Host-adaptation in *Legionellales* is 2.4 Ga, coincident with eukaryogenesis

Eric Hugoson[1,2], Tea Ammunét[1] †, and Lionel Guy[1]*

[1] Department of Medical Biochemistry and Microbiology, Science for Life Laboratories, Uppsala University, Box 582, 75123 Uppsala, Sweden

[2] Department of Microbial Population Biology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, D-24306 Plön, Germany

† current address: Medical Bioinformatics Centre, Turku Bioscience, University of Turku, Tykistökatu 6A, 20520 Turku, Finland

* corresponding author

Abstract

Bacteria adapting to living in a host cell caused the most salient events in the evolution of eukaryotes, namely the seminal fusion with an archaeon [1], and the emergence of both the mitochondrion and the chloroplast [2]. A bacterial clade that may hold the key to understanding these events is the deep-branching gammaproteobacterial order *Legionellales* – containing among others *Coxiella* and *Legionella* – of which all known members grow inside eukaryotic cells [3]. Here, by analyzing 35 novel *Legionellales* genomes mainly acquired through metagenomics, we show that this group is much more diverse than previously thought, and that key host-adaptation events took place very early in its evolution. Crucial virulence factors like the Type IVB secretion (Dot/Icm) system and two shared effector proteins were gained in the last *Legionellales* common ancestor (LLCA), while many metabolic gene families were lost in LLCA and its immediate descendants. We estimate that LLCA lived circa 2.4 Ga ago, predating the last eukaryotic common ancestor (LECA) by at least 0.5 Ga [4]. These elements strongly indicate that host-adaptation arose only once in *Legionellales*, and that these bacteria were using advanced molecular machinery to exploit and manipulate host cells very early in eukaryogenesis.

Introduction

The recent discovery of Asgard archaea and their placement on the tree of life [5,6] sheds light on early eukaryogenesis, confirming that eukaryotes arose from a fusion between an archaeon and a bacterium. However, many questions pertaining to eukaryogenesis remain unanswered. In particular, the timing and the nature of the fusion is vigorously debated [1,7–9]. Mito-late scenarios [8,10,11] posit that endosymbiosis of the mitochondrion occurred in a eukaryote that was capable of phagocytosis, while mito-early scenarios [12] posit that mitochondrial endosymbiosis triggered eukaryogenesis. In many scenarios, phagocytosis is considered a prerequisite for mitochondrion endosymbiosis and therefore a key component needed for eukaryogenesis [7]. It is not certain when eukaryotes gained the ability to phagocytose bacteria, but it was most certainly prior to the last eukaryotic common ancestor (LECA) [1,7].

The rise of bacteria-phagocytosing eukaryotes created a new ecological opportunity for bacteria, as the eukaryotic cytoplasm is a rich environment. Many bacteria have adapted to exploit this niche, by resisting digestion once phagocytosed by their predators. A host-adapted lifestyle has evolved many times in many different taxonomic groups [13], but there are few large groups comprised solely of host-adapted members; such groups include *Legionellales*, *Chlamydiales*, *Rickettsiales* and *Mycobacteriaceae*. *Legionellales* is a diverse group of *Gammaproteobacteria* [3,14] that lives only intracellularly and include the well-studied accidental human pathogens *Coxiella burnetii* and *Legionella* spp. *Legionellales* species vary greatly in lifestyle [3], ranging from facultatively intracellular (like *Legionella* spp.) to obligatorily intracellular (like the vertically inherited *Coxiella* symbionts of ticks [15,16]). Because of their rarity and fastidious nature, these host-adapted bacteria are underrepresented in genomic databases; individual isolates from only 7 genera have been sequenced out of an estimated > 450 genera [14].

Hallmarks of adaptation to intracellular space include smaller population sizes,

genome reduction and degradation, and pseudogenization [13]. In addition, the infection process

linked to an intracellular lifestyle requires a number of specialized functions. For instance, the

Type IVB secretion system (T4BSS) plays a key role in the interaction of *Coxiella* [17] and

Legionella [18,19] with their hosts, injecting a wide diversity of protein effectors into the host

cell. These effectors alter the host behavior, preventing the bacterium from being digested and

aiding exploitation of host resources, among others. Some *Legionella* species encode as many

as 18 000 types of effectors, but only eight of these are conserved throughout the genus [20,21].

To better understand the evolutionary history of *Legionellales* and its relationships

with their early hosts, we gathered 35 genomic sequences from novel *Legionellales* through

whole-genome sequencing, binning of metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs), and

database mining.

Results and Discussion

Phylogenetic relationships and diversity among *Legionellales*

Bayesian and maximum-likelihood phylogenies confirm that *Legionellaceae* and

Coxiellaceae are monophyletic sister clades (hereafter jointly referred as *Legionellales* sensu

stricto) are monophyletic, sister clades, and diverged rapidly from each other after the last

Legionellales common ancestor (LLCA) (**Fig. 1**). The phylogeny reveals extensive,

previously unknown diversity among *Legionellales* (**Fig. 1**). *Coxiellaceae* comprises two

large clades, one including the known genera *Coxiella*, *Rickettsiella* and *Diplorickettsia*, and

the other including the amoebal pathogen *Aquicella* [22] and environmental MAGs. Notably, the

two MAGs in *Legionellales* that are resolved as outside *Legionella* have small genomes (2.2

and 1.9 Mb, respectively, see **Supp. Figure 3**), whereas genomes within *Legionella* (except

for *Ca.* L. polyplacis, an obligate louse endosymbiont [23]) range from 2.3 to 4.9 Mb [21]. This

pattern suggests that the last common ancestor of *Legionellaceae* had a smaller genome than

extant *Legionella* species, although it cannot be completely excluded that genome reduction

occurred independently in these two MAGs.

Figure 1 | Bayesian phylogeny of *Legionellales*. Tree inferred with PhyloBayes using a

GTR+CAT model and a concatenated amino acid alignment of 109 single-copy orthologs

(Bact109) comprising 93 *Legionellales* genomes, 16 genomes from other

Gammaproteobacteria, and rooted with an outgroup of 4 genomes from non-

Gammaproteobacteria Proteobacteria (dataset Legio93). Numbers on branches show

posterior probabilities (pp). Branches without numbers indicate pp = 1. Terminal nodes in

bold indicate taxa recovered in this study either by database mining or sequencing. Green

branches indicate clades where no genomic data was available prior to this study. The scale

shows the average number of substitutions per site. The colored groups and Roman numerals

Interestingly, two MAGs recovered from the TARA Ocean sampling campaign are

included in the *Legionellaceae*, one as a sister clade to the *Legionella* genus, and one

clustering within the "green group", having *L. birminghamensis* and *L. quinlivanii* as closest

relatives (**Fig. 1**). The discovery of two *Legionella* genomes in a marine environment supports

rising evidence that *Legionella* and other genera of the *Legionellales* can colonize saline

waters [14,77]. Strikingly, both MAGs branching as sister groups to the *Legionella* genus have

small genomes (2.2 and 1.9 Mb, respectively), whereas genomes in the *Legionella* genus

(except for *Ca.* L. polyplacis, which is an obligate endosymbiont of a louse [23]) range from 2.3

to 4.9 Mb [21]. This argues in favor of a *Legionellaceae* last common ancestor that had a

smaller genome than the extant *Legionella* species. Incidentally, both MAGs contained inside

the *Legionella* clade III [21] also display smaller genomes than their closest relatives: 1.9 and

2.3 Mb, whereas clade III *Legionella* spp. range from 3.1 to 3.9 Mb. The same is also true,

albeit to a lesser extent, with the MAG branching in clade IV (Legionella_sp_40_6: 3.1 Mb;

rest of the clade: 3.4-4.9 Mb). The reduced genome size in these MAGs, associated with the

longer branches leading to them, might indicate shifts in lifestyles, either towards

streamlining as in the *Pelagibacterales* [78] or towards an increased dependency on their host [13],

similarly to *Ca.* Legionella polyplacis [23].

