Host range expansion and genetic plasticity drive the trade-off between integrative and extrachromosomal mobile genetic elements

Jean Cury[1,2], Pedro H. Oliveira[1,2,*], Fernando de la Cruz[3], Eduardo P.C. Rocha[1,2]

Affiliations.

[1]Microbial Evolutionary Genomics, Institut Pasteur, 28, rue Dr Roux, Paris, 75015, France,
[2]CNRS, UMR3525, 28, rue Dr Roux, Paris, 75015, France,
[3] Instituto de Biomedicina y Biotecnología de Cantabria (IBBTEC),

Universidad de Cantabria, Calle Albert Einstein 22, 39011 Santander, Spain

*Currently at: Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, New York, USA

Classification: Biological Sciences/Evolution

Corresponding author: Jean Cury (jean.cury@normalesup.org)

Abstract

Self-transmissible mobile genetic elements drive horizontal gene transfer between prokaryotes. Some of these elements integrate in the chromosome, whereas others replicate autonomously as plasmids. Recent works showed the existence of few differences, and occasional interconversion, between the two types of elements. Here, we enquired on why evolutionary processes have maintained the two types of mobile genetic elements by comparing integrative and conjugative elements (ICE) with extrachromosomal ones (conjugative plasmids) of the highly abundant MPF_T conjugative type. Expectedly, we found that plasmids encode more replicases and partition systems, whereas ICEs encode more integrases. Yet, the two types of elements often clustered together in terms of gene repertoires because they encode both types of functions. Plasmids and ICEs encode similar accessory functions, but in different quantity; ICEs encode more metabolic genes and conjugative plasmids over-represent antibiotic resistance genes. We hypothesized that plasmids might be more plastic, whereas ICEs could have broader host ranges. Indeed, plasmids are more variable in size, have more DNA repeats, and exchange genes more frequently. On the other hand, ICEs are more frequently transferred between distant taxa. We found few very similar ICEs and plasmids, but when they are present in distant bacterial hosts, their composition suggests that long-range transfer of a plasmid can be stabilized if it becomes an ICE. This work suggests that the differential plasticity and transmissibility of the elements drives their abundance and functional content, thus explaining the co-existence of plasmids and integrative elements in Prokaryotes.

Keywords: Mobile genetic elements, horizontal gene transfer, molecular evolution, microbial genomics, conjugation

Significance statement

Horizontal transfer of genetic information between bacteria drives their rapid adaptation and is often mediated by mobile genetic elements. We identify differences between conjugative elements that may explain why some of them integrate in the chromosome (ICE) whereas others remain as independent replicons in the cell (plasmids). We show that plasmids are more plastic: they have wider variations in gene repertoires, more repeats, and transfer more genes between elements. On the other hand, ICEs have broader host ranges. Plasmids transferring to very distinct hosts seem to require integration – as ICEs - to be maintained in the genome. This contributes to elucidate the longstanding question of why there is stable co-existence of integrative and extrachromosomal mobile elements in Prokaryotes.

Introduction

The genomes of Prokaryotes have mobile genetic elements (MGEs) integrated in the chromosome or replicating as extrachromosomal elements. These MGEs usually encode non-essential but ecologically important traits (1, 2). Extra-chromosomal elements, such as conjugative plasmids (CPs) and lytic phages, replicate autonomously in the cell using specialized replicases to recruit the bacterial DNA replication machinery (or to use their own). Plasmids and extra-chromosomal prophages can also increase their stability in cellular lineages using partition systems, for proper segregation during bacterial replication (3), resolution systems, to prevent accumulation of multimers (4), and restriction-modification or toxin-antitoxin systems, for post-segregation killing of their hosts (5). Alternatively, many MGEs integrate into the chromosome. This is the case of the vast majority of known prophages, of most conjugative elements (ICEs), and of many elements with poorly characterized mechanisms of genetic mobility (*e.g.*, many pathogenicity islands)(6–8). The integrated elements are replicated along with the host chromosome and require an additional step of excision before being transferred between cells. This raises a question that has not been addressed in the literature: what are the relative benefits and disadvantages of the integrated and extrachromosomal forms of a MGE?

To address this question, we analyzed the differences and similarities between ICEs and CPs. We focused on these elements because both forms are frequently found in bacteria, they can be easily detected in genomes, and the mechanism of conjugation is well known. Conjugative elements have a crucial role in spreading antibiotic resistance and virulence genes among bacterial pathogens (9–12). Recently, several works suggested that the line separating integrative ICEs and CPs could be thinner than anticipated (13), because some ICEs encode plasmid-associated functions like replication (14) or partition (15), some plasmids encode integrases (16), and ICEs and CPs are intermingled in the phylogenetic tree of conjugative systems (17). Finally, both forms – ICEs and CPs – are found throughout the bacterial kingdom, but their relative frequency depends on the taxa and on the mechanisms of conjugation (7). These differences suggest that conjugative elements endure diverse selective pressures for being integrative or extrachromosomal depending on unknown environmental, genetic, or physiological variables.

We thought that key differences in the biology of integrative and extrachromosomal
elements might provide them with different types of advantages. ICEs require an additional
step of integration/excision during transfer, which may take time and requires genetic
regulation. Their integration in the chromosome may affect the latter's organization and
structure, and these collateral effects might increase with the size of the element. On the
other hand, ICEs replicate as part of chromosomes and could thus be lost from the cell at
lower rates than plasmids. Furthermore, plasmids must recruit the host replication
machinery, which may render elements incompatible and is known to constrain their host
range: many plasmids are able to conjugate into distantly related hosts, but are unable to
replicate there (18–20). We thus hypothesize that ICEs might be favored when transfers
occur between distant hosts, whereas plasmids might provide more genetic plasticity
because their size is not constrained by chromosomal organization.

Here, we study conjugative elements of the type MPF_T. This is the most frequent and best-
studied type of conjugative systems (17), and the only one for which we can identify
hundreds of elements of each of the forms (ICEs and CPs). We restricted our analysis to
genera containing both CPs and ICEs, to avoid, as much as possible, taxonomical biases. We
first describe the content of both types of elements and highlight their differences and
similarities. Next, we quantify their genetic similarity and the extent of their gene
exchanges. Finally, we show that chromosomal integration facilitates the colonization of
novel taxa by a conjugative element.

