

# An Event-Driven Approach for Studying Gene Block Evolution in Bacteria

David C Ream , Asma R Bankapur and Iddo Friedberg \*  
Department of Microbiology  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH  
USA

September 11, 2022

## Abstract

**Motivation:** Gene blocks are genes co-located on the chromosome. In many cases, genes blocks are conserved between bacterial species, sometimes as operons, when genes are co-transcribed. The conservation is rarely absolute: gene loss, gain, duplication, block splitting, and block fusion are frequently observed. An open question in bacterial molecular evolution is that of the formation and breakup of gene blocks, for which several models have been proposed. These models, however, are not generally applicable to all types of gene blocks, and consequently cannot be used to broadly compare and study gene block evolution. To address this problem we introduce an event-based method for tracking gene block evolution in bacteria.

**Results:** We show here that the evolution of gene blocks in proteobacteria can be described by a small set of events. Those include the insertion of genes into, or the splitting of genes out of a gene block, gene loss, and gene duplication. We show how the event-based method of gene block evolution allows us to determine the evolutionary rate, and to trace the ancestral states of their formation. We conclude that the event-based method can be used to help us understand the formation of these important bacterial genomic structures.

**Availability:** The software is available under GPLv3 license on

[http://github.com/reamdc1/gene\\_block\\_evolution.git](http://github.com/reamdc1/gene_block_evolution.git)

Supplementary online material:

<http://iddo-friedberg.net/operon-evolution>

**Contact:** Iddo Friedberg [i.friedberg@miamioh.edu](mailto:i.friedberg@miamioh.edu)

## 1 Introduction

In bacterial and archaeal genomes, gene blocks are sequences of genes co-located on the chromosome. The evolutionary conservation of gene blocks is strikingly apparent between many genomes. It may also be that conservations across numerous taxa indicate that at least some conserved blocks are operons: a special case of gene blocks where the genes are co-transcribed to polycistronic mRNA and are often associated with a single function, such as a metabolic pathway or a protein complex. It is estimated that 5-25% of bacterial genes reside in operons ([37]). Typically operons are under the control of one or more regulator proteins, which facilitate co-regulated transcription. From an evolutionary point of view, there are several questions that are asked about operons and gene blocks. How did these units evolve? What confers fitness upon genes in an operon or block structure as opposed

---

\*to whom correspondence should be addressed: [i.friedberg@miamioh.edu](mailto:i.friedberg@miamioh.edu)

to not being neighboring? Are certain operons more or less evolutionarily conserved in bacteria? What affects the conservation of the operon or gene block structure in different taxa?

