Compensatory evolution facilitates the acquisition of multiple plasmids in bacteria

Alfonso SANTOS-LOPEZ^{1#}, Cristina BERNABE-BALAS¹, Alvaro SAN MILLAN^{1 Φ},
Rafael ORTEGA-HUEDO¹, Andreas HOEFER¹, Manuel ARES-ARROYO¹, and Bruno
GONZALEZ-ZORN^{1*}.

¹ *Departamento de Sanidad Animal and Centro de Vigilancia Sanitaria Veterinaria
(VISAVET), Facultad de Veterinaria, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain*

[#] Current address: *Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, University of
Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA.*

^Φ Current address: *Department of Microbiology, Ramón y Cajal University Hospital
(IRYCIS), and CIBERESP. 28034, Madrid, Spain.*

*Corresponding author: bgzorn@ucm.es; Tel.: +34 91 3943707

Abstract

The coexistence of multicopy plasmids is a common phenomenon. However, the evolutionary forces promoting these genotypes are poorly understood. In this study, we have analyzed multiple ColE1 plasmids (pB1000, pB1005 and pB1006) coexisting within *Haemophilus influenzae* RdKW20 in all possible combinations. When transformed into the naïve host, each plasmid type presented a particular copy number and produced a specific resistance profile and biological cost, whether alone or coexisting with the other plasmids. Therefore, there was no fitness advantage associated with plasmid coexistence that could explain these common plasmid associations in nature. Using experimental evolution, we showed how *H. influenzae* Rd was able to completely compensate the fitness cost produced by any of these plasmids. Crucially, once the bacterium has compensated for a first plasmid, the acquisition of new multicopy plasmid(s) did not produced any extra biological cost. We argue therefore that compensatory adaptation pave the way for the acquisition of multiple coexisting ColE1 plasmids.

Importance

Antibiotic resistance is a major concern for human and animal health. Plasmids play a major role in the acquisition and dissemination of antimicrobial resistance genes. In this report we investigate, for the first time, how plasmids are capable to cohabit stably in populations. This coexistence of plasmids is driven by compensatory evolution alleviating the cost of a first plasmid, which potentiates the acquisition of further plasmids at no extra cost. This phenomenon explains the high prevalence of plasmids coexistence in wild type bacteria, which generates multiresistant clones and contributes to the maintenance and spread of antibiotic resistance genes within bacterial populations.

Introduction

Antibiotic resistance is a serious problem in animal and human health and bacterial plasmids play an essential role in the dissemination of resistance (1). In last years, numerous works have described the importance of small ColE1-like plasmids in the dissemination of resistance genes (2-15). These plasmids replicate via two RNAs (16). Natural SNPs in these RNAs allow different ColE1-like plasmids to stably cohabit within the same cell (17, 18). If the plasmids bear antibiotic resistance genes, this cohabitation confers antibiotic multiresistance to the host bacteria (9).

The acquisition of plasmids usually entails a biological cost to the host bacterium that will generate a selection against plasmid-bearing clones (19, 20). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the accumulation of various plasmids will decrease the fitness of bacteria and therefore clones bearing several plasmids will be outcompeted in bacterial populations. Notwithstanding, ColE1 plasmids cohabitation is a common phenomenon in nature (9, 11, 13, 14, 21). In this study we test two hypotheses that could explain the high prevalence of plasmid coexistence in nature: i) Positive epistasis: the cost imposed by multiple ColE1 plasmids is lower than the addition of the costs produced by each of the plasmids alone (22) and ii) compensatory evolution increasing permissiveness to ColE1-like plasmids: once the bacterium has compensated the cost of a single plasmid the acquisition of new replicons does not affect the bacterial fitness (23).

Here, we demonstrated that once the fitness cost of a ColE1-like plasmid is compensated the acquisition of more ColE1-like plasmids does not incur any biological cost to the bacteria, facilitating plasmid cohabitation.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial strains, culture conditions and antibiotic susceptibility determination. All strains and plasmids used in this study are listed in Table S1. *H. influenzae* was electroporated with pB1000, pB1005 and/or pB1006 from *P. multocida* BB1044 (9) as previously described (10). *H. influenzae* was cultured on chocolate agar PolyViteX plates (BioMérieux, France) and in *Haemophilus* Test Medium (HTM) broth (Wider, Francisco Soria Melguizo, Spain) shaking at 125 RPM and 37° C in microaerophilic conditions (5% CO₂). Antibiotic susceptibility was determined via minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of ampicillin, streptomycin and tetracycline by broth microdilution according to the CLSI guidelines (24).

Plasmid stability. We assessed the stability of the plasmids in all ColE1-bearing strains (Table 1). All three plasmids in the seven combinations presented 100% stability in *H. influenzae* Rd after 200 generations.

Plasmid copy number quantification. The average plasmid copy number per cell was determined by quantitative PCR (qPCR) as described by San Millan *et al.* (25). To determine the plasmid copy number five independent DNA extractions were performed for each strain and qPCR was then carried out in triplicate for each extraction. Each

strain was grown in 2 ml of fresh HTM and the DNA was extracted at an OD600 of approximately 0.9 using the QIAamp DNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Inc, Chatworth, California, USA). The DNA was quantified using a Nanodrop. Following the indications of Providenti *et al.* (26), digested DNA is a better template for plasmid quantification by qPCR than non-digested DNA. Therefore, plasmids were linearized with *PstI* (Takara, Japan) for 2 hours at 37°C. In order to determine the average plasmid copy number per chromosome, the chromosomal monocopy gene *rpoB* was amplified to compare the ratio of plasmid-chromosomal DNA.

