Title

Defence systems drive accessory genome interactions in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

Authors

Charlotte E. Chong[1,12], Aaron Weimann[2,3,4], Aleksei Agapov[5,12], Joanne L. Fothergill[6,12],

Michael A. Brockhurst[7,12], Julian Parkhill[4], R. Andres Floto[2,8,9,10], Mark D. Szczelkun[11,12],

Edze R. Westra[5,12], Multi-Defence Consortium[12], Kate S. Baker*[1,12]

1. Department of Genetics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

2. VPD Heart Lung Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

3. Cambridge Centre for AI in Medicine, University of Cambridge, UK

4. Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge; Cambridge, UK

5. Environment and Sustainability Institute, Biosciences, University of Exeter,
Penryn, UK

6. Department of Clinical Infection, Microbiology and immunology, University of
Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

7. Division of Evolution, Infection and Genomics, School of Biological Sciences,
University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

8. Cambridge Centre for Lung Infection, Royal Papworth Hospital, Cambridge, UK

9. Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

10. Cambridge University Hospitals Trust, Cambridge, UK

11. DNA-Protein Interactions Unit, School of Biochemistry, University of Bristol,
Bristol, UK

12. Multi-Defence Consortium, https://sites.exeter.ac.uk/multidefence/,
Environment and Sustainability Institute, Biosciences, University of Exeter,
Penryn, UK

*Corresponding Author: kb827@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

As well as undergoing mutational selection, bacterial genomes are shaped by a

complex evolutionary interplay among diverse accessory genome elements (AGEs). In

this study we define AGEs as encompassing both autonomous elements including

phage, plasmids, integrative conjugative elements (ICEs) and carried elements such as defence systems (DSs) and antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs). Genomic studies can facilitate our better understanding of the relationships among these AGEs within microbial genomes, offering deeper insights into their roles in bacterial adaptation and evolution. Emerging evidence suggests that bacterial DSs can interact both synergistically and antagonistically with each other, and ecological studies describe non-random patterns of co-occurrence and avoidance of DSs in bacterial populations. Here, we analysed the distributions of DSs and other AGEs in a recently curated dataset of 4,288 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* genomes. Genomic DS content varied by ecological niche, with higher numbers per genome in non-CF isolates (average n=7.9) compared to CF isolates (average n=6.9). We observed multiple phylogenetically independent associations (n=426) and dissociations (n=50) among DSs, and among other AGEs, many of which had a plausible biological basis. We further explored the relative importance of interactions among different AGEs, revealing that DSs and anti-defence systems engage in the most significant interactions with other AGEs and, most notably, with each other. Ultimately, these patterns of DS interactions and their variation across ecological niches reveals the evolutionary conflicts shaping bacterial accessory genomes and provides a significant public resource for downstream studies on DS and other AGE interactions.

Keywords

Bacterial genomics, bacterial immunity, defence systems interactions, co-occurrence, bacterial defence

Introduction

Bacterial evolution is partially driven by the acquisition of beneficial traits like antimicrobial resistance (AMR), which is often facilitated by horizontal gene transfer (HGT) of accessory genome elements (AGEs) such as plasmids, integrative conjugative elements (ICEs) and phages (1, 2). However, the uptake of this genetic material can also affect fitness and in some cases cause cell death, so in response to this evolutionary pressure, bacteria have acquired immunity against these types of AGEs. Bacteria can contain many complex defence systems (DSs) to defend against harmful invasion ensuring a balance between adaptability and genomic integrity (3). DSs such as

restriction-modification (RM) and CRISPR-Cas are powerful contributors to the control

of HGT but in some case can stabilise AGEs like phage and plasmids (4, 5).

Multiple and diverse sets of DSs are often found within bacterial genomes, with

an average of five DSs found in over 20,000 sequenced prokaryotic genomes (6, 7).

Furthermore, recent studies demonstrate that DSs may be found clustered in defence

islands (3, 7-11). These genomic regions are also commonly associated with

autonomous AGEs that are thought to be responsible for their mobilisation (12, 13). The

proximity to autonomous AGEs and resultant genome plasticity offers a fitness benefit to

bacteria living and responding to a phage-rich environment (3). It has been hypothesised

that defence islands form within bacterial genomes due to mechanistic synergism

between clustered DSs promoting co-localisation and mobilisation between genomes

(11, 14). Additionally, it has also been suggested that defence islands are promoted by

the same evolutionary forces-such as HGT, selective advantage, and genetic linkage that

drive the aggregation of AMR and pathogenicity genes on autonomous AGEs, such as

plasmids, ICEs and phage (11, 15, 16). However, little is known about which DS

interactions in naturally evolving populations might represent putative mechanistic

interactions that shape HGT, and which are merely co-localisations of convenience.

To address these deficiencies in understanding, here we comprehensively

analyse phylogenetically independent interactions among DSs, and other AGEs,

including plasmids, integrative conjugative elements (ICEs), antimicrobial resistance

genes (ARGs), phages, and the newly described anti-defence systems in a recently

curated global dataset of 4,288 *P. aeruginosa* genomes (17). *P. aeruginosa* is an ideal

organism to study DS interaction as previous studies have found it contains varied DSs

(6, 9, 18). It is a widely distributed, Gram-negative bacterium and is found in a diverse

range of ecological niches. As an opportunistic pathogen, it is a major concern in hospital

settings, causing a broad range of infections, particularly in individuals with cystic

fibrosis (CF). Its adaptability has contributed to its status as a World Health Organisation

high-priority AMR pathogen (19). Furthermore, DSs were recently revealed to play a key

role in its adaptation to different transmission models, making it a valuable model for

studying bacterial immunity (9, 17, 20). These interaction patterns among DS and other

AGEs provide valuable insights into microbial ecology, evolution, and potential

mechanistic interactions.

Methods

Genomic dataset

P. aeruginosa genomes used in this study were previously described (17). We

utilised 4,288 genomes from studies of AMR in healthcare settings (21-24), individuals

with cystic fibrosis (17, 25, 26), bacteraemia (27) and non-CF bronchiectasis (28), from

studies into high-risk *P. aeruginosa* (29-31) and from the International *Pseudomonas*

Consortium (32) (Supplementary Table 1). Isolate genomes from 9 deeply sampled CF

patients from the TeleCF study were (17) down sampled, and only genomes

representative of diversity were included in the analysis. Genomes were assembled from

short-read sequence data, using the Velvet (33) or SPAdes (34) assembler using the

Assembly Improvement pipeline (35), as described by Weimann, et al. (2024). Bacterial

genomes were annotated with PROKKA v1.14.6 (36).