Several models exist to explain gene block evolution (for more extensive reviews see [8, 20]). One of the first models proposed for biopathway evolution is the Natal or Retrograde model which proposed that genes are arranged in blocks and operons due to tandem gene duplications derived from the depletion of metabolites in the environment ([13]). However, this model does not explain many operons which encode for proteins that are not homologous. Early *co-adaptation models* (reviewed in: [32]) applied to operons propose that neighboring genes into operons would lower the chances of co-adapted genes being separated by random recombination. However, orthologous replacements of operon genes have been observed, suggesting that preservation of co-localization of co-adapted alleles is not an exclusive reason for operons to form. The *coregulation model* is derived from the original definition of an operon: that the neighboring operon genes is due to the increased benefit of coregulation, providing an increased fitness for the population which has the operon ([27]). However, intermediate stages involving the cotranscription of non-beneficial genes cannot explain an incremental increase in fitness. The *selfish operon* model ([19]) proposes that the formation of gene blocks in bacteria is mediated by transfer of DNA within and among taxa. The model proposes an increase in fitness for the constituent genes because it enables the transfer of functionally coupled genes that would otherwise not increase fitness if they were separate. Furthermore, the joining of genes into blocks and eventually operons is beneficial for the horizontal gene transfer (HGT) of weakly selected, functionally coupled genes. Thus, we expect to see a certain percentage of “genetic hitchhikers”: non-beneficial genes that are coupled to beneficial genes in the operon. It seems that the selfish operon model does account for the structure of some operons, but is not the only mechanism of operon construction. The main finding against the selfish operon model’s exclusivity is the much lower number of “hitchhiking”, non-essential genes than expected ([24]). Price *et al.* proposed that operon evolution is being driven by selection on gene expression patterns, and they also found that although genes within operons are usually closely spaced, genes in highly expressed operons may be widely spaced because of regulatory fine-tuning by intervening sequences. This study was based on a comparative analysis of two genomes, but included extensive expression data ([26]). Another model is that of the *mosaic operons* ([21]). In this model, shuffling, disruption, and HGT play dominant parts in operon formation. Under this model, an operon is not a steady-state evolutionary entity, but rather a dynamic entity which continuously acquires or loses genes via HGT. In their paper, Omelchenko *et al.* have shown that although some operons follow the Selfish model, many do not, with HGT of individual genes into operons being quite common. Whole operon transfer was identified in about 30% of the operons studied. Another 20% of the operons were identified as mosaic operons. However, the study does not attempt to further classify the different types of mosaic operons, but rather provides an in-depth study of some of them. A study of the *his* operon by Fani *et al.* has proposed a “piecewise” model to operon evolution ([6]). The piecewise model suggests that the construction of the *his* operon is a sequential series of events starting from a scattered set of constituent genes. Other models include an adaptive life cycle of operons, in which they rarely evolve optimally ([26]).

Each of the operon evolution models present a mechanism and fits a biological rationale to the observation that operons/gene blocks exist in extant taxa. However these models do not readily allow us to quantify the changes between either operons/gene block or between different organisms. Moreover, more than one model can generally be applied to a chosen gene block and set of taxa. Therefore, there is a need to create a universally applicable method for charting gene block evolution. Having such a method on hand can help determine the specific evolutionary trajectory of any given gene block.




Figure 1: The event-driven approach for operon evolution. Species  $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{E}$  are arranged in a phylogenetic species tree.  $\mathcal{A}$  is a source taxon, with gene block  $\mathcal{A}(a, b, c)$ . In species  $\mathcal{B}$  there is a strand reversal of the homolog  $\mathcal{B}c$ , which is treated as a split. The orthoblock in species  $\mathcal{C}$  has a deletion of gene  $\mathcal{C}c$  when compared with species  $\mathcal{A}$  or  $\mathcal{B}$ . The orthoblock in  $\mathcal{D}$  has a duplication of gene  $\mathcal{B}b$  in relation to taxon  $\mathcal{A}$ . The orthoblock in species  $\mathcal{E}$  has a split and a deletion of gene  $\mathcal{E}a$ .

## 2 Approach

Here we present a novel approach to investigate gene block evolution which we call the *event-driven method*. Our approach borrows from the model describing the evolution of DNA and protein sequences. The accepted model for sequence evolution postulates two types of basic events leading to changes: indels and mutations. Indels and mutations are assigned scores ([3, 12]) based on the frequency of their occurrence over time. Given a pair of sequences, a typical hypothesis is posed as to whether they are homologs. The hypothesis is not rejected if we can show that these two sequences are significantly similar. In practical terms, the similarity between two sequences is ascertained if the cumulative score of indels and mutation events differentiating the sequences is below a certain threshold, determined by an appropriate null model, so that it can be stated that the sequences are significantly similar. Note that the smallest unit in which a change can happen is the nucleotide (DNA) or the amino-acid (protein).

The event-driven method of gene block evolution we present here describes evolutionary events that occur between gene blocks that are homologous between different bacterial species. The atomic unit of change is now the *gene* as a building-block of a gene block, rather than the nucleotide as the building block of a gene. This procedure is best explained by example. Suppose that genome  $\mathcal{A}$  has neighboring genes  $\mathcal{A}(a, b, c)$  in that order (In this annotation, upper case letters are the taxon, lower case letters are the genes). Genome  $\mathcal{B}$  has homologs to those in  $\mathcal{A}$   $\mathcal{B}(a, b)$  are neighboring, but  $\mathcal{B}c$  is located somewhere else in the chromosome, and reversed. As for genome  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $c$  was deleted, so  $\mathcal{C}(a, b)$  are neighboring. For the scenario described, we can say that there was a gene split event between  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , and a gene deletion event between  $\mathcal{C}$  and any of the other genomes for the gene block  $\mathcal{A}(a, b, c)$ . When the phylogenetic tree is known, these events can be placed on the tree. See full example in Figure 1.

