Resource conservation manifests in the genetic code

Liat Shenhav[1,*] and David Zeevi[2,*,^]

[1]Department of Computer Science, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

[2]Center for Studies in Physics and Biology, Rockefeller University, New York, NY, USA

[*]denotes equal contribution

[^]dzeevi@rockefeller.edu

Abstract

Nutritional limitation is a strong selective force in many environments, driving competition for

resources across organisms. However, there is still much unknown about how selective pressures

resulting from nutrient limitation have shaped microbial coding sequences. Here, we study this

'resource-driven' selection using metagenomic and single-cell data of marine microbes, with

concurrent environmental measurements. We present evidence indicating that a significant

portion of the selection exerted on marine microbes is explained by the environment and is

strongly associated with nitrogen availability. We further identify specific mutations in coding

sequences associated with environmental nutrient concentrations. Finally, we demonstrate that

this optimization for resource conservation is encoded in the very structure of the standard genetic

code, providing robustness against random mutations that increase carbon and nitrogen

incorporation into protein sequences. Notably, this robustness generalizes to codon choices from

multiple taxa across all domains of life, including the Human genome. Overall, we show that

nutrient conservation exerts a significant selective pressure on coding sequences and may have

even contributed to the evolution of the genetic code.

Introduction

Marine microbes, which make up more than half of the biomass in the ocean[1], are involved in key cycling of nutrients that make up all living systems. They account for nearly half of the carbon compound synthesis on Earth, thereby producing about 50% of breathable oxygen[2]. These microbes also cycle nutrients to perform numerous other important roles, such as biodegradation of complex organic material and fixation of atmospheric nitrogen, while flourishing in a wide range of environments with varying ambient conditions such as oxygen and nitrogen levels, light and temperature[3,4]. Nonetheless, evolutionary forces acting on ocean microbes are not fully understood[4].

With rapidly changing climate and environment, understanding the types of stress exerted on microbes in marine habitats is of paramount importance. Recent studies[4,5] provide evidence of high variability in the core genomic properties of marine microbes, including GC content and genome size, suggesting that this variability is linked to the concentrations of nutrients in the environment. Nitrogen and carbon are major limiting factors in the marine environment and their concentrations are typically inversely correlated[6]. It was shown that in low-nitrogen environments there is a lower incorporation of nitrogen-rich side-chains into proteins, a strong A+T bias in nucleotide sequences, and smaller genome sizes[7,8]. An opposite trend was shown for carbon[4]. These studies suggested a purifying selective pressure associated with resource conservation, which we term 'resource-driven' selection.

This resource-driven selection postulates that DNA mutations which result in excess incorporation of nutrients such as nitrogen and carbon into proteins, are disfavored. However, not all mutations have the same effect on protein sequences due to constraints imposed by the structure of the genetic code. The standard genetic code, common to virtually all of life on earth, is known to be highly efficient in mitigating the effects of mistranslation errors and point mutations[9–12], specifically those leading to radical changes in amino acids. This error minimization is prominent among

theories regarding the origin of the genetic code[13–16], postulating selection to minimize the adverse

effect of point mutations and translation errors as the principal factor governing code evolution[17–

24]. Theories of error minimization typically assert that the genetic code had evolved to minimize

changes to protein function and structure and suggest structurally-informed amino acid properties

based on hydropathy and stereochemistry (e.g., the polar requirement scale[9,25] and hydropathy

index[26]), for its quantitative exploration. To our knowledge, optimizations in the genetic code have

not been studied thus far in terms of nutrient conservation.

Here, we use publicly available metagenomic and single-cell data from marine habitats across

the globe, coupled with their corresponding measurements of environmental conditions, to

characterize and quantify the selective pressure resulting from nutrient limitation. For this

analysis, we estimate selection in 746 marine samples (**Fig. S1A**) and quantify its 'resource-

driven' component, while controlling for potential confounders such as effective population size

and time. We find that 'resource-driven' selection is a ubiquitous purifying selective force

associated with environmental nutrient concentrations, and particularly nitrogen. We show that

genes are affected by this selective force as a function of their expression and propensity for

secretion, which determines their impact on the organismal nutritional budget. We further identify

specific mutations in coding sequences associated with environmental concentrations of nitrogen,

in nitrate form. Based on the patterns of these mutations, we hypothesize that the structure of the

genetic code, known to minimize the effects of DNA mutations on the structure and function of

proteins, also minimizes resource expenditure given a random mutation. We test this hypothesis

and show that the choice of codons used in the genome of the organism, along with the structure

of the genetic code, provide robustness against random mutations that increase carbon and

nitrogen incorporation into protein sequences. We further demonstrate that this optimization for

resource conservation, encoded in the standard genetic code, is not confounded by previously

reported optimizations of protein structure and function. We extend this observation to multiple

mutation rates and codon distributions across the tree of life, and suggest resource conservation

as an important contributor to the evolution of the genetic code.

Results

Single nucleotide polymorphisms in marine microbial genes reveal significant purifying

selection

To better understand the mechanisms governing resource-driven selection acting on marine

microbes, we sought to characterize, at the single nucleotide level, how coding sequences of

marine microbes are affected by resource availability in their environment. To this end, we devised

a computational pipeline that calculates metrics of selection from marine metagenomic samples

(**Fig. S1B**). We downloaded metagenomic sequences of 746 samples from the Tara oceans[3]

(n=136); and bioGEOTRACES[27] (n=480) expeditions; and the Hawaii Ocean- (HOT; n=68); and

Bermuda Atlantic- (BATS; n=62) Time-series[27] (**Fig. S1A**; Methods). We aligned these reads to

the Ocean Microbiome Reference Gene Catalog (OM-RGC)[3], a database of genes from marine

environments that is accompanied by functional and taxonomic information. We then searched

for single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in genes that had sufficient high-quality coverage

(**Fig. S1B**; Methods). Overall, we found 71,921,864 high-confidence SNPs which passed our

stringent filtering (Methods), in a total of 1,590,843 genes.

To quantify purifying selection on different gene functions, we annotated genes from the OM-RGC

database to inform their functional group membership with either KEGG orthology (KO[70]) or

eggNOG orthologous group (OG[53]; Methods). We then calculated, using called SNPs, the ratio of

nonsynonymous polymorphisms (pN), which lead to a change in the resulting amino acid, to

synonymous polymorphisms (pS), which maintain the coded amino acid (pN/pS; Methods), for

each orthologous group in each sample. This measure approximates dN/dS, which requires

genomic sequences at the strain-level and quantifies the magnitude and type of selection

(purifying, neutral or positive) exerted on protein-coding sequences[28,29]. Interestingly, across all

samples, we found pN/pS ratios to be close to zero with an average of 0.074 across all OGs (CI

[0.072, 0.075]; **Fig. S1C**) and 0.079 across all KOs (CI [0.077, 0.080]; **Fig. S1D**), indicating

widespread purifying selection in the marine environment.

Strong resource-driven selection apparent across marine microbial genes

Based on recent studies[4,7,8], we hypothesized that nutrient availability is a central driver of this

purifying selection, affecting the evolution of coding sequences in marine microbes. Therefore,

we sought to quantify the environmental contribution to this selective pressure, estimated by

pN/pS. We considered environmental measurements taken alongside each sample, including the

depth of the sample, water temperature and salinity, and the concentrations of nitrate, nitrite,

oxygen, phosphate and silicate (**Fig. S2A-H**; Methods). All these measurements presented

consistent correlation patterns with the pN/pS of many KEGG and eggNOG orthologs (**Fig. S3**).

Specifically, we found lower pN/pS ratios at shallow depths and low nitrate concentrations,

indicating that these conditions may invoke stronger purifying selection.

However, as these environmental measurements are also highly correlated with each other (e.g.,

nitrate and phosphate concentrations increase and temperature decreases with depth; **Fig. S2I**),

we cannot accurately estimate their individual effects. We therefore sought to estimate the fraction

of variance in pN/pS explained by the environment while accounting for these covariations. We

used a linear mixed model (LMM) with variance components, commonly used in population

genetics[30] (Methods), which allows to estimate the fraction of variance in pN/pS ratios (dependent

variable) that is explained by the environment (random effect) while controlling for the complex

correlation structure between the environmental parameters, in a data-driven manner. We term

the fraction of the variance in pN/pS that is explained by resource availability 'environmental

explained variance' (EEV; Methods). Across both KEGG and eggNOG orthologs we found that a

significant fraction of the variance in pN/pS can be attributed to the environment (**Fig. 1A,B,**

S4A,B; Mann-Whitney *U* test P<10^{-16}). We note that this association between environmental

measurements and the magnitude of purifying selection is significant even after controlling for

potential confounders such as time or effective population size (**Fig. S4C,D**; Mann-Whitney *U* test

P<10^{-16} ; **Supplementary Note 1**) as well as in specific environmental niches (**Fig. S5**; Mann-

Whitney *U* test P<10^{-20} ; **Supplementary Note 2**).

Figure 1. Analysis of pN/pS reveals resource-driven selection. *(A) Box plot (line, median; box,*

IQR; whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles) of the variance of eggNOG OG pN/pS that was explained by

the environment in a linear mixed model (LMM; Methods) as compared to the same data with shuffled

labels. (B) Same as A, for KEGG KO pN/pS. (C) Box plot (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 5th and

95th percentiles) of the variance of KEGG KO dN/dS in genus Prochlorococcus that was explained by

the environment in a linear model. (D) Same as C, for the SAR-11 clade. (E) Same as C, for the SAR-

86 clade. P, Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

As opposed to pN/pS, in which the population-wide ratio of nonsynonymous to synonymous

polymorphisms is calculated from metagenomic sequences, dN/dS estimates the ratio of

substitution rates across a phylogeny. While dN/dS calculation requires genomic sequences at

the strain-level that are available for only a small number of samples and from limited strains, it

allows for a more accurate quantification of purifying selection in the taxa represented in the

phylogeny. We therefore sought to confirm our findings thus far using dN/dS. To this end, we

used benchmarking data in the form of assembled genomes from uncultivated single cells from

dominant and representative lineages of the surface ocean (SAR-11, SAR-86 and

Prochlorococcus)[31], and their corresponding environmental measurements (Methods). We

calculated dN/dS for KEGG orthologs in each lineage. Given the small number of samples, we

estimated the fraction of variance explained by the environment using a linear model with

environmental covariates (Methods). Across all bacterioplankton lineages comprising the

benchmarking data, we found that a significant portion of the variance in dN/dS ratios calculated

from single-cell data is explained by the environment (SAR-11, SAR-86, Prochlorococcus;

Wilcoxon signed-rank test $P<10^{-16}$; **Fig. 1C-E, S4E-G**). Similar to our original LMM, we note that

this association holds, across all three bacterioplankton lineages, even after controlling for time

as a confounder (Wilcoxon signed-rank test $P<10^{-16}$; **Fig. S6**; **Supplementary Note 3**) and for

phylogeny, using phylogenetic generalized least-square regression (Methods). These results

validate our findings using pN/pS calculated from metagenomic sequences and demonstrate the

association between selective pressure and environmental conditions, even in a single clade. This

indicates that associations of pN/pS or dN/dS with environmental variables are likely not

confounded by organismal properties which may differ in tropism across environments, but rather

exhibit a consistent trend even within a single clade.