Detection of accessory genome elements in bacterial genomes

DSs and anti-defence systems were detected in *P. aeruginosa* draft assembly

FASTA files using DefenseFinder-DB v1.2.2 (accessed April 2023) and Anti-

DefenseFinder-DB v1.3.0 (accessed December 2024) respectively (6). These databases

contained 152 DSs and 41 anti-defence systems. Integrative conjugative elements (ICEs)

and plasmids were detected in bacterial genomes using ICEberg v.2.0 (1032 database

entries) (37) and PlasmidFinder v.2.1.6 (116 database entries) (38) databases via

ABRicate v.1.0.1(39), using default parameters. Phage genomes present within the *P.*

aeruginosa isolates were detected using geNomad v. 1.7.0 (40) and further characterised

with PHASTEST webserver (~410,000 viral sequences) (41). Additionally, ARGs were

identified using NCBI AMRFinderPlus v. v3.11.11, which contains 6,428 ARG entries (42).

Identifying co-occurrence

Coinfinder v.1.10 (43) was used for detecting significant interactions (i.e.

associations and dissociations) among AGEs in the *P. aeruginosa* dataset, using the

presence and absence data of defence systems, phage, plasmids, ICEs and ARGs, along

with a maximum likelihood tree phylogenetic tree of 3012 patient representative isolates generated by Weimann *et al*, as input (Supplementary Table 1, see Figure 1C in Weimann, et al 2024) (17). A smaller dataset was used in the phylogeny (n= 2941) to avoid overrepresentation of clones from deeply sampled patients whilst ensuring all the genetic diversity was kept (17). Gephi (44) was used to further interrogate interactions and visualise the effect size (observed/expected occurrences) of significant interactions (defined as Bonferroni-corrected binomial exact test *p*<0.01). In addition to effect size, significant interactions were also triaged by the frequency (n= 400 for DS only interactions and n= 300 for AGE interactions) of the AGE and their given D-value (D-value >0), a measure of phylogenetic independence that quantifies the phylogenetic signal of a binary trait. A lower D-value indicates a strong phylogenetic conservation (traits following Brownian motion evolution), while a higher D-value suggests more random distribution independent of phylogeny.

Statistical analyses

A Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to compare the frequency of AGEs in genomes between niches. The association of DSs with CF and non-CF genomes was tested using Fisher's exact test with Bonferroni-adjusted p-values. T-tests were used to evaluate the differences in number of DSs, anti-defence systems and other AGEs per genome length (kb) between genomes isolates between niches, and to assess differences in DS frequency between isolates containing CRISPR-Cas Type I-F compared to those without. To compare the length of contiguous sequences (kb) containing Pycsar and Shedu DSs (to those containing any other DS), we performed a Kruksall-Wallis rank sum test followed by a Dunn's post hoc test for pairwise comparisons. All analyses were performed using R v 4.4.0.

To assess the relative importance of interactions among different AGE features, we calculated the proportion of significant interactions as a fraction of total theoretically possible pairs (among detected elements in the AGE types). All significantly interacting pairs were calculated based on the total number of each genomic element found (i.e. ARG = 449, anti-defence system = 30, DS = 131, ICE = 19, phage = 30, plasmid = 13 see Supplementary Table 1). To determine the total number of theoretically possible pairs between different AGE databases (i.e. types of accessory genome feature e.g. ARGs,

DSs), we multiplied the size of the respective database (i.e. N_{AMR} x N_{DS}, where N is the

number of elements detected in the dataset). For pairs within the same category (e.g.,

AMR-AMR, we calculated the possible pairs as N_{AMR} x $(N_{AMR}-1)/2$ to adjust for duplicates.

The proportion of the observed number of significant interactions for each pair type was

then divided by the total theoretically possible pairs for that category to determine the

proportion of (possible) pairs that were significantly interacting.

Results

<u>The accessory genome features of *P. aeruginosa* differ between niches</u>

To explore the variation in the DSs of *P. aeruginosa* we analysed the DS repertoire

of 4,288 *P. aeruginosa* genomes which were isolated from several sources (Figure 1A)

and included globally distributed human, animal and environmental isolates. We

grouped isolates into two categories: CF and non-CF and compared their frequency of

AGE carriage (i.e. presence and absence). This categorisation was informed by findings

from Weimann, et al (2024), which reported enrichment of genes involved in

transcriptional regulation, inorganic ion transport, lipid metabolism and significant

depletion of genes involved in bacterial defence in epidemic clones of *P. aeruginosa*.

Therefore, we sought to examine whether similar patterns were evident in the distribution

across a representative dataset of CF and non-CF isolates. This revealed that *P.*

aeruginosa were rich in AGEs (i.e. DS (CF: 99.4% (n=2011/2023), non-CF: 99.8%

(n=2262/2265)), anti-defence system (CF: 57.5% (n=1164/2023), non-CF: 66.9%

(n=1516/2265)), plasmid (CF: 8.2% (n=166/2023), non-CF: 13.2% (n=301/2265)), ARG

(CF: 100% (n=2023/2023), non-CF: 100% (n=2265/2265)), ICE (CF: 97.1% (n=1965/2265),

non-CF: 98.1% (n=2222/2265)) and phage (CF: 30.1% (n=609/2023), non-CF: 48.1%

(n=1089/2265)) in both niches (Figure 1A, 1B, 1C & Table 1).

Overall, *P. aeruginosa* contained an average of 7 DSs, with 99.7 % (n=4274/4288)

of isolates containing at least 1 DS, consistent with previous studies (6, 18)(Figure 1B,

1C, Supplementary Table 1 & 2). Numerous DSs (n=131) were found, with RM Type I being

the frequently found system, present in 72 % (n=3081/4288) of genomes. This is

consistent with published observations stating that RM systems are present in >74% of

prokaryotic genomes, with an average of ≥2 RM systems per genome (4). To explore

whether any DS was associated with either the CF or non-CF niche, we compared the

proportion of genomes containing each of the DSs per niche, which revealed that 31% (n=41/131) of DSs detected in this dataset were significantly associated with niche; 37% (n=15/41) with the CF niche and the remainder with the non-CF niche (Bonferroni-corrected Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.05$). The DSs associated most significantly with CF and non-CF niches were DarTG and Druantia II respectively (Figure 1C). CRISPR-Cas Type I-F was found in the most genomes within the CF niche and was significantly associated with CF isolates, while RM Type I was the most common and significantly associated with non-CF isolates.

To ensure changes in accessory genome content did not result from differences in total genome content between the two niches, we then ascertained AGE content while adjusting for genome size. Specifically, we found that *P. aeruginosa* genomes isolated from CF patients had significantly smaller genomes (t-test, $p < 0.05$) and overall contained fewer DSs, anti-defence systems, plasmids, ARGs and phage (Wilcoxon rank-sum test, $p < 0.05$) (Figure 1B, Supplementary Figure 1). These CF-associated depletions in AGEs were true, even when frequencies were adjusted to frequencies per kilobase of genome (t-test, $p < 0.05$, Supplementary Figure 1). These findings are congruent with previous studies that show isolates from CF patients exhibit genome reduction compared to non-CF isolates as host-specialisation is more advanced in bacteria adapting to chronically infected lungs compared to strains causing more acute infections (17), and is consistent with a broader trend of genomic streamlining in host-adapting pathogens (45-50).