100
101

Results

Functional and genetic differences between ICEs and CPs

We analyzed a set of 151 ICEs and 136 CPs of the same genera and of type MPF_T, most of which were from Proteobacteria (96.9%). Both ICEs and CPs were found to be AT-richer than their host chromosomes, which is a common feature in MGEs and horizontally transferred genes (21). However, the difference was three times smaller for ICEs (Fig. 1A), presumably because they replicate with the chromosome or remain a longer time in the same host. The average size of CPs is slightly larger (75kb vs 59kb), and the median slightly smaller (46kb vs 52kb) than that of ICEs. In contrast, CPs have more diverse sizes than ICEs (Fig. 1B), showing a coefficient of variation twice as large (1.05 vs 0.49). The size of the conjugative elements depends on the size of the bacterial genome (after discounting the size of their conjugative elements), this effect being much stronger for CPs (Fig. 1C). CPs also have four times higher density of large DNA repeats than ICEs (Fig. 1D). These results suggest that CPs diversify faster than ICEs.

HGT concentrates in a few hotspots in bacterial chromosomes, presumably to minimize disruption in their organization (22). We used HTg50, a measure of the concentration of HGT in chromosomes that corresponds to the minimal number of spots required to account for 50% of horizontally transferred genes (22), to test if chromosomes with fewer integration hotspots had more plasmids. Indeed, there is a negative association between the number of plasmids, weighted by their size, and the chromosomes' HTg50 (Spearman ρ=-0.35, p-value=0.0016, Fig. S1).

We then quantified the differences between ICEs and CPs in terms of functions associated with their biology, with a focus on stabilization functions. Relaxases are part of the rolling circle replication initiator proteins and some have been shown to act as replicases(14, 23) or site-specific recombinases (24, 25). Since all conjugative elements encode a relaxase, by definition, they may also have these functions. In the following, we focused on typical plasmid replication initiator proteins (more than 95% of them are involved in theta-replication, and none is matched by the protein profiles of relaxases), and serine or tyrosine recombinases as integrases. Expectedly, ICEs showed higher frequency of integrases, while CPs had more frequently identifiable partition and replication systems. Some ICEs encode

partition systems (11%) and many encode a replicase (40%), while 37% of CPs encode at
least one tyrosine or serine recombinase (Fig. 2A). These results further illustrate a
continuum between the two types of elements: about half of the elements (40% and 48%,
ICEs and CPs, respectively) have functions usually associated with the other type and may
(rarely) lack functions typically associated with its own type (Fig. 2B). We identified plasmid
incompatibility systems of diverse types, whereas no ICE could not be typed in the current
scheme (Fig. S2).

We then made similar analyses for functions usually regarded as accessory or unrelated to
the biology of MGEs (Fig. 2B). ICEs were more likely to carry restriction-modification systems
(x2.8) than CPs (but not orphan methylases), suggesting that ICEs endure stronger selective
pressure for stabilization in the genome. In contrast, they were significantly less likely to
carry antibiotic resistance genes or integrons. They also had fewer identifiable entry-
exclusion systems, which may reflect the ability of ICEs to tolerate the presence of multiple
similar elements in the cell (26). The classification of genes in the four major functional
categories of the EggNOG database, showed that ICEs had relatively more genes encoding
metabolic and cellular processes. We have previously shown that genes of unknown or
poorly characterized function were over-represented in ICEs relative to their host
chromosome (27). The frequency of these genes is even higher in plasmids (61% vs 46%).
Hence, both types of elements have many functions in common, but their relative frequency
often differs significantly.

Genetic similarities between ICEs and CPs

The results of the previous section, together with previously published studies (see
Introduction), suggest that ICEs and CPs either share a common history or often exchange
genes (or both). We detailed the relationships of homology between ICEs and CPs using the
weighted Gene Repertoire Relatedness (wGRR), which measures the frequency of bi-
directional best hits between two elements weighted by their sequence similarity (see
Methods). We clustered the matrix of wGRR using the Louvain algorithm (28), and found six
well-distinguished groups (Fig. 3). Two groups (1 and 6) are only constituted of CPs, two are
composed of more than 90% of ICEs (3 and 5) and two have a mix of both types of elements
(2 and 4) (Fig.3, top bar). Bacterial species are scattered between groups, showing that they

are not the key determinant of the clustering. Some groups are only from γ-proteobacteria,

but others include bacteria from different classes. Groups where elements are from the

same taxonomic classes tend to have either CPs or ICEs, whereas the others have mixtures

of both elements. Group 4, includes many ICEs and CPs, where all ICEs have integrases while

more than half of the CPs lack both replication and partition systems (Fig. 4). This group

includes almost only elements from ε-proteobacteria that may have specificities that we

were not able to take into account. In contrast, almost all ICEs of groups 2 and 3 encode an

integrase and all CPs have partition or replication systems.

We controlled for the effect of the MPF genes in the previous clustering analysis by re-doing

it without these genes (Fig. S3). This produced the same number of groups - N1 to N6 - and

90% of the elements of the former groups were classed in the same novel groups (Fig. S4).

The only qualitatively significant difference between the two analyses concerned the group

2 for which 36% of the elements were now classed in groups N4 or N6. Overall, these

controls confirm that ICEs and CPs can be grouped together, and apart from other elements

of the same type. The grouping is not caused by sequence similarity between conjugative

systems. Instead, it probably reflects either within group genetic exchanges between ICEs

and CPs, or interconversions of the two types of elements.

Genetic exchanges: CPs become ICEs for broader host range

The clustering of ICEs and CPs could be explained by genetic transfer between them. To

address this question, we searched for pairs of conjugative elements with low wGRR (<30%)

but some highly similar homologs (>80% sequence identity). This identified several cases of

recent transfer of a single or a few genes between elements (Fig. 5A). In agreement with our

observations of higher genetic plasticity in CPs, most transfers took place between these

types of elements (Fig. 5.B-D).