qPCRs were performed using a My iQ Single Color Real-Time PCR Detection System (Bio-Rad laboratories) with the iQ SYBR Green Supermix (Bio-Rad Laboratories) at a final DNA concentration of 10 pg/μl. The reaction efficiency was calculated for each reaction based on the standard curve generated by performing a qPCR with five 8-fold dilutions of the template DNA in triplicate (~0.2 ng/μl to 50 fg/μl working range of DNA concentration), and reactions with an R^2 lower than 0.985 were discarded. All primers used in the reactions, as well as the melting temperatures and efficiencies of the qPCRs are described in Table S2. The amplification conditions were as follows: initial denaturation for 10 min at 94°C, followed by 30 cycles of denaturation for 1' at 94°C, annealing for 1' at 51,7°C (*rpoB*) or 58,5°C (pB1000) 55,1°C (pB1005) and 54,6°C (pB1006) and extension for 1' at 72°C. Inter-run calibration samples were used to normalize the results from different plates of each qPCR. To calculate plasmid copy number per chromosome we used the following formula:

$$cn = \frac{(1 + E_c)^{C_{tc}}}{(1 + E_p)^{C_{tp}}} * \frac{S_c}{S_p}$$

Where *cn* is the plasmid copy number per chromosome, S_c and S_p are the sizes of the chromosomal and plasmid amplicons (in bp), E_c and E_p are the efficiencies of the chromosomal and plasmid qPCRs (relative to 1), and C_{tc} and C_{tp} are the threshold cycles of the chromosomal and plasmid reactions, respectively.

Fitness determination

Bacterial fitness was determined by direct competition experiments between *H. influenzae* Rd and *H. influenzae* Rd bearing plasmid(s) in HTM medium in 3-5 independent experiments (25). Strains were grown for 16 hours at 37°C and 5% CO₂ in HTM, then 10⁶ CFU of each competitor were suspended in 2 ml of HTM broth. The inocula was grown at 37° C, 5% CO₂ and 125 RPM for 24 hours, after which 10⁶ CFU were transferred to 2 ml of fresh HTM every 24 hours (1/1000) for 5 days, resulting in 10 generations per serial passage. Samples were taken at time 0 and every 24 hours for 5 days. Aliquots were then plated onto non-selective chocolate agar, and the ratio of the two competing strains was measured by replica plating 50-100 colonies on chocolate agar plates containing ampicillin, streptomycin and/or tetracycline corresponding the resistance gene(s) borne by the plasmid(s). The selection coefficients (*s*) were calculated using the regression model $s = \ln(CI/t)$, where the CI (competition index) was calculated

everyday as the ratio between the CFU of the resistant and susceptible strains at $t1$ divided by the same ratio at $t0$. Time (t) was calculated as the $\log_2$ of the dilution factor (i.e. number of bacterial generations). Relative fitness (W) was calculated as $1-s$.

Epistasis among plasmids was determined as described by Hall *et al.*(27). Epistasis (ε) can be calculated as $\varepsilon = W_{(\text{plasmid A;plasmid B})} - W_{(\text{plasmid A})} \times W_{(\text{plasmid B})}$, where $W_{(\text{plasmid A})}$ or $W_{(\text{plasmid B})}$ is the relative fitness of the strain bearing plasmid 1 or plasmid 2 compared to the plasmid free strain and $W_{(\text{plasmid A;plasmid B})}$ is the relative fitness of the strain bearing both plasmids relative to the same plasmid free strain. Then, the propagation error (σ_ε) was calculated by applying with the formula:

$$\sigma_\varepsilon = \sqrt{\sigma^2_{(\text{plasmid A ; plasmid B})} + \sigma^2_{(\text{plasmid A})} W^2_{(\text{plasmid B})} + \sigma^2_{(\text{plasmid B})} W^2_{(\text{plasmid A})}}$$

If the epistasis value is within the propagation error range, there are no significant epistatic interactions between the plasmids. If on the other hand the value is beyond the range of the propagation error one can assume that there are epistatic interactions. Both formulas were adjusted to estimate the epistasis among the three plasmids.

***In silico* analysis**

We analyzed all Pasteurellaceae and Enterobacteriaceae genomes available in the GenBank database as of November 2015. Only genomes with the status “Complete” were included in the analysis.

Results and discussion

Coexistence of multicopy plasmids is common in nature

ColE1 plasmids are found mainly in the families of bacteria Enterobacteriaceae and Pasteurellaceae (2, 4, 7, 9, 15, 28-30). We combined *in silico* and experimental information to analyze the prevalence of ColE1 plasmid coexistence in nature.

We scanned the presence of ColE1 plasmids in the Enterobacteriaceae family where they were first described (16). We detected 631 plasmids in databases, in 490 complete genomes. 100 plasmids (16% of the total) belonged to the ColE1 superfamily. 45% of ColE1 plasmids coexisted with at least another ColE1 plasmid in the same cell (Table S1). We analyzed the distribution of ColE1 plasmids described in the Enterobacteriaceae genomes. As described by San Millan *et al.* (22) if plasmids were distributed randomly, they would follow a Poisson distribution across bacterial hosts. If there is any factor influencing the plasmid distribution such as conjugation, epistasis or selection, the observed ratio of plasmid per genome may suffer a significant deviation from the expected Poisson distribution. We found significantly different pattern between the observed and the expected distribution of genomes bearing zero, one, and two or more ColE1 plasmids: (chi-square test, $P < 0.001$, $\chi^2 = 0.903$, $df = 2$) (Figure 1). Observed strains lacking plasmids are as common as expected, while strains carrying only one ColE1 replicon were underrepresented and the strains bearing 2 or more ColE1

plasmids were overrepresented. These results confirm a tendency towards ColE1 plasmid coexistence in enterobacteria.