Figure 1. The distribution of accessory genome elements in *P. aeruginosa*. (A) Isolation niches for genomes in dataset (*n* = 4289). **(B)** The number of accessory genome elements (DSs, anti-DSs, ICEs, plasmids, ARGs and phages) per genome is shown as a

proportion of genomes containing that number of element, stratified by CF/non-CF niche. Significant differences between the proportion of isolates containing any number of accessory genome elements from CF and non-CF niche's is denoted with a * (Wilcoxon rank sum test $p<0.05$). **(C)** The proportion of genomes containing the 50 most prevalent DSs by niche (see Supplementary Table 1 for full dataset). ICE = Integrated Conjugative Element ARGs = Antimicrobial Resistance Genes CF = cystic fibrosis DS = Defence System.

Table 1. Summary of differences between genomes from CF and non-CF patients

Feature	Niche	Mean	Range (Min-Max)	IQR (Q1-Q3)
Isolates	CF	2023	-	-
	non-CF	2265	-	-
Genome Size (Mb)	CF	6.6	5.9-7.5	6.4-6.5
	non-CF	6.7	5.8-7.7	6.5-6.9
DSs	CF	6.9	0-18	4-9
	non-CF	7.9	0-18	5-10
Anti-defence Systems	CF	1.4	0-7	0-2
	non-CF	1.6	0-9	0-3
ARGs	CF	10	7-21	9-10
	non-CF	11	7-31	9-12
Plasmids	CF	0.08	0-2	0-0
	non-CF	0.2	0-3	0-0
ICEs	CF	1.4	0-5	1-2
	non-CF	1.3	0-4	1-2
Phages	CF	0.3	0-3	0-1
	non-CF	0.6	0-3	0-1

Determining defence system interactions

To identify putative synergistic or antagonistic DS interactions across *P. aeruginosa*, we explored which DSs were more frequently associated (putative synergism) or dissociated (putative antagonism) with each other than expected by chance and independent of evolutionary relationships. For this we employed CoinFinder (43), which identifies phylogenetically independent associations and dissociations between traits (in our case, accessory genome categories of elements) and also estimates the phylogenetic independence (as measured by D-value) of traits.

229   This association analysis revealed 182 pairwise interactions among DSs (27.9%, n=182 of 653 possible pairs) that were significantly associating or dissociating with one another (Bonferroni-corrected binomial exact test $p<0.01$, Figure 2, Supplementary Table 3 & 4). Association interactions made up 85.2% (n=155/182) of the total significant DS pairs and the remaining interactions were dissociations. Overall, the dominance of associations over dissociations supports current hypotheses that DS complement each other (14, 18, 51, 52). Each interacting DS (n=36) had a variable number of associations and dissociations, with an average of 10 interactions (range 2-19), and RM Type I having the most interactions (n=19). The high frequency of interactions between RM Type I and other systems may reflect that RM shapes the DS complement of genomes. Other DSs also exhibited high numbers of associations, such as RM Type IV, Pycsar and AbiE, which all associated with 17 other DSs (Figure 1C, 2 & Supplementary Table 3 & 4).

241   To focus our attention on those associations that may have significant roles in shaping *P. aeruginosa* populations, we triaged DSs to focus on those that were comparatively mobile and more common. As a proxy for mobility, we used the phylogenetic independence (D-value) of each DS. As a lower D-value indicates a strong phylogenetic conservation we considered DSs with a D-value of over 0 (Figure 2A) in our downstream analysis. Additionally, we filtered the interactions to only include DSs that were present in over 400 (9.3%, n= 400/4288 of the total dataset, full data in Supplementary Tables 3 & 4) genomes (Figure 2A). Of the 15 DSs that passed these thresholds, 13 were found to both associate and dissociate with other systems, with the remaining 2 having only associations (Figure 2A). Among these 15 DSs, RM Type II, Gabija Lamassu and AbiE were the most frequent and exhibited the most phylogenetic independence (Figure 2A).

253   Having triaged on frequency and phylogenetic independence, we then sought to interrogate DS interactions by visualising the effect size (inferred from the ratio of observed vs expected occurrences, methods) of each association alongside the number of interactions of each DS (Figure 2 B & C, Supplementary Table 3 & 4). This revealed that among the 54 (n= 54/155 total associations) interactions between the 15 triaged DSs, Druantia III and Mokosh Type I association exhibited the strongest interaction (Figure 2B). This indicates a possible mechanistic synergism and is consistent with experimental

evidence suggesting Druantia III and Mokosh Type I both protect against similar phages

such as T4, through nuclease-based mechanisms (7, 53, 54).

We then examined DS pairs that were found to dissociate from each other. As

these only made up only 14.8% (n=27/182) of the total significant interactions (Figure 2C

& Supplementary Table 4) we applied no triage thresholds. Here we found that CRISPR-

Cas Type I-F had the most dissociations with other DSs, such as other RMs Type I & II and

Pycsar (Figure 2C & Supplementary Figure 2). Isolates containing CRISPR-Cas Type I-F

(n=159/4288) contained fewer DSs, compared to isolates not containing CRISPR-Cas

Type I-F (t-test, *p*<0.05) (Supplementary Figure 2). These strong indicators for

dissociation of CRISPR-Cas Type I-F are consistent with it being commonly found in *P.*

aeruginosa and blocking HGT of foreign DNA and even other DS (5, 55, 56).

As recent studies have shown that DSs are frequently encoded within horizontally

transferrable defence islands or genomic hotspots (3, 9-11, 53) we sought to explore

whether the DS associations resulted from co-localisation. Therefore, we assessed

whether the significant associating and dissociating DS pairs (n= 77, Figure 2B & C) were

present on the same contiguous sequence (contig) in our draft genome assemblies (as

an imperfect but practicable proxy of co-localisation, Figure 3). This revealed that of all

DS containing contigs, only 29% (n=7086/24211) carried two or more DSs. Within the

7086 contigs containing ≥2 DS, associating DS pairs were co-located in only 22% of cases

i.e. were on the same contig 4,367 times out of a total of 19,472 pairs occurring across

genomes (Figure 3). As a counterfactual for understanding the rates of co-localisation

among associating DS pairs, we examined co-localisation rates among dissociating DS

pairs. As anticipated, the rates of co-localisation were far lower i.e. 0.5%, n=175/37,098

pairs across all genomes, though this varied among interacting pairs (Figure 3). We found

the rate of co-localisation for 22 (of 54) associating pairs was lower than 0.034% (with

0.034% being the highest co-localisation proportion for a dissociating pairs) (Figure 3).

Overall, this indicated that associations detected here are phylogenetically independent

and are unlikely to have resulted from co-localisation. We observed that some

associating DS, such as Shedu and Pycsar, were less-frequently co-located than

systems that were dissociated in the population (Figure 3 & Supplementary Figure 3).