We hypothesized that ICEs could hold an advantage over CPs to colonize novel hosts,

because replication restricts plasmid host range. To test this hypothesis, we analyzed the

wGRR between pairs of ICEs and pairs of CPs in function of the phylogenetic distance

between their bacterial hosts. This showed similar patterns for the two types of elements,

with the notable exception that there are no pairs of highly similar plasmids (wGRR>50%) in

distant hosts (more than 0.1 substitutions/position, *e.g.,* the average distance in the tree

between *E. coli* and *P. aeruginosa*). In contrast, a third of all ICEs (n=50) are in these

conditions (Fig. 6A, Fig. S5). The same analysis after removing the MPF genes shows wGRR

values shifted to lower values for all elements, but qualitatively similar trends (Fig. S6). This

suggests a major difference in the ability of ICEs and CPs to be stably maintained after their

transfer into a distant host.

We then analyzed the pairs ICE-CP. We found few pairs of highly similar ICEs and CPs in

closely related hosts (bottom right corner of Fig. 6, n=8 for wGRR>50% and d < 10^{-2}),

suggesting that interconversion between these elements remains rare within a clade. A

larger number of ICE-CP pairs were very similar but present in distant hosts (n=38, Fig. 6).

The most parsimonious explanation for these observations, is the recent transfer of one of

the elements (ICE or CP) to a distant bacterial host. We identified the latter element based

on the differences in terms of tri-nucleotide composition between the elements and the

host chromosomes (defined as pvalue in (29)). We then computed for each ICE-CP pair the

difference between the pvalue of the pair ICE-host and that of the pair CP-host (see

Methods). In agreement to our observation that ICEs have broader host ranges, these

differences indicate that ICEs are relatively more distant from the host chromosome for

pairs with high wGRR in distant hosts than for the rest of the pairs (Wilcoxon rank sum test,

p-value<10^{-20}, Fig. 6B, and Fig. S7). The rarity of ICE-CP pairs in closely related hosts, their

abundance in distant hosts, and the identification that ICEs are the most compositionally

atypical relative to the host in the latter, suggest that successful transfer of CPs to distant

hosts is favored when they integrate the chromosome and become ICEs.

Discussion

In this study, we quantified the differences between ICEs and CPs to evaluate the claims that they are essentially equivalent MGEs (13, 14, 27). We found that numerous CPs have integrases (although these may serve for dimer resolution and not integration (30)), numerous ICEs encode replication and partition functions, the elements often cluster them together, and they exchange genetic information. Furthermore, relaxases – present in both ICEs and CPs – have been shown to act as integrases or replication initiators (31). Hence, ICEs and CPs constitute closely related elements sharing many functions beyond those related to conjugation. Yet, there are also some clear differences between them (Fig. 7). First, genes encoding plasmid replicases and partition systems are more frequent in plasmids, and tyrosine and serine recombinases are more frequent in ICEs. Interestingly, we could not attribute incompatibility groups to ICEs, suggesting that the replication module is rarely exchanged between ICEs and CPs. Second, the frequency of certain accessory traits is different: plasmids are more likely to encode antibiotic resistance genes whereas ICEs encode more metabolism-related genes, even if this could result from biases in the database towards nosocomial pathogens. Finally, the %GC relative to the host, the number of repeats, the patterns of gene variation and exchange, and the host range are quantitatively different in the two types of elements. After integrating all this information, we propose that in spite of their similarities each type has specific advantages.

Even if there are some known families of large (>200kb) ICEs (32, 33), most of these elements in our dataset have a narrower variation in size than CPs. This suggests that CPs are more flexible than ICEs in terms of the amount of genetic information they can carry and in their ability to accommodate novel information. CPs also exchange genes more frequently. Mechanistically, the rate of recombination between plasmids may be higher because they encode more repeats, integrons, and transposable elements. Plasmid copy number, when high, may also contribute to increase recombination rates. Interestingly, recombination mediated by transposable elements has been shown to be drive the evolution of certain plasmids(34, 35), and to accelerate the reduction of plasmid cost thus stabilizing the element after horizontal transfer (36). The restrictions in size variation of ICEs are probably not due to the mechanism of integration or excision because such reactions

occur between very distant recombination sites (37). Instead, very large ICEs may disrupt chromosome organization by affecting the distribution of motifs, changing chromosome folding domains, or unbalancing the sizes of replichores (38). Repeat-mediated recombination leads to replicon rearrangements, and may lead to stronger counter-selection of DNA repeats in ICEs than in CPs, further restricting their size variation and their flux of gene exchange. Interestingly, the size of plasmids varies much more steeply with genome size than the size of ICEs, suggesting that CPs may play a particularly important role in the evolution of large bacterial genomes of Proteobacteria, which have higher rates of genetic exchanges (39), and often contain mega-plasmids (40).

Some plasmids are known to be broad-host range and adapt to novel hosts, especially if they carry adaptive traits that compensate for the initially poor intrinsic persistence of the element (41, 42). However, within the large phylogenetic span considered in this work, MPF_T ICEs have broader host ranges. Actually, the first known ICE, Tn916 (not MPF_T, thus not included in this study), became notorious due to its ability to spread antibiotic resistance between distant phyla (43). We thus propose that ICEs are the ones compositionally atypical in the pairs of very similar elements ICE-CPs present in distant hosts, because CPs conjugating to distantly related bacteria have a higher probability of being maintained in the novel lineage if they become ICEs.

Other traits may provide advantages to ICEs or CPs. The ability of plasmids to modify their copy number may accelerate adaptive evolutionary processes, such as the acquisition of antibiotic resistance (44). On the other hand, ICEs might be more stably maintained in lineages because they replicate within the chromosome. Finally, the carriage of ICEs and CPs may have different costs. The cost of plasmids has been extensively studied and is strongly dependent on the traits they encode (45). Much less is known about the cost of ICEs; several reports suggest that they lead to low fitness costs when conjugation is not expressed, but their fitness cost varies much more between elements during transfer(12). Direct comparisons of the cost of carriage of ICE and CPs carrying similar traits are unavailable. Further work will be needed to test these hypotheses.

Occasional transfers between CPs and ICEs allow them to access the other elements' gene pool. These events may create elements with traits of ICEs and of CPs, as observed in more

than a third of all conjugative elements, and lead to their clustering in the wGRR group 5.

Additionally, they facilitate the interconversion of one type of element into the other.

Many elements are mobilizable but not able to conjugate independently (40, 46). These

elements often encode a relaxase that recognizes the element's origin of transfer and is able

to interact with a T4SS from an autonomously conjugative element to transfer to other cells.

