

Pan-genomics: Unmasking the gene diversity hidden in the bacteria species.

Luis David Alcaraz*

Correspondence:

lalcaraz@ieecologia.unam.mx
Departamento de Ecología de la
Biodiversidad. Instituto de
Ecología. Universidad Nacional
Autónoma de México, AP 420
Ciudad Universitaria, 04510
México D.F., México

*To whom correspondence should
be addressed


Abstract

The dramatic increase in genome sequencing during the last years has changed our ideas about bacteria diversity, from single gene to whole community DNA surveys; we have learned that the nature largest gene repository resides in bacteria. Comparison of bacteria genomes has contributed to understand the flexibility in size and gene content as well as the gene movement due to gene family expansions and Horizontal Gene Transfer. Bacteria species are currently defined by means of 16S rRNA sequence comparisons and some limited phenotypic traits. There is an ongoing debate about the biological and evolutive significance of the bacteria species, and thus the need of refine the definition of it using the most of the genomic shared information. When comparing multiple genomes of related strains we can divide the common shared features like the core genome, and the strain specific genes are known as accessory genome, both accessory and core genome as the total of the genetic composition are known as pan-genome. Here we present the possibilities using pan-genomics as a workhorse to describe both taxonomical and functional diversity within bacteria.

Keywords: pan-genomics; core genome; bacteria species; taxonomic diversity; functional diversity

The largest amount of life's gene functions diversity resides in bacteria, this affirmation was possible in the last decade due to rapid development of sequencing technologies, also known as Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) [1]. NGS has aided to describe huge amounts of new species at the genomes level. Despite a bias toward sequencing of human pathogens there are up to 7,411 complete sequenced bacteria genomes up to date. As well as, thousands of Whole Genome Shotgun (WGS) sequencing projects, which when taken into account they gave an approximate of $\geq 30,000$ ongoing and available genome sequences [2]. Our current knowledge at the genes level could be summarized as genes in this planet are the ones kept by bacteria and its exceptions (including us within exceptions). Current criteria for naming a bacteria species rely mostly on comparison of 16S rRNA gene (16S) sequences and evaluation of some phenotypic traits like fatty acid profiles, sugar uptake and assimilation, etc. The 16S threshold for delimiting a species is 97% identity of sequence conservation, lower identity values stands for different species. This cut-off value was derived from an old fashion metric when comparing genomes of different species (like *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* sp.) and showing a 70% whole DNA-DNA hybridization along phenotypic shared traits, when 16S arose like the gold standard for molecular phylogenetics the equivalent for a 70% DNA-DNA was correlated with a 97% identity at 16S level [3]. There are several critics to define

bacteria species through this arbitrary cut-off criteria and its biological meaning, nonetheless the value of 16S comparisons to determine large scale evolutionary relationships of is accepted universally, what is questioned is to rely only in 16S sequence comparisons for defining bacteria species [4] (see Figure 1).



Further complications with the use of 16S as a tool to define species are that current species conceptual frame was intended for sexual organisms, inheriting their genomes in a vertical direction. With bacteria and its promiscuity things go complicated, bacteria have capabilities to perform Horizontal Gene Transfer (HGT) and recombination of genes varies from clonal lineages to highly recombinant even named panmictical (highly promiscuous) strains [5]. HGT can operate from single genes to whole genomic islands that are a plus in highly selective environments (think about antibiotic resistance mechanisms, etc.). The difficulties come to a dead-end when it comes to define species in bacteria, and forgetting the plasticity of gene movement in these organisms. We have to cope with Taxonomic Operational Units (OTUs) as our closest proxy to define the bacteria species, more with a need of a working unit rather to its biological or evolutionary significance. The OTUs are defined as clusters of aligned 16S rRNA sequences having at least 97% identity amongst them

[6]. One of the currently finest strategies, without genome sequencing is to define close related bacteria strains by means multiple gene alignments and comparisons to define close related strains, this is called of Multi Locus Sequence Typing and Multi Locus Sequence Analysis (MLST and MLSA, respectively). The rationale behind MLST is to use several (~7) conserved genes interdispersed in the genomes to avoid the chance of genetic linkage, by amplifying, sequencing, aligning and concatenating the sequences, put them in a single artificial sequence to maximize the amount of genetic information parsed into the substitution model and thus propose a phylogenetic hypothesis that helps to discriminate between close related strains [7].

