Cost of altered translation accuracy shapes adaptation to antibiotics in *E. coli*

Laasya Samhita[1,2]*, Sharvari Tamhankar[1], Joshua Miranda,[1] Aabeer Basu[2] and Deepa Agashe[1]*

Address:

[1]National Centre for Biological Sciences, GKVK Campus, Bellary Road, Bengaluru-560065, India

[2]Ashoka University, Rajiv Gandhi education city, Sonipat-131029, India

*Correspondence:

laasya.samhita@ashoka.edu.in, dagashe@ncbs.res.in

Abstract

Protein synthesis, while central to cellular function, is error-prone. The resulting mistranslation is

generally costly, but we do not know how these costs compare or interact with the costs imposed by

external selection pressures such as antibiotics. We also do not know whether and how these costs are

compensated during evolution. It is important to answer these questions, since mistranslation is

ubiquitous and antibiotic exposure, widespread. We quantified the growth cost of genetically

increasing and decreasing mistranslation rates, and exposure to low antibiotic concentrations, in

Escherichia coli. Mistranslation costs were generally lower than the cost imposed by antibiotics, and

exacerbated in a strain-specific manner under antibiotic exposure. All strains quickly compensated the

antibiotic cost during experimental evolution, via antibiotic- and genotype- specific mutations. In

contrast, mistranslation costs were significantly reduced only in some cases, without clear causal

mutations. Control populations that evolved without antibiotics consistently compensated the cost of

accuracy, and evolved increased antibiotic resistance as a by-product. Our work demonstrates that

even when the cost of mistranslation is weak, altered translation accuracy can shape adaptive

outcomes and underlying genetic mechanisms, with strong collateral fitness effects for apparently

unrelated phenotypes such as antibiotic resistance.

Keywords

translation accuracy, antibiotic resistance, fitness cost, experimental evolution, mistranslation

Introduction

Mistranslation contributes to non-genetic variation in all life forms. Translation errors and the resultant heterogenous protein sequences were long considered sources of cellular noise, but it is now clear that they have significant, sometimes even predictable, phenotypic effects. Mistranslation is typically costly (Mohler and Ibba 2017), reducing mean division times at the single cell level, and lowering growth rates at the population level (Samhita et al., 2021). Such costs are thought to be mediated primarily by misfolding or aggregation of mistranslated proteins (Drummond and Wilke 2008, Paredes et al., 2012) as well as reduced availability of functional proteins (Ruan et al., 2008, Bullwinkle and Ibba 2016). These broad costs also mean that higher levels of global mistranslation can exacerbate the effect of deleterious mutations (Bratulic et al., 2017, Schmutzer and Wagner 2023) or reduce the fitness advantage of beneficial mutations (Schmutzer and Wagner 2023). How do cells prevent such mistranslation or reduce its fitness effects? Across evolutionary timescales, evidence from comparative genomics indicates that cost mitigation can occur via multiple mechanisms. For example, in diverse taxa, protein coding sequences preferentially use codons that minimize mistranslation, and this pattern gets stronger with increasing gene expression (Drummond and Wilke 2008). Simulations suggest that normally untranslated sequences in the 3'UTR that are occasionally read through (leading to mistranslation) are selectively purged (Kosinski and Masel 2020). Despite these cost-minimizing strategies, mistranslation can still present a significant cellular burden. Under these circumstances, over-expressing chaperones or increasing protease levels can immediately buffer the phenotypic effects of mistranslation (Ruan et al., 2008, Samhita et al., 2020), presumably by decreasing the load of non-functional and aggregated proteins. Thus, there is substantial evidence for the deleterious consequences of mistranslation, and preventive and compensatory mechanisms to combat it.

On the other hand, a growing body of work also shows a range of benefits of mistranslation (Javid et al., 2014, Schwartz et al., 2016, Samhita et al., 2020), especially under external selection pressures that also impose fitness costs. For example, mistranslating *Escherichia coli* cells under heat stress show higher survival than their WT counterparts (Evans et al., 2019). Under oxidative stress, both eukaryotic and bacterial cells increase the incidence of a particular form of mistranslation — specific tRNA misacylation — with a concomitant survival benefit (Netzer et al., 2009, Schwartz et al., 2016). The effect of mistranslation on the response to antibiotic exposure has been a particular favourite, explored across several studies (Javid et al., 2014, Bratulic et al., 2015, Samhita et al., 2020). Mistranslation can lead to faster adaptation, a higher frequency of antibiotic resistance as compared with the wild type (Javid et al., 2014, Weil et al., 2017, Samhita et al., 2020), or different mutational outcomes (Zheng et al., 2021). Mistranslation can also confer antibiotic resistance via novel mechanisms that are as yet unclear (Schwartz et al., 2016). In contrast, some studies comparing mistranslating vs. wild type *E. coli* either found no difference in the rate or effect of mutations in antibiotic resistance genes (Bratulic et

al., 2017), or found identical mutations under selection from inhibitory antibiotic concentrations (Samhita et al., 2020). Thus, although mistranslation can have both positive and negative impacts for cells, our ability to predict net outcomes – especially across evolutionary timescales – remains poor.

One reason for the poor predictive power is that we do not understand exactly how the costs imposed by mistranslation compare or interact with the costs imposed by external stressors such as antibiotics. This is important, because these interactions may determine possible adaptive mechanisms, ultimately influencing evolutionary outcomes. For example, in the *E. coli* experiments mentioned above, under strong selection (high antibiotic dose), mistranslating populations fixed amino acid changes that stabilized protein structure; while under weak selection (low antibiotic dose) a reduction in protein expression appeared to drive adaptation (Bratulic et al., 2015). In later work, this effect was attributed to epistasis between the genetic background (which determined the level of mistranslation) and the phenotypic effect of new mutations (Zheng et al., 2021). Higher levels of mistranslation generally exacerbated the negative impact of deleterious mutations, altering the identity of fixed mutations during evolution. However, the observed fitness variation across strains could not be separately attributed to costs imposed by mistranslation versus antibiotics, or compensation thereof. This is especially important to delineate with antibiotic selection because cost compensation for a given antibiotic can vary with genetic background, study design (*in vitro/in vivo*), drug concentration, and the temporal context of antibiotic treatment (e.g., administering different antibiotics sequentially or in combination) (reviewed in Andersson and Hughes 2010). Thus, it is unclear if the costs of antibiotic change with mistranslation levels, or whether the two costs interact to influence adaptive dynamics under antibiotic selection. One study that inadvertently combined both costs involved the antibiotic tavabarole. This synthetic antibiotic inactivates the essential enzyme leucine tRNA synthetase (LeuRS) that amino-acylates tRNA[Leu]. Like most synthetases, LeuRS contains an editing domain that removes incorrectly incorporated amino acids, increasing translation accuracy. The binding site of tavabarole falls within the editing domain, such that resistance-conferring mutations often increase mistranslation (Melnikov et al., 2020). As a result, such mutants develop antibiotic resistance while simultaneously incurring a cost of mistranslation. Overall, it is clear that costs of mistranslation and antibiotic exposure could interact in multiple ways. Separating these costs, and their interactions, is necessary to understand how the costs vs benefits of mistranslation may alter the dynamics of adaptation to antibiotics.