Many of the disadvantages of conjugative plasmids and ICEs are similar to those of

mobilizable plasmids and integrative mobilizable elements, whether they encode a relaxase

or not. Notably, the former must be replicated in the extrachromosomal state, and the

latter integrate the genome where they must not disrupt genome organization. Patterns

observed in conjugative elements are thus likely to be applicable to mobilizable ones.

These results may also be relevant to understand lysogeny by temperate phages. The vast

majority of known prophages are integrated in the chromosome, but some replicate like

plasmids (47, 48). Considering that prophages share some of the constraints of conjugative

elements, they are likely to be under similar trade-offs. However, phages are under

additional constraints. Notably, their genome size is much less variable than that of

conjugative elements, because it must be packaged into the virion (49), and this may render

the extrachromosomal prophages less advantageous in terms of accumulating novel genes.

This could explain why most prophages are integrative whereas conjugative systems are

more evenly split between integrative and extrachromosomal elements.

Material and Methods

Data. Conjugative systems of type T (MPF$_T$) were searched in the set of complete bacterial

genomes from NCBI RefSeq (http://ftp.ncbi.nih.gov/genomes/refseq/bacteria/, last

accessed in November 2016). We analyzed 5562 complete genomes from 2268 species,

including 4345 plasmids and 6001 chromosomes. The classification of the replicon in

plasmid or chromosome was taken from the information available in the GenBank file. Our

method to delimit ICEs is based on comparative genomics of closely related strains. Hence,

we restricted our search for conjugative systems to the species for which we had at least

five genomes completely sequenced (164 species, 2990 genomes).

Detection of conjugative systems and delimitation of ICEs. Conjugative systems were

detected using the CONJscan module of MacSyFinder (50), with protein profiles and

definitions of the MPF type T, published previously (51). ICEs were delimited with a

comparative genomics method, as developed in a previous work (27).

Weighted gene repertoire relatedness. This score represents the number of homologous

proteins between two elements, weighted by their sequence identity, as described in (27).

The formula is:

$$wGRR_{A,B} = \sum_i \frac{id(A_i, B_i)}{min(A, B)} if\, \overset{\leftrightarrow}{evalue}(A_i, B_i) < 10^{-5}$$

Where (A_i, B_i) is the ith pair of homologous protein between element A and element B,

id(A$_i$,B$_i$) is the sequence identity of their alignment, min(A,B) is the number of proteins of

the element with fewest proteins (A or B). The sequence identity was computed with blastp

v.2.2.15 (default parameters)(52) and kept all bi-directional best hits with an e-value lower

than 10^{-5}. The groups were made using the Louvain algorithm (28). We controlled for the

consistency of the heuristic used to assess that the group found are not form a local

optimal. We performed 100 clustering, which led to the same classification in 95% of the

time.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by an European Research Council grant [EVOMOBILOME

n°281605], and a grant from the Agence National de la Recherche [MAGISBAC, ANR-14-

CE10-0007]. Work in FdlC lab was supported by grants BFU2014-55534-C2-1-P and

BFU2014-62190-EXP from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness. We

thank Alan Grossman and Marie Touchon for comments and suggestions, and Aude

Bernheim for providing the phylogenetic tree of proteobacteria. J.C. is a member of the

'Ecole Doctorale Frontière du Vivant (FdV) – Programme Bettencourt'.

References

1. Frost LS, Leplae R, Summers AO, Toussaint A (2005) Mobile genetic elements: the agents of open source evolution. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 3(9):722–32.

2. Ochman H, Lawrence JG, Groisman EA (2000) Lateral gene transfer and the nature of bacterial innovation. *Nature* 405(6784):299–304.

3. Ebersbach G, Gerdes K (2005) Plasmid segregation mechanisms. *Annu Rev Genet* 39:453–79.

4. Summers DK (1991) The kinetics of plasmid loss. *Trends Biotechnol* 9(8):273–278.

5. Kobayashi I (2001) Behavior of restriction-modification systems as selfish mobile elements and their impact on genome evolution. *Nucleic Acids Res* 29(18):3742–3756.

6. Dobrindt U, Hochhut B, Hentschel U, Hacker J (2004) Genomic islands in pathogenic and environmental microorganisms. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2(5):414–24.

7. Guglielmini J, Quintais L, Garcillán-Barcia MP, de la Cruz F, Rocha EPC (2011) The repertoire of ICE in prokaryotes underscores the unity, diversity, and ubiquity of conjugation. *PLoS Genet* 7(8):e1002222.

8. Canchaya C, Proux C, Fournous G, Bruttin A, Brussow H (2003) Prophage Genomics. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 67(2):238–276.

9. Johnson CM, Grossman AD (2015) Integrative and Conjugative Elements (ICEs): What They Do and How They Work. *Annu Rev Genet* 49(1):annurev-genet-112414-055018.

10. Bellanger X, Payot S, Leblond-bourget N, Guédon G (2014) Conjugative and mobilizable genomic islands in bacteria: evolution and diversity. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 38:720–760.

11. Carraro N, Burrus V (2014) Biology of Three ICE Families: SXT/R391, ICEBs1, and ICESt1/ICESt3. *Microbiol Spectr* 2(6):1–20.

12. Delavat F, Miyazaki R, Carraro N, Pradervand N, van der Meer JR (2017) The hidden
life of integrative and conjugative elements. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 41(4):512–537.

13. Carraro N, Burrus V (2015) The dualistic nature of integrative and conjugative
elements. *Mob Genet Elements* 5(6):98–102.

14. Lee C a, Babic A, Grossman AD (2010) Autonomous plasmid-like replication of a
conjugative transposon. *Mol Microbiol* 75(2):268–79.

15. Carraro N, Poulin D, Burrus V (2015) Replication and Active Partition of Integrative
and Conjugative Elements (ICEs) of the SXT/R391 Family: The Line between ICEs and
Conjugative Plasmids Is Getting Thinner. *PLOS Genet* 11(6):e1005298.

16. Nunes-Düby SE, Kwon HJ, Tirumalai RS, Ellenberger T, Landy a (1998) Similarities and
differences among 105 members of the Int family of site-specific recombinases.
Nucleic Acids Res 26(2):391–406.

17. Guglielmini J, de la Cruz F, Rocha EPC (2013) Evolution of conjugation and type IV
secretion systems. *Mol Biol Evol* 30(2):315–31.