Two other groups, *Berkiella* spp. and *Piscirickettsia* spp. could not be placed with

very high confidence in the tree (**Supp. Table 1**). However, Bayesian phylogenies (**Supp.**

Figure 1 and 2) inferred with the CAT model consistently placed *Berkiella* as sister clade to

Legionellales sensu stricto (ss), so *Berkiella* + *Legionellales* is hereafter referred to as

Legionellales sensu lato (sl). The placement of *Piscirickettsia* is not as consistent, and further

studies are needed to establish whether it is more closely related to *Legionellales* or the

Francisella/Fangia group.

Evolution of genome content in *Legionellales*

To better understand the evolution of host-adaptation in the order, we reconstructed gene flow

within *Legionellales*. The phylogenetic birth-and-death model implemented in Count [24] was

used on the same set of genomes (Legio93) as the tree in **Fig. 1**. The reconstructed gene flow

reveals 553 gene family losses from the last free-living ancestor to LLCA sl (**Fig. 2, Supp.**

Figure 3, Supp. Table 2). These 553 losses can be compared to 781 losses on the branch

leading to *Fangia/Francisella*, another intracellular group. A subsequent large gain in gene

families in the last common ancestors of *Legionellaceae* and *Berkiella* spp. (588 and 556,

respectively) but not in the ancestors of *Coxiellaceae* (*Coxiella/Aquicella*) suggests that

LLCA had a genome size comparable to that of the latter group (average: 1.8 Mb), compatible

with genome sizes of gammaproteobacterial intracellular bacteria [13].

Figure 2 | Overview of ancestral reconstruction of *Legionellales* genomes, with the

T4BSS system and the *Legionella*-conserved effectors detailed. The ancestral

reconstruction is based on the Bayesian tree in **Fig. 1**. At the left of each node, barplots depict

the number of gene families (blue, ranging from 0 to 2295) inferred at that node, as well as

the number of gene family gains (green, from 0 to 589) and losses (red, from 0 to 781) on the

A crucial feature for the success of many host-adapted bacteria is the ability to transfer

proteins into the host's cytoplasm, typically through secretion systems. Among the

proteobacterial VirB4-family of ssDNA conjugation systems (Type IV Secretion Systems,

T4SS), one called T4BSS (also called MPF$_I$ or I-type T4SS) probably arose early in the group

[25]. It is present in almost all extant *Legionellales*, with the exception of the extremely reduced

endosymbionts of the group (**Supp. Figure 3**), where it is either missing completely or

pseudogenized. It is partly missing in several of the small, novel *Coxiellaceae* MAGs,

possibly indicating increased host dependence. However, it is difficult to assess with certainty

whether genes absent in MAGs represent true losses or are the result of incomplete binning of

metagenomic contigs. T4BSS in *Legionellales* appears largely collinear (**Fig. 3, Supp. Figure**

4). Ancestral reconstruction of the order revealed that T4BSS, as it is found in extant

Legionellales, originated after the last free-living ancestor but before the LLCA, with several

proteins added over time (**Fig. 2**). IcmW and IcmS (two small acidic cytoplasmic proteins,

part of the coupling protein subcomplex [79,80]), IcmC/DotE, IcmD/DotP and IcmV (three small

integral inner membrane proteins, of uncharacterized functions) were gained in the LLCA sl.

IcmQ, a cytoplasmic protein and IcMN/DotK, an outer membrane lipoprotein [81], were

acquired in the LLCA sl stricto, after the divergence with *Berkiella*. The limited amount of

characterized functions for these proteins prevents us to infer exactly how their gain allowed

161 the LLCA to infect eukaryotic cells. However, except for IcmN/DotK, all these proteins are

162 located either in the inner membrane or in the cytoplasm, suggesting that the specific role of

163 the *Legionellales*-gained proteins is related to the coupling protein complex rather than in the

164 core complex.

Figure 3 | Collinearity of T4BSS in *Legionellales*. Genes are colored as they appear in *Legionella pneumophila* Philadelphia. Lines connecting rows show similarities between the sequences, as identified by tblastx. Red lines indicate a direct hit, blue lines a complementary one. Darker shades indicate higher bit scores of the tblastx hit.

A homologous T4BSS system is present in *Fangia hongkongensis*, but mostly absent

in the free-living *Gammaproteobacteria* and in *Francisella*, a sister clade to *Fangia*. It is

likely that the T4BSS in *Fangia* has been acquired by horizontal gene transfer, possibly from

Piscirickettsia (**Supp. Figure 5** and **6**).

Contrarily to T4BSS itself, which is highly conserved throughout the order, effectors

are much more versatile. Of the eight effectors conserved in the *Legionella* genus [21], only two

are found outside of the *Legionellaceae* family (**Fig. 2**): RavC (lpg0107) is found in most

Legionellales ss, while LegA3/AnkH/AnkW (lpg2300) is found in *Legionellales* ss and

Berkiella. MavN (lpg2815), which is conserved in *Legionella* spp. and was found in

Rickettsiella [20], is found only in a few *Coxiellaceae* species (**Fig. 2**; **Supp. Figure 3**), and is

unlikely to have been acquired in the LLCA. Although the function of these effectors is not

precisely known, LegA3/AnkH contains ankyrin repeats, and has been suggested to play a

role in process involved in modulation of phagosome biogenesis [26].

Dating the rise of the *Legionellales*

Absolute dating of bacterial trees is often inconclusive, because very few reliable biomarkers

can be unambiguously attributed to a bacterial clade and used as calibration points [27].

However, one such biomarker is okenone, a pigment whose degradation product okenane has

been found in the 1.64-Ga-old Barney Creek Formation [28], and is exclusively produced by a

subset of *Chromatiaceae*. *Chromatiaceae* (part of the purple sulfur bacteria) and

Legionellales are phylogenetically close to each other within *Gammaproteobacteria* [29]. We

reasoned that the last common ancestor of all okenone-producing *Chromatiaceae* had to be at

least as old as the earliest known trace of okenone, i.e. ≥1.64 Ga (**Fig. 4**). Using this

constraint and a relaxed molecular clock model, we were able to calibrate a Bayesian tree

based on a dataset including genomes from 105 *Gammaproteobacteria* (of which 22 belong

Legionellales and 19 to *Chromatiaceae*) and 5 outgroups (Gamma105 dataset). We estimate

that LLCA existed ca. 2.43 Ga ago (**Fig. 4**), with a 95% high posterior density ranging from

2.70 to 2.26 Ga (see **Supp. Table 4**).

Figure 4 | Bayesian estimation of the appearance of the LLCA. *Chromatiaceae* are
highlighted in red, with okenone-producing species in bold. *Legionellales* are highlighted in
green. The red vertical line is drawn at 1.64 Ga, the age of the Barney Creek Formation which
contains okenane, which gives the lower estimate for the divergence of *Chromatiaceae*.
Horizontal bars at interior nodes represent the highest posterior density interval (95%) as
determined by BEAST. The red horizontal bar indicates the last common ancestor of all
okenone-producing *Chromatiaceae*, the green bars indicate ancestors of *Legionellales*, with,
from top to bottom, the last common ancestor of *Legionellaceae*, *Legionellales* ss,
Coxiellaceae, and *Legionellales* sl (LLCA). The underlying tree is shown in **Supp. Figure 2**.

We took several steps to mitigate confounding factors in estimating the age of LLCA.
Firstly, we carefully selected genomes included in the Gamma105 dataset: (i) we included a
large outgroup, both in the *Gammaproteobacteria* and outside; (ii) whenever possible, we
included genomes that were breaking long branches; (iii) we removed fast-evolving genomes,
but kept those breaking long branches.