In summary, our analyses of DS interactions in *P. aeruginosa* revealed a complex

network of both association and dissociation interactions. Most significant interactions

were associations, with DSs such as RM Type II, Gabija, Lamassu and AbiE frequently associating with other systems. Strong interactions between DSs may point towards functional synergy. Conversely, frequent dissociations with CRISPR-Cas Type I-F indicates its role in restricting HGT and conferring a selective disadvantage to co-occurring DSs. Although co-localisation of DSs on contigs was generally low, some associations such as Mokosh Type I, and RM Type IV were consistently (n=415/415 genomes containing the pair) co-located. While such co-localisation can suggest potential functional synergy (52, 57), in this case, the phylogenetically independent co-occurrence patterns could indicate that their co-inheritance is likely driven by genetic linkage rather than necessarily reflecting synergistic interactions between the systems (Figure 2A). These findings highlight the dynamic interplay between DSs, with implications for understanding how they may shape the adaptive landscape of *P. aeruginosa* populations.

Association   **Dissociation**

Figure 2. The distributions, associations and dissociations of defence systems in the global *P. aeruginosa* population. (A) The frequency and phylogenetic independence of DSs with significant interactions (i.e. associations or dissociations). Green dots highlight DSs that were found to have significant associations while purple dots indicate DSs that had both significant associations and dissociations (no systems were found to only have

significant dissociations, full data in Supplementary Table 3 & 4). Red dashed lines show

triage cut-off values of 0 and 400 for Phylogenetic independence and Frequency

respectively. **(B)** Interaction network of associations among DSs. Each node depicts a DS

scaled in size by the number of significant associations it had. Edges represent individual

associations between DSs with the thickness corresponding to the effect size (i.e.

strength of association). **(C)** Interaction network of DS dissociations. Each node similarly

depicts a DS scaled in size by the number of significant dissociations it had. Edges

represent individual dissociations between DSs with thickness corresponding to effect

size.

Interacting pair occurs on same
contiguous sequence
(proportion of genomes containing pair)

Figure 3. The proportion of pairs of DSs showing interactions of association (upper)

and dissociation (lower) that occur on the same contiguous sequences in draft

assemblies. Axes labels are ordered alphabetically. Error bars represent standard error.

The red dashed line intersects the x-axis at 0.04 on both plots to highlight the difference

in scale.

<u>Interactions of DS with other accessory genome elements</u>

To explore the complexity of integral links among DSs and other AGEs, including

the recently described anti-defence systems, we used similar methods to characterise

the interactions among DSs and all other AGEs. This analysis revealed a total of 591

significant interactions between specific AGEs distributed across accessory genome

feature categories (Figure 4 & Supplementary Table 3 & 5). As with DS comparisons, we

triaged the interactions by frequency (using those present in 7%, n=300/4288) of each

element across the dataset and phylogenetic independence (D-value > 0) (Figure 4A).

Analysis of the 36 (of 68) AGEs meeting these triage criteria revealed a network with 201

associations of various effect sizes and differences in the number of associations

(ranging between 2 and 31 per element) (Figure 4A & Supplementary Table 3 & 5). Of the

201 pairs passing the threshold, anti-CRISPR AcrIF3 and anti-CRISPR AcrIF5 show the

strongest association (Figure 4A & Supplementary Table 5). Other comparatively strong

associations included those between ARGs *qacEΔ* and *sul1*, and DS AbiE and ICE bhp.sal

(Figure 4A & Supplementary Table 5).

Regarding the dissociation interactions among these individual AGEs, CRISPR-

Cas Type I-F was again found to have the most negative interactions (29.8%, n=17/57

total dissociations with no triage criteria applied). The significant dissociation between

CRISPR-Cas Type I-F and RM Type II was also exhibited in this analysis, further supporting

the observation that they may not act synergistically in *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 4B &

Supplementary Table 5). The opposite is seen for the Gram-positive bacteria *Listeria*,

Streptococcus and *Staphylococcus*, where CRISPR-Cas Type IV and VI systems have

been observed to provide synergistic protection against phage infection with RM systems

suggesting synergy maybe system type specific and species specific (58-60). We also

observed that the ARG blaPDC3 had 2 strong dissociations with both RM Type IIG and

blaOXA-488 (Figure 4B & Supplementary Table 5). Notably, we also observed distinct

patterns of interaction between DSs and their cognate inhibitors, where anti-CRISPR

systems associate with CRISPR-Cas Type I-E but dissociate from CRISPR-Cas Type I-F

and anti-CBASS systems associate with CBASS systems. Hence, the phylogenetically independent associations and dissociations we have found among individual AGEs in this analysis represent putative interactions for which there is likely a strong mechanistic or ecological basis.

To draw out broader trends in interactions among this plethora of AGEs, we then sought to explore the broader dynamics and relative importance of interactions among different feature categories of the AGEs. To do this, AGEs were collapsed into feature categories (i.e. ARGs, DS, phages, etc) and the associations examined. Overall, this analysis revealed more associations than dissociations, with 90.4% (n=534) of the 591 interactions being associations. Among accessory genome features, we found the highest numbers of associations between ARGs and DSs (31.1%, n=166/534 interacting pairs) followed by DSs and DSs (27% n=144/534) and anti-defence systems and DSs (n=11% 60/534, Figure 4C). Conversely, ARGs and DSs (35.1% n= 20/57) along with DSs and DSs (45.6% n=26/57) had the most dissociations (Figure 4C). These analyses suggest that the accessory genome landscape of *P. aeruginosa* has many ARG-DS and DS-DS interactions.

To move these results closer to meaningful insights on the relative importance of accessory genome feature interactions within *P. aeruginosa*, we contextualised these results by adjusting for the total number of detected AGEs in each feature category (to account for possible bias arising from database size differences). Specifically, we assessed the number of significantly interacting pairs between accessory genome feature categories as a proportion of total theoretically possible pairs enumerated from the two sets of detected AGEs (e.g. for ARG to DS interactions, there were a total of 166 significant associations among a theoretical total of 58,819 possible interactions, enumerated from the detection of 449 unique ARGs and 131 unique DS, giving a proportion of 0.003 significant pairs (Methods, Figure 4D). Overall, this revealed that DS association interactions were the most often significant, and associated with anti-defence systems and ICEs were also high (Figure 4D). Self-interactions between anti-defence systems as well with DSs were also high. Dissociation interactions, although lower in abundance, were more frequently significant between DS-DS, anti-defence-DS, and plasmid-DS pairs (Figure 4D). Hence, our results suggest that the interactions of DSs and anti-defence systems are important interactions among the interplay of the

accessory genome, likely shaping the composition of bacterial genomes, impacting

genetic diversity, AMR, and evolution. These findings are consistent with an apparent

continuous arms race between both DSs and anti-defence systems, taking place

alongside external selective pressures which affect retention and diversification of the

accessory genome (3, 61, 62). Furthermore, the predominance of ICE and plasmid

interactions highlights their known role in facilitating HGT of DSs, anti-defence systems,

and ARGs; additionally shaping genome composition (3, 63).

