Host range and genetic plasticity explain the co-existence of 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 Genomi cs, 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),

Instituto de Biomedicina y Biotecnología de Cantabria, Universidad de Cantabria-CSIC, 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. We observed that

plasmids encode more replicases, partition systems, and antibiotic resistance genes,

whereas ICEs encode more integrases and metabolism-associated genes. ICEs and plasmids

have similar average sizes, but plasmids are much more variable, have more DNA repeats,

and exchange genes more frequently. On the other hand, we found that ICEs are more

frequently transferred between distant taxa. We propose a model where differential

plasticity and transmissibility range explain the co-occurrence of integrative and extra-

chromosomal elements in microbial populations. In particular, the conversion from ICE to

plasmid allows ICE to be more plastic, while the conversion from plasmid to ICE allows the

expansion of the element's host range.

Keywords: Mobile genetic elements, horizontal gene transfer, molecular evolution,

microbial genomics, conjugation

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. The existence of both integrative and extra-chromosomal elements was a fruitful source of controversy in the dawn of molecular biology, eventually leading to the discovery of the molecular mechanisms allowing both states (9, 10). Yet, a complementary question does not seem to have been addressed in the literature: Why are there both types of elements? What are the relative benefits and disadvantages of the integrated and extrachromosomal MGE?

To address these questions, 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 (11–14). Recently, several works suggested that the line separating integrative ICEs and CPs could be thinner than anticipated (15), because some ICEs encode plasmid-associated functions like replication (16) or partition (17), some plasmids encode integrases (18), and ICEs and CPs are intermingled in the phylogenetic tree of conjugative systems (19). 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 depend on 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 (20–22). 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 (19), 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.

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 (23). 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.

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

111 in panel B. **D**. Density of repeats is higher in CPs than in ICEs (0.30 vs 0.078 repeats per kb,

112 same test, p-value $< 10^{-10}$).

114 HGT concentrates in a few hotspots in bacterial chromosomes, presumably to minimize

115 disruption in their organization (24). We used HTg50, a measure of the concentration of

116 HGT in chromosomes that corresponds to the minimal number of spots required to account

117 for 50% of horizontally transferred genes (24), to test if chromosomes with fewer

118 integration hotspots had more plasmids. Indeed, there is a negative association between

119 the number of plasmids, weighted by their size, and the chromosomes' HTg50 (Spearman

120 ρ=-0.35, p-value=0.0016, Fig. S1).

121 We then quantified the differences between ICEs and CPs in terms of functions associated

122 with their biology, with a focus on stabilization functions. Relaxases are part of the rolling

123 circle replication initiator proteins and some have been shown to act as replicases(16, 25) or

124 site-specific recombinases (26, 27). Since all conjugative elements encode a relaxase, by

125 definition, they may also have these functions. In the following, we focused on typical

126 plasmid replication initiator proteins (more than 95% of them are involved in theta-

127 replication, and none is matched by the protein profiles of relaxases), and serine or tyrosine

128 recombinases as integrases. Expectedly, ICEs showed higher frequency of integrases, while

129 CPs had more frequently identifiable partition and replication systems. Some ICEs encode

130 partition systems (11%) and many encode a replicase (40%), while 37% of CPs encode at

131 least one tyrosine or serine recombinase (Fig. 2A). These results further illustrate a

132 continuum between the two types of elements: about half of the elements (40% and 48%,

133 ICEs and CPs, respectively) have functions usually associated with the other type and may

134 (rarely) lack functions typically associated with its own type (Fig. 2B). Interestingly, we

135 observe that ICEs containing replication or partition systems contain more repeats per

136 nucleotide than the others (Wilcoxon rank-sum test, p-value = 0.02). We identified plasmid

137 incompatibility systems of diverse types, whereas ICE could not be typed in the current

138 scheme (Fig. S2).

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.

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 (28). 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 (29). 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 (30), 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.

Fig. 3: Heatmap of the wGRR scores, 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).

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).

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).

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 ($\rho_{ICE-ICE}$ = 0.90, ρ_{CP-CP} = 0.83). The

blue 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.

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 *Escherichia coli* and *Pseudomonas 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 wGRR 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.

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.