In Pasteurellaceae there were too few genomes available in databases for a robust analysis. However, previous works suggested that ColE1 plasmid coexistence is also common (9-12, 31, 32). Actually, plasmid pB1000, which is the most widely distributed ColE1-like plasmid in this family, has been always described coexisting with other ColE1 plasmids: in *Haemophilus parasuis* (32), *Pasteurella aerogenes* (33) *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae* (Accession number to GenBank: CP001904) and *Pasteurella multocida* (9) (see Table S1). Taken together, our data showed that coexistence of ColE1-like plasmids is a frequent event in nature.

Biological cost of ColE1 plasmids has a multiplicative effect

Plasmids produce a fitness cost in bacteria (19, 20). It is reasonable to assume that bacteria bearing two (or three) plasmids would present a decrease in fitness compared to bacteria bearing only one plasmid. However, Silva *et al.* (34) and San Millan *et al.* (22) have demonstrated that, in some cases, the presence of one plasmid favors the presence of a second: once a bacterium had acquired a plasmid, the presence of a second (or third) plasmid in the host does not incur an additional significant biological cost, even when these plasmids produced a cost when they are alone in the cell. This phenomenon is known as positive epistasis between coexisting plasmids.

To determine whether epistatic interactions can explain ColE1 coexistence, we transformed *H. influenzae* RdKw20 (Rd hereinafter) by electroporation with the plasmids pB1000, pB1005 and pB1006, recovered from the a clinical isolate of *P. multocida* BB1044 (9). Thus, we produced a model of bacteria with seven possible plasmid combinations (one, two or three different ColE1 plasmids per bacterium). All three plasmids are composed by a variable region in which antibiotic resistance genes are encoded -*bla*_{ROB-1} in pB1000, *strA* in pB1005 and the *tet*(O) in pB1006- and a highly similar conserved region with the plasmid housekeeping functions (Figure S1).

To estimate the biological cost associated with the replicon(s), we performed direct competition assays between *H. influenzae* Rd strain bearing the plasmid(s) and the plasmid-free *H. influenzae* Rd strain in culture medium lacking antibiotic pressure. As expected, bacteria bearing one or more plasmid(s) were less fit than the ancestral strain (Table 1 and Figure 2). In order to test if epistatic interactions were able to explain coexistence of ColE1 replicons, we calculated epistasis as described by Hall *et al.* (27) (see methods). No significant epistatic interactions were found across the four combinations: pB1005/pB1006 ($\epsilon = -0.009$, $\sigma_{\epsilon} = \pm 0.0425$), pB1000/pB1006 ($\epsilon = -0.017$, $\sigma_{\epsilon} = \pm 0.042$), pB1000/pB1005 ($\epsilon = 0.000$, $\sigma_{\epsilon} = \pm 0.025$) and pB1000/pB1005/pB1006 ($\epsilon = 0.0002$, $\sigma_{\epsilon} = \pm 0.021$). (Figure 2). The biological cost of ColE1 plasmids produced a multiplicative effect: the relative fitness of strains carrying two or more ColE1 plasmids (e.g. $W_{(pB1000, pB10056)} = 0.899$) was not significantly different from a multiplication of the relative fitnesses of the two bacteria bearing each one of the plasmids (e.g. $W_{(pB1000)}$

$\times W_{(pB1006)} = 0.946 \times 0.979 = 0.899$). These results therefore suggest that epistatic interactions among recently acquired plasmids are may not be at the origin of ColE1 plasmid coexistence.

The cost of ColE1-like plasmids is proportional to total plasmid copy number

Previous reports showed that the biological cost of a single plasmid, including a ColE1 plasmid (18, 35), is proportional to its copy number in the host cell (19, 36). We measured plasmid copy number (PCN) of pB1000, pB1005 and pB1006 in all the strains using quantitative PCR (qPCR) (Table 1, Figure 3). For all three plasmids, their specific PCN remained equal whether coexisting with the other plasmids or inhabiting the cell alone: pB1000 (ANOVA: $P = 0.95$; $F = 0,10$; $df = 3, 16$), pB1005 (ANOVA: $P = 0,79$; $F = 0,33$; $df = 3, 16$) and pB1006 (ANOVA: $P = 0.54$; $F = 0,75$; $df = 3, 16$). These results suggested that replication of these ColE1 plasmids, and therefore PCN control, remained independent despite the high similarity of their conserved region. Interestingly the total PCN, regardless of plasmid type, strongly correlated with the reduction of relative fitness in the host bacteria (Pearson's test $r(19) = 0.90$; $P < 0.001$) (Figure 3). Therefore, the total number of plasmids present in the cell could explained the biological cost imposed by these ColE1 replicons in a non-adapted host, even when the plasmids carried different resistance genes.

We also analyzed the resistance levels conferred by the plasmids in the different combinations. We measured the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of the three main antibiotics counteracted by the three plasmids (pB1006; tetracycline, pB1005; streptomycin and pB1000; ampicillin). The resistance levels conferred by these plasmids remained constant whether they were alone or coexisting, suggesting that plasmid coexistence did not affect the expression level of these genes (Table 1).

In summary, our results showed that recently acquired ColE1 plasmids acted as independent biological units in the cell, conferring antibiotic resistance, maintaining copy number and imposing fitness costs autonomously.