If changes in gene blocks can be represented using a small set of events, the number and type of these events can be used to describe the evolutionary history of the gene block. Here we report on a set of 38 operons from *E. coli* whose homologs we have examined across 33 taxa of proteobacteria. For these 38 operons and related orthologous gene blocks, we show an implementation of the event-driven approach to operon evolution.

## 3 Methods

We define the following concepts: **reference taxon** is a taxon where operons have been identified by experimental means. Here we use *E. coli* K-12 MG1655 as the reference taxon. We chose *E. coli* because it is expertly and comprehensively annotated in the RegulonDB

database ([30]). **Neighboring genes:** two genes are considered neighboring if they are 500 nucleotides or fewer apart, and on the same strand. A **gene block** comprises no fewer than two open reading frames, or ORFs which are neighboring. An **event** is a change in the gene block between any two species with homologous gene blocks. **Orthoblocks** (gene blocks that are orthologous) are defined as follows: two organisms have orthoblocks when each organism must have at least two neighboring genes that are homologous to genes in a gene block in the reference taxon’s genome. Genes are considered homologous if their pairwise BLAST e-value is  $10^{-10}$  or less. Relying on a strict BLAST threshold may exclude homologous proteins whose sequence similarity is not high (false negatives). However, this strategy will rarely include proteins with a different function (false positives). This rigorous threshold was chosen with the primary goal of minimizing false positives when inferring function by similarity.

### 3.1 Evolutionary events

Next we define events that we use to examine changes in gene block structure between different bacterial taxa relative to *E. coli*. We chose a set of target taxa with known phylogenetic relationships. The genomes of the target taxa were searched for homologous blocks to the operons found in *E. coli*. The operons we chose were selected based on the following criteria: 1. all the genes were protein coding; 2. for all blocks chosen, the co-transcription was experimentally determined in *E. coli*; 3. each operon comprised at least five genes; 4. each operon has orthoblocks in at least nine other genomes. Using these filtering criteria, and RegulonDB’s annotation of *E. coli* as our reference taxon, we compiled 38 operons for this study. See Supplementary Material, Table S1 for a full list of operons.

We define the following pairwise events between orthoblocks from different taxons:

1. **Splits** If two genes in one taxon are neighboring and their homologs in the other taxon are not, then that is defined as a single *split event*. The distance is the minimal number of split events identified between the compared genomes.
2. **Deletions** A gene exists in the operon in the one taxon, but its homolog cannot be found in an orthoblock in another taxon. Note that the definition of homolog, e-value  $10^{-10}$  is strict, and may result in false negatives. The *deletion distance* is the number of deletion events identified between the compared target genomes.
3. **Duplications** A duplication event is defined as having gene  $j$  in a gene block in the source genome, and a homologous genes ( $j', j''$ ) in the homologous block in the target genome. The *duplication distance* is the number of duplication events counted between the source and target genomes. The duplication has to occur in a gene block to be tallied.

Other events were examined too: rearrangement of genes, genes moving to another strand, fusion and fission of open reading frames. These event types correlated strongly with one or more of the three event types listed above, and were therefore discarded. Fusion/fission of open reading frames were rare in our data set, so this event type was discarded as well.

The event-driven method does not account for horizontal gene transfer, which is suggested as a common mechanism for transferring neighboring genes ([19]). However, We have not yet incorporated HGT into our model. We have tried using AlienHunter ([16]), and the IslandViewer ([17]) suite to detect HGT events in our data. However, given that the taxa we are analyzing are closely related, these software were unable to detect HGT events.