Secondly, we tested several clock models: strict, relaxed with uncorrelated log-normal

distribution, and relaxed with random local distribution. The latter was not computationally

tractable. The four chains run for the strict clock model (10 million generations each)

converged but the strict clock assumption appeared invalid when examining the variation of

mutation rates obtained from the relaxed clock model. The results of the strict clock model

were therefore not used. For the relaxed clock model (uncorrelated log-normal), five chains

were run, one for 55.7 million generations, and four for 10 million generations each. Most of

the parameters achieved an ESS score > 100, a good indication that the chains had efficiently

sampled the parameter space. The mutation rate and the mean of the ucld parameter did not

reach high ESS scores but were negatively correlated with each other. Despite not fully

converging, the five trees from the five chains yielded similar results. In particular, the

estimation of the age of LLCA was consistent between the chains (see **Supp. Table 4**), which

strongly indicates that the chains correctly explored the parameter space. To estimate how the

chosen priors affected the runs, the parameters obtained from the actual run (57 million

generations) were compared with those from a run with 10 million generations drawing only

from the priors. All parameters displayed very different distributions, suggesting that the

choice of the priors had very little effect on the obtained values.

Conclusion

The common ability of *Legionellales* bacteria to invade eukaryotic cells combined with the

presence and high conservation of the crucial host-adaptation genes, namely a complete

T4BSS and two effectors, strongly suggest that the last common ancestor of *Legionellales*

was already infecting other cells. The hypothesis that LLCA used these mechanisms to infect

or interact with other prokaryotes cannot be completely ruled out, but seems extremely

unlikely for several reasons. For example, if LLCA was only infecting prokaryotes, then the

ability to infect eukaryotes would have to have evolved independently several times within

Legionellales, in all free-living descending clades, with no exception (all experimentally

investigated *Legionellales* are able to live inside the cytoplasm of eukaryotic cells).

Furthermore, each of these independent host-adaptation events would have to have involved

the same host-adaptation genes (all experimentally investigated *Legionellales* use the same

T4BSS to interact with their hosts).

It is also likely that LLCA, like extant *Legionellales*, depended on phagocytosis (or its

prototypic version), a mechanism exclusively found in eukaryotes. This implies that LLCA

appeared after the division of Archaea and the first eukaryotic common ancestor (FECA), thus

placing rise of phagocytosis and FECA at 2.26 Ga at the latest. Given a consensual estimate

of the last eukaryotic common ancestor's (LECA) age of 1.0–1.6 Ga [4], the time for

eukaryogenesis, defined as the time elapsed between FECA and LECA [1], would be at least

660 Ma, but could be >1.2 Ga.

The existence of a phagocytosing eukaryote at 2.26 Ga has implications for

hypotheses of eukaryogenesis. Four of the most prominent of these (reviewed e.g. in [9]) make

different assumptions about the timing of the mitochondrial endosymbiosis. In the hydrogen

hypothesis [12], the mitochondria arrived early ('mito-early'), with the mitochondrial

endosymbiosis event itself triggering eukaryogenesis. In the phagocytosing archaeon model

(PhAT) [30], the syntrophy hypothesis [10], and the serial endosymbiosis model [8], the

mitochondrion arrive late ('mito-late'). Specifically, in the PhAT model, phagocytosis

machinery is a pre-requisite for the fusion of the mitochondrial progenitor with an Asgard

archaeon. The very early emergence of phagocytosis proposed in this contribution supports a

mito-late scenario.

In summary, we show here that the last *Legionellales* common ancestor already

possessed a T4BSS and two effectors, and existed over 2.26 Ga ago. We propose that LLCA,

upon being phagocytosed by eukaryotic cells, already had the ability to resist digestion, owing

to its host-adaptation genes. Thus, phagocytosis is at least 2.26 Ga old, earlier than previously

thought. This hypothesis is consistent with a scenario in which some early eukaryotes

developed phagocytic properties and fed on prokaryotes. Some of these, among them LLCA,

rapidly acquired the abilities to resist host digestion and exploit the novel, rich ecological

niche that is the eukaryotic cytoplasm.

Material and Methods

Bacterial strains

269 Two species of *Aquicella* (*A. lusitana*, DSM 16500 and *A. siphonis*, DSM 17428) [22] were

270 ordered from the DSMZ strain culture and grown at 37°C for 5 days on Buffered Charcoal

271 Yeast Extract (BCYE) agar plates with *Legionella* BCYE supplement (OXOID).

DNA Extraction and sequencing, assembly and annotation

DNA was extracted from pure culture isolates (*Aquicella* spp.) using the Genomic Tip 100

DNA extraction kit (QIAGEN), following the manufacturer's instructions. DNA extracted

from pure cultures was sequenced by PacBio, using one SMRT cell for each isolate. Reads

were assembled using the HGAP.3 pipeline, resulting in one unitig per replicon. The

assembly was confirmed by performing cumulative GC skews on each replicon [31]. All

replicons had repetitive sequences at the beginning and the end of the sequences, suggesting

that they were circular. One unitig in *A. lusitana* had multiple repeats of the same sequences

and was edited manually. All chromosomes were rotated to have the origin of replication, as

determined by cumulative GC skews, at the beginning of the sequence. The final sequences

were confirmed by mapping ~500k shorter reads (2x300 bp, obtained from an Illumina MiSeq

run) to the sequences obtained from PacBio. No SNP could be found in any of the replicons.

All sequencing, as well as quality control and assembly of the PacBio reads, was performed at

NGI, SciLifeLab, Uppsala and Stockholm, Sweden.

The sequences were then annotated with prokka 1.12-beta [32], using prodigal 2.6.3 [33] to

call protein-coding genes, Aragorn 1.2 [34] to predict tRNAs and barrnap 0.7 [35] to predict

rRNAs. Default functional annotation was performed by prokka. Both genomes are submitted

at the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA) under study number PRJEB29684.

Protein marker sets

A set of 139 PFAM protein domains was used as a starting point both to perform quality

control of MAGs and for phylogenomic reconstructions. The original set was used by Rinke

et al (Supplementary Table 13 in [36]) to estimate the completeness of their MAGs. We used the

same set (referred to as Bact139) to estimate MAG completeness. A large subset of the 139

protein domains are very frequently located in the same protein in a vast majority of

Proteobacteria. This was evidenced by investigating 1083 genomes, using phyloSkeleton 1.1

[37] to select one representative per proteobacterial genus and to identify proteins containing the

Bact139 domain set. Of these domains which often co-localized in the same protein, only the

most widespread one was retained. In total, only 109 domains were used to identify proteins

suitable for phylogenomics analysis. This set is referred to as Bact109 and is available in

phyloSkeleton 1.1 [37].

Metagenome assembly

The 86 metagenomes with the highest fraction of reads belonging to *Legionellales* [14] were

selected (Supp. Table 5) and downloaded from MGnify [38]. Metagenomes sequenced only

with 454 (Roche), or that were too complex to be assembled on the computational cluster at

our disposition (512 Gb RAM) were not included. Raw reads were downloaded from the

European Nucleotide Archive (ENA) and trimmed using Trim Galore (v0.4.2) [39] to remove

standard adapter sequences. Additionally, reads were trimmed using Trimmomatic (v0.36) [40]

with a sliding window (4:15) to only discard low-quality bases without losing whole reads.

Trimmed reads were then assembled using SPAdes (St. Petersburg genome assembler)

(v3.7.1) [41], using the --meta option and kmer sizes 21, 33, and 55 for metagenome sizes that

did not require running on a HPCC (High Performance Computer Cluster). More complex

metagenomes requiring a HPCC were assembled on UPPMAX with a single kmer, 31.

Contigs smaller than 500 bp were then discarded.

Identification of MAGs belonging to *Legionellales*

To identify MAGs belonging to *Legionellales*, the ggkBase (https://ggkbase.berkeley.edu/)

and NCBI Genome databases were screened for MAGs attributed to Gammaproteobacteria.

MAGs obtained through metagenomic binning from a previous published study [42] and from a

prepublication [43] that branched close to *Legionella pneumophila* were also included.

The selected MAGs and the assembled metagenomes were screened using the same

ribosomal protein (r-protein) pipeline as described in [6], hereafter referred to as RP15. Briefly,

this pipeline uses first PSI-BLAST 2.9.0+ to search the given metagenomes and MAGs for 15

ribosomal proteins, which are universally located in a single chromosomal locus. Contigs

containing at least 8 of the 15 r-proteins are then retained, and referred to as r-contigs.