Compensatory evolution favors the acquisition of new ColE1 plasmids

Our results suggested that the common coexistence of ColE1 plasmids in nature is not due to positive epistasis alleviating the cost imposed by multiple plasmids. An alternative hypothesis that we propose here is that plasmid coexistence may be promoted by compensatory evolution. The idea underlying this hypothesis is that after the acquisition of a first (ColE1) plasmid by a bacterium, compensatory evolution will eliminate the fitness cost produced this plasmid (22, 37-45). If the cost imposed by different ColE1 plasmids comes from a similar origin, as our previous results suggested, adaptation to this plasmid would facilitate the acquisition of further ColE1 plasmids at no extra cost.

To test this hypothesis, we propagated *H. influenzae* Rd bearing pB1000, which is the plasmid imposing the highest fitness cost (approximately 5% reduction in relative fitness), for 200 generations. Rd/pB1000 increased 18% its relative fitness after 100 and 25% after 200 generations. We selected 1 clone from the Rd/pB1000 population after 100 and 200 generations and we transformed pB1006 and pB1005 separately and together in these clones. We measured the relative fitness of all these clones and, interestingly, there were no significant differences among the relative fitnesses of Rd/pB1000 clones and the new clones bearing also pB1005, pB1006 and pB1005/pB1006 at generation 100 (ANOVA $P = 0,85$ $F = 0,16$ $df = 2,6$) or 200 (ANOVA $P = 0,92$ $F = 0,16$ $df = 2,6$) (Figure 4). In addition, there were no differences in the plasmid copy number across the experiment: pB1000 (ANOVA $P = 0.75$, $F = 0.29$ $df = 2,12$), pB1005 (ANOVA $P = 0.25$, $F = 1.83$ $df = 2,5$) and pB1006 (ANOVA $P = 0.71$, $F = 0.36$ $df = 2,6$) showing that the reduction of the fitness cost of the replicons were not related with a decrease in the plasmid copy number.

To confirm that the absence of costs associated to additional plasmid carriage in our experiment was a result of compensatory evolution and not only a result of general adaptation to the experimental conditions, we propagated the Rd strain lacking the plasmid in the same conditions as described above during 100 generations. This evolved Rd strain increased its relative fitness approximately 21.5% (SEM = 0,011) compared to the ancestral Rd (Figure 4). We selected a clone from the population and we electroporated pB1006, pB1005, pB1000 and pB1006/pB1005/pB1000. The fitness cost (s) of the plasmids in the resulting strains were: pB1006 $s = -0,034$ (SEM ± 0.008), pB1005 $s = -0.086$ (SEM ± 0.050), pB1000 $s = -0,045$ (SEM ± 0.018) and pB1006/pB1005/pB1006 $s = -0,078$ (SEM ± 0.019). Therefore, the plasmids imposed the same biological cost as in the non-evolved strain: pB1006 (two-tailed t-test $P = 0.55$; $t = -1.92$; $df = 4$), pB1005 (two-tailed t-test $P = 0.57$; $t = -0.97$; $df = 4$), pB1000 (two-tailed t-test $P = 0.62$; $t = -0.80$; $df = 4$) and pB1006/pB1005/pB1000 (two-tailed t-test $P = 0.29$; $t = -0,40$; $df = 4$).

Taken together, these results showed that compensation of the cost produced by pB1000 facilitated the acquisition of pB1005 and pB1006 cost by the host bacterium at no additional (Figure 5).

Conclusion

This study provides new information regarding the biology, cost, persistence and maintenance of multicopy plasmids in bacterial populations. ColE1 plasmids tend to coexist in natural bacteria, conferring antibiotic multiresistance (9, 13, 14). Our results suggest that compensatory evolution mitigating the initial cost produced by a ColE1 plasmid pre-adapts the host bacterium to acquire extra ColE1 plasmids. Although we have only explored the case of plasmids ColE1, a recent report showed that mutations compensating for a particular plasmid also alleviated the cost of plasmids from different families (23). Therefore, we argue that the ability of different bacteria to compensate the

costs produced by plasmids may play a key role shaping the distribution of plasmids across bacteria (46).

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by REDEEX-2 (MICINN, BFU 2011-14145-E) and EU projects EvoTAR 282004-FP7 and EFFORT 613754-FP7. We thank Natalia Montero for excellent technical assistance.

Author contribution

AS-L, ASM and BG-Z conceived and designed the experiments; AS-L, MA-A, CB-B performed the experiments; AS-L, ASM, and BG-Z analyzed the data; RO-H contributed reagents/materials analysis tools; AS-L, AH, ASM and BG-Z wrote the paper; BG-Z approved the final version of the manuscript.