We next sought to find the dominant environmental factor, with respect to association with pN/pS

ratios, as a post hoc analysis. We found that nitrate is more strongly correlated with pN/pS ratios

than any other environmental parameter (**Fig. S7**; Kolmogorov-Smirnov test; $P<10^{-30}$ for all

comparisons). While we cannot rule out the possibility of an unmeasured confounding factor, such

as labile dissolved organic carbon, these results are supported by previous studies[4,5,7] which

examined nutrient conservation in DNA and protein sequences of marine microbes and showed

their association with environmental nitrogen concentrations.

Environmental association is stronger in resource-consuming genes

In light of these findings which are supported by previous studies[4,7], we hypothesize that

mutations that increase the nitrogen requirements of cells are selected against, especially in

nitrogen-limited oceans. Our hypothesis implies that highly expressed genes would be under

stronger purifying selection[7,8,32] (illustrated in **Fig. S8**). In highly expressed genes, a mutation

leading to the incorporation of additional resources would have a stronger effect on the nutrient

economy of the cell, as one highly transcribed DNA sequence could translate to thousands of

proteins, each consuming more resources. To quantitatively corroborate this and examine

whether highly expressed genes have higher EEV as compared to lowly expressed genes, we

used an additional expression dataset for marine microbial genes[33] to rank KEGG orthologs by

their mean expression (Methods). We found that the 100 most highly expressed KEGG KOs had

a significantly higher fraction of the variance in their pN/pS explained by the environment (i.e.,

higher EEV), as compared to the 100 least expressed ones (**Fig. 2A, S9**; Mann-Whitney U test

$P<10^{-9}$). We replicated these results using dN/dS ratios calculated from single-cell data within

each bacterioplankton lineage (Mann-Whitney U test $P<10^{-7}$). This finding provides a data-driven

evolutionary perspective to the theory and experiments showing lower resource incorporation in

highly expressed genes[7,8].

Given the 'resource sensitivity' observed in highly expressed genes, we further hypothesized that

genes coding for extracellular proteins will also exhibit a higher EEV as compared to intracellular-

protein coding genes, as in this case the resources excreted from the cell cannot be recycled. We

indeed found that extracellular protein-coding genes had significantly higher EEV as compared to

other gene groups (Methods; **Fig. S10**; $P<0.05$). In summary, the high EEV in resource-

consuming genes, (i.e., highly expressed and extracellular protein-coding), further strengthens

our results regarding the breadth of resource-driven selection.

***Figure 2. Effects of resource-driven selection on coding sequences.** (A) Box plot (line, median;*

box, IQR; whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles) of variance in pN/pS explained by the environment in

the 100 lowest and highest expressed KEGG KOs. P, Mann-Whitney U test. (B) Depiction of mutation

flux (Methods) common in high versus low environmental nitrate concentrations, affecting amino acid

nitrogen (left) and carbon (right) content. Yellow arrows, increase in resource; blue arrows, decrease

in resource; arrow thickness corresponds to number of atoms changed by mutation.

Resource-driven selection drives specific amino acid changes

As our results indicate that mutations leading to an addition of resources would be more common

in nutrient-rich environments, we sought to quantify how they manifest in specific amino acid

changes. To this end, we compared the codon mutation frequencies in low- and high-nitrate

samples, after accounting for simplex-related confounders (Methods), and found significant

differences in codon mutation frequencies (**Fig. S11A-C**). We sought to examine the typical

change in nutrient consumption in varying nitrate concentrations. We thus defined mutation flux,

as the ratio between a codon mutation and its reverse, thereby measuring the typical flux of

nutrients; and estimated it using the log-odds ratio between the two (e.g., $log\,(p(AAA \rightarrow$

$AAC)/p(AAC \rightarrow AAA)$). Notably, across all the mutations significantly more prevalent in samples

from high nitrate environments (Methods), averaged across amino acids, we find a total increase

in nitrogen (**Fig. 2B**; 18 N atoms summed across all significant amino acid changes, P=0.0082),

decrease in carbon (**Fig 2B**; -37 atoms, P=0.0165), decrease in sulfur (-6 atoms, P=0.009), a

decrease in molecular weight (-508.91 g/mol, P=0.0193) and a non-significant decrease in oxygen

(-6 atoms, P=0.1505). These results provide additional evidence that the higher the nitrate

concentrations are, the weaker the selection against mutations leading to higher nitrogen

incorporation into protein sequences. While nitrate concentrations increase with depth (**Fig. S2I**),

labile dissolved organic carbon concentrations typically decrease[34]. We therefore also show the

specific codon mutations reducing carbon incorporation into proteins in nitrogen rich and typically

carbon poor, environments (**Fig. 2B, S11D**).

Our results are supported by previous observations regarding genomic and proteomic changes

associated with environmental concentrations of nitrate[4]. Mutations in nitrogen-rich and typically,

carbon-poor environments were shown to drive an increase in genomic GC content (which

increases nitrogen requirements), as well as by higher nitrogen and lower carbon in protein

sequences. Using SNP data, we corroborate these findings, and show that mutations leading to

higher GC content and those leading to higher nitrogen proteins are more prevalent in high-nitrate

waters as compared to low-nitrate (**Fig. S12A,B**). We note that mutations leading to higher GC

content (higher nitrogen DNA) often result in higher nitrogen proteins due to the structure of the

genetic code[4,7]. We further deconvolve these two types of mutations and find that while the ratio

of mutations that lead to higher nitrogen DNA but do not change protein nitrogen-content

increases with environmental nitrate (R=0.333; **Fig. S12C**), the ratio of mutations that increase

protein nitrogen but do not change DNA nitrogen-content is even more strongly correlated with

nitrate concentrations (R=0.473; **Fig. S12D**). We hypothesize that this is due to the higher copy

number of protein as compared to DNA and RNA, often in the order of 10^2-10^5 protein copies per

RNA molecule[35,36] leading to higher cost per gene, and thus to stronger selective pressure. Our

results suggest a differential effect of mutations on nutrient incorporation in DNA as compared to

protein sequences.

Resource-conservation as an optimization mechanism in the genetic code

We observed selection against DNA mutations which result in excess incorporation of nutrients, such as nitrogen and carbon, into proteins. However, not all mutations have the same effect on protein sequences due to constraints imposed by the structure of the genetic code, which was shown to minimize the impact of point mutations on protein structure and function[25,26,37]. We therefore hypothesized that the genetic code also minimizes the impact of point mutations on nutrient incorporation into proteins. Specifically, we hypothesized that the genetic code acts as a buffer between the DNA level, where mutations occur, and the protein level, where resource-driven selection is exerted, such that the expected cost of a random DNA mutation, in terms of added resources to proteins, is minimized.

To rigorously test this hypothesis, we first defined a cost function for each element e (e.g., carbon, nitrogen), such that the 'tariff' of a single mutation is the added number of amino acid atoms resulting from the mutation. As an example, a missense mutation from codon CCA to codon CGA results in an amino acid change from proline to arginine, and an increase of 3 nitrogen atoms and one carbon atom, setting the nitrogen cost of such mutation to 3 and the carbon cost to 1 (**Fig. 3A**).

To estimate the cost of a random mutation on each element, across the entire genetic code, we calculated, for nitrogen, carbon and oxygen, the Expected Random Mutation Cost (ERMC) for the standard genetic code V_S:

$$ERMC_e(V_S) = \sum_{v,v' \in V_S} P(v)P(mut(v,v'))c_e^+(v,v'),$$

where $P(v)$ is the abundance of codon v, calculated from all marine samples; $P(mut(v,v'))$ is the probability of mutation from codon v to codon v', set to be the relative abundance of the single

nucleotide mutation driving this codon change (e.g. for mutation from GCA to CCA, we use the

abundance of G-to-C transversions), calculated from all mutations observed in fourfold

degenerate codons to avoid sites under strong selection; and the cost function $c_e^+(v, v')$ is the

number of atoms of element e added to the post-mutation amino acid compared to the pre-

mutation one (Methods). For the standard genetic code, and typical codon abundances and

mutation rates calculated from marine microbes, we report an ERMC of 0.440, 0.158 and 0.163

for carbon, nitrogen and oxygen respectively, corresponding to an average increase of this

number of atoms per random mutation (**Fig. 3B**).

To check if the genetic code, along with codon abundances and mutation rates in marine

microbes, is indeed robust to resource-consuming mutations, we compared it to other hypothetical

codes. We simulated alternative genetic codes by randomizing the first and second position in all

codons one million times, while constraining the permutation in stop codons, to create a null

distribution of ERMC (Methods). We found that the standard genetic code, common to most life

forms, is parsimonious in terms of carbon and nitrogen utilization, given a random mutation,

manifested by minimization of the ERMC for nitrogen (**Fig. 3B**; $ERMC_N$ P=0.0142) and carbon

(**Fig. 3B**; $ERMC_C$ P=0.0119), while in the ERMC for oxygen we did not find a significant trend

(**Fig. 3B**; $ERMC_O$ P=0.8704).

We compared the extent of the robustness observed in the standard genetic code against the

addition of carbon and nitrogen to well-studied structure and function error minimization

mechanisms[38–41]. To this end, we calculated ERMC for changes in amino acid hydropathy[26] and

the polar requirement (PR)[9,25], structurally-informed amino acid properties commonly used to

determine code error minimization (Methods). We found that these optimization mechanisms are

of a similar magnitude to those shown here for nitrogen and carbon (Methods; **Fig. S13C,D**;

$ERMC_{hyd}$ P=0.0152; $ERMC_{PR}$ P=0.0137).

