

# Supplementary Information for

A non-mutational mechanism of inheritance in the Archaeon *Sulfolobus solfataricus*.

Sophie Payne, Samuel McCarthy, Tyler Johnson, Erica North, and Paul Blum.

Paul Blum Email: [pblum1@unl.edu](mailto:pblum1@unl.edu)

### **This PDF file includes:**

Supplemental Methods Figs. S1, S2 & S3 Tables S1 to S6 References for supplementary information

#### **Supplemental methods**

#### **Genome and transcriptome sequencing.**

Sequencing of parental, partially-evolved and fully evolved SARC strains. Paired-end sequencing was performed as in McCarthy et al (1). Genome coverage was ≥500 for all samples, read length was 100bp, and insert size was about 300-500bp. The SARC strains were aligned to their respective parental strains using Bowtie2 v2.3.4.1 (default settings with –sensitive, –end-to-end and –interleaved options) (2) and Samtools v1.9 (default settings) (3). To avoid false negatives for genomic rearrangements and transpositions, genome sequences were also assembled into contigs *de novo* using SPAdes v33.7.1 (default settings with –careful option) (4) and into scaffolds using Ragout reference-assisted assembly (default settings) (5). For genome sequencing, lineage traceability was verified by ensuring the SARC strains contained the same mutations as their ancestral partially evolved strain. This consistency of mutations also confirms mutation authenticity. Genome and transcriptome sequence information is available in the NCBI databank. Prior to sequencing, genomic DNA was analyzed by electrophoresis and formed a single high molecular weight band lacking smearing. The absence of additional lower molecular weight bands indicated a lack of plasmids that might act to facilitate genome rearrangement or transposition.

Sequencing of passaging control strain (SUL120). The genome of the SUL120 passaging control strain was sequenced using the PacBio sequencing platform. The point mutation accuracy of this method is comparable to that of Illumina and identifies mobile element transfer efficiently (6). The DNA sample was purified by phenol/chloroform extraction and sheared using a Megaruptor instrument (Diagenode, Liege, Belgium) to a 10kb average size. The fragments were converted into a sequencing library using the SMRTbell Template Prep Kit 1.0 (Pacific Biosciences). The library was sequenced using P6C4 chemistry on a single-molecule real-time (SMRT) cell with a 240-min collection protocol on a PacBio RSII sequencer. The PacBio hierarchical genome assembly pipeline (RS\_HGAP.2) was used to assemble the data *de novo*, with polishing using the PacBioSMRT-Portal embedded Quiver software. Sequencing data filtering parameters were set to have a minimum polymerase read quality of 0.8 and a minimum seed length of 6kp for the assembly. The BLASR aligner (Pacific Biosciences) was used to align the RAW reads to the *de novo* assembly at default settings. For other analyses filtered subreads were extracted from the PacBio data using the RS\_Subreads.1 protocol (Pacific Biosciences) at default settings. PacBio data produced 120-fold genome coverage.

#### **Analysis of genomic data.**

Point mutation identification. Evolved strain (SARC-B, SARC-C, SARC-H, SARC-I, SARC-N, SARC-O) genomes were compared to parental genomes to identify mutations using variant calling software bcftools v1.9 (3) and vcflib v1.9 (7) (default settings). Variant calls were filtered for DP>50 to allow coverage at least 10% of the average, and QUAL >30 for calls with less than 0.1% chance of error. Putative mutations were visually inspected using Integrative Genomics Viewer (IGV). Mutations were classified as "likely" when between 50 and 80% of aligned bases differed from the reference genome. Mutations were classified as "real" when > 80% of aligned bases differed from the reference genome. All "likely" mutations were experimentally tested using PCR and resequencing (8) to be reclassified as "real". "Real" mutations were bioinformatically analyzed further and recorded in Table S2. For SUL120 however, the high mutation count precluded resequencing of all 102 ≤80% point mutations. Instead, to estimate the accuracy of point mutations, a random sample of 11 mutations where ~75% of aligned

bases at that position differed from the genome were resequenced. Based on the 75% alignment, the mutated position was predicted to be erroneous 25% of the time (3/11). Instead, all were found to be true mutations.

The point mutations identified using the methods above were bioinformatically analyzed to determine codon positions and effect on protein sequence or regulation. For the SARC strains, mutation location was also cross-referenced to known functional domains to identify potential sources of changes in protein function. Potential relationships between mutated genes were investigated through manual annotation and literature searches, in addition to searching the KEGG database for presence in similar pathways.

