Resident microbial communities inhibit growth and antibiotic

resistance evolution of *Escherichia coli* in human gut microbiome

samples

Authors: Michael Baumgartner[1], Florian Bayer[2], Angus Buckling[2], Alex R. Hall[1]

[1]Institute of Integrative Biology, Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zürich,

8092 Zürich, Switzerland

[2]Biosciences, University of Exeter, Penryn, Cornwall TR10 9FE, UK

Correspondence: michael.baumgartner@env.ethz.ch

Keywords: Antibiotic resistance; Microbiome; Horizontal Gene Transfer; Plasmids;

Competition

Abstract

Countering the rise of antibiotic resistant pathogens requires improved understanding of how

resistance emerges and spreads in individual species, which are often embedded in complex

microbial communities such as the human gut microbiome. Interactions with other

microorganisms in such communities might suppress growth and resistance evolution of

individual species (e.g. via resource competition), but could also potentially accelerate

resistance evolution via horizontal transfer of resistance genes. It remains unclear how these

different effects balance out, partly because it is difficult to observe them directly. Here, we

used a gut microcosm approach to quantify the effect of three different human gut microbiome

communities on growth and resistance evolution of a focal strain of *Escherichia coli*. We found

the resident microbial communities not only suppressed growth and colonization by focal *E.*

coli, they also prevented it from evolving antibiotic resistance upon exposure to a beta-lactam

antibiotic. With samples from all three human donors, our focal *E. coli* strain only evolved

antibiotic resistance in the absence of the resident microbial community, even though we found

highly effective resistance plasmids in resident microbial communities. We identified genetic

constraints (lack of transfer genes) that can explain why our focal strain failed to acquire some

of these plasmids, and for other plasmids further experiments revealed physical constraints on

conjugative transfer. This suggests interactions with resident microbiota can inhibit antibiotic

resistance evolution of individual species, and the potential for this to be counterbalanced by

horizontal gene transfer depends on *in situ* transfer dynamics.

Introduction

The over- and inappropriate use of antibiotics has promoted the evolution of resistance in pathogens, resulting in a crisis for human health care [1]. To combat this problem, it is important to understand the underlying mechanisms of how resistance is acquired by bacteria and spreads within bacterial populations and communities [2,3]. A large body of research has used direct observations of resistance evolution in simplified laboratory conditions to understand how antibiotics drive the spread of resistance [4,5]. A key limitation of this approach is that it excludes interactions with other microorganisms, which we can expect to be important for bacteria evolving in natural or clinical settings because they spend most of their time in dense and diverse microbial communities. Interactions in species-rich microbial communities might negatively affect growth of individual species via, for example, competition for resources or niche space [6]. This may in turn inhibit antibiotic resistance evolution of individual species, because reduced population growth should reduce the supply of new genetic variation. On the other hand, interspecific interactions also potentially have positive effects on growth and evolution of individual species via, for example, exchange of genetic material [7] or cross-feeding [9,10] . In support, observations of bacteria isolated from natural and clinical settings indicate genes involved in antibiotic resistance evolution are often horizontally transferable [11,12]. Despite this, direct observations of how these different types of effects balance out are lacking. Consequently, it remains unclear how interactions with species-rich microbial communities affect growth and antibiotic resistance evolution of individual species or strains of bacteria.

The impact of interactions with other microorganisms for antibiotic resistance evolution is likely to be particularly important in the human gastrointestinal tract. This is one of the most

densely inhabited environments in the world, colonized by a rich diversity of bacteria, viruses

and eukarya, which are embedded in a network of biotic interactions [13,14]. Interactions

among microorganisms in the gut microbiome (which we take here to mean the resident

microorganisms, their genes and the local abiotic environment, following Marchesi & Ravel

[15] and Foster et al. [14]) play an important role for human health [16]. For example, the

microbiome protects the host from pathogens by minimizing the potential niche space for an

invading species [17,18]. This suggests competitive interactions with other microorganisms are

common, which we would expect to inhibit population growth of individual taxa and in turn

constrain their ability to evolve antibiotic resistance. On the other hand, some interactions in

the gut may be mutualistic [10] or modify the effects of antibiotics on individual species [19],

potentially resulting in a net positive effect on growth. Moreover, recent metagenomic studies

[20–22] showed the gut microbiome harbours a variety of mobile genetic elements, often

carrying resistance and virulence genes, that are shared by community members. Consistent

with this, horizontal transfer of resistance genes within individual hosts is central to resistance

evolution in several key pathogens found in the gastrointestinal tract [23–25]. This suggests

interactions with other microorganisms in the gut microbiome can also promote growth and

resistance of individual taxa. We aimed to quantify the net effect of interactions with species-

rich communities of other microorganisms, in particular those found in the human

gastrointestinal tract, for growth and resistance evolution of a given strain that newly arrives

in the community.

We approached this question using a human gut microcosm system consisting of anaerobic

fermentors filled with human faecal slurry, including the resident microbial community and

the beta-lactam antibiotic ampicillin, to which bacteria can evolve resistance either

chromosomally or mediated horizontally by picking up a beta-lactamase gene. Because the

microbiota in faecal samples reflects the diversity of the distant human gastrointestinal tract

[26], this approach allowed us to produce microcosms containing species-rich communities

sampled from human gut microbiomes. We aimed to determine how interactions with this

resident microbial community affected growth and resistance evolution of *Escherichia coli*.

We focused on *E. coli* because it is a ubiquitous gut commensal [27] and key opportunistic

pathogen [28] for which antibiotic resistance is an increasing problem [29]. We inoculated each

microcosm with a tagged, focal *E. coli* strain, before tracking its growth and resistance

evolution in the presence and absence of antibiotics. By also including microcosms containing

sterilized versions of the same faecal slurry (where the resident microbial community had been

deactivated), we quantified the net effect of interactions with the resident microbial

community. This approach allowed us to (i) track growth and resistance evolution of the focal

strain in the presence and absence of resident microbial communities sampled from multiple

human donors; (ii) isolate plasmid-carrying *E. coli* strains from the resident microbial

community and identify constraints on horizontal transfer of resistance genes; (iii) characterize

the resident microbial communities and how they changed over time. Our results show the

resident microbial community inhibits both growth and resistance evolution of *E. coli*, despite

the presence of resistance plasmids that can be conjugatively transferred to our focal strain in

certain physical conditions.

Results

Resident microbial communities suppressed growth of a focal E. coli *strain*

We cultivated our focal *E. coli* strain in anaerobic microcosms in the presence and absence of

an antibiotic and three different samples of gastrointestinal microbiomes, each from a different

human donor, for seven days (Sup. Fig 1). Antibiotic treatment (ampicillin) reduced focal strain

abundance (effect of antibiotic in a generalized linear mixed model with zero inflation,

glmmadmb, χ^2 = 14.14, d.f. = 1, P < 0.001; Fig 1). Inclusion of the resident microbial

community from human faecal samples also reduced focal strain abundance over time, which

we inferred by comparing the community treatments (faecal slurries including the resident

microbial community) to the community-free treatments (sterilized versions of the same faecal

slurries; effect of community in glmmadmb, χ^2 = 6.65, d.f. = 1, P = 0.01; Fig 1). The

suppressive effect was strongest for populations exposed to both antibiotics and the resident

microbial community (antibiotic×community interaction in glmmadmb, χ^2 = 5.2, d.f. = 1, P =

0.02; Fig 1), resulting in extinction of the focal strain (below our detection limit) in populations

exposed to the resident microbial communities from human donors 1 and 3, and to very low

abundance with the community from human donor 2 (Fig 1). Average abundance of the focal

strain depended on which human donor sample was used to prepare the microcosms (effect of

human donor in glmmadmb, χ^2 = 12.08, d.f. = 2, P = 0.002). For example, in the absence of

ampicillin only the resident microbial community from human donor 1 was associated with a

rapid decrease of our focal strain under the detection limit. Despite the suppressive effect of all

three resident microbial communities, we found no evidence that abiotic factors in the faecal

slurry were suppressive for the focal strain: there was no significant variation in average focal

strain abundance among the community-free treatments and the control treatment containing

only the basal growth medium that was used to prepare faecal slurries (linear mixed effects

model, glmer: χ^2 = 0.41, d.f. = 3, P = 0.94). In summary, the resident microbial communities

sampled from three human donors each suppressed growth of a focal *E. coli* strain growing in

anaerobic fermentors filled with faecal slurry, and this effect was amplified by adding

antibiotics.

Stable total bacterial abundance but variable community composition over time

We used flow cytometry to estimate total bacterial abundance in microcosms containing

resident microbial communities, where we observed suppression of the focal strain above. In

antibiotic-free microcosms, total bacterial abundance was approximately stable over time ($>10^9$

cells/ml; Fig 2), and was higher on average than in microcosms exposed to antibiotics (effect

of antibiotic in a linear mixed effects model, lmm: $\chi^2 = 10.37$, d.f. = 1, $P = 0.001$). However,

the suppressive effect of the antibiotic varied over time (antibiotic×time interaction in lmm: χ^2

$= 101.81$, d.f. = 7, $P < 0.001$), being strongest at the beginning of the experiment. The effect

of the antibiotic also varied across communities from different human donors (antibiotic×donor

interaction in lmm: $\chi^2 = 79.30$, d.f. = 2, $P < 0.001$), with those from human donors 1 and 2

showing a stronger recovery after the first application of ampicillin (which resulted in a drop

in abundance after 24h) than the community from human donor 3. These results show our

experimental set-up sustained high numbers of microorganisms in the community treatments

over time in both the presence and absence of antibiotics.

