Host-encoded DNA methyltransferases modify the epigenome and host tropism of

invading phages

Michiko Takahashi,[a#] Satoshi Hiraoka,[b] Yuki Matsumoto,[c] Rikako Shibagaki,[a] Takako

Ujihara,[d] Hiromichi Maeda,[a] Satoru Seo,[a] Keizo Nagasaki,[c] Hiroaki Takeuchi,[e]

Shigenobu Matsuzaki[f]

[a]Department of Surgery, Kochi Medical School, Kochi University, Nankoku, Kochi,

Japan

[b]Research Center for Bioscience and Nanoscience (CeBN), Research Institute for Marine

Resources Utilization, Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology

(JAMSTEC), Yokosuka, Kanagawa, Japan

[c]Faculty of Agriculture and Marine Science, Kochi University, Nankoku, Kochi, Japan

[d]Science Research Center, Kochi University, Nankoku, Kochi, Japan

[e]Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences, Health and Science, International

University of Health and Welfare Graduate School, Narita, Chiba, Japan

[f]Faculty of Health Sciences, Kochi Gakuen University, Kochi, Kochi, Japan

Running Head: DNA methylation of host bacteria and adapted phages

[#]Address correspondence to Michiko Takahashi, michikot@kochi-u.ac.jp.

Michiko Takahashi and Satoshi Hiraoka contributed equally to this work. Author order

was determined based on correspondence to this work.

Word counts for the abstract and text: 4942

Abstract

A part of prokaryotic DNA methyltransferases (MTases) is associated with phage-defense systems (e.g., restriction-modification [RM] system) to combat the invasion of foreign DNA (e.g., phages). To date, the epigenomes of host and phage during the infection cycle have not been directly observed, and their association with phage infection efficiency remains unclear. Here, using the wide-host-range phage KHP30T and three *Helicobacter pylori* strains (26695, 3401T, and HPK5) that possess different sets of MTases, we investigated changes in infection efficiency and epigenomes of the phage via adaptation to each host strain. Based on the designed multi-stage infection flow, adapted phages showed higher titers only against the last infected *H. pylori* strain, suggesting an attendant change in host tropism. Using single-molecule real-time sequencing, we retrieved each complete genome and 15 and 20 methylated motifs from *H. pylori* 3401T and HPK5, respectively. In general, the methylated motifs were common between pairs of adapted phages and the last infected host strain. Some exceptions were identified that may arise from phase variation. Our results demonstrate phage genomes are methylated by host-encoded MTases during the infection cycle as they pass through the host RM system, resulting in increased infection efficiency of phages against the same host strain.

Importance

The restriction–modification (RM) system has a great impact on host-phage interactions in nature. Single molecule real-time sequencing is invaluable for identifying DNA methylation in prokaryotic and viral genomes. However, no studies have compared DNA modification between host prokaryotes and infecting phages. Here, to model bacteria–phage interactions mediated by host-encoded MTases, we performed titration of adapted phages via a multi-stage infection flow together with direct observation of the epigenomes of both bacterial host and phage. We believe that such an approach would enhance our understanding of microbial ecology.

Keywords

Introduction

DNA methylation modification catalyzed by methyltransferases (MTases) is a

universal cellular process of epigenetic regulation in all three kingdoms of life and viruses

(1). In prokaryotes, DNA methylation generally occurs in three forms; N6-methyladenine

(m6A), C5-methylcytosine (m5C), and N4-methylcytosine (m4C) (2, 3). A part of

prokaryotic MTases is associated with restriction-modification (RM) systems that defend

against foreign DNA such as conjugative plasmids and phages (4–6). Most of these

systems comprise a MTase and restriction endonuclease (REase) that recognizes a

specific target sequence for cleavage. These RM systems are classified as Type I, II, and

III according to their subunit composition, cofactor requirements, structure of their

recognition sequence, and mode of action (7). The REase interacts with its target DNA

sequence to cleave the DNA, whereas the MTase methylates the recognition site to protect

the site from cleavage (7). Consequently, host genomic DNA is methylated by the

endogenous MTase and protected against REase digestion, while unmethylated foreign

DNAs will be subject to cleavage by the REase (7, 8). In contrast to the three major groups,

Type IV systems are made up of only REase(s), which recognize and cleave methylated

DNAs (7, 8).

Apart from the RM systems, other phage defense systems possibly mediated by

DNA methylation have recently been discovered, e.g., BREX (9) and DISARM (10). In

addition to these defense systems, DNA methylation also contributes to various

physiological functions such as asymmetric cell division (11, 12), motility (13), and

pathogen virulence (14–16). Thus, methylation-mediated biological processes have an

impact on a wide range of microbial ecology including phage-host interactions. Indeed,

there has been growing interest in epigenomic systems among diverse prokaryotes and

viruses given their importance in microbial physiology, genetics, evolution, and ecology

(17–19).

Phages occasionally evade a host's defense system(s), allowing them to

successfully multiply in cells of the same host strain (20, 21). Thus, against the same

bacterial strain these so-called adapted phages show increased infectious titer. Based on

cultivation and infection experiments using well-characterized microbes with authentic

RM systems (e.g., *Escherichia coli*, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Haemophilus* spp, and *Salmonella*

spp.), it is believed that phage genomes are modified by MTases encoded on the host

genome during infection. Hence, the adapted phages grab a 'protective suit' against the

host RM system, although the phage is still restricted by other strains with different sets

of MTases (22). The development of single molecule real-time (SMRT) sequencing has

proved to be invaluable for detecting DNA modifications (23–30). However, to the best

of our knowledge, there have been no reports that directly compared the epigenomes of

the same phage strain after infection with different host strains.

We previously reported KHP30, a double-stranded DNA phage belonging to the

Schmidvirus genus (31–33) that infects *Helicobacter pylori*. KHP30, which shows a

wide-range of host specificity, has a pseudolysogenic life cycle in which the phage

genome forms an episome in the host cell rather than integrating into its genome (32).

Despite their small genome size, *H. pylori* harbors multiple RM systems with high

compositional variation, resulting in highly diverse methylomes (34–36). However, no

epigenomic evaluation has been performed whether the MTases encoded in the *H. pylori*

genome function against invading phages. Based on these considerations, we reasoned

that KHP30 and *H. pylori* is an appropriate model for investigating methylation-mediated

phage-host interactions.

Here, we investigated the infection efficiency and epigenomic changes of

KHP30T phages (derived from KHP30) adapted to three *H. pylori* strains (26695, 3401T,

and HPK5) that harbor different sets of MTases via a designed multi-stage infection flows

(Fig. 1). Our results highlighted that the adapted phages showed high infectious titers

against strains of *H. pylori* that the phage infected in the last generation, but low titers

against other strains. Epigenomic analysis revealed methylated motifs on the KHP30T

genome were shared with those of the last adapted *H. pylori* strains. These findings

suggest that the phage genome was modified by host-encoded MTases, resulting in the

phage DNA evading cleavage by the cognate REases. The modified phage showed

increased infection efficiency in the same bacterial strain.