To understand the impact of both mistranslation and antibiotic exposure on adaptive trajectories, we simultaneously quantified the costs of altered translation accuracy and cost of exposure to antibiotics in *E. coli*. From previous work, we know that both increasing and decreasing translation accuracy can lead to a fitness cost (Samhita et al., 2021). We therefore evolved strains with both higher and lower translation accuracy than the wild type strain (WT), in sub-inhibitory concentrations of three antibiotics with differing modes of action: ciprofloxacin (causes DNA damage), ampicillin (blocks cell wall

biosynthesis) and kanamycin (protein synthesis inhibitor, also causes mistranslation). Using growth rate
measurements of ancestral and evolved lines, we defined the ancestral costs of antibiotic and altered
translation accuracy and investigated how these costs changed during the course of evolution at both
the phenotypic and genotypic levels **(Figure 1)**. We find that while antibiotic costs dominate and are
rapidly compensated, the costs of altered accuracy are compensated in specific genotype by
environment combinations. We previously reported that both WT and mistranslating cells fix the same
beneficial mutations during short-term adaptation to inhibitory concentrations (~5X MIC, minimum
inhibitory concentration) of ciprofloxacin (Samhita 2020). Here, under milder selection pressures (sub-
MIC) imposed over a longer time period, we find mutational diversity across strains in all antibiotics,
suggesting that evolutionary predictability is confounded both by altered accuracy and antibiotic
selection at sub-MIC.
121
122 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**
123
Bacterial strains
We used KL16 *E. coli* cells (Low 1968) as our wild type strain (WT). To generate strains with altered
accuracy, we used four genetically altered derivatives of the WT: two mistranslating (Mis-1 and Mis-
2), one hyper-accurate (HA) and one with a combination of a mistranslating and hyper-accurate strains
(Mis-1+HA). The KL*ΔZWV* strain ('Mis-1'), lacks three of four initiator tRNA genes encoded by *E.*
coli (Samhita et al., 2013). Initiator tRNA acts only at the first step of protein synthesis and has no
substitute (Gualerzi and Pon 2015). This strain therefore has a lower rate of protein synthesis, a ~20%
slower growth rate than the WT (Samhita et al., 2020), and mistranslates through at least one
mechanism: initiation of translation at non-AUG codons (Samhita et al., 2013). The KL*rpsDE68D*
strain ('Mis-2') mistranslates by reducing the fidelity of codon- anticodon interactions on the ribosome,
providing us with an independent mechanism of mistranslation (Agarwal et al., 2015). To increase
translation accuracy in the WT, we introduced a mutation (K42R) in the ribosomal protein S12,
generating strain KL*rpsLK42R* ('HA' for 'hyper-accurate'). The mutation reduces the frequency of
errors during mRNA decoding (Chumpolkulwong et al., 2004). Finally, we introduced the same
mutation into strain Mis-1, generating the hybrid strain 'Mis-1+HA'. Note that the introduction of
hyper-accurate ribosomes does not reverse the non-AUG initiation seen in Mis-1, however it lowers
overall background mistranslation levels by reducing decoding errors (Samhita et al., 2020).
141
Growth conditions and media
We grew bacterial cultures in Luria Bertani medium (LB) in 48-well plates under shaking conditions
or on LB-agar plates containing 1.8% (w/v) agar (Difco) in static conditions, in both cases at 37ºC. In
the experimental evolution regime, we added antibiotics (Sigma-Aldrich) at the following sub-
inhibitory concentrations: ampicillin (amp) at 2.25 µg/mL (MIC for WT KL16 is ~4 µg/mL),

kanamycin sulphate (Kan) at 4 µg/mL (MIC ~10 µg/mL), ciprofloxacin (Cip) at 10 ng/mL (MIC ~20

ng/mL) and kasugamycin (Ksg) at 30 µg/mL (MIC ~ 10 µg/mL). Kasugamycin inhibits initiation of

protein synthesis (Schluenzen et al., 2006), and served as a tRNA-independent method of reducing

translation initiation events, i.e., a control for our mistranslating line which lacks three of four initiator

tRNA genes. In all cases, the exact sub-MIC antibiotic concentration used in the experiments was set

by the concentration beyond which the Mis-1 genotype (the slowest strain) either did not grow or

showed severe growth retardation within 12 h.

Experimental evolution under antibiotic selection

Bacterial populations were grown in plain LB or LB supplemented with one of three antibiotics as

described **(Fig. 1b),** generating 4 treatments per strain with 5-6 biological replicates per strain per

treatment (five well-separated independent colonies from a freshly streaked plate of each strain).

Populations were grown in 48-well plates for ~300 generations (15 days) under shaking conditions at

37°C. Additionally, we also evolved WT supplemented with kasugamycin to serve as a control. All

lines were sub-cultured every 12 h, with 1% by volume transferred to fresh medium (5 µL in 500 µL).

Every 3 days and finally on the 16th day, stocks of the evolved (mixed) cultures were stored in 40%

glycerol at -80°C for further analysis. Due to practical constraints, WT and Mis-1 were evolved first

across all regimes, followed by HA and Mis-1+HA and finally Mis-2 and WT(Ksg), in three separate

sets with an overall time period of 3 months.

Measuring growth rate and MIC as a fitness proxy

We measured growth rates of evolved populations and their respective ancestors in the regime they

were evolved in, as well as in LB. Conversely, lines evolved in LB were also tested for growth in

antibiotic-containing media. We first inoculated a loopful of each freezer stock in LB for ~8 h, and then

transferred 5 µL to 495 µL of LB with antibiotics (as needed) at the same concentration they were

subjected to during the experimental evolution, and allowed cultures to grow at 37 ºC with shaking at

200 rpm for 12-14 h. We inoculated 5 µL of these pre-cultures into 495 µL growth media in 48-well

plates (Corning) and incubated in an automated growth reader (Biotek), with shaking, at 37 ºC,

recording absorbance at $O.D_{600nm}$ every 15 minutes for 18-24 h. We measured the growth rate of three

technical replicates per biological replicate in each growth medium. In each 48-well plate, we included

the relevant ancestors in the same medium to estimate and account for day-to-day variation in growth

rates. Note that ancestral values did not in fact vary significantly and the same 5 biological replicates

are represented in each figure. Maximum growth rate in early log phase (below $OD_{600nm} \sim 0.3$) was

estimated using the Curve Fitter software (Delaney et al. 2013). We compared ancestral with evolved

growth rates and used the value as a proxy for fitness.

To determine minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) before and after evolution, we used the

standard qualitative broth microdilution technique (Wiegand et al., 2008). Antibiotic concentrations

were serially increased 2-fold until growth inhibition was observed. The lowest concentration at which inhibition was observed was designated the MIC. These results were confirmed by streaking out the glycerol stock on agar plates carrying the relevant antibiotics at MIC as well as the concentration that was 2-fold below the MIC.