To investigate the community composition in these microcosms, we used amplicon sequencing

of the variable regions 3 and 4 of the 16s rRNA gene. This revealed similar levels of within-

sample diversity (Shannon's alpha diversity; Sup. Fig 2) in microbiome samples from the three

human donors at the start of the experiment. Within-sample diversity then decreased slightly

over the first 24h of the experiment, and significantly between 24h and 168h (effect of time in

a linear mixed effects model including data from 24h and 168h, lme: $F_{1, 14} = 481.43$, $P < 0.001$).

This applied across the three human donors (effect of human donor, lme: $F_{2, 15} = 2.07$, $P =$

0.16), which also showed similar shifts in taxonomic composition over time (Fig 3).

Communities at 0h were dominated by the families *Lachnospiraceae* and *Ruminococcaceae*,

plus *Prevotellaceae* for human donor 3. Over time these groups became less abundant relative

to *Enterobacteriaceae* and *Bacteroidaceae* (note the focal strain also contributes to the total

abundance of *Enterobacteriaceae* in some microcosms, although our analysis of total bacterial abundance above indicates the focal strain was always in the minority compared to other *Enterobacteriaceae*, ranging between 0% and ~30% depending on the treatment group). Compared to changes over time, ampicillin had a weak effect on within-sample diversity (effect of antibiotic: $F_{1,\,14} = 11.37$, $P = 0.006$). This interpretation was supported by an alternative analysis (Principal Coordinate Analysis; Sup. Fig 3) based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities. Thus, despite approximately stable total abundance, we saw changes in community composition over time that were more pronounced than differences among communities from different human donors or antibiotic treatments.

Antibiotic resistance evolved only in the absence of resident microbial communities

We screened for the emergence of antibiotic-resistant variants of the focal strain (that had acquired resistance to ampicillin) after every growth cycle by plating each population onto antibiotic-selective plates (8 μg/ml ampicillin; approximating the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of the focal strain). We never observed resistant variants of the focal strain in any of the community treatments (populations exposed to the resident microbial communities from human microbiome samples). By contrast, in community-free treatments (basal growth medium and sterilized human faecal slurries) resistant variants appeared toward the end of the experiment at 120h (slurry from human donor 1) and 144h (basal growth medium and slurry from human donor 3), although not in sterilized samples from human donor 2 (Fig 1). Thus, the resident microbial community from human microbiome samples suppressed antibiotic resistance evolution in our focal strain.

To investigate genetic mechanisms associated with resistance evolution and general adaptation

to our experimental conditions, we performed whole-genome sequencing for two sets of focal

strain isolates from the final time point: 8 ampicillin-resistant colony isolates from ampicillin

plates (one from each of the eight populations where we observed the emergence of antibiotic

resistance during the experiment) and 33 randomly selected colony isolates from ampicillin-

free plates (each from a different population and across all treatments). In the antibiotic-

resistant isolates, all SNPs and the deletion we found (Table 1) were in genes related to

membranes (*ompR, ftsI, opgB*), general stress response (*rpoC, relA*) or transcription regulation

(*rpoD*). Two genes were mutated independently in multiple colony isolates: *rpoC* and *rpoD*.

We also detected an insertion sequence (IS) movement between *perR* and *insN* in two colony

isolates. Of genes where we detected mutations in a single colony isolate, *ftsI* [30], *relA* [31]

and *ompR* [32] have each been previously annotated as being involved in resistance to beta-

lactam antibiotics. Consistent with a role in ampicillin resistance, *ompR* was also mutated in

three randomly selected colony isolates, all from populations that had been exposed to

ampicillin during the experiment (Sup. Table 1). We found six other genes mutated in parallel

in between 2 and 5 randomly selected colony isolates (Sup. Table 1). Five of these were

mutated in isolates from both antibiotic and antibiotic-free treatments. This included *insN*

(involved in transposition) and *gtrS* (involved in aerobic respiration), both mutated in five

isolates. Across the two sets of colony isolates (randomly selected and antibiotic-resistant),

three other loci were mutated in both sets. These were *rpoD* (only in isolates that had been

exposed to antibiotics), *opgB* and *yaiO* (both in isolates from antibiotic and antibiotic-free

treatments). In summary, we found some parallel genetic changes specific to antibiotic

treatments and consistent with known resistance mechanisms, plus other genetic changes that

occurred across antibiotic and antibiotic-free treatments and are therefore more likely involved

in general adaptation.

Resistance plasmids in resident E. coli *and constraints on their transfer*

We next sought to explain why we never observed antibiotic resistance evolution of the focal

strain in the presence of resident microbial communities, which we had expected to harbour

beneficial resistance genes [21,22,33–35]. We hypothesized this could have been due to a lack

of horizontally transferable resistance genes in the resident microbial communities. However,

we detected ampicillin resistant *E. coli* in the resident microbial communities from human

donors 1 and 3 (by selective plating), and after sequencing their genomes we identified several

antibiotic resistance genes that were associated with plasmid genes in these isolates (Fig 4;

Sup. Table 2). In the isolates from human donor 1, the plasmid formed one large contig with

three known resistance genes (Fig 4; Sup. Table 2), including the one conferring resistance to

beta-lactam antibiotics. We also identified two IncF replicons on this plasmid and a complete

set of *tra* genes, which are involved in conjugative plasmid transfer. For genome assemblies

from isolates of human donor 3, we also found the plasmid replicon and resistance genes on

the same contig in one out of six sequenced isolates. The other five genome assemblies

contained the same resistance genes and replicon across multiple smaller contigs (Sup. Table

2). Mapping the corresponding sequencing reads to the single contig found in one isolate

revealed complete coverage in all five cases, consistent with the putative plasmid having the

same genomic structure across each of the isolates. This putative plasmid from human donor 3

also carried multiple resistance genes, including beta-lactamases, and an IncQ replicon, which

is a part of the *repA* gene [36], but we detected no *tra* genes (Fig 4; Sup. Table 2).

We hypothesized that the lack of plasmid-driven resistance evolution in our focal strain might

have been caused by constraints on conjugative transfer that made these plasmids inaccessible.

Using a conjugative mating assay on agar, we never found transconjugants of our focal strain

when it was mixed with a plasmid-carrying isolate from human donor 3. This is consistent with

the lack of *tra* genes on this plasmid and suggests it could not be transferred into our focal

strain by conjugation in the absence of other drivers of horizontal gene transfer (e.g. phages or

other plasmids). This is also consistent with past work suggesting IncQ plasmids are

mobilizable rather than conjugative [37,38], and that we did not detect any other plasmid

replicons in the same isolates that might have belonged to helper plasmids that could mobilize

the IncQ plasmid. However, for the plasmid from human donor 1 we found transconjugants of

our focal strain at the end of the mating assay, which we confirmed by colony PCR (Sup. Fig

4). This suggests this plasmid was conjugative and could be transferred to our focal strain,

consistent with the presence of *tra* genes on this plasmid (Fig 4; Sup. Table 2).

Given that the resistance plasmid from human donor 1 was transferable into our focal strain,

why did it not spread in the main experiment above? We hypothesized this could result from

plasmid-borne resistance being less beneficial than resistance acquired by chromosomal

mutation (as we observed in the main experiment). We would expect a net benefit of resistance

to result in increased population growth at the antibiotic concentration applied during the

experiment (7.2 μg/ml). We found acquisition of the plasmid conferred a much larger increase

in population growth across all non-zero concentrations than that observed for evolved colony

isolates that had evolved resistance via chromosomal mutation during the main experiment

(Fig 5A). The minimal inhibitory concentration for evolved isolates with chromosome-borne

resistance was 2-4 times higher than for the ancestral focal strain, whereas the MIC of the

transconjugant focal strain (with the plasmid from human donor 1) was higher than the highest

concentration we tested (Fig 5A). The transconjugant also did not show reduced growth in the

absence of antibiotics (at 0 μg/ml in Fig 5A), indicating the large increase in resistance was not

offset by large fitness costs. This suggests resistance conferred by the plasmid from human

donor 1 has a strong benefit compared to chromosomally acquired resistance. Therefore the

lack of plasmid spread in the main experiment cannot be attributed to a weak benefit compared

to chromosomal resistance.

Another possible explanation for the lack of transfer of the resistance plasmid from human

donor 1 in the main experiment is that conjugative transfer of this plasmid might be specific to

particular environmental conditions. This has been observed for other plasmids across various

experimental abiotic conditions [39,40]. We tested this by carrying out mating assays as above,

but in a range of different experimental conditions. We detected transconjugants that had

acquired the plasmid at a final frequency of around 0.2% (as a fraction of the total recipient

population) after mixing the plasmid-carrying isolate from human donor 1 and the focal strain

on an agar surface, but we did not find any transconjugants after doing the same experiment in

three different types of liquid growth medium (lysogeny broth (LB), anaerobic LB, and

anaerobic community-free faecal slurry as in the main experiment; Fig 5B). This shows transfer

of the conjugative plasmid we isolated from human donor 1 requires particular abiotic

conditions, which may explain why our focal strain failed to evolve resistance via horizontal

gene transfer in the presence of resident microbial communities.

