CRISPR-Cas is beneficial in plasmid competition, but limited by competitor toxin-antitoxin activity when horizontally transferred.

David Sünderhauf*[1], Jahn R. Ringger[1+], Leighton James Payne[2], Rafael Pinilla-Redondo[2], William H. Gaze[3], Sam P Brown[4, 5], Stineke van Houte*[1]

*corresponding authors; DS: david@sunderhauf.net, SvH: C.van-Houte@exeter.ac.uk

[1] Environment and Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter Penryn Campus, Penryn, TR10 9FE, UK

[2] Section of Microbiology, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

[3] European Centre for Environment and Human Health, University of Exeter Penryn Campus, Penryn, TR10 9FE

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

[5] Center for Microbial Dynamics and Infection, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

[+]current address: Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Basel, 4051 Basel, Switzerland

ORCIDs:

DS - 0000-0002-8007-3351; JR - 0009-0002-1831-3630; LJP - 0000-0003-2305-6827; RPR - 0000-0003-3521-460X; WHG - 0000-0002-9345-6204; SPB - 0000-0003-1892-9275; SVH - 0000-0001-7047-1308

Abstract

Bacteria can encode dozens of different immune systems that protect cells from infection by mobile genetic elements (MGEs). Interestingly, MGEs may also carry immune systems, such as CRISPR-Cas, to target competitor MGEs, but it is unclear when this is favoured by natural selection. Here, we develop and test novel theory to analyse the outcome of competition between plasmids when one carries a CRISPR-Cas system that targets the other plasmid. Our model and experiments reveal that plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas is beneficial to the plasmid carrying it when the plasmid remains in its host. However, CRISPR-Cas is selected against when the plasmid carrying it transfers horizontally, if the competitor plasmid encodes a toxin-antitoxin (TA) system that elicits post-segregational killing. Consistent with a TA barrier to plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas, a bioinformatic analysis reveals that naturally occurring CRISPR-Cas-bearing plasmids avoid targeting other plasmids with TA systems.

Our work shows how the benefit of plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas is severely reduced against TA-encoding competitor plasmids, but only when plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas is horizontally transferred. These findings have key implications for the distribution of prokaryotic defenses and our understanding of their role in competition between MGEs, and the utility of CRISPR-Cas as a tool to remove plasmids from pathogenic bacteria.

Introduction

Mobile genetic elements (MGEs) are widely distributed throughout the prokaryotic tree of life. As facilitators of horizontal gene transfer, MGEs have the potential to shape ecology and evolution of bacterial populations and to disseminate genes, such as antimicrobial resistance (AMR) genes, between bacterial strains and species. Conjugative plasmids are the most effective distributors of horizontally transferred genes in bacterial communities (Nazarian *et al.*, 2018), and are therefore key drivers of the AMR crisis. Plasmids frequently co-infect the same bacterial cell (San Millan *et al.*, 2014), and therefore often compete for the same ecological niche, i.e. their bacterial host. Prokaryotic immune systems are abundant throughout bacterial genomes and can alter not only how the bacterial host interacts with MGEs, but also how co-infecting MGEs interact with each other (Rocha and Bikard, 2022). Indeed, immune systems are more frequently carried by MGEs than by bacterial chromosomes (reviewed in (Beamud *et al.*, 2024)). However, how natural selection acts on immune systems when they are encoded on chromosomes versus on MGEs is an open question.

CRISPR-Cas (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats – CRISPR-associated) is an adaptive prokaryotic immune response, where an immune memory is formed by integrating a short sequence of an invading MGE into the CRISPR locus as a "spacer". This array of spacers is expressed and processed into small guide RNA that associate with a Cas protein or protein complex. Together, this ribonucleoprotein complex acts as an RNA-guided DNA or RNA nuclease to specifically recognise the MGE during a subsequent infection, and cleave its genome and/or transcripts (reviewed in (Makarova *et al.*, 2020)). CRISPR-Cas systems are common on bacterial chromosomes (~42% of chromosomes carry a CRISPR-Cas

system), but are also found on ~3% of plasmids. (Pinilla-Redondo *et al.*, 2022).

Plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems can be nucleolytic or silence gene expression,

and have been implicated in plasmid warfare (reviewed in (Koonin and Makarova,

2024)): plasmids' CRISPR spacers tend to match other, competing plasmids –

particularly those of similar size which occupy the same niche (Pinilla-Redondo *et al.*,

2022; Benz *et al.*, 2024).

In response, plasmids may invest in traits that give them a fitness advantage in the

face of such competition with CRISPR-Cas-bearing plasmids. These can be either

through direct interference with CRISPR-Cas such as anti-CRISPRs (Mahendra *et al.*,

2020), or through other, CRISPR-Cas-independent, features such as plasmid

incompatibility (Novick, 1987), Bet/Exo systems (Roy *et al.*, 2020), entry exclusion

(Garcillán-Barcia and de la Cruz, 2008), and toxin-antitoxin (TA) systems (Harms *et*

al., 2018). Of these, TA systems are highly prevalent across plasmids: together with

multimer resolution systems and partition systems, TA were theorised to be essential

to large virulence plasmids (Sengupta and Austin, 2011) and a recent analysis of over

40000 NCBI-deposited plasmids of varying sizes found that 35% encoded at least one

TA locus (Guan *et al.*, 2024). TA systems function by simultaneous production of a

toxin and a short-lived antitoxin. If the plasmid – and therefore the TA genes it carries

– are removed, the antitoxin will degrade faster than the toxin, freeing the toxin up to

harm or kill the bacterial host. This addictive nature of TA systems means their removal

is strongly selected against (Harms *et al.*, 2018), and this phenomenon is theorised to

be beneficial to plasmid competition (Cooper and Heinemann, 2000; Cooper *et al.*,

2010; Rankin *et al.*, 2012). Previous work has shown that TA systems may also

interfere with CRISPR-Cas targeting of plasmids: A chromosomally-encoded Type I-E

CRISPR-Cas system was shown to be selected against when it targeted a CcdAB TA-

encoding plasmid (Van Sluijs *et al.*, 2019), and pOXA-48a's pemIK TA system was identified as a barrier to removal by a mobilisable plasmid encoding a synthetic Type II CRISPR-Cas9 system (Reuter *et al.*, 2021).

While it is therefore clear that both TA systems and CRISPR-Cas immune systems are important during within-cell plasmid competition (Rankin *et al.*, 2012; Benz *et al.*, 2024), it is unclear how selection acts on these traits when they directly compete with one another. Given that CRISPR-Cas-directed removal of TA plasmids is selected against (Van Sluijs *et al.*, 2019; Reuter *et al.*, 2021), we hypothesize that the benefit of CRISPR-Cas systems to plasmid competition may be limited by the presence of a TA system on competing plasmids.

To explore this hypothesis, we constructed a mathematical model predicting the outcome of plasmid competition between a TA-bearing and a CRISPR-Cas-bearing plasmid within an individual host, dependent on whether the CRISPR-Cas plasmid was acting offensively (i.e. the CRISPR-Cas-bearing plasmid invaded the host) or defensively (i.e. the CRISPR-Cas-bearing plasmid protected its host from competitor plasmid invasion). The model predicted that the outcome of plasmid competition depended on this ecological scenario, as well as TA and CRISPR-Cas strength: when offensive, CRISPR-Cas provided diminishing benefits to its plasmid when faced with a stronger competing TA system that was already established in the host cell. We further built an experimental system by allowing IncP plasmids pKJK5::csg (IncP1ε; CRISPR-Cas9 plasmid) and RP4 (IncP1α; TA plasmid) to compete for *E. coli* hosts. We found that carrying active CRISPR-Cas was always beneficial to pKJK5 when CRISPR-Cas was acting defensively. By contrast, selection only favoured

CRISPR-Cas on pKJK5 during offense (i.e. when invading a host in which RP4 was

established) if the competitor RP4 did not carry an active TA system. Finally, we further

tested our theory and generalized our experimental results by bioinformatically

analysing plasmids carrying CRISPR-Cas systems and their target plasmids and

found that these targeted plasmids did not typically encode TA systems.

This work highlights the limits of an active CRISPR-Cas immune system in plasmid

competition and underlines the advantages of TA systems to plasmid spread and

persistence.

Results

<u>Mathematical modelling predicts that CRISPR-Cas benefit is dependent on TA activity of competitor plasmids.</u>

Both CRISPR-Cas and toxin-antitoxin systems have been implicated in plasmid-level competition (Rankin *et al.*, 2012; Benz *et al.*, 2024). In a mathematical analysis, we set out to formalise the relative benefits of CRISPR-Cas to a plasmid when competing with a plasmid encoding TA, depending on asymmetries due to distinct offensive versus defensive roles of CRISPR-Cas and TA. A defensive role occurs when a plasmid is already resident in a cell line. In contrast, an offensive role occurs when a plasmid is a newly arrived invader in a cell (i.e. the plasmid is horizontally transferred to a new host).