A backbone of known organisms (with complete genomes and established

taxonomies) was used to help identifying to which known clades the r-contigs belong. The

package phyloSkeleton 1.1 [37] was used to select one representative genome in each family

within Gammaproteobacteria, one in each order of the Beta- and Alphaproteobacteria, as well

as *Mariprofundus* and *Acidithiobacillus*. phyloSkeleton also identified orthologs of 15

ribosomal proteins in the gathered genomes.

The RP15 orthologs gathered from both the metagenomic sources and the backbone

were aligned with MAFFT L-INS-I v7.273 [44], and the alignments concatenated through the

RP15 pipeline. The resulting concatenated alignment was used to infer a rough phylogenetic

tree using FastTree 2.1.8 [45], using the WAG model. R-contigs that were clearly unrelated to

Legionellales were removed from the dataset, while the remaining proteins were realigned

and concatenated, to generate a new tree. This process was iterated until all remaining MAGs

and r-contigs were deemed belonging to *Legionellales*. A final phylogeny was inferred with

RAxML 8.2.8 [46] using the PROTGAMMA model which allowed automatic selection of best

substitution matrix to infer a more robust phylogeny.

Metagenomic binning and quality control

Metagenomes containing r-contigs belonging to *Legionellales* were then binned with ESOM

1.1 [47,48]. An ESOM map was generated from contigs over 2 kb with a 10 kb sliding window,

and visualized using the ESOM analyzer, highlighting the location of the r-contig and

selecting the corresponding bin. The completeness and redundancy of all MAGs were then

controlled using miComplete 0.1 [49]

Some MAGs were very similar to each other, due to different versions of the same bin

being present in databases. The most complete MAG was then selected for each set, provided

they were not more redundant than another genome within the same set. If equal in

completeness the NCBI-submitted MAG was preferred.

Phylogenomics

Two sets of genomes were used for phylogenomics in this contribution. Both sets consist of

part or all of the novel *Legionellales* MAGs and genomes, supplemented with varying subsets

of outgroups. The initial selection of the representative organisms and identification of

markers was done with phyloSkeleton 1.1 [37], initially choosing one representative per class in

the *Betaproteobacteria*, the *Zetaproteobacteria* and the *Acidithiobacillia*; one per genus in the

Gammaproteobacteria, except in the *Piscirickettsiaceae* and the *Francisellaceae* (one per

species). That initial selection of genomes was then trimmed down to reduce the

computational burden of tree inference.

For both sets, protein markers from the Bact109 set were identified with

phyloSkeleton 1.1 [37]. Each marker was aligned separately with mafft-linsi v7.273 [44]. The

resulting alignments were trimmed with BMGE v1.12 [50], using the BLOSUM30 matrix and

the stationary-based trimming algorithm. The alignments were then concatenated. From these

alignments, maximum-likelihood trees were reconstructed with FastTreeMP v2.1.10 [45] using

the WAG substitution matrix. Upon visual inspection of the resulting trees, the genome

selection was reduced to remove closely related outgroups, and the phylogenomic procedure

repeated. Once the genome dataset was final, a maximum-likelihood tree was inferred with

IQ-TREE v1.6.5 [51], using the LG [52] substitution matrix, empirical codon frequencies, four

gamma categories, the C60 mixture model [53] and PMSF approximation [54]; 1000 ultrafast

bootstraps were drawn [55].

The first set of genomes, called Gamma105, was used to correctly place *Legionellales*

in *Gammaproteobacteria*, in particular with respect to *Chromatiaceae*. It encompasses 110

genomes, of which 105 are *Gammaproteobacteria*, one is a *Zetaproteobacterium*, 3 are

Betaproteobacteria, and one is an *Acidithiobacillia*. The selected *Gammaproteobacteria*

include representatives from *Legionellales* (22), *Chromatiaceae* (19), *Francisellaceae* (17)

and *Piscirickettsiaceae* (4) (**Supp. Table 6**).

The second set, called Legio93, is focused on *Legionellales* itself and comprises 113

genomes, of which 93 belong to *Legionellales* and the rest to other *Gammaproteobacteria* (16

genomes), *Betaproteobacteria* (2 genomes), *Acidithiobacillia* (1 genome) and

Zetaproteobacteria (1 genome) (**Supp. Table 7**).

For both sets, single-gene maximum-likelihood trees were inferred for each marker.

The BMGE-trimmed alignments were used to infer a tree using IQ-TREE 1.6.5, using the

automatic model finder [56], limiting the matrices to be tested to the LG matrix and the C10 and

C20 mixture models. Single-gene trees were visually inspected for the presence of very long

branches resulting from distant paralogs being chosen by phyloSkeleton.

For both sets, a Bayesian phylogeny was inferred with phylobayes MPI 1.5a [57] from

the concatenated BMGE-trimmed alignments, using a CAT+GTR model. Four parallel chains

were run for 9500 generations (Gamma105 set) and 3500 generations (Legio93 set),

respectively. The chains did not converge in either set. For Legio93, all four chains yielded

the same topology for all deep nodes in and around *Legionellales*. For Gamma105, 3 out of 4

chains yielded the same overall topology, while the last one had the *Piscirickettsia* and the

Berkiella clades inverted (**Supp. Table 1**). The majority-rule tree obtained from the Bayesian

trees for Legio93 was subsequently used for the ancestral reconstruction (see below), while

the one for Gamma105 was used as input tree to estimate the time of divergence of the LLCA

(see below).

Identification of okenone-producing *Chromatiaceae*

To relate the earliest documented trace of okenone [28,58] to a specific ancestor, we took two

approaches. First, we compared a list of okenone-producing *Chromatiaceae* [59] with the

genomes available in Genbank and at the JGI Genome Portal [60]. We found five okenone-

producing *Chromatiaceae* genomes. Second, we used homologs of the proteins encoded by

the genes *crtU* and *crtY*, which are considered essential to synthesize okenone [61], to screen the

nr database. We used the proteins from *Thiodictyon syntrophicum* str. Cad16 (accession

number: CrtU, AEO72326.1; CrtY, AEO72327.1) as queries in a PSI-BLAST 2.9.0+ search [62]

restricted to the order *Chromatiales*, keeping only proteins with at least 50% similarity.

Gathered homologs (n=7 in both cases) were aligned with MAFFT L-INS-I v7.273 [44] and the

alignment was pressed into a hidden Markov model (HMM) with HMMer 3.1b2 [63]. Using

phyloSkeleton [37], we collected all *Chromatiales* genomes from NCBI (n=130) and queried

these, together with the Gamma105 set with both HMMs. A significant similarity (E-value <

10^{-10}) for CrtU and CrtY was found in 42 and 25 genomes, respectively. A hit for both

proteins was found in 8 genomes only, of which 6 belong to the *Chromatiaceae*. Of these 6, 4

were already identified by the first method listed above; one was a MAG that was too

incomplete to include in further phylogenomics analysis; the last one was another MAG that

was included in later analysis. The other two genome that had proteins similar to CrtU and

CrtY are *Kushneria aurantia* DSM 21353, a member of the *Halomonadaceae* and

Immundisolibacter cernigliae TR3-2, which branches very close to the root of the

Gammaproteobacteria: these two might represent cases of horizontal gene transfer.

Time-constrained tree

To estimate the time of divergence of LLCA, we used BEAST 2 [64], using a strict and a

relaxed clock model (uncorrelated log-normal) [65]. To reduce computational load, we used a

fixed input tree (Bayesian, Gamma105; see above). The following parameters were used: the

concatenated alignment (104 proteins) was used as a single partition; for site model, a LG

matrix with 4 gamma categories and 10% invariant was used, estimating all parameters; for

the relaxed clock model, an uncorrelated log-normal model was used, estimating the clock

rate. The following prior distributions were used: shape of the gamma distributions for the site

model: exponential; mutation rate: 1/x; proportion of invariants: uniform; ucld mean: 1/X,

offset: 0, ucld std: gamma. To calibrate the clock, it was assumed that the last common

ancestor of all okenone-producing *Chromatiaceae* was at least as old as the rocks where the

earliest traces of okenane (a degradation product of okenone) was found, 1.640 ± 0.03 Ga old

[28,58,66]. A prior was thus set for that the divergence time of the monophyletic group

comprising these organisms: the divergence time was drawn from an exponential distribution

of mean 0.1 Ga with an offset of 1.64 Ga. Although it cannot be completely excluded, no

evidence suggests that other organisms had produced okenone earlier than the last common

ancestor of *Chromatiaceae*: the only mentions of okenone in the scientific literature are linked

to the presence of *Chromatiaceae*.