References

1. Carattoli A. 2013. Plasmids and the spread of resistance. *Int J Med Microbiol* 303:298-304.
2. Cao V, Lambert T, Courvalin P. 2002. ColE1-like plasmid pIP843 of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* encoding extended-spectrum beta-lactamase CTX-M-17. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy* 46:1212-7.
3. Handford CL, Stang CT, Raivio TL, Dennis JJ. 2009. The contribution of small cryptic plasmids to the antibiotic resistance of enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli* E2348/69. *Can J Microbiol* 55:1229-39.
4. Zioga a, Whichard JM, Kotsakis SD, Tzouveleakis LS, Tzelepi E, Miriagou V. 2009. CMY-31 and CMY-36 cephalosporinases encoded by colEI-like plasmids. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 53:1256-1259.
5. Pallecchi L, Riccobono E, Sennati S, Mantella A, Bartalesi F, Trigos C, Gotuzzo E, Bartoloni A, Rossolini GM. 2010. Characterization of small ColE-like plasmids mediating widespread dissemination of the qnrB19 gene in commensal enterobacteria. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 54:678-82.
6. Pallecchi L, Riccobono E, Mantella A, Fernandez C, Bartalesi F, Rodriguez H, Gotuzzo E, Bartoloni A, Rossolini GM. 2011. Small qnrB-harboring ColE-like plasmids widespread in commensal enterobacteria from a remote Amazonas population not exposed to antibiotics. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 66:1176-8.
7. Chen CY, Strobaugh TP, Frye JG. 2010. Characterization of small ColE1-like plasmids conferring kanamycin resistance in *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovars Typhimurium and Newport. *Plasmid* 63:150-4.
8. Kehrenberg C, Schwarz S. 2000. Identification of a truncated, but functionally active tet(H) tetracycline resistance gene in *Pasteurella aerogenes* and *Pasteurella multocida*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 188:191-5.
9. San Millan A, Escudero JA, Gutierrez B, Hidalgo L, Garcia N, Llagostera M, Dominguez L, Gonzalez-Zorn B. 2009. Multiresistance in *Pasteurella multocida* is mediated by coexistence of small plasmids. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 53:3399-3404.
10. San Millan A, Garcia-Cobos S, Escudero JA, Hidalgo L, Gutierrez B, Carrilero L, Campos J, Gonzalez-Zorn B. 2010. *Haemophilus influenzae* clinical isolates with plasmid pB1000 bearing bla_{ROB-1}: fitness cost and interspecies dissemination. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 54:1506-11.
11. Moleres J, Santos-López A, Lázaro I, Labairu J, Prat C, Ardanuy C, González-Zorn B, Aragon V, Garmendia J. 2015. Novel bla_{ROB-1}-Bearing Plasmid Conferring Resistance to β -Lactams in *Haemophilus parasuis* Isolates from Healthy Weaning Pigs. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 81:3255-67.
12. Tristram SG, Littlejohn R, Bradbury RS. 2010. bla_{ROB-1} presence on pB1000 in *Haemophilus influenzae* is widespread, and variable cefaclor resistance is associated with altered penicillin-binding proteins. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 54:4945-7.
13. Stoesser N, Sheppard AE, Pankhurst L, De Maio N, Moore CE, Sebra R, Turner P, Anson LW, Kasarskis A, Batty EM, Kos V, Wilson DJ, Phetsouvanh R, Wyllie D, Sokurenko E, Manges AR, Johnson TJ, Price LB, Peto TE, Johnson JR, Didelot X, Walker AS, Crook DW, Modernizing Medical Microbiology Informatics G. 2016. Evolutionary History of the Global Emergence of the *Escherichia coli* Epidemic Clone ST131. *MBio* 7:e02162.
14. Stoesser N, Sheppard AE, Peirano G, Anson LW, Pankhurst L, Sebra R, Phan HTT, Kasarskis A, Mathers AJ, Peto TEA, Bradford P, Motyl MR, Walker AS, Crook DW, Pitout JD. 2017. Genomic epidemiology of global *Klebsiella pneumoniae* carbapenemase (KPC)-producing *Escherichia coli*. *Sci Rep* 7:5917.

15. de Toro M, Rodriguez I, Rojo-Bezares B, Helmuth R, Torres C, Guerra B, Saenz Y. 2013. pMdT1, a small ColE1-like plasmid mobilizing a new variant of the aac(6')-Ib-cr gene in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 68:1277-80.
16. Tomizawa JI, Ohmori H, Bird RE. 1977. Origin of replication of colicin E1 plasmid DNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 74:1865-9.
17. Lacatena RM, Cesareni G. 1981. Base pairing of RNA I with its complementary sequence in the primer precursor inhibits ColE1 replication. *Nature* 294:623-6.
18. Santos-Lopez A, Bernabe-Balas C, Ares-Arroyo M, Ortega-Huedo R, Hoefer A, San Millan A, Gonzalez-Zorn B. 2017. A Naturally Occurring Single Nucleotide Polymorphism in a Multicopy Plasmid Produces a Reversible Increase in Antibiotic Resistance. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 61.
19. Baltrus DA. 2013. Exploring the costs of horizontal gene transfer. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 28:489-95.
20. San Millan A, MacLean RC. 2017. Fitness Costs of Plasmids: a Limit to Plasmid Transmission. *Microbiology Spectrum* 5. no. 5 doi:10.1128/microbiolspec.MTBP-0016-2017
21. Lanza VF, de Toro M, Garcillan-Barcia MP, Mora A, Blanco J, Coque TM, de la Cruz F. 2014. Plasmid flux in *Escherichia coli* ST131 sublineages, analyzed by plasmid constellation network (PLACNET), a new method for plasmid reconstruction from whole genome sequences. *PLoS Genet* 10:e1004766.
22. San Millan A, Heilbron K, MacLean RC. 2014. Positive epistasis between co-infecting plasmids promotes plasmid survival in bacterial populations. *The ISME journal* 8:601-12.
23. Loftie-Eaton W, Bashford K, Quinn H, Dong K, Millstein J, Hunter S, Thomason MK, Merrih H, Ponciano JM, Top EM. 2017. Compensatory mutations improve general permissiveness to antibiotic resistance plasmids. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0243-2.
24. CLSI. 2007. CLSI. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing-Seventeenth edition: Approved Standar M100-S17. CLSI, Wayne, PA, USA.
25. San Millan A, Santos-Lopez A, Ortega-Huedo R, Bernabe-Balas C, Kennedy SP, Gonzalez-Zorn B. 2015. Small-Plasmid-Mediated Antibiotic Resistance Is Enhanced by Increases in Plasmid Copy Number and Bacterial Fitness. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 59:AAC.00235-15.
26. Providenti MA, O'Brien JM, Ewing RJ, Paterson ES, Smith ML. 2006. The copy-number of plasmids and other genetic elements can be determined by SYBR-Green-based quantitative real-time PCR. *J Microbiol Methods* 65:476-87.
27. Hall AR, MacLean RC. 2011. Epistasis buffers the fitness effects of rifampicin-resistance mutations in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Evolution* 65:2370-9.
28. Dixon LG, Albritton WL, Willson PJ. 1994. An analysis of the complete nucleotide sequence of the *Haemophilus ducreyi* broad-host-range plasmid pLS88. *Plasmid* 32:228-32.
29. Ibanez M, Alvarez I, Rodriguez-Pena JM, Rotger R. 1997. A ColE1-type plasmid from *Salmonella enteritidis* encodes a DNA cytosine methyltransferase. *Gene* 196:145-58.
30. Pan L. 2010. A New ColE1-like Plasmid Group Revealed by Comparative Analysis of the Replication Proficient Fragments of Vibrionaceae Plasmids. *Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* 20:1163-1178.
31. San Millan A, Giufré M, Escudero JA, Hidalgo L, Gutierrez B, Cerquetti M, Gonzalez-Zorn B. 2011. Contribution of ROB-1 and PBP3 mutations to the resistance phenotype of a β -lactamase-positive amoxicillin/clavulanic acid-resistant *Haemophilus influenzae* carrying plasmid pB1000 in Italy. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy* 66:96-9.