To formalise plasmid competition dynamics, we begin with a simple conceptualisation of plasmid competition (Figure 1A). Our approach focuses on cells co-infected with both plasmids (*CT* and *TC* cells), with plasmids differentiated by their order of arrival. *C* represents cells where a CRISPR-Cas plasmid is resident, while *T* represents cells where a TA plasmid is resident. In the event *C* cells experience a conjugation event introducing a TA-plasmid, we have a *CT* cell containing both a resident CRISPR-Cas plasmid and an invading TA plasmid. Conversely, *TC* cells are created when a *T* cell acquires a CRISPR-Cas plasmid.

Our model defines transition rates from co-infected states (*CT* or *TC*) to singly infected states (*C* or *T*) (arrows in Figure 1A, more detail in Figure S1A). These transition rates are defined by plasmid segregational loss (baseline rate s), modified by *C*- and *T*-specific traits of CRISPR-Cas-induced enhanced segregation (blue in Figure 1A; multiplicative factor x; $x > 1$ implies increased segregation rate $x \cdot s$) and TA-induced

post-segregational killing (red arrow in Figure 1A; probability of PSK y). In the event of PSK, we assume that the liberated resources (nutrients, space) can enhance the growth of remaining C or T cells, weighted by parameter f (Rankin *et al.*, 2012). Finally, asymmetries in parameter values between resident and invader roles are captured by subscripts r and i. Given lower plasmid copy number and lower gene expression for invading versus established plasmids (Fraikin *et al.*, 2024), our default assumptions are $s_i > s_r$; $x_r > x_i \geq 1$; $1 > y_r > y_i \geq 0$. Given spatial structuring so that T cells are enriched in neighbourhood of TC cells (and vice-versa for C near CT cells), we further assume $1 > f_r + f_i > f_r > f_i \geq 0$. The resulting transition rates (Figure S1A, equations E1-E4) are used to define fitness functions for CRISPR-Cas and TA plasmids in both resident and invader contexts (equations E5-8, Supplementary Results 1). Finally, we used these transition rates to calculate the relative competitive success of the CRISPR-Cas plasmid R_C (Figure 1A, equations E9-E10), which is a measure of the relative fitness of the CRISPR-Cas compared to the TA plasmid.

Analysis of R_C for either resident or invader CRISPR-Cas plasmids provided the following core predictions concerning the impact of CRISPR-Cas and TA investments (x and y) on their relative competitive success (derivations are detailed in Supplementary Results 1): Firstly, in the absence of PSK (no TA; $y = 0$), increasing investment in CRISPR-Cas (increasing x) always increases CRISPR-Cas competitive success, regardless of whether in a defensive (Figure 1B) or offensive role (Figure 1C). Secondly, in the presence of PSK ($y > 0$), increasing CRISPR-Cas investments is still beneficial in a resident context (Figure 1B), but can become detrimental in an offensive role, given sufficiently high resident PSK (y_r) (Figure 1C, strong TA). Analytical conditions for this qualitative shift in behaviour are defined in Supplementary Results 1.

In conclusion, our mathematical modelling predicted an asymmetric outcome of

plasmid competition, depending on CRISPR-Cas mode of action. When resident,

investing in stronger CRISPR-Cas always benefitted its own plasmid. However, in

offense CRISPR-Cas switched from an asset to a liability in plasmid competition,

dependent on a sufficiently strong TA response on the competitor plasmid.

Figure 1: Mathematical modelling predicts that CRISPR-Cas has a greater potential to

benefit its plasmid in defence than in offense.

A: Structure of the mathematical model. C (CRISPR-Cas bearing) and T (TA-bearing) plasmids reside in host cells, and we consider five distinct cell types. CT denotes a C cell that has been invaded by a T plasmid and vice-versa; PSK cells are dead cells after post-segregational killing. When the plasmids co-reside, they are subject to basic biological parameter s (segregational loss). CRISPR-Cas and TA alter parameter s by their own modes of action x and y respectively. Parameter f describes the positive effect PSK cells have on growth of T kin. All parameters adopt distinct values when their respective plasmids are resident (r) or invasive (i). a and b refer to baseline plasmid fitness and a scaling parameter of the relevant competitive transition respectively. For full equations, see Supplementary Results 1.

B, C Relative competitive success of the C plasmid, in either resident (R_{Cr}) or invader role (R_{Ci}). Values >1 describe a CRISPR-Cas plasmid with higher fitness than the TA competitor, and values <1 describe a more competitive TA plasmid as a function of strength of CRISPR-Cas system x. This relationship is shown for three example TA strengths x. Both x and y adopt different maximum values depending on which plasmid is resident (no TA y_i / y_r = 0; moderate TA y_i / y_r = 0.33 / 0.66; strong TA y_i / y_r = 0.66 / 0.99; maximum x_r = 1300; maximum x_i = 900). This figure presents horizontal cross-sections of the relative competitive success across the entire x and y parameter space presented in Figure S1B-C. Parameter choices are specified in Supplementary Results 1.

Experimentally competing a CRISPR-Cas and TA plasmid showed a universal CRISPR-Cas benefit in defence, but not in offense.

Our mathematical modelling predicts that the benefits of a plasmid-encoded CRISPR-Cas system are limited during competition with TA plasmids. We sought to test these predictions experimentally in a model system where we could modulate CRISPR-Cas and TA strength in a binary way by turning these systems on and off. To this end, we used competitor plasmids pKJK5::csg and RP4 as models to examine how selection acts on plasmid-encoded CRISPR-Cas under "defensive" and "offensive" modes of action (Figure 2A-B). Due to plasmid incompatibility resulting in segregational loss, these plasmids cannot be co-maintained in the same host indefinitely but can co-exist for several generations (Bahl *et al.*, 2007), giving ample window of opportunity for plasmid competition within the same bacterial host. Plasmid pKJK5::csg was engineered to carry a minimal Type II CRISPR-Cas9 system (Sünderhauf *et al.*, 2023b), and we turned CRISPR-Cas activity on or off by using two isogenic plasmid variants that only differed in their respective fixed targeting specificity (Figure 1A, see Methods). Competitor plasmid RP4 naturally carries the Type II TA system *parABCDE*, where *parABC* form a segregational stability system and *parDE* code for a TA system that can kill plasmid-free segregants (Adamczyk and Jagura-Burdzy, 2003). Due to the higher stability of the ParE DNA gyrase inhibiting toxin over the ParD antitoxin, *parDE* loss causes an arrest in cell division, SOS induction, and cell filamentation (Fraikin and Melderen, 2023). We turned RP4's TA activity off by supplying an expression vector engineered to carry RP4's *par* TA operon (pCDF1b_par) to all potential plasmid hosts, thus allowing supply of the antitoxin *in trans* and thereby negating the PSK effect of RP4's TA system. As a control, empty vector pCDF1b was supplied in all treatments where TA remained turned on (Figure 1A). These vectors pCDF1b and

pCDF1b_par are compatible with both pKJK5 and RP4 and were maintained throughout all experiments in the absence of antibiotic selection (Figure S3).

To assess plasmid competition outcome under different modes of CRISPR-Cas action, we set up mating assays including three *Escherichia coli* DH5α hosts with different plasmid content (Figure 2B). In this way, we could track plasmid competition when CRISPR-Cas was acting defensively (a pKJK5 host was invaded by RP4) and when CRISPR-Cas was acting offensively (an RP4 host was invaded by pKJK5). Further, we included an intermediate scenario where both plasmids invade an initially naïve, plasmid-free host. In this scenario, the mode of action of CRISPR-Cas could be either offensive or defensive. After solid-surface filter mating, we measured numbers of each host and their respective plasmid content by selective plating, making use of different chromosomal resistance gene tags in each *E. coli* host. We calculated the plasmids' competitive ratio for each scenario. This metric is a log10 of the proportion of pKJK5 over RP4 carriage within hosts and describes which plasmid won the competition for each host; positive values indicate that CRISPR-Cas plasmid pKJK5 was more abundant in its host, and negative values indicate that TA plasmid RP4 was more abundant.

This analysis revealed that when CRISPR-Cas was acting defensively, the CRISPR-Cas plasmid won the competition in every case where CRISPR-Cas was switched on (Figure 2C; competitive ratio = 1.41 (N=1) and 1.94 ± 0.0085 respectively; significantly higher than 0 with $p < 0.001$ after T-test and Bonferroni adjustment for multiple testing with α = 0.005). In stark contrast, when CRISPR-Cas was acting offensively, switching on CRISPR-Cas had a differential effect depending on TA status of the competitor plasmid. When TA was absent from the competitor, switching on CRISPR-Cas brought little or no benefit to CRISPR-Cas plasmid pKJK5 (Figure 2D; competitive ratio = 0.32

± 0.13; p = 0.07 and non-significant with α = 0.005). However, when the competitor

plasmid's TA was switched on, switching on CRISPR-Cas was highly detrimental to

pKJK5 (competitive ratio = -2.19 ± 0.11; p < 0.001 and significant with α = 0.005).