Genome rearrangement identification. Mauve 2.4.0 progressive Mauve aligner was used to identify genome rearrangements in reference-mapped genomes using default settings (9). Deleted regions were validated to be pre-existing transposase ORFs, and insertion sequences were analyzed using BLAST to identify a potential source ORF. The identities of all active transposases were identified based on BLAST sequence similarity. Of the 255 putative transposases annotated in the SULA genome, the families of 129 IS elements could be determined using the annotation available for the *S. solfataricus* SULA genome on NCBI (Genbank accession number CP011057.1 (1, 10)). Genome rearrangements were validated using PCR and agarose gel size comparison. For SUL120, the accuracy of a representative set of 10 transposons was extrapolated to the larger dataset. Because 4 of 4 tested insertions were real, all insertion events were included in SUL120 transposition analysis. Of 6 deletion events detected in sequencing data, none were found to have existed in the parental SULA strain via PCR. As a result, many SUL120 deletion events might be false positives arising from improper assembly of IS regions in SULA. Although 18 deletion events were originally detected in SUL120, a conservative estimate of 0 events was used for transposition analysis.

As the SARC-I strain was found to have no point mutations or apparent transpositions, DELLY v0.7.8 (default settings) (11) was used to identify genome rearrangements such as transposition, inversions and copy number variation. A simulated inversion was called with a PASS filter and a PE score of 1000. On real datasets (SULG and SARC-I), potential SVs and CNV were filtered to those with a PASS filter and PE score > 100. Those that only appeared in SARC-I were analyzed further by visualization in IGV. The four potential inversions that passed filtering and were supported by split reads in IGV were tested using PCR. Primers flanked the breakpoints and would produce amplicons if there was no rearrangement. Primers were also chosen that would amplify if an inversion occurred. With this, all putative rearrangements were excluded. Pindel v0.2.5b9 (default settings) was used as an alternative method to test for structural rearrangements. Results were filtered to have a read depth of 100, and that each potential event required that the reads that supported it in SARC-I were ≥2x greater than in SULG. No additional putative structural rearrangements were detected. Point mutation rate was calculated as mutations per base per cell division (Cell divisions = 120, bases = 2.7Mb). The transposition rate was calculated as transpositions each cell division cycle. Point mutation and transposition counts were determined as described above. The cell division count was determined by tracking cell growth over the course of passaging.

#### **Analysis of transcriptomic data**

Determination of the SARC transcriptome. Transcriptomic data from the evolved SARC strains was compared to their parental strains using EdgeR (12) and analyzed to find conserved gene expression

patterns likely to contribute to acid resistance. To avoid the introduction of artifacts, only genes whose differential expression results had p-values ≤ 0.05 in all three SARC lines were analyzed further. Altered expression of a gene that was conserved in all SARC strains was likely to be phenotypically important (part of the SARC transcriptome) and not a result of random chance. The number of genes with conserved expression predicted to be false positives was determined by multiplying the highest p-values of each dataset (0.05), and then multiplying by the total genes in the transcriptome. For example, the false discovery rate for genes with conserved expression in three fully evolved SARC strains was  $\sim 0.05^{3} \times$ 2924 = 0.37 genes. The false discovery rate for genes conserved in all six fully evolved and partially evolved intermediates was  $\sim 0.05^6 \times 2924 = 0.00005$  genes. To be considered a SARC transcriptome gene: (1) The fold change direction was consistent between the three fully evolved SARC strains, such that all are upregulated or all are downregulated. (2) The average fold change between the 3 strains was greater than 2 fold. (3) The SARC-I acid-stress control showed an expression shift in the same direction, showing that the transcriptomic change was heritable and not due to stress. (4) The range of standard error for the average does not bring the fold change to less than 2. (5) The gene was not a transposase, as transposases are unlikely to contribute to the SARC phenotype.

Identification of factors that could facilitate the SARC transcriptome. To determine whether transcriptomic changes correlated with GC content, small regions of high GC content were identified by calculating the GC% for every 5bp and looking for regions of where a stretch >20bp in length was >20% different than the norm up to 100bp away from a transcriptionally altered gene. Proximity to tRNAs and origins of replication was determined using the NCBI genome browser. To determine whether the SARC transcriptome could be co-regulated, DAVID v6.8 (default settings) (13) was used to determine gene ontology and functional enrichment relative to the *S. solfataricus* genome. A Benjamini-Hochberg corrected p-value of 0.1 was used as a cutoff for significant enrichment (14, 15). To determine the existence of potential transcription factor binding sites, the 100bp 5' flanking regions of the 12 most upregulated genes and 12 most downregulated genes in the SARC transcriptome were collected in addition to 17 unaltered genes. The sequences were submitted to MEME v4.11.2 (default settings) (16) and analyzed on normal mode, searching for zero or one motif occurrence per sequence, and searching for 5 motifs total. The occurrence of each motif, regardless of p-value, within the SULA genome was determined using FIMO v4.11.2 (default settings), with a p-value limit of 0.0001.