Discussion

We found resistance via chromosomal mutation to an important class of antibiotics (beta-

lactams) evolved in a focal *E. coli* strain in our experiment only in the absence of resident

microbial communities sampled from healthy human volunteers. The suppressive effect of

these resident microbial communities was strong enough that the focal *E. coli* strain was driven

towards extinction (below our detection limit) when it was exposed to both antibiotics and the

community simultaneously. Consequently, the net effect of the resident microbial communities

here was to confer a form of colonization resistance against a non-resident strain, and to prevent

that strain from evolving antibiotic resistance. Our analysis of resident *E. coli* isolates (not the

focal strain) from the microbial communities showed this occurred despite the presence of

beneficial, horizontally transferable plasmids with the potential to confer resistance in our focal

strain. Genomic analyses and conjugation experiments with these plasmids showed the *in situ*

transfer dynamics depend critically on genetic (the presence of genes encoding the machinery

for conjugative transfer) and abiotic (physical structure of the environment) factors. This is

important because ultimately it is the *in situ* transfer dynamics that will determine whether or

not horizontal transfer of beneficial resistance genes is sufficient to counteract the growth-

suppressive effects of interactions with the community and confer a net benefit to invading

lineages.

The first key implication of our work is that as well as suppressing growth and colonization by

invading strains [18,41], the gastrointestinal microbiota can inhibit antibiotic resistance

evolution. There are several possible ecological mechanisms by which the microbiota may

suppress growth of invading lineages [42], such as niche and nutrient competition [43], direct

killing via bacteriocins [17,44], phage production [45] or by changing the concentration of

compounds such as primary and secondary bile acids [46,47]. It was not our aim to pull apart

the mechanisms by which bacteria in the microbiota compete with or suppress *E. coli* (studied

in more detail elsewhere; [44,48]), although supernatant experiments revealed no evidence of

direct inhibition via phages (see Methods). Crucially, no matter how interactions with the

microbiota suppress growth of an invading lineage, we expect the reduced population size,

growth and replication to in turn reduce the supply of new genetic variation. Our experiment

showed that this can be strong enough to prevent antibiotic resistance evolution. By contrast,

in the absence of the resident microbiota, resistance evolved in eight replicate populations. This

is consistent with *in vitro* work with malaria parasites showing competition between two

species under resource limitation impeded drug resistance evolution [49] and recent studies

with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* showing that a eukaryotic predator [50] or a bacteriophage [51]

can suppress the emergence of antibiotic resistance. Thus, suppression of an invading lineage

via interactions with resident microbiota may frequently have a knock-on effect on resistance

evolution.

A second key implication of our data concerns the genetic and environmental constraints on

horizontal gene transfer that determine whether or not the growth-suppressive effects of the

microbiota are counter-balanced by horizontal transfer of beneficial genes. We found the

unavailability of one putative plasmid to the invading focal strain was associated with a lack

of known conjugative transfer machinery. This plasmid belonged to the IncQ group, which is

considered mobilizable but not conjugative [37]. The other plasmid we isolated was

conjugative, but transfer depended on the abiotic conditions. This suggests the potential for

plasmid transfer to allow invading lineages to overcome the suppressive effects of the

microbiota depends critically on whether they are conjugative (which can be predicted from

sequence data) and on the sensitivity of conjugative transfer to local physical conditions (which

is harder to predict from sequence data). Consistent with this, previous research has shown

conjugative transfer in *E. coli* and other species is sensitive to the physical experimental

conditions [40,52]. Furthermore, mating pair formation machinery, usually encoded by the

plasmid, in some cases promotes biofilm formation, which can in turn promote the spread of

plasmids [53]. This raises the question of whether some plasmids have evolved to manipulate

the physical structure of bacterial populations to promote transfer and overcome the otherwise

suppressive effect of interactions with plasmid-free cells. Plasmids are clearly sometimes

transferred *in vivo*, as has been observed in animal models [54,55] and human gut microbiomes

[33,34,56]. In line with plasmids being key vectors of beta-lactamases [57], the conjugative

plasmid we identified was highly effective in terms of resistance. This suggests plasmid-borne

resistance will be under strong positive selection once established and can spread rapidly via

clonal expansion. However, our experiment showed the initial horizontal transfer required for

such spread is sensitive to genetic and abiotic constraints.

Our approach allowed us to isolate the effect of interactions between diverse microbial

communities and a focal *E. coli* strain. Our amplicon sequence data showed the communities

had a representative taxonomic composition for healthy human donors. There were still diverse

communities present at the end of the seven-day experiment, albeit with a change in the relative

abundance of different taxa. The observed rise of *Enterobacteriaceae* and *Bacteroidaceae* has

been seen in other experiments with gastrointestinal communities (e.g. [58]) and might be

explained by the nutrient content of the medium, micromolar oxygen levels or such *in vitro*

systems favouring faster population growth [59]. More importantly, the shift in community

composition over the seven-day experiment does not explain the observed suppressive effect

of the communities on the focal strain, because this was already visible after one day. Thus,

although our experimental system likely differs from the gastrointestinal tracts these bacteria

were isolated from in ways that affect community composition, cultivating them *in vitro*

allowed us to quantify the effect of species-rich communities sampled from gastrointestinal

tracts on resistance evolution, and we observed a consistent effect across the time series for

each donor. A key challenge for future work will be to determine how such effects are modified

in vivo by local spatial structure [60] and immune responses [61]. Indeed, interactions mediated

via the host immune system are another possible mechanism of colonization resistance [62–

64]. We suspect real progress will require a combination of animal models (direct observations

in vivo, but non-human microbiomes [24]), comparative analysis of human microbiota and

infection outcomes (e.g. [65]), and further work with systems such as ours measuring the

effects of human microbiota directly in simplified conditions.

In conclusion, we showed species-rich microbial communities sampled from human

gastrointestinal tracts can suppress growth and resistance evolution of an invading lineage.

Given the variety and likely common occurrence of mechanisms that can generate such

suppression of invaders (e.g. resource competition), these types of effects are likely common

in species-rich communities such as the mammalian gastrointestinal tract. Our other data

showed, whether or not these suppressive effects are counter-balanced by beneficial horizontal

gene transfer, depends on genetic and environmental constraints that can impede the spread of

resistance plasmids. This has important implications for the prediction of resistance evolution

from genetic and metagenomics data, such as those widely collected through surveillance

efforts [66,67]: identifying mobile resistance genes in a diverse community is not enough to

predict resistance evolution, requiring in addition information about genetic and environmental

constraints on *in situ* transfer dynamics.

Material and Methods

Bacterial strains

We used *Escherichia coli* K12 MG1655 carrying a Streptomycin resistance mutation (*rpsL*

K43R) as the focal strain. Two days prior to the experiment we streaked the focal strain on LB-

agar (Sigma-Aldrich, Buchs, Switzerland) and incubated overnight at 37 °C. To incubate the

focal strain cultures anaerobically prior to the microcosm experiment, we prepared 42 Hungate

tubes (VWR, Schlieren, Switzerland) with LB (Sigma-Aldrich), which was supplemented with

0.5 g/l L-Cysteine and 0.001 g/l Resazurin, flushed the headspace with nitrogen, sealed the

tubes with a rubber stopper and autoclaved them. One day before the experiment, we randomly

picked 42 colonies and inoculated them in the 42 Hungate tubes containing anaerobic LB, and

incubated at 37 °C overnight with 220 rpm shaking. We then used these 42 independent

cultures of the focal strain to inoculate the main experiment described below.

Human microbiome samples

We used three stool samples from anonymous, consenting human donors. Participants received

an information sheet and a consent form with the sampling kit. The consent form stated that by

donating a sample they consent to taking part in the study; no other written or oral consent

form was collected because of the fully anonymized sampling protocol. Inclusion criteria were:

older than 18 years, not obese, not recovering from surgery and no antibiotics in the last six

months. The sampling protocol was approved by the ETHZ Ethics Commission (EK 2016-N-

55). All samples were collected at the Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH

Zürich on the 15th of May 2018. Each sample was collected in a 500 ml plastic specimen

container (Sigma-Aldrich) and kept anaerobic using one AnaeroGen anaerobic sachet (Thermo

Scientific, Basel, Switzerland). The three samples used for the experiment were randomly

selected from a larger number of donated samples. We collected the samples in the morning

before the experiment and kept them for maximum one hour before processing. To prepare

faecal slurry from each sample, we re-suspended 20 g of sample in 200 ml anaerobic peptone

wash (1 g/l peptone, 0.5 g/l L-Cysteine, 0.5 g/l bile salts and 0.001 g/l Resazurin; Sigma-

Aldrich) to prepare a 10% (w/v) faecal slurry. We then stirred the slurry for 15 min on a

magnetic stirrer to homogenize, followed by 10 min of resting to sediment. At this point we

removed 100 ml of each faecal slurry ('fresh slurry'), which we used later to re-introduce the

resident microbial community to sterilized slurry (for the community treatments). To sterilize

the faecal slurries, we transferred 100 ml to a 250 ml Schott bottle, flushed the headspace with

Nitrogen gas, sealed them with rubber stoppers and autoclaved for 20 min at 121 °C.