Quantifying fitness costs of altered translation accuracy and antibiotic exposure

To determine the fitness costs arising from antibiotic exposure as well as altered translation accuracy, we measured ancestral ('anc') and evolved ('evo') growth rates in the presence vs. absence of antibiotic (for antibiotic cost) and relative to ancestral WT in LB (for the cost of altered accuracy, which arises from any deviation from WT translation accuracy) (Figure 1a). Specifically, we used the following calculation for each strain.

$$Cost\ of\ altered\ accuracy_{anc} = \frac{Growth\ rate\ of\ WT_{anc}\ in\ LB}{Growth\ rate\ of\ focal\ strain_{anc}\ in\ LB}$$

$$Cost\ of\ altered\ accuracy_{evo} = \frac{Growth\ rate\ of\ WT_{anc}\ in\ LB}{Growth\ rate\ of\ focal\ strain_{evo}\ in\ LB}$$

$$Cost\ of\ antibiotic_{anc} = \frac{Growth\ rate\ of\ focal\ strain_{anc}\ in\ LB}{Growth\ rate\ of\ focal\ strain_{anc}\ in\ antibiotic}$$

$$Cost\ of\ antibiotic_{evo} = \frac{Growth\ rate\ of\ focal\ strain_{anc}\ in\ LB}{Growth\ rate\ of\ focal\ strain_{evo}\ in\ antibiotic}$$

We used ancestral growth rates in LB for the numerator so that as the costs increase, the value of the fraction increases, making it simpler to assess the magnitude of the cost. Note that the antibiotic cost is not a measure of the cost of antibiotic resistance, although in evolved lines both resistance and compensation for resistance are likely to contribute to the antibiotic cost calculation. In principle, this calculation for costs can be applied to any strain, irrespective of its prior exposure to antibiotic. Accuracy costs are defined relative to ancestral WT growth in LB, and will only have biological meaning if applied to strains whose translation accuracy had been altered.

Whole-genome sequencing to identify mutations and determine mutation spectra

In order to track genotypic changes that occurred during adaptation, we subjected populations from our 15-day stocks (and where required, from other timepoints) to whole genome sequencing. We extracted genomic DNA (GenElute Bacterial Genomic DNA kit, Sigma-Aldrich, and Wizard DNA extraction kit, Promega) and quantified it (Qubit HS dsDNA assay, Invitrogen). We prepared paired-end libraries using the Illumina Nextera XT DNA library preparation kit following the manufacturer's instructions.

We then sequenced all 15-day evolved lines on an Illumina HiSeq 2500 platform using the 2x100 bp
paired-end reaction chemistry, and obtained ~3 million reads per sample with quality >Q30 (reads
below this quality cut-off were discarded), corresponding to an average per base depth of ~100X. Our
WT strain KL16 (a derivative of MG1655 with ~50 mutations) does not have a sequenced genome
available. Therefore, for each sample, we aligned quality-filtered reads to the NCBI reference *E. coli*
K-12 MG1655 genome (RefSeq accession ID GCA_000005845.2) using the package Breseq
(Deatherage and Barrick 2014). After removing ancestral (KL16) mutations from evolved lines, we
extracted a list of base-pair substitutions and indels from the Breseq output. We only counted mutations
with >50% frequency, and verified that all were represented in at least 10 reads, before proceeding with
further analysis. For the MA lines, reads from pooled samples were aligned to the MG1655 genome
using the Burrows-Wheeler short-read alignment tool, BWA (Li and Durbin 2009). We generated
pileup files using SAMtools (Li et al. 2009) and used the VARSCAN package to extract a list of base-
pair substitutions and short indels (< 10bp) (Koboldt et al. 2009). We only retained mutations with
>80% frequency that were represented by at least 5 reads for further analysis.

Evolution under a mutation accumulation (MA) regime to determine mutation rate and spectrum
To test whether altering translation accuracy changes the mutation rate or spectrum, we conducted a
mutation accumulation experiment, allowing populations to evolve largely under genetic drift followed
by WGS to identify mutations, as described earlier (Sane et al, 2018). We founded 50 MA lines each
for the three strains KL16 (WT), KL*ΔZWV* (Mis-1) and KL*ΔZWV*(HA) (Mis-1 + HA). For each line, in
order to minimize the impact of selection, we streaked out a randomly selected colony (on or near a
pre-marked spot) on a fresh agar plate every 24 h, thereby passing the population through single colony
bottlenecks. Every 3 days, we inoculated a part of the transferred colony in LB broth at 37ºC for ~3
hours and froze 1 mL of the growing culture with 8% DMSO at -80 ºC. For the current study, we only
used stocks frozen on the final day, i.e., day 60. Based on previous work (Sane et al., 2018, Sane et al.,
2023), we expected this time to be sufficient for the accumulation of one mutation per line on average.
We pooled 10 lineages from the last (60 day) timepoint creating 5 pools per strain and extracted DNA
from a total of 15 such pools for the 3 strains mentioned above. To estimate mutation rate and spectrum,
we considered the total mutations present across all 5 pools (5x10=50 total lines) for a given strain at
day 60, and averaged that number across the number of lines. 60 days with 24-hour plate transfers at
~27.5 generations per day corresponds to ~1650 generations. Mutation rate was calculated as:

248
$$\frac{Total\ number\ of\ SNPs}{Number\ of\ lineages\ .\ Number\ of\ generations\ .\ Genome\ length}$$

250 We had 50 lineages, 1500 generations total (~25 in 24 hours) and 4,641,652 bp as genome length. Note
251 that due to the pooling, we could not determine exactly how many mutations occurred in any given line;

252 hence, we could not estimate confidence intervals for mutation rates. To determine the mutation
253 spectrum, we quantified the proportion of different types of observed mutations.
254
255 **RESULTS**
256
All strains with altered translation accuracy show rapid adaptation across regimes
To assess the role of altered translational fidelity in adaptation to antibiotics, we evolved strains with
varying levels of mistranslation for ~300 generations in one of three antibiotics possessing different
modes of action: ciprofloxacin (Cip), kanamycin (Kan) and ampicillin (Amp), and one (control)
antibiotic-free regime. We genetically increased wild type (WT) mistranslation rate either by using a
strain with depleted initiator tRNA content ('Mis-1', same as the 'Mutant' in (Samhita et al., 2013)) or
by introducing a mutation in the ribosomal protein S4 ('Mis-2'). To reduce mistranslation, we
introduced a mutation in the ribosomal protein S12, which generates 'hyper-accurate' ribosomes (strain
'HA', same as WT(HA) in (Samhita et al., 2020)). Additionally, we included a strain that carried both
a mistranslating mutation as well as the hyper-accurate one (Mis-1+HA (Samhita et al., 2020)).
267
The mistranslating strains Mis-1 and Mis-1+HA paid an initial fitness cost relative to the WT during
growth in rich LB medium, whereas the HA strain did not show a cost of hyper-accuracy **(Fig. 1a)**.
Note that despite lower mean fitness compared to WT, large variation across replicates of strain Mis-2
meant that this difference was not significant; thus, Mis-2 did not show a significant ancestral fitness
cost of mistranslation **(Fig. 1a)**. On adding antibiotics, all ancestors showed a (further) decline in fitness
(**Fig. 1a;** see Table S1 for statistical comparisons). Thus, antibiotic pressure exacerbated the cost of
mistranslation, and also imposed an independent cost for non-mistranslating strains (WT and HA).
275
Our experimental evolution protocol involved dilution with transfer to fresh media every 12 h (~15
generations) and should therefore select for faster growth rate (**Fig. 1b**). Nearly all strains showed a
significant increase in growth rate by 300 generations, excepting WT in Kan and Amp and HA in Amp
(Fig. 1c, Table S1). Additionally, all strains showed an increase in MIC values (from sub-MIC to ~10X
MIC for Cip, ~25X MIC for Amp and ~5X MIC for Kan, Fig. S2, ancestral vs evolved MIC, paired t-
test for all strains, t= 4815 for Cip, t= 84.4 for Kan and t=457.4 for Amp, P<0.001 for all comparisons)
with no perceptible across-strain differences **(Fig. S2)**. Note that several strains with altered accuracy
reached higher absolute growth rates than the evolved WT strain. Both genotype and antibiotic
determined the outcome, independently and via genotype by environment (GxE) interactions (ANOVA:
evolved fitness~ strain x antibiotic, $F_{antibiotic}$ =97.86, $F_{genotype}$ = 188.2, $F_{interaction}$ =97.6, P<0.001 in each
case). Finally, WT control lines evolved under the antibiotic kasugamycin (Ksg, which reduces
translation initiation events without affecting tRNA copy number, serving as a control for Mis-1 in LB)
also showed higher fitness, with the mean growth rate increasing from 0.53 to 1.37 (WT ancestral vs