Adding up complexity layers, we are just recently noticing that we were missing huge amounts of bacteria diversity out there, for some environments we only knew about 1% of the estimated diversity in part because of the difficulties to culture bacteria in Petri dishes [8]. Parallel to the advancement of sequencing technologies the sequencing environmental DNA and thus the genomes of uncultivated bacteria are been developed, this is known as metagenomics. Metagenomics can be performed on virtually any environment to study both functional and taxonomical diversities [9]. The metagenomes taxonomical diversity is mostly conducted via Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) amplification of 16S rRNA libraries of the studied community. Whole Genome Shotgun Metagenomics has also been developed and with this insight we can know about both community taxonomic and metabolic diversity. Metagenomics has been applied to a wide range of environments to know the microbes associated to them, and this is known like the microbiome. The studied microbiomes and its environments are diverse and go from acid mine drainages, soils, oil spills, sea water, plants, and animals [9, 10, 11, 12, 13].

The vast majority of current microbial diversity studies rely only on 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing and comparison. At the end of the study one ends up with a large dataset of OTUs and bunches of multivariate analysis. The final goal is trying to correlate, and in the best cases associate one particular trait (i.e. disease, pollution resistance, etc.) with a particular set of OTUs. One major source of error for these studies has to be with the sampling, which usually lacks of direct replicas and studies across time; this is getting better due to the reducing costs of mass sequencing. Additional experiment complications with 16S involves variable copy number across different genomes [14] biased PCR due to the primer design template [15], varying sequences lengths result of the current technologies (100 - 1,000 base pairs) and using the same threshold as if the sequence was full length 16S, etc.

The sequencing technologies are getting cheaper and accurate, facts that had allowed analysis of whole genomic variation within the very same bacteria species. The pan-genome concept arose when comparing *Streptococcus agalactiae* strains who accomplished all the current taxonomical and clinical criteria to be part of the very same species, producing the same symptomatic illness, hosting the very same 16S rRNA sequences [16]. But, when comparing the genome sequences of the *S. agalactiae* isolated from different patients against the reference genome it was totally unexpected to find out that each strain shared 20% of the genes. In bacteria genomes, there is a high density of coding genes with small intergenic spaces and lower amount of repetitive DNA when comparing with eukaryotes. So,


in bacteria differences in genome size correlates directly with coding sequences, the larger of your bacterial genome, the more functions you can potentially perform with the genes coded in your genome. *S. agalactiae*'s variation in conservancy of genes are huge, when comparing different eukaryote species, for instance divergence in shared coding sequences across different species like chimpanzees and humans does not go further than 1.23% [17]. Thinking about the differences of 20% in a single bacterium, supposed to be the very same species and finding this difference within the same species is astonishing. The sum of the shared and strain unique genes across all the compared genomes is called pan-genome, which in turn can be divided in core genome and accessory genome. In some cases, like the *S. agalactiae*, there is a predicted chance to get new genes for each new sequenced strain, this is called an open pan-genome. For other groups the dynamics are different and there is not predicted new genes for new sequenced strains like is the case for the *Bacillus cereus*, this is called a closed pan-genome [16, 18, 19].

Core genome phylogenetic are the next level of MLST schema, comparing whole shared genome information coded in the genomes of interest strains. Core genome phylogenomics is done by comparing all the shared (orthologous) genes amongst all the compared species, then align each one of the genes and then concatenating the alignments to build a supermatrix, which in turns feed a phylogenetic reconstruction; this approach is known as core genome phylogenomics [20] (see Figure 2). The usual parameters of classic molecular evolution, like nucleotide diversity and synonymous/non-synonymous ratios, could be inferred from the core genome alignments. The core genomes could be defined at varying taxonomical depths and could be used to analyze shared gene features from species, genus, family, order, class, and phylum. The upper level of taxonomical resolution (i.e. phylum), the fewer shared genes expected, at lower taxonomical hierarchy (species) is expected to have the larger amount of shared genes. The extra bonus of getting core genomes is that we are able to build molecular functions profiles with the conserved genes across a taxonomic range and find out gene functions responsible for the group cohesion. For example, core genome analysis we can aid to find for the expected genes for a enterobacteria like *E. coli* or a sporulating genus like *Bacillus* [21, 19]. Core genome analysis can be helpful to analyze particular phenotypic features like the core genome for any shared trait (i.e. sporulation, heat resistance, antibiotic degradation, etc.) when comparing the shared genes conservancy profile for multiple species dealing with the same environmental challenges [19].