The four chains run for the strict clock model (10 million generations each) converged

but the strict clock assumption seemed unrealistic when examining the variation of mutation

rates obtained from the relaxed clock model. For the relaxed clock model, five chains were

run, one for 55.7 million generations, and four for 10 million generations each. Traces were

examined with Tracer 1.6.0 [67]. Most of the parameters achieved an ESS score > 100. The

mutation rate and the mean of the ucld parameter did not reach very high ESS scores but were

negatively correlated with each other. Trees were extracted with TreeAnnotator 2.4.7 (part of

BEAST), deciding the burn-in fraction after visual examination of the traces (see **Supp.**

Table 4). Despite not fully converging, the five trees from the five chains yielded similar

results.

To estimate how the chosen priors affected the runs, a run with 10 million generations

was performed, drawing from the priors. Parameters were compared in Tracer 1.6.0. All

parameters displayed very different distributions, suggesting that the choice of the priors had

very little effect on the obtained values.

Protein family clustering and annotation

All 113 proteomes from the Legio93 set were clustered into protein families using OrthoMCL

2.0.9 [68]. All proteins were aligned to each other with the blastp variant of DIAMOND

v0.9.8.109 [69], with the --more-sensitive option, enabling masking of low-complexity regions

(--masking 1), retrieving at most 10^5 target sequences (-k 100000), with a E-value threshold

of 10^{-5} (-e 1e-5), and a pre-calculated database size (--dbsize 98280075). In the clustering

step, mcl 14-137 [70] was called with the inflation parameter equal to 1.5 (-I 1.5), as

recommended by OrthoMCL.

Annotation of the protein families obtained by OrthoMCL was performed by

searching for protein accession number in a list of reference genomes (see below). If any

protein in a family was present in the first genome, the family was attributed this annotation;

else, the second genome was searched for any of the accession numbers, and so on. The

reference list was as follow (Genbank accession numbers between parentheses): *Legionella*

pneumophila subsp. *pneumophila* strain Philadelphia 1 (AE017354), *Legionella longbeachae*

NSW150 (FN650140), *Legionella oakridgensis* ATCC 33761 (CP004006), *Legionella*

fallonii LLAP-10 (LN614827), *Legionella hackeliae* (LN681225), *Tatlockia micdadei*

ATCC33218 (LN614830), *Coxiella burnetii* RSA 493 (AE016828), *Coxiella* endosymbiont

of *Amblyomma americanum* (CP007541), *Escherichia coli* str. K-12 substr. MG1655

(U00096), *Francisella tularensis* subsp. *tularensis* (AJ749949), *Piscirickettsia salmonis* LF-

89 = ATCC VR-1361 (CP011849), *Acidithiobacillus ferrivorans* SS3 (CP011849), *Neisseria*

meningitidis MC58 (AE002098), *Rickettsiella grylli* (NZ_AAQJ00000000.2). *Legionella*

effector orthologous groups were identified by comparing protein accession numbers with the

list provided by [20].

Ancestral reconstruction

The flow of genes in the order *Legionellales* was analyzed by reconstructing the genomes of the ancestors. The ancestral reconstruction was performed with Count v10.04 [24], which implements a maximum-likelihood phylogenetic birth- and death-model. The Bayesian input tree was obtained from the Legio93 dataset (see above) and the OrthoMCL families as described above. The rates (gain, loss, and duplication) were first optimized on the OrthoMCL protein families, to allow different rates on all branches. The family size distribution at the root was set to be Poisson. All rates and the edge length were drawn from a single Gamma category, allowing 100 rounds of optimization, with a 0.1 likelihood threshold. Reconstruction of gene flow was then performed by using posterior probabilities.

Analysis of the Type IVB secretion system

Homologs of the Type IVB secretion system were identified with MacSyFinder v1.0.3 [71]. We used the pT4SSi profile, corresponding to the Type IV Secretion System encoded by the IncI R64 plasmid and *Legionella pneumophila* (T4BSS; also referred to as MPF_I) [72], as query to search all proteomes in the Gamma105 and the Legio93 datasets. This profile includes models for the 17 proteins of the IncI R64 plasmid that have a homolog in *L. pneumophila*. The profile does not cover 6 of the Dot/Icm proteins shared among *L. pneumophila* and *C. burnetii* (IcmFHNQSW). MacSyFinder was run in "ordered_replicon" mode, and using the following HMMer options: --coverage-profile 0.33, --i-evalue-select 0.001. A T4BSS was identified if, within 30 neighboring genes: (i) a IcmB/DotU/VirB4 homolog was present, (ii) at least 6 out of the other 16 were also present, (ii) no relaxase (MOBB) were identified. Since the Icm/Dot system is often split in several operons, not all proteins could be identified by MacSyFinder in "ordered_replicon" mode, but most were since the operon which contains IcmB/DotU/VirB4 is the largest.

495  To inspect the gene organization further in a selection of organisms, a subset of 12

496 representative genomes were aligned with tblastx 2.2.30 [73], with an E-value threshold of 0.01,

497 not filtering the sequences for low complexity regions, and splitting the genomes in smaller

498 pieces when reaching the maximum number of hits between two segments. Results were first

499 visualized in ACT [74], and a final version of the comparison was drawn with genoPlotR [75]. In

500 the cases where MacSyFinder failed to detect a T4BSS, a similar visual inspection of the

501 comparison of the genome with both *L. pneumophila* and *C. burnetii* was performed.

502  For the genomes where the T4BSS was detected by MacSyFinder, twelve proteins

503 (IcmBCDEGKLOPT, DotAC) were retrieved, aligned with mafft-linsi v7.273 [44], trimmed

504 with trimAl v1.4.rev15 [76], using the -automated1 setting, and concatenated. The concatenated

505 alignment was used to infer a maximum-likelihood tree with IQ-TREE v1.6.8 [51], forcing the

506 use of the LG [52] substitution matrix, but letting ModelFinder [56] select the across-site

507 categories, which resulted in the C60 mixture model [53]; 1000 ultrafast bootstraps were drawn

508 [55]. For the genomes not belonging to *Legionellales* sl (R64, *Fangia hongkongensis*,

509 *Acidithiobacillus ferrivorans*, *Acidiferrobacter thiooxydans* and *Alteromonas stellipolaris*),

510 only a few proteins were retrieved by the automated approach. A preliminary tree displayed

511 very long branches, and the procedure above was repeated without these four genomes. For

512 the 12 genomes for which the T4BSS was manually annotated, a tree based on the alignment

513 of 26 proteins belonging to the T4BSS was performed as above, resulting in a LG+F+I+G4

514 model being selected.

Data availability

516 The raw and assembled data for the *Aquicella* genomes is deposited at the European

517 Nucleotide Archive (ENA) under study accession PRJEB29684. The assemblies for *A.*

518 *lusitana* and *A. siphonis* have the accessions GCA_902459475 (replicons LR699114.1-

519   LR699118.1) and GCA_902459485 (replicons LR699119.1- LR699120.1).

520   MAGs, genomes, associated proteomes and alignments underlying the trees presented

521   in this contribution are available at Zenodo, with DOI 10.5281/zenodo.3543579.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council [2017-03709 to L.G.], Science for

Life Laboratory [SciLifeLab National Project 2015 to L.G.], and the Carl Tryggers

Foundation [CTS 15:184, CTS 17:178 to L.G.].