evolved, t test, t=29.2, P<0.001). Interestingly, Mis-1 evolved in LB reached roughly the same mean
value of absolute growth rate, increasing from 1.1 to 1.35 (Mis-1 ancestral vs. evolved, t test, t= 10.84,
P<0.001), suggesting that the use of WT+Ksg to mimic Mis-1 growth was appropriate.
292
At the early stages of the evolution experiments, during the 12 h population transfer we inoculated a
second microplate to estimate population level growth rates. Given the lack of replication, we were not
confident about the accuracy of these growth rates. Nonetheless, the data suggested that within 4 days
of evolution (~80 generations), the mistranslating strains had already increased fitness by ~10 to 25%
(data not shown). Population level whole genome sequencing showed that at this early stage, several
mistranslating populations harboured mutations in antibiotic resistance genes (e.g., *gyrA*, *fusA*, and
marR mutations) at >80% frequency; but these were rarely observed in WT and HA populations **(Table**
S2). These results suggested that mistranslating strains adapted at faster rates, via antibiotic-specific
mutations that likely compensated for the fitness costs imposed by each antibiotic.
302
The cost of antibiotic (but not accuracy) declines consistently over the course of adaptation
To delineate the costs imposed by mistranslation versus exposure to antibiotic, we assessed fitness costs
(**Fig. 1a**) for both ancestral and evolved strains. The cost of antibiotic reflects the proportional reduction
in growth rate of the focal strain in the absence vs presence of antibiotic (as a ratio), and the cost of
altered accuracy reflects the reduction in growth rate of the WT ancestor vs. the focal strain in LB (see
Methods for details). In both cases, the absence of a cost would result in a value of 1, which should
occur when there is no perturbation of growth rate by addition of antibiotic or by altering accuracy.
Increasing values above 1 would indicate higher costs, whereas values below 1 would indicate a relative
benefit. Note that the antibiotic cost here is only a measure of growth rate retardation in the presence of
antibiotic, and does not reflect fitness costs associated with mutations that provide antibiotic resistance.
313
All antibiotic-evolved lines showed a significant decline in the cost of antibiotic exposure (henceforth
called cost of antibiotic), except WT and HA in Amp and WT in Kan (**Fig. 2a, Table S1**). In contrast,
the cost of mistranslation changed only across specific genotype-antibiotic combinations **(Fig. 2b,**
Table S1; also see Fig. 3 for comparison of antibiotic vs. accuracy costs). The difference between
Mis-1 and Mis-1+HA is striking: although both strains had initially similar costs of mistranslation **(Fig.**
1a and Fig. 2b), Mis-1 showed comprehensive cost compensation in all antibiotics, whereas Mis-1+HA
did so only in Kan where the load of mistranslation would be exacerbated by kanamycin-induced
inaccuracies (**Fig. 2b**). Similarly, the difference between strains HA and Mis-2 is also noteworthy.
Neither strain had a significant ancestral cost of altered accuracy (**Fig. 1a and 2b**), leading us to expect
that accuracy costs would remain unchanged in these strains during adaptation. However, while neither
strain showed significant cost compensation in Cip, strain HA showed an increase in accuracy cost
when evolved in Amp and Kan, while Mis-2 costs did not change significantly in either antibiotic (**Fig.**

2b). Importantly, all LB-evolved lines reduced the cost of altered accuracy, even in cases (such as HA

and Mis-2) when the initial cost was not very high (**Fig. 2c**). Thus, accuracy costs were rapidly

compensated in all strains evolved in LB, even leading to a relative benefit of altered accuracy (cost

below 1) in Mis-2 and HA (**Fig. 2c**); but under antibiotic selection, this seems to be more difficult.

Overall, it appears that the cost of antibiotic imposes a stronger selection pressure than altered accuracy

(**Fig. 3**).

Since we defined the cost of antibiotic by current and not past exposure to antibiotic, we also computed

the antibiotic cost for our control lines evolved in LB (**Fig. 4, Table S1**). The antibiotic cost of Cip

either increased or did not change (**Fig. 4a**), whereas for Amp and Kan nearly all tested strains showed

a reduction in antibiotic cost despite never being exposed to the antibiotic **(Fig. 4b-c)**. Note that in

ampicillin, we could only compute growth rates for WT and Mis-1 since all other strains showed noisy

growth profiles. Thus, growing in antibiotic-free media for several generations is sufficient for bacteria

to compensate for an antibiotic-induced growth defect, despite no direct selection. Similarly, we

measured accuracy cost compensation in antibiotic-evolved lines, by testing their growth in LB. Mis-

1, which had the highest ancestral accuracy costs, showed cost compensation across all regimes. For

the most part, other strains either showed no compensation or, as with HA, increased rather than

decreased ancestral accuracy costs after evolution in antibiotics. **(Fig. 4d-f)**. On the other hand, as

discussed above, all lines evolved in LB showed a significant compensation of accuracy costs **(Fig. 2c,**

Table S1).

Overall, we found that exposure to antibiotic (at the sub-MIC concentrations used here) extracts a higher

fitness cost than altered accuracy (**Fig. 3**) and this cost is compensated in all lines **(Fig. 2a)**, even in

strains evolved without antibiotic exposure **(Fig. 4a-c)**. Accuracy cost compensation, on the other hand,

occurs consistently only in the absence of antibiotic (**Fig. 2b)**, and is both regime and strain specific.