Figure 3. Resource-conservation is facilitated by the genetic code. *(A) Nitrogen (left), carbon (center) and oxygen (right) content of different amino acids depicted along their positions in the standard genetic code. (B) Histograms of the expected random mutation cost (ERMC), in 1,000,000 random permutations of the genetic code for nitrogen (left, blue), carbon (center, black) and oxygen (right, red). Black-yellow bar marks the ERMC of the standard genetic code, ERMC(Vs), for each of the elements. (C) Heat map of ERMC$_{CN}$ P-values across 39 organisms and 11 transition:transversion rates. Organisms in each of the groups are ordered according to the GC content of their coding sequences.*

We next sought to confirm that our elemental cost function is not confounded by these known

optimization mechanisms. To this end, we devised a hierarchical model which examined the

subset of genetic codes (out of the 1M hypothetical codes) that have a lower ERMC than the

standard genetic code for PR or hydropathy, and tested whether this subset is also optimized for

nitrogen or carbon (Methods). If nutrient optimization exists separately from structural

optimization, we expect the standard genetic code to be optimized for carbon and nitrogen as

compared to this subset, featuring significantly lower $ERMC_N$ and $ERMC_C$. We find that out of the

13,729 hypothetical codes that have $ERMC_{PR}$ lower than the standard genetic code, only 83 have

lower $ERMC_N$ (**Fig. S13E**; P=0.0058) and only 442 have lower $ERMC_C$ (**Fig. S13E**; P=0.037).

Similarly, out of 15,223 hypothetical genetic codes that have $ERMC_{hyd}$ lower than the standard

genetic code, only 270 have lower $ERMC_N$ (**Fig. S13F**; P=0.019) and only 249 have lower $ERMC_C$

(**Fig. S13F**; P=0.0208). This is in contrast with the observed overlap between hydropathy and PR:

out of the 15,223 hypothetical codes that have $ERMC_{hyd}$ lower than the standard code, 6,736 have

lower $ERMC_{PR}$ (**Fig. S13F**; P=0.4425). This result indicates that the detected carbon and nitrogen

optimization in the genetic code is not confounded by previously reported optimization properties

such as hydropathy and PR.

Remarkably, only 128 out of 1M randomized genetic codes were more resource-robust than the

standard genetic code in conservation of nitrogen and carbon together (**Fig. S13G,H**; $ERMC_{CN}$

P=1.28×10^{-4}). We note that this number is significantly smaller than the number of shuffled codes

expected to have both a lower $ERMC_C$ and $ERMC_N$ (Chi-square test of independence P=0.0013;

Table S1). This finding suggests that there is a smaller overlap than expected between the

nitrogen and carbon optimizations that are encoded in the genetic code, possibly driven by a small

overlap between the positions of high nitrogen amino acids and high carbon amino acids. This

property of the genetic code potentially enables efficient optimization for both carbon and nitrogen

at the same time. Altogether, these results indicate that resource optimization in marine microbes

is driven by the structure of the genetic code, alongside specific amino acid choices. We also

show that this nutrient optimization mechanism in the genetic code is of the same order of

magnitude as known optimization mechanisms, and is not confounded by them.

The genetic code facilitates resource conservation across kingdoms

To show that the resource-robustness of the genetic code was not limited to our dataset and

analytic approach, we calculated the ERMC of 187 species of genera *Prochlorococcus* and

Synechococcus, major marine microbial clades. We calculated codon abundances and mutation

rates using published protein-coding sequences[5] and the accepted transition:transversion rate of

$2:1$[42] (Methods). By testing the ERMC of the standard genetic code in these species against a

null distribution generated using these known parameters rather than ones inferred from marine

samples, we corroborated significant conservation of carbon, nitrogen, and both elements

combined (**Fig. S14A**; $ERMC_C$ mean P=0.013, P=0.020; $ERMC_N$ mean P=0.049, P=0.032;

$ERMC_{CN}$ P=0.0004, P=0.0007 for *Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus*, respectively).

To explore whether this nutrient conservation optimization mechanism of the genetic code

extends across organisms, we performed a similar calculation using codon abundances from 39

organisms across all domains of life, including all human protein-coding sequences, and tested a

range of transition:transversion rates (Methods). We find that, similarly to marine microbes, the

genetic code features optimization in terms of resource utilization for all tested organisms,

manifested by a significant minimization of the combined ERMC of nitrogen and carbon in all

transition:transversion rates tested (P<0.01, **Fig. 3C**). Moreover, we find significant optimization,

albeit of a lower magnitude, even in the theoretical case where all codon abundances are the

same (**Fig. S14B**). The codon abundances of a great majority of organisms also demonstrate

significant minimization of ERMC in nitrogen (**Fig. S14C**) and carbon (**Fig. S14D**), given a random

mutation, for a wide range of transition:transversion rates. These results indicate that resource

optimization in the genetic code transcends taxonomy, codon choices, and mutation rates. It

shows that the genetic code may have structural properties that make it robust in terms of

resource consumption.

Structural principles drive optimization in the genetic code

We next wished to examine the organizing principles that drive the resource optimization evident

in the standard genetic code. We observed that codons of the nitrogen-rich amino acids histidine,

glutamine, asparagine, lysine and arginine span only two nucleotides in their first position and two

in their second position. We define this organization to be a 'square' arrangement (**Fig. 4A**;

Methods), and hypothesize that, as compared to other arrangements, it amplifies nitrogen

conservation. Specifically, in the square arrangement, codons coding for some amino acids

(alanine, valine, phenylalanine, and several leucine and serine codons) require at least two

mutations to increase the number of nitrogen atoms in the resulting amino acid. This is in contrast

to other hypothetical arrangements, including a 'diagonal' arrangement in which nitrogen-rich

amino acid codons span all possible nucleotides in the first and second positions (**Fig. 4A**;

Methods). We suggest that the diagonal arrangement would be nutrient-wasteful, as in such

arrangements a single mutation both in the first or second codon position, could increase the

nitrogen content of a protein. To rigorously test this hypothesis, we generated 10,000 random

genetic codes, with 220 arrangements happening to embody a square structure, and 127 a

diagonal one. We found that, when compared to all other possible arrangements, square

arrangements present a significantly lower $ERMC_N$ (**Fig. 4A**; Mann-Whitney U test $P<10^{-10}$) while

diagonal arrangements exhibit a significantly higher $ERMC_N$ (**Fig. 4A**; Mann-Whitney U test $P<10^{-10}$

). This result demonstrates that resource optimization in the genetic code is driven by structural

principles, perhaps underlying the optimization observed across kingdoms.

Figure 4. Structural properties and codon usage bias underlying optimality in the genetic code.
(A) Box plot (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles) of ERMC$_N$ of square arrangements (left) and diagonal arrangements (right, Methods), as compared to all other arrangements (center) out of 10,000 randomized arrangements of the code. P, Mann-Whitney U test. (B) Violin plot of codon usage among 187 species of Prochlorococcus and Synechococcus showing significant preference of threonine codons ACT and ACC as compared to ACA and ACG, and of isoleucine codon ATT as compared to ACA. P, Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

Finally, we hypothesized that codon usage for a single amino acid may also be biased due to the

differential cost of a random mutation for each codon. We therefore examined all amino acids

coded by codons with adenine in their first position, focusing on codon usage of the amino acid

threonine. We note that a C-to-G transversion in the second position for codons ACT and ACC

yields serine (AGT and AGC, respectively), and that the same mutation for codons ACA and ACG

yields arginine (AGA and AGG, respectively; **Fig. 4B**, inset). Arginine has higher carbon and

nitrogen content than serine. We thus hypothesized that for a cell to conserve nutrients in case of

a random mutation, codons ACT and ACC should have a higher abundance than codons ACA

and ACG, respectively, given a known GC-bias that is a genomic quantity. To test this hypothesis,

we examine codon usage in 187 *Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus* strains, and show a

significantly higher use of ACT as compared to ACA (**Fig. 4B**; Wilcoxon signed-rank test P<10[-20])

and ACC as compared to ACG (**Fig. 4B**; Wilcoxon signed-rank test P<10[-20]). Similarly, isoleucine

codon ATT has higher abundance as compared to ATA (**Fig. 4B**; Wilcoxon signed-rank test P<10^{-}

^{20}). These results demonstrate that resource conservation is a central driving force in selection

processes that may guide codon usage and thereby affect not only protein sequence but also

cellular translation efficiency.

Discussion

In this work, we characterize and quantify the selective forces exerted by nutrient availability on

protein coding genes in marine environments. As metrics for purifying selection, we calculate

pN/pS from marine metagenomic samples and dN/dS from single-cell genome assemblies. We

control for potential confounders and show that a substantial fraction of the variance in these

metrics could be attributed to environmental factors while highlighting a strong association with

nitrate concentrations. We further show that the variance in pN/pS and dN/dS that is attributable

to environmental factors increases with the potential impact of a gene on the cellular nutritional

budget, with higher EEV in highly expressed and extracellular protein-coding genes. Using single

nucleotide polymorphisms from across marine samples, we characterize the typical mutations in

high- versus low-nitrate marine environments and show that the former drive incorporation of

additional nitrogen-rich amino acids and fewer carbon-rich amino acids to protein sequences.

Finally, we show that a significant portion of DNA mutations may not result in increased nutrient

incorporation into protein sequences, due to the pattern of codon arrangements in the genetic

code. We provide evidence that the standard genetic code, shared among most lifeforms, along

with organismal codon choices, is robust against the incorporation of additional atoms of nitrogen

and carbon given a random mutation. We quantitatively demonstrate that this nutrient

conservation is not confounded by known error minimization mechanisms of the genetic code and

it is of similar extent in terms of robustness to the effect of point mutations. Notably, we show that

the standard genetic code surpasses a great majority of randomly arranged codes in conservation

of nitrogen and carbon, across multiple taxa from all domains of life and across multiple codon

choices and mutation rates.

It should be noted that in addition to resource-driven selection there are likely additional selective

forces that contribute to the observed association of pN/pS (and of dN/dS) with the environment.

Genomic GC-content is associated with exposure to UV radiation[43] and nitrogen availability[4,44] yet

nonsynonymous mutations, especially in codons encoding structurally and functionally important

protein positions, are likely to be less affected by GC bias. In addition, codon usage bias has been

shown to be associated with the environment[45], and clearly we cannot rule out the association of

the environment with other selective forces operating on synonymous mutations that have not

been reported yet.