18. Guiney DG (1982) Host range of conjugation and replication functions of the
Escherichia coli sex plasmid Flac. Comparison with the broad host-range plasmid RK2.
J Mol Biol 162(3):699–703.

19. Zhong Z, Helinski D, Toukdarian A (2005) Plasmid host-range: Restrictions to F
replication in Pseudomonas. *Plasmid* 54(1):48–56.

20. Klümper U, et al. (2015) Broad host range plasmids can invade an unexpectedly
diverse fraction of a soil bacterial community. *ISME J* 9:934–945.

21. Rocha EPC, Danchin A (2002) Base composition bias might result from competition for
metabolic resources. *Trends Genet* 18(6):291–4.

22. Oliveira PH, Touchon M, Cury J, Rocha EPC (2017) The chromosomal organization of
horizontal gene transfer in Bacteria. *Nat Commun* 8(841):1–10.

23. Carraro N, et al. (2016) Plasmid-like replication of a minimal streptococcal integrative

and conjugative element. *Microbiol (United Kingdom)* 162(4):622–632.

24. Francia MV, Clewell DB (2002) Transfer origins in the conjugative Enterococcus
faecalis plasmids pAD1 and pAM373: Identification of the pAD1 nic site, a specific
relaxase and a possible TraG-like protein. *Mol Microbiol* 45(2):375–395.

25. César CE, Machón C, De La Cruz F, Llosa M (2006) A new domain of conjugative
relaxase TrwC responsible for efficient oriT-specific recombination on minimal target
sequences. *Mol Microbiol* 62(4):984–996.

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

27. Cury J, Touchon M, Rocha EPC (2017) Integrative and conjugative elements and their
hosts: composition, distribution and organization. *Nucleic Acids Res* (17):1–14.

28. Blondel VD, Guillaume J-L, Lambiotte R, Lefebvre E (2008) Fast unfolding of
communities in large networks. *J Stat Mech*. doi:10.1088/1742-
5468/2008/10/P10008.

29. Suzuki H, Yano H, Brown CJ, Top EM (2010) Predicting plasmid promiscuity based on
genomic signature. *J Bacteriol* 192(22):6045–55.

30. Carnoy C, Roten C-A (2009) The dif/Xer recombination systems in proteobacteria.
PLoS One 4(9):e6531.

31. Wawrzyniak P, Płucienniczak G, Bartosik D (2017) The Different Faces of Rolling-Circle
Replication and Its Multifunctional Initiator Proteins. *Front Microbiol* 8(November):1–
13.

32. Sullivan JT, Ronson CW (1998) Evolution of rhizobia by acquisition of a 500-kb
symbiosis island that integrates into a phe-tRNA gene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
95(April):5145–5149.

33. Kers JA, et al. (2005) A large, mobile pathogenicity island confers plant pathogenicity
on Streptomyces species. *Mol Microbiol* 55(4):1025–1033.

34. Hall JPJ, Williams D, Paterson S, Harrison E, Brockhurst MA (2017) Positive selection
inhibits gene mobilization and transfer in soil bacterial communities. *Nat Ecol Evol*
1(9):1348–1353.

35. He S, et al. (2016) Mechanisms of Evolution in High-Consequence Drug Resistance.
MBio 7(6):e01987-16.

36. Porse A, Schønning K, Munck C, Sommer MOA (2016) Survival and Evolution of a
Large Multidrug Resistance Plasmid in New Clinical Bacterial Hosts. *Mol Biol Evol*
33(11):2860–2873.

37. Wu LJ, Errington J, Rossignol M, Cornet F, Boccard F (2002) A large dispersed
chromosomal region required for chromosome segregation in sporulating cells of
Bacillus subtilis. *EMBO J* 21(15):4001–11.

38. Touchon M, Rocha EPC (2016) Coevolution of the organization and structure of
prokaryotic genomes. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* 8(1):1–18.

39. Oliveira PH, Touchon M, Rocha EPC (2016) Regulation of genetic flux between
bacteria by restriction-modification systems. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113(20):5658–
63.

40. Smillie C, Garcillán-Barcia MP, Francia MV, Rocha EPC, de la Cruz F (2010) Mobility of
plasmids. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 74(3):434–52.

41. De Gelder L, Williams JJ, Ponciano JM, Sota M, Top EM (2008) Adaptive plasmid
evolution results in host-range expansion of a broad-host-range plasmid. *Genetics*
178(4):2179–2190.

42. Loftie-Eaton W, et al. (2017) Compensatory mutations improve general
permissiveness to antibiotic resistance plasmids. *Nat Ecol Evol* 1:1354–1363.

43. Clewell DB, Flannagan SE, Jaworski DD (1995) Unconstrained bacterial promiscuity:
the Tn916–Tn1545 family of conjugative transposons. *Trends Microbiol* 3(6):229–236.

44. San Millan A, Escudero JA, Gifford DR, Mazel D, Maclean RC (2016) Multicopy

plasmids potentiate the evolution of antibiotic resistance in bacteria. *Nat Ecol Evol*
1(10):1–8.

45.   San Millan A, MacLean RC (2017) Fitness Costs of Plasmids: a Limit to Plasmid
Transmission. *Microbiol Spectr* 5(5):1–12.

46.   Guédon G, Libante V, Coluzzi C, Payot S, Leblond-Bourget N (2017) The obscure world
of integrative and mobilizable elements, highly widespread elements that pirate
bacterial conjugative systems. *Genes (Basel)* 8(11). doi:10.3390/genes8110337.

47.   Ravin N V. (2011) N15: The linear phage-plasmid. *Plasmid* 65(2):102–109.

48.   Łobocka MB, et al. (2004) Genome of Bacteriophage P1. *J Bacteriol* 186(21):7032–
7068.

49.   Touchon M, Moura de Sousa JA, Rocha EP (2017) Embracing the enemy: The
diversification of microbial gene repertoires by phage-mediated horizontal gene
transfer. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 38:66–73.

50.   Abby SS, Néron B, Ménager H, Touchon M, Rocha EPC (2014) MacSyFinder: A
Program to Mine Genomes for Molecular Systems with an Application to CRISPR-Cas
Systems. *PLoS One* 9(10):e110726.

51.   Guglielmini J, et al. (2014) Key components of the eight classes of type IV secretion
systems involved in bacterial conjugation or protein secretion. *Nucleic Acids
Res*:gku194-.