Results

Titration of adapted phages

We designed multi-stage infection flows using KHP30T phage and three *H.*

pylori strains (26695, 3401T, and HPK5) to obtain adapted phages with different infection

histories (Fig. 1, Fig. S1). Using this strategy, we retrieved nine adapted phages (K2, K23,

K232, K23H, K23H3, K2H, K2H2, K2H3, K2H3H). For example, K23 represents a

<u>K</u>HP30T phage adapted to *H. pylori* <u>2</u>6695 in the first stage and to *H. pylori* <u>3</u>401T in the

second stage. Infectious titers were then determined using plaque assay. Adapted phages

showed high titers against *H. pylori* strains that the phage infected in the last generation,

but low titers against non- or previously-adapted hosts (Fig. 2, S2). For example, K2, the

phage adapted to *H. pylori* 26695 in the first stage (Fig. 1), showed a significantly higher

titer (9.2 $\log_{10}$ plaque forming units [PFU]/mL) against 26695, but a markedly lower titer

against 3401T and HPK5 (3.1 and 3.9 log PFU/mL, respectively) ($p < 0.01$, Tukey–

Kramer test). Focusing on second-stage phages, K23 showed a significantly higher titer

(8.9 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL) against *H. pylori* 3401T than against 26695 and HPK5 (0.8, and 1.8

$\log_{10}$ PFU/mL, respectively) ($p < 0.01$), even though K23 had adapted to 26695 in the

first stage. K2H also showed the same trend: a titer against *H. pylori* HPK5 (8.2 $\log_{10}$

PFU/mL) that was significantly higher than against 26695 and 3401T (1.9 and 2.4 $\log_{10}$

PFU/mL, respectively) ($p < 0.01$).

Similarly, third-stage adapted phages showed titers against the most recent host

strain that were higher than against other strains. For example, K232 (line 1 in Fig. 1) and

K2H2 (line 3) showed significantly higher titers against *H. pylori* 26695 (9.6, and 8.2

$\log_{10}$ PFU/mL, respectively) than against the other two strains ($p < 0.01$). The same trend

was observed in the fourth-stage of phages. K23H3 (line 2) showed a higher titer against

3401T (8.6 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL) than against HPK5 (1.8 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL) ($p < 0.01$). Similarly,

K2H3H (line 4) showed a higher titer against *H. pylori* HPK5 (9.2 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL) than

against 3401T (3.1 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL, $p < 0.01$).

Comparing the adapted phages from different lines, the infectious titers against

each of the last host strains were generally similar. For example, K2, K232, and K2H2

shared *H. pylori* 26695 as the host strain in the last stage, and all of them showed >8.0

$\log_{10}$ PFU/mL against 26695 (8.2–9.6 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL) but significantly lower titers against

other strains (3.1–3.9 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL). Likewise, K23 and K23H3 showed significantly

higher titers against 3401T (8.5–8.6 $\log_{10}$ PFU/mL) than against any other strain. Phages

K2H, K23H, and K2H3H also showed significantly higher titers against HPK5 (8.2–9.2

$\log_{10}$ PFU/mL) than the others.

Genomic analysis of host *H. pylori* strains and adapted phages

SMRT sequencing of two *H. pylori* strains (3401T and HPK5) and three adapted

phages (K2, K23, and K2H) was performed to determine the epigenomes of the host

strains and adapted phages in the infection flow. Genomic and epigenomic data of *H.*

pylori 26695 were retrieved from the NCBI RefSeq database (CP003904.1) and a

previously published report (37). Complete circular genomes of *H. pylori* 3401T and

HPK5 were obtained via *de novo* assembly using HiFi reads (Table S1). The general

characteristics of these genomes (e.g., genome size, CDS number, CG content) were

similar to those of other *H. pylori* genomes deposited in the NCBI database. The

reconstructed *H. pylori* 3401T genome showed >99.99% average nucleotide identity

(ANI) to the ancestral strain *H. pylori* 3401 (AP024599.1) (38). Slight differences in

sequence most likely arose from genomic mutation during serial subculturing and/or use

of different sequencing technologies and bioinformatics software tools. No

extrachromosomal content was identified in these strains.

Based on functional annotation using REBASE, we predicted 32–36 MTases and

16–21 REase genes from the three *H. pylori* genomes (Table S1, S2). The most abundant

MTase type was Type II, whereas the other Types I and III were almost compatible. A

systematic search of phage-defense systems on the genomes revealed 14, 9, and 14 RM

systems from *H. pylori* 26695, 3401T and HPK5, respectively (Table S3). Thus, over half

of the detected MTases were orphans. The most abundant modification type was m6A,

followed by m5C and m4C. No other systems involved in DNA modification (e.g., BREX

(9) and DISARM (10)) were found. In addition to modification-mediated defense systems,

6-9 other systems (e.g., AbiL (39) and Dynamins (40, 41)) were identified from the three

strains (Table S3).

Mapping analysis of KHP30T reads to the original KHP30 phage genome

(AB647160.1) (31) identified an approximately 2-kb insertion in all three phages. No

single-nucleotide polymorphisms or short indels were found. The insert matched a part

of the *H. pylori* 3401 chromosome, indicating the region transferred from the host during

serial passaging in the laboratory. The insertion was considered unlikely to significantly

affect the general characteristics of the phage (e.g., infection efficiency or host tropism).

Indeed, the titration as described above (Fig. 2) was consistent with previous reports (31–

33). The KHP30T complete circular genome was reconstructed using HiFi reads from K2

phages (Table S1). Based on read mapping analysis, no obvious genomic variations fixed

in the population were identified in any of the phages. No MTase and REase genes or

phage defense systems were found in the phage genome.

Epigenomic analysis of *H. pylori* strains and adapted phages

We successfully identified a number of base modifications in both the *H. pylori*

and phage genomes (Fig. 2, Table S4, Fig. S4). From motif predictions, we detected 15

and 20 motifs in the *H. pylori* 3401T and HPK5 genomes, respectively, as well as 17

motifs in *H. pylori* 26695 retrieved from a previous study (37) (Table S4). Among the

motifs, the most abundant modification type was m6A, followed by m4C and m5C. There

was a slight discrepancy in modification types of the encoded MTases, possibly

underestimated due to the low detection power of m5C modifications by SMRT

sequencing. Indeed, the detected m5C motifs showed low modification ratios (<50.0%)

in all three *H. pylori* strains. Only two motifs (CA<u>T</u>G and GA<u>T</u>C, where the bold and

underlined characters indicate modified bases and reverse complement of modified bases,

respectively) were shared among the three strains, whereas 28 of 39 (72%) motifs were

present in either of the three strains, indicating high diversity in the methylated motifs

among the strains. This trend is concordant with previous studies that found *H. pylori*

strains harbor large numbers of modified motifs with highly divergent combinations

among strains (37, 42).

Next, we compared the *H. pylori* strains and adapted phages. Overall, methylated

motifs were shared between the pairs of *H. pylori* strain and phages that were adapted to

the strain (Fig. 3). For example, among the motifs detected from *H. pylori* HPK5 with the

exception of m5C motifs, 17 of 19 were highly modified on phage K2H (>68.9% and

>63.6% modification ratios of motifs on the host and phage genomes, respectively).

Similarly, 12 of 13 motifs were shared between the pair of *H. pylori* 3401T and phage

K23 (>73.9% and >41.7%, respectively). Also, 12 of 14 motifs were concordantly

methylated between *H. pylori* 26695 and phage K2 (>95.2% and >71.3%, respectively).

By contrast, sets of methylated motif were not shared between different combinations of

host and phage.

Intriguingly, several motifs were identified that were methylated on host

genomes but scarcely methylated on adapted phage genomes. For instance, an m6A-type

motif G**A**TGG was methylated on the *H. pylori* 3401T genome with a high modification

ratio (73.9%), but was absent on the K23 genome. Similarly, motif CCTTG**A** was highly

modified in *H. pylori* HPK5 (81.1%) but not in K2H (7.1%). Two motifs, A<u>T</u>TA**A**T and

CGR**A**T, were also reported to be methylated with high modification ratios (98.5% and

98.9%, respectively) in *H. pylori* 26695 (37), in contrast to K2 (0.0% and 22.6%,

respectively).

Discussion

H. pylori harbors more than 24 MTase genes, some of which are thought to be

involved in RM systems (37, 42–45). To better understand the associations of DNA

methylation with phage-host interactions, we designed multi-stage infection flows (Fig.