In light of these results, we hypothesize that resource driven selection is equally exerted on all

parts of the protein-coding gene. This sets it apart from selection to maintain the structural integrity

of a protein or the function of its active site, which occur predominantly in structurally important

regions[46]. Thus, accounting for resource-driven selection may improve the identification of

alternative translation start sites, alternatively spliced introns, or readthrough stop codons, as

intermittently translated regions of the protein may be under weaker resource-driven selection as

compared to constitutively translated ones[47].

We show that the genetic code optimizes nutrient conservation, calling upon an examination of

code evolution theories. Hypotheses regarding the origin of the genetic code include

stereochemical affinity between a codon or anticodon and their amino acid[48,49]; a frozen accident

theory[16], relying on the fact that the code is highly immutable; a co-evolution of the genetic code

with the emergence of amino acid-producing biosynthetic pathways[14]; and an early fixation of an

optimal genetic code, suggesting that the code evolved under selection for error minimization[50].

Our results are in line with the latter theory of optimality, and suggest that the genetic code may

also have been optimized for nutrient conservation. This implies that the genetic code can be

viewed as a buffer between the evolutionary forces of mutation and selection, the former occurring

in DNA sequences and the latter predominantly in proteins. Simply put, the genetic code

determines which mutations the selective forces 'see'. In the case of nutrient conservation, many

DNA mutations do not result in the incorporation of additional nutrients into proteins, and are thus

not selected against, which may allow more 'freedom' to explore the mutation-space.

We show that the codon choices of organisms across the tree of life, along with the structure of

the genetic code, confer robustness against mutations that add nitrogen to the protein sequence.

It is possible that amino acid and codon usage in organisms have evolved to lower nutrient

consumption in case of a random mutation, informed by the structure of the code. Interestingly,

this is also true for heterotrophic eukaryotes which are net N-producers. We hypothesize that

while an organism may be a net N-producer, it is possible that conservation of resources still

results in a selective advantage, in times of low nutrient availability and hunger. In multicellular

organisms, we hypothesize that resource conservation may be essential during development,

where rates of growth are conserved and a deviation from them may be selected against.

Since the genetic code is common, with only a few changes, to virtually all organisms across the

tree of life, we can assume that it was already fixed in its current form, or one very similar, in the

last universal common ancestor. If, as previously postulated[50], the genetic code evolved through

selection, it may reflect the selective pressures on organisms in the beginning of life on earth.

While we do not know the nature of nutrient cycling in the primordial ocean, we can hypothesize

that scarcity of nitrogen and carbon that are common now may have also prevailed alongside

early lifeforms. If so, an organism harboring a nitrogen- and carbon-efficient genetic code would

have had a selective advantage over its peers, especially in the absence of fully evolved DNA

mutation repair mechanisms.

Overall, by using publicly available data on ocean microbes and their corresponding

environmental measurements, we were able to discern a ubiquitous purifying selective pressure

which shapes marine microbial life, and may have even shaped the structure of the genetic code

that was since preserved for billions of years. With the advent of new multi-omic data from

environmental studies, we will be able to better divulge the intricate relationships of microbes with

a rapidly changing global environment.

Methods

Marine microbiome samples

Marine samples collected with Tara oceans[3], bioGEOTRACES[27], the Hawaii Ocean Timeseries

(HOT) and the Bermuda Atlantic Timeseries Series (BATS) [27] were downloaded from ENA with

accessions ENA:PRJEB1787 (TARA oceans prokaryotic fraction), ENA:PRJNA385854

(bioGEOTRACES) and ENA:PRJNA385855 (HOT/BATS), each sample with a minimum of 5

million reads. For all samples for which a size parameter was available, we selected the 0.22µm+

size category (typically between 0.22 and 5µm). This includes TARA ocean samples[3] (prokaryote

size) and data pertaining to expression[33]. In samples from the bioGEOTRACES[27], HOT[27] and

BATS[27] sampling stations, we used the available size fraction, larger than 0.2µm.

Mapping of Illumina reads to reference gene sequences

Samples were mapped to nucleotide sequences from the Ocean Microbiome Reference Gene

Catalog (OM-RGC) [3] using bowtie2 with parameters --sensitive -a 20 --quiet -p 8 and saved as

a bam file using the 'samtools view' command. As gene sequences are relatively short, reads

from both ends of the metagenomic sequencing samples were mapped separately, and reunited

prior to variant calling.

Determining metagenomic read assignment probability

We determined the probability of assignment of metagenomic reads to marine microbial genes

using the Iterative Coverage-based Read-assignment Algorithm (ICRA)[51] with parameters

max_mismatch=12, consider_lengths=True, epsilon=1e-6, max_iterations=30, min_bins=4,

max_bins=100, min_reads=10, dense_region_coverage=60, length_minimum=300,

length_maximum=2e5, use_theta=False. To prevent spurious mapping, alignments were

considered for downstream analysis only if the probability of alignment was higher than 0.9.

Variant calling

Alignments from both ends of all sequencing runs pertaining to the same sample were united

using the samtools cat command and sorted using the samtools sort command, with default

parameters.

To facilitate variant calling in tractable timescales, each filtered, untied and sorted .bam file was

split into chunks, each encompassing 10,000 reference sequences (out of about 40 million

reference sequences). For each such batch of reference sequences, we called variants across

all samples using the following command: bcftools mpileup --threads 4 -a FORMAT/AD -Q 15 -L

1000 -d 100000 -m 2 -f <OM-RGC fasta> <bam filenames> | bcftools call --threads 4 -Ov -mv -o

<output vcf>, where <OM-RGC fasta> is the fasta file of OM-RGC nucleotide sequences, <bam

filenames> are the filenames of all .bam files pertaining to the reference sequence chunk in

question, and <output vcf> is the output .vcf file pertaining to that same chunk.

To ensure that sequencing errors do not skew our results, we considered single nucleotide

variants as SNPs for downstream analysis only if they had a GATK quality score of at least 30,

and an allele frequency of at least 1%[52]. While the GATK quality requirements filter out

sequencing errors randomly distributed across the genes, the 1% criterion eliminates random

sequencing errors that accumulate in the same position when depth of coverage reaches very

high numbers.

For a sample mapped to a reference gene to be considered for downstream analysis, we

demanded that at least 60% of SNPs called along the length of the reference gene for that sample

would be supported by at least 4 reads, thereby enabling accurate calculation of pN/pS ratios.

For a gene to be considered for downstream analysis, we demanded for that gene to have at least

one SNP common to 20 or more samples.

Calculation of pN/pS in single genes

While comparing SNP patterns across samples, it is instrumental to avoid biases due to differences in coverage. We therefore downsampled the read coverage depth to the minimum depth across all samples, for each position in a sample that was supported by more than 4 reads. For positions that had minimum support of fewer than 4 reads, no subsampling was performed. Subsampling was performed by drawing from a multinomial distribution, with n trials and variant probabilities p, where n was set to the calculated minimum depth and p set to the relative abundance of each variant in the given sample.

The ratio of non-synonymous and synonymous polymorphisms was calculated by considering all called SNPs in every gene. First, we calculate a consensus sequence for each gene by taking, for each SNP position, the variant that was overall more common across all samples (after the subsampling performed above). We counted, for each gene, the number of non-synonymous and synonymous sites across the consensus sequence. For each SNP position in each sample, we counted the number of synonymous and nonsynonymous substitutions. As more than one variant can exist in a single sample, we considered the relative abundance of synonymous to nonsynonymous substitutions dictated by the different variants. For example, if the reference codon was CAC, coding for histidine, one variant, a C-to-G transversion in the third position abundant at 50%, led to a nonsynonymous mutation that resulted in glutamine (CAG) while another variant in the same sample and the same position was a synonymous C-to-T transition, we counted 0.5 synonymous substitutions and 0.5 nonsynonymous substitutions. We followed by calculating the pN/pS ratio:

$$pN/pS = \frac{nonsynonymous\ substitutions}{nonsynonymous\ sites} / \frac{synonymous\ substitutions}{synonymous\ sites}$$

Aggregation of calculated metrics using KEGG and eggNOG orthologies

Functional assignments to KEGG KOs and eggNOG OGs for all OM-RGC genes were computed using eggNOG-mapper v2 based on the eggNOG v5.0 database[53,54]. For each functional assignment in each sample, all OM-RGC genes assigned with the same functional assignment were concatenated and treated as one long genomic sequence per the calculation of pN/pS ratios. To reduce noise in pN/pS calculation, we considered only KOs and OGs that had at least 5 genes per sample, in at least 50 samples.

Benchmarking data of assembled genomes

Benchmarking data was employed in the form of uncultivated single cells of the dominant and representative lineages of the surface ocean (SAR-11, SAR-86 and Prochlorococcus) from different parts of the ocean. We used genomes varying at the strain level[31], with potentially minimal batch effects, as those have been analyzed in a single laboratory.

Calculation of dN/dS in single genes

For every gene ortholog in each one of the lineages dN/dS was calculated as follows:

1. We extracted all gene sequences pertaining to each ortholog from all strains within each clade. We determined orthologous genes using the annotation that was published alongside the single-cell data. For each clade, we chose the annotation type that had the highest coverage of genes, i.e., prokka[55] for Prochlorococcus, and Swissprot[56] for SAR11 and SAR86.

2. To account for the possibility that gene sequences may be misannotated resulting in the grouping of more than one orthologous group under the same name, we performed

additional curation by clustering genes using Ward hierarchical clustering[57] on protein

sequences using normalized edit distance (Levenshtein) as a dissimilarity metric. We cut

off clusters that had dissimilarity lower than 30%, to ensure structural similarity.

3. For each of the resulting clusters that had more than 20 members (i.e., genes

corresponding to strains within the clade) we generated a multiple sequence alignment

(MSA) of protein sequences using MAFFT[58] , with the following command:

mafft --quiet --maxiterate 1000 --localpair <input_fasta> > <output_msa>

Following that, we computed a codon alignment using the generated MSA and nucleotide

sequences, with the biopython AlignIO package.

4. Using the MSA, we computed a phylogenetic tree of the sequences using raxml[59]

(raxmlHPC command line version) with model GTRGAMMA; rooted it using the -f I

modifier; and computed the ancestral sequence using the -f A modifier.

5. For each leaf node (strain ortholog) in the phylogenetic tree of gene sequences, we

calculated dN/dS with respect to the tree root, using the biopython cal_dn_ds function with

the "ML" model (Goldman and Yang 1994) and default parameters.