32. San Millan A, Escudero JA, Catalan A, Nieto S, Farelo F, Gibert M, Moreno MA, Dominguez L, Gonzalez-Zorn B. 2007. Beta-lactam resistance in *Haemophilus parasuis* is mediated by plasmid pB1000 bearing blaROB-1. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy* 51:2260-4.
33. Wright CL, Strugnell RA, Hodgson AL. 1997. Characterization of a *Pasteurella multocida* plasmid and its use to express recombinant proteins in *P. multocida*. *Plasmid* 37:65-79.
34. Silva RF, Mendonça SCM, Carvalho LM, Reis AM, Gordo I, Trindade S, Dionisio F. 2011. Pervasive Sign Epistasis between Conjugative Plasmids and Drug-Resistance Chromosomal Mutations. *PLoS Genetics* 7:e1002181.
35. San Millan A, Escudero JA, Gifford DR, Mazel D, MacLean RC. 2016. Multicopy plasmids potentiate the evolution of antibiotic resistance in bacteria. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*.
36. Martinez JL, Cercenado E, Rodriguez-Creixems M, Vincente-Perez MF, Delgado-Iribarren A, Baquero F. 1987. Resistance to beta-lactam/clavulanate. *Lancet* 2:1473.
37. San Millan A, Toll-Riera M, Qi Q, MacLean RC. 2015. Interactions between horizontally acquired genes create a fitness cost in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Nat Commun* 6:6845.
38. Pena-Miller R, Rodriguez-Gonzalez R, MacLean RC, San Millan A. 2015. Evaluating the effect of horizontal transmission on the stability of plasmids under different selection regimes. *Mob Genet Elements* 5:1-5.
39. Harrison E, Brockhurst MA. 2012. Plasmid-mediated horizontal gene transfer is a coevolutionary process. *Trends in Microbiology* 20:262-267.
40. Harrison E, Guymer D, Spiers AJ, Paterson S, Brockhurst MA. 2015. Parallel compensatory evolution stabilizes plasmids across the parasitism-mutualism continuum. *Curr Biol* 25:2034-9.
41. Hall JP, Wood AJ, Harrison E, Brockhurst MA. 2016. Source-sink plasmid transfer dynamics maintain gene mobility in soil bacterial communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113:8260-5.
42. Loftie-Eaton W, Yano H, Burleigh S, Simmons RS, Hughes JM, Rogers LM, Hunter SS, Settles ML, Forney LJ, Ponciano JM, Top EM. 2016. Evolutionary Paths That Expand Plasmid Host-Range: Implications for Spread of Antibiotic Resistance. *Mol Biol Evol* 33:885-97.
43. Yano H, Wegrzyn K, Loftie-Eaton W, Johnson J, Deckert GE, Rogers LM, Konieczny I, Top EM. 2016. Evolved plasmid-host interactions reduce plasmid interference cost. *Mol Microbiol* doi:10.1111/mmi.13407.
44. Porse A, Schonning K, Munck C, Sommer MO. 2016. Survival and evolution of a large multidrug resistance plasmid in new clinical bacterial hosts. *Mol Biol Evol* doi:10.1093/molbev/msw163.
45. Stalder T, Rogers LM, Renfrow C, Yano H, Smith Z, Top EM. 2017. Emerging patterns of plasmid-host coevolution that stabilize antibiotic resistance. *Scientific Reports* 7:4853.
46. Medaney F, Ellis RJ, Raymond B. 2016. Ecological and genetic determinants of plasmid distribution in *Escherichia coli*. *Environ Microbiol* 18:4230-4239.

Figure 1. Distribution of ColE1 plasmids in bacterial genomes.

Number of plasmids per bacterial genome. The grey bars represent the expected number of genomes carrying from zero to ≥ 2 plasmids following a Poisson distribution (using the average plasmid/strain observed in the 490 bacterial genomes analyzed from GenBank). The white bars represent the observed frequency of strains carrying zero to ≥ 2 plasmids in the bacterial genomes analyzed.

Figure 2. Plasmid copy number and fitness.

Correlation between relative fitness of the Rd strain transformed with the different plasmids (Y axis), calculated as $1+s$, and total plasmid copy number per chromosome (X axis). From left to right the blue circles represent the empirical fitness of: Rd/pB1006, Rd/pB1005, Rd/pB1000, Rd/pB1005/pB1006, Rd/pB1006/pB1000, RdpB1005/pB1000 and Rd/pB1005/pB1006/pB1005. SEM are also indicated. Orange circumferences denote the expected fitness calculated as the multiplication of the fitnesses of the strains bearing plasmids independently. From left to right is represented the theoretical fitness of Rd/pB1005/pB1006, Rd/pB1006/pB1000, RdpB1005/pB1000 and Rd/pB1005/pB1006/pB1005.