Figure 4. Interactions among accessory genome elements in *P. aeruginosa*. (A) Significant associations network among individual accessory genome elements. Each

node depicts a genomic element coloured by type according to the inlaid key. Nodes are scaled by the number of significant associations the element has. Edges represent significant associations between elements with thickness scaled by effect size. Elements have been triaged using a Phylogenetic independence value of ≥0 and being found in >300 genomes. **(B)** Significant dissociations network among individual accessory genome elements. Each node depicts a genomic element coloured by type according to the inlaid key. Nodes are scaled by the number of significant dissociations the element has. Edges represent significant dissociations between elements with thickness scaled by effect size. **(C)** Bubble plots representing significant associations (upper) or dissociations (lower) interactions between pairs of accessory genome feature categories (axes). Bubbles are scaled by the number of significant interactions between those categories. **(D)** The relative importance of AGE interactions is shown as bar plots showing the proportion of feature category pair interactions that were found to be significant associations (dark grey) or dissociations (light grey) with the denominator of the total number of theoretical pairs (to account for database size). Feature category pairs are indicated by groups above the bar plots (coloured according to the inlaid key) and x-axis labels.

Discussion

In this study we investigated AGEs across ecological niches of global *P. aeruginosa* population to find biologically meaningful relationships among the densely packed accessory genome.

The comprehensive analysis of 4,288 *P. aeruginosa* genomes revealed 31% of detected DSs were significantly associated with bacterial niche, highlighting the role of environmental pressures in shaping genome defence strategies. Notably, the CF niche isolates were enriched for DarTG and CRISPR-Cas Type I-F, while non-CF niche isolates exhibited a higher prevalence of Druantia II and RM-Type I systems. These findings suggest that CF-adapted *P. aeruginosa* may rely on distinct defence mechanisms, potentially reflecting selection for systems that counteract host-adapted phages or environmental stress. Different bacteria DSs may be favoured under distinct ecological conditions, yet identifying the environmental drivers of their distribution in complex environments remains challenging. Although, there are studies that have previously

linked some ecological factors such as force of infection to the evolution of immune
strategies, where bacteria in lower infection risk environments can favour CRISPR
immunity compared to surface modification immunity (64, 65). This is supported by
increased abundance of CRISPR systems in thermophiles that reside in low infection risk
environments (66, 67) and may go some way to explain the enrichment of CRISPR-Cas
Type I-F in *P. aeruginosa* isolates in this study. Furthermore, pan-genome differences
between different phylogroups of *P. aeruginosa* suggest that variation in defence
systems likely modulates the extent and nature of homologous recombination, with
more diverse of abundant systems potentially restricting the uptake of exogenous DNA
(68). Additionally, CF isolates exhibited significant genome reduction and contained
fewer DSs, anti -defence systems, plasmids, ARGs and phages per kilobase of genome
length, supporting the hypothesis that long-term adaptation to the host-lung
environment drives genomic streamlining, through loss of genes linked to motility,
virulence and environmental adaptability due to focused selection pressures in chronic
infection.

We found a high density of DSs in *P. aeruginosa* genomes, consistent with
previous studies, and extended this work by illuminating the many significant
interactions among DSs. Associating interactions were far more common than
dissociating ones, supporting the hypotheses that DSs function in a complementary
manner, working alongside each other to provide a multi-layered approach against
invading AGEs, providing protection if other defence mechanisms fail (6, 14, 18, 51-53,
69, 70). Distinctly however, we reveal that associations are unlikely due to co-
localisations in defence islands.

Conversely, CRISPR-Cas Type I-F had the highest number of dissociations,
particularly with RM systems and Pycsar. Given its well documented role in blocking
HGT, including the acquisition of other DSs, this may explain why genomes containing
CRISPR-Cas Type I-F harboured significantly fewer DSs than those without it (55, 56,
71).Together, these findings highlight the complex interactions shaping DS organisation
and suggests that while many DSs complement one another, CRISPR-Cas Type I-F may
act as a gatekeeper, limiting genomic plasticity in *P. aeruginosa* living in potentially
nutrient deficient, highly competitive or stressful environments. Hence, the interactions
we show among defence systems here represent plausible meaningful biological

mechanistic (or ecological) interactions that occur among DSs that are not attributable

to co-inheritance on defence islands (7, 53, 72).

Overall, our study of the accessory genome interactions in *P. aeruginosa* revealed

a complex network of interactions among accessory genome feature categories. The

most frequent interactions were between ARGs and DSs, followed by DS-DS interactions

and DS-anti-defence system interactions, suggesting that DSs play a central role in

structuring the *P. aeruginosa* accessory genome. Many defence genes are found in the

accessory genome and are a key contributor to intraspecific variation of bacteria (73, 74).

However, their high turnover rate, co-acquisition with AGEs and persistence in the

accessory genome all affect the amount of protection that they offer against HGT (65, 75,

76), as will shifting environments, as highlighted above.

At a finer scale, out data revealed strong associations between specific AGEs,

such as anti-CRISPR AcrIF3 and AcrIF5, as well as the ARG pair *qacEΔ* and *sul1* and the

DS AbiE with ICE bhp.sal. These findings reinforce the notion that AGEs interact to

promote dissemination and survival in the environment, where AcrIF5 works closely with

AcrIF3 to block Cas 2/3 recruitment to ensure that CRISPR-Cas Type I-F cannot degrade

foreign DNA (69). The spread of ARGs is facilitated somewhat by DSs, where systems

such as Abi, Gabija, CBASS and RM have been found to be more frequently located within

or next to AGEs like ICEs, to affect AGE propagation, stability and HGT to confer

resistance in bacteria (3, 53, 75, 77, 78). Our study reveals key associations and

dissociations that are phylogenetically independent and likely driven by strong

mechanistic or ecological interactions.

There are several limitations to this study. Firstly, although our dataset includes

isolates from diverse ecological niches, many isolates originate from studies on AMR,

which may bias genome composition. Our findings are also reliant on the content and

curation of various AGE databases, so may have failed to detect significant interactions

with yet undescribed AGEs. Furthermore, our association interactions appeared to be

robust against incidental co-localisation but ascertaining the full impact of co-

localisation would be better evaluated with complete genomes assembled from long-

read sequencing data (e.g. as in Wu et al., 2024). Another limitation is that we relied

solely on DefenseFinder (6) to identify DSs, which may not fully capture the diversity of

all DSs. As a result, we may have missed relevant interactions due to incomplete or

imperfect annotations. Our *in-silico* investigation into putative synergism or antagonism among AGEs in *P. aeruginosa* does not offer explanations of the mechanistic or ecological basis for those interactions. However, the approach is robust to many confounding factors (e.g. phylogenetic dependence and the impact of genome size and co-localisation), and many had a plausible mechanistic basis, so we put forward these interactions as strong candidates for future research on biologically meaningful interactions among the accessory genome milieu in *P. aeruginosa*.

The results of this work highlight the importance and complexity of accessory genome interactions in bacteria, particularly the expanding array of DSs and anti-defence systems in shaping accessory genome interactions. Multiple association and dissociation interactions between DSs, and other accessory genome features were found and suggest adaptation of *P. aeruginosa* is driven by the selective forces in their environment. Future research should aim to explore and validate these putative interactions both phenotypically and mechanistically, and to look for other possible drivers of synergy, such as co-regulation.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 1. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolates, associated metadata and accessory genome feature content used in this study.