Antibiotic target-specific mutations dominate in the adapted populations

To examine the genetic changes that underlie our observations, we subjected all evolved populations

from the final timepoint (~300 generations) to whole genome population sequencing. While all lines

showed multiple mutations that rose to >50% frequency, genes known to play a role in antibiotic

resistance via target alteration or efflux pump activation dominated, particularly in Cip and Kan **(Fig.**

5a-c, Tables S3 and S4). This agrees with our observation that antibiotic costs impose a strong selection

pressure, and are fixed rapidly across lines. However, barring a few shared genes with mutations, all

strains with altered accuracy showed distinct mutation profiles in a given antibiotic, indicating that

altered accuracy changes the genetic basis of adaptation to a given selection pressure. Notably, Mis-2

populations frequently showed mutations in *eaeH* (with identical nucleotide changes across

populations), and *rclA/rclR* (varied intergenic mutations across populations, **Table S3**), including in

LB. These mutations may either reflect a strain-specific mutational hotspot, or they may be broadly beneficial mutations that repeatedly rise to high frequency. Prior work suggests that *eaeH* is a cell surface protein (although it could be a pseudogene in K-12 strains (Homma et al., 2002)), and shares sequence similarity with the EaeH virulence factor that aids attachment to intestinal cells in enteropathogenic *E. coli* (Eltai et al., 2020). *rclA* is a flavoprotein that confers protection against oxidative stress (Meredith et al., 2022), while *rclR* is a transcriptional activator in the same regulon (Parker et al., 2013). Thus, it is plausible that these mutations are beneficial under antibiotic selection, specifically in the Mis-2 background. Apart from these mutations, repeatability across biological replicates was generally poor. However, in most cases, non-WT strains acquired high-frequency mutations in a wider range of genes (**Fig. 5a** and **5d**), consistent with prior work showing that mistranslation enhanced genotypic diversity across evolved replicates (Zheng et al., 2021). We find that this applies even if translation accuracy is enhanced rather than reduced.

Next, although the LB-evolved lines all show a significant reduction of accuracy costs **(Fig. 2c)**, none of the high-frequency mutations involve components of protein synthesis **(Fig. 5d)**. It appears therefore that accuracy costs are indirectly compensated, either via epistasis with the original accuracy-altering mutation or through pleiotropic effects of mutations that are not directly connected to protein synthesis. Finally, our experiments included exposing WT to the antibiotic Kasugamycin (Ksg) as a tRNA-independent method of reducing translation initiation events, i.e., a control for our Mis-1 line which lacks three of four initiator tRNA genes. Some evolved mutations in these lines, such as those in RsmA/KsgA, are directly involved in Ksg resistance (Ochi et al., 2009) and all were distinct from Mis-1 in LB (compare **Fig. 5d** with **Fig. S3**). Again, these results emphasize that the mechanism by which protein synthesis is perturbed is important for determining which mutations are fixed, and that antibiotic costs generally dominate over the costs introduced by accuracy changes. Finally, we tested whether mutational diversity is influenced by altered mutation rate or bias in strains with altered translation accuracy. Basal mutation rates and spectra for WT, Mis-1, and Mis-1(HA) estimated by whole-genome sequencing of mutation accumulation (MA) lines were indistinguishable **(Tables 1 and S5)**. Thus, the observed mutational diversity is likely to be determined primarily by differential strength and mechanisms of selection imposed by altered accuracy and/or antibiotic exposure.

DISCUSSION

Mistranslation and its adaptive potential have intrigued biologists for some time now. Recent studies have found that mistranslation can promote adaptation to several inhospitable environments, including during growth in antibiotics. However, to properly assess the role of protein synthesis errors in adaptation, the costs imposed by mistranslation as well as the externally imposed selection pressure must be taken into account. In this study, for the first time, we define and quantify the costs of altering translation accuracy and costs incurred by antibiotic exposure, and tease apart their individual impacts

on the paths to adaptation. We do so by subjecting strains with both *higher* and *lower* translation accuracy than the WT to experimental evolution for ~300 generations in three bactericidal antibiotics with diverse modes of action, so as to observe the impact of antibiotic-specific effects. We find that antibiotic costs are typically higher than those imposed by altered accuracy, and are always rapidly compensated even in the absence of direct selection; whereas accuracy costs are only compensated occasionally, and most comprehensively in the absence of antibiotics. Our whole genome analysis of cost compensation during evolution shows a good match with the phenotypic data, with mutations that lead to antibiotic resistance dominating in evolved lines. Additionally, altered accuracy changes the genetic basis of adaptation to antibiotics. Although all lines show target mutations, non-WT lines also show some high frequency, strain-specific off-target mutations. Previously, we showed that mistranslation increased phenotypic heterogeneity, and proposed that it could alter evolutionary dynamics across populations (Samhita et al., 2021). In support of this prediction, here we show that altering translation accuracy in either direction can diversify the genetic paths to adaptation under moderate selection pressures (sub-MIC antibiotic concentrations). Given that bacteria in natural environments show a range of mistranslation rates (Mikkola and Kurland 1992), we suggest that simultaneous imposition of antibiotic and translation accuracy costs may shape distinct adaptive outcomes under antibiotic selection.

Altering translation accuracy in either direction increases mutational diversity under moderate selection pressures

Prior work with a reporter gene conferring antibiotic resistance showed that mistranslation increased mutational diversity across replicates (Zheng et al., 2021). Our results both support and extend these data: we find that mutational repeatability varies across strains (i.e., due to altered accuracy), and is also antibiotic-specific. Importantly, increasing as well as decreasing WT translation accuracy alters the identity of mutations favoured during adaptation, suggesting that deviation from WT accuracy — rather than mistranslation load itself, as proposed previously (Zheng et al., 2021)— may be key to mutational diversification. Among the three antibiotics used, we see maximum across-strain mutational diversification in ampicillin **(Fig. 5c)**, and more shared mutations (at the gene level) across strains in Cip and Kan. This suggests that antibiotic modes of action also influence mutational predictability on the background of altered accuracy.

Among the strains we used, inter-replicate variability was lowest in the WT, where mutations largely occurred in genes encoding known antibiotic targets (e.g.: *gyrA* and *marR* in Cip, *fusA* in Kan and *mppA* and *pgrR* in Amp). When antibiotic regimes were compared, mutations in Cip-evolved lines tended to show higher repeatability, suggesting that paths to Cip resistance may be limited even at sub-MIC antibiotic concentrations. In contrast, mutations in the Amp and Kan regimes were more diverse, both across replicates and across strains. Note that in line with previous work (Pereira et al., 2023), we

observed frequent background mutations that drive adaptation to growth in micro-well plates (e.g.,
mutations in *fimE*, *fimA*, *trkH*, *rpoA*, *ptsP* and *rpoC*) and likely have no association with antibiotic
resistance or translation accuracy. Changing translation fidelity certainly appears to alter the fitness
landscape as predicted by prior models (Schmutzer and Wagner 2023); however, in the absence of a
clear relationship between mistranslation level and mutational diversity or evolutionary predictability,
we are currently unable to postulate a hypothesis as to how this occurs. It would appear that both the
mode of mistranslation and the specific selective pressure (here, the mechanisms of action of specific
antibiotics) shape the fitness landscape, altering the mutational basis for adaptation.

Altered translation accuracy affects multiple aspects of adaptation
Our work adds new dimensions to prior studies implicating mistranslation in altering the rate, degree
and genetic basis of adaptation. Early in evolution, high-frequency adaptive mutations are observed
only in mistranslating strains, which also appear to adapt faster, commensurate with larger initial
antibiotic costs. This observation is similar to earlier work with fungi **(Weil et al., 2017)** and in line
with diminishing adaptive returns (Card et al., 2019). In contrast, the hyper-accurate strain HA with a
negligible cost of altered accuracy (i.e., ancestral growth rate comparable to WT) did not show an
increase in growth rate or any mutations in this time period. Irrespective of the degree and mode by
which translation accuracy was changed, all strains evolved to reach the same MIC values (from sub-
MIC to ~10X MIC for Cip, ~25X MIC for Amp and ~5X MIC for Kan, **Fig. S2**). Despite identical final
MIC values, strains with altered accuracy often had higher final growth rates than the WT (except in
Cip), indicating that altered accuracy may lead to diverse effects on distinct components of fitness.
Similar results were reported in earlier work where a plasmid-borne TEM-1 gene for ampicillin
resistance was evolved in a WT vs. mistranslating strain background for 6-8 generations under various
target antibiotics (Bratulic et al., 2017): the mistranslating strain achieved similar MIC but higher cell
densities than the WT in the absence of antibiotic.