### 3.2 Different Conservation Rates for Gene Blocks in Proteobacteria

**Determining orthology:** To trace the events that affect genes in gene blocks, it is necessary to determine which genes are orthologous between any two taxa when more than two possible homolog pairings may exist. The problem may be stated as follows: given a gene  $g$  in genome  $A$ , and a set of homologs to  $g$  in genome  $B$ ,  $H_g^B = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n\}$ , which of the genes in  $H_g^B$  is the ortholog to  $g$ ? The Best Reciprocal Hits (BRH) method is commonly used to find orthologs, however, BRH assumes that ortholog  $g_i$  is necessarily that which is most similar to  $g$ , discounting the possibility of different evolutionary rates of paralogs. We therefore take a different approach in determining ortholog identity for genes in homology blocks. When selecting a single ortholog among all possible homologs in  $H_g$ , we use synteny and sequence similarity to determine which of the genes in an examined genome is the correct ortholog. To do so we use the following three criteria:

1. **Prioritizing by gene blocks** We prioritize orthologs that are in gene blocks over orthologs that are isolated in the genome, and we look for the minimal number of such blocks that contain a representative of every ortholog that we recover. Example: the operon in *E. coli* had gene block  $(abcdef)$ . The target genome has the following orthologs grouped in its genome:  $(abcd)$ ,  $(abc)$ . In this case, we will choose as orthologs the genes populating  $(abcd)$ .
2. **Recovering maximum number of genes** We consider the number of genes found. Example: the reference taxon operon had the gene block  $(abcdef)$ . The studied genome has the following blocks  $(abcd)$  and  $((abc), (de))$ . We would choose  $((abc), (de))$ , two blocks, even though  $(abcde)$  is one block, because in the latter case we recover more homologs.
3. **Minimizing duplications** If in the target genome we have a choice between ortholog groups  $((abc), (de))$  or  $((abcd), (de))$  we choose the first because it has the minimal number of gene duplications.

We now define a *target homolog* as a gene in the target genome that is a homolog to a gene in a gene block in the reference genome *E. coli*. and a *target homolog block* as one or more target homologs, spaced  $\leq 500$  bp.

- 1: **for** geneBlock in ReferenceGenome **do**
- 2:     **for** genes in geneBlock **do**
- 3:         Find all homologs in the target genome with BLAST e-value  $\leq 10^{-10}$
- 4:     **end for**
- 5:     Find all homologs in the target genome that are neighboring ( $\leq 500$ bp)
- 6:     Use a greedy algorithm to recover the maximum number of target homologs prioritizing by gene blocks while minimizing gene duplications and maximizing number of genes recovered.
- 7: **end for**

**Event-based distances.** Once orthologs are chosen, we are able to define the event-based distance between any two gene blocks with respect to split events, duplication events and deletion events. The distance between any two homologous gene blocks found in target organisms is defined as follows:

1. *Split distance* ( $d_s$ ) is the absolute difference in the number of relevant gene blocks between the two taxa. Example: for the reference gene block with genes  $(abcdefg)$  Genome  $A$  has blocks  $((abc), (defg))$  and genome  $B$  has  $((abc), (de), (fg))$ . Therefore,  $d_s(A, B) = |2 - 3| = 1$ .
2. *Duplication distance* ( $d_u$ ) is the pairwise count of duplications between two orthoblocks. Example: we have a reference gene block  $(abcde)$ . Now, for genomes  $A$  and  $B$  the

orthoblocks are  $A = ((abd))$   $B = ((abbcc))$ . Gene  $b$  causes a duplication distance  $d_u(A, B)$  of 1. Gene  $c$  generates a distance of one deletion (see below) and one duplication. This is because the most parsimonious explanation is that the most recent ancestor for  $A$  and  $B$  may have had one copy of  $c$ , thus generating a duplication in one lineage, and a deletion in another. Since gene  $d$  exists only in the reference genome, it has no bearing on the event-based distance between the homologous gene blocks  $A$  and  $B$ .