#### **Recombination with phenotypic and expression analysis**

Genes for recombination. SARC genes selected for homologous recombination were SULA\_2869, a pyruvate ferredoxin oxidoreductase, and SULA\_2027, a formate hydrogenlyase/proton translocating membrane protein. Both were upregulated in the SARC strains and likely to be involved in acid resistance (17, 18). As a non-SARC control gene, SULA\_0895 (aldehyde dehydrogenase) was chosen because it had unaltered expression in the SARC strains and was shown previously to be non-essential (19).

Recombination procedure. A 1kb segment of the gene of interest and its promoter was amplified using primers (Table S7) and inserted into a marker-containing suicide plasmid, pUC19-*lacS*. Plasmid inserts were sequenced to avoid introducing mutations. SARC-I was transformed, and the insertion and excision of the plasmid was traced using the *lacS* marker. Integration at the target site was validated using PCR. Segregants were collected from the same recombinant intermediate having the integrated plasmid and both copies of the target locus to ensure that the final recombinants arose from the same

genetic intermediate. To enrich for unique segregation events, passage number from this intermediate was limited.

Expression analysis after recombination. Recombinants at SARC loci that acquired acid-sensitive phenotypes were predicted to have also acquired decreased expression of the target SARC gene. Similarly, recombinants that retained acid resistant phenotypes were predicted to have unaltered expression levels of the target SARC gene. Because recombinants at SARC loci varied in phenotype, three acid-sensitive (altered phenotype) and three acid-resistant isolates (unchanged phenotype) for each recombinant set (SULA\_2027, SULA\_2869) were measured for expression of the targeted SARC gene. A control non-SARC gene recombinant set (SULA\_0895) was similarly tested.

To determine whether expression changes incurred by HR were locus specific, expression levels of genes targeted for HR were compared to expression of the same gene in isolates that underwent HR at a different locus. For expression analysis of recombinants, all RNA was extracted from mid-exponential phase cell cultures that had been passaged twice at pH 1.2 to stabilize physiology and expression patterns after the transformation. RT-PCR amplifications were performed in parallel the gene SULA\_2002, which was used for expression normalization because it had consistent expression across all transcriptomes. The amount of expression difference between the SARC and parental strains were consistent with RNAseq data, but of a lower intensity as is sometimes observed for qRTPCR (20). SigmaPlot 11.0 was used for statistical analysis of growth and expression data.

#### **Data availability**

The genome sequences for *S. solfataricus* 98/2 strain SULA, partially evolved strain SARC-B (SULB) and terminal SARC strain SARC-C (SULC) are available at GenBank under the accession numbers CP011057.2, CP011055.2 and CP011056.2, respectively (1, 10). Newly resequenced SULG and its derived lineages SARC-H and SARC-I are available under accession numbers CP033235, CP033236, CP033237. SULM and its derived lineages SARC-N and SARC-O are available under accession numbers CP033238, CP033239, CP033240. SULA120 is available under accession number CP033241. Raw DNA-seq data are available in the JGI Genome portal under JGI Project IDs 1019966 (SULA), 1019969 (SARC-B), 1019972 (SARC-C), 1019975 (SULG), 1019978 (SARC-H), 1019981 (SARC-I), 1019984 (SULM), 1019987 (SARC-N) and 1019990 (SARC-O). Raw RNA-seq data are available in the JGI Genome portal under JGI Project IDs 1019993 (SULA), 1019996 (SARC-B), 1019999 (SARC-C), 1020002 (SULG), 1020005 (SARC-H), 1020008 (SARC-I), 1036511 (SARC-I stress control) 1020011 (SULM), 1020014 (SARC-N) and 1020017 (SARC-O). RNA-seq data is also available in the Sequence Read Archive under accession numbers SRX872629 and SRX872630 (SULA), SRX872631 and SRX872632 (SARC-B), SRX712375 and SRX712376 (SARC-C), SRX872634 and SRX872633 (SULG), SRX875205 (SARC-H), SRX712379 and SRX712378 (SARC-I), SRX872636 and SRX872635 (SULM), SRX712413 and SRX712412 (SARC-N), and SRX872640 and SRX872639 (SARC-O).