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 (31)). 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 compared the genetic organization of ICEs and CPs to evaluate the hypothesis that they are essentially equivalent MGEs (15, 16, 29). We found that numerous CPs have integrases (although these may serve for dimer resolution and not integration (32)), and numerous ICEs encode replication and partition functions. Relaxases – present in both ICEs and CPs – have been shown to act as integrases or replication initiators in certain elements (33), which provides further functional overlapping between the elements. Hence, ICEs and CPs share many functions beyond those related to conjugation. These similarities explain why they can cluster together in terms of gene repertoires, even when excluding conjugation functions.

There are also some clear differences between CPs and ICEs explaining why they can also group separately. First, genes encoding replicases and partition systems are more frequent in plasmids, while tyrosine and serine recombinases are more frequent in ICEs. Interestingly, we could not attribute incompatibility groups to ICEs, suggesting that, either the replication module is rarely exchanged between ICEs and CPs, or it evolves too rapidly. 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. We controlled for taxonomical bias by analyzing ICEs and CPs from the same genera, yet the precise functions we observed are dependent on the dataset which, here, is biased toward nosocomial pathogens. A dataset of bacteria from other environments might present other functional differences in terms of the traits they carry. Finally, the difference in %GC content 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 advantages favored in specific situations. In particular, our results suggest that interconversion between ICEs and CPs gives them access to the higher genetic plasticity of CPs and the broader host range of ICEs (Fig. 7).

Fig. 7: Interconversion between ICEs and CPs allows access to the higher genetic plasticity of
CPs and the broader host range of ICEs. **A**. Many ICEs and CPs encode the functions of the
other element, facilitating CP<->ICE interconversion. **B**. Conjugative transfer to a
taxonomically distant host often precludes stabilization of CPs because they are non-
permissive for plasmid replication. ICEs seem at an advantage when conjugating to distant
hosts, presumably because they integrate the chromosome. **C**. CPs can be salvaged after
transfer in a non-permissive host if they integrate the chromosome (as ICE). We call this
effect host-range expansion. **D**. Mutations and/or gene acquisitions can result in an ICE with
the ability to replicate as a plasmid. CPs have wider distribution of size and exchange more
genetic information, which allows them to acquire novel genetic information at higher rates,
which may eventually be adaptive for their hosts.

Even if there are some known families of large (>200kb) ICEs (34, 35), these elements have a

remarkably narrower variation in size than CPs in our dataset. 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. We also show that CPs exchange genes

more frequently. Mechanistically, this higher rate of gene exchange between CPs may result

from recombination between DNA repeats, gene acquisition by integrons, and genome

rearrangements by transposable elements. We showed that CPs encode all of these in

higher number. Plasmid copy number, when high, may also contribute to increase

recombination rates in plasmids relative to ICEs. Interestingly, recombination mediated by

transposable elements has been shown to drive the evolution of certain plasmids (36, 37)

and to accelerate the reduction of plasmid cost, thus stabilizing the element after horizontal

transfer (38). 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 (39). Instead, very large ICEs may disrupt chromosome organization by

affecting the distribution of motifs, changing chromosome folding domains, or unbalancing

the sizes of replichores (40). 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 (41), and often contain

mega-plasmids (42).

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 (43, 44). However, within the large phylogenetic span considered in this work,

MPF_T ICEs have broader host ranges than CPs. 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 (45). We propose that the plasmid to ICE

conversion can elicit conjugative transmission to otherwise non-permissive hosts. This

results in an effective expansion of the host range of the element (now an ICE). Once

installed in the recipient chromosome, the ICE can incorporate a new replication system, or

freely mutate its own. If it obtains a functional replication system in the new host the

reverse interconversion may occur (Fig. 7). This results in a plasmid with a new host range

and the higher evolvability of an autonomous plasmid.

The similarities between certain groups of ICEs and CPs in terms of gene repertoires, the

integration of CPs as ICEs upon long-range transfer, and the exchange of genetic information

between them are novel evidence for interconversion between the two types of elements.

This had previously been proposed based on the phylogeny of the conjugative system (7).

Inter-conversion of elements and occasional transfers between CPs and ICEs allow them to

access the other elements' gene pool. These events may result in conjugative elements

sharing many traits of the other type of element, as we observed in more than a third of all

conjugative elements, and should produce many genetic similarities between ICEs and CPs.
The latter probably facilitate further interconversions between the elements.