In the naïve host, switching on CRISPR-Cas on its own benefitted pKJK5 (Figure 2E;

competitive ratio 0.73 ± 0.1; p = 0.0019 and significant with α = 0.005). When TA was

switched on alongside this, there was no clear winner of the competition (competitive

ratio = -0.21 ± 0.096; p = 0.1), however CRISPR-Cas still provided a benefit to pKJK5

relative to the scenario where CRISPR-Cas was switched off, where TA plasmid RP4

won the competition (competitive ratio = -0.94 ± 0.066; p = 0.00014).

While we identified RP4's *parABCDE* TA system as interfering with CRISPR-Cas

efficacy in these experiments, we acknowledged that other traits of RP4 may be

responsible for the observed effects; RP4 is a 60kB conjugative plasmid carrying many

gene cassettes, including additional TA systems. To determine whether our observed

effects are caused directly by the *parABCDE* TA system we therefore verified our

conclusions by cloning the *par* operon onto a series of cloning vectors with different

backbones of varying incompatibility group and offensively competing pKJK5 against

these (Figure S4, Supplementary Results 2). This confirmed that CRISPR-Cas on its

own can benefit pKJK5, but if a competitor plasmid carries the *par* TA system,

CRISPR-Cas is detrimental to pKJK5 in offense – regardless of competitor plasmid

backbone.

Together, our experiments show that a defensive CRISPR-Cas system was always

beneficial to its host plasmid, in agreement with the mathematical model which

predicted that a stronger CRISPR-Cas response in defence would benefit the plasmid

carrying it regardless of competitor TA status. In addition, we experimentally showed

that during a mixed mode of CRISPR-Cas action when invading and competing in

naïve hosts, turning on CRISPR-Cas also benefitted the CRISPR-Cas plasmid pKJK5,

even in the presence of TA. While this effect was not strong enough to lead to pKJK5

winning the competition, there was never a detriment of carrying CRISPR-Cas.

In conclusion, we found that the benefit of an offensive CRISPR-Cas system to its host

plasmid depends on payload genes encoded on competitor plasmids; namely, a TA

system on a competitor means that offensive CRISPR-Cas is detrimental to its

plasmid. These limitations were not observed for defensive CRISPR-Cas systems, or

CRISPR-Cas plasmids co-invading naïve hosts.

Figure 2: CRISPR-Cas is beneficial in defence but limited by TA in offense in

experimental plasmid competition.

A – CRISPR-Cas and TA activity were tweaked on competitor plasmids in a binary

manner by switching each system on or off. pKJK5::csg carries a gene cassette

encompassing *cas9, sgRNA, GFP* with either RP4-targeting or non-targeting guides,

RP4 naturally carries TA system *parABCDE*. B – Plasmids were competed using three

E. coli DH5α hosts with different plasmid content, allowing us to assess competitive

outcome under defensive, offensive, or no clear mode of CRISPR-Cas action. After

filter mating, plasmid content of each host was assessed by selective plating.

C-E Mean ± standard error of the competitive ratio (log10 of pKJK5-carrying hosts /

RP4-carrying hosts) describes outcome of plasmid competition (N=5). Values >0

indicate CRISPR-Cas plasmid pKJK5 winning the competition, and values <0 indicate

TA plasmid RP4 winning the competition for a certain host. The dashed line indicates

a neutral outcome with competitive ratio = 0. Data are presented for treatments in

which CRISPR-Cas and TA activity were toggled on or off in all combinations.

Stars indicate significant differences from 0 as assessed by T test and Bonferroni

adjustment for multiple testing; *$p < 0.005$ with $\alpha = 0.005$; see Table 2 for all p values.

na – not assessed due to N=1 after removal of missing values (no carriage of TA

plasmid RP4 recorded in 4 out of 5 replicates).

<u>Plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems preferentially target plasmids lacking TA</u>

<u>systems.</u>

Our model and experiments suggest that plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems are

highly competitive when acting defensively. In contrast, their offensive benefits are

limited to conflicts where the competitor plasmid does not encode a TA system. To test

whether this constraint is reflected in natural systems, we analysed genomic data to

assess the association between CRISPR-Cas targeting and TA presence. If the fitness

benefit of CRISPR-Cas systems in plasmid competition is limited by TA systems, we

hypothesised that naturally occurring plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems would

preferentially target plasmids without TA systems.

To answer this question, we analysed existing data on the plasmid-targeting spacers

of plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems (Pinilla-Redondo *et al.*, 2022), focusing on

identifying which of these targeted plasmids encoded TA systems. The resulting

targeting network provided a comprehensive picture of plasmids that were targeted by

plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems (N=1340), and the TA systems these targeted

plasmids encoded (Figure 3A). In particular, Type II TA were most commonly identified,

with *parDE* being detected ~565 times.

Within this network, 34% of plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems were Type IV

systems (Figure S5A), which function by repressing target gene expression, rather

than causing nucleolytic cleavage (Benz *et al.*, 2024; Čepaitė *et al.*, 2024). This mode

of action may allow targeted plasmids to persist without triggering post-segregational

killing (PSK), potentially obscuring the relationship between targeting and TA

presence. Indeed, Type IV-A3-targeted plasmids have been shown to persist when

targeted in non-essential regions (Benz *et al.*, 2024). Therefore, we repeated the

analysis while excluding Type IV systems. This reduced the number of targeted

plasmids to 463, of which only 11% (N=51) encoded TA systems, and none encoded

parDE (Figure S5B).

Correlational analyses on the partitioned data (all CRISPR-Cas types, Type IV only,

and non-Type IV) yielded contrasting results. In all cases, Pearson's χ^2 tests confirmed

a significant relationship between CRISPR-Cas targeting and TA presence (χ^2 = 94.08,

334.48, and 171.83 respectively; $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$), with small effect sizes ($\varphi = 0.073$, 0.137, and 0.098 respectively). When considering all plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas types or Type IV only, TA-encoding plasmids were targeted more often than expected under the null hypothesis of no relationship between CRISPR-Cas targeting and TA carriage (residuals = 7.21 and 13.82; $p = 5.71 \times 10^{-13}$ and 1.04×10^{-43} respectively; Figure 3B). This contradicts our hypothesis that plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems should preferentially target plasmids lacking TA systems.

In contrast, when we excluded Type IV CRISPR-Cas systems, the association between CRISPR-Cas targeting and TA carriage reversed: fewer TA-encoding plasmids were targeted than expected (residual = -10; $p = 1.49 \times 10^{-23}$), consistent with our experimental data and model predictions.

Overall, these results indicate that nucleolytic plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems preferentially target plasmids lacking TA systems. This supports and extends our model and experimental findings to natural systems across diverse CRISPR-Cas and TA system types. We conclude that nucleolytic, plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems provide significant defensive benefits, even in the face of TA. In contrast, their benefits in offence are constrained by the presence of TA systems on competitor plasmids.

Figure 3: Plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems (excluding Type IV) avoid targeting plasmids with toxin-antitoxin systems.

A – Naturally-occurring plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems and the plasmids they target (Pinilla-Redondo *et al.*, 2022) were analysed for toxin-antitoxin (TA) carriage.

B - Comparison of observed vs. expected counts of targeted plasmids encoding TA by CRISPR-Cas type. Brown bars show the observed counts of plasmids in each group compared to the expected counts (grey bars) under the null hypothesis of independence between targeting and TA presence. Error bars represent standard error. Residuals and *p* values are presented after a Pearson's χ^2 test. Full contingency

tables for all categories of plasmids can be found in Figure S6 (targeted or not targeted

by CRISPR-Cas, coding or not coding for TA).

Discussion

In this work, we uncovered the limitations of CRISPR-Cas in plasmid competition.

Mathematical modelling predicted that when plasmids compete within co-infected

cells, CRISPR-Cas can provide a benefit to the plasmid it resides on. However, when

the competitor plasmid encodes a strong toxin-antitoxin (TA) system, CRISPR-Cas is

only beneficial when defensive and resident in a host. We further observed this

outcome of CRISPR-Cas- and TA-plasmid competition in an experimental model

system, showing how offensive CRISPR-Cas becomes a liability when targeting a

resident TA plasmid, while defensive and co-invading CRISPR-Cas could provide a

benefit even when competing against a TA plasmid. Finally, we further tested our

theory and generalised our experimental findings by bioinformatically showing that

plasmid-borne nucleolytic CRISPR-Cas systems avoid targeting other plasmids

carrying TA systems.