1) and analyzed methylomes of three *H. pylori* strains (26695, 3401T and HPK5) and

three adapted KHP30T phages (K2, K23, and K2H) with different infection histories. The

adapted phages showed high titers against the most recently infected host strain, but much

lower titers against the other strains even if previously adapted (Fig. 2). Considering the

generation time during cultivation, gene expression disorder or enzymatic inactivation

caused by genomic mutations were not expected to significantly affect infection tropism.

Indeed, the re-proliferated phages also showed high titers only against the most recently

infected host strains (Fig. S5). The three *H. pylori* strains harbored different sets of MTase

genes, many of which were located close to the REase genes that comprise the RM

systems (Table S1, S2). Based on epigenomic analysis, the adapted phages shared

methylated motifs of the last adapted host strain. This observation indicated phage

epigenomes were modified by host MTases during infection. Taken together, our work

demonstrated that adapted phages acquire DNA methylation by the host, which

contributes to escape from the host's RM systems and increased infection efficiency, as

has long been assumed (46). Nonetheless, this is the first study to report direct

observations of epigenomic changes in the phage genome during infection (Fig. S4).

Overall the methylated motifs were shared between the adapted phage and host,

but some exceptions were found. Specifically, several motifs were modified in the host

genome but not in the adapted phage (Fig. 3). These exceptions may, in part at least, be

explained by phase variation found in several RM systems from *H. pylori* strains (Fig.

S3). Phase variation, a mechanism of random and reversible switching of gene expression,

generates transcriptional, translational, and/or phenotypic variation in a bacterial

population (47). Bacterial MTases associated with RM systems are phase-variable,

resulting in heterogeneous cells with active or inactive RM systems within the clonal

population (48). Consequently, phages prefer to infect RM system-reduced cells, and the

majority of phage epigenome is thus catalyzed by the set of MTases encoded by such

hosts. One of the key signatures that regulates phase variation is a simple sequence repeat

(SSR) inside or upstream of the gene; in the former case, phase-variable ON/OFF

switching occurs resulting in reversible changes in the number of SSRs (48–52). Here,

we found several phase-variable regulons (phasevarions) associated with RM system

genes in the three *H. pylori* genomes (Fig. S3, Supplemental text). Additional

experimental evaluation at single-cell resolution would be required to better understand

the relationship between phase variation and phage infection (e.g., a combination of

immunofluorescence imaging for measurement of phase variated proteins (53) and

fluorescence *in situ* hybridization for detecting infected phages). Moreover,

bioinformatics needs to be improved because current modification detection tools are not

designed to consider phase-variation epigenomes. Instead, these tools call statistically-

certain modifications within a population in binary scale. Another possible explanation

for unshared methylated motifs is that the phage have anti-RM systems that block the host

MTase activity. For example, proteins DarA and DarB from P1 phage protect recognition

sites on their genome from host RM systems (54, 55), and Ocr of T7 phage mimics phage

DNA structure to block the DNA-binding groove of Type I REases/MTases (56). No

genes associated with known anti-RM systems listed in a previous review (57) were found

in the KHP30T genome.

There are several limitations to this study. First, we have not experimentally

confirmed the activities and specificity of the MTases and REases. Thus, it is still unclear

which RM systems are effective for phage defense as well as the identity of MTases

responsible for the modified motifs. Second, while SMRT sequencing technology

efficiently identifies m6A and m4C modifications (37) other types of modification exist

in nature. Among these methylations, m5C modification is one of the most widespread

modifications following m6A and m4C. In total, five m5C motifs were detected in the

three *H. pylori* strains (Table S4). All of them showed low modification ratios (Fig. 3,

Table S4), presumably due to the low detection power of the modification type using

current SMRT technology. In addition to methylation, other epigenetic modifications,

such as phosphorothioate modification, have recently been reported to play a significant

role in phage defense (58). To better understand epigenomic functions, further

methodological developments to measure a wide variety of DNA modifications are

required. Third, although HiFi reads are highly accurate (>99.9%), sequencing of

homopolymer regions remains challenging (59–61). Thus, it is still difficult to estimate

tract number diversity. Nonetheless, because of high genome coverages (Table S1), tracts

associated with RM genes (Fig. S3) likely reflect the dominant state of the actual phase

variation within a population.

Defense systems are involved in an arms race between phages and hosts (62).

Thus, epigenomic systems greatly impact eco-evolution and promote microbial

diversification (63, 64). Our data showed that the phage epigenome was changed by its

host bacteria during infection, resulting in the reinforcement of phage infection ability

against the host (Figs. 2, 3). To counter the epigenomic synchronization of phages and to

avoid the extinction of the entire host population by phage prevalence, some prokaryotes

change their sets of phage-defense systems heterogeneously. For example, many species

of gut bacteria, such as *Bacteroides fragilis* and *H. pylori*, showed strain-level variations

in gene sets involved in phage defense systems including MTases (65–67). However,

because gene acquisition and deletion relies on genomic events, such as horizontal gene

transfer and recombination, this occurs at low frequently. By contrast, a more dynamic

strategy involves phase variation for phage prevalence prevention in the community. For

example, in *Vibrio cholerae* phase variation modulates the expression of

lipopolysaccharide O1 antigen to escape predation by an O1-specific phage (68). In the

case of *H. pylori*, inter-strain variation in methylomes caused by MTase phase variation

have been reported (42, 43). Thus, antagonistic co-evolution within prokaryotes and

phages associated with epigenetic changes is of interest in understanding a wide range of

microbial ecosystems.

Our results are also emerged an attention to the potential application of phage

therapy. The gastrointestinal microbiome involves a complex set of interactions that are

closely related to human physiology, such as the metabolic, immune, and neuroendocrine

systems (69). *H. pylori* is one of the most common human gastrointestinal pathogens that

colonizes over half of the world's population. *H. pylori* infection is a risk factor for gastric

cancer, which is the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths (70–72). Given the

prevalence of antibiotic-resistant *H. pylori*, development of alternative treatment

approaches is crucial (73, 74). One promising approach is the utilization of lytic phages

as a self-amplifying drug to specifically kill susceptible bacteria (75, 76). Phages have favorable characteristics such as host-specificity, self-amplification, biofilm degradation, and low toxicity to human (77, 78). Indeed, phage therapy is expected to contribute to the treatment of a wide range of infectious diseases in human and plants (79–82). However, the strategy is not effective against prokaryotes that resist phage infection. Controlling DNA modifications in the phage genome in advance of their therapeutic application would be needed to avoid degradation by host modification-mediated defense systems such as RM system. One possible approach entails the preparation of a cocktail of adapted phages whose epigenomes are diversified using variable sets of MTases. The concept of the phage cocktail has already been proposed and experimentally evaluated using *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (83, 84). The preparation of a set of adapted phages with different epigenomes covering all possible motifs specified by host RM systems would be technically demanding. Nonetheless, such a cocktail would increase the probability of overcoming the host's defense systems. For example, the multi-stage infection flow (Fig. 1) could be used for the adaptive evolution of phages to improve their endogenous ability to resist stress caused by temperature changes or exposure to UV radiation (85–87). Indeed, this infection approach was applied to generate pre-adapting phages under the host-phage co-evolutionary system (i.e., phage training) (88, 89). Further research to understand the mechanism of phage adaptation and to evaluate the therapeutic potential of adapted phages would contribute to the good design of phage cocktails aiming for medical and industrial applications.

Conclusions

In this study, our data provides evidence that a phage passed through the host RM system acquired methylation modifications mediated by host-encoded MTases during infection. The adapted phage showed significantly higher titer against the last infected host strain. This observation likely arises due to the neutralization of the host RM system by the acquired modifications. Our results help elucidate the DNA methylation-mediated phage–host interactions that significantly impact on microbial ecology in a wide

347 range of environments.