The in-depth study of the core genome sheds light over relevant evolutionary questions, like what are the conserved genes across a taxonomic range, its cut-off similarity values and what are the functional gene constrains of this conservancy. Based on the central dogma of molecular biology one would expect that genes coding for the core machinery of replication (DNA), transcription (RNA) and translation (proteins) would be universally conserved as well as some other house-keeping genes. Phylogenetic reconstructions relying in the whole genome are maybe closer to explain the organism evolutionary history, rather than individual genes genealogies. Important applications also arise, like the development of strain specific vaccines due to the knowledge of the variation within the conserved genes of a species [22].

With the pan-genome (see Figure 2), the accessory genome presence/absence patterns through the compared bacteria could be result of gene loss or gene acquisition

through Horizontal Gene Transfer. The importance of gene acquisition/loss ratio is yet to be covered but there are some examples like the one examining the *Achaea Sulfolobus islandicus* and the importance of analyzing its pan-genome to determine strain and even location specific genes and their dynamics [23]. The building of the pan-genome is helpful to have a full inventory of the metabolic capabilities of a given group of organisms. Differences in the unique genes of close related bacteria could be a partial answer of local adaptation to particular life styles or niches (i.e. free-living, host-associate, virulence, etc.).



The main goal of the 16S amplicons studies is to: have a diversity inventory of a particular environment and try to associate OTUs with particular functions, using the 16S OTU as a proxy for the metabolic diversity. Predictions trying to connect a particular OTU with metabolic functions, for example a gut environment is dominated by say *E. coli* related OTUs, then taking a single reference genome of

a single strain would be a naive guess if fails to consider that we can have up to 30% in presence-absence of coding genes, and that particular genes in the accessory genomes are the probable environment restricted genes. However, several attempts are performed now trying to use the large amount of 16S massive sequencing from virtually any environment and infer metabolic diversity and link it to phylogenetic distances [24, 25]. Another approach in trying to gain insights into the metabolic diversity when only having 16S sequences could be to have pan-genomes catalogues for all the known groups of bacteria with sequenced genomes, generating confidence intervals based on gene presence-absence within particular bacteria.

The 16S gene databases are one of the most prolific ones. The understanding of what we know actually about bacteria diversity is mostly in debt with 16S sequence analysis. For sure it's been useful and will keep that way when studying unknown environments and when the goal is to have a first glimpse about complexity of the community structure. For pathogens, diagnosis and management this was outdated some time ago and the need to develop rapid and accurate methods for resolving close relative type strains derived into the MLST analysis. With the current pace of sequencing technologies development is urgent to redefine the minimum standards when defining bacteria diversity. The new bacteria diversity standards are likely to require core and pan-genomics analysis to define the bacteria, as well as understanding local dynamics for pan-genomics at each taxonomic unit.

The beauty of not knowing a precise way to describe a species should not be taken like a pitfall for microbiology. With bacteria, we are dealing with the major repository of genes and biological functions that have allowed microbes to be the major players in our world, from biogeochemical cycles, energy harvesting and cycling and thus making life for all the other being forms possible. The species concept, developed for when you are well behaved and transmit your genes in vertical form seems a little rigid when dealing with bacteria and its tremendous capabilities of transforming and sharing its genes in a happy and promiscuous way. We just need to refine our vision and take into account the internal variability for genes and thus functions of each related bacteria, and praise it, develop new indexes (like Genome Similarity Score [19]) that take into account the whole set of shared features when comparing bacteria, along sides phylogenetic traditional ways. If we are aware of the current utilitarian bacteria species concept and that we understand that some of the major traits of a bacterium, like pathogenesis, are likely to occur in close related working units call them species or OTUs, we can cope with that. But being unaware of the huge functional diversity connected to what we already call a bacterium species is nonsense nowadays.