A crucial role of TA in plasmid establishment, spread, and maintenance has previously

been documented (Cooper and Heinemann, 2000; Cooper *et al.*, 2010; Rankin *et al.*,

2012). Our data adds to this broad utility of TA throughout a plasmid's life cycle, as we

found that TA contributed to TA plasmid competitiveness in nearly all experimental

scenarios (Figure 2). Underlining this, our mathematical model predicted that unlike

CRISPR-Cas (the benefit of which diminished when competing TA was stronger), TA

became more beneficial in the presence of a stronger CRISPR-Cas response on the

competitor plasmid when the TA plasmid was resident (Figure S2B).

Regardless, TA and CRISPR-Cas show striking similarity in that they benefit their own plasmid more when acting defensively than offensively (Figure 2, Figure S2). It is well established that plasmids are more fit when residing in a host cell than when conjugating into a new host (reviewed in (San Millan and MacLean, 2017)): conjugation itself is costly (e.g. by SOS-response activation; (Baharoglu *et al.*, 2010)), a novel plasmid is associated with a high transient fitness cost (Prensky *et al.*, 2021), and existing plasmid-host pairs can benefit from compensatory mutations to ameliorate fitness costs (Hall *et al.*, 2019). Here, we add to this body of evidence by showing that specific plasmid-encoded genes, namely CRISPR-Cas and TA, also provide a higher benefit to vertically transferred plasmids than to those that are horizontally transferred when facing plasmid competition. These findings can help explain naturally observed repression of conjugative machinery (Lundquist and Levin, 1986).

Recent modelling showed that plasmid cost is a key determinant of whether a plasmid carrying TA can become established in a bacterial population carrying (chromosomally encoded) CRISPR-Cas systems (Siedentop *et al.*, 2024). In support of this, modelling showed that plasmids struggle to become established during plasmid competition when co-infection comes with a significant cost (Igler *et al.*, 2021). We do not directly measure plasmid costs in our experimental system, but our mathematical model conceptualises the presence of both CRISPR-Cas and TA as a costly state due to a PSK effect. Experimentally, we are likely overinflating the strength of TA compared to natural populations: we carried out the experimental work in DH5α, a recA- *E. coli* strain. RecA is implicated in *parDE* TA function, where recA- strains typically see survival rates ~3 orders of magnitude lower than recA+ strains (Fraikin and Van Melderen, 2024). Nevertheless, our bioinformatic analyses confirms that our

experimental results are generalisable by revealing a dissociation between plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas targeting and competitor plasmid TA carriage.

Our findings clearly show that due to their offensive capability, plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems are under different selective pressures than chromosomally encoded CRISPR-Cas systems. This helps explain the distribution and mobility of microbial defence systems, where certain systems are more commonly found on specific mobile genetic elements (MGEs) rather than the bacterial chromosome (for instance, a number of defences are commonly found on prophage; reviewed in (Georjon and Bernheim, 2023; Patel and Maxwell, 2023). Similarly, our results indicate that it is unsurprising that certain types of CRISPR-Cas lacking a nuclease, such as Type IV, are preferentially found on plasmids (Pinilla-Redondo *et al.*, 2022). In our bioinformatics analysis, we found that only nucleolytic, non-Type IV, plasmid borne CRISPR-Cas systems avoid targeting plasmids carrying TA systems. Based on this, we hypothesise that plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems adopt different evolutionary strategies in light of competitor plasmids encoding TA. A plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas system can avoid targeting TA plasmids to overcome limitations caused by TA in offense, as showcased in our data and bioinformatics analysis. An alternative evolutionary scenario can involve the loss of nucleolytic activities, as seen for plasmid-borne Type IV and Type V-M (Wu *et al.*, 2022) CRISPR-Cas systems, which would not have these limitations and can target TA-carrying plasmids without paying the costs of PSK induction. In addition to silencing rather than cleaving DNA, Type IV CRISPR-Cas systems may overcome TA activity by additional means. For instance, the propensity of Type IV CRISPR-Cas systems to co-opt their host's spacer acquisition machinery (Newire *et al.*, 2020; Benz *et al.*, 2024) may strengthen Type IV CRISPR-Cas's role in defence (while resident in its host, the CRISPR-Cas system can acquire

new spacers to defend from MGEs), while dampening its role in offense (when moving

to a new host, the CRISPR-Cas system cannot acquire new spacers until established).

A dampened CRISPR-Cas strength in offense may allow CRISPR-Cas mobility by

circumventing autoimmunity arising from chromosomal targeting. The proposed

evolutionary history of Type IV CRISPR-Cas systems supports the hypothesis that

plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems adopt different evolutionary strategies to remain

effective in light of TA: nucleolytic Type III CRISPR-Cas lost its HD nuclease domain

and diverged towards gene silencing activity by association with helicase DinG over

evolutionary timescales (Moya-Beltrán *et al.*, 2021). Overall, the association between

TA and the effectivity of CRISPR-Cas in plasmid competition helps explain the

distribution and mobility of bacterial defence systems and the propensity of certain

defences to associate with particular MGEs.

Throughout this work, we assayed plasmid competition outcome within individual

plasmid hosts. Despite this limitation, our work has further-reaching implications. On

a population level, within-host plasmid competition may be particularly relevant to

highly permissive plasmid hosts – bacteria in which the cost of plasmid maintenance

is low and which can cause persistence of plasmids on a community level (Li *et al.*,

2018; Alonso-del Valle *et al.*, 2021), or in hosts closely associated with certain plasmid

lineages, such as clinically problematic bacterial strains of *E. coli* Sequence Type (ST)

131 and their IncF plasmids (Kondratyeva *et al.*, 2020). Our results could inform

predictions of community-level plasmid persistence, where a resident CRISPR-Cas

plasmid in such highly permissive plasmid hosts may prevent their colonisation by TA-

encoding competitor plasmids, and thus prevent TA plasmid dissemination throughout

the microbial community. In addition to making predictions about plasmid prevalence,

our work can inform the use of CRISPR-Cas delivery tools (engineered plasmids used

to directly kill or resensitise bacteria to antibiotics through removal of AMR-encoding

plasmids (Pursey *et al.*, 2018; Sünderhauf *et al.*, 2023b)). Our work indicates that

CRISPR-Cas delivery tools will be more effective when delivered prophylactically, i.e.

when CRISPR-Cas is allowed to act defensively rather than offensively. When they

are required to act offensively, other factors such as target plasmid copy number and

compatibility can inform optimal CRISPR-Cas delivery tool design (Kippnich *et al.*,

2024). Alternatively, designing offensive CRISPR-Cas tools to intentionally target TA-

encoding multidrug-resistance plasmids could be a means of destabilizing pathogenic

bacteria rather than just eliminating their problematic plasmids.

In this work, we describe how the relevance of CRISPR-Cas to plasmid competition

depends on its mode of action: defensive CRISPR-Cas is universally beneficial, but

the benefit of offensive CRISPR-Cas can be limited by TA genes present on competitor

plasmids. This work underlines the utility of TA systems to plasmid competition and

explains their ubiquity, and in addition may help to predict which plasmids can become

established in clinically relevant species and communities. Further, we help explain

the distribution of bacterial defence systems by uncovering under which conditions

plasmid-borne CRISPR-Cas systems are selected for, and inform the use of CRISPR-

Cas based technologies.

Methods

<u>Mathematical model</u>

Mathematical modelling was carried out using Wolfram Mathematica v14.1. Equations

E9-E10 (see Supplementary Results 1) were imported into R version 4.3.2. Output

plots were generated using RStudio version 2023.09.1+494 with the following

packages: dplyr, ggplot2.

<u>Plasmids and strains</u>

Plasmids and strains used in this study are summarised in Table 1. *Escherichia coli*

DH5α strains DH5α::CmR, DH5α::GmR, and DH5α::SmR were constructed by

electroporating DH5α with pBAM1-Gm, pBAM1-Sm, and pBAM1-Cm respectively and

selecting for resistant recombinants; resistance gene insertion was confirmed by PCR

(Martínez-García *et al.*, 2011; Dimitriu *et al.*, 2022) and verifying their respective

resistant phenotypes after transfer in the absence of antibiotics.

RP4-targeting pKJK5::csg[aphA99] ('CRISPR-Cas on' version of pKJK5) was

constructed using λ-red mediated recombineering and pKJK5 as a template, as

described in (Sünderhauf *et al.*, 2023b) with the exception that *cas9*, *sgRNA*

(programmed to target *aphA* with specificity AAATGGGCGCGTGATAAGGT) and *gfp*

were inserted into pKJK5's *intI1* gene. Non-targeting control pKJK5::csg[nt2]

('CRISPR-Cas off' version of pKJK5) was previously published as pKJK5::*gfp*[PL]

(Sünderhauf *et al.*, 2023a) and carries a random non-functional *sgRNA*.