Cost compensation is accompanied by raising but never by lowering translation accuracy
In our work, raising baseline translation accuracy also led to other interesting effects. For instance,
while most genotypes adapted by simultaneously reducing antibiotic and accuracy costs, in the strain
with hyper-accurate translation the cost of accuracy *increased* during adaptation to antibiotics.
Additionally, no mutations relevant for translation accuracy were observed. In contrast, two of the
mistranslating lines (Mis-1 replicate 2, and Mis-1+HA replicate 2**)** that evolved in kanamycin
— therefore bearing an increased burden of translation errors — adapted by acquiring mutations that
confer hyper-accuracy (H77L and P91Q respectively in the ribosomal protein S12 (Zengel et al., 1977,
Siller et al., 2010, Agarwal and O'Connor 2014), likely reducing mistranslation levels. The reason why
we sometimes observed mutations that increase accuracy, but none that decrease accuracy, remains
unclear and needs further exploration. Overall, it is clear that multiple drivers determine cost

compensation for antibiotics and altered accuracy: genotype, magnitude of the cost, mechanism of mistranslation (or hyper-accuracy), and the mode of action of the specific antibiotic.

Limitations and future directions

In conclusion, our work brings up several new ideas that merit further exploration, while also highlighting limits in our current state of knowledge. An important caveat in our work is that although we define two separate costs, they are necessarily intertwined. We measure antibiotic cost compensation in strains whose translation accuracy is also altered, and vice-versa. We hope that future work will identify other ways of quantifying the costs of accuracy in conjunction with diverse selection pressures. Another caveat is that although we do not see any difference in mutation rates or spectra across strains, higher concentrations of the antibiotics Cip and Amp can enhance mutation rates (reviewed in Andersson and Hughes 2014), and hence, our results may have limited predictive power for adaptive trajectories under high antibiotic concentrations. Finally, while antibiotic costs dominate over costs of altered accuracy, the mechanism of cost compensation for altered accuracy remains a mystery. Measuring translation accuracy in our LB-evolved lines may shed some light on whether the cost compensation occurs through a reversion to WT levels of translation accuracy, or via other unrelated mechanisms.

Despite these limitations, we can now hypothesize that diverse magnitudes of translational accuracy across bacteria (Mikkola and Kurland 1992) may be yet another factor that makes it so difficult to predict the fitness costs of antibiotic resistance (Hinz et al., 2024) . Importantly, we find that growth in rich media *alone* for several generations can result in low-level antibiotic resistance with no known target mutations, an observation that does not bode well for the continuing rise of drug resistance. Our results emphasize the role of non-target mutations (reviewed in Hughes and Andersson 2017) that may confer antibiotic resistance through epistasis with the genetic background, via pleiotropic effects, or through constant exposure to sub-MIC antibiotics, activating stress responses (reviewed in Andersson and Hughes 2014). These observations also have implications for clinical treatment, suggesting that if left unchecked, even drug-sensitive pathogens could respond poorly to late antibiotic treatment. We see mutational diversity even across WT replicate lines, suggesting that in addition to potentiating large effect mutations (Pereira et al., 2023), sub-MIC antibiotic exposure may reduce evolutionary repeatability, in our case exacerbated by changes in translation accuracy. This hypothesis needs further exploration, and is especially important given that several antibiotics target protein synthesis. More generally, while the phenotypic effects of mistranslation continue to be explored, we show here that altering wild type translation accuracy in either direction can have significant consequences on bacterial adaptation to external selective pressures. Thus, to better understand and predict bacterial evolution, we suggest that it is important to disentangle, define, and quantify the (internal) costs of altering translation accuracy and the (external) costs imposed by the environment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank DA and LS lab members and Vidyanand Nanjundiah for critical comments on the manuscript, and Shazia Parveen for help with running growth curves. We acknowledge funding and support from the Wellcome Trust/DBT India Alliance (grant IA/E/14/1/501771 to LS); Axis bank (support for AB and grant to LS), IISER Pune (fellowship to ST), the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB, grant SRG/2023/001817 to LS), the National Centre for Biological Sciences (NCBS–TIFR) and the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India (Project Identification No. RTI 4006 to DA), and the National Centre for Biological Sciences and the Trivedi School of Biosciences (TSB) at Ashoka university for infrastructure and research support.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

LS and DA conceived of the project and designed work; LS, ST, JM and AB conducted experiments; LS carried out analyses with help from JM and AB; LS and DA acquired funding and wrote the manuscript.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. (a) Ancestral costs of accuracy and exposure to antibiotic. Mean growth rates (+/- SD) of all five ancestral strains in the four growth regimes used in this study. Dotted lines indicate antibiotic cost while double-headed arrows indicate accuracy cost (n=5 for all except WT and Mis-1 in Kan, Cip and LB, where n=6 and HA in LB, where n=4). Note that the figure shows growth rate differences rather than ratios which we use in computing cost values (See Methods). **(b) Schematic for experimental evolution.** We initiated cultures for our experimental evolution regime using single colonies from an agar plate (n=5 for all except except WT and Mis-1 in Kan, Cip and LB, where n=6 and HA in LB, where n=4). We grew cultures in 48 well plates under shaking conditions at 37°C in four regimes: LB with one of three antibiotics, and LB alone (control). We assessed adaptation using change in maximum growth rate. **(c) Most strains rapidly adapt to low antibiotic concentrations across regimes.** Comparison of mean growth rates for ancestral vs evolved lines, tested in the same regimes in which they evolved (n=5 for all except except WT and Mis-1 in Kan, Cip and LB, where n=6 and HA in LB, where n=4). All lines showed a significant increase in growth rate except when indicated ('ns', not significant; Table S1).

Figure 2. (a) Cost of antibiotic declines in most strains during adaptation. Comparison of mean antibiotic costs for ancestral vs evolved lines for a given genotype, tested in the same regimes in which it evolved (n=5 for all except WT and Mis-1 in Kan and Cip, where n=6). All lines showed a significant

decrease in cost except when indicated ('ns', not significant; Table S1). **(b) Cost of altered accuracy declines for select genotype-antibiotic combinations.** Comparison of mean accuracy costs for ancestral vs evolved lines for a given genotype, tested in the same regimes in which it evolved (n=5 for all except WT and Mis-1 in Kan and Cip, where n=6) . All lines showed a significant decrease in cost, except when indicated ('ns', not significant; Table S1). Note that HA in Amp showed a significant increase rather than decrease. **(c) Cost of altered accuracy declines for all genotype-antibiotic combinations in LB.** Comparison of mean accuracy costs for ancestral vs evolved lines for a given genotype, tested in the same regime in which it evolved (n=5 for Mis-2 and Mis-1+HA, n=6 for WT and Mis-1 and n=4 for HA) . All lines showed a significant decrease in cost, except when indicated ('ns', not significant; Table S1).