References

1. Metzker, M.L.: Sequencing technologies — the next generation. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **11**(1), 31–46 (2009)
2. Pagani, I., Liolios, K., Jansson, J., Chen, I.-M.A., Smirnova, T., Nosrat, B., Markowitz, V.M., Kyrpides, N.C.: The Genomes OnLine Database (GOLD) v.4: status of genomic and metagenomic projects and their associated metadata. *Nucleic acids research* **40**(Database issue), 571–9 (2012)
3. Goris, J., Konstantinidis, K.T., Klappenbach, J.a., Coenye, T., Vandamme, P., Tiedje, J.M.: DNA-DNA hybridization values and their relationship to whole-genome sequence similarities. *International journal of systematic and evolutionary microbiology* **57**(Pt 1), 81–91 (2007)
4. Fraser, C., Alm, E.J., Polz, M.F., Spratt, B.G., Hanage, W.P.: The bacterial species challenge: making sense of genetic and ecological diversity. *Science* **323**(5915), 741–746 (2009)
5. Smith, J.M., Smith, N.H., Rourke, M.O., Spratt, B.G., O'Rourke, M.: How Clonal are Bacteria? *PNAS* **90**(10), 4384–4388 (1993)

6. Konstantinidis, K.T., Tiedje, J.M.: Prokaryotic taxonomy and phylogeny in the genomic era: advancements and challenges ahead. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **10**(5), 504–509 (2007)
7. Gevers, D., Cohan, F.M., Lawrence, J.G., Spratt, B.G., Coenye, T., Feil, E.J., Stackebrandt, E., Peer, Y.V., Vandamme, P., Thompson, F.L., Swings, J.: Re-evaluating prokaryotic species. *Microbiology* **3**(September), 733–739 (2005)
8. Vartoukian, S.R., Palmer, R.M., Wade, W.G.: Strategies for culture of 'unculturable' bacteria. *FEMS microbiology letters* **309**(1), 1–7 (2010)
9. Lundberg, D.S., Lebeis, S.L., Paredes, S.H., Yourstone, S., Gehring, J., Malfatti, S., Tremblay, J., Engelbrektson, A., Kunin, V., Rio, T.G.D., Edgar, R.C., Eickhorst, T., Ley, R.E., Hugenholtz, P., Tringe, S.G., Dangl, J.L.: Defining the core *Arabidopsis thaliana* root microbiome. *Nature* **488**(7409), 86–90 (2012)
10. Belda-Ferre, P., Alcaraz, L.D., Cabrera-Rubio, R., Romero, H., Simón-Soro, A., Pignatelli, M., Mira, A.: The oral metagenome in health and disease. *The ISME journal* **1**(11), 46–56 (2011)
11. Rusch, D.B., Halpern, A.L., Sutton, G., Heidelberg, K.B., Williamson, S., Yooshep, S., Wu, D., Eisen, J.A., Hoffman, J.M., Remington, K., Beeson, K., Tran, B., Smith, H., Baden-Tillson, H., Stewart, C., Thorpe, J., Freeman, J., Andrews-pfannkoch, C., Venter, J.E., Li, K., Kravitz, S., Heidelberg, J.F., Utterback, T., Rogers, Y.-H., Falc, N, L.I., Souza, V., Bonilla-Rosso, G., Eguarte, L.E., Karl, D.M., Sathyendranath, S., Platt, T., Bermingham, E., Gallardo, V., Tamayo-Castillo, G., Ferrari, M.R., Strausberg, R.L., Nealson, K., Friedman, R., Frazier, M., Venter, J.C.: The Sorcerer II Global Ocean Sampling Expedition: Northwest Atlantic through Eastern Tropical Pacific. *PLoS Biology* **5**(3), 0 (2007)
12. Mendes, R.: Deciphering the Rhizosphere Microbiome. *Science* **1097** (2011)
13. Beazley, M.J., Martinez, R.J., Rajan, S., Powell, J., Piceno, Y.M., Tom, L.M., Andersen, G.L., Hazen, T.C., Van Nostrand, J.D., Zhou, J., Mortazavi, B., Sobecky, P.: Microbial community analysis of a coastal salt marsh affected by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *PloS one* **7**(7), 41305 (2012)