Environmental variables

For each sample, we compiled measurements pertaining to the following environmental

measurements: Depth [m], Nitrate [µmol/kg], Nitrate+Nitrite [µmol/kg], Oxygen [µmol/kg],

Phosphate [µmol/kg], Silicate [µmol/kg], Temperature [°C] and Salinity.

Tara oceans metadata was downloaded from PANGAEA (https://doi.pangaea.de/10.1594/) with

accession numbers PANGAEA.875575 (Nutrients) and PANGAEA.875576 (Watercolumn

sensor), and recorded median values for all the above nutrients were extracted. Tara nutrient

concentrations were given as [µmol/l]. Conversion to [µmol/kg] was done by dividing the

measured concentration by the measured specific gravity for the same sample.

bioGEOTRACES metadata was compiled from CTD sensor data and discrete sample data from

the GEOTRACES intermediate data product v.2[60]. HOT metadata was downloaded from the ftp

server of the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (ftp://ftp.soest.hawaii.edu/hot/) and BATS metadata

was downloaded from the Bermuda Institute of Ocean Sciences (http://bats.bios.edu/bats-data/).

As GEOTRACES/HOT/BATS ocean water samples are not linked to specific biological samples

as is the case with Tara oceans samples, we considered only water samples from the exact same

geographic location, within a day from biological sample collection time, and within 5% difference

in depth of collection, and chose the closest sample in terms of time and depth of collection. As

all these measurements of environmental conditions are highly correlated with each other (**Fig.**

S2I), we utilized this correlation structure to impute missing values using the EM algorithm [61].

Linear mixed models

We used a linear mixed model (LMM) with variance components, commonly used in population

genetics[30] (Methods), which allows to estimate the fraction of variance in pN/pS ratios (dependent

variable) that is explained by the environment (random effect) while controlling for the complex

correlation structure between the environmental parameters, in a data-driven manner.

Generative model. Consider a collection of $M_i, where\ i \in \{1,2\}$ features (i.e., $M_{1,2}$ number of

KEGG and eggNOG orthologs respectively), each measured across N samples. We get as input

an $(M_i \times N)$ matrix O^i, where $O_{nm}{}^i$ is the pN/pS of ortholog m in sample n. Let $y^i{}_m =$

$(O_{m1}{}^i, \ldots, O_{mN}{}^i)$ be a $N \times 1$ vector representing the pN/pS in ortholog m, according to grouping

$i,$ across N samples (e.g., pN/pS in KO K02274 across N samples). Let W be a $(N \times q)$

normalized matrix of environmental measurements. This included the depth of the sample, water

temperature and salinity, as well as concentration of the key molecules nitrate, nitrite, oxygen,

phosphate and silicate.

With these notations, we assume the following generative linear model:

$$y^i{}_m = Wu_m + \epsilon_m, \qquad (1)$$

618   where u_m and ϵ_m are independent random variables distributed as $u_m \sim N(0, \sigma^2{}_{u_m} I)$ and $\epsilon_m \sim$

619    $N(0, \sigma^2_{\epsilon_m} I)$. The parameters of the model are $\sigma^2{}_{u_m}$ and $\sigma^2_{\epsilon_m}$

620   An equivalent mathematical representation of model (1) is given by

$$y^i{}_m \sim N(0, \sigma^2_K K + \sigma^2_{\epsilon_m} I), \qquad (2)$$

622   where $\sigma^2_K = M_i \sigma^2{}_{u_m}, K = \frac{1}{M_i} WW^T$. We will refer to K as the environmental kinship matrix, which

623   represents the similarity, in terms of environmental covariates, between every pair of samples

624   across grouping i (i.e., represent the correlation structure to the data).

626   _Environmental explained variance (EEV)._ The explained variance of a specific feature $y^i{}_m$ by the

627   environmental measurements

$$\chi^i{}_m = \frac{\sigma^2_K}{\sigma^2_K + \sigma^2_{\epsilon_m}}. \qquad (3)$$

629   **Estimating effective population size**

630   To approximate effective population size (N_e) we use fourfold degenerate synonymous diversity.

631   Calculation was adapted from Schloissnig et al.[28]:

$$\pi_{ffsyn}(S, G) = \frac{1}{|G_{ffsyn}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|G_{ffsyn}|} \sum_{B_1 \in \{A,C,G,T\}} \sum_{B_2 \in \{A,C,G,T\} \setminus B_1} \frac{x_{i,B_1}}{c_i} \times \frac{x_{i,B_2}}{c_i - 1}, \qquad (4)$$

where S is the sample, G is the gene of interest, $|G_{ffsyn}|$ is the number of fourfold degenerate

sites, x_{i,B_j} is the number of times nucleotide B_j was seen in the fourfold degenerate position i,

and c_i is the coverage of position i.

Controlling for the effects of time and effective population size

To control for the effects of time and effective population size, we added these two potential

confounders to our LMM as fixed effects. We formulate our LMM as follows:

641
$$y^i{}_m \; = \; \beta_{o_i} \; + \beta_{1_i} pS_i \; + \beta_{2_i} SD_i + W u_m + \epsilon_m \; , \qquad (5)$$

where β_{0_i} is the intercept, pS (as a proxy for time) is the first fixed effect with β_{1_i} as its coefficient,

SD_i (as a proxy for effective population size) is the second fixed effect with β_{2_i} as its coefficient.

W is a normalized matrix of environmental factors, u_m and ϵ_m are independent random variables

distributed as $u_m \sim N(0, \sigma^2{}_{u^n{}_m} I)$ and $\epsilon_m \sim N(0, \sigma^2_{\epsilon_m} I)$. The parameters of the model are β_{o_i} ,

β_{1_i} , β_{2_i} $\sigma^2{}_{u_m}$ and $\sigma^2_{\epsilon_m}$.

LMM on samples from the epipelagic zone

To demonstrate that the association of pN/pS with the environment is not confounded by depth,

we reran the LMM (eq. 5) only on samples from the epipelagic zone (up to 76m, median depth

across 746 samples).

Linear model for dN/dS rates

We modeled the benchmarking data by constructing a linear model for dN/dS (the dependent

variable) with the environmental factors as independent variables:

657
$$dN/dS_m \; = \; \beta_{0_m} \; + \; W u_m + \epsilon_m, \qquad (6)$$

where β_{0_m} is the intercept, W is a normalized matrix of environmental factors and u_m is a vector

of environmental coefficients. $\epsilon_m \sim N(0, \sigma^2{}_{\epsilon_m} I)$. $m \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, where M is the number of genes

tested.

To account for the effect of time as potential confounder we constructed the following linear model

for dN/dS (the dependent variable) with the environmental factors and dS (as a proxy for time) as

independent variables.

$$dN/dS_m = \beta_{0_m} + \beta_{1_m} dS_m + Wu_m + \epsilon_{2_m}, \qquad (7)$$

where β_{0_m} is the intercept, dS (as a proxy for time) is a fixed effect with β_{1_m} as its coefficient, W

is a normalized matrix of environmental factors and u_m is a vector of environmental coefficients

that were available with these samples (phosphate, depth, nitrate + nitrite). $\epsilon_{2_m} \sim N(0, \sigma^2_{\epsilon_{2_m}} I)$.

$m \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, where M is the number of genes tested. In this model we only used depth,

$NO_2 + NO_3$ and phosphate, as these were the environmental factors available for the benchmarking

data.

To account for potential underlying structure in terms of phylogeny, we applied phylogenetic

generalized least squares[62] (PGLS) regression in addition to ordinary least squares (OLS)

regression to model dN/dS. Phylogenetic regression models are used when there is an underlying

phylogenetic clustering structure of the observations. In this case samples may be lowly or highly

phylogenetic diverged leading to residuals that are not *i.i.d.*, which can affect the fit of the model.

On the other hand, the caveat of PGLS is an underestimation of the R^2 as compared to linear

models[63,64]. In our data PGLS and OLS essentially gave the same results and we therefore only

report the latter.

KEGG KO expression data as a ranking metric

Using expression data from 4,092 KEGG KOs collected by Kolody et al.[33], we ranked the KO

genes in our marine samples in the following way. We first represent the expression data in

relative abundance space (normalize each sample by its read counts). Next, for each focal KO i,

where $i \in \{1, \ldots, I\}$, we sum across its different instances within each sample. The input is an

$m \times n$ matrix, where m is the number of different instances of focal KO i, and n is the number of

samples. The output is a vector of length n: $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Finally, we average the expression levels

$(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ across samples: $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j$ and rank the KOs based on the calculated average

expression. Notably, we limited the scope of our analysis to samples collected only in small

fraction filters ($0.22\ \mu m$).

Determination of extracellular genes

To determine extracellular gene groups, we searched the eggNOG v.5 OG database for the words

'secreted' or both words 'extracellular' and 'protein' in their description. We demanded that the

words 'autoinducer', 'expression', 'role' and 'hypothetical' are not in the description to prevent

instances where (a) the OG in question describes a hypothetical protein; and (b) where the OG

produces a secreted particle but is not secreted by itself, as is the case with autoinducer producing

genes. To ensure robust pN/pS calculations, descriptions encompassing 10 OGs or more were

assigned a group name, while descriptions encompassing less than 10 OGs were all grouped

together in one group.

Calculation of mutation flux in divergent nitrate concentrations

To calculate the differential rate of nutrient incorporation between environments, we compare, for

each pair of codons *a* and *b*, the ratio of mutations that result in *a* becoming *b* and the ratio of

reverse mutations, that result in *b* becoming *a*. We term this quantity mutation flux. To prevent

simplex-related confounding effects, mutation flux is estimated using the log-odds ratio between

the two (e.g., $log\ (p(AAA \rightarrow AAC)/p(AAC \rightarrow AAA))$). We created a matrix $H^{(U)}$ as follows: Consider

a set U of all genes for which SNP measurements exist and a subset $T \subseteq U$ of this set across

K samples. Let $G^{(T)}{}_j = (V, E)$ be a codon graph for subset T and sample j, where $v \in V$ is a codon

(e.g., CUU coding for Alanine) and $(v, v') \in E$ if and only if v and v' are one mutation apart (e.g.,

CUU for Alanine and CAU for Histidine). Let $w^{(T)}_j : (v, v') \to [0,1]$ be a weight function where

$w^{(T)}_j(v, v') = \frac{Number\ of\ mutations\ turning\ v\ to\ v\prime\ in\ subset\ T\ and\ sample\ j}{Number\ of\ occurrences\ of\ codon\ v\ in\ subset\ T\ and\ sample\ j}$. Let $H^{(T)}$ be a matrix of

dimension ($|E| \times K$), where $H^{(T)}_{(v,v\prime),j} = w^{(T)}_j(v, v')$.