Vector pOGG99_par was constructed by deleting genes from pOPS0378 (Mendoza-

Suárez *et al.*, 2020) to generate a minimal vector: *mCherry* was removed by digestion

with EcoRI, extraction, and re-ligation of the 6043 bp band. Next, site-directed

mutagenesis of *aphA* was carried out using primers pOGG0_mut_fw and

pOGG0_mut_rv and Thermo Scientific's site-directed mutagenesis kit according to

manufacturer's instructions. In this way, the nucleotide at position 96 within *aphA* was

silently mutated from C to G to bring the gene sequence in line with that found on our

laboratory's version of RP4 and allow targeting by pKJK5::csg[aphA99]. Successful

mutation was confirmed by Sanger sequencing of the finished plasmid using primer

pOGG0_sequence. pOGG99 was constructed by excising *parABCDE* from

pOGG99_par: pOGG99_par was digested with BlpI and BglII, the 3664 bp fragment

was extracted and religated with annealed and phosphorylated linker oligos

(pOGG99_parRemoval_top & btm). This yielded pOGG99, a version of pOGG99_par

where *parABCDE* are replaced with a multiple cloning site module.

Vector pHERD99 was constructed by annealing oligos aphA99PAM_top and

aphA99_btm and inserting them into pHERD30T's HindIII and KpnI restriction sites

following standard molecular cloning protocols. Vector pSEVA251-99 was constructed

by site-directed mutagenesis of pSEVA251's *aphA* gene as described for

pOGG99_par above.

Vectors pCDF1b_par, pHERD99_par, and pSEVA251-99_par were constructed by

parABCDE amplification using pOGG99_par as a template and primers par_fw and

par_rv with high-fidelity Phusion polymerase (NEB) and insertion into pCDF1b,

pHERD99's, and pSEVA251-99's KpnI restriction site respectively. This *parABCDE*

operon is 99.96% identical to RP4's with a single nucleotide mismatch in the non-

coding area between *parA* and *parB*.

All cloned plasmids were subjected to long-read sequencing by Plasmidsaurus using

Oxford Nanopore Technology with custom analysis and annotation. Annotated

sequences are deposited on Genbank with IDs listed in Table 1.

 Table 1: Strains, Plasmids, and primers

Strains			
Name	**Shorthand**	**Notes**	**Reference**
Escherichia coli DH5α	DH5α		Common laboratory strain
Escherichia coli K12::mCherry	K12::mCherry	Chromosomal Km^R, mCherry, lacI insertion	(Klümper *et al.*, 2015)
Escherichia coli DH5α::CmR	DH5α::CmR	Chromosomal *cat* insertion	*This study*
Escherichia coli DH5α::GmR	DH5α::GmR	Chromosomal *aacC1* insertion	*This study*
Escherichia coli DH5α::SmR	DH5α::SmR	Chromosomal *aad* insertion	*This study*

Plasmids			
Plasmid	**Resistance and Payload**	**Notes**	**Reference**
pKJK5::csg[aphA99]	Tetracycline, Trimethoprim, CRISPR-Cas9 cassette targeted towards *aphA*	"CRISPR-Cas on" version of pKJK5::csg	*This study*
pKJK5::csg[nt2]	Tetracycline, Trimethoprim, non-targeting CRISPR-Cas9 cassette	"CRISPR-Cas off" version of pKJK5::csg. Previously referred to as pKJK5::*gfp*^{PL}	(Sünderhauf *et al.*, 2023a)
pHERD30T	Gentamicin	pBR322 vector	(Qiu *et al.*, 2008)
pHERD99	Gentamicin, includes [aphA99] target site	Genbank acc. OR900359	*This study*
pHERD99_par	Gentamicin, [aphA99] target site, *parABCDE*	Genbank acc. OR900360	*This study*
pCDF1b	Streptomycin		Novagen (EMD Millipore)
pCDF1b_par	Streptomycin, *parABCDE*	Genbank acc. OR900361	*This study*
pSEVA251	Kanamycin	IncQ vector; Genbank acc. JX560330	(Silva-Rocha *et al.*, 2013)
pSEVA251-99	Kanamycin (targetable by pKJK5::csg[aphA99])	Genbank acc. PV231316	*This study*
pSEVA251-99_par	Kanamycin, *parABCDE*	Genbank acc. PV231317	*This study*

pOPS0378	Kanamycin, mCherry, *parABCDE*	Addgene #133229	(Mendoza-Suárez *et al.*, 2020)
pOGG99	Kanamycin	IncP vector; Genbank acc. PV231318	*This study*
pOGG99_par	Kanamycin, *parABCDE*	Genbank acc. PV231319	*This study*
RP4	Tetracycline, Kanamycin, Ampicillin, *parABCDE*	Genbank acc. L27758	(Pansegrau *et al.*, 1994)
pBAM1-Gm	Ampicillin, Gentamicin	Tn5 *aacC1* transposon	(Martínez-García *et al.*, 2011)
pBAM1-Sm	Ampicillin, Streptomycin	Tn5 *aad* tranposon	(Martínez-García *et al.*, 2011)
pBAM1-Cm	Ampicillin, Chloramphenicol	Tn5 *cat* transposon	(Dimitriu *et al.*, 2022)
Primers and sequences			
Name	**Sequence (5' → 3')**		
[aphA99]	AAATGGGCGCGTGATAAGGT		
[nt2]	GTTTTCTGCCTGTCGATCCAGTTTTAGAGCTCTAAAACTGGATCGACAGGCAGAAAACATGTCGATCCA		
par_fw	TCGGTACCTGCATGAGCTTGTGGAAGTG		
par_rv	CAGGTACCTGCTCAACAGGTTCGCA		
aphA99PAM_top	AGCTTAAATGGGCGCGTGATAAGGTTGGTAC		
aphA99PAM_btm	CAACCTTATCACGCGCCCATTTA		
pOGG0_mut_fw	TGGGCGCGTGATAAGGTGGGTCAGAGCGGC		
pOGG0_mut_rv	TTTATAGCCATACAGATCCGCATCCATGTTGCTGTTCAGACGC		
pOGG0_sequence	TATTGGTGAGAATCCAGGCA		
pOGG99_parRemoval_top	TGAGCCAAGCTTGCATGCCTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCCGGGTACCGAGCTCGAATTCACTA		
pOGG99_parRemoval_btm	GATCTAGTGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGCATGCAAGCTTGGC		

Culture conditions

Unless otherwise stated, all strains were cultured shaking 180 rpm in LB broth or

statically on LB plates at 37˚C. Where appropriate, cultures or plates were

supplemented with the following antibiotics at the following concentrations: Ap – 100

µg/mL ampicillin; Cm – 25µg/mL chloramphenicol; Gm – 50 µg/mL gentamicin; Km –

50 µg/mL kanamycin; Sm – 50 µg/mL streptomycin; Tc – 12 µg/mL tetracycline; Tmp

– 10 µg/mL trimethoprim.

<u>Conjugation experiments</u>

In three-strain competitions (Figure 2), bacterial hosts used were *E. coli* DH5α::SmR

containing pKJK5::csg, *E. coli* DH5α::CmR containing RP4, and *E. coli* DH5α::GmR.

All three strains either also contained empty vector pCDF1b, or pCDF1b_par for TA-

off treatments.

In two-strain competitions (Figure S4), *E. coli* K12::mCherry containing pKJK5::csg

was used as donor, and the recipient was *E. coli* DH5α::CmR containing either RP4,

pHERD99, pSEVA251-99, pOGG99, or their *par*-encoding derivatives.

To turn CRISPR-Cas activity on or off, we used two different pKJK5::csg variants with

fixed targeting specificity: pKJK5::csg[aphA99] was programmed to target RP4's *aphA*

gene, and pKJK5::csg[nt2] encoded a non-functional sgRNA with a random 69-nt

target sequence that is not present in the model system (plasmid pKJK5::*gfp*^{PL};

(Sünderhauf *et al.*, 2023a)).

