   mBio.
2021;12(6):e0293821.

32.   Rousset F, Depardieu F, Miele S, Dowding J, Laval AL, Lieberman E, et al.
Phages and their satellites encode hotspots of antiviral systems. Cell Host Microbe.
2022;30(5):740-53 e5.

33.   Ibarra-Chavez R, Hansen MF, Pinilla-Redondo R, Seed KD, Trivedi U. Phage
satellites and their emerging applications in biotechnology. FEMS Microbiol Rev.
2021;45(6).

34.   Bair CL, Black LW. A type IV modification dependent restriction nuclease that
targets glucosylated hydroxymethyl cytosine modified DNAs. J Mol Biol.
2007;366(3):768-78.

35.   Iranzo J, Puigbo P, Lobkovsky AE, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. Inevitability of Genetic
Parasites. Genome biology and evolution. 2016;8(9):2856-69.

36.   van Houte S, Buckling A, Westra ER. Evolutionary Ecology of Prokaryotic
Immune Mechanisms. Microbiology and molecular biology reviews : MMBR.
2016;80(3):745-63.

37.   Puigbo P, Makarova KS, Kristensen DM, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. Reconstruction of
the evolution of microbial defense systems. BMC evolutionary biology.
2017;17(1):94.

38.   Iranzo J, Cuesta JA, Manrubia S, Katsnelson MI, Koonin EV. Disentangling the
effects of selection and loss bias on gene dynamics. Proceedings of the National
Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2017;114(28):E5616-E24.

39.   Koonin EV, Makarova KS, Wolf YI. Evolutionary Genomics of Defense Systems
in Archaea and Bacteria. Annual review of microbiology. 2017;71:233-61.

40.   Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Chaumeil PA, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P. A
complete domain-to-species taxonomy for Bacteria and Archaea. Nature
biotechnology. 2020;38(9):1079-86.

41.   Bowers RM, Kyrpides NC, Stepanauskas R, Harmon-Smith M, Doud D, Reddy
TBK, et al. Minimum information about a single amplified genome (MISAG) and a
metagenome-assembled genome (MIMAG) of bacteria and archaea. Nature
biotechnology. 2017;35(8):725-31.

42.   Russel J, Pinilla-Redondo R, Mayo-Munoz D, Shah SA, Sorensen SJ.
CRISPRCasTyper: Automated Identification, Annotation, and Classification of CRISPR-
Cas Loci. CRISPR J. 2020;3(6):462-9.

43.   Payne LJ, Meaden S, Mestre MR, Palmer C, Toro N, Fineran PC, et al. PADLOC:
a web server for the identification of antiviral defence systems in microbial genomes.
Nucleic acids research. 2022;50(W1):W541-W50.

44.   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.

45.   Page AJ, Cummins CA, Hunt M, Wong VK, Reuter S, Holden MT, et al. Roary:
rapid large-scale prokaryote pan genome analysis. Bioinformatics. 2015;31(22):3691-
3.

46.   Galperin MY, Wolf YI, Makarova KS, Vera Alvarez R, Landsman D, Koonin EV.
COG database update: focus on microbial diversity, model organisms, and
widespread pathogens. Nucleic acids research. 2021;49(D1):D274-D81.

47.   Yan Y, Zheng J, Zhang X, Yin Y. dbAPIS: a database of anti-prokaryotic immune
system genes. Nucleic acids research. 2024;52(D1):D419-D25.

48.   Akhter S, Aziz RK, Edwards RA. PhiSpy: a novel algorithm for finding
prophages in bacterial genomes that combines similarity- and composition-based
strategies. Nucleic acids research. 2012;40(16):e126.

49.   Gomez MJ, Diaz-Maldonado H, Gonzalez-Tortuero E, Lopez de Saro FJ.
Chromosomal replication dynamics and interaction with the beta sliding clamp
determine orientation of bacterial transposable elements. Genome biology and
evolution. 2014;6(3):727-40.

50.   Liu M, Li X, Xie Y, Bi D, Sun J, Li J, et al. ICEberg 2.0: an updated database of
bacterial integrative and conjugative elements. Nucleic acids research.
2019;47(D1):D660-D5.

51.   Katoh K, Standley DM. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version
7: improvements in performance and usability. Molecular biology and evolution.
2013;30(4):772-80.

52.   Suyama M, Torrents D, Bork P. PAL2NAL: robust conversion of protein
sequence alignments into the corresponding codon alignments. Nucleic acids
research. 2006;34(Web Server issue):W609-12.

53.   Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. FastTree 2--approximately maximum-likelihood
trees for large alignments. PLoS One. 2010;5(3):e9490.

54.   Stamatakis A. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-
analysis of large phylogenies. Bioinformatics. 2014;30(9):1312-3.

55.   Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for
phylogenetic   tree   display   and   annotation.   Nucleic   acids   research.
2021;49(W1):W293-W6.

56.   Li D, Dinnage R, Nell LA, Helmus MR, Ives AR. phyr: An r package for
phylogenetic species-distribution modelling in ecological communities. Methods in
Ecology and Evolution. 2020;11(11):1455-63.

57.   Cohen O, Pupko T. Inference and characterization of horizontally transferred
gene   families   using   stochastic   mapping.   Molecular   biology   and   evolution.
2010;27(3):703-13.

58.   Wolf YI, Makarova KS, Lobkovsky AE, Koonin EV. Two fundamentally different
classes of microbial genes. Nature microbiology. 2016;2:16208.

59.   D'Agostino RB, Belanger A, D'Agostino Jr RB. A Suggestion for Using Powerful
and Informative Tests of Normality. The American Statistician. 1990;44(4):316-21.

60.   Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant TE, Haberland M, Reddy T, Cournapeau D,
et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat
Methods. 2020;17(3):261-72.

Abi
Gabija
RM
DRT
DMS
CBASS
CRISPR

Actinobacteria

Clostridia

Proteobacteria

Bacilli

Bacteroidetes

A

Pa

Pv Pd

S1 S2 S3

Negative (p < 0.05)

Positive (p < 0.05)

Negative (|ES| > SSES)

Positive (ES > SSES)

a

Tree depth (subst. per site)
10^{-1} 10^{-3} 10^{-5}

Abi
Gabija
RM
DRT
DMS
CBASS
CRISPR

10^{-4} 10^{-3} 10^{-2} 10^{-1} 1   10 10^2 10^3 10^4

Gene gain ratio (DEF$^+$ / DEF$^-$)

b

Depth > 10^{-3} Depth < 10^{-5}

Abi   n = 118   n = 276
Gabija   n = 67   n = 259
RM   n = 96   n = 94
DRT   n = 75   n = 261
DMS   n = 88   n = 91
CBASS   n = 53   n = 199
CRISPR   n = 222   n = 216

log pdf

10^{-4} 10^{-2} 1 10^2 10^4

Gene gain ratio (DEF$^+$ / DEF$^-$)

c

C. diphteriae
C. difficile
K. pneumoniae
S. anginosus
B. uniformis
A. radioresistens

10^{-4} 10^{-3} 10^{-2} 10^{-1} 1   10 10^2 10^3 10^4

Gene gain ratio (DEF$^+$ / DEF$^-$)

d

% located in MGE

12
8
4

Abi   Gabija   RM   DRT   DMS   CBASS   CRISPR

Number of species

Number of species

Genome size

Prophage genes

Actinobacteria

Clostridia

Bacilli

Bacteroidetes

Proteobacteria

Abi
Gabija
RM
DRT
DMS
CBASS
CRISPR

Negative (p < 0.05)
Positive (p < 0.05)
Negative (|ES| > SSES)
Positive (ES > SSES)