52.   Altschul SF, et al. (1997) Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: A new generation of protein
database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Res* 25(17):3389–3402.

53.   Oliveira PH, Touchon M, Rocha EPC (2014) The interplay of restriction-modification
systems with mobile genetic elements and their prokaryotic hosts. *Nucleic Acids Res*
42(21):1–14.

54.   Touchon M, et al. (2014) The Genomic Diversification of the Whole Acinetobacter
Genus: Origins, Mechanisms, and Consequences. *Genome Biol Evol* 6(10):2866–2882.

55. Gibson MK, Forsberg KJ, Dantas G (2014) Improved annotation of antibiotic resistance
determinants reveals microbial resistomes cluster by ecology. *ISME J* 9(1):207–216.

56. Huerta-Cepas J, et al. (2016) eggNOG 4.5: a hierarchical orthology framework with
improved functional annotations for eukaryotic, prokaryotic and viral sequences.
Nucleic Acids Res 44(D1):D286-93.

57. Eddy SR (2011) Accelerated Profile HMM Searches. *PLoS Comput Biol* 7(10):e1002195.

58. Cury J, Jové T, Touchon M, Néron B, Rocha EP (2016) Identification and analysis of
integrons and cassette arrays in bacterial genomes. *Nucleic Acids Res* 44(10):4539–50.

59. Achaz G, Boyer F, Rocha EPC, Viari A, Coissac E (2007) Repseek, a tool to retrieve
approximate repeats from large DNA sequences. *Bioinformatics* 23(1):119–121.

60. Katoh K, Standley DM (2013) MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
Improvements in performance and usability. *Mol Biol Evol* 30(4):772–780.

61. Criscuolo A, Gribaldo S (2010) BMGE (Block Mapping and Gathering with Entropy): a
new software for selection of phylogenetic informative regions from multiple
sequence alignments. *BMC Evol Biol* 10:210.

62. Filipski A, Murillo O, Freydenzon A, Tamura K, Kumar S (2014) Prospects for building
large timetrees using molecular data with incomplete gene coverage among species.
Mol Biol Evol 31(9):2542–2550.

63. Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP (2009) Fasttree: Computing large minimum evolution
trees with profiles instead of a distance matrix. *Mol Biol Evol* 26(7):1641–1650.

64. Suzuki H, Sota M, Brown CJ, Top EM (2008) Using Mahalanobis distance to compare
genomic signatures between bacterial plasmids and chromosomes. *Nucleic Acids Res*
36(22):e147.

65. Carattoli A, et al. (2014) In Silico detection and typing of plasmids using plasmidfinder
and plasmid multilocus sequence typing. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 58(7):3895–
3903.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1: Comparison between 136 CPs (blue) and 151 ICEs (yellow) in composition and sizes. **A**. CPs are AT richer than ICEs relative to their hosts (Wilcoxon rank sum test, p-value$<10^{-3}$). **B**. ICEs and CPs have different distributions of size (same test, p-value<0.05). Median sizes: ICEs (52.5 kb) > CPs (46.1 kb). Averages: ICEs (59 kb) < CPs (74.6 kb) **C.** Size of the element as a function of the genome size of its host (decreased by the size of the mobile element itself). Shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence interval. The Y-axis is identical to the one in panel B. **D**. Density of repeats is higher in CPs than in ICEs (0.30 vs 0.078 repeats per kb, same test, p-value $< 10^{-10}$).

Fig. 2: Comparisons of the functions carried by ICEs and CPs. **A.** Elements encoding (+) or lacking (-) replication or partition systems ("Rep or Par") or an integrase. **B.** Accessory functions over-represented (yellow) or under-represented (blue) in ICEs relative to CPs. Colored bars: significantly different from zero, p-value < 0.05 Fisher exact test with Bonferroni-Holm correction for multiple tests. Grey bars otherwise.

505   **Fig. 3**: Heatmap of the wGRR scores, ordered after the size of Louvain's group (depicted on
506   the left bar). The top bar represents the proportion of ICEs (yellow) and CPs (blue) for each
507   group. The bottom bar assigns a color corresponding to the host's species or class (γ-
508   proteobacteria in red, β-proteobacteria in green, α-proteobacteria in blue, ε-
509   proteobacteria in orange, Fusobacteria and Acidobacteria in grey).

Fig. 4: Mosaic plot representing the frequency of key functions of conjugative elements in terms of the Louvain's groups (Fig. 3). The width of the bar is proportional to the number of elements in a given Louvain's group (see the number of elements of each group on the top of the bars) and the areas reflect the proportion of the elements with the function. The colors represent the type of function, and their tint represent the part of ICEs (lighter) and CPs (darker).

Fig. 5: 2D histogram of the wGRR score of pairs of conjugative elements as a function of the protein identity of their homologues. **A**. Distribution for the entire dataset. wGRR values are correlated with protein identity of the elements' homologs ($\rho_{\text{ICE-ICE}}$ = 0.90, $\rho_{\text{CP-CP}}$ = 0.83). The black rectangle zooms on a region where the pairs of elements are very different (GRR<30%), yet they encode at least one very similar protein (identity > 80%). The dashed line separates the elements where protein identity is higher than wGRR x 2/3. **B**. Zoom for ICE-ICE comparisons. **C**. ICE-CP comparisons. **D**. CP-CP comparisons.

Fig. 6: wGRR as function of the host phylogenetic distance **A**. 2D histogram of the distribution of the wGRR score as a function of the phylogenetic distance for pairs of CPs (left) and pairs of ICEs (right). The bottom row corresponds to all pairs with distance lower than 10^{-5} (including those in the same host). Elements in the black rectangle are depicted in a phylogenetic tree in Fig. S5. **B**. Proportion of ICEs more distinct in terms of tri-nucleotides from their host than CPs. Bins are larger than in A. to increase the power of the statistical analysis. Color code: ICEs (Red) or CPs (Blue) are more distinct from the host in terms of tri-nucleotide composition than the other element. Grey: not significant (binomial test, p-value $> 10^{-2}$). White: no elements in the bin.