Materials and Methods

Culture conditions of *H. pylori* and phages

H. pylori 26695, 3401T (derived from *H. pylori* 3401) and HPK5 were routinely
cultured on BEV plates (Brucella broth [Becton Dickinson, Cockeysville, MD, USA]
supplemented with 1.5% agar, 10% heat-inactivated equine serum [Hyclone Laboratories,
South Logan, UT, USA], and 10 μg/mL vancomycin) at 37°C under microaerobic
conditions (10% CO_2). A preculture of *H. pylori* was prepared by incubating in 5 mL of
BEV broth at 37°C under microaerobic conditions with shaking (200 rpm of reciprocating
shaking with an EYEKA multi-shaker; Tokyo Rikakikai, Tokyo, Japan) for 20 h.

Phage KHP30T, working stock of KHP30 was prepared from a filtered
supernatant of *H. pylori* 3401 after inoculation of KHP30 as described previously (31).
Phage stocks were stored at 4°C. Nine adapted phage cultures were prepared by using
KHP30T to infect three *H. pylori* strains (26695, 3401T, and/or HPK5) in defined
sequential steps (Fig. 1). Detailed procedures for phage adaptation are described in
Supplemental text.

Titration of adapted phages

The infectious titers of nine adapted phages (K2, K23, K232, K23H, K23H3,
K2H, K2H2, K2H3, K2H3H) and three re-proliferated phages (K2, K23, K2H cultured
at large-scale; see Supplemental text) were measured by plaque assay (32). In brief, 100
μL of serial 10-fold diluted adapted phages (Fig. S1 right) and 500 μL of *H. pylori*
preculture (approximately 1×10^8 CFU/mL) were co-cultured on double-layered plates.
Plaques were counted after incubation at 37°C under microaerobic conditions for 3 days.
Each experiment was carried out in three independent biological replicates (*n* = 3) and
each biological replicate contained two technical replicates. To test the differences in
phage titers, Tukey-Kramer test was performed using 'multcomp' R package version 1.4-
20.

DNA extraction and SMRT sequencing

Genomic DNAs of *H. pylori* 3401T and HPK5 were extracted using QIAGEN Genomic-tips 100/G (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions. For SMRT sequencing, library preparation and high-fidelity (HiFi) sequencing using the PacBio Sequel II system (Pacific Biosciences, Menlo Park, CA, USA) were performed by Macrogen Japan (Tokyo, Japan).

Genome DNAs of three adapted phages (K2H, K2, K23) were prepared using the phenol-chloroform extraction method after large-scale cultivation and particle purification (see Supplemental text). For K2H, the extracted genomic DNA was sheared to 10 kb for SMRTbell library preparation and subjected to SMRT sequencing in continuous long read (CLR) mode using the PacBio Sequel system (Pacific Biosciences). For K2 and K23, DNA were shared to 10-15 kb length for SMRTbell library preparation and sequenced in circular consensus sequencing (CCS) mode using PacBio Sequel II system (Pacific Biosciences). All library preparation and sequencing for the phages were performed by Azenta (South Plainfield, NJ, USA).

Bioinformatics

For *H. pylori* 3401T and HPK5, HiFi reads were converted to add conventional kinetic information using ccs-kinetics-bystrandify script, provided by PacBio. HiFi reads were *de novo* assembled using Hifiasm (90) with the '-l0' option. Each circular chromosomal genome was then manually retrieved. To reduce calculation times for modification identification, low complexity regions were masked using komplexity (https://github.com/eclarke/komplexity) with '--mask --threshold 0.65' options. HiFi reads were mapped to the masked genomes using pbmm2, an official wrapper software for minimap2 (91), to calculate interpulse duration ratios. Modification detection and motif prediction were performed using ipdSummary a and MotifMaker, respectively (SMRT Link package v12.0 with default settings). Considering the detection power of modified nucleotides by SMRT sequencing, m4C and m6A motifs with scores >100000

and all m5C motifs were retrieved as candidate methylated motifs. Motifs with

ambiguous sequences were manually curated. For example, TCGA**A**VV (where V =

A/C/G) was detected in *H. pylori* 3401T, but the spurious partial sequence VV was likely

due to incomplete detection of the motif, and probably represents the palindrome <u>T</u>CG**A**.

Data on methylated motifs in *H. pylori* 26695 were retrieved from a previous study (37).

For the phage genome sequenced in CCS mode (K2 and K23), subreads

containing at least three full-pass subreads on each polymerase read and with >99%

average base-call accuracy were retained as HiFi reads using the standard PacBio SMRT

software package with default settings. For downstream epigenomic analysis, HiFi reads

were converted to add conventional kinetic information. HiFi reads from K2 were then

de novo assembled using canu (92) with '-pacbio-hifi genomeSize=30k' options, and one

chromosomal genome was retrieved after manual curation. For comparative genomic

analysis, a reference KHP30 genome (AB647160.1) was retrieved from the NCBI RefSeq

Database, and subreads (K2H) and HiFi reads (K2 and K23) were mapped on the

reference genome using pbmm2 with subreads or HiFi read mode, respectively. For

epigenomic analysis, subreads and HiFi reads from each phage were mapped to the

assembled KHP30T genome as described above. Nucleotide modifications were

predicted using ipdSummary a and MotifMaker from SMRT Link packages v10.2 and

v12.0 for PacBio Sequel and Sequel II data, respectively, according to the supported

systems of each software version, with the default settings. The algorithm used by

MotifMaker employs a statistical test for motif identification and was therefore not

applicable to small phage genomes, in which insufficient number of motif sequences for

de novo identification of modified motifs (26). Consequently, we focused on the host

genomes for motif prediction.

CDSs with >33 aa length in each genome were predicted using Prodigal (93)

with default settings or with '-meta' option for *H. pylori* and phage genomes, respectively.

Genes encoding MTases, REases, and DNA sequence-recognition proteins (S subunits)

were identified using DIAMOND (94). Sequences were compared against an

experimentally confirmed gold-standard dataset from REBASE (95) (downloaded on 1st

March 2024), with a cutoff e-value of ≤1E-5. REBASE was used to retrieve sequence

specificity for each MTase and REase. Phage defense systems were predicted using

PADLOC (96). ANI was calculated using FastANI (97). Circos plots were generated

using 'interacCircos' R package (98). Homopolymers with more than nine repeat numbers

and located inside or less than 100 bp upstream of RM system genes were retrieved as

SSRs associated with the RM system.

Acknowledgments

The authors thankfully acknowledge Kazuhiro Hanazaki (Kochi University

Hospital) for the financial support. The authors are greatful to Waka Ishida and Yusaku

Funaoka for experimental support, and to Daichi Morimoto for helpful comments on this

work. The experiments were conducted at the Division of Biological Research, Science

Research Center, Kochi University. Computations were partially performed on the

supercomputer system at the Institute for Chemical Research, Kyoto University, and the

NIG supercomputer system at ROIS National Institute of Genetics, and the Data Analysis

and the Earth Simulator systems at JAMSTEC.

Author contributions

M.T. designed the study, acquired funding, performed the experiments, and

drafted the manuscript. S.H. designed the study, performed the bioinformatics analyses,

and wrote the manuscript. Y.M., R.S., and T.U. performed the experiments. H.M. acquired

funding and provided resources. S.S., K.N., and H.T. supervised the project. S.M.

conceived the original idea, acquired funding, and supervised the project. All authors have

read and approved the final manuscript.

Data availability

The assembled genomes were deposited in DDBJ/ENA/GenBank (Table S1). All

data are registered under BioProject ID PRJDB17787

[https://ddbj.nig.ac.jp/resource/bioproject/PRJDB17787].

Funding

This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (grant numbers JP20K15582 and JP22K08875), ACT-X, Japan Science and Technology Agency (grant numbers JPMJAX21BD and JPMJAX22BK), and the budget of Kochi University Hospital (Japan).