Inoculating anaerobic gut microcosms, sampling and bacterial enumeration

For the start of the experiment (Sup. Fig 1), we filled 42 Hungate tubes with 7 ml of basal

medium (2 g/l Peptone, 2 g/l Tryptone, 2 g/l Yeast extract, 0.1 g/l NaCl, 0.04g K_2HPO_4, 0.04

g/l KH_2PO_4, 0.01 g/l $MgSO_4x7H_2O$, 0.01 g/l $CaCl_2x6H_2O$, 2g/l $NaHCO_3$, 2 ml Tween 80, 0.005

g/l Hemin, 0.5 g/l L-Cysteine, 0.5 g/l bile salts, 2g/l Starch, 1.5 g/l casein, 0.001g/l Resazurin,

pH adjusted to 7, addition of 0.001g/l Menadion after autoclaving; Sigma-Aldrich), and for the

subsequent re-inoculation cycles with 6.5 ml of basal medium. We flushed the head space of

each tube with nitrogen gas, sealed it with a rubber septum and autoclaved to produce anaerobic

microcosms containing only basal medium.

On day one of the experiment, we introduced faecal slurry and antibiotics to each tube

according to a fully factorial design (Sup. Fig 1), with three replicate microcosms in each

combination of Human Donor (1, 2 or 3), Community (present or absent) and Antibiotic (with

or without). In the community-free treatments, we added 850 µl of sterile slurry. In the

community treatments, we added 350 µl of fresh slurry and 500 µl of sterilized slurry. In the

antibiotic treatment, we added ampicillin to a final concentration of 7.2 µg/ml, approximating

the IC90 (concentration required to reduce growth by 90%) for the focal strain; this was

introduced 2h after the focal strain had been inoculated (8 µl of focal *E. coli* from one of the

42 overnight cultures introduced at 0h; approximately 1:1000 dilution). As a control treatment

testing for the effect of sterilized slurry, we also inoculated the focal strain into three replicate

microcosms containing only the basal medium (supplemented with 850 µl of peptone wash to

equalize the volume with the slurry treatments), and we did this with and without antibiotic

treatment. We incubated all microcosms at 37 °C in a static incubator. After 24h we transferred

a sample of 800 μl from each microcosm to a new microcosm (containing basal medium plus

500 μl of sterile slurry from the corresponding human donor in the community and community-

free treatments, or basal medium plus peptone wash for the basal medium treatment,

supplemented with ampicillin at each transfer in the antibiotic treatments), and we repeated

this for seven days.

To estimate the abundance of the focal strain during the experiment, we used a combination of

selective plating and colony PCR. For selective plating, we serially diluted the samples and

plated them on Chromatic MH agar (Liofilchem, Roseto degli Abruzzi, Italy), which allowed

us in a first step to discriminate *E. coli* from other species based on colony colour. By

supplementing these agar plates with Streptomycin (200 μg/ml), to which our focal strain is

resistant, we selected against other *E. coli* that were not resistant to Streptomycin. To screen

for variants of our focal strain that acquired resistance to Ampicillin during the experiment, we

additionally plated each sample onto the same agar supplemented with both Streptomycin (200

μg/ml, Sigma-Aldrich) and Ampicillin (8 μg/ml, Sigma-Aldrich). We did this after every

growth cycle. Despite initial screening of microbiome samples revealing no resident *E. coli*

that could grow on our selective plates, later in the experiment we found such bacteria to be

present in some samples (that is, non-focal strain *E. coli* that could grow on our plates and were

presumably very rare at the beginning of the experiment). To discriminate between these *E.*

coli and our focal strain, we used colony PCR with specific primers (forward (5'- AGA CGA

CCA ATA GCC GCT TT-3'); reverse (5'- TTG ATG TTC CGC TGA CGT CT-3')). For

colony PCR, we picked 10 colonies randomly for each time point and treatment. The PCR

reaction mix consisted of 2x GoTaq green master mix, 2.5 μM of each primer and nuclease

free water. The thermal cycle program ran on a labcycler (Sensoquest, Göttingen, Germany)

with 6 min 95°C initial denaturation and the 30 cycles of 95°C for 1 min, 58°C for 30s, 72°C

for 35s and a final elongation step of 72°C for 5 min. For gel electrophoresis we transferred 5

µl of the PCR reaction to a 1.5% agarose gel stained with sybr safe (Sigma-Aldrich) and

visualized by UV illumination. Focal strain abundance was then estimated by multiplying the

frequency of the focal strain determined by colony PCR with the total colony count for each

plate. To account for the possibility that the focal strain was still abundant in populations where

we found 0/10 colonies (that is, where it could have been rare relative to resident *E. coli* but

still present), we additionally screened the DNA extracted from the community (described

below) of the final time point by PCR (as described above for the colony PCR, but using 30 ng

of DNA as template). We did this for all microcosms from the community treatment and

detected PCR products in all cases where we detected focal strain by plating and colony PCR,

and none of the cases where we did not, consistent with our analysis of individual colonies and

suggesting that in those microcosms the focal strain had been completely excluded during the

experiment.

To estimate total microbial abundance in each microcosm supplemented with the microbiome

we used flow cytometry. We diluted samples by 1:10000 with phosphate buffered saline (PBS)

and stained them with Sybr green (Sigma-Aldrich). We used a Novocyte 2000R (ACEA

Biosciences Inc. , San Diego, CA, USA), equipped with a 488 nm laser and the standard filter

setup for the flow cytometric measurements.

We froze samples after every transfer from each microcosm at -80 °C, and at the end of the

experiment we isolated two sets of focal strain colony isolates for sequencing. First, we

randomly picked a single focal strain colony isolate from each microcosm where the focal

strain was detected at the end of the experiment (from Streptomycin plates; *n*=33). Second, we

randomly picked a single ampicillin-resistant colony isolate of the focal strain from each of the

8 populations at the end of the experiment where they were detected (from Streptomycin +

Ampicillin plates; *n*=8). We grew each colony isolate overnight in LB (with Ampicillin for the

ampicillin-resistant isolates), mixed 1:1 with 50% glycerol and stored at -80 °C.

Supernatant assay for potential phage killing

We also screened the initial faecal slurries from each human donor for evidence of lysis of our

focal strain, which might be caused by lytic phages. We centrifuged each faecal slurry (10 min,

2000 g), filtered the supernatant with cellulose (Melitta, Egerkingen, Switzerland), then 0.45

and 0.22 μm syringe filters, then supplemented with $MgSO_4$ and $CaCl_2$ (final concentration 8

μM), and stored at 4 °C. We then made lawns of the focal strain on agar and added 10 μl of

supernatant extract from each human donor and incubated 24h at 37 °C. We never observed

any plaques or evidence of lysis.

Whole genome sequencing and Bioinformatics

We sequenced all of the randomly selected (*n*=33) and ampicillin-resistant (*n*=8) focal strain

colony isolates. Prior to DNA extraction, we grew each isolate overnight in LB, then

concentrated the liquid cultures by centrifugation and extracted DNA with the Magattract kit

(Qiagen, Hilden;Germany) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Quality and quantity of

DNA was assessed with Nanodrop (Thermo Fisher) and Qubit (Thermo Fisher). At the

Functional Genomics Center (ETH Zürich / University of Zürich) DNA was processed with

Nextera library prep kit and sequenced on the Illumina Hiseq 4000 platform. We filtered raw

sequencing reads with trimmomatic [68] and mapped the reads to the reference with snippy

(https://github.com/tseemann/snippy) to detect variants. Deletions were identified by using the

coverage analysis tool of CLC Genomics Workbench 11 (Qiagen) with a read threshold value

of 0 and a window size of 1. We identified IS elements with ISfinder (Siguier 2006) in the

ancestor genome and used these sequences to detect IS movements in the evolved strains with

ismapper[70].

We additionally sequenced 12 ampicillin-resistant resident *E. coli* colony isolates (not the focal

strain). We isolated these colony isolates from microcosms filled with faecal slurry from human

donors 1 and 3 at the final time point of the experiment (6 for each donor, each from a different

microcosm). We picked, grew and sequenced these colony isolates as described above for focal

strain isolates. We then made de Novo assemblies of the resulting sequences with spades [71]

and annotated them with prokka [72]. We screened for known antibiotic resistance genes and

the presence of plasmid replicons by a local blast query against the resfinder [73] and

plasmidfinder [36] databases.

To identify genes that are involved in mating pair formation or mobilization of the plasmid we

screened the genome annotation files and blasted potential candidate genes against the NCBI

nucleotide database to verify them.