We would like to thank Thijs Ettema and Lisa Klasson for constructive discussion;

Jennah Dharamshi and Lina Juzokaite for help with the 16S amplicon protocol; Laura Eme

for help with dating issues; Joran Martijn and Julian Vosseberg for the help with the Tara

Ocean binning; and Jennifer Ast for her help with editing the manuscript. We would also like

to thank the Ag1000G project for releasing early their data.

Author contributions

532   L.G. conceived the study and drafted the manuscript. E.H. performed database screening and

533   metagenomics; T.A. analyzed the T4BSS and effectors; E.H. and L.G. performed

534   phylogenomics. All authors contributed to writing the final manuscript and approve it.

References

1. Eme, L., Spang, A., Lombard, J., Stairs, C. W. & Ettema, T. J. G. Archaea and the origin

of eukaryotes. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **15**, 711–723 (2017).

2. Sagan, L. On the origin of mitosing cells. *J. Theor. Biol.* **14**, 225-IN6 (1967).

3. Duron, O., Doublet, P., Vavre, F. & Bouchon, D. The Importance of Revisiting

Legionellales Diversity. *Trends Parasitol.* **34**, 1027–1037 (2018).

4. Eme, L., Sharpe, S. C., Brown, M. W. & Roger, A. J. On the age of eukaryotes:

evaluating evidence from fossils and molecular clocks. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* **6**,

(2014).

5. Spang, A. *et al.* Complex archaea that bridge the gap between prokaryotes and

eukaryotes. *Nature* **521**, 173--179 (2015).

6. Zaremba-Niedzwiedzka, K. *et al.* Asgard archaea illuminate the origin of eukaryotic

cellular complexity. *Nature* **541**, 353–358 (2017).

7. Poole, A. M. & Gribaldo, S. Eukaryotic Origins: How and When Was the Mitochondrion

Acquired? *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **6**, a015990 (2014).

8. Pittis, A. A. & Gabaldón, T. Late acquisition of mitochondria by a host with chimaeric

prokaryotic ancestry. *Nature* **531**, 101–104 (2016).

9. López-García, P., Eme, L. & Moreira, D. Symbiosis in eukaryotic evolution. *J. Theor.*

Biol. **434**, 20–33 (2017).

10. López-García, P. & Moreira, D. Selective forces for the origin of the eukaryotic nucleus.

BioEssays **28**, 525–533 (2006).

11. Spang, A. *et al.* Proposal of the reverse flow model for the origin of the eukaryotic cell

based on comparative analyses of Asgard archaeal metabolism. *Nat. Microbiol.* **4**, 1138–

1148 (2019).

12. Martin, W. & Müller, M. The hydrogen hypothesis for the first eukaryote. *Nature* **392**,

37–41 (1998).

13. Toft, C. & Andersson, S. G. E. Evolutionary microbial genomics: insights into bacterial

host adaptation. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **11**, 465–475 (2010).

14. Graells, T., Ishak, H., Larsson, M. & Guy, L. The all-intracellular order Legionellales is

unexpectedly diverse, globally distributed and lowly abundant. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.*

94, (2018).

15. Guizzo, M. G. *et al.* A Coxiella mutualist symbiont is essential to the development of

Rhipicephalus microplus. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 17554 (2017).

16. Gottlieb, Y., Lalzar, I. & Klasson, L. Distinctive Genome Reduction Rates Revealed by

Genomic Analyses of Two Coxiella-Like Endosymbionts in Ticks. *Genome Biol Evol* **7**,

1779–96 (2015).

17. van Schaik, E. J., Chen, C., Mertens, K., Weber, M. M. & Samuel, J. E. Molecular

pathogenesis of the obligate intracellular bacterium *Coxiella burnetii*. *Nat. Rev.*

Microbiol. **11**, 561–73 (2013).

18. Isberg, R. R., O'Connor, T. J. & Heidtman, M. The Legionella pneumophila replication

vacuole: making a cosy niche inside host cells. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **7**, 12–24 (2009).

19. Segal, G., Feldman, M. & Zusman, T. The Icm/Dot type-IV secretion systems of

Legionella pneumophila and Coxiella burnetii. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* **29**, 65–81 (2005).

20. Burstein, D. *et al.* Genomic analysis of 38 Legionella species identifies large and diverse

effector repertoires. *Nat. Genet.* **48**, 167–75 (2016).

21. Gomez-Valero, L. *et al.* More than 18,000 effectors in the Legionella genus genome

provide multiple, independent combinations for replication in human cells. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. **116**, 2265–2273 (2019).

22. Santos, P. *et al.* Gamma-proteobacteria Aquicella lusitana gen. nov., sp. nov., and

Aquicella siphonis sp. nov. infect protozoa and require activated charcoal for growth in

laboratory media. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **69**, 6533–40 (2003).

23. Rihova, J., Novakova, E., Husnik, F. & Hypsa, V. Legionella Becoming a Mutualist:

Adaptive Processes Shaping the Genome of Symbiont in the Louse Polyplax serrata.

Genome Biol Evol **9**, 2946–2957 (2017).

24. Csuros, M. Count: evolutionary analysis of phylogenetic profiles with parsimony and

likelihood. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 1910–2 (2010).

25. Guglielmini, J., de la Cruz, F. & Rocha, E. P. Evolution of conjugation and type IV

secretion systems. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **30**, 315–31 (2013).

26. Habyarimana, F. *et al.* Role for the Ankyrin eukaryotic-like genes of Legionella

pneumophila in parasitism of protozoan hosts and human macrophages. *Environ.*

Microbiol. **10**, 1460–1474 (2008).

27. Brocks, J. J. & Pearson, A. Building the Biomarker Tree of Life. *Rev. Mineral. Geochem.*

59, 233–258 (2005).

28. Brocks, J. J. & Schaeffer, P. Okenane, a biomarker for purple sulfur bacteria

(Chromatiaceae), and other new carotenoid derivatives from the 1640 Ma Barney Creek

Formation. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **72**, 1396–1414 (2008).

29. Williams, K. P. *et al.* Phylogeny of gammaproteobacteria. *J. Bacteriol.* **192**, 2305–14

(2010).

30. Martijn, J. & Ettema, T. J. From archaeon to eukaryote: the evolutionary dark ages of the

eukaryotic cell. *Biochem. Soc. Trans.* **41**, 451–7 (2013).

31. Guy, L., Karamata, D., Moreillon, P. & Roten, C.-A. H. Genometrics as an essential tool

for the assembly of whole genome sequences: The example of the chromosome of

Bifidobacterium longum NCC2705. *BMC Microbiol.* **5**, (2005).

32. Seemann, T. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2068–9

(2014).

33. Hyatt, D. *et al.* Prodigal: prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site

identification. *BMC Bioinformatics* **11**, 119 (2010).

34. Laslett, D. & Canback, B. ARAGORN, a program to detect tRNA genes and tmRNA

genes in nucleotide sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**, 11–6 (2004).

35. Seemann, T. *Barrnap: BAsic Rapid Ribosomal RNA Predictor*. (2013).

36. Rinke, C. *et al.* Insights into the phylogeny and coding potential of microbial dark matter.

Nature **499**, 431–437 (2013).

37. Guy, L. phyloSkeleton: taxon selection, data retrieval and marker identification for

phylogenomics. *Bioinformatics* **33**, 1230–1232 (2017).

38. Mitchell, A. L. *et al.* EBI Metagenomics in 2017: enriching the analysis of microbial

communities, from sequence reads to assemblies. *Nucleic Acids Res* **46**, D726–D735

(2018).

39. Krueger, F. *Trim Galore!* (Babraham Bioinformatics, 2017).

40. Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M. & Usadel, B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–20 (2014).

41. Bankevich, A. *et al.* SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to

single-cell sequencing. *J. Comput. Biol.* **19**, 455–77 (2012).

42. Martijn, J., Vosseberg, J., Guy, L., Offre, P. & Ettema, T. J. G. Deep mitochondrial origin

outside the sampled alphaproteobacteria. *Nature* **557**, 101–105 (2018).