**Fig. S1.** Growth of SUL120 and SARC-C at pH 3.0 (n=2).





**C**





**Fig. S2. Excluding known mechanisms of transcriptomic inheritance.** A. Exclusion of the occurrence of predicted genome rearrangements in SARC-I. A.1. Schematic for validating Delly-predicted inversions using PCR primers. Arrows indicate gene region (black) and primers (green and blue). WT, wild type orientation, INV, inverted orientation. A.2. Locations of inversions (INV) predicted using DELLY and primers used to determine occurrence of inversions. A.3. Results for PCR determination of the presence of inversions in SULG (WT) and SARC-I (adapted). "S" indicates SARC-I lanes while blank lanes are SULG. Identical amplicons for SULG and SARC-I indicate no inversion event. B. Location of tRNAs (purple circles) and origins of replication (orange circles) in relation to the SARC transcriptome (see figure 1B). C. DAVID gene ontology clustering and functional enrichment analysis results for the SARC transcriptome. D. MEME motif discovery results from upregulated, downregulated SARC transcriptome genes or random unaltered genes. E. Occurrence frequency of each discovered motif (regardless of e-value) in the SULA genome using FIMO



Fig. S3. Growth rate at low pH and expression data for SARC recombinants and controls. A) Recombinant growth rates at low pH for averaged relative growth data presented in Fig 4A. Open circles: SARC-I parental control (C) that did not undergo recombination. Colored circles: isolates with highly altered growth that were tested for expression. Horizontal bars: average of triplicates. B) Individual data and recombinant strain identities for averaged expression data presented in Fig 4B. Expression levels are measured relative to non-SARC strain SULG. Open circles: SARC-I parental control (C) that did not undergo recombination. Colored circles: recombinants with highly altered growth that were tested for expression. Grey circles: recombinants with mostly unaltered growth that were tested to determine whether SARC expression levels were retained.

# **Table S1. Strains used in study.**



NA = not whole-genome resequenced for upload to GenBank

<b>Strain</b>	Coordinate	<b>Nucleotide</b> Change	<b>Transition (Ts) or</b> <b>Transversion (Tv)</b>	Amino acid change	ORF#	Annotation	<b>KEGG Pathway</b>
<b>Partially evolved and</b> terminal SARC-C	507,235	$C \rightarrow T$	<b>Ts</b>	Synonymous	<b>SULA_0550</b>	Hypothetical protein	<b>NA</b>
<b>Partially evolved and</b> terminal SARC-C	590,768	$C \rightarrow T$	Ts	$\mathsf{Gly} \rightarrow \mathsf{Asp}$	<b>SULA 0631</b>	Formate dehydrogenase / Oxidoreductase	ssoa00630 - Glyoxylate and dicarboxylate metabolism
<b>Partially evolved and</b> terminal SARC-C	962,913	$G \rightarrow A$	<b>Ts</b>	Thr $\rightarrow$ Ile	<b>SULA 0993</b>	Amino acid permease	<b>NA</b>
<b>SARC-C</b>	1,253,935	$C \rightarrow A$	Tv	Arg $\rightarrow$ Leu	<b>SULA 1334</b>	Hypothetical protein (predicted MFS superfamily domain)	<b>NA</b>
<b>SARC-C</b>	2,569,782	$C \rightarrow T$	Ts	<b>NA</b>	<b>SULA 2764</b>	pseudogene	<b>NA</b>
<b>Partially evolved and</b> terminal SARC-O	1,476,035	$C \rightarrow T$	<b>Ts</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>SULA 1594</b>	Hypothetical protein (predicted transcriptional regulator domain)	<b>NA</b>
<b>Partially evolved and</b> terminal SARC-O	1,476,069	$C \rightarrow T$	Ts	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Intergenic region	<b>NA</b>
<b>Partially evolved and</b> terminal SARC-O	1,480,239	$C \rightarrow T$	Ts	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Intergenic region	<b>NA</b>
SARC-O	111,938	$C \rightarrow A$	Tv	$Arg \rightarrow Met$	<b>SULA 0122</b>	Flagellar protein Flal	<b>NA</b>
SARC-O	231,532	$T \rightarrow C$	Ts	Synonymous	<b>SULA 0260</b>	Pyruvate carboxylase/ Biotin carboxylase(1st step in fatty acid synthesis)	ssoa00630 - Glyoxylate and dicarboxylate metabolism ssoa00680 - Methane metabolism