Mating experiments with plasmids from resident E. coli

We aimed to determine whether the resident *E. coli* colony isolates could act as plasmid donors

for our focal strain (transferring antibiotic resistance plasmids via conjugation). Because the

replicate *E. coli* colony isolates that we sequenced from each human donor (1 and 3) were

almost identical on the DNA sequence level (Sup. Table 2), we randomly chose one colony

isolate from each human donor as a potential plasmid donor strain. We used a focal strain as

the potential plasmid recipient in these experiments, which was only different from the focal

strain used in the main experiment by addition of a dTomato marker and a Chloramphenicol

resistance cassette (enabling us to detect transconjugants by selective plating). In the first set

of mating experiments, we grew overnight cultures of the potential plasmid donor strains and

the potential plasmid recipient strain in LB at 37 °C with shaking. We then pelleted the

overnight cultures by centrifugation (3000 rpm, 5 min), washed them twice with PBS and

resuspended them in 300 µl PBS. We then mixed the donor and recipient strains 1:1 (v:v), and

transferred 100 µl of this mixture to each of three replicate LB plates, and incubated the plates

for 6h at 37 °C. After that, we washed the cells off the plate with 500 µl PBS and streaked out

50 µl of this plate wash on LB plates supplemented with Ampicillin and Chloramphenicol. To

verify plasmid uptake by the transconjugants, we used a colony-PCR screen with primers

targeting the recipient strain (same primer set we used above to identify the focal strain) and

three additional primer sets targeting the beta-lactamase gene *blaTem-1b* (blaFW: 5'-

TGCAACTTTATCCGCCTCCA-3'; blaRV 5'-TTGAGAGTTTTCGCCCCGAA-3'), the

traC   gene   (traFW   5'-   TCGATAAACGCCAGCTGGTT-3';   traRV   5'-

AGGTGAAAACCCACAGCGAA-3') and the replicon *IncFIC (FII)* (IncFW 5'-

CACCATCCTGCACTTACAATGC-3'; IncRV 5'- TCAGGCCCGGTTAAAAGACA-3')

with the same PCR reaction mix and settings as described above.

To test whether environmental conditions affected conjugation efficiency, we performed a

second set of mating experiments in four different conditions: solid LB agar, liquid LB, liquid

anaerobic LB and anaerobic sterile faecal slurry. We prepared the liquid LB (Sigma-Aldrich)

and LB agar (Sigma-Aldrich) for all treatments in the same way (independent of whether they

were aerobic or anaerobic), supplementing them with 0.5 g/l L-Cysteine and 0.001 g/l

Resazurin (reducing agent and anaerobic indicator respectively). For the anaerobic LB

treatment, we transferred 0.9 ml LB to each Hungate tube, flushed the headspace with nitrogen

and sealed it with a rubber stopper before autoclaving. For the anaerobic sterile faecal slurry

treatment, we added 0.45 ml LB to each Hungate tube and 0.45ml thawed slurry under

anaerobic conditions, before flushing the headspace with Nitrogen, sealing and autoclaving.

Prior to each mating assay, recipient and donor strains were inoculated, washed, concentrated

and mixed exactly the same way as described above for the first set of mating experiments. For

each solid and liquid treatment four replicates were inoculated with 100 µl of the 1:1 donor

recipient mix, either under aerobic or anaerobic conditions according to the respective

treatment and all tubes and plates were incubated for 6h under static conditions at 37 °C. We

stopped the mating assay by either vortexing the liquid cultures or washing off the cells from

the plates with 1 ml of PBS. 100 µl of each bacterial suspension was then plated on selective

agar plates containing either Chloramphenicol to count total number of recipient cells or a mix

of Chloramphenicol and Ampicillin to count the number of transconjugants. After 24h we

calculated transconjugant frequencies by dividing cfu counts of plasmid-positive colonies by

the total cfu count of recipient cells [55].

We measured susceptibility to ampicillin for the ancestral focal strain from the main

experiment, the focal strain used in the conjugation experiment (with the dTomato tag), one

focal strain transconjugant (with the plasmid from the resident *E. coli* isolate of human donor

1), the resident *E. coli* isolate of human donor 1 (carrying the same plasmid), and all eight

ampicillin resistant focal strain isolates from the main experiment. We did this by measuring

OD600 after 24h incubation at various concentrations of ampicillin. We prepared overnight

cultures of each isolate in a randomly organized master plate, and then inoculated the

susceptibility assay using a pin replicator to transfer approximately 1 µl of the overnight

cultures to assay plates filled with 100 µl of 0-60 µg/ml ampicillin per well. We measured OD

at 0h and after 24h with a NanoQuant infinite M200Pro platereader (Tecan).

Amplicon sequencing

We thawed samples of fresh faecal slurry from 0h and samples from each microcosm in the

community treatments after 24h and 168h on ice and homogenised them by vortexing. We

concentrated 3 ml of each slurry sample by centrifuge subsequently twice 1.5 ml of the same

slurry sample directly in the bead beating extraction tubes provided by the extraction kit

(Qiagen). We extracted the DNA following the protocol of the powerlyzer power soil kit

(Qiagen). DNA yield and quality were checked by Qubit and Nanodrop.

We amplified the V3 and V4 region of the 16s rRNA gene with three slightly modified

universal primers [74] with an increment of a 1-nt frame shift in each primer [75] to increase

Miseq sequencing output performance between target region and Illumina adapter. The target

region was amplified by limited 17 cycle PCR with all three primer sets in one reaction for

each sample. We cleaned up PCR products and in a second PCR adapters with the Illumina

barcodes of the Nextera XT index Kit v2 were attached. We checked 10 randomly selected

samples on the Tapestation (Agilent, Basel, Switzerland) for the proper fragment size. We

quantified library by qPCR with the KAPA library quantification Kit (KAPA Biosystems,

Wilmington, MA, USA) on the LightCycler 480 (Roche, Basel, Switzerland). We normalized

quantified samples, pooled them in equimolar amounts and loaded the library with 5% PhiX

on the illumnina MiSeq platform with the Reagent Kit V3 at the Genetic Diversity Center

(ETHZ).

Sequencing reads were trimmed on both ends with seqtk (https://github.com/lh3/seqtk) and

amplicons were merged into pairs with flash [76]. USEARCH [77] was then used to trim primer

sites and amplicons were quality filtered using prinseq [78]. We clustered the quality filtered

sequences into zero-radius operational taxonomic units (ZOTU) using USEARCH. We used

Sintax implemented in the USEARCH pipeline with the SILVA database [79] for the

taxonomic assignment of the ZOTU sequences. For the analysis of taxonomic data including

plotting Shannnon diversity, relative proportions of taxa and to generate the PCoA plots, we

used the Phyloseq package in R [80].

Statistical analyses

We used R 3.5.1 [81] for all analyses. To test whether focal strain abundance differed between

treatments, we used a generalized linear mixed effects model with the glmmadmb function of

the glmmADMB package, with zero inflation and a poisson error distribution [82]. For this

analysis we excluded the basal medium treatment and used time, antibiotic (with / without),

resident microbial community (with / without) and human donor (1 / 2 / 3) as fixed effects and

replicate population as a random effect. The model was reduced by removing non-significant

(P>0.05) interactions using F-tests. P values for interaction terms in the reduced model were

obtained with type II Wald chisquare tests. To test whether there was an inhibitory effect of

sterilized slurry on the focal strain, we used the glmer function of the lme4 [83] R package. For

this analysis we included only community-free and antibiotic-free treatments, with focal strain

abundance as the response variable, donor as a fixed effect, replicate population as a random

effect, and a poisson error distribution.

To analyse differences in total bacterial abundance in the community treatments, we used a

linear mixed effects model with the lmer function of lme4 [83], with a poisson error

distribution. Time, donor and antibiotic were fixed effects and replicate population a random

affect. To analyse variation of Shannon diversity, we used a linear mixed effects model with

the lme function of nlme [84]. We excluded time point 0h from the analysis, and included

Time, Donor and Antibiotic as fixed effects and replicate population as a random effect.

Finally, to analyze similarities of microbiome samples based on the 16s rRNA data, we applied

the Bray-Curtis distance metric with the ordinate function of the Phyloseq R package to get

coordinates for the principal coordinate analysis (PCoA). On this dataset we ran a

permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) with the adonis function of

vegan [85], using the distance matrix obtained from the PCoA analysis but omitting time point

0h. We did this separately for time points 24h and 168h .

Data availability

Sequences have been deposited in the European Nucleotide Archive under the study accession

number PRJEB32627 for the whole genome sequences of single colonies and PRJEB33429 for

the 16s rRNA gene amplicon data. Other data will be available through the Dryad repository

upon publication.

Acknowledgements

We thank Katia Pfrunder-Cardozo for help with experiments and sequencing, the Genetic

Diversity Center (ETH Zurich), the Functional Genomics Center (ETH Zurich / University of

Zurich), and Jean-Claude Walser for sequencing and bioinformatics support. Funded by Swiss

National Science Foundation project 31003A_165803.