 Figure legends

Fig. 1 Overview of multi-stage infection flow. Nine KHP30T phages were prepared by

adapting to three strains of *H. pylori* (26695, 3401T, HPK5) through four infection stages

and four lines. Details of the adaptation procedure are provided in the Supplemental text

and Fig. S1.

Fig. 2 Infectious titer of adapted KHP30T. Orange, blue, and green bars represent

KHP30T titers against *H. pylori* 26695, 3401T, and HPK5, respectively. Error bars

represent standard deviation ($n = 3$).

Fig. 3 Methylomes of adapted phages and *H. pylori* strains. Methylated motifs were

predicted from the three *H. pylori* strains. Motifs are shown separately according to

methylation type. Phages and *H. pylori* strains are colored in red and black, respectively,

in the bottom text. Text on the left side indicates the methylated motifs with methylated

nucleotide position and methylation type. The top dendrogram was calculated using

Euclidean distance and Ward method. For *H. pylori* 26695, methylated motifs and ratios

were retrieved from the previous study reported by Krebes et al. (2014), and gray cells

indicate motifs for which no data are available. Some motifs showed comparatively high

modification ratios due to motif overlap. For example, the modification ratio of CGRAT

(R=A/G) in *H. pylori* 3401T is explained by motif overlapping with CGR**A**, which was

detected from epigenomic analysis of the strain. In addition, CGWAG (W=A/T) in *H.*

pylori 3401T partly overlapped with CGRA, i.e., CGAAG. A motif GAGG in *H. pylori*

HPK5 also overlapped with the detected GAGGA from the strain, and in contrast,

GAGGA in K2 overlap with GAGG reported from *H. pylori* 26695 previously. Among

all seven CCGCAT sites in K23, two and one overlapped with other motifs CATG (i.e.,

CCGCATG) and **A**TCC (i.e., CCGCATCC), respectively. Hence, CCGCAT showed a

comparatively higher modification ratio in K23.

Fig. S1 Overview of preparation procedure for adapted phages.

Fig. S2 Tukey-Kramer pairwise comparisons of phage titers. Corresponding titers are

shown in Fig. 2. Combination of phage and host strain are indicated as 'adapted phage':

'initial of host strain' format in the x-axis: for example, 'K2:2' means a titer of K2 against

H. pylori 26695. Solid black bar within each box represents median. Upper alphabet

summarizes the results of the Tukey-Kramer test; letters denote significant differences (p

< 0.01) in mean titers with groups a > b > c > d > e > f.

Fig. S3 Genetic organization of RM system genes associated with SSRs.

Homopolymeric tracts inside or upstream of RM genes were specified as SSRs. RM gene

types are indicated by color and text inside to each CDS. CDSs not assigned to RM system

genes are colored in gray.

Fig. S4 Methylomes of adapted phages. Circos plot showing the distribution of DNA

methylation. Orange, blue, and red bars represent m4C, m5C, and m6A modifications,

respectively. K2 and K23 were sequenced using PacBio Sequel II in CCS mode, whereas

K2H was sequenced using PacBio Sequel in CLR mode.

Fig. S5 Infectious titer of re-proliferated phages. (a) Orange, blue, and green bars

represent titer of re-proliferated KHP30T phages to *H. pylori* 26695, 3401T, and HPK5,

respectively. Error bars indicate standard deviation ($n = 3$). (b) Tukey-Kramer pairwise

comparisons of re-proliferated phage titers. Phage and host combinations are indicated in

the same format as Fig. S2. Infectious titer of the 'Original phages' is derived from Fig.

2. Solid black bar within each box represents median. Upper alphabet summarizes the

results of the Tukey-Kramer test; letters denote significant differences ($p < 0.01$) in mean

titers with groups a > b > c > d > e > f.

Supplemental tables

Table S1 Descriptions and statistics of *H. pylori* strains and KHP30T phages.

Table S2 Detected RM system genes in *H. pylori* strains.

Table S3 Predicted phage defense systems in *H. pylori* strains.

Table S4. Methylated motifs predicted from *H. pylori* strains.

References

1.   Struck A-W, Thompson ML, Wong LS, Micklefield J. 2012. S-adenosyl-methionine-
dependent methyltransferases: highly versatile enzymes in biocatalysis, biosynthesis
and other biotechnological applications. Chembiochem 13:2642–2655.

2.   Weigele P, Raleigh EA. 2016. Biosynthesis and function of modified bases in bacteria
and their viruses. Chem Rev 116:12655–12687.

3.   Seong HJ, Han S-W, Sul WJ. 2021. Prokaryotic DNA methylation and its functional
roles. J Microbiol 59:242–248.

4.   Labrie SJ, Samson JE, Moineau S. 2010. Bacteriophage resistance mechanisms. Nat
Rev Microbiol 8:317–327.

5.   Ando T, Ishiguro K, Watanabe O, Miyake N, Kato T, Hibi S, Mimura S, Nakamura
M, Miyahara R, Ohmiya N, Niwa Y, Goto H. 2010. Restriction-modification systems
may be associated with *Helicobacter pylori* virulence. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 25
Suppl 1:S95-8.

6.   Arber W. 1974. DNA modification and restriction. Prog Nucleic Acid Res Mol Biol
14:1–37.

7.   Ershova AS, Rusinov IS, Spirin SA, Karyagina AS, Alexeevski AV. 2015. Role of
restriction-modification systems in prokaryotic evolution and ecology. Biochemistry
80:1373–1386.

8.   Mruk I, Kobayashi I. 2014. To be or not to be: regulation of restriction-modification
systems and other toxin-antitoxin systems. Nucleic Acids Res 42:70–86.

9.   Goldfarb T, Sberro H, Weinstock E, Cohen O, Doron S, Charpak-Amikam Y, Afik S,
Ofir G, Sorek R. 2015. BREX is a novel phage resistance system widespread in
microbial genomes. EMBO J 34:169–183.

10. Ofir G, Melamed S, Sberro H, Mukamel Z, Silverman S, Yaakov G, Doron S, Sorek
R. 2017. DISARM is a widespread bacterial defence system with broad anti-phage
activities. Nat Microbiol 3:90–98.

11. Zhou X, Wang J, Herrmann J, Moerner WE, Shapiro L. 2019. Asymmetric division
yields progeny cells with distinct modes of regulating cell cycle-dependent
chromosome methylation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 116:15661–15670.

12. Kozdon JB, Melfi MD, Luong K, Clark TA, Boitano M, Wang S, Zhou B, Gonzalez
D, Collier J, Turner SW, Korlach J, Shapiro L, McAdams HH. 2013. Global
methylation state at base-pair resolution of the *Caulobacter* genome throughout the
cell cycle. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110:E4658-67.

13. Vandenbussche I, Sass A, Pinto-Carbó M, Mannweiler O, Eberl L, Coenye T. 2020.
DNA methylation epigenetically regulates gene expression in *Burkholderia*

cenocepacia and controls biofilm formation, cell aggregation, and motility. mSphere
5.

14. Oliveira PH, Ribis JW, Garrett EM, Trzilova D, Kim A, Sekulovic O, Mead EA, Pak
T, Zhu S, Deikus G, Touchon M, Lewis-Sandari M, Beckford C, Zeitouni NE, Altman
DR, Webster E, Oussenko I, Bunyavanich S, Aggarwal AK, Bashir A, Patel G,
Wallach F, Hamula C, Huprikar S, Schadt EE, Sebra R, van Bakel H, Kasarskis A,
Tamayo R, Shen A, Fang G. 2020. Epigenomic characterization of *Clostridioides*
difficile finds a conserved DNA methyltransferase that mediates sporulation and
pathogenesis. Nat Microbiol 5:166–180.

15. Nye TM, Jacob KM, Holley EK, Nevarez JM, Dawid S, Simmons LA, Watson ME
Jr. 2019. DNA methylation from a Type I restriction modification system influences
gene expression and virulence in *Streptococcus pyogenes*. PLoS Pathog 15:e1007841.