**Table S2. Location and type of mutations occurring in SARC strains and SUL120.** 



















# **Table S3. Identity of SARC transcriptome genes and fold-change in expression compared to parental strains.**









# **Table S4. Identity and location of transposition events occurring in SARC and SUL120 strains**









#### **Table S6. Primers used in this work.**



#### **Supplementary Information References**

- 1. McCarthy S*, et al.* (2016) Expanding the Limits of Thermoacidophily in the Archaeon Sulfolobus solfataricus by Adaptive Evolution. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 82(3):857-867.
- 2. Langmead B & Salzberg SL (2012) Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat Methods* 9(4):357-359.
- 3. Li H (2011) A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery, association mapping and population genetical parameter estimation from sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 27(21):2987- 2993.
- 4. Bankevich A*, et al.* (2012) SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. *J Comput Biol* 19(5):455-477.
- 5. Kolmogorov M, Raney B, Paten B, & Pham S (2014) Ragout-a reference-assisted assembly tool for bacterial genomes. *Bioinformatics* 30(12):i302-309.
- 6. Chin CS*, et al.* (2013) Nonhybrid, finished microbial genome assemblies from long-read SMRT sequencing data. *Nat Methods* 10(6):563-569.
- 7. Garrison E (Vcflib, a simple C++ library for parsing and manipulating VCF files.
- 8. Mu WB*, et al.* (2016) Sanger Confirmation Is Required to Achieve Optimal Sensitivity and Specificity in Next-Generation Sequencing Panel Testing. *J Mol Diagn* 18(6):923-932.
- 9. Darling AE, Mau B, & Perna NT (2010) progressiveMauve: multiple genome alignment with gene gain, loss and rearrangement. *PLoS One* 5(6):e11147.
- 10. McCarthy S*, et al.* (2015) Complete Genome Sequence of Sulfolobus solfataricus Strain 98/2 and Evolved Derivatives. *Genome Announc* 3(3).
- 11. Rausch T*, et al.* (2012) DELLY: structural variant discovery by integrated paired-end and splitread analysis. *Bioinformatics* 28(18):i333-i339.
- 12. Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, & Smyth GK (2010) edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics* 26(1):139-140.
- 13. Huang DW, Sherman BT, & Lempicki RA (2009) Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene lists using DAVID bioinformatics resources. *Nat Protoc* 4(1):44-57.
- 14. Benjamini Y & Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the False Discovery Rate a Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *J Roy Stat Soc B Met* 57(1):289-300.
- 15. Huang da W, Sherman BT, & Lempicki RA (2009) Bioinformatics enrichment tools: paths toward the comprehensive functional analysis of large gene lists. *Nucleic Acids Res* 37(1):1-13.
- 16. Bailey TL & Elkan C (1994) Fitting a mixture model by expectation maximization to discover motifs in biopolymers. *Proc Int Conf Intell Syst Mol Biol* 2:28-36.
- 17. Noguchi K*, et al.* (2010) Hydrogenase-3 Contributes to Anaerobic Acid Resistance of Escherichia coli. *Plos One* 5(4).
- 18. Lim JK, Mayer F, Kang SG, & Muller V (2014) Energy conservation by oxidation of formate to carbon dioxide and hydrogen via a sodium ion current in a hyperthermophilic archaeon. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 111(31):11497-11502.
- 19. Maezato Y, Dana K, & Blum P (2011) Engineering Thermoacidophilic Archaea using Linear DNA Recombination. *Strain Engineering: Methods and Protocols* 765:435-445.
- 20. Zhang C*, et al.* (2014) Analysis of differential gene expression and novel transcript units of ovine muscle transcriptomes. *PLoS One* 9(2):e89817.
- 21. Rolfsmeier M & Blum P (1995) Purification and characterization of a maltase from the extremely thermophilic crenarchaeote Sulfolobus solfataricus. *J Bacteriol* 177(2):482-485.
- 22. Schelert J*, et al.* (2004) Occurrence and characterization of mercury resistance in the hyperthermophilic archaeon Sulfolobus solfataricus by use of gene disruption. *J Bacteriol* 186(2):427-437.
- 23. Chung HY*, et al.* (1997) Xanthine dehydrogenase/xanthine oxidase and oxidative stress. *Age (Omaha)* 20(3):127-140.
- 24. Hersh BM*, et al.* (1996) A glutamate-dependent acid resistance gene in Escherichia coli. *J Bacteriol* 178(13):3978-3981.
- 25. Richard H & Foster JW (2004) Escherichia coli glutamate- and arginine-dependent acid resistance systems increase internal pH and reverse transmembrane potential. *J Bacteriol* 186(18):6032-6041.
- 26. Rapala-Kozik M, Wolak N, Kujda M, & Banas AK (2012) The upregulation of thiamine (vitamin B1) biosynthesis in Arabidopsis thaliana seedlings under salt and osmotic stress conditions is mediated by abscisic acid at the early stages of this stress response. *BMC Plant Biol* 12:2.