Competing interests

The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

References

1. O'Neill J. Tackling drug-resistant infections globally: final report and recommendations. HM Gov Welcome Trust UK. 2016; Available from: http://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final paper_with cover.pdf

2. Davies J. Origins and evolution of antibiotic resistance. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2010;74: 417–433. doi:10.1128/MMBR.00016-10

3. Berendonk TU, Manaia CM, Merlin C, Fatta-Kassinos D, Cytryn E, Walsh F, et al. Tackling antibiotic resistance: the environmental framework. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2015;13: 310–317. doi:10.1038/nrmicro3439

4. Andersson DI, Hughes D. Antibiotic resistance and its cost: is it possible to reverse resistance? Nat Rev Microbiol. 2010;8: 260–271. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2319

5. Palmer AC, Kishony R. Understanding, predicting and manipulating the genotypic evolution of antibiotic resistance. Nat Rev Genet. 2013;14: 243–248. doi:10.1038/nrg3351

6. Hibbing ME, Fuqua C, Parsek MR, Peterson SB. Bacterial competition: surviving and thriving in the microbial jungle. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2010;8: 15–25. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2259

7. Ochman H, Lawrence JG, Groisman EA. Lateral gene transfer and the nature of bacterial innovation. Nature. 2000;405: 299–304. Available: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2000Natur.405..299O

8. Bauer MA, Kainz K, Carmona-Gutierrez D, Madeo F. Microbial wars: competition in ecological niches and within the microbiome. Microb Cell. 2018;5: 215–219. doi:10.15698/mic2018.05.628

9. Seth EC, Taga ME. Nutrient cross-feeding in the microbial world. Front Microbiol.

2014;5: 1–6. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2014.00350

10.   Rakoff-Nahoum S, Foster KR, Comstock LE. The evolution of cooperation within the

gut microbiota. Nature. 2016;533: 255–259. doi:10.1038/nature17626

11.   Aminov RI. Horizontal Gene Exchange in Environmental Microbiota. Front

Microbiol. 2011;2: 1–19. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2011.00158

12.   Stokes HW, Gillings MR. Gene flow, mobile genetic elements and the recruitment of

antibiotic resistance genes into Gram-negative pathogens. FEMS Microbiol Rev.

2011;35: 790–819. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6976.2011.00273.x

13.   Ley RE, Peterson DA, Gordon JI. Ecological and Evolutionary Forces Shaping

Microbial Diversity in the Human Intestine. Cell. 2006;124: 837–848.

doi:10.1016/j.cell.2006.02.017

14.   Foster KR, Schluter J, Coyte KZ, Rakoff-Nahoum S. The evolution of the host

microbiome as an ecosystem on a leash. Nature. 2017;548: 43–51.

doi:10.1038/nature23292

15.   Marchesi JR, Ravel J. The vocabulary of microbiome research: a proposal.

Microbiome. 2015;3: 31. doi:10.1186/s40168-015-0094-5

16.   Kinross JM, Darzi AW, Nicholson JK. Gut microbiome-host interactions in health and

disease. Genome Med. 2011;3: 14. doi:10.1186/gm228

17.   Lawley TD, Walker AW. Intestinal colonization resistance. Immunology. 2013;138:

1–11. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2567.2012.03616.x

18.   Libertucci J, Young VB. The role of the microbiota in infectious diseases. Nat

Microbiol. 2019;4: 35–45. doi:10.1038/s41564-018-0278-4

19.   Vega NM, Gore J. Collective antibiotic resistance: mechanisms and implications. Curr

Opin Microbiol. 2014;21: 28–34. doi:10.1016/j.mib.2014.09.003

20.   Forslund K, Sunagawa S, Kultima JR, Mende DR, Arumugam M, Typas A, et al.

709  Country-specific antibiotic use practices impact the human gut resistome. Genome

710  Res. 2013;23: 1163–1169. doi:10.1101/gr.155465.113

711 21. Bengtsson-Palme J, Angelin M, Huss M, Kjellqvist S, Kristiansson E, Palmgren H, et

712  al. The Human Gut Microbiome as a Transporter of Antibiotic Resistance Genes

713  between Continents. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2015;59: 6551–6560.

714  doi:10.1128/AAC.00933-15

715 22. Sommer MOA, Dantas G, Church GM. Functional Characterization of the Antibiotic

716  Resistance Reservoir in the Human Microflora. Science. 2009;325: 1128–1131.

717  doi:10.1126/science.1176950

718 23. Juhas M. Horizontal gene transfer in human pathogens. Crit Rev Microbiol. 2015;41:

719  101–108. doi:10.3109/1040841X.2013.804031

720 24. Salyers A, Gupta A, Wang Y. Human intestinal bacteria as reservoirs for antibiotic

721  resistance genes. Trends Microbiol. 2004;12: 412–416. doi:10.1016/j.tim.2004.07.004

722 25. Conlan S, Park M, Deming C, Thomas PJ, Young AC, Coleman H, et al. Plasmid

723  Dynamics in KPC-Positive Klebsiella pneumoniae during Long-Term Patient

724  Colonization. MBio. 2016;7: 1–9. doi:10.1128/mBio.00742-16

725 26. Eckburg PB. Diversity of the Human Intestinal Microbial Flora. Science. 2005;308:

726  1635–1638. doi:10.1126/science.1110591

727 27. Tenaillon O, Skurnik D, Picard B, Denamur E. The population genetics of commensal

728  Escherichia coli. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2010;8: 207–217. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2298

729 28. Kaper JB, Nataro JP, Mobley HLT. Pathogenic Escherichia coli. Nat Rev Microbiol.

730  2004;2: 123–140. doi:10.1038/nrmicro818

731 29. de Kraker MEA, Davey PG, Grundmann H. Mortality and Hospital Stay Associated

732  with Resistant Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli Bacteremia: Estimating the

733  Burden of Antibiotic Resistance in Europe. Opal SM, editor. PLoS Med. 2011;8:

e1001104. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001104

30.   Kishii K, Chiba N, Morozumi M, Hamano-Hasegawa K, Ubukata K, Kurokawa I, et

al. Diverse mutations in the ftsI gene in ampicillin-resistant Haemophilus influenzae

isolates from pediatric patients with acute otitis media. J Infect Chemother. 2010;16:

87–93. doi:10.1007/s10156-009-0011-6

31.   Strugeon E, Tilloy V, Ploy M, Da Re S. The Stringent Response Promotes Antibiotic

Resistance Dissemination by Regulating Integron Integrase Expression in Biofilms.

MBio. 2016;7: 1–9. doi:10.1128/mBio.00868-16

32.   Knopp M, Andersson DI. Predictable Phenotypes of Antibiotic Resistance Mutations.

Wright GD, editor. MBio. 2018;9: 1–14. doi:10.1128/mBio.00770-18

33.   Trobos M, Lester CH, Olsen JE, Frimodt-Moller N, Hammerum AM. Natural transfer

of sulphonamide and ampicillin resistance between Escherichia coli residing in the

human intestine. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2008;63: 80–86. doi:10.1093/jac/dkn437

34.   Lester CH, Frimodt-Moller N, Sorensen TL, Monnet DL, Hammerum AM. *In Vivo*

Transfer of the vanA Resistance Gene from an Enterococcus faecium Isolate of

Animal Origin to an E. faecium Isolate of Human Origin in the Intestines of Human

Volunteers. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2006;50: 596–599.

doi:10.1128/AAC.50.2.596-599.2006

35.   Bidet P, Burghoffer B, Gautier V, Brahimi N, Mariani-Kurkdjian P, El-Ghoneimi A, et

al. *In vivo* transfer of plasmid-encoded *ACC-1 AmpC* from *Klebsiella pneumoniae*

to *Escherichia coli* in an infant and selection of impermeability to imipenem in *K.*

pneumoniae . Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2005;49: 3562–3565.

doi:10.1128/AAC.49.8.3562-3565.2005

36.   Carattoli A, Zankari E, García-Fernández A, Voldby Larsen M, Lund O, Villa L, et al.

In Silico Detection and Typing of Plasmids using PlasmidFinder and Plasmid

Multilocus Sequence Typing. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014;58: 3895–3903.

doi:10.1128/AAC.02412-14

37. Loftie-Eaton W, Rawlings DE. Diversity, biology and evolution of IncQ-family

plasmids. Plasmid. 2012;67: 15–34. doi:10.1016/j.plasmid.2011.10.001

38. Rozwandowicz M, Brouwer MSM, Fischer J, Wagenaar JA, Gonzalez-Zorn B, Guerra

B, et al. Plasmids carrying antimicrobial resistance genes in Enterobacteriaceae. J

Antimicrob Chemother. 2018;73: 1121–1137. doi:10.1093/jac/dkx488

39. Angles ML, Marshall KC, Goodman AE. Plasmid transfer between marine bacteria in

the aqueous phase and biofilms in reactor microcosms. Appl Environ Microbiol.

1993;59: 843–850.

40. Bradley DE. Specification of the Conjugative Pili and Surface Mating Systems of

Pseudomonas Plasmids. J Gen Microbiol. 1983;129: 2545–2556.

doi:10.1099/00221287-129-8-2545

41. Buffie CG, Pamer EG. Microbiota-mediated colonization resistance against intestinal

pathogens. Nat Rev Immunol. 2013;13: 790–801. doi:10.1038/nri3535

42. Kamada N, Chen GY, Inohara N, Núñez G. Control of pathogens and pathobionts by

the gut microbiota. Nat Immunol. 2013;14: 685–690. doi:10.1038/ni.2608

43. Momose Y, Hirayama K, Itoh K. Competition for proline between indigenous

Escherichia coli and E. coli O157:H7 in gnotobiotic mice associated with infant

intestinal microbiota and its contribution to the colonization resistance against E. coli

O157:H7. Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek. 2008;94: 165–171. doi:10.1007/s10482-008-

9222-6

44. Schamberger GP, Diez-Gonzalez F. Selection of Recently Isolated Colicinogenic

Escherichia coli Strains Inhibitory to Escherichia coli O157:H7. J Food Prot. 2002;65:

1381–1387. doi:10.4315/0362-028X-65.9.1381

45.   Ott SJ, Waetzig GH, Rehman A, Moltzau-Anderson J, Bharti R, Grasis JA, et al.

785   Efficacy of sterile fecal filtrate transfer for treating patients with *Clostridium difficile*

786   infection. Gastroenterology. 2017;152: 799-811.e7. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2016.11.010

787   46.   Buffie CG, Bucci V, Stein RR, McKenney PT, Ling L, Gobourne A, et al. Precision

788   microbiome reconstitution restores bile acid mediated resistance to Clostridium

789   difficile. Nature. 2015;517: 205–208. doi:10.1038/nature13828

790   47.   Theriot CM, Koenigsknecht MJ, Carlson PE, Hatton GE, Nelson AM, Li B, et al.