43. Delmont, T. O. *et al.* Nitrogen-Fixing Populations Of Planctomycetes And Proteobacteria

Are Abundant In The Surface Ocean. *bioRxiv* (2017).

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

improvements in performance and usability. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **30**, 772–80 (2013).

45. Price, M. N., Dehal, P. S. & Arkin, A. P. FastTree 2--approximately maximum-likelihood

trees for large alignments. *PloS One* **5**, e9490 (2010).

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

large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1312–3 (2014).

47. Dick, G. J. *et al.* Community-wide analysis of microbial genome sequence signatures.

Genome Biol. **10**, R85 (2009).

48. Ultsch, A. & Moerchen, F. *ESOM-Maps: tools for clustering, visualization, and*

classification with Emergent SOM. (2005).

49. Hugoson, E., Lam, W. T. & Guy, L. miComplete: weighted quality evaluation of

assembled microbial genomes. *Bioinformatics* doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz664.

50. Criscuolo, A. & Gribaldo, S. BMGE (Block Mapping and Gathering with Entropy): a new

software for selection of phylogenetic informative regions from multiple sequence

alignments. *BMC Evol Biol* **10**, 210 (2010).

51. Nguyen, L. T., Schmidt, H. A., von Haeseler, A. & Minh, B. Q. IQ-TREE: a fast and

effective stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies. *Mol. Biol.*

Evol. **32**, 268–74 (2015).

52. Le, S. Q. & Gascuel, O. An improved general amino acid replacement matrix. *Mol. Biol.*

Evol. **25**, 1307–20 (2008).

53. Quang le, S., Gascuel, O. & Lartillot, N. Empirical profile mixture models for

phylogenetic reconstruction. *Bioinformatics* **24**, 2317–23 (2008).

54. Wang, H. C., Minh, B. Q., Susko, E. & Roger, A. J. Modeling Site Heterogeneity with

Posterior Mean Site Frequency Profiles Accelerates Accurate Phylogenomic Estimation.

Syst Biol **67**, 216–235 (2018).

55. Hoang, D. T., Chernomor, O., von Haeseler, A., Minh, B. Q. & Vinh, L. S. UFBoot2:

Improving the Ultrafast Bootstrap Approximation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **35**, 518–522 (2018).

56. Kalyaanamoorthy, S., Minh, B. Q., Wong, T. K. F., von Haeseler, A. & Jermiin, L. S.

ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nat Methods* **14**,

587–589 (2017).

57. Rodrigue, N. & Lartillot, N. Site-heterogeneous mutation-selection models within the

PhyloBayes-MPI package. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1020–1 (2014).

58. Brocks, J. J. *et al.* Biomarker evidence for green and purple sulphur bacteria in a stratified

Palaeoproterozoic sea. *Nature* **437**, 866–870 (2005).

59. Takaichi, S. Distribution and Biosynthesis of Carotenoids. in *The Purple Phototrophic*

Bacteria (eds. Hunter, C. N., Daldal, F., Thurnauer, M. C. & Beatty, J. T.) 97–117

(Springer Netherlands, 2009).

60. Nordberg, H. *et al.* The genome portal of the Department of Energy Joint Genome

Institute: 2014 updates. *Nucleic Acids Res* **42**, D26-31 (2014).

61. Vogl, K. & Bryant, D. A. Biosynthesis of the biomarker okenone: chi-ring formation.

Geobiology **10**, 205–15 (2012).

62. Altschul, S. F. *et al.* Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein

database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **25**, 3389–3402 (1997).

63. Mistry, J., Finn, R. D., Eddy, S. R., Bateman, A. & Punta, M. Challenges in homology

search: HMMER3 and convergent evolution of coiled-coil regions. *Nucleic Acids Res* **41**,

e121 (2013).

64. Bouckaert, R. *et al.* BEAST 2: a software platform for Bayesian evolutionary analysis.

PLoS Comput Biol **10**, e1003537 (2014).

65. Drummond, A. J., Ho, S. Y., Phillips, M. J. & Rambaut, A. Relaxed phylogenetics and

dating with confidence. *PLoS Biol* **4**, e88 (2006).

66. Page, R. W. & Sweet, I. P. Geochronology of basin phases in the western Mt Isa Inlier,

and correlation with the McArthur Basin. *Aust. J. Earth Sci.* **45**, 219–232 (1998).

67. Rambaut, A., Drummond, A. J., Xie, D., Baele, G. & Suchard, M. A. Posterior

Summarization in Bayesian Phylogenetics Using Tracer 1.7. *Syst Biol* **67**, 901–904

(2018).

68. Li, L., Stoeckert, C. J. & Roos, D. S. OrthoMCL: Identification of Ortholog Groups for

Eukaryotic Genomes. *Genome Res.* **13**, 2178–2189 (2003).

69. Buchfink, B., Xie, C. & Huson, D. H. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using

DIAMOND. *Nat Methods* **12**, 59–60 (2015).

70. Enright, A. J., Van Dongen, S. & Ouzounis, C. A. An efficient algorithm for large-scale

detection of protein families. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **30**, 1575–1584 (2002).

71. Abby, S. S., Neron, B., Menager, H., Touchon, M. & Rocha, E. P. MacSyFinder: a

program to mine genomes for molecular systems with an application to CRISPR-Cas

systems. *PloS One* **9**, e110726 (2014).

72. Guglielmini, J. *et al.* Key components of the eight classes of type IV secretion systems

involved in bacterial conjugation or protein secretion. *Nucleic Acids Res* **42**, 5715–27

(2014).

73. Altschul, S. F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E. W. & Lipman, D. J. Basic local alignment

search tool. *J. Mol. Biol.* **215**, 403–10. (1990).

74. Carver, T. J. *et al.* ACT: the Artemis comparison tool. *Bioinformatics* **21**, 3422–3423

(2005).

75. Guy, L., Kultima, J. R. & Andersson, S. G. E. genoPlotR: Comparative gene and genome

visualization in R. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 2334–2335 (2010).

76. Capella-Gutierrez, S., Silla-Martinez, J. M. & Gabaldon, T. trimAl: a tool for automated

alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1972–3

(2009).

77. Gast, R. J., Moran, D. M., Dennett, M. R., Wurtsbaugh, W. A. & Amaral-Zettler, L. A.

Amoebae and Legionella pneumophila in saline environments. *J. Water Health* **9**, 37–52

(2011).

78. Giovannoni, S. J. SAR11 Bacteria: The Most Abundant Plankton in the Oceans. *Annu.*

Rev. Mar. Sci. **9**, 231–255 (2017).

79. Kwak, M.-J. *et al.* Architecture of the type IV coupling protein complex of *Legionella*

pneumophila. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2**, 17114 (2017).

80. Sutherland, M. C., Nguyen, T. L., Tseng, V. & Vogel, J. P. The Legionella IcmSW

Complex Directly Interacts with DotL to Mediate Translocation of Adaptor-Dependent

Substrates. *PLOS Pathog.* **8**, e1002910 (2012).

81. Ghosal, D. *et al.* Molecular architecture, polar targeting and biogenesis of the Legionella

Dot/Icm T4SS. *Nat. Microbiol.* **4**, 1173–1182 (2019).

Supplementary material

Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Figure 1: Bayesian phylogeny of the order *Legionellales*. Based on a concatenated amino-acid alignment of 105 single-copy orthologs, the tree was inferred with PhyloBayes using a GTR+CAT model. The tree encompasses 93 *Legionellales* genomes and is rooted with an outgroup of 4 genomes from *Proteobacteria* other than *Gammaproteobacteria*. Numbers on branches show posterior probabilities (pp). Branches

 without number indicate pp = 1. Terminal nodes in bold indicate taxa recovered in this study.

729   Green branches indicate clades where no genomic data was available prior to this study. The

730   scale shows the average number of substitutions per site. The colored groups and Roman

731   numerals in the *Legionellaceae* correspond to the groupings in [20] and [21], respectively.