Supplementary Table 2. DefenseFinder and Anti-defenseFinder output from *P. aeruginosa* dataset.

Supplementary Table 3. Accessory genome elements found to significantly interact by Coinfinder, their associated D-value, frequencies and interactions.

Supplementary Table 4. List of DSs pairs found to associate and dissociate by Coinfinder.

Supplementary Table 5. List of accessory genome feature pairs found to associate and dissociate by Coinfinder.

Supplementary Figure 1. Number of defence systems **(A)**, anti-defence systems **(B)**,

ICEs **(C)**, plasmids **(D)**, ARGs **(E)** and phage **(F)** present in *P. aeruginosa* per genome

length (kb) of genomes isolated from CF patients and non-CF sources. Significant

differences in number of accessory genome elements per genome length (kb) between

genomes isolates from CF and non-CF niches is denoted with a * (*t*-test *p*<0.05). ICE =

Integrated Conjugative Element ARGs = Antimicrobial Resistance Genes CF = cystic

fibrosis DS = Defence System.

To evaluate the possible dominant negative association of CRISPR-Cas Type I-F, we determined that those genomes in this study containing CRISPR-Cas Type I-F (n=159/4288) contained fewer DSs 6.7 (range 0-17), compared with 7.2 (range 1-18) in non-CRISPR-Cas Type I-F containing genomes (t-test, *p*<0.05).

530   **Supplementary Figure 2**. Comparison of the number of DSs found in *P. aeruginosa*

531   isolates containing the DS CRISPR-Type I-F (n=1591) and isolates that did not (n=2683).

532   The plot shows the median (line), interquartile ranges (box), and range (whiskers) of the

533   number for each group. Outliers are shown as individual markers. The asterisk

534   indicates a statistically significant difference *(p*<0.05) as measured by a *t*-test.

Shedu and Pycsar, which were on average found to co-localise in lower proportions, compared to other non-Pycsar/Shedu containing pairs (average proportion of co-localisation in DS pairs containing, Pycsar = 0.01, Shedu = 0.06 and all other system pairs = 0.2. To confirm that these apparently low-rates of non-co-localisation of Pycsar and Shedu were not the result of disproportionately shorter contigs, we assessed the average contig length (kb) of sequences containing these DSs relative to other DS-containing contigs. This revealed that Shedu or Pycsar containing contigs (average of 347 kb and 316 kb respectively) were actually slightly longer than contigs containing other DSs (average of 262 kb) (Kruksall-Wallis rank sum test and Dunn's post hoc test = $p<0.05$) suggesting that this is a genuine interaction between Shedu and Pycsar, and other systems and might represent either functional redundancy or mechanistic antagonism with other systems.

Supplementary Figure 3. Comparison of length in kilobases of contiguous sequences

containing either Pycsar (n=739), Shedu (n=830) or all other DS (n=33650). The plot

shows the median (line), interquartile ranges (box), and range (whiskers) of the number

for each group. Outliers are shown as individual markers. The asterisk indicates a

statistically significant difference ($p<0.05$) as measured by a Kruksall-Wallis rank test

followed by a Dunn's post hoc test for pairwise comparisons.

Funding Information

This work was supported by a grant from the Biotechnology and Biological

Sciences Research Council sLoLa BB/X003051/1, awarded to K.S.B, M.A.B, M.D.S and

E.R.W and a Wellcome Discovery Award (226602/Z/22/Z) to R.A.F and A.W.

Author contributions

C.E.C and K.S.B contributed to the writing of the original draft. All authors (C.E.C,

A.W, A.A, J.L.F, M.A.B, J.P, R.A.F, M.D.S, E.R.W, M.C and K.S.B) contributed to reviewing

and editing of subsequent drafts. C.E.C was responsible for formal analysis,

investigation, visualisation and methodology. A.W, J.P, R.A.F, and C.E.C. contributed to

data curation. K.S.B, M.A.B, M.D.S, C.E.C, and E.R.W contributed to funding acquisition

and conceptualisation. K.S.B and E.R.W were responsible for project administration.

K.S.B was responsible for supervision.

Acknowledgements

We thank all current and past members of the Multi-Defence Consortium for

providing scientific support.

Competing Interests Statement

E.R.W. is inventor on patent GB2303034.9.

Data availability

Short-read DNA was downloaded from the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA) by

Weimann et al. (2024)(17). ENA run accessions can be found in Supplementary Table 1.

References

1.   Vos M, Buckling A, Kuijper B, Eyre-Walker A, Bontemps C, Leblond P, et al. Why
do mobile genetic elements transfer DNA of their hosts? Trends in Genetics.
2024;40(11):927-38.
2.   Arnold BJ, Huang IT, Hanage WP. Horizontal gene transfer and adaptive evolution
in bacteria. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2022;20(4):206-18.
3.   Bernheim A, Sorek R. The pan-immune system of bacteria: antiviral defence as a
community resource. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2020;18(2):113-9.
4.   Oliveira PH, Touchon M, Rocha EPC. The interplay of restriction-modification
systems with mobile genetic elements and their prokaryotic hosts. Nucleic Acids
Research. 2014;42(16):10618-31.
5.   Watson BNJ, Staals RHJ, Fineran PC. CRISPR-Cas-Mediated Phage Resistance
Enhances   Horizontal   Gene   Transfer   by   Transduction.   mBio.
2018;9(1):10.1128/mbio.02406-17.
6.   Tesson F, Hervé A, Mordret E, Touchon M, d'Humières C, Cury J, et al. Systematic
and quantitative view of the antiviral arsenal of prokaryotes. Nature Communications.
2022;13(1):2561.
7.   Millman A, Melamed S, Leavitt A, Doron S, Bernheim A, Hör J, et al. An expanded
arsenal of immune systems that protect bacteria from phages. Cell Host Microbe.
2022;30(11):1556-69.e5.
8.   Maestri A, Pons BJ, Pursey E, Chong CE, Gandon S, Custodio R, et al. The bacterial
defense system MADS interacts with CRISPR-Cas to limit phage infection and escape.
Cell Host & Microbe. 2024.
9.   Johnson MC, Laderman E, Huiting E, Zhang C, Davidson A, Bondy-Denomy J. Core
defense hotspots within *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* are a consistent and rich source of
anti-phage defense systems. Nucleic Acids Res. 2023;51(10):4995-5005.
10.   Rousset F, Depardieu F, Miele S, Dowding J, Laval A-L, Lieberman E, et al. Phages
and their satellites encode hotspots of antiviral systems. Cell host & microbe.
2022;30(5):740-53. e5.
11.   Hochhauser D, Millman A, Sorek R. The defense island repertoire of the
Escherichia coli pan-genome. PLOS Genetics. 2023;19(4):e1010694.
12.   Novick RP, Ram G. The Floating (Pathogenicity) Island: A Genomic Dessert.
Trends in Genetics. 2016;32(2):114-26.
13.   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.
14.   Wu Y, Garushyants SK, van den Hurk A, Aparicio-Maldonado C, Kushwaha SK,
King CM, et al. Bacterial defense systems exhibit synergistic anti-phage activity. Cell
Host & Microbe. 2024;32(4):557-72.e6.
15.   Partridge SR, Kwong SM, Firth N, Jensen SO. Mobile Genetic Elements Associated
with Antimicrobial Resistance. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2018;31(4).
16.   Rocha EPC, Bikard D. Microbial defenses against mobile genetic elements and
viruses: Who defends whom from what? PLOS Biology. 2022;20(1):e3001514.
17.   Weimann A, Dinan AM, Ruis C, Bernut A, Pont S, Brown K, et al. Evolution and
host-specific   adaptation   of   *Pseudomonas   aeruginosa*.   Science.
2024;385(6704):eadi0908.