Figure 3. Simultaneous changes in antibiotic and accuracy costs during adaptation. Evolutionary change in cost of antibiotic vs cost of accuracy, for the four genotypes with altered accuracy (n=5 for all except HA in LB, where n=4). Arrows indicate the direction of the change during adaptation. Colours indicate three different antibiotics. Statistical comparisons are detailed in Table S1.

Figure 4. (a-c) Antibiotic cost compensation occurs in the absence of direct selection. Mean values (+/- SD) for evolved vs ancestral antibiotic costs across all genotypes for the LB regime (n=5 for all except HA, where n=4). WT and Mis-1 lines evolved in LB were tested at a later time in Cip, and hence ancestral costs for these lines are marginally different from the original ancestral costs, recorded separately in the raw data (Table S6). For Amp, only WT and Mis-1 data could be computed. Statistical comparisons are detailed in Table S1. **(d-f) Cost of altered accuracy remains unchanged in antibiotic-evolved lines.** Mean values (+/- SD) for evolved vs ancestral accuracy costs across all genotypes evolved in antibiotics and tested in LB (n=5 for all except WT and Mis-1 in Kan and Cip where n=6). Values on the diagonal indicate that ancestors and evolved lines have identical costs. Statistical comparisons are detailed in Table S1.

Figure 5. Antibiotic resistance-conferring mutations dominate in evolved lines. Heat maps for all four selection regimes (**a-c**), antibiotics; **d**, LB, showing gene-level mutations of >50% frequency in evolved populations (n=5 except for HA in LB, where n=4 and WT and Mis-1 in Kan, Cip and LB where n=6). Shades of blue indicate the number of replicate lines that carried a mutation in a given gene; white indicates that no replicates of a given strain showed a mutation in that gene. Known resistance-associated mutations are highlighted in yellow. Details of all mutations are given in Tables S3 and S4.

REFERENCES

Agarwal, D., Kamath, D., Gregory, S. T. and O'Connor, M. 2015. "Modulation of decoding fidelity by ribosomal proteins S4 and S5." J Bacteriol **197**(6): 1017-1025.

Agarwal, D. and O'Connor, M. 2014. "Diverse effects of residues 74-78 in ribosomal protein S12 on decoding and antibiotic sensitivity." Biochem Biophys Res Commun **445**(2): 475-479.

Andersson, D. I. and Hughes, D. 2010. "Antibiotic resistance and its cost: is it possible to reverse resistance?" Nat Rev Microbiol **8**(4): 260-271.

Andersson, D. I. and Hughes, D. 2014. "Microbiological effects of sublethal levels of antibiotics." Nat Rev Microbiol **12**(7): 465-478.

Bratulic, S., Gerber, F. and Wagner, A. 2015. "Mistranslation drives the evolution of robustness in TEM-1 beta-lactamase." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **112**(41): 12758-12763.

Bratulic, S., Toll-Riera, M. and Wagner, A. 2017. "Mistranslation can enhance fitness through purging of deleterious mutations." Nat Commun **8**: 15410.

Bullwinkle, T. J. and Ibba, M. 2016. "Translation quality control is critical for bacterial responses to amino acid stress." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **113**(8): 2252-2257.

Card, K. J., LaBar, T., Gomez, J. B. and Lenski, R. E. 2019. "Historical contingency in the evolution of antibiotic resistance after decades of relaxed selection." PLoS Biol **17**(10): e3000397.

Chumpolkulwong, N., Hori-Takemoto, C., Hosaka, T., Inaoka, T., Kigawa, T., Shirouzu, M., Ochi, K. and Yokoyama, S. 2004. "Effects of Escherichia coli ribosomal protein S12 mutations on cell-free protein synthesis." Eur J Biochem **271**(6): 1127-1134.

Deatherage, D. E. and Barrick, J. E. 2014. "Identification of mutations in laboratory-evolved microbes from next-generation sequencing data using breseq." Methods Mol Biol **1151**: 165-188.

Drummond, D. A. and Wilke, C. O. 2008. "Mistranslation-induced protein misfolding as a dominant constraint on coding-sequence evolution." Cell **134**(2): 341-352.

Eltai, N. O., Al Thani, A. A., Al Hadidi, S. H., Al Ansari, K. and Yassine, H. M. 2020. "Antibiotic resistance and virulence patterns of pathogenic Escherichia coli strains associated with acute gastroenteritis among children in Qatar." BMC Microbiol **20**(1): 54.

Evans, C. R., Fan, Y. and Ling, J. 2019. "Increased mistranslation protects E. coli from protein misfolding stress due to activation of a RpoS-dependent heat shock response." FEBS Lett.

Gualerzi, C. O. and Pon, C. L. 2015. "Initiation of mRNA translation in bacteria: structural and dynamic aspects." Cell Mol Life Sci **72**(22): 4341-4367.

Hinz, A., Amado, A., Kassen, R., Bank, C. and Wong, A. 2024. "Unpredictability of the Fitness Effects of Antimicrobial Resistance Mutations Across Environments in Escherichia coli." Mol Biol Evol **41**(5).

Homma, K., Fukuchi, S., Kawabata, T., Ota, M. and Nishikawa, K. 2002. "A systematic investigation
identifies a significant number of probable pseudogenes in the Escherichia coli genome." <u>Gene</u> **294**(1-
2): 25-33.

Hughes, D. and Andersson, D. I. 2017. "Environmental and genetic modulation of the phenotypic
expression of antibiotic resistance." <u>FEMS Microbiol Rev</u> **41**(3): 374-391.

Javid, B., Sorrentino, F., Toosky, M., Zheng, W., Pinkham, J. T., Jain, N., Pan, M., Deighan, P. and
Rubin, E. J. 2014. "Mycobacterial mistranslation is necessary and sufficient for rifampicin phenotypic
resistance." <u>Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A</u> **111**(3): 1132-1137.

Kosinski, L. J. and Masel, J. 2020. "Readthrough Errors Purge Deleterious Cryptic Sequences,
Facilitating the Birth of Coding Sequences." <u>Mol Biol Evol</u> **37**(6): 1761-1774.

Low, B. 1968. "Formation of merodiploids in matings with a class of Rec- recipient strains of
Escherichia coli K12." <u>Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A</u> **60**(1): 160-167.

Melnikov, S. V., Stevens, D. L., Fu, X., Kwok, H. S., Zhang, J. T., Shen, Y., Sabina, J., Lee, K., Lee,
H. and Soll, D. 2020. "Exploiting evolutionary trade-offs for posttreatment management of drug-
resistant populations." <u>Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A</u> **117**(30): 17924-17931.

Meredith, J. D., Chapman, I., Ulrich, K., Sebastian, C., Stull, F. and Gray, M. J. 2022. "Escherichia coli
RclA is a highly active hypothiocyanite reductase." <u>Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A</u> **119**(30): e2119368119.

Mikkola, R. and Kurland, C. G. 1992. "Selection of laboratory wild-type phenotype from natural
isolates of Escherichia coli in chemostats." <u>Mol Biol Evol</u> **9**(3): 394-402.

Mohler, K. and Ibba, M. 2017. "Translational fidelity and mistranslation in the cellular response to
stress." <u>Nat Microbiol</u> **2**: 17117.