791   Antibiotic-induced shifts in the mouse gut microbiome and metabolome increase

792   susceptibility to Clostridium difficile infection. Nat Commun. 2014;5: 3114.

793   doi:10.1038/ncomms4114

794   48.   Fabich AJ, Jones SA, Chowdhury FZ, Cernosek A, Anderson A, Smalley D, et al.

795   Comparison of Carbon Nutrition for Pathogenic and Commensal Escherichia coli

796   Strains in the Mouse Intestine. Infect Immun. 2008;76: 1143–1152.

797   doi:10.1128/IAI.01386-07

798   49.   Wale N, Sim DG, Jones MJ, Salathe R, Day T, Read AF. Resource limitation prevents

799   the emergence of drug resistance by intensifying within-host competition. Proc Natl

800   Acad Sci. 2017;114: 13774–13779. doi:10.1073/pnas.1715874115

801   50.   Hiltunen T, Cairns J, Frickel J, Jalasvuori M, Laakso J, Kaitala V, et al. Dual-stressor

802   selection alters eco-evolutionary dynamics in experimental communities. Nat Ecol

803   Evol. 2018;2: 1974–1981. doi:10.1038/s41559-018-0701-5

804   51.   Zhang QG, Buckling A. Phages limit the evolution of bacterial antibiotic resistance in

805   experimental microcosms. Evol Appl. 2012;5: 575–582. doi:10.1111/j.1752-

806   4571.2011.00236.x

807   52.   Bradley DE, Taylor DE, Cohen DR. Specification of surface mating systems among

808   conjugative drug resistance plasmids in Escherichia coli K-12. J Bacteriol. 1980;143:

1466–1470.

53.   Ghigo J-M. Natural conjugative plasmids induce bacterial biofilm development.

Nature. 2001;412: 442–445. doi:10.1038/35086581

54.   Lester CH, Frimodt-Moller N, Hammerum AM. Conjugal transfer of aminoglycoside

and macrolide resistance between Enterococcus faecium isolates in the intestine of

streptomycin-treated mice. FEMS Microbiol Lett. 2004;235: 385–391.

doi:10.1016/j.femsle.2004.04.050

55.   Stecher B, Denzler R, Maier L, Bernet F, Sanders MJ, Pickard DJ, et al. Gut

inflammation can boost horizontal gene transfer between pathogenic and commensal

Enterobacteriaceae. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2012;109: 1269–1274.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1113246109

56.   Karami N, Martner A, Enne VI, Swerkersson S, Adlerberth I, Wold AE. Transfer of an

ampicillin resistance gene between two Escherichia coli strains in the bowel

microbiota of an infant treated with antibiotics. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2007;60:

1142–1145. doi:10.1093/jac/dkm327

57.   Philippon A, Arlet G, Jacoby GA. Plasmid-Determined AmpC-Type -Lactamases.

Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2002;46: 1–11. doi:10.1128/AAC.46.1.1-11.2002

58.   Anjum M, Madsen JS, Nesme J, Jana B, Wiese M, Jasinskyte D, et al. Fate of CMY-2-

encoding plasmids introduced into the human fecal microbiota by exogenous

Escherichia coli. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2019;63: 1–13.

doi:10.1128/AAC.02528-18

59.   Van den Abbeele P, Grootaert C, Marzorati M, Possemiers S, Verstraete W, Gerard P,

et al. Microbial Community Development in a Dynamic Gut Model Is Reproducible,

Colon Region Specific, and Selective for Bacteroidetes and Clostridium Cluster IX.

Appl Environ Microbiol. 2010;76: 5237–5246. doi:10.1128/AEM.00759-10

60.   Tropini C, Earle KA, Huang KC, Sonnenburg JL. The Gut Microbiome: Connecting

835   Spatial Organization to Function. Cell Host Microbe. 2017;21: 433–442.

836   doi:10.1016/j.chom.2017.03.010

837   61.   Barroso-Batista J, Demengeot J, Gordo I. Adaptive immunity increases the pace and

838   predictability of evolutionary change in commensal gut bacteria. Nat Commun.

839   2015;6: 8945. doi:10.1038/ncomms9945

840   62.   Zheng Y, Valdez PA, Danilenko DM, Hu Y, Sa SM, Gong Q, et al. Interleukin-22

841   mediates early host defense against attaching and effacing bacterial pathogens. Nat

842   Med. 2008;14: 282–289. doi:10.1038/nm1720

843   63.   Satoh-Takayama N, Vosshenrich CAJ, Lesjean-Pottier S, Sawa S, Lochner M, Rattis

844   F, et al. Microbial Flora Drives Interleukin 22 Production in Intestinal NKp46+ Cells

845   that Provide Innate Mucosal Immune Defense. Immunity. 2008;29: 958–970.

846   doi:10.1016/j.immuni.2008.11.001

847   64.   Vaishnava S, Behrendt CL, Ismail AS, Eckmann L, Hooper L V. Paneth cells directly

848   sense gut commensals and maintain homeostasis at the intestinal host-microbial

849   interface. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2008;105: 20858–20863. doi:10.1073/pnas.0808723105

850   65.   Chang JY, Antonopoulos DA, Kalra A, Tonelli A, Khalife WT, Schmidt TM, et al.

851   Decreased Diversity of the Fecal Microbiome in Recurrent Clostridium difficile –

852   Associated Diarrhea. J Infect Dis. 2008;197: 435–438. doi:10.1086/525047

853   66.   Schürch AC, van Schaik W. Challenges and opportunities for whole-genome

854   sequencing-based surveillance of antibiotic resistance. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2017;1388:

855   108–120. doi:10.1111/nyas.13310

856   67.   European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Surveillance of antimicrobial

857   resistance in Europe Annual report of the European Antimicrobial Resistance

858   Surveillance Network (EARS-Net) 2017. Available from:

https://ecdc.europa.eu/sites/portal/files/documents/EARS-Net-report-2017-update-jan-

2019.pdf%0Ahttps://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/antimicrobial-resistance-

surveillance-europe-2016

68. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. Bioinformatics. 2014;30: 2114–2120.

doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170

69. Siguier P. ISfinder: the reference centre for bacterial insertion sequences. Nucleic

Acids Res. 2006;34: D32–D36. doi:10.1093/nar/gkj014

70. Hawkey J, Hamidian M, Wick RR, Edwards DJ, Billman-Jacobe H, Hall RM, et al.

ISMapper: Identifying transposase insertion sites in bacterial genomes from short read

sequence data. BMC Genomics. 2015;16: 1–11. doi:10.1186/s12864-015-1860-2

71. Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Dvorkin M, Kulikov AS, et al.

SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell

sequencing. J Comput Biol. 2012;19: 455–77. doi:10.1089/cmb.2012.0021

72. Seemann T. Prokka: Rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics. 2014;30:

2068–2069. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu153

73. Zankari E, Hasman H, Cosentino S, Vestergaard M, Rasmussen S, Lund O, et al.

Identification of acquired antimicrobial resistance genes. J Antimicrob Chemother.

2012;67: 2640–2644. doi:10.1093/jac/dks261

74. Klindworth A, Pruesse E, Schweer T, Peplies J, Quast C, Horn M, et al. Evaluation of

general 16S ribosomal RNA gene PCR primers for classical and next-generation

sequencing-based diversity studies. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41: e1.

doi:10.1093/nar/gks808

75. Lundberg DS, Yourstone S, Mieczkowski P, Jones CD, Dangl JL. Practical

innovations for high-throughput amplicon sequencing. Nat Methods. 2013;10: 999–

1002. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2634

76.   Magoč T, Salzberg SL. FLASH: Fast length adjustment of short reads to improve

genome assemblies. Bioinformatics. 2011;27: 2957–2963.

doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr507

77.   Edgar RC. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST.

Bioinformatics. 2010;26: 2460–2461. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq461

78.   Schmieder R, Edwards R. Quality control and preprocessing of metagenomic datasets.

Bioinformatics. 2011;27: 863–864. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr026

79.   Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The SILVA

ribosomal RNA gene database project: Improved data processing and web-based tools.

Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41: 590–596. doi:10.1093/nar/gks1219

80.   McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. Phyloseq: An R package for reproducible interactive analysis

and graphics of microbiome census data. PLoS One. 2013;8.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0061217

81.   R core team . A language and environment for statistical computing (version 3.2. 2). R

Found Stat Comput Vienna, Austria. 2015; Available from: http://www.R-project.org/

82.   Fournier DA, Skaug HJ, Ancheta J, Ianelli J, Magnusson A, Maunder MN, et al. AD

Model Builder: Using automatic differentiation for statistical inference of highly

parameterized complex nonlinear models. Optim Methods Softw. 2012;27: 233–249.

doi:10.1080/10556788.2011.597854

83.   Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using

lme4. J Stat Softw. 2015;67: 74. doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01

84.   Pinheiro J, Douglas B, DebRoy S, Deepayan S, R CoreTeam. nlme: linear and

nonlinear mixed-effects models. R package version 3.1-140. 2019; Available from:

https://CRANR-project.org/package=nlme.