Single colonies from streak plates of mating partners were suspended in 15-25 mL LB

with antibiotics appropriate to maintain their plasmid content (see Table 1) and grown

overnight. These T0 cultures were then washed twice with 0.9% (w/v) NaCl and

adjusted to OD600 = 0.5. Washed, OD-adjusted cultures were filter mated in a 1:1(:1)

ratio:

Filter matings were carried out using a 12-stream Millipore vacuum pump, sterilised

with 70% Ethanol and UV light before and after each batch of filter mating and

assembled in a Cat2 biosafety cabinet. For each mating, a 0.22 μm glass microfibre

filter (Whatman) was placed onto a vacuum pump position, dampened with 200 μL

sterile 0.9% NaCl, and topped with a 0.22 μm cyclopore membrane (Whatman). Fully

assembled filter positions were equilibrated by applying a vacuum until 2 mL of 0.9%

NaCl were pumped through. Next, 1 mL of OD-adjusted donors and 1 mL of OD-

adjusted recipients (or 600 μL of each mating partner in 3-strain competitions) were

added to each filter position together with 1 mL 0.9% NaCl, and a vacuum applied until

the strain mix was pumped through (N=5). Control matings always included donor-

only, recipient-only (and naïve-strain-only where appropriate), and buffer-only sterility

controls and yielded results as expected. Cyclopore membranes were placed cell-

side-up onto a 10% LB plate (supplemented with 0.9% NaCl) and incubated at 37˚C

for 36 hours. Then, cells were recovered by placing each filter into 3 mL of 0.9% NaCl

and vortexed for 15 seconds. This cell suspension was frozen in 20% (w/v) glycerol at

-70˚C and plated onto selective plates with various antibiotic regimes to assess strain

prevalence and strains' plasmid content.

<u>Selective plating</u>

Samples were plated in 5 μL droplets in dilutions ranging from 10^0-10^{-7} onto LB

medium containing different combinations of antibiotics. Cm, and Gm were used to

select for DH5α::Cm and DH5α::Gm respectively, and combining these antibiotics with

Tmp and Km allowed growth of only DH5α hosts carrying pKJK5 and RP4 respectively.

Colonies were counted at the most appropriate dilution, and GFP fluorescence of

pKJK5::csg-containing colonies confirmed stringency of selective regimes.

To assess overall sample composition and plasmid content of the DH5α::SmR host,

we plated 50 μL of a 10^{-5} dilution of each replicate onto LB plates without selection

and suspended 96 colonies of each sample in 250 µL LB each following overnight incubation. Previous assessment of colonies from selective plates sub-cultured on non-selective media indicated that RP4 and pKJK5::csg did not become lost over this timeframe in the absence of selection. The 96 clones picked from each replicate were then replica-stamped onto plates containing no selection, Cm, Gm, Km, and/or, Tmp. Clones growing on LB, but not LB supplemented with Cm or with Gm were scored as DH5α::SmR clones, and the Km / Tmp selective plates were used to score their plasmid content.

Plasmid competitive ratio

We calculated pKJK5 and RP4's competitive ratio as follows:

$$competitive\ ratio = \log\left(\frac{\text{hosts containing pKJK5}}{\text{hosts containing RP4}}\right)$$

This gives a measure of which plasmid is more frequent in a certain host and therefore won the competition for the host at the end of the experiment. Positive competitive ratios indicate pKJK5 winning the competition, negative ratios indicate RP4 winning, and ratios ≈ 0 indicate equal carriage of pKJK5 and RP4 in the host.

Statistical analyses

Colony counts on all selective plates from all experiments, together with plasmid competitive ratios used to produce figures are available in supplementary material.

Data processing, data visualisation, and statistical analyses were carried out using R version 4.3.2 and RStudio version 2023.09.1+494 with the following packages: flextable, dplyr, readr, tidyr, ggplot2.

Competitive ratio

We carried out one-sample T tests and Bonferroni adjustment for multiple testing to

test for significant differences of plasmid competitive ratio to 0, indicating either RP4

or pKJK5 winning the plasmid competition. Statistical significance of 'TA off'

competitive ratio in DH5α::SmR could not be assessed due to N=1, as no RP4 carriage

was recorded in most replicates. For all *p* values, see Table 2. Competitive ratios of

vector competitions (Figure S4) were assessed in the same way. For all *p* values, see

Table 3.

Table 2: T tests adjusted for multiple testing (Figure 2). Significant values after

Bonferroni adjustment in bold. Host refers to *E. coli* DH5α chromosomal tag

identity; S – SmR (defensive CRISPR-Cas), C – CmR (offensive CRISPR-Cas),

G – GmR (naïve host).

CRISPR-Cas status	host	TA status	p value (unadjusted)
on	C	on	**0.0000365582932**
on	C	off	0.0719892969523
on	G	on	0.0966797444140
on	G	off	**0.0018640114602**
on	S	on	**0.0000002614983**
off	C	on	**0.0009984435471**
off	C	off	0.4685379085725
off	G	on	**0.0001373821288**
off	G	off	0.2664700148622
off	S	on	0.1845008343480

Bonferroni-adjusted significance threshold α = 0.005

    Table 3: T tests adjusted for multiple testing (Figure S4). Significant values after

    Bonferroni adjustment in bold.

plasmid_backbone	CRISPR_status	par_status	p value (unadjusted)
RP4	off	on	**0.00241983623**
RP4	on	on	**0.00129308853**
pHERD99	off	off	**0.00196693917**
pHERD99	off	on	**0.00281440466**
pHERD99	on	off	**0.00075665162**
pHERD99	on	on	**0.00096428453**
pOGG99	off	off	0.00472375166
pOGG99	on	off	0.01437141407
pSEVA251-99	off	off	**0.00198288741**
pSEVA251-99	off	on	**0.00102338623**
pSEVA251-99	on	off	**0.00055796800**
pSEVA251-99	on	on	**0.00001333917**

Bonferroni-adjusted significance threshold α = 0.0042

 Additionally, we fitted separate Generalised Linear Models to data generated in two-

 strain competitions (Figure S4). GLMs were chosen so inclusion of additional variables

 (e.g. replicate and position on filter pump) could be tested, and the final models chosen

 for not including non-significant explanatory variables and upholding model

 assumptions. For model structures and coefficients see Table 4. pHERD99 and

 pSEVA251-99 data were followed up by Tukey's HSD test, see Table 5. Note that

 statistical models were constructed based on inverted data (-(competitive ratio)).

640   Table 4: GLM structures and coefficients for Figure S4.

RP4 model   comprat ~ CRISPR_status

	Estimate	Standard Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)	
(Intercept)	0.487	0.110	4.417	0.0022	**
CRISPR_statuson	0.629	0.156	4.032	0.0038	**

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

(Dispersion parameter for gaussian family taken to be 0.06080916)
Null deviance: 1.475 on 9 degrees of freedom
Residual deviance: 0.4865 on 8 degrees of freedom

---

pOGG99 model   comprat ~ CRISPR_status

	Estimate	Standard Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)	
(Intercept)	5.503	0.273	20.184	0.0000	***
CRISPR_statuson	-4.707	0.323	-14.590	0.0000	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

(Dispersion parameter for gaussian family taken to be 0.1486764)
Residual deviance: 0.7434 on 5 degrees of freedom

---

pHERD99 model   comprat ~ CRISPR_status*TA_status

	Estimate	Standard Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)	
(Intercept)	0.871	0.156	5.573	0.0000	***
CRISPR_statuson	-2.113	0.221	-9.563	0.0000	***
TA_statuson	0.356	0.221	1.609	0.1271	
CRISPR_statuson:TA_statuson	2.391	0.312	7.652	0.0000	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

(Dispersion parameter for gaussian family taken to be 0.1220155)
Null deviance: 25.33 on 19 degrees of freedom
Residual deviance: 1.952 on 16 degrees of freedom

---

pSEVA251-99 model   comprat ~ CRISPR_status*TA_status

	Estimate	Standard Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)	
(Intercept)	1.004	0.117	8.565	0.0000	***
CRISPR_statuson	-0.509	0.166	-3.072	0.0073	**
TA_statuson	-0.158	0.166	-0.955	0.3539	
CRISPR_statuson:TA_statuson	3.603	0.234	15.370	0.0000	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

(Dispersion parameter for gaussian family taken to be 0.06870578)
Null deviance: 39.18 on 19 degrees of freedom
Residual deviance: 1.099 on 16 degrees of freedom

642   <u>Table 5: Tukey's HSD results for Figure S4CD.</u>

pHERD99 (CRISPR:TA status)	diff	lwr	upr	p value (adjusted)
off:off-on:off	2.1126735	1.480613329	2.7447337	**2.83E-07**
off:on-on:off	2.4682169	1.836156677	3.1002771	**3.21E-08**
on:on-on:off	2.7462391	2.114178923	3.3782993	**6.92E-09**
off:on-off:off	0.3555433	-0.276516842	0.9876035	4.01E-01
on:on-off:off	0.6335656	0.001505405	1.2656258	**4.94E-02**
on:on-off:on	0.2780222	-0.354037943	0.9100824	6.01E-01
pSEVA251-99 (CRISPR:TA status)	diff	lwr	upr	p value (adjusted)
off:on-on:off	0.3510055	-0.12328835	0.8252993	1.90E-01
off:off-on:off	0.5092798	0.03498597	0.9835737	**3.32E-02**
on:on-on:off	3.4450619	2.97076801	3.9193557	**3.44E-12**
off:off-off:on	0.1582743	-0.31601952	0.6325682	7.76E-01
on:on-off:on	3.0940564	2.61976252	3.5683502	**1.51E-11**
on:on-off:off	2.9357820	2.46148820	3.4100759	**3.27E-11**

Streptomycin resistant c.f.u.