3. *Deletion distance*  $d_d$  is the difference in number of orthologs that are in the homologous gene blocks of the genome of one organism, or the other, but not in both.

**Gene block frequency matrices** The rules outlined above allow us to determine the pairwise distance, for a given event and gene block, between any two genomes in our corpus. To visualize the frequency of an event in a block, we created matrices whose axes are the examined species, and whose cell is the normalized value of the pairwise distance for any given event. For an event  $v$  being one of insertion, deletion or duplication, for any two taxa  $i$  and  $j$  with homology blocks, the value for the normalized distance matrix entry  $M_{ij}$  is:

$$M_{ij} = \frac{d_v(i, j) - \bar{x}_{d_v}}{\sigma_{d_v}}$$

Where  $\bar{x}_{d_v}$  is the mean value of the distance for event  $v$  calculated over all pairs of taxa  $n_p$  sharing that event:

$$\bar{x}_{d_v} = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i < j} d_v(i, j)$$

and  $\sigma_{d_v}$  is the standard deviation.

**Choice of proteobacteria species, and phylogenetic tree construction.** We chose our species as in ([6]), removing a few species that we deemed to be too evolutionarily close. The phylogenetic trees shown in the study were constructed from multiple sequence alignments of the *rpoD* gene, using ClustalX 2.1 ([18]), followed by neighbor-joining. Table S3 lists the species used.


## 4 Results

The results of this study show an interesting variety in gene block evolution. First, we show the *gene block tree* diagrams in a phylogenetic tree. These diagrams show the gene blocks as we find them in the different species we examine. The lack of a gene in the gene block phylogenetic tree does not mean the homolog does not exist in that taxon, but rather that it is no longer detectable by BLAST at the threshold of  $10^{-10}$ . Further, if a gene block is missing from the phylogenetic tree, it means that there are no two genes in the gene block that are neighboring in the genome within a distance of  $\leq 500$ bp.


To visualize the frequency of events, we generate gene block event frequency matrices as described in Methods. The value of each matrix is a  $z$ -score. Figure 2 shows two conserved gene blocks, and Figure 3 shows two non-conserved gene blocks.

### 4.1 Conservation of Gene Blocks and Relationship to Function

The event-driven method enables us to examine the relative conservation of gene blocks in proteobacteria. Figure 4 the gene blocks are arranged in descending order of conservation. The most conserved block is the operon *rplKAJL-rpoBC*, a highly conserved transcription unit of ribosomal proteins (*rplK*, *rplK*, *rplA* and *rplL*) and two RNA polymerase subunits (*rpoB* and *rpoC*) ([33]), Figure 2(a).




(a) rplKAJL-rpoBC: deletions, duplications, splits




(b) atpIABCEFGH: deletions, duplications, splits

Figure 2: Highly conserved orthoblocks. The color matrices each show degree of relative conservation of the event between any two species. Left to right: Deletions, duplications, splits. Blue to red scale is high to low conservation  $z$ -score as described in Methods. The boxes outline (top to bottom):  $\alpha$ -,  $\epsilon$ -,  $\beta$ -, and  $\gamma$ -proteobacteria. **a:** rplKAJL-rpoBC has only a single gene deletion in *Wollinella*, no gene duplications, and a few splits (red squares, rightmost panel) including genes that moved to another strand. **b:** the atp orthoblock shows deletions of *atpI* and a false deletion of *atpE* due to low similarity to *E. coli atpE* in  $\epsilon$  and  $\alpha$  proteobacteria (left matrix). No gene duplications are exhibited (middle panel). Splits are due to strand reversal of component genes (right panel). High resolution figure available at: <http://iddo-friedberg.net/operon-evolution/>



(a) paaABCDEFGHIJK: deletions, duplications, splits



(b) hyfABCDEFGHIJR-focB: deletions, duplications, splits

Figure 3: Less conserved orthoblocks. Green squares are genomes in which component genes were not found using BLAST. **a**: phenylacetate degradation orthoblock. **b**: the hyf operon encoding the fourth hydrogenase in *E. coli* is not expressed under known conditions. See text for details on both operons. High resolution figure available at: <http://iddo-friedberg.net/operon-evolution/>