We next sum-normalized H per each sample and compared the codon mutation frequencies

between the 40 lowest- and 40 highest-nitrate samples. Despite significant differences in codon

mutation frequencies between low-nitrate and high-nitrate samples, some of the difference could

be driven by the simplex properties of the sum-normalized codon mutation frequencies, and some

could be attributed to the different rates of synonymous mutations between the high- and low-

nitrate groups, which, combined with simplex properties, may affect observed nonsynonymous

mutation rates. To address simplex properties, we employed a centered log-ratio (CLR)

normalization on *H*. The CLR transformation is a mapping, per codon composition, from the

simplex to a Euclidean vector subspace. This log transforms each value and then centers them

around zero as given below:

723
$$CLR(V) = [log\frac{v_1}{g(v)}, \ldots, log\frac{v_D}{g(v)}] = log(v) - log(g(v))$$

where g(v) is the geometric mean of all of the codons.

To address differences in rates of the different types of mutations, for each mutation (v, v') in

the CLR normalized matrix $H'^{(U)}$ we calculated the log odds ratio between the mutation and its

reverse mutation. Namely, we computed mutation flux matrix $F^{(U)}$ where $F^{(U)}_{(v,v\prime),j} =$

$H^{(U)}_{(v,v\prime),j} - H^{(U)}_{(v\prime,v),j}$. We compared differences in codon mutation flux between low- and high

nitrate samples using the Mann-Whitney *U* test.

Calculation of expected random mutation cost per genetic code

Let V be a genetic code with a set $V_s \subset V$ of stop codons. Let $P(v)$ be the abundance of codon

$v \in V$ in a sample and $P(mut(v, v'))$ the probability of a single mutation from codon v to v'. Let

$c_e : V \times V \to Z$ be a cost function for element e, where:

$$c_e(v, v') = \#\ of\ atoms\ of\ e\ in\ v' - \#\ of\ atoms\ of\ e\ in\ v.$$

When testing the random mutation cost on hydrophobicity:

$$c_{hyd}(v, v') = 0\ if\ v\ and\ v'\ are\ both\ hydrophilic\ or\ hydrophobic, 1\ otherwise\ .$$

With these notations, we define the expected cost of genetic code V for element e as follows:

$$E[C_e(V)] = \sum_{v,v' \in V}(v)P(mut(v, v'))c_e(v, v'),$$

and the ERMC cost as:

$$ERMC_e(V) = \sum_{v,v' \in V}(v)P(mut(v, v'))c_e^+(v, v'),$$

where

$$c^+{}_e = max(0, c_e).$$

We estimate $ERMC_e(V)$ as follows:

1. We define $P(v)$ as the median abundance of all codons v' coding for the same amino acid

as v.

2. We wished to calculate mutation rates in sites that were under minimal selection. To this

end, we estimated $P(mut(v, v'))$ by calculating, from fourfold-degenerate synonymous

mutation sites the average abundance of each single nucleotide mutation (e.g. A to C)

across all genes in which there are called SNPs in all ocean samples, excluding stop

codons. We then estimate $P(mut(v, v'))$ using the relative abundances of all pairs of single

nucleotide mutations. We estimate $P(mut(v, v'))$ for *Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus*

and Human genomes using published transition:transversion rates[5,65].

3. We calculate c using information on the amino acids which each codon codes for.

To compute a P-value, we generate a null distribution by calculating $ERMC_e(V)$ for alternative

genetic codes. We randomize the first and second position of all codons, while maintaining that

the two sets of first and second positions in which the stop codons reside are separated by a

single transition mutation.

Confounding effects between cost functions for the structure of the genetic code

To confirm that our elemental cost function is not confounded by traditional properties of amino

acids such as the polar requirement (PR) and hydropathy index[38–41], we calculated the expected

random mutation cost (ERMC), per genetic code, using these common cost functions across 1

million simulated alternative codes. To this end, we randomized the first and second position of

all codons, while maintaining that the two sets of first and second positions in which the stop

codons reside are separated by a single transition mutation. We next calculated a contingency

table for each pair of cost functions for both nitrogen and carbon (i.e., $ERMC_N(V){:}ERMC_{PR}(V)$,

$ERMC_N(V){:}ERMC_{hyd}(V)$, $(V){:}ERMC_{PR}(V)$, $ERMC_C(V){:}ERMC_{hyd}(V)$). We assign each code to one

of four bins in the following way: (1) surpassing the standard genetic code in both cost functions

(e.g., nitrogen and PR), (2) surpassing the standard genetic code only in element e cost (e.g. only

nitrogen), (3) surpassing the standard genetic code only in the traditional cost function (e.g., PR),

(4) not surpassing the standard genetic code in neither. Finally, we applied the Chi-square test of

independence with two degrees of freedom to each contingency table.

Finally, we examined the subset of genetic codes (out of the 1M hypothetical codes) that have a

lower ERMC than the standard genetic code in terms of PR ($ERMC_{PR}$) or hydropathy ($ERMC_{hyd}$),

and tested whether this subset is also optimized for nitrogen and carbon. To this end, we created

a null model in which we compute EMRC only accounting for hydropathy or PR robustness and

an expanded, nested model that adds minimization of nitrogen and carbon utilization. Under the

null, we expect that in the subset of codes optimizing for hydropathy and PR, nitrogen and carbon

utilization will also be minimized. Under the alternative, if such nutrient optimization indeed exists

separately from structural optimization, we expect that nitrogen carbon and utilization will not be

optimized. Exact P-values are defined to be the fraction of shuffled codes with ERMC smaller or

equal to the standard genetic code (one for each element - carbon and nitrogen) in this subset of

codes that have a lower ERMC than the standard genetic code in terms of PR ($ERMC_{PR}$) or

hydropathy ($ERMC_{hyd}$).

Determination of 'square' and 'diagonal' arrangements of the nitrogen genetic code

We define a 'square' arrangement of the codons coding for nitrogen-rich amino acids histidine,

glutamine, asparagine, lysine and arginine as one where their codons span only two nucleotides

in the first position and two nucleotides in the second position. In the standard genetic code, these

amino acids are coded by CAN, CGN, AAN, AGR, following a square configuration. In contrast,

a 'diagonal' arrangement of the codons coding for these amino acids is one where they span all

possible nucleotides in the first position and all possible nucleotides in the second position. For

example, a genetic code where TTY codes for histidine, TTR for glutamine, CCN and AAR for

arginine, GGY for asparagine and GGR for lysine constitutes a 'diagonal' arrangement of nitrogen

amino acids. In each of the alternative genetic codes we generated, we tested whether either of

these conditions hold and, if so, designated the code as 'square' or 'diagonal' accordingly.

***Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus* genomic data and mutation rates**

We downloaded *Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus* protein-coding gene sequences (where

available) from the Joint Genome Institute (https://genome.jgi.doe.gov/portal/) following

accession numbers published by Berube et al.[5]. To estimate codon relative abundance $P(v)$, we

counted and sum-normalized codons in all protein-coding genes for each species. To estimate

codon mutation rate $P(mut(v, v'))$, we used the published transition:transversion rate of 2:1 for

Prochlorococcus and *Synechococcus* [42].

Multiple taxa ERMC calculation

To calculate ERMC for 39 taxa across multiple transition:transversion rates, we downloaded

codon usage and GC-content data collected by Athey et al.[66]. We used codon usage counts to

estimate $P(v)$ and 11 transition:transversion rates (1:5, 1:4, 1:3, 1:2, 2:3, 1:1, 3:2, 2:1, 3:1, 4:1,

5:1) to estimate $P(mut(v, v'))$.

References

1. Bar-On, Y. M., Phillips, R. & Milo, R. The biomass distribution on Earth. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*

Sci. U. S. A. **115**, 6506–6511 (2018).

2. del Giorgio, P. A. & Duarte, C. M. Respiration in the open ocean. *Nature* **420**, 379–384

(2002).

3. Sunagawa, S. *et al.* Structure and function of the global ocean microbiome. *Science* **348**,

1261359 (2015).

4. Mende, D. R. *et al.* Environmental drivers of a microbial genomic transition zone in the

ocean's interior. *Nature Microbiology* vol. 2 1367–1373 (2017).

5. Berube, P. M., Rasmussen, A., Braakman, R., Stepanauskas, R. & Chisholm, S. W.

Emergence of trait variability through the lens of nitrogen assimilation in Prochlorococcus.

Elife **8**, (2019).

6. Druffel, E. R. M., Griffin, S., Coppola, A. I. & Walker, B. D. Radiocarbon in dissolved

organic carbon of the Atlantic Ocean. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **43**, 5279–5286 (2016).

7. Grzymski, J. J. & Dussaq, A. M. The significance of nitrogen cost minimization in

proteomes of marine microorganisms. *ISME J.* **6**, 71–80 (2012).

8. Akashi, H. & Gojobori, T. Metabolic efficiency and amino acid composition in the proteomes

of Escherichia coli and Bacillus subtilis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **99**, 3695–3700

(2002).

9. Koonin, E. V. & Novozhilov, A. S. Origin and evolution of the genetic code: the universal

enigma. *IUBMB Life* **61**, 99–111 (2009).

10. Hinegardner, R. T. & Engelberg, J. RATIONALE FOR A UNIVERSAL GENETIC CODE.

Science **142**, 1083–1085 (1963).

11. Woese, C. R., Hinegardner, R. T. & Engelberg, J. Universality in the Genetic Code. *Science*

vol. 144 1030–1031 (1964).

12. Woese, C. R. Order in the genetic code. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **54**, 71–75 (1965).

13. Gamow, G. Possible Relation between Deoxyribonucleic Acid and Protein Structures.

Nature **173**, 318–318 (1954).

14. Wong, J. T. A co-evolution theory of the genetic code. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **72**,

1909–1912 (1975).

15. Freeland, S. J. & Hurst, L. D. The genetic code is one in a million. *J. Mol. Evol.* **47**, 238–248

(1998).