16. Mannweiler O, Pinto-Carbó M, Lardi M, Agnoli K, Eberl L. 2021. Investigation of
Burkholderia cepacia complex methylomes via single-molecule, real-time
sequencing and mutant analysis. J Bacteriol 203:e0068320.

17. Srikhanta YN, Fox KL, Jennings MP. 2010. The phasevarion: phase variation of type
III DNA methyltransferases controls coordinated switching in multiple genes. Nat
Rev Microbiol 8:196–206.

18. Furuta Y, Kobayashi I. 2012. Mobility of DNA sequence recognition domains in
DNA methyltransferases suggests epigenetics-driven adaptive evolution. Mob Genet
Elements 2:292–296.

19. Sánchez-Romero MA, Casadesús J. 2020. The bacterial epigenome. Nat Rev
Microbiol 18:7–20.

20. Friman V-P, Soanes-Brown D, Sierocinski P, Molin S, Johansen HK, Merabishvili M,
Pirnay J-P, De Vos D, Buckling A. 2016. Pre-adapting parasitic phages to a pathogen
leads to increased pathogen clearance and lowered resistance evolution with
Pseudomonas aeruginosa cystic fibrosis bacterial isolates. J Evol Biol 29:188–198.

21. Rohde C, Resch G, Pirnay J-P, Blasdel B, Debarbieux L, Gelman D, Górski A, Hazan
R, Huys I, Kakabadze E, Łobocka M, Maestri A, Almeida G, Makalatia K, Malik D,
Mašlaňová I, Merabishvili M, Pantucek R, Rose T, Štveráková D, Van Raemdonck
H, Verbeken G, Chanishvili N. 2018. Expert opinion on three phage therapy related
topics: Bacterial phage resistance, phage training and prophages in bacterial
production strains. Viruses 10:178.

22. Krüger DH, Bickle TA. 1983. Bacteriophage survival: multiple mechanisms for
avoiding the deoxyribonucleic acid restriction systems of their hosts. Microbiol Rev
47:345–360.

23. Coy SR, Gann ER, Papoulis SE, Holder ME, Ajami NJ, Petrosino JF, Zinser ER, Van
Etten JL, Wilhelm SW. 2020. SMRT sequencing of Paramecium bursaria chlorella
virus-1 reveals diverse methylation stability in adenines targeted by restriction
modification systems. Front Microbiol 11:887.

24. Forde BM, McAllister LJ, Paton JC, Paton AW, Beatson SA. 2019. SMRT
sequencing reveals differential patterns of methylation in two O111:H- STEC
isolates from a hemolytic uremic syndrome outbreak in Australia. Sci Rep 9:9436.

25. Hiraoka S, Okazaki Y, Anda M, Toyoda A, Nakano S-I, Iwasaki W. 2019.
Metaepigenomic analysis reveals the unexplored diversity of DNA methylation in an
environmental prokaryotic community. Nat Commun 10:159.

26. Hiraoka S, Sumida T, Hirai M, Toyoda A, Kawagucci S, Yokokawa T, Nunoura T.
2022. Diverse DNA modification in marine prokaryotic and viral communities.
Nucleic Acids Res 50:1531–1550.

27. Jeudy S, Rigou S, Alempic J-M, Claverie J-M, Abergel C, Legendre M. 2020. The
DNA methylation landscape of giant viruses. Nat Commun 11:2657.

28. Murray IA, Clark TA, Morgan RD, Boitano M, Anton BP, Luong K, Fomenkov A,
Turner SW, Korlach J, Roberts RJ. 2012. The methylomes of six bacteria. Nucleic
Acids Res 40:11450–11462.

29. Murphy J, Klumpp J, Mahony J, O'Connell-Motherway M, Nauta A, van Sinderen
D. 2014. Methyltransferases acquired by lactococcal 936-type phage provide
protection against restriction endonuclease activity. BMC Genomics 15:831.

30. Sun C, Chen J, Jin M, Zhao X, Li Y, Dong Y, Gao N, Liu Z, Bork P, Zhao X-M, Chen
W-H. 2023. Long-read sequencing reveals extensive DNA methylations in human
gut phagenome contributed by prevalently phage-encoded methyltransferases. Adv
Sci (Weinh) 10:e2302159.

31. Uchiyama J, Takeuchi H, Kato S-I, Takemura-Uchiyama I, Ujihara T, Daibata M,
Matsuzaki S. 2012. Complete genome sequences of two *Helicobacter pylori*
bacteriophages isolated from Japanese patients. J Virol 86:11400–11401.

32. Uchiyama J, Takeuchi H, Kato S-I, Gamoh K, Takemura-Uchiyama I, Ujihara T,
Daibata M, Matsuzaki S. 2013. Characterization of *Helicobacter pylori*
bacteriophage KHP30. Appl Environ Microbiol 79:3176–3184.

33. Kamiya R, Uchiyama J, Matsuzaki S, Murata K, Iwasaki K, Miyazaki N. 2022. Acid-
stable capsid structure of *Helicobacter pylori* bacteriophage KHP30 by single-
particle cryoelectron microscopy. Structure 30:300-312.e3.

34. Ando T, Xu Q, Torres M, Kusugami K, Israel DA, Blaser MJ. 2000. Restriction-
modification system differences in *Helicobacter pylori* are a barrier to interstrain

plasmid transfer. Mol Microbiol 37:1052–1065.

35. Alm RA, Ling LS, Moir DT, King BL, Brown ED, Doig PC, Smith DR, Noonan B,
Guild BC, deJonge BL, Carmel G, Tummino PJ, Caruso A, Uria-Nickelsen M, Mills
DM, Ives C, Gibson R, Merberg D, Mills SD, Jiang Q, Taylor DE, Vovis GF, Trust
TJ. 1999. Genomic-sequence comparison of two unrelated isolates of the human
gastric pathogen *Helicobacter pylori*. Nature 397:176–180.

36. Bubendorfer S, Krebes J, Yang I, Hage E, Schulz TF, Bahlawane C, Didelot X,
Suerbaum S. 2016. Genome-wide analysis of chromosomal import patterns after
natural transformation of *Helicobacter pylori*. Nat Commun 7:11995.

37. Krebes J, Morgan RD, Bunk B, Spröer C, Luong K, Parusel R, Anton BP, König C,
Josenhans C, Overmann J, Roberts RJ, Korlach J, Suerbaum S. 2014. The complex
methylome of the human gastric pathogen *Helicobacter pylori*. Nucleic Acids Res
42:2415–2432.

38. Takahashi M, Matsumoto Y, Ujihara T, Maeda H, Hanazaki K, Nagasaki K, Takeuchi
H, Matsuzaki S. 2021. Complete genome sequence of *Helicobacter pylori* strain
3401, a suitable host for bacteriophages KHP30 and KHP40. Microbiol Resour
Announc 10:e0064721.

39. Deng Y-M, Liu C-Q, W. Dunn N. 1999. Genetic organization and functional analysis
of a novel phage abortive infection system, AbiL, from *Lactococcus lactis*. J
Biotechnol 67:135–149.

40. Millman A, Melamed S, Leavitt A, Doron S, Bernheim A, Hör J, Garb J, Bechon N,
Brandis A, Lopatina A, Ofir G, Hochhauser D, Stokar-Avihail A, Tal N, Sharir S,
Voichek M, Erez Z, Ferrer JLM, Dar D, Kacen A, Amitai G, Sorek R. 2022. An
expanded arsenal of immune systems that protect bacteria from phages. Cell Host
Microbe 30:1556-1569.e5.

41. Guo L, Sattler L, Shafqat S, Graumann PL, Bramkamp M. 2022. A bacterial
dynamin-like protein confers a novel phage resistance strategy on the population
level in *Bacillus subtilis*. MBio 13.