14. Klappenbach, J.a., Saxman, P.R., Cole, J.R., Schmidt, T.M.: rrndb: the Ribosomal RNA Operon Copy Number Database. *Nucleic acids research* **29**(1), 181–4 (2001)
15. Engelbrektson, A., Kunin, V., Wrighton, K.C., Zvenigorodsky, N., Chen, F., Ochman, H., Hugenholtz, P.: Experimental factors affecting PCR-based estimates of microbial species richness and evenness. *The ISME journal* **4**(5), 642–7 (2010)
16. Tettelin, H., Masignani, V., Cieslewicz, M.J., Donati, C., Medini, D., Ward, N.L., Angiuoli, S.V., Crabtree, J., Jones, A.L., Durkin, A.S., DeBoy, R.T., Davidsen, T.M., Mora, M., Scarselli, M., Margarit y Ros, I., Peterson, J.D., Hauser, C.R., Sundaram, J.P., Nelson, W.C., Madupu, R., Brinkac, L.M., Dodson, R.J., Rosovitz, M.J., Sullivan, S.A., Daugherty, S.C., Haft, D.H., Selengut, J., Gwinn, M.L., Zhou, L., Zafar, N., Khouri, H., Radune, D., Dimitrov, G., Watkins, K., O'connor, K.J., Smith, S., Utterback, T.R., White, O., Rubens, C.E., Grandi, G., Madoff, L.C., Kasper, D.L., Telford, J.L., Wessels, M.R., Rappuoli, R., Fraser, C.M.: Genome analysis of multiple pathogenic isolates of *Streptococcus agalactiae*: implications for the microbial "pan-genome". *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **102**(39), 13950–13955 (2005)
17. The Chimpanzee Sequencing and Analysis Consortium: Initial sequence of the chimpanzee genome and comparison with the human genome. *Nature* **437**(7055), 69–87 (2005)
18. Mira, A., Martín-Cuadrado, A.: The bacterial pan-genome: a new paradigm in microbiology. *International Microbiology*, 45–57 (2010)
19. Alcaraz, L.D., Moreno-Hagelsieb, G., Eguarte, L.E., Souza, V., Herrera-Estrella, L., Olmedo, G.: Understanding the evolutionary relationships and major traits of *Bacillus* through comparative genomics. *BMC genomics* **11**(1), 332 (2010)
20. Alcaraz, L.D., López-Ramírez, V., Moreno-Letelier, A., Herrera-Estrella, L., Souza, V., Olmedo-Alvarez, G.: Genomics of bacteria from an ancient marine origin: Clues to survival in an oligotrophic environment. In: Dar, I.A., Mithas, A.D. (eds.) *Earth and Environmental Sciences*, 1st edn., pp. 609–630. Intech, Croatia (2011)
21. Sims, G.E., Kim, S.-H.: Whole-genome phylogeny of *Escherichia coli*/Shigella group by feature frequency profiles (FFPs). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **108**(20), 8329–34 (2011)
22. Luciani, F., Bull, R.a., Lloyd, A.R.: Next generation deep sequencing and vaccine design: today and tomorrow. *Trends in biotechnology* **30**(9), 443–452 (2012)
23. Reno, M., Held, N.: Biogeography of the *Sulfolobus islandicus* pan-genome. *PNAS* **106**(21) (2009)
24. Langille, M.G.I., Zaneveld, J., Caporaso, J.G., McDonald, D., Knights, D., Reyes, J.a., Clemente, J.C., Burkepile, D.E., Vega Thurber, R.L., Knight, R., Beiko, R.G., Huttenhower, C.: Predictive functional profiling of microbial communities using 16S rRNA marker gene sequences. *Nature biotechnology* **31**(9), 814–21 (2013)
25. Okuda, S., Tsuchiya, Y., Kiriya, C., Itoh, M., Morisaki, H.: Virtual metagenome reconstruction from 16S rRNA gene sequences. *Nature Communications* **3**, 1203 (2012)