16. Crick, F. H. The origin of the genetic code. *J. Mol. Biol.* **38**, 367–379 (1968).

17. Massey, S. E. A neutral origin for error minimization in the genetic code. *J. Mol. Evol.* **67**,

510–516 (2008).

18. Massey, S. E. Genetic code evolution reveals the neutral emergence of mutational

robustness, and information as an evolutionary constraint. *Life* **5**, 1301–1332 (2015).

19. Massey, S. E. The neutral emergence of error minimized genetic codes superior to the

standard genetic code. *J. Theor. Biol.* **408**, 237–242 (2016).

20. Novozhilov, A. S. & Koonin, E. V. Exceptional error minimization in putative primordial

genetic codes. *Biol. Direct* **4**, 44 (2009).

21. Novozhilov, A. S., Wolf, Y. I. & Koonin, E. V. Evolution of the genetic code: partial

optimization of a random code for robustness to translation error in a rugged fitness

landscape. *Biol. Direct* **2**, 24 (2007).

22. Salinas, D. G., Gallardo, M. O. & Osorio, M. I. Local conditions for global stability in the

space of codons of the genetic code. *Biosystems.* **150**, 73–77 (2016).

23. Torabi, N., Goodarzi, H. & Shateri Najafabadi, H. The case for an error minimizing set of

coding amino acids. *J. Theor. Biol.* **244**, 737–744 (2007).

24. Zhu, W. & Freeland, S. The standard genetic code enhances adaptive evolution of proteins.

J. Theor. Biol. **239**, 63–70 (2006).

25. Woese, C. R., Dugre, D. H., Saxinger, W. C. & Dugre, S. A. The molecular basis for the

genetic code. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **55**, 966–974 (1966).

26. Haig, D. & Hurst, L. D. A quantitative measure of error minimization in the genetic code. *J.*

Mol. Evol. **33**, 412–417 (1991).

27. Biller, S. J. *et al.* Marine microbial metagenomes sampled across space and time. *Sci Data*

5, 180176 (2018).

28. Schloissnig, S. *et al.* Genomic variation landscape of the human gut microbiome. *Nature*

493, 45–50 (2013).

29. McDonald, J. H. & Kreitman, M. Adaptive protein evolution at the Adh locus in Drosophila.

Nature **351**, 652–654 (1991).

30. Price, A. L., Zaitlen, N. A., Reich, D. & Patterson, N. New approaches to population

stratification in genome-wide association studies. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **11**, 459–463 (2010).

31. Pachiadaki, M. G. *et al.* Charting the Complexity of the Marine Microbiome through Single-

Cell Genomics. *Cell* vol. 179 1623–1635.e11 (2019).

32. Koonin, E. V. Are There Laws of Genome Evolution? *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **7**, e1002173

(2011).

33. Kolody, B. C. *et al.* Diel transcriptional response of a California Current plankton

microbiome to light, low iron, and enduring viral infection. *ISME J.* (2019)

doi:10.1038/s41396-019-0472-2.

34. Anderson, T. R. & le B. Williams, P. J. A one-dimensional model of dissolved organic

carbon cycling in the water column incorporating combined biological-photochemical

decomposition. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* vol. 13 337–349 (1999).

35. Milo, R. What is the total number of protein molecules per cell volume? A call to rethink

some published values. *Bioessays* **35**, 1050–1055 (2013).

36. Taniguchi, Y. Quantifying E. coli Proteome and Transcriptome with Single-molecule

Sensitivity in Single Cells. *Seibutsu Butsuri* vol. 51 136–137 (2011).

37. Woese, C. R. Evolution of the genetic code. *Naturwissenschaften* **60**, 447–459 (1973).

38. de Oliveira, L. L., de Oliveira, P. S. L. & Tinós, R. A multiobjective approach to the genetic
code adaptability problem. *BMC Bioinformatics* **16**, 52 (2015).

39. Di Giulio, M. & Medugno, M. The level and landscape of optimization in the origin of the
genetic code. *J. Mol. Evol.* **52**, 372–382 (2001).

40. Higgs, P. G. A four-column theory for the origin of the genetic code: tracing the evolutionary
pathways that gave rise to an optimized code. *Biol. Direct* **4**, 16 (2009).

41. Sengupta, S. & Higgs, P. G. Pathways of Genetic Code Evolution in Ancient and Modern
Organisms. *J. Mol. Evol.* **80**, 229–243 (2015).

42. Urbach, E., Scanlan, D. J., Distel, D. L., Waterbury, J. B. & Chisholm, S. W. Rapid
Diversification of Marine Picophytoplankton with Dissimilar Light-Harvesting Structures
Inferred from Sequences of Prochlorococcus and Synechococcus (Cyanobacteria). *Journal*
of Molecular Evolution vol. 46 188–201 (1998).

43. Singer, C. E. & Ames, B. N. Sunlight ultraviolet and bacterial DNA base ratios. *Science*
170, 822–825 (1970).

44. Mcewan, C. E. A., Gatherer, D. & Mcewan, N. R. Nitrogen-fixing aerobic bacteria have
higher genomic GC content than non-fixing species within the same genus. *Hereditas* **128**,
173–178 (1998).

45. Botzman, M. & Margalit, H. Variation in global codon usage bias among prokaryotic
organisms is associated with their lifestyles. *Genome Biol.* **12**, R109 (2011).

46. Liu, J., Zhang, Y., Lei, X. & Zhang, Z. Natural selection of protein structural and functional
properties: a SNP perspective. *Genome Biology* vol. 9 R69 (2008).

47. Read, R. W. *et al.* Nitrogen cost minimization is promoted by structural changes in the
transcriptome of N-deprived Prochlorococcus cells. *ISME J.* **11**, 2267–2278 (2017).

48. Hopfield, J. J. Origin of the genetic code: a testable hypothesis based on tRNA structure,
sequence, and kinetic proofreading. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **75**, 4334–4338 (1978).

49. Yarus, M., Widmann, J. J. & Knight, R. RNA–Amino Acid Binding: A Stereochemical Era for

the Genetic Code. *J. Mol. Evol.* **69**, 406 (2009).

50. Freeland, S. J., Knight, R. D., Landweber, L. F. & Hurst, L. D. Early fixation of an optimal

genetic code. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **17**, 511–518 (2000).

51. Zeevi, D. *et al.* Structural variation in the gut microbiome associates with host health.

Nature **568**, 43–48 (2019).

52. 1000 Genomes Project Consortium *et al.* A map of human genome variation from

population-scale sequencing. *Nature* **467**, 1061–1073 (2010).

53. Huerta-Cepas, J. *et al.* Fast Genome-Wide Functional Annotation through Orthology

Assignment by eggNOG-Mapper. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **34**, 2115–2122 (2017).

54. Huerta-Cepas, J. *et al.* eggNOG 5.0: a hierarchical, functionally and phylogenetically

annotated orthology resource based on 5090 organisms and 2502 viruses. *Nucleic Acids*

Res. **47**, D309–D314 (2019).

55. Seemann, T. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bio-Informatics 30: 2068--2069.

(2014).

56. Bairoch, A. & Apweiler, R. The SWISS-PROT protein sequence database and its

supplement TrEMBL in 2000. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **28**, 45–48 (2000).

57. Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*

58, 236–244 (1963).

58. Katoh, K. & Standley, D. M. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:

improvements in performance and usability. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **30**, 772–780 (2013).

59. Stamatakis, A. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large

phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1312–1313 (2014).

60. Schlitzer, R. *et al.* The GEOTRACES Intermediate Data Product 2017. *Chem. Geol.* **493**,

210–223 (2018).

61. Honaker, J., King, G., Blackwell, M. & Others. Amelia II: A program for missing data. *J.*

Stat. Softw. **45**, 1–47 (2011).

62. Symonds, M. R. E. & Blomberg, S. P. A Primer on Phylogenetic Generalised Least

Squares. *Modern Phylogenetic Comparative Methods and Their Application in Evolutionary*

Biology 105–130 (2014) doi:10.1007/978-3-662-43550-2_5.

63. Westoby, M., Leishman, M. R. & Lord, J. M. On misinterpreting the'phylogenetic correction'.

J. Ecol. **83**, 531–534 (1995).

64. Rheindt, F. E. & Grafe, T. U. Rapidly evolving traits and the comparative method: how

important is testing for phylogenetic signal? *Evol. Ecol.* (2004).

65. Wang, J., Raskin, L., Samuels, D. C., Shyr, Y. & Guo, Y. Genome measures used for

quality control are dependent on gene function and ancestry. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 318–323

(2015).

66. Athey, J. *et al.* A new and updated resource for codon usage tables. *BMC Bioinformatics*

18, 391 (2017).

67. Charlesworth, B. Effective population size and patterns of molecular evolution and

variation. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **10**, 195–205 (2009).

68. Lynch, M. & Conery, J. S. The evolutionary fate and consequences of duplicate genes.

Science vol. 290 1151–1155 (2000).

69. Hughes, A. L., Friedman, R., Rivailler, P. & French, J. O. Synonymous and

nonsynonymous polymorphisms versus divergences in bacterial genomes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*

25, 2199–2209 (2008).

70. Kanehisa, M. & Goto, S. KEGG: kyoto encyclopedia of genes and genomes. *Nucleic Acids*

Res. **28**, 27–30 (2000).

Supplementary Information

Supplementary Note 1. The association between the environment and pN/pS is robust to

time and effective population size.

The magnitude of purifying selection, approximated by pN/pS ratios, may increase as a function

of both time and effective population size[67,68]. These two mechanisms might also be associated

with environmental conditions and we thus sought to control for them as potential confounders.

Time may affect the magnitude of pN/pS ratios via random genetic drift. Effective population size

may affect selection via competition, as in large populations, any slightly deleterious mutation is

rapidly selected against. We used the ratio of synonymous substitutions (i.e., pS) calculated from

our data as an approximation of dS, representing neutral polymorphism rate, as a proxy for time[69].

To approximate effective population size, we relied on population genetic theory suggesting that

effective population size is scaled to diversity at the silent sites when assuming constant mutation

rate between populations. As our data is composed of closely related sequences and hence

similar mutation rate, we used fourfold-degenerate synonymous diversity (SD) as a proxy for the

effective population size[28] (Methods).

We first tested whether SD is associated with environmental conditions, and compared the SD of

populations from different oceanic regions with different environmental parameters. We found that

pN/pS was more strongly associated with most environmental parameters than SD (Kolmogorov-

Smirnov test $P<10^{-20}$ for depth, nitrate, oxygen, phosphate, silicate and temperature ; $P<10^{-5}$ for

NO_2+NO_3 concentrations; non-significant for salinity; **Fig. S3**) suggesting that selection on protein

sequences may be more strongly affected by the environment than effective population sizes are.