42. Furuta Y, Namba-Fukuyo H, Shibata TF, Nishiyama T, Shigenobu S, Suzuki Y,
Sugano S, Hasebe M, Kobayashi I. 2014. Methylome diversification through changes
in DNA methyltransferase sequence specificity. PLoS Genet 10:e1004272.

43. Nell S, Estibariz I, Krebes J, Bunk B, Graham DY, Overmann J, Song Y, Spröer C,
Yang I, Wex T, Korlach J, Malfertheiner P, Suerbaum S. 2018. Genome and
methylome variation in *Helicobacter pylori* with a *cag* pathogenicity island during
early stages of human infection. Gastroenterology 154:612-623.e7.

44. Estibariz I, Overmann A, Ailloud F, Krebes J, Josenhans C, Suerbaum S. 2019. The

core genome m5C methyltransferase JHP1050 (M.Hpy99III) plays an important role

in orchestrating gene expression in *Helicobacter pylori*. Nucleic Acids Res 47:2336–

2348.

45. Vasu K, Nagaraja V. 2013. Diverse functions of restriction-modification systems in

addition to cellular defense. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 77:53−72.

46. Isaev AB, Musharova OS, Severinov KV. 2021. Microbial arsenal of antiviral

defenses - Part I. Biochemistry 86:319–337.

47. de Vries N, Duinsbergen D, Kuipers EJ, Pot RGJ, Wiesenekker P, Penn CW, van

Vliet AHM, Vandenbroucke-Grauls CMJE, Kusters JG. 2002. Transcriptional phase

variation of a type III restriction-modification system in *Helicobacter pylori*. J

Bacteriol 184:6615–6623.

48. Atack JM, Tan A, Bakaletz LO, Jennings MP, Seib KL. 2018. Phasevarions of

bacterial pathogens: methylomics sheds new light on old enemies. Trends Microbiol

26:715–726.

49. Gor V, Ohniwa RL, Morikawa K. 2021. No change, no life? What we know about

phase variation in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Microorganisms 9:244.

50. Nahar N, Tram G, Jen FE-C, Phillips ZN, Weinert LA, Bossé JT, Jabbari JS, Gouil

Q, Du MRM, Ritchie ME, Bowden R, Langford PR, Tucker AW, Jennings MP, Turni

C, Blackall PJ, Atack JM. 2023. *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae* encodes multiple

phase-variable DNA methyltransferases that control distinct phasevarions. Nucleic

Acids Res 51:3240–3260.

51. Moxon R, Bayliss C, Hood D. 2006. Bacterial contingency loci: the role of simple

sequence DNA repeats in bacterial adaptation. Annu Rev Genet 40:307–333.

52. Bayliss CD. 2009. Determinants of phase variation rate and the fitness implications

of differing rates for bacterial pathogens and commensals. FEMS Microbiol Rev

33:504–520.

53. Ben-Assa N, Coyne MJ, Fomenkov A, Livny J, Robins WP, Muniesa M, Carey V,

Carasso S, Gefen T, Jofre J, Roberts RJ, Comstock LE, Geva-Zatorsky N. 2020.

Analysis of a phase-variable restriction modification system of the human gut

symbiont *Bacteroides fragilis*. Nucleic Acids Res 48:11040–11053.

54. Iida S, Streiff MB, Bickle TA, Arber W. 1987. Two DNA antirestriction systems of

bacteriophage P1, *darA*, and *darB*: characterization of *darA*- phages. Virology

157:156–166.

55. Teklemariam AD, Al-Hindi RR, Qadri I, Alharbi MG, Ramadan WS, Ayubu J, Al-

Hejin AM, Hakim RF, Hakim FF, Hakim RF, Alseraihi LI, Alamri T, Harakeh S. 2023.

The battle between bacteria and bacteriophages: a conundrum to their immune system. Antibiotics (Basel) 12.

56. Roberts GA, Stephanou AS, Kanwar N, Dawson A, Cooper LP, Chen K, Nutley M, Cooper A, Blakely GW, Dryden DTF. 2012. Exploring the DNA mimicry of the Ocr protein of phage T7. Nucleic Acids Res 40:8129–8143.

57. Samson JE, Magadán AH, Sabri M, Moineau S. 2013. Revenge of the phages: defeating bacterial defences. Nat Rev Microbiol 11:675–687.

58. Jiang S, Chen K, Wang Y, Zhang Y, Tang Y, Huang W, Xiong X, Chen S, Chen C, Wang L. 2023. A DNA phosphorothioation-based Dnd defense system provides resistance against various phages and is compatible with the Ssp defense system. MBio 14:e0093323.

59. Hebert PDN, Braukmann TWA, Prosser SWJ, Ratnasingham S, deWaard JR, Ivanova NV, Janzen DH, Hallwachs W, Naik S, Sones JE, Zakharov EV. 2018. A Sequel to Sanger: amplicon sequencing that scales. BMC Genomics 19.

60. Wenger AM, Peluso P, Rowell WJ, Chang P-C, Hall RJ, Concepcion GT, Ebler J, Fungtammasan A, Kolesnikov A, Olson ND, Töpfer A, Alonge M, Mahmoud M, Qian Y, Chin C-S, Phillippy AM, Schatz MC, Myers G, DePristo MA, Ruan J, Marschall T, Sedlazeck FJ, Zook JM, Li H, Koren S, Carroll A, Rank DR, Hunkapiller MW. 2019. Accurate circular consensus long-read sequencing improves variant detection and assembly of a human genome. Nat Biotechnol 37:1155–1162.

61. Mc Cartney AM, Shafin K, Alonge M, Bzikadze AV, Formenti G, Fungtammasan A, Howe K, Jain C, Koren S, Logsdon GA, Miga KH, Mikheenko A, Paten B, Shumate A, Soto DC, Sović I, Wood JMD, Zook JM, Phillippy AM, Rhie A. 2022. Chasing perfection: validation and polishing strategies for telomere-to-telomere genome assemblies. Nat Methods 19:687–695.

62. Hampton HG, Watson BNJ, Fineran PC. 2020. The arms race between bacteria and their phage foes. Nature 577:327–336.

63. Scanlan PD. 2017. Bacteria-bacteriophage coevolution in the human gut: implications for microbial diversity and functionality. Trends Microbiol 25:614–623.

64. Dimitriu T, Szczelkun MD, Westra ER. 2020. Evolutionary ecology and interplay of prokaryotic innate and adaptive immune systems. Curr Biol 30:R1189–R1202.

65. O'Connell Motherway M, Zomer A, Leahy SC, Reunanen J, Bottacini F, Claesson MJ, O'Brien F, Flynn K, Casey PG, Munoz JAM, Kearney B, Houston AM, O'Mahony C, Higgins DG, Shanahan F, Palva A, de Vos WM, Fitzgerald GF, Ventura M, O'Toole PW, van Sinderen D. 2011. Functional genome analysis of *Bifidobacterium breve* UCC2003 reveals type IVb tight adherence (Tad) pili as an

essential and conserved host-colonization factor. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
108:11217–11222.

66. Zhu A, Sunagawa S, Mende DR, Bork P. 2015. Inter-individual differences in the
gene content of human gut bacterial species. Genome Biol 16:82.

67. Yawata Y, Kiyokawa T, Kawamura Y, Hirayama T, Takabe K, Nomura N. 2019. Intra-
and interspecies variability of single-cell innate fluorescence signature of microbial
cell. Appl Environ Microbiol 85.

68. Seed KD, Faruque SM, Mekalanos JJ, Calderwood SB, Qadri F, Camilli A. 2012.
Phase variable O antigen biosynthetic genes control expression of the major
protective antigen and bacteriophage receptor in *Vibrio cholerae* O1. PLoS Pathog
8:e1002917.