Figure 3. Plasmid copy number in Rd transformed strain.

Plasmid copy number per chromosome (Y axis) measured from the seven different combinations (X axis). Green, blue and red dots denote pB1006, pB1005 and pB1000 respectively. SEM are also indicated.

454

455

456 Figure 4 Plasmids cost across the experiment Rd/pB1000

457 Fitness cost ($\pm$ SEM) of pB1006 (green), pB1005 (red) and pB1000/pB1005/pB1000
 458 (grey) calculated as the selection coefficient (see methods) at different time-points of
 459 the experiment. In t_0 , the dots represent the fitness cost of the plasmids when newly
 460 acquired by Rd strain. In t_{100} and t_{200} is represented the biological cost of the plasmids
 461 when transformed in the Rd/pB1000 evolved during 100 and 200 generations. In C- is
 462 represented the biological cost of the plasmids transformed in the Rd evolved without
 463 pB1000 during 100 generations.

Acquisition of new plasmids	Fitness variation
Non-evolved bacteria
↓
↓
Environmentally adapted bacteria
↓
↓
Compensated plasmid by adaptation
=

465

466 Figure 5. Compensatory evolution facilitates plasmid cohabitation.

467 Acquisition of new plasmid(s) and the effect on the bacterial relative fitness. Red circle
468 denote the acquired plasmid. Non-evolved bacteria or non-evolved plasmid are shown
469 in black; laboratory adapted bacteria are shown in blue and compensated bacteria-
470 plasmid are shown in green. The acquisition of a new ColE1 plasmid in the naïve host
471 (bearing or lacking a plasmid), entails a decrease in the bacterial relative fitness, as well
472 as the acquisition of the plasmid in an environmental-adapted bacterium lacking a
473 plasmid. The acquisition of a new plasmid in the compensated plasmid-carrying
474 bacteria does not result in any fitness cost.

Strain	Plasmid Copy Number	Relative Fitness ^a	MIC(mg/l) ^b		
			Tet	Str	Amp
Rd	0	1	2	8	0,25
Rd/pB1006	10,53 ± 1,112	0,979 ± 0,012	16	8	0,25
Rd/pB1005	20,45 ± 2,59	0,950 ± 0,013	2	1024	0,25
Rd/pB1000	25,02 ± 1,92	0,946 ± 0,002	2	8	512
Rd/pB1005/pB1006	28,17 ± 2,37	0,921 ± 0,017	16	1024	0,25
Rd/pB1006/pB1000	33,96 ± 3,01	0,909 ± 0,003	16	8	512
Rd/pB1005/pB1000	43,22 ± 4,43	0,899 ± 0,009	2	512	512
Rd/pB1006/pB1005/pB1006	53,58 ± 12,48	0,883 ± 0,016	32	512	512

475

476 Table 1. Plasmid copy number, relative fitness and MIC of the transformed plasmids in
477 Rd.

478 Plasmid copy number, fitness and antimicrobial susceptibility of the seven strains
479 generated eletroporing the plasmids in the Rd strain. ^a The relative fitness is expressed
480 compared to the Rd strain. ^b Tet, tetracycline; Str, streptomycin and Amp, ampicillin.

481

482

483

484 Figure S1. Genetic structure of ColE1 plasmids utilized in this study.

485 Schematic diagram of the 3 ColE1 plasmids used in this study. The reading frames for
486 genes are shown as arrows, with the direction of transcription indicated by the
487 arrowhead. The names of the genes are indicated. Genes encoding plasmid relaxases are
488 shown in gray and the *rom* gene implicated in the regulation of plasmid replication is
489 shown in yellow. In pB1000, two vertical bars bracket the region containing the origin
490 of replication (*oriV*). The large vertical bar separates the conserved region of the
491 plasmids, to the right, from the variable region of the plasmids, to the left. The
492 accession numbers of plasmids are also indicated. The origins of replication (*oriV*s) of
493 these three plasmids are highly similar compared to the unique *oriV* described in a
494 ColE1 from Pasteurellaceae family (28): 89.43%, 99.93% and 91.01% conservation in
495 pB1000, pB1005 and pB1006 respectively.

496

Strain or plasmid	Description and characteristics ^a	Reference
Strain		
<i>H. influenzae</i>		
Rd	Tet ^S , Str ^S , Amp ^S recipient strain in electroporation	NC_000907
Rd/pB1006	Rd electroporated with pB1006, Tet ^R ,	This work
Rd/pB1005	Rd electroporated with pB1005, Str ^R ,	This work
Rd/pB1000	Rd electroporated with pB1000, Amp ^R ,	This work
Rd/pB1006/pB1005	Rd electroporated with pB1006 and pB1005, Tet ^R , Str ^R	This work
Rd/pB1006/pB1000	Rd electroporated with pB1006 and pB1000, Tet ^R , Amp ^R ,	This work
Rd/pB1005/pB1000	Rd electroporated with pB1006 and pB1000, Str ^R , Amp ^R ,	This work
Rd/pB1006/pB1005/pB1000	Rd electroporated with pB1006 and pB1000, Tet ^R , Str ^R , Amp ^R ,	This work
Plasmids		
pB1000	<i>mobA mobB mobC bla_{ROB-1}</i> ; ColE1 superfamily	(9)
pB1005	<i>mobA mobB mobC strA</i> ; ColE1 superfamily	(9)
pB1006	<i>mobA mobB mobC tet(O)</i> ; ColE1 superfamily	(9)

498

499 Table S1. Strains and plasmids used in this study.

500 Strains and plasmids used in the compensation-acquisition hypothesis. ^a Tet,
501 tetracycline; Str, streptomycin and Amp, ampicillin; “R” and “S” means resistant and
502 susceptible respectively.