Fig. 7: To integrate or not to integrate? ICEs and CPs have similar conjugative systems but
persist in different ways (resp. integrating the chromosome or replicating independently).
ICEs over-represent integrases, whereas plasmids over-represent replication and partition
functions (although both can have all of these functions). ICEs seem at an advantage when
conjugating to distant hosts, presumably because they integrate the chromosome. On the
other hand, plasmids have broader distribution of size and exchange more genetic
information.
548

 Supplementary Material for the Manuscript :

Host range expansion and genetic plasticity drive the trade-off
between integrative and extrachromosomal mobile genetic elements

Jean Cury, Pedro H. Oliveira, Fernando de la Cruz, Eduardo P.C. Rocha

Material and Methods: Extended version

Data

Conjugative systems of type T (MPF_T) were searched in the set of complete bacterial
genomes from NCBI RefSeq (http://ftp.ncbi.nih.gov/genomes/refseq/bacteria/, last
accessed in November 2016). We analyzed 5562 complete genomes from 2268 species,
including 4345 plasmids and 6001 chromosomes. The classification of the replicon in
plasmid or chromosome was taken from the information available in the GenBank file. Our
method to delimit ICEs is based on comparative genomics of closely related strains. Hence,
we restricted our search for conjugative systems to the species for which we had at least
five genomes completely sequenced (164 species, 2990 genomes).

Detection of conjugative systems and delimitation of ICEs

Conjugative systems were detected using the CONJscan module of MacSyFinder (50), with
protein profiles and definitions of the MPF type T, published previously (51). ICEs were
delimited with the same methodology, as developed in a previous work (27). Briefly, we
identified the core genomes of the species. The region between two consecutive genes of
the core genome defined an interval in each chromosome. We then defined spots as the
sets of intervals in the chromosome flanked by genes of the same two families of the core
genome (22). We then identified the intervals and the spots with conjugative systems. The
information on the sets of gene families of the spots with ICEs (i.e., the spot pan-genome)
was used to delimit the element boundaries (script available at
https://gitlab.pasteur.fr/gem/spot_ICE). This methodology was shown to be accurate at the
gene level (precise nucleotide boundaries are not identifiable by this method, see (27)).

Functional analyses

Partition systems, replication systems, entry-exclusion systems and restriction modification systems were annotated with HMM profiles, as described in our previous work (27, 53). Integrases were annotated with the PFAM profile PF00589 for the Tyrosine recombinases and the combination of PFAM profiles PF00239 and PF07508 for Serine recombinases. DDE Transposases were detected with Macsyfinder (50) with models used previously (54). Antibiotic resistance genes were detected with ResFams profiles (core version v1.1) (55) using the --cut_ga option. We determined the functional categories of genes using their annotation as provided by their best hits to the protein profiles of the EggNOG database for bacteria (version 4.5, bactNOG) (56). Genes not annotated by the EggNOG profiles were classed as "Unknown" and included in the "Poorly characterized" group. The HMM profiles were used to search the genomes with HMMER 3.1b2 (57), and we retrieved the hits with an e-value lower than 10^{-3} and with alignments covering at least 50% of the profile. Integrons were detected using IntegronFinder version 1.5.1 with the --local_max option for higher accuracy (58). Repeats (direct and inverted) were detected with Repseek (version 6.6) (59) using the option -p 0.001 which set the p-value for determining the minimum seed length.

Statistics

We tested the over-representation of a given function or group of functions using Fisher's exact tests on contingency tables. For partition, replication and integration, the contingency table was made by splitting replicons in those encoding or not encoding the function and between ICEs and CPs. The use of presence/absence data instead of the absolute counts was made because the presence of at least one occurrence of a system is sufficient to have the function and because the counts were always low. For the other functions, the contingency table was made by splitting the proteins of the element in those annotated for a given function and the remaining ones. This allowed to take into account the differences in the number of genes between elements. The Fisher-exact tests were considered as significant after sequential Holm-Bonferroni correction, with a family-wise error rate of 5% (the probability of making at least one false rejection in the multiple tests, the type I error). From the contingency table, we computed the relative ratio (or relative risk) of having a

606 given function more often in ICEs than in CPs. The relative ratio is computed as follow:

607 $RR = \frac{ICEwF/N_{ICE}}{CPwF/N_{CP}}$ where *ICEwF* is the number of ICE (or proteins in ICEs) with the given

608 function, and N_{ICE}, the total number of ICE (or proteins in ICEs), and likewise for CP. The

609 term $ICEwF/N_{ICE}$ is an estimation of the probability of an ICE (or a protein in an ICE) to

610 carry a given a function.

Phylogenetic distances

Phylogenetic distances were extract from the Proteobacterial tree of the Core-genome. To

build the tree, we identified the genes present in at least 90% of the 2897 genomes of

Proteobacteria larger than 1 Mb that were available in GenBank RefSeq in November 2016.

A list of orthologs was identified as reciprocal best hits using end-gap free global alignment.

Hits with less than 37% similarity in amino acid sequence and more than 20% difference in

protein length were discarded. We then identified the protein families with relations of

orthology in at least 90% of the genomes. They represent 341 protein families. We made

multiple alignments of each protein family with MAFFT v.7.205 (with default options) (60)

and removed poorly aligned regions with BMGE (with default options) (61). Genes missing in

a genome were replaced by stretches of "–" in each multiple alignment, which has been

shown to have little impact in phylogeny reconstruction (62). The tree of the concatenate

alignment was computed with FastTree version 2.1 under the LG model (63). We chose the

LG model because it was the one that minimized the AIC.

Distance to the host

We used the differences in tri-nucleotide composition to compute the genetic distance

between the mobile element and its host chromosome, as previously proposed (64). The

analysis of ICEs was done by comparing the element with the chromosome after the

removal of its sequence from the latter. Briefly, we computed the trinucleotide relative

abundance ($x_{ijk} \forall i, j, k \in \{A, T, C, G\}$) for the chromosomes (in windows of 5 kb) and for the

conjugative elements (entire replicon), which is given by: $x_{ijk} = f_{ijk}/f_i f_j f_k$, with f the

frequency of a given k-mer in the sequence (29). We first computed the Mahalanobis

distance between each window and the host chromosome as follow:

$$D = \sqrt{(w - h)^T H^{-1}(w - h)}$$

with *w*, the vector of tri-nucleotide abundances (x_{ijk}) in a given window, and *h*, the mean of

the vector of x_{ijk} (*i.e.*, the average tri-nucleotide abundance in the chromosome). *H* is the

covariance matrix of the tri-nucleotide relative abundances. The inverse of the covariance

matrix (H^{-1}) downweights frequent trinucleotides, like the tri-nucleotides corresponding to

start codons, which are common to conjugative elements and chromosome and could bias

the distance. We computed the Mahalanobis distance between conjugative elements and

their hosts' chromosomes (same formula as above, but *w* is now for a conjugative element

instead of a chromosome window). We then computed the probability (p-value) that the

measured distance between a conjugative element and the host's chromosome is the same

as any fragment of the host's chromosome.