69. Chen C-C, Liou J-M, Lee Y-C, Hong T-C, El-Omar EM, Wu M-S. 2021. The
interplay between *Helicobacter pylori* and gastrointestinal microbiota. Gut Microbes
13:1–22.

70. Malfertheiner P, Camargo MC, El-Omar E, Liou J-M, Peek R, Schulz C, Smith SI,
Suerbaum S. 2023. *Helicobacter pylori* infection. Nat Rev Dis Primers 9:19.

71. Chaturvedi R, de Sablet T, Asim M, Piazuelo MB, Barry DP, Verriere TG, Sierra JC,
Hardbower DM, Delgado AG, Schneider BG, Israel DA, Romero-Gallo J, Nagy TA,
Morgan DR, Murray-Stewart T, Bravo LE, Peek RM Jr, Fox JG, Woster PM, Casero
RA Jr, Correa P, Wilson KT. 2015. Increased *Helicobacter pylori*-associated gastric
cancer risk in the Andean region of Colombia is mediated by spermine oxidase.
Oncogene 34:3429–3440.

72. Shirani M, Pakzad R, Haddadi MH, Akrami S, Asadi A, Kazemian H, Moradi M,
Kaviar VH, Zomorodi AR, Khoshnood S, Shafieian M, Tavasolian R, Heidary M,
Saki M. 2023. The global prevalence of gastric cancer in *Helicobacter pylori*-
infected individuals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Infect Dis 23:543.

73. Tacconelli E, Carrara E, Savoldi A, Harbarth S, Mendelson M, Monnet DL, Pulcini
C, Kahlmeter G, Kluytmans J, Carmeli Y, Ouellette M, Outterson K, Patel J, Cavaleri
M, Cox EM, Houchens CR, Grayson ML, Hansen P, Singh N, Theuretzbacher U,
Magrini N, Aboderin AO, Al-Abri SS, Awang Jalil N, Benzonana N, Bhattacharya S,
Brink AJ, Burkert FR, Cars O, Cornaglia G, Dyar OJ, Friedrich AW, Gales AC,
Gandra S, Giske CG, Goff DA, Goossens H, Gottlieb T, Guzman Blanco M,
Hryniewicz W, Kattula D, Jinks T, Kanj SS, Kerr L, Kieny M-P, Kim YS, Kozlov RS,
Labarca J, Laxminarayan R, Leder K, Leibovici L, Levy-Hara G, Littman J,
Malhotra-Kumar S, Manchanda V, Moja L, Ndoye B, Pan A, Paterson DL, Paul M,
Qiu H, Ramon-Pardo P, Rodríguez-Baño J, Sanguinetti M, Sengupta S, Sharland M,

Si-Mehand M, Silver LL, Song W, Steinbakk M, Thomsen J, Thwaites GE, van der
Meer JWM, Van Kinh N, Vega S, Villegas MV, Wechsler-Fördös A, Wertheim HFL,
Wesangula E, Woodford N, Yilmaz FO, Zorzet A. 2018. Discovery, research, and
development of new antibiotics: the WHO priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria
and tuberculosis. Lancet Infect Dis 18:318–327.

74. de Brito BB, da Silva FAF, Soares AS, Pereira VA, Santos MLC, Sampaio MM,
Neves PHM, de Melo FF. 2019. Pathogenesis and clinical management of
Helicobacter pylori gastric infection. World J Gastroenterol 25:5578–5589.

75. Chan BK, Abedon ST. 2012. Phage therapy pharmacology phage cocktails. Adv Appl
Microbiol 78:1–23.

76. Kortright KE, Chan BK, Koff JL, Turner PE. 2019. Phage therapy: a renewed
approach to combat antibiotic-resistant bacteria. Cell Host Microbe 25:219–232.

77. Lin DM, Koskella B, Lin HC. 2017. Phage therapy: an alternative to antibiotics in
the age of multi-drug resistance. World J Gastrointest Pharmacol Ther 8:162–173.

78. Loc-Carrillo C, Abedon ST. 2011. Pros and cons of phage therapy. Bacteriophage
1:111–114.

79. Pires Diana P., Cleto Sara, Sillankorva Sanna, Azeredo Joana, Lu Timothy K. 2016.
Genetically engineered phages: a review of advances over the last decade. Microbiol

Mol Biol Rev 80:523−543.

80. Abedon ST, Kuhl SJ, Blasdel BG, Kutter EM. 2011. Phage treatment of human
infections. Bacteriophage 1:66–85.

81. Balogh B, Jones JB, Iriarte FB, Momol MT. 2010. Phage therapy for plant disease
control. Curr Pharm Biotechnol 11:48–57.

82. Loc Carrillo C, Atterbury RJ, el-Shibiny A, Connerton PL, Dillon E, Scott A,
Connerton IF. 2005. Bacteriophage therapy to reduce *Campylobacter jejuni*
colonization of broiler chickens. Appl Environ Microbiol 71:6554–6563.

83. Tanji Y, Shimada T, Yoichi M, Miyanaga K, Hori K, Unno H. 2004. Toward rational
control of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 by a phage cocktail. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol
64:270–274.

84. Gu J, Liu X, Li Y, Han W, Lei L, Yang Y, Zhao H, Gao Y, Song J, Lu R, Sun C, Feng
X. 2012. A method for generation phage cocktail with great therapeutic potential.
PLoS One 7:e31698.

85. Holder KK, Bull JJ. 2001. Profiles of adaptation in two similar viruses. Genetics
159:1393–1404.

86. Cox J, Schubert AM, Travisano M, Putonti C. 2010. Adaptive evolution and inherent

tolerance to extreme thermal environments. BMC Evol Biol 10:75.

87. Kering KK, Zhang X, Nyaruaba R, Yu J, Wei H. 2020. Application of adaptive

evolution to improve the stability of bacteriophages during storage. Viruses 12:423.

88. Borges AL. 2021. How to train your bacteriophage. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

89. Borin JM, Avrani S, Barrick JE, Petrie KL, Meyer JR. 2021. Coevolutionary phage

training leads to greater bacterial suppression and delays the evolution of phage

resistance. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 118.

90. Cheng H, Concepcion GT, Feng X, Zhang H, Li H. 2021. Haplotype-resolved de

novo assembly using phased assembly graphs with hifiasm. Nat Methods 18:170–

175.

91. Li H. 2018. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics

34:3094–3100.

92. Nurk S, Walenz BP, Rhie A, Vollger MR, Logsdon GA, Grothe R, Miga KH, Eichler

EE, Phillippy AM, Koren S. 2020. HiCanu: accurate assembly of segmental

duplications, satellites, and allelic variants from high-fidelity long reads. Genome

Res 30:1291–1305.

93. Hyatt D, Chen G-L, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. 2010. Prodigal:

prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC

Bioinformatics 11:119.

94. Buchfink B, Xie C, Huson DH. 2015. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using

DIAMOND. Nat Methods 12:59–60.

95. Roberts RJ, Vincze T, Posfai J, Macelis D. 2015. REBASE--a database for DNA

restriction and modification: enzymes, genes and genomes. Nucleic Acids Res

43:D298-9.

96. Payne LJ, Todeschini TC, Wu Y, Perry BJ, Ronson CW, Fineran PC, Nobrega FL,

Jackson SA. 2021. Identification and classification of antiviral defence systems in

bacteria and archaea with PADLOC reveals new system types. Nucleic Acids Res

49:10868–10878.

97. Jain C, Rodriguez-R LM, Phillippy AM, Konstantinidis KT, Aluru S. 2018. High

throughput ANI analysis of 90K prokaryotic genomes reveals clear species

boundaries. Nat Commun 9:5114.

98. Cui Z, Cui Y, Zang T, Wang Y. 2021. interacCircos: an R package based on JavaScript

libraries for the generation of interactive circos plots. Bioinformatics 37:3642–3644.