The log10 of proportion of streptomycin resistant c.f.u. presented in Figure S3 followed

a normal distribution and was assessed by one-sample T tests and Bonferroni

adjustment for multiple testing for differences to 0 (log10 of 1; complete maintenance

of bystander vector pCDF1b). No differences were statistically significant (Table 4).

<u>Table 6: T tests adjusted for multiple testing (Figure S3).</u> Significant values after

Bonferroni adjustment in bold.

CRISPR status	TA status	p value (unadjusted)
off	off	0.54312707
off	on	0.80081603
on	off	0.04135612
on	on	0.98506756

Bonferroni-adjusted significance threshold α = 0.0125

<u>Bioinformatic Analyses</u>

The sequences of 17828 de-replicated plasmid found across prokaryotic genomes

(Pinilla-Redondo *et al.*, 2022) were retrieved from NCBI using rentrez (Winter, 2017).

CRISPR-Cas presence and targeting information were adopted from (Pinilla-Redondo

et al., 2022). Plasmid open reading frames were predicted with prodigal v2.6.3 (Hyatt

et al., 2010). Toxin-antitoxin nucleotide or protein sequences were retrieved from

TADB v3.0 (Guan *et al.*, 2024). To identify complete toxin-antitoxin systems, plasmids

were searched with BLAST v2.16.0 (Camacho *et al.*, 2009) and hits were filtered for

cases where both a toxin and antitoxin component were directly adjacent. Statistical

analyses were run using R v4.4.2 base functions.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Mario Mestre (KU Copenhagen, Denmark) and Edze

Westra (University of Exeter, UK) for stimulating and inspiring discussions and

enthusiasm.

For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a 'Creative Commons

Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from

this submission.

Funding

DS was supported in part by grant MR/N0137941/1 for the GW4 BIOMED MRC DTP,

awarded to the Universities of Bath, Bristol, Cardiff and Exeter from the Medical

Research Council (MRC)/UKRI. JRR was supported by a summer studentship from

the Lister Institute for Preventative Medicine. LJP and RPR were supported by

research grant VIL60763 from VILLUM FONDEN. SPB acknowledges funding from

the US National Science Foundation (NSF 2321502). WHG and SvH acknowledge

funding from the JPI-AMR HARISSA programme (MISTAR; MR/W031191/1), and in

addition SvH acknowledges funding from the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences

Research Council (BB/R010781/1; BB/S017674/1) and the Lister Institute for

Preventative Medicine.

References

Adamczyk, M. and Jagura-Burdzy, G. 2003. Spread and survival of promiscuous
IncP-1 plasmids. *Acta Biochimica Polonica* 50: 425–453.
Alonso-del Valle, A., León-Sampedro, R., Rodríguez-Beltrán, J., DelaFuente, J.,
Hernández-García, M., Ruiz-Garbajosa, P., Cantón, R., Peña-Miller, R. and
San Millán, A. 2021. Variability of plasmid fitness effects contributes to
plasmid persistence in bacterial communities. *Nature Communications* 12:
2653.
Baharoglu, Z., Bikard, D. and Mazel, D. 2010. Conjugative DNA Transfer Induces the
Bacterial SOS Response and Promotes Antibiotic Resistance Development
through Integron Activation. *PLOS Genetics* 6: e1001165.
Bahl, M.I., Hansen, L.H., Goesmann, A. and Sørensen, S.J. 2007. The multiple
antibiotic resistance IncP-1 plasmid pKJK5 isolated from a soil environment is
phylogenetically divergent from members of the previously established α, β
and δ sub-groups. *Plasmid* 58: 31–43.
Beamud, B., Benz, F. and Bikard, D. 2024. Going viral: The role of mobile genetic
elements in bacterial immunity. *Cell Host & Microbe* 32: 804–819.
Benz, F., Camara-Wilpert, S., Russel, J., Wandera, K.G., Čepaitė, R., Ares-Arroyo,
M., Gomes-Filho, J.V., Englert, F., Kuehn, J.A., Gloor, S., Mestre, M.R.,
Cuénod, A., Aguilà-Sans, M., Maccario, L., Egli, A., Randau, L., Pausch, P.,
Rocha, E.P.C., Beisel, C.L., Madsen, J.S., Bikard, D., Hall, A.R., Sørensen,
S.J. and Pinilla-Redondo, R. 2024. Type IV-A3 CRISPR-Cas systems drive
inter-plasmid conflicts by acquiring spacers in trans. *Cell Host & Microbe* 32:
875-886.e9.
Camacho, C., Coulouris, G., Avagyan, V., Ma, N., Papadopoulos, J., Bealer, K. and
Madden, T.L. 2009. BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC
Bioinformatics* 10: 421.
Čepaitė, R., Klein, N., Mikšys, A., Camara-Wilpert, S., Ragožius, V., Benz, F.,
Skorupskaitė, A., Becker, H., Žvejytė, G., Steube, N., Hochberg, G.K.A.,
Randau, L., Pinilla-Redondo, R., Malinauskaitė, L. and Pausch, P. 2024.
Structural variation of types IV-A1- and IV-A3-mediated CRISPR interference.
Nature Communications 15: 9306.
Cooper, T.F. and Heinemann, J.A. 2000. Postsegregational killing does not increase
plasmid stability but acts to mediate the exclusion of competing plasmids.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 97: 12643–12648.

Cooper, T.F., Paixão, T. and Heinemann, J.A. 2010. Within-host competition selects for plasmid-encoded toxin–antitoxin systems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 277: 3149–3155.

Dimitriu, T., Kurilovich, E., Łapińska, U., Severinov, K., Pagliara, S., Szczelkun, M.D. and Westra, E.R. 2022. Bacteriostatic antibiotics promote CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity by enabling increased spacer acquisition. *Cell Host & Microbe* 30: 31-40.e5.

Fraikin, N. and Melderen, L.V. 2023. Single-cell evidence for plasmid addiction mediated by toxin-antitoxin systems. 2023.08.29.555305.

Fraikin, N. and Van Melderen, L. 2024. Single-cell evidence for plasmid addiction mediated by toxin–antitoxin systems. *Nucleic Acids Research* 52: 1847–1859.

Fraikin, N., Couturier, A. and Lesterlin, C. 2024. The winding journey of conjugative plasmids toward a novel host cell. *Current Opinion in Microbiology* 78: 102449.

Garcillán-Barcia, M.P. and de la Cruz, F. 2008. Why is entry exclusion an essential feature of conjugative plasmids? *Plasmid* 60: 1–18.

Georjon, H. and Bernheim, A. 2023. The highly diverse antiphage defence systems of bacteria. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 21: 686–700.

Guan, J., Chen, Y., Goh, Y.-X., Wang, M., Tai, C., Deng, Z., Song, J. and Ou, H.-Y. 2024. TADB 3.0: an updated database of bacterial toxin–antitoxin loci and associated mobile genetic elements. *Nucleic Acids Research* 52: D784–D790.

Hall, J.P.J., Wright, R.C.T., Guymer, D., Harrison, E. and Brockhurst, M.A. 2019. Extremely fast amelioration of plasmid fitness costs by multiple functionally diverse pathways. *Microbiology* 166.

Harms, A., Brodersen, D.E., Mitarai, N. and Gerdes, K. 2018. Toxins, Targets, and Triggers: An Overview of Toxin-Antitoxin Biology. *Molecular Cell* 70: 768–784.

Hyatt, D., Chen, G.-L., LoCascio, P.F., Land, M.L., Larimer, F.W. and Hauser, L.J. 2010. Prodigal: prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. 11: 119.

Igler, C., Huisman, J.S., Siedentop, B., Bonhoeffer, S. and Lehtinen, S. 2021. Plasmid co-infection: linking biological mechanisms to ecological and evolutionary dynamics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 377: 20200478.

Kippnich, J., Benz, F., Uecker, H. and Baumdicker, F. 2024. Effectiveness of CRISPR-Cas in Sensitizing Bacterial Populations with Plasmid-Encoded Antimicrobial Resistance. 2024.07.05.602127.

Klümper, U., Riber, L., Dechesne, A., Sannazzarro, A., Hansen, L.H., Sørensen, S.J. and Smets, B.F. 2015. Broad host range plasmids can invade an unexpectedly diverse fraction of a soil bacterial community. *The ISME Journal* 9: 934–945.