Supplementary Figure 2: Bayesian estimation of the phylogenetic relationships of 105

Gammaproteobacteria. The tree is inferred from the Gamma105 dataset, which encompasses

110 genomes, including 105 *Gammaproteobacteria* and 5 other *Proteobacteria*. The selected

Gammaproteobacteria include 22 *Legionellales*, 19 *Chromatiaceae*, 17 *Francisellaceae* and 4

Piscirickettsiaceae. Four phylobayes chains were run from the concatenated BMGE-trimmed

alignments of 104 protein markers, using a CAT+GTR model. Numbers on the branches

represent the posterior probability. The tree was rooted with the five outgroup genomes. This

tree was used as an input for the time-constrained tree show on **Fig. 4.**

Supplementary Figure 3: Gene flow analysis in the *Legionellales* and other *Gammaproteobacteria* genomes, with focus on the T4BSS system and the *Legionella*-conserved effectors. At the left of each node, barplots depict the number of gene families (blue, ranging from 0 to 3322) inferred in that ancestor, as well as the number of family gains (green, from 0 to 613) and losses (red, from 0 to 781) occurring on the branch leading to that ancestor. To the right of each terminal node, a circle depicts the size of the corresponding genome (proportional to the diameter of the circle) and its G+C content (color of the circle). On the right panel, squares represent proteins included in the T4BSS (separated according to

the three operons present in R64 [19]) and the eight effectors conserved in *Legionella*. The

colors represent the number of homologs of each gene in the genome: red, absent; light blue,

one copy; dark blue, several copies.

Supplementary Figure 4: Collinearity of the T4BSS in *Legionellales*. Genes are colored as

they appear in *Legionella pneumophila* Philadelphia (LegPhi). Areas between the rows

display similarities between the sequences, as identified by tblastx. The sequences displayed

here in addition are the IncI plasmid R64 from *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium

(R64), *Legionella longbeacheae* (LegLon), a putative Legionellales TARA121 (Tara121),

Berkiella aquae (BerAqu)*, Rickettsiella isopodorum* (RicIso), *Coxiella burnetii* RSA93

(CoxRSA93), *Piscirickettsia salmonis* (PisSal), *Fangia hongkongensis* (FanHon) and

Acidithiobacillus ferrivorans (AciFer).

Supplementary Figure 5: Maximum-likelihood phylogeny of the T4BSS in the

Legionellales. The phylogeny is based on 12 genes of the T4BSS automatically detected by

MacSyFinder. Number on branches represent the percent of bootstrap support. Branches

without number indicate 100% bootstrap support. The scale represents the number of

substitutions per site. Taxa in bold were selected for manual curation and are represented in

Supp. Figure 6 and **4**.

Supplementary Figure 6: Maximum-likelihood phylogeny of the T4BSS. The phylogeny is

based on the concatenation of the alignments of the 25 genes displayed on **Fig. 2** and **Supp.**

Figure 4, manually curated. Numbers on branches indicate the percentage of bootstrap

support. The scale represents the number of substitutions per site.

Supplementary Figure 7: Maximum-likelihood tree of 105 *Gammaproteobacteria*. The

underlying alignment is the same as in **Supp. Figure 2**. The tree was inferred with IQ-tree,

using the LG substitution matrix, empirical codon frequencies, four gamma categories, the

C60 mixture model and PMSF approximation. A thousand UltraFast bootstrap were drawn.

The numbers on the branches represent the percentage of bootstrap tree supporting that

branch. The scale represents the average number of substitutions per site.

Supplementary Figure 8: Maximum-likelihood tree of the *Legionellales*. The underlying

alignment is the same as in **Supp. Figure 1**. The tree was inferred with IQ-tree, using the LG

substitution matrix, empirical codon frequencies, four gamma categories, the C60 mixture

model and PMSF approximation. A thousand UltraFast bootstrap were drawn. The numbers

on the branches represent the percentage of bootstrap tree supporting that branch. The scale

represents the average number of substitutions per site.

Supplementary tables

Supplementary Table 1.

Summary of the phylogenetic placement of *Berkiella* and *Piscirickettsia* according to different methods.

Method	Set	*Berkiella* Sister clade	Support *	*Piscirickettsia* Sister clade	Support *	Full tree
PhyloBayes, CAT+GTR	Legio93	*Legionellales* ss	1	*Legionellales* ss + *Berkiella*	1	Fig S1
	Gamma105	*Legionellales* ss	0.76 †	NBG + *Francisella*	0.76 †	Fig S2
IQ-TREE, LG+C60+PMSF	Legio93	NBG + *Francisella* ‡	85	*Legionellales* ss	85	Fig S8
	Gamma105	NBG + *Francisella*	99	*Legionellales* ss	99	Fig S7

* : support is expressed as posterior probability for Bayesian trees and % bootstrap support for maximum likelhood trees
†: in both cases, 3 out of 4 chains support the branch with pp = 1; the last chain supports the opposite (*Piscirikettsia* with *Legionellales*; *Berkiella* with *Gammaproteobacteria*)
‡: NBG, non-basal *Gammaproteobacteria* (*Vibrionales*, *Enterobacteriales*, *Pseudomonadales*, etc).

Supplementary Table 2 (Separate file).

Ancestral reconstruction of the *Legionellales*. Output from Count. For each taxon and ancestor, the table shows the estimated probabilities of families present, present in multiple copies (multi) gained, lost, expanded and contracted at each node. Ancestor IDs (numbers) are shown on the tree on **Supp. Figure 3**.

Supplementary Table 3 (Separate file).

Ancestral reconstruction of the genes in T4BSS and conserved effectors in *Legionellales*. For each of these genes (columns) and each of the genomes and ancestors (rows), the table shows the number of copies, the probability of presence, presence in multiple copies, gain, loss, expansion and contractions (in different blocks of rows). Ancestor IDs (numbers) are shown on the tree on **Supp. Figure 3**.

807 **Supplementary Table 4.**

808 Summary of the age of LLCA in different BEAST runs.

Chain number	Generations (M)	Burn-in (%)	LLCA Age (Ga)	95% credible interval – lower bound (GA)	95% credible interval – higher bound (GA)	*Chromatiaceae* LCA Age (Ga)
0	55.7	25	2.4315	2.2569	2.7001	1.7295
1	10.0	20	2.2483	2.0757	2.506	1.7299
2	10.0	25	2.2816	2.1249	2.5345	1.7304
3	10.0	25	2.4669	2.29	2.7393	1.7292
4	10.0	50	2.3331	2.1554	2.5967	1.729

 Supplementary Table 5: Metagenomes containing high fractions of reads mapping to

 Legionellales 16S rDNA.

Accession
ERR598943
SRR1185414
ERR589611
SRR1202095
ERR481104
ERR346687
ERR346672
ERR346678
ERR346689
ERR346671
SRR350864
ERR695596
SRR350867
ERR272377
ERR571345
ERR249384
ERR532617
ERR571347
SRR1209976
SRR1199270
SRR1202089
ERR476939
ERR481106
ERR272378
ERR650528
SRR066138
SRR062218
ERR059353
ERR430972
SRR062168
SRR512582
SRR000905
ERR059351
ERR317255
SRR062149
ERR059347
ERR323780
ERR059350
SRR062243
ERR071289
SRR062159
SRR035082
ERR358544
SRR512809
ERR589374
ERR323707
ERR589381
SRR062130
ERR149036
ERR599003
ERR738547
ERR598952
ERR599098

ERR599063
ERR599016
ERR358549
ERR598950
ERR598945
ERR738548
ERR738549
ERR599113
ERR598997
ERR599104
ERR599137
ERR505057
ERR599118
ERR257715
ERR505054
ERR315863
ERR505056
ERR599032
ERR599050
ERR317264
ERR599139
ERR864075
ERR599163
ERR599038
ERR599081
ERR599065
ERR599095
ERR272375
ERR599052
ERR598978
ERR599077
ERR598992
ERR599023

813   **Supplementary Table 6 (Separate file).**

814   Gamma105 dataset, genomes used to place *Legionellales* in the *Gammaproteobacteria*.

815   **Supplementary Table 7 (Separate file).**

816   Legio93 dataset, genomes used to reconstruct the *Legionellales* genomic tree.