85.   Oksanen J, Kindt R, Legendre P, O'Hara B, Simpson GL, Solymos P, et al. vegan:

910   Community Ecology Package. 2019; Available from: https://CRANR-

911   project.org/package=vegan.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Resident microbial communities suppressed growth and resistance evolution of

focal *E. coli*. Each panel shows abundance of the focal *E. coli* strain (in colony-forming units

per ml) over seven days for either basal medium (top row) or with faecal slurry from one of

three human donors, in the absence (left panels) or presence (right panels) of ampicillin applied

after 2h and thereafter at each transfer. Empty symbols show community-free treatments; filled

symbols show treatments with the resident microbial community; red symbols show

microcosms where we detected ampicillin-resistant colony isolates of the focal strain. The three

lines in each treatment show three replicate microcosms. Microcosms where we detected no

focal strain colonies are plotted at 10^0.

Fig. 2. Total bacterial abundance over time in community treatments with and without

antibiotics. Each panel shows data from a single human donor (rows) with or without

ampicillin (columns), with the three replicate communities in each panel shown by three

different lines. Total bacterial abundance was measured by flow cytometry (see Methods).

Fig. 3. Changes in community composition over time. Relative abundance of the 15 most

prevalent bacterial families in each microcosm at 0h, 24h and 168h.

Fig. 4. Schematic maps of resistance genes, replicons and transfer-related genes for the

putative plasmid contigs found in the sequenced resident *E. coli* isolates. (A) Putative

plasmid contig of human donor 1 isolate with indicated replicon sequences (IncFIC, IncFIA),

genes involved in horizontal gene transfer (*tra* and *trb*) and resistance genes (*blaTem*, *sul2*,

aph(3)). (B) Map of putative plasmid contig of human donor 3 isolate with indicated replication

genes (*repA* and *repC*) and resistance genes (*blaTem*, *sul2*, *aph(3)*, *aph(6)*, *tet(A)*). Colours on

the ring stand for coding (black) and non-coding regions (green).

Fig. 5. Transfer of a resistance plasmid from the resident microbial community is

sensitive to abiotic conditions, and it confers a large increase in resistance. (A) Antibiotic

susceptibility of the ancestral focal strain, the version of the focal strain used to isolate

transconjugants (see Methods), the focal strain with the plasmid (transconjugant), the resident

E. coli isolate used as the plasmid donor, and eight evolved focal strain colony isolates that we

isolated on ampicillin plates and that had chromosomal mutations (Sup. Table 2). Each point

shows mean ±s.e. (B) Transconjugant frequency (as a percentage of the total recipient

population) after mating experiments in various conditions. The recipient strain was a tagged

version of the ancestral focal strain and the plasmid donor was a resident *E. coli* isolate from

human donor 1. For the faecal slurry treatment we used sterilized faecal slurry from human

donor 1.

956   Fig.2

959   Fig. 3

Table 1: Genes mutated in ampicillin resistant colony isolates of the focal strain from the end of the experiment. Asterisks indicate genes also mutated in randomly selected clones from ampicillin free plates (see Sup. Table 1).

Treatment group	Human donor	Replicate	afuB	afuC	cspB <> cspF	cyoA	fecI	ftsI	insA <> uspC	insB1	insD1	ompR	opgB*	perR	perR <> insN	relA	rpoC	rpoD	yaiO*	yehE	yjhD <> insO	yjhD <> yjhE
Basal medium with antibiotic	None	1			x			●							x							x
		2		x																x		
		3													x	●	●					
Community-free with antibiotic	1	1							x	x				x					●			
		2											●									
		3	x				x							●						x		
Community-free with antibiotic	3	1							x										●			
		2					x										▲				x	

▲ Deletion   x Insertion   ● SNP

964 Fig. 4

968   Fig. 5

Supplementary material

Sup. Fig. 1

Sup Fig 1: Summary of experimental evolution in faecal slurry. Treatments consisted of basal medium only, basal medium supplemented with

sterilized faecal slurry (without community) from one of three human donors, or basal medium supplemented with sterilized faecal slurry to which

the resident microbial community had been reintroduced (with community). After inoculation, all treatments were incubated for 2h at 37 °C, before

7 µg/ml ampicillin was added in the antibiotic treatment. Every 24h, we sampled each microcosm and transferred an aliquot to fresh medium

(either basal medium or sterilized faecal slurry) with or without antibiotics. We serially diluted each sample and spread it on chromatic agar plates

with or without antibiotics to quantify focal strain abundance (verified by colony PCR) and to screen for resistance. We sequenced focal strain

isolates from the final time point and investigated community composition by 16s rRNA gene amplicon sequencing. We monitored total bacterial

abundance in the community treatments by flow cytometry.

Supplementary Table 1 (continued on next page): Genomic variants found in randomly selected colony isolates of the focal strain picked from ampicillin-free agar plates at the end of the experiment.

Treatment group	Human donor	Replicate	arpA <> iclR	casA <> ygcB	clsA	entD	frsA <> phoE	gatY <> fbaB	gatZ	gfvA+B+C, insA+B	gtrS	hsdS	insI1, insX	insN	intD	intD, xisD,exoD, peaD	iraM <> ycgX	mmuM+P, afuB+C, insB1	ompF <> asnS	ompR	ompT	opgB	rpoD	serS	tfaD	tfaD <> ybcY	tfaX <> appY	waaS	waaU	wbbK	wecB	yaiO	yaiP	yaiS <> tauA	ybbD	ybcy	ybfK <> kdpE	yddK	ydjO	yedR <> yedS	yfcV <> sixA	yfjI	ygeF	yhhI	yibV	yjbS	yjgL	yjhB	yjiS <> yjiT	Δ 566060-584707	Δ 568024-586058
Basal medium without antibiotic	None	1												x																																						
		2											▲					▲																	x																	
		3	No mutations detected																																																
Community-free without antibiotic	1	1	No mutations detected																																																	
		2																						●																											
		3	No mutations detected																																																
Community without antibiotic	1	1	Focal strain below detection limit																																																
		2																																																		
		3																																																		
Community-free without antibiotic	2	1	No mutations detected																																																
		2																																																		
		3									▲													●								●																			
Community without antibiotic	2	1	No mutations detected																																																
		2																																																		
		3																																																		
Community-free without antibiotic	3	1																																															x		
		2									▲															▲					▲																		x		
		3								●																																									
Community without antibiotic	3	1					x							●								●			● ●													●												▲
		2											x																																						
		3		x ●												▲											▲						x						●										▲

▲ Deletion   X Insertion   ● SNP

Continuation supplementary Table 1: Genomic variants found in randomly selected colony isolates of the focal strain picked from ampicillin-free agar plates at the end of the experiment.

▲ Deletion   X Insertion   ● SNP

Supplementary Table 2: Antibiotic resistance genes, plasmid replicons and genes involved in conjugative transfer found on the putative plasmids of isolates from the resident *E. coli* community of each replicate population

Genomic feature	Function	Putative plasmid from human donor 1 without antibiotics of replicate community:			Putative plasmid from human donor 1 with antibiotics of replicate community:			Putative plasmid from human donor 3 without antibiotics of replicate community:			Putative plasmid from human donor 3 with antibiotics of replicate community:		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
blaTem-1b	Beta lactam resistance	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
aph(3")	Aminoglycoside resistance	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
aph(6)	Aminoglycoside resistance	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
sul2	Sulphonamide resistance	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
tet(A)	Tetracycline resistance	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
IncQ1	Replicon	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
IncFIC(FII)	Replicon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
IncFIA	Replicon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
tra genes [a]	Involved in conjugative transfer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

[a] traA, traB, traC, traD, traE, traF, traG, traH, traI, traK, traL, traM, traN, traP, traQ, traS, traT, traU, traV, traW, traX, traY

  Sup. Fig. 2

Sup Fig 2: Within-sample diversity over time. Diversity is estimated here using Shannon's diversity index in each initial sample, after 24h and 168h in each treatment (three replicates per treatment group and time point, except for at 0h).

1017   Sup. Fig. 3

1018

1019

1020

1025   **Sup Fig 3: Variable similarity of microbial communities across time and treatment**

1026   **groups.** Each panel shows samples from a single human donor, with the same axes used in

1027   each panel. Points show the initial sample (0h) and microcosms from 24h and 168h with and

1028   without antibiotics (legend at right). Similarities between communities were calculated by

1029   Bray-Curtis distance and plotted using Principal Coordinate Analysis (see Methods).

1030

1031   Sup. Fig. 4

1046   **Sup Fig 4: Agarose gel electrophoresis picture of the PCR products specific for plasmid**

1047   **genes and a chromosomal marker of the focal strain.** We used these primer sets to verify

1048   plasmid uptake of the transconjugants. Primers are given in the main text in the methods

1049   section.

1050