Netzer, N., Goodenbour, J. M., David, A., Dittmar, K. A., Jones, R. B., Schneider, J. R., Boone, D.,
Eves, E. M., Rosner, M. R., Gibbs, J. S., Embry, A., Dolan, B., Das, S., Hickman, H. D., Berglund, P.,
Bennink, J. R., Yewdell, J. W. and Pan, T. 2009. "Innate immune and chemically triggered oxidative
stress modifies translational fidelity." <u>Nature</u> **462**(7272): 522-526.

Ochi, K., Kim, J. Y., Tanaka, Y., Wang, G., Masuda, K., Nanamiya, H., Okamoto, S., Tokuyama, S.,
Adachi, Y. and Kawamura, F. 2009. "Inactivation of KsgA, a 16S rRNA methyltransferase, causes
vigorous emergence of mutants with high-level kasugamycin resistance." <u>Antimicrob Agents
Chemother</u> **53**(1): 193-201.

Paredes, J. A., Carreto, L., Simoes, J., Bezerra, A. R., Gomes, A. C., Santamaria, R., Kapushesky, M.,
Moura, G. R. and Santos, M. A. 2012. "Low level genome mistranslations deregulate the transcriptome
and translatome and generate proteotoxic stress in yeast." <u>BMC Biol</u> **10**: 55.

Parker, B. W., Schwessinger, E. A., Jakob, U. and Gray, M. J. 2013. "The RclR protein is a reactive
chlorine-specific transcription factor in Escherichia coli." <u>J Biol Chem</u> **288**(45): 32574-32584.

Pereira, C., Warsi, O. M. and Andersson, D. I. 2023. "Pervasive Selection for Clinically Relevant
Resistance and Media Adaptive Mutations at Very Low Antibiotic Concentrations." <u>Mol Biol Evol</u>
40(1).

Ruan, B., Palioura, S., Sabina, J., Marvin-Guy, L., Kochhar, S., Larossa, R. A. and Soll, D. 2008. "Quality control despite mistranslation caused by an ambiguous genetic code." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **105**(43): 16502-16507.

Samhita, L. 2020. "The Boggarts of biology: how non-genetic changes influence the genotype." Curr Genet **10.1007/s00294-020-01108-5**.

Samhita, L., P, K. R., Stephenson, G., Thutupalli, S. and Agashe, D. 2021. "The impact of mistranslation on phenotypic variability and fitness." Evolution **75**(5): 1201-1217.

Samhita, L., Raval, P. K. and Agashe, D. 2020. "Global mistranslation increases cell survival under stress in Escherichia coli." PLoS Genet **16**(3): e1008654.

Samhita, L., Virumae, K., Remme, J. and Varshney, U. 2013. "Initiation with elongator tRNAs." J Bacteriol **195**(18): 4202-4209.

Sane, M., Diwan, G. D., Bhat, B. A., Wahl, L. M. and Agashe, D. 2023. "Shifts in mutation spectra enhance access to beneficial mutations." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **120**(22): e2207355120.

Sane, M., Miranda, J. J. and Agashe, D. 2018. "Antagonistic pleiotropy for carbon use is rare in new mutations." Evolution **72**(10): 2202-2213.

Schluenzen, F., Takemoto, C., Wilson, D. N., Kaminishi, T., Harms, J. M., Hanawa-Suetsugu, K., Szaflarski, W., Kawazoe, M., Shirouzu, M., Nierhaus, K. H., Yokoyama, S. and Fucini, P. 2006. "The antibiotic kasugamycin mimics mRNA nucleotides to destabilize tRNA binding and inhibit canonical translation initiation." Nat Struct Mol Biol **13**(10): 871-878.

Schmutzer, M. and Wagner, A. 2023. "Not Quite Lost in Translation: Mistranslation Alters Adaptive Landscape Topography and the Dynamics of Evolution." Mol Biol Evol **40**(6).

Schwartz, M. H., Waldbauer, J. R., Zhang, L. and Pan, T. 2016. "Global tRNA misacylation induced by anaerobiosis and antibiotic exposure broadly increases stress resistance in Escherichia coli." Nucleic Acids Res.

Siller, E., DeZwaan, D. C., Anderson, J. F., Freeman, B. C. and Barral, J. M. 2010. "Slowing bacterial translation speed enhances eukaryotic protein folding efficiency." J Mol Biol **396**(5): 1310-1318.

Weil, T., Santamaria, R., Lee, W., Rung, J., Tocci, N., Abbey, D., Bezerra, A. R., Carreto, L., Moura, G. R., Bayes, M., Gut, I. G., Csikasz-Nagy, A., Cavalieri, D., Berman, J. and Santos, M. A. S. 2017. "Adaptive Mistranslation Accelerates the Evolution of Fluconazole Resistance and Induces Major Genomic and Gene Expression Alterations in Candida albicans." mSphere **2**(4).

Wiegand, I., Hilpert, K. and Hancock, R. E. 2008. "Agar and broth dilution methods to determine the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of antimicrobial substances." Nat Protoc **3**(2): 163-175.

Zengel, J. M., Young, R., Dennis, P. P. and Nomura, M. 1977. "Role of ribosomal protein S12 in peptide chain elongation: analysis of pleiotropic, streptomycin-resistant mutants of Escherichia coli." J Bacteriol **129**(3): 1320-1329.

Zheng, J., Bratulic, S., Lischer, H. E. L. and Wagner, A. 2021. "Mistranslation can promote the exploration of alternative evolutionary trajectories in enzyme evolution." J Evol Biol **34**(8): 1302-1315.

694   Zheng, J., Guo, N. and Wagner, A. 2021. "Mistranslation Reduces Mutation Load in Evolving Proteins
695   through Negative Epistasis with DNA Mutations." <u>Mol Biol Evol</u> **38**(11): 4792-4804.

Figure 1

(a)

(b)

Figure 1c

(i) Cip (ii) Kan (iii) Amp (iv) LB

WT
Mis-1
Mis-2
HA
Mis-1+HA

Figure 2a

Figure 2b

Figure 2c

Figure 3. Simultaneous changes in antibiotic and altered accuracy costs are seen across genotypes

Figure 4. Antibiotic cost compensation occurs in the absence of direct selection

Figure 5: Antibiotic resistance conferring mutations dominate among adapted lines

(a)

Ciprofloxacin

Figure 5: Antibiotic resistance conferring mutations dominate among adapted lines

(b)

Kanamycin

Figure 5. Antibiotic resistance conferring mutations dominate among adapted lines

(c)

Ampicillin

(d)

LB

Table 1: Mutation rates and spectra do not change with altered translation accuracy.
The observed number of mutations of different types are shown, for each MA-evolved strain.
Mutation bias is compared across strains using chi-square tests (e.g., SNP vs. indel bias).

Mutation type	Strain			Comparison of mutation bias			
	WT	Mis-1	Mis-1+HA	WT vs Mis-1		WT vs (Mis-1+HA)	
				χ^2	P	χ^2	P
SNP	64	71	74	0.02	0.98	0.77	0.38
Indel	8	9	13				
Transition	36	39	36	0.02	0.87	0.8	0.38
Transversion	28	32	38				
AT to GC	15	22	23	0.74	0.39	0.95	0.33
GC to AT	34	35	35				
Coding	51	50	56	1.5	0.2	0.3	0.57
Non-coding	13	21	18				
Mutation rate	1.8×10^{-10}	2.5×10^{-10}	2.6×10^{-10}				