We further found that in KOs with the highest EEV these differences are the most pronounced

(Wilcoxon signed-rank test $P<10^{-15}$; **Fig. S15**).

As LMMs also allow controlling for potential confounders as fixed effects, we next added our

approximations of time and the effective population size to our LMM in order to account for their

effect on the magnitude of pN/pS ratios. Accounting for these potential confounders as fixed

effects would enable a a more accurate quantification of the environmental effect. Similar to the

results of our original LMM, across both KEGG and eggNOG orthologs, we found that a significant

fraction of the variance in pN/pS can be attributed to the environment, even after controlling for

these confounders (**Fig. S4C,D**; Mann-Whitney U test $P<10^{-16}$) and a high correlation between

EEV estimated by the two models ($R^2=0.947$ and 0.929 for KEGG and eggNOG, respectively;

Fig. S16).

Supplementary Note 2. The association between the environment and pN/pS is not

confounded by depth.

To demonstrate that our results are not confounded by depth, the environmental variable with the

second strongest correlation to pN/pS (after nitrate), we recalculated our LMM only on samples

from the epipelagic zone (Methods). Similar to the original results of the LMM, we show significant

variance explained in pN/pS in this environmental niche (**Fig. S5**; Mann-Whitney U test $P<10^{-20}$).

1003

Supplementary Note 3. The association between the environment and dN/dS in specific

lineages is robust to time.

To account for the same potential confounders as in the original LMM model model, we added

the rate of synonymous substitutions (dS) to the model, as a measure of time (Methods). Similar

to the results of our original model, we found that a significant portion of the variance in dN/dS

ratios is explained by the environment, even after controlling for time as a confounder, across the

three bacterioplankton lineages tested (SAR-11, SAR-86 and Prochlorococcus; Wilcoxon signed-

rank test $P<10^{-16}$; **Fig. S6**). These results validate our findings using pN/pS calculated from

metagenomic sequences and demonstrate the association between selective pressure and

environmental conditions, even in a single clade. This indicates that associations of pN/pS or

dN/dS with environmental variables are not confounded by organismal properties which may differ

in tropism across environments, but rather exhibit a consistent trend even within a single clade.

1016

1017 **Supplementary Figures**

1018

1019 **Figure S1.** (A) Geographical overview of the samples used in this study. (B) Illustration of our
1020 computational pipeline. (C,D) Histogram of pN/pS rates for eggNOG orthologous groups (OG[53]; C)
1021 and KEGG orthologs (KO[70]; D) across all marine samples.

1022

1023

Figure S2. (A-H) Distribution of measurements taken alongside marine microbial samples for depth (A), nitrate (B), nitrate and nitrite (C), oxygen (D), phosphate (E), salinity (F), silicate (G) and temperature (H). (I) Spearman correlation coefficients between all pairs of environmental measurements across all available samples.

1028

Figure S3. (A-P) Histograms of Spearman correlations between synonymous diversity (red) or pN/pS (blue) and environmental variables, for both KEGG KOs and eggNOG OGs. Panels A, C, E, G, I, K, M and O depict correlations between OG calculated parameters and depth, nitrate, nitrite and nitrite, oxygen, phosphate, salinity, silicate and temperature, respectively. Panels B, D, F, H, J, L, N and P depict correlations between KO calculated parameters and depth, nitrate, nitrite and nitrite, oxygen, phosphate, salinity, silicate and temperature, respectively. P, one-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

1035

Figure S4. (A) Left, box plot (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles) of the variance of eggNOG OG pN/pS rates that was explained by the environment in a basic linear mixed model (LMM) setting (Methods) as compared to the same data with shuffled labels; Right, mean

variance explained in unshuffled data (red) as compared to a histogram (blue) of mean variance

explained in 500 executions with shuffled data. (B) Same as A, for KEGG KO pN/pS. (C) Same as A,

for variance in eggNOG OG pN/pS in a LMM corrected for confounding factors of time and effective

population size. (D) Same as C, for KEGG KO pN/pS. (E) Box plot (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers,

5th and 95th percentiles) of the variance of KEGG KO dN/dS in genus *Prochlorococcus* that was

explained by the environment in a linear model. (F) Same as E, for the SAR-11 clade. (G) Same as E,

for the SAR-86 clade. ****, Wilcoxon signed-rank test $P<10^{-16}$.

1046

1047

1048   **Figure S5.** Box plot (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles) of the variance

1049   of KEGG KO pN/pS ratios that was explained by the environment in epipelagic samples (up to

1050   76m) as compared to the same data with shuffled labels.

1051

1052

1053   **Figure S6.** Box plots (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 10th and 90th percentiles) of explained

1054   variance in dN/dS using linear models considering the environment only (left, red), dS only

1055   (middle, blue), or both (right, green). (A) Prochlorococcus, (B) SAR-11 clade and (C) SAR-86

1056   clade. **, Wilcoxon signed-rank test $P<0.01$; ***, $P<10^{-5}$; ****, $P<10^{-16}$.

1057

1058

Figure S7. Histograms of Spearman correlations between environmental variables (blue) or their inverses (red) and pN/pS ratios of KEGG KOs as compared to a Spearman correlation between the concentration of nitrate and pN/pS ratios (green). P, one sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

Figure S8. Illustration of the potential environmental effect of nitrate on protein-coding sequences.

1065

1066

1067 **Figure S9.** (top, red) 24 highly expressed KOs, exhibiting high correlation between pN/pS and

1068 nitrate concentrations. (bottom, blue) 24 lowly expressed KOs, exhibiting low correlation between

1069 pN/pS and nitrate concentrations. R, Spearman rho.

1070

1071　**Figure S10.** Box plot (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles) of variance in

1072　pN/pS explained by the environment in extracellular gene groups versus all eggNOG OGs.

1073

1074

Figure S11. (A-C) Histograms of the distribution of Mann-Whitney *U* P-values of codon-to-codon mutations compared between (A) 40 low-nitrate samples and 40 other low-nitrate samples selected randomly out of the 80 lowest-nitrate samples; (B) 40 high-nitrate samples and 40 other high-nitrate samples selected randomly out of the 80 highest-nitrate samples; (C) 40 low-nitrate samples and 40 high-nitrate samples selected randomly out of the 80 lowest and highest nitrate samples. (D) Depiction of mutation flux (Methods) common in high versus low environmental nitrate concentrations, affecting amino acid nitrogen and carbon content. Two-headed arrows mark cases where different codons of the same amino acid have opposite mutation fluxes.

1083

Figure S12. Scatter plots of nitrate concentrations (x-axis) versus percent of mutations (y-axis)

for (A) all AT to GC mutations; (B) All mutations in coding sequences changing an amino acid

with no nitrogen in its side-chain to one with nitrogen in the side-chain (non-N to N mutations);

(C) AT to GC mutations not changing protein nitrogen; (D) non-N to N mutations not changing GC

content. R and P, Spearman correlation coefficient and P-value; line, linear fit; shaded area, 95%

confidence interval for fit.

1090

1091

Figure S13. Upper panel: (Top) Nitrogen content (A; blue color scale), carbon content (B; black), hydropathy (C; green-red) and polar requirement (D; purple) of different amino acids depicted along their positions in the standard genetic code. (Bottom) Histograms of the expected random mutation cost (ERMC), in 1,000,000 random permutations of the genetic code for nitrogen (blue), carbon (black), hydropathy (green) and polar requirements (purple). Lower panel: Histograms of ERMC for nitrogen (blue), carbon (black), hydropathy (green) and polar requirements (purple) for the subset of shuffled genetic codes with ERMC lower than the standard genetic code for (E) the polar requirement, (F) hydropathy, (G) carbon and (H) nitrogen. Vertical black-yellow line, ERMC of the standard genetic code for each property. P, permutation test.

Figure S14. (A) Box plots (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles) of P-values for the ERMC of the standard genetic code for nitrogen (left), carbon (center) and both (right) across 187 Prochlorococcus (P, blue) and Synechococcus (S, red) strains. (B) Heat map of ERMC P-values for nitrogen, carbon and both, for a theoretical case in which all codons are of the same abundance. (C,D) Same as Fig. 3C for $ERMC_N$ (D) and $ERMC_C$ (E) P-values.

Figure S15. Box plots (line, median; box, IQR; whiskers, 10th and 90th percentiles) of P-values (t-test, multiple hypothesis adjustment) between samples with high-N (more than 19.6 µmol/kg) and low-N (0 µmol/kg), for KEGG KOs ordered by their EEV in the LMM, for both pN/pS (blue) and synonymous diversity (red). ****, Wilcoxon signed-rank test $P<10^{-15}$.

1114

1115 **Figure S16.** (A,B) scatter plot of explained variance in a linear mixed model considering only
1116 environmental factors as random effects (x-axis) versus a model considering environmental
1117 factors as random effects plus dS (as a proxy for time) and synonymous diversity (as a proxy for
1118 effective population size) as fixed effects (y-axis) in all (A) KEGG KOs and (B) eggNOG OGs.

1119

Cost function a	Cost function b	Sign a	Sign b	Alternative code counts	Chi-squared P-value
n+	c+	<	<	128	1.32E-03
			>=	14106	
		>=	<	11802	
			>=	973964	
n+	hyd	<	<	270	2.71E-04
			>=	13964	
		>=	<	14953	
			>=	970813	
n+	pr	<	<	83	4.68E-16
			>=	14151	
		>=	<	13646	
			>=	972120	
c+	hyd	<	<	249	4.86E-07
			>=	11681	
		>=	<	14974	
			>=	973096	
c+	pr	<	<	442	4.29E-107
			>=	11488	
		>=	<	13287	
			>=	974783	

Table S1. Contingency tables for each pair of cost functions for both nitrogen (n+) and carbon (c+), compared to PR (pr) and Hydropathy index (hyd), across 1 million simulated genetic codes. Each code is assigned to one of four bins: (1) surpassing the standard genetic code in both cost functions (<; <), (2) surpassing the standard genetic code only in element e cost (<; >=), (3) surpassing the standard genetic code only in the traditional cost function (>=; <), (4) not surpassing the standard genetic code in neither (>=; >=). Chi-square test of independence was applied to each contingency table.