Kondratyeva, K., Salmon-Divon, M. and Navon-Venezia, S. 2020. Meta-analysis of Pandemic Escherichia coli ST131 Plasmidome Proves Restricted Plasmid-clade Associations. *Scientific Reports* 10: 36.

Koonin, E.V. and Makarova, K.S. 2024. CRISPR in mobile genetic elements: counter-defense, inter-element competition and RNA-guided transposition. *BMC Biology* 22: 295.

Li, L., Dechesne, A., He, Z., Madsen, J.S., Nesme, J., Sorensen, S.J. and Smets, B.F. 2018. Estimating the Transfer Range of Plasmids Encoding Antimicrobial Resistance in a Wastewater Treatment Plant Microbial Community. acs.estlett.8b00105.

Lundquist, P.D. and Levin, B.R. 1986. TRANSITORY DEREPRESSION AND THE MAINTENANCE OF CONJUGATIVE PLASMIDS. *Genetics* 113: 483–497.

Mahendra, C., Christie, K.A., Osuna, B.A., Pinilla-Redondo, R., Kleinstiver, B.P. and Bondy-Denomy, J. 2020. Broad-spectrum anti-CRISPR proteins facilitate horizontal gene transfer. *Nature Microbiology* 5: 620–629.

Makarova, K.S., Wolf, Y.I., Iranzo, J., Shmakov, S.A., Alkhnbashi, O.S., Brouns, S.J.J., Charpentier, E., Cheng, D., Haft, D.H., Horvath, P., Moineau, S., Mojica, F.J.M., Scott, D., Shah, S.A., Siksnys, V., Terns, M.P., Venclovas, Č., White, M.F., Yakunin, A.F., Yan, W., Zhang, F., Garrett, R.A., Backofen, R., van der Oost, J., Barrangou, R. and Koonin, E.V. 2020. Evolutionary classification of CRISPR–Cas systems: a burst of class 2 and derived variants. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 18: 67–83.

Martínez-García, E., Calles, B., Arévalo-Rodríguez, M. and de Lorenzo, V. 2011. pBAM1: an all-synthetic genetic tool for analysis and construction of complex bacterial phenotypes. *BMC Microbiology* 11: 38.

Mendoza-Suárez, M.A., Geddes, B.A., Sánchez-Cañizares, C., Ramírez-González, R.H., Kirchhelle, C., Jorrin, B. and Poole, P.S. 2020. Optimizing Rhizobium-legume symbioses by simultaneous measurement of rhizobial competitiveness and N2 fixation in nodules. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117: 9822–9831.

Moya-Beltrán, A., Makarova, K.S., Acuña, L.G., Wolf, Y.I., Covarrubias, P.C., Shmakov, S.A., Silva, C., Tolstoy, I., Johnson, D.B., Koonin, E.V. and Quatrini, R. 2021. Evolution of Type IV CRISPR-Cas Systems: Insights from CRISPR Loci in Integrative Conjugative Elements of Acidithiobacillia. *The CRISPR Journal*.

Nazarian, P., Tran, F. and Boedicker, J.Q. 2018. Modeling Multispecies Gene Flow Dynamics Reveals the Unique Roles of Different Horizontal Gene Transfer Mechanisms. 9: 2978.

Newire, E., Aydin, A., Juma, S., Enne, V.I. and Roberts, A.P. 2020. Identification of a Type IV-A CRISPR-Cas System Located Exclusively on IncHI1B/IncFIB Plasmids in Enterobacteriaceae. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 11.

Novick, R.P. 1987. Plasmid incompatibility. *Microbiological Reviews* 51: 381–395.

Pansegrau, W., Lanka, E., Barth, P.T., Figurski, D.H., Guiney, D.G., Haas, D., Helinski, D.R., Schwab, H., Stanisich, V.A. and Thomas, C.M. 1994. Complete Nucleotide Sequence of Birmingham IncPa Plasmids. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 623–663.

Patel, P.H. and Maxwell, K.L. 2023. Prophages provide a rich source of antiphage defense systems. *Current Opinion in Microbiology* 73: 102321.

Pinilla-Redondo, R., Russel, J., Mayo-Muñoz, D., Shah, S.A., Garrett, R.A., Nesme, J., Madsen, J.S., Fineran, P.C. and Sørensen, S.J. 2022. CRISPR-Cas systems are widespread accessory elements across bacterial and archaeal plasmids. *Nucleic Acids Research* 50: 4315–4328.

Prensky, H., Gomez-Simmonds, A., Uhlemann, A. and Lopatkin, A.J. 2021. Conjugation dynamics depend on both the plasmid acquisition cost and the fitness cost. *Molecular Systems Biology* 17.

Pursey, E., Sünderhauf, D., Gaze, W.H., Westra, E.R. and van Houte, S. 2018. CRISPR-Cas antimicrobials: Challenges and future prospects. *PLOS Pathogens* 14: e1006990.

Qiu, D., Damron, F.H., Mima, T., Schweizer, H.P. and Yu, H.D. 2008. PBAD-based shuttle vectors for functional analysis of toxic and highly regulated genes in

Pseudomonas and Burkholderia spp. and other bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 74: 7422–7426.

Rankin, D.J., Turner, L.A., Heinemann, J.A. and Brown, S.P. 2012. The coevolution of toxin and antitoxin genes drives the dynamics of bacterial addiction complexes and intragenomic conflict. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279: 3706–3715.

Reuter, A., Hilpert, C., Dedieu-Berne, A., Lematre, S., Gueguen, E., Launay, G., Bigot, S. and Lesterlin, C. 2021. Targeted-antibacterial-plasmids (TAPs) combining conjugation and CRISPR/Cas systems achieve strain-specific antibacterial activity. *Nucleic Acids Research* 49: 3584–3598.

Rocha, E.P.C. and Bikard, D. 2022. Microbial defenses against mobile genetic elements and viruses: Who defends whom from what? *PLOS Biology* 20: e3001514.

Roy, D., Huguet, K.T., Grenier, F. and Burrus, V. 2020. IncC conjugative plasmids and SXT/R391 elements repair double-strand breaks caused by CRISPR–Cas during conjugation. *Nucleic Acids Research* 48: 8815–8827.

San Millan, A. and MacLean, R.C. 2017. Fitness costs of plasmids: a limit to plasmid transmission. *Microbiology Spectrum* 5: 5.5.02.

San Millan, A., Heilbron, K. and MacLean, R.C. 2014. Positive epistasis between co-infecting plasmids promotes plasmid survival in bacterial populations. *The ISME Journal* 8: 601–612.

Sengupta, M. and Austin, S. 2011. Prevalence and Significance of Plasmid Maintenance Functions in the Virulence Plasmids of Pathogenic Bacteria. *Infection and Immunity* 79: 2502–2509.

Siedentop, B., Losa Mediavilla, C., Kouyos, R.D., Bonhoeffer, S. and Chabas, H. 2024. Assessing the Role of Bacterial Innate and Adaptive Immunity as Barriers to Conjugative Plasmids. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 41: msae207.

Silva-Rocha, R., Martínez-García, E., Calles, B., Chavarría, M., Arce-Rodríguez, A., de las Heras, A., Páez-Espino, A.D., Durante-Rodríguez, G., Kim, J., Nikel, P.I., Platero, R. and de Lorenzo, V. 2013. The Standard European Vector Architecture (SEVA): a coherent platform for the analysis and deployment of complex prokaryotic phenotypes. *Nucleic Acids Research* 41: D666–D675.

Sünderhauf, D., Klümper, U., Gaze, W.H., Westra, E.R. and Van Houte, S. 2023a. Interspecific competition can drive plasmid loss from a focal species in a microbial community. *The ISME Journal*.

Sünderhauf, D., Klümper, U., Pursey, E., Westra, E.R., Gaze, W.H. and van Houte, S. 2023b. Removal of AMR plasmids using a mobile, broad host-range CRISPR-Cas9 delivery tool. *Microbiology* 169: 001334.

Van Sluijs, L., Van Houte, S., Van Der Oost, J., Brouns, S.J., Buckling, A. and Westra, E.R. 2019. Addiction systems antagonize bacterial adaptive immunity. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 366: 47.

Winter, D.J. 2017. rentrez: An R package for the NCBI eUtils API. *The R Journal* 9: 520–526.

Wu, W.Y., Mohanraju, P., Liao, C., Adiego-Pérez, B., Creutzburg, S.C.A., Makarova, K.S., Keessen, K., Lindeboom, T.A., Khan, T.S., Prinsen, S., Joosten, R., Yan, W.X., Migur, A., Laffeber, C., Scott, D.A., Lebbink, J.H.G., Koonin, E.V., Beisel, C.L. and van der Oost, J. 2022. The miniature CRISPR-Cas12m effector binds DNA to block transcription. *Molecular Cell* 82: 4487-4502.e7.