503

Primers	Sequence (5' → 3')	Fragment amplified	Efficiency	Annealing T°
TET(O) F	CCAGACAGCAGTGACATC	pB1006 (200 bp)	95,7-99,1%	54,6°C
TET(O) R	TCGGAATCTTCATTATCTGTAGT			
STRA F	TTGGTTTGTCATAGATATTC	pB1005 (199 bp)	98,8%	55,1°C
STRA R	AATGATGAGCGATTTATTC			
ROB-1 F	CCAATTCTGTTTCATTCGGTAAC	pB1000 (195 bp)	95,8%	58,5°C
ROB-1 R	CATAAGCAAAGCGTTCATCTG			
RPOB F	GCAGACGAAGCGGAAATC	<i>rpoB</i> (192 bp)	95,7-99,8%	51,7°C
RPOB R	AAGGCTATAAGAACCTGTTGAAC			

504

505 Table S2. Primers used in this study.

506 Primers used in the qPCRs. The sequence, fragment amplified, efficiency of the qPCR
507 and Annealing T° of the primers are indicated.

Specie	Strain	ColE1-like plasmid	Others ^a	Characteristics ^b
Enterobacteriaceae				
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i>	CAV1741	pCAV1741-1960, pCAV1741-3233	4	HP ¹ , HP
<i>C. freundii</i>	CAV1321	pCAV1321-1916, pCAV1321-3233, pCAV1321-3820, pCAV1321-4310, pCAV1321-4938	4	HP, HP, HP, HP, HP
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	34978	P34978-4.398, p34978- 5.413, p34978-2.725	3	HP, HP, HP, HP
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	O26:H11	pO26_4, pO26_3	2	HP, R/M ²
<i>E. coli</i>	SMS-3-5	pSMS35-8, pSMS35_3	2	Col-E10 ³ , IS1
<i>E. coli</i>	O55:H7	p12579_5, p12579_4, p12579_3	2	M/R; Aph(3'')-ib, Aph(6)-Id; TEM-1
<i>E. coli</i>	E24377A	pETEC_6, pETEC_5	4	Aph(6)-Id, Aph(3'')-Ib, <i>sul2</i> ; <i>nga</i>
<i>E. coli</i>	SE11	pSE11-5, pSE11-4	4	HP, <i>nga</i>
<i>E. coli</i>	PCN061	PCN061p3, PCN061p2, PCN061p1	3	<i>sul2</i> , Aph(3'')-Ib, Aph(6)-Id; HP; HP
<i>E. coli</i>	ST648	pEC648_7, pEC648_5	4	HP, HP.
<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	CAV1374	pCAV1374-6538, pCAV1374-14	9	Tn3, Tn3
<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	234-12	pKpn2312-5, pKpn23412-4	0	HP, HP
<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	MGH 78578	pKPN6, pKPN7	3	HP, HP
<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	Kp13	pKP13b, pKP13c	4	SMR ⁴
<i>Salmonella</i> <i>Typhimurium</i>	CFSAN001921	unnamed 2 (NC_021843), unnamed3 (NC_021816)	1	HP, HP
<i>S. enterica</i>	YU39	pYU39_4.8, pYU39_4.2	4	HP, HP
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	CAV1492	pCAV1492-3223, pCAV1492-6393	4	ND
<i>Shigella flexneri</i>	2002017	pSFxv_3, pSFxv_4, pSFxv_5	2	<i>strA</i> , HP, Fe ⁵
<i>S. sonnei</i>	Ss046	pSS046_spA, pSS046_spB	2	<i>tet(A)</i> , Col-E1 ³
Pasteurellaceae				
<i>A. pleuropneuminae</i>	AP76	pB1002, pB1003, APP7_C	ND	<i>bla</i> _{ROB-1} ; <i>strA</i> , <i>sul2</i> ; *
<i>H. parasuis</i>	BB1020	pB1000, pB1006	ND	<i>bla</i> _{ROB-1} , <i>tet(O)</i>
<i>P. aerogenes</i>	BB1084	pB1000, pIG1	ND	<i>bla</i> _{ROB-1} , <i>strA</i>
<i>P. multocida</i>	BB1038	pB1000, pB1005	ND	<i>bla</i> _{ROB-1} ; <i>strA</i> , <i>sul2</i>
<i>P. multocida</i>	BB1039	pB1000, p9956	ND	<i>bla</i> _{ROB-1} , <i>tet(H)</i>
<i>P. multocida</i>	BB1046	pB1002, pB1003	ND	<i>bla</i> _{ROB-1} ; <i>strA</i> , <i>sul2</i>
<i>P. multocida</i>	BB1044	pB1000, pB1005, pB1006	ND	<i>bla</i> _{ROB-1} ; <i>strA</i> , <i>sul2</i> ; <i>tet(O)</i>

Table S3. ColE1 plasmids cohabiting in nature.

^a Non ColE1 plasmids presented in the same cell^b Genes founded in the variable región of ColE1 plasmids: ¹ HP, Hypothetical Protein; ² M/R, Restriction/Modification System; ³ Col-E1, Colicin E1; ⁴ SMR, *Small Multidrug Resistance proteins*; ⁵ Fe, involved in ferric resistance; * Cryptic plasmid.