We compared ICEs and CPs in relation to their compositional distance to the host. For this,

we made the null hypothesis that the proportion of ICEs having a p-value lower than CPs

follows a binomial distribution whose expected proportion is that of the entire dataset (the

proportion of ICEs having a p-value lower than CP), precisely:

$H_0 = N(pvalue_{ICE} < pvalue_{CP})/N_{Comparisons}$, where $N_{Comparisons}$ is the total number of

ICE-CP pairs, *i.e.* $151 \times 136 = 20536$.

Network analysis of gene repertoire relatedness

We built a network describing the relations of homology between the elements. The nodes

in the network are conjugative elements and they are linked if they share a given relation of

homology. More precisely, the relationship between two elements was quantified with the

weighted Gene Repertoire Relatedness score (wGRR). This score represents the number of

homologous proteins between two elements, weighted by their sequence identity, as

described in (27). The formula is:

$$wGRR_{A,B} = \sum_i \frac{id(A_i, B_i)}{min(A,B)} \overset{\leftrightarrow}{if} evalue(A_i, B_i) < 10^{-5}$$

Where (A_i, B_i) is the *i*[th] pair of homologous protein between element A and element B,

id(A$_i$,B$_i$) is the sequence identity of their alignment, min(A,B) is the number of proteins of

the element with fewest proteins (A or B). The sequence identity was computed with blastp

v.2.2.15 (default parameters)(52) and kept all bi-directional best hits with an e-value lower

than 10^{-5}.

The network was built based on the wGRR matrix. Its representation was made using the

Fruchterman-Reingold force-directed algorithm as implemented in the NetworkX v1.11

python library. The groups were made using the Louvain algorithm (28). We controlled for

the consistency of the heuristic used to assess that the group found are not form a local

optimal. We performed 100 clustering, which led to the same classification in 95% of the

time.

Incompatibility typing

We determined the incompatibility group of replicons using the method of PlasmidFinder

(65). We used BLASTN (52) to search the replicons for sequences matching the set of 116

probes used by PlasmidFinder. We kept the hits with a coverage above 60% and sequence

identity above 80%, as recommended by the authors. Around 3% of the elements had

multiple incompatibility types attributed.

Supplementary Figures

Fig. S1: Distribution of the frequency of plasmids in genomes of a species as function of the HTg50 in the corresponding species (HTg50 values taken from (22)). There is a negative correlation as measured with the Spearman coefficient rho=-0.35; p-value= 0.0016.

Fig. S2: Distribution of inc type among ICE and CP. No ICEs could be typed.

Fig. S3 : Heatmap of the wGRR scores without MPF genes, ordered after the size of Louvain's group
(depicted on the left bar). The top bar represents the proportion of ICEs (yellow) and CPs (blue) for
each group. The bottom bar assigns a color corresponding to the host's species or class (γ-
proteobacteria in red, β-proteobacteria in green, α-proteobacteria in blue, ε-proteobacteria in
orange, Fusobacteria and Acidobacteria in grey).

clustering.

Fig. S4: **Top.** Distribution of the Louvain's group in the new groups formed after removing the MPF genes. Each new group correspond to the first groups, at the exception of group 2. **Bottom.** Mosaic plot representing the frequency of key functions of conjugative elements in terms of the Louvain's groups (Fig. 3). The width of the bar is proportional to the number of elements in a given Louvain's group (see the number of elements of each group on the top of the bars) and the areas reflect the proportion of the elements with the function. The colors represent the type of function, and their tint represent the part of ICEs (lighter) and CPs (darker).

700
701

702
Fig. S5: Taxonomic distribution of each element in the pairs of elements found in the black
rectangle of Fig. 6. The phylogenetic tree of Proteobacteria is depicted on the left, and the
major clades are colored according to taxonomic classes. The single genome in black is an
Acidithiobacillia. On the right, a line links two hosts if they contain two elements with a
wGRR higher than 20% and a phylogenetic distance higher than 0.1. The thickness of the line
is proportional to the wGRR. ICE-ICE relationships are in yellow, CP-CP in blue and ICE-CP in
green.
710

711
Fig. S6: wGRR computed without MPF genes as function of the host phylogenetic distance **A**.
2D histogram of the distribution of the wGRR score computed without the MPF genes as a
function of the phylogenetic distance for pairs of CPs (left) and pairs of ICEs (right). The
bottom row corresponds to all pairs with distance lower than 10^{-5} (including those in the
same host). **B**. Proportion of ICEs more distinct in terms of tri-nucleotides from their host
than CPs. Bins are larger than in A. to increase the power of the statistical analysis. Color
code: ICEs (Red) or CPs (Blue) are more distinct from the host in terms of tri-nucleotide
composition than the other element. Grey: not significant (binomial test, p-value > 10^{-2}).
White: no elements in the bin.
721

Fig. S7: Distribution of the difference in p-values between ICEs and CPs, relative to the regions highlighted in Fig. 6B. The lower the p-value the more distant is the element from its host's chromosome. The rectangle corresponds to the black rectangle in Fig. 6B. There is a significant difference between both distributions (Wilcoxon rank-sum test, p-value<10^{-20}). Outside of the rectangle ICEs and CPs show similar average p-values when compared with their hosts, whereas inside the difference is negative, indicating lower p-values in ICEs.

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary tables can be found at the following address:

https://gitlab.pasteur.fr/gem/ICE_CP

Table 1: List of elements (protein, recombination site) found in conjugative element of type T, with corresponding functional annotation when available.

Table 2: Summary information per element (ICE or CP).

Table 3: list of pairs of elements with corresponding information (e.g. wGRR, phylogenetic distance of the host)

Table 4: Same as Table 3 but wGRR is computed without MPF genes.