18.   Costa AR, van den Berg DF, Esser JQ, Muralidharan A, van den Bossche H, Bonilla
BE, et al. Accumulation of defense systems in phage-resistant strains of *Pseudomonas*
aeruginosa. Sci Adv. 2024;10(8):eadj0341.
19.   World Health Organisation (WHO). WHO Bacterial Priority Pathogens List, 2024
2024   [Available   from:
https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/376776/9789240093461-
eng.pdf?sequence=1.
20.   Botelho J, Tüffers L, Fuss J, Buchholz F, Utpatel C, Klockgether J, et al. Phylogroup-
specific variation shapes the clustering of antimicrobial resistance genes and defence
systems   across   regions   of   genome   plasticity   in   *Pseudomonas   aeruginosa*.
eBioMedicine. 2023;90:104532.
21.   Kos VN, Déraspe M, McLaughlin RE, Whiteaker JD, Roy PH, Alm RA, et al. The
resistome of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in relationship to phenotypic susceptibility.
Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2015;59(1):427-36.
22.   Chilam J, Argimón S, Limas MT, Masim ML, Gayeta JM, Lagrada ML, et al. Genomic
surveillance of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in the Philippines, 2013–2014. Western Pacific
surveillance and response journal: WPSAR. 2021;12(2):4.
23.   del Barrio-Tofiño E, López-Causapé C, Cabot G, Rivera A, Benito N, Segura C, et
al. Genomics and susceptibility profiles of extensively drug-resistant *Pseudomonas*
aeruginosa   isolates   from   Spain.   Antimicrobial   agents   and   chemotherapy.
2017;61(11):10.1128/aac. 01589-17.
24.   Khaledi A, Weimann A, Schniederjans M, Asgari E, Kuo TH, Oliver A, et al.
Predicting antimicrobial resistance in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* with machine learning-
enabled molecular diagnostics. EMBO molecular medicine. 2020;12(3):e10264.
25.   Stapleton PJ, Izydorcyzk C, Clark S, Blanchard A, Wang PW, Yau Y, et al.
Pseudomonas aeruginosa strain-sharing in early infection among children with cystic
fibrosis. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2021;73(9):e2521-e8.
26.   Marvig RL, Sommer LM, Molin S, Johansen HK. Convergent evolution and
adaptation of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* within patients with cystic fibrosis. Nature
genetics. 2015;47(1):57-64.
27.   Reynolds R, Hope R, Williams L. Survey, laboratory and statistical methods for the
BSAC Resistance Surveillance Programmes. Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy.
2008;62(suppl_2):ii15-ii28.
28.   Hilliam Y, Moore MP, Lamont IL, Bilton D, Haworth CS, Foweraker J, et al.
Pseudomonas aeruginosa adaptation and diversification in the non-cystic fibrosis
bronchiectasis lung. European Respiratory Journal. 2017;49(4).
29.   Moore MP, Lamont IL, Williams D, Paterson S, Kukavica-Ibrulj I, Tucker NP, et al.
Transmission, adaptation and geographical spread of the *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*
Liverpool epidemic strain. Microbial genomics. 2021;7(3):000511.
30.   López-Causapé C, Sommer LM, Cabot G, Rubio R, Ocampo-Sosa AA, Johansen
HK, et al. Evolution of the *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* mutational resistome in an
international cystic fibrosis clone. Scientific reports. 2017;7(1):5555.
31.   Turton JF, Wright L, Underwood A, Witney AA, Chan Y-T, Al-Shahib A, et al. High-
resolution analysis by whole-genome sequencing of an international lineage (sequence
type 111) of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* associated with metallo-carbapenemases in the
United Kingdom. Journal of clinical microbiology. 2015;53(8):2622-31.

32. Freschi L, Vincent AT, Jeukens J, Emond-Rheault J-G, Kukavica-Ibrulj I, Dupont M-J, et al. The *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* pan-genome provides new insights on its population structure, horizontal gene transfer, and pathogenicity. Genome biology and evolution. 2019;11(1):109-20.

33. Zerbino DR, Birney E. Velvet: algorithms for de novo short read assembly using de Bruijn graphs. Genome research. 2008;18(5):821-9.

34. Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Dvorkin M, Kulikov AS, et al. SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. Journal of computational biology. 2012;19(5):455-77.

35. Page AJ, De Silva N, Hunt M, Quail MA, Parkhill J, Harris SR, et al. Robust high-throughput prokaryote de novo assembly and improvement pipeline for Illumina data. Microbial genomics. 2016;2(8):e000083.

36. Seemann T. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics. 2014;30(14):2068-9.

37. 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. 2018;47(D1):D660-D5.

38. Carattoli A, Zankari E, García-Fernández A, Voldby Larsen M, Lund O, Villa L, et al. In silico detection and typing of plasmids using PlasmidFinder and plasmid multilocus sequence typing. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014;58(7):3895-903.

39. Seemann T. Abricate. Github.

40. Camargo AP, Roux S, Schulz F, Babinski M, Xu Y, Hu B, et al. Identification of mobile genetic elements with geNomad. Nature Biotechnology. 2024;42(8):1303-12.

41. Wishart DS, Han S, Saha S, Oler E, Peters H, Grant JR, et al. PHASTEST: faster than PHASTER, better than PHAST. Nucleic Acids Res. 2023;51(W1):W443-w50.

42. Feldgarden M, Brover V, Gonzalez-Escalona N, Frye JG, Haendiges J, Haft DH, et al. AMRFinderPlus and the Reference Gene Catalog facilitate examination of the genomic links among antimicrobial resistance, stress response, and virulence. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):12728.

43. Whelan FJ, Rusilowicz M, McInerney JO. Coinfinder: detecting significant associations and dissociations in pangenomes. Microb Genom. 2020;6(3).

44. Bastian M, Heymann S, Jacomy M, editors. Gephi: an open source software for exploring and manipulating networks. Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media; 2009.

45. Langridge GC, Fookes M, Connor TR, Feltwell T, Feasey N, Parsons BN, et al. Patterns of genome evolution that have accompanied host adaptation in *Salmonella*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2015;112(3):863-8.