Other traits may provide advantages specifically to either ICEs or CPs. The ability of plasmids
to modify their copy number may accelerate adaptive evolutionary processes, such as the
acquisition of antibiotic resistance (46). 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 (47). 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 (14).
Direct comparisons of the cost of carriage of ICEs and CPs carrying similar traits are
unavailable. Further experimental work will be needed to test these hypotheses.

Many mobile elements are mobilizable but not able to conjugate independently (42, 48).
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. Some other elements only contain an origin of transfer that is recognized by a
relaxase of another element. Many of the disadvantages of CPs 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 (49, 50). 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 (51), 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.

In summary, our results show that there are specific fitness benefits associated with the

divergent lifestyles identified for pairs of highly similar ICEs and CPs. We should emphasize

that our model proposes that plasmid to ICE transition results in broadening the host range

of the element, with a concomitant fitness benefit associated with higher rates of its

horizontal transfer. The ICE to plasmid transition, on the other hand, results in added

versatility of the cargo content (increased size range, etc.), which enhances the evolvability

of the mobile element. These factors may promote or even drive the interconversion

between plasmids and ICEs in an ever-changing environment. The concepts presented in

this work will provide a better understanding of the evolution of bacterial genomes and

their mobile genetic 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 (52), with protein profiles and definitions of the MPF type T, published previously (53). ICEs were delimited with the same methodology, as developed in a previous work (29). 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 (24). 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 (29)).

Functional analyses

Partition systems, replication systems, entry-exclusion systems and restriction modification systems were annotated with HMM profiles, as described in our previous work (29, 54). 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 (52) with models used previously (55). Antibiotic resistance genes were detected with ResFams profiles (core version v1.1) (56)

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) (57). 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 (58), 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 (59). Repeats (direct and inverted) were detected with Repseek (version

6.6) (60) 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

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

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

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

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

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) (61)

and removed poorly aligned regions with BMGE (with default options) (62). 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 (63). The tree of the concatenate

alignment was computed with FastTree version 2.1 under the LG model (64). 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 (65). 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 (31). 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 (29). The formula is:

$$wGRR_{A,B} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{id(A_i, B_i)}{min(A, B)} \overset{\leftrightarrow}{if} evalue(A_i, B_i) < 10^{-5}$$

Where (A_i, B_i) is the ith pair among N pairs of homologous proteins 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)(66) 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 (30). 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

(67). We used BLASTN (66) 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.

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.   Lederberg J (1998) Plasmid (1952 – 1997). *Plasmid* 9:1–9.

10.   Jacob F, Schaeffer P, Wollman EL (1960) Episomic Element in Bacteria. *Symp. Soc.*
Gen. Microbiol, pp 67–91.

11.   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.

12.   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.

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

14. 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.

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

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

17. 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.

18. 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.

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

20. 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.

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

22. 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.

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

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

559   25.   Carraro N, et al. (2016) Plasmid-like replication of a minimal streptococcal integrative
560   and conjugative element. *Microbiol (United Kingdom)* 162(4):622–632.

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

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

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

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

571   30.   Blondel VD, Guillaume J-L, Lambiotte R, Lefebvre E (2008) Fast unfolding of
572   communities in large networks. *J Stat Mech*. doi:10.1088/1742-
573   5468/2008/10/P10008.

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

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

578   33.   Wawrzyniak P, Płucienniczak G, Bartosik D (2017) The Different Faces of Rolling-Circle
579   Replication and Its Multifunctional Initiator Proteins. *Front Microbiol* 8(November):1–
580   13.

581   34.   Sullivan JT, Ronson CW (1998) Evolution of rhizobia by acquisition of a 500-kb
582   symbiosis island that integrates into a phe-tRNA gene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*

95(April):5145–5149.

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

36.   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.

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

38.   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.

39.   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.

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

41.   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.

42.   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.

43.   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.

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

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

46. 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.

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

48. 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.

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

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

51. 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.

52. 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.

53. 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-.

54. 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.

55. Touchon M, et al. (2014) The Genomic Diversification of the Whole Acinetobacter

Genus: Origins, Mechanisms, and Consequences. *Genome Biol Evol* 6(10):2866–2882.

56.   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.

57.   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.

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

59.   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.

60.   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.

61.   Katoh K, Standley DM (2013) MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:

Improvements in performance and usability. *Mol Biol Evol* 30(4):772–780.

62.   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.

63.   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.

64.   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.

65.   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.

66.   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.

67.   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.