46. Bengtsson RJ, Dallman TJ, Allen H, Silva PMD, Stenhouse G, Pulford CV, et al. Accessory Genome Dynamics and Structural Variation of *Shigella* from Persistent Infections. mBio. 2021;12(2):10.1128/mbio.00254-21.

47. Grote A, Earl AM. Within-host evolution of bacterial pathogens during persistent infection of humans. Current Opinion in Microbiology. 2022;70:102197.

48. Miles SL, Santillo D, Torraca V, Jiménez ATL, Jenkins C, Baker S, et al. Enhanced virulence and stress tolerance are signatures of epidemiologically successful *Shigella sonnei*. bioRxiv. 2025:2025.02.05.636615.

49.   Parkhill J, Sebaihia M, Preston A, Murphy LD, Thomson N, Harris DE, et al.
Comparative analysis of the genome sequences of *Bordetella pertussis*, *Bordetella*
parapertussis and *Bordetella bronchiseptica*. Nature genetics. 2003;35(1):32-40.
50.   Oré N, Tekaia FR, Ti AT, WHEELER PR, CHURCHER C, DA V ID HS, et al. The
decaying genome of *Mycobacterium leprae*. Lepr Rev. 2001;72(4):387-98.
51.   Agapov A, Baker KS, Bedekar P, Bhatia RP, Blower TR, Brockhurst MA, et al. Multi-
layered genome defences in bacteria. Current Opinion in Microbiology. 2024;78:102436.
52.   Tesson F, Bernheim A. Synergy and regulation of antiphage systems: toward the
existence of a bacterial immune system? Current Opinion in Microbiology.
2023;71:102238.
53.   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):eaar4120.
54.   Gao L, Altae-Tran H, Böhning F, Makarova KS, Segel M, Schmid-Burgk JL, et al.
Diverse enzymatic activities mediate antiviral immunity in prokaryotes. Science.
2020;369(6507):1077-84.
55.   Wheatley RM, MacLean RC. CRISPR-Cas systems restrict horizontal gene transfer
in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. The ISME Journal. 2021;15(5):1420-33.
56.   Elliott JFK, McLeod DV, Taylor TB, Westra ER, Gandon S, Watson BNJ. Conditions
for the spread of CRISPR-Cas immune systems into bacterial populations. The ISME
Journal. 2024;18(1).
57.   Payne LJ, Hughes TCD, Fineran PC, Jackson SA. New antiviral defences are
genetically embedded within prokaryotic immune systems. bioRxiv.
2024:2024.01.29.577857.
58.   Williams MC, Reker AE, Margolis SR, Liao J, Wiedmann M, Rojas ER, et al.
Restriction endonuclease cleavage of phage DNA enables resuscitation from Cas13-
induced bacterial dormancy. Nat Microbiol. 2023;8(3):400-9.
59.   Dupuis M-È, Villion M, Magadán AH, Moineau S. CRISPR-Cas and restriction–
modification systems are compatible and increase phage resistance. Nature
communications. 2013;4(1):1-7.
60.   Kim H, Marraffini LA. Cas9 interaction with the tracrRNA nexus modulates the
repression of type II-A CRISPR-cas genes. Nucleic Acids Research. 2024;52(17):10595-
606.
61.   Niault T, van Houte S, Westra E, Swarts DC. Evolution and ecology of anti-defence
systems in phages and plasmids. Current Biology. 2025;35(1):R32-R44.
62.   Murtazalieva K, Mu A, Petrovskaya A, Finn RD. The growing repertoire of phage
anti-defence systems. Trends in Microbiology. 2024;32(12):1212-28.
63.   Samuel B, Mittelman K, Croitoru SY, Ben Haim M, Burstein D. Diverse anti-
defence systems are encoded in the leading region of plasmids. Nature.
2024;635(8037):186-92.
64.   Westra Edze R, van Houte S, Oyesiku-Blakemore S, Makin B, Broniewski Jenny M,
Best A, et al. Parasite Exposure Drives Selective Evolution of Constitutive versus
Inducible Defense. Current Biology. 2015;25(8):1043-9.
65.   van Houte S, Buckling A, Westra Edze R. Evolutionary Ecology of Prokaryotic
Immune Mechanisms. Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews. 2016;80(3):745-63.

66. Anderson RE, Brazelton WJ, Baross JA. Using CRISPRs as a metagenomic tool to
identify microbial hosts of a diffuse flow hydrothermal vent viral assemblage. FEMS
Microbiol Ecol. 2011;77(1):120-33.
67. Makarova KS, Grishin NV, Shabalina SA, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. A putative RNA-
interference-based immune system in prokaryotes: computational analysis of the
predicted enzymatic machinery, functional analogies with eukaryotic RNAi, and
hypothetical mechanisms of action. Biol Direct. 2006;1:7.
68. Choudhury Samara T, Piper Kathryn R, Montoya-Giraldo M, Ikhimiukor Odion O,
Dettman Jeremy R, Kassen R, et al. Heterogeneity in recombination rates and accessory
gene co-occurrence distinguish *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* phylogroups. mSystems.
2025;0(0):e00301-25.
69. Xie Y, Zhang L, Gao Z, Yin P, Wang H, Li H, et al. AcrIF5 specifically targets DNA-
bound CRISPR-Cas surveillance complex for inhibition. Nature Chemical Biology.
2022;18(6):670-7.
70. Beavogui A, Lacroix A, Wiart N, Poulain J, Delmont TO, Paoli L, et al. The
defensome of complex bacterial communities. Nature Communications.
2024;15(1):2146.
71. 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.
72. Vassallo CN, Doering CR, Littlehale ML, Teodoro GIC, Laub MT. A functional
selection reveals previously undetected anti-phage defence systems in the E. coli
pangenome. Nature Microbiology. 2022;7(10):1568-79.
73. Smith WPJ, Wucher BR, Nadell CD, Foster KR. Bacterial defences: mechanisms,
evolution and antimicrobial resistance. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2023;21(8):519-
34.
74. Meaden S, Fineran PC. Bacterial defense islands limit viral attack. Science.
2021;374(6566):399-400.
75. Liu Y, Botelho J, Iranzo J. Timescale and genetic linkage explain the variable
impact of defense systems on horizontal gene transfer. Genome Res. 2025;35(2):268-78.
76. Koonin EV, Makarova KS, Wolf YI. Evolutionary Genomics of Defense Systems in
Archaea and Bacteria*. Annual Review of Microbiology. 2017;71(Volume 71, 2017):233-
61.
77. Gu Q, Zhu X, Yu Y, Jiang T, Pan Z, Ma J, et al. Type II and IV toxin-antitoxin systems
coordinately stabilize the integrative and conjugative element of the ICESa2603 family
conferring multiple drug resistance in Streptococcus suis. PLOS Pathogens.
2024;20(4):e1012169.
78. Touchon M, Bernheim A, Rocha EPC. Genetic and life-history traits associated
with the distribution of prophages in bacteria. The ISME Journal. 2016;10(11):2744-54.