No gene duplications or deletions were detected. Our program does erroneously call a deletion of the *rplJ* in *Wolinella*, but this is an error due to the stringent e-value cutoff and having a single exemplar of the *rplJ* gene as a query. The splits we detect are mostly between the *rplKA* and *rplJL-rpoBC* transcription units. The genes in this operon have multiple promoter and attenuator sites ([28]), and have been shown to be governed by a complex set of signals ([33]). It appears that a complete tetracistronic product is transcribed from *rplKAJL* with less abundant bicistronic products of *rplK-rplA* and *rplJ-rplL* ([4]), which may explain the strong conservation of these four genes in this gene block.

Another well-conserved operon is the *atp* operon, which codes for the genes for the  $H^+$ -ATPase complex. ATP synthase is responsible for generating ATP using the proton motive force (PMF) across the cell membrane ([7]). We examined the operon coding for ATP synthase, *atpIBEFHAGDC*. While highly conserved, this operon does exhibit gene deletions in some taxa. Most notably the gene *atpI*, a nonessential gene that codes for a helper protein that assists the assembly of the ATP-synthase complex’s rotor. We readily recover this gene in orthoblocks in organisms that are closely related to *E. coli*. We did not observe any duplications in our dataset, The *atpI* deletion was a true deletion, which makes sense functionally as the *atpI* gene codes for the AtpI protein which is a nonessential component of the  $H^+$ -ATPase complex. The other components supposedly deleted, *afpF*, *atpE* in  $\epsilon$ -proteobacteria and  $\alpha$ -proteobacteria are highly dissimilar to the equivalent *E. coli* genes, and are therefore not identifiable as homologs (e-value using BLAST > 0.01, data not shown). See Figure 2(b).

At the other edge of the conservation spectrum, we examined the *hyf* operon. As the genome diagram shows, the gene block of 12 genes is not conserved as a single block in any of the proteobacteria in our data set ([1]). The *hyf* proton-translocating formate hydrogenlyase block of 12 genes appears to be an operon only in *E. coli*, although many of the genes appear in separate blocks in other bacteria. The *hyf* operon in *E. coli* is probably silent, at least



under the environmental conditions examined, and has only been expressed under artificial conditions ([31]). Not being able to express it in *E. coli* under native conditions suggests it may be redundant, as does its lack of conservation in the species examined. See Figure 3(a).

The *paa* operon in *E. coli* encodes for a multicomponent oxygenase/reductase subunit for the aerobic degradation of phenylacetic acid. The *E. coli* operon comprises 11 genes. The distribution of the genes of this operon in 102 bacterial genomes was studied in detail in ([20]). The authors' conclusions from this study was that *de novo* clustering of some of this orthoblock's genes occur repeatedly, due to weak selective pressure. The proximity of genes sets up opportunities for co-transcription. Specifically, this study has shown that genes *paaA*, *B*, *C* and *paaD*, when they are found, always co-occur in an operon. This makes sense, as those genes form a stable molecular complex with those genes coding for essential subunits for the degradation of phenylacetate ([10]). Both our study's and Martin *et al*'s found the full gene block only in *E. coli* and *Pseudomonas putida*. Another gene-block co-occurrence we find in our study is that of *paaF* and *paaG*, in 12 out of 23 species in which any components of the *paa* orthoblock occur. The products of these two genes form the FaaGH complex, another stable complex which catalyzes consecutive steps in the phenylacetate degradation pathway, and it was hypothesized that the proximity of the two proteins in a complex provides a fitness advantage ([11]).

To determine if there is a relationship between gene block conservation and the function of the gene blocks, we assigned each operon keywords based on its function. The categories we used were Metabolism, Information, Molecular Complex, Stress Response, Energy, and Environmental Response. The keywords were assigned based on reading the literature relevant for each operon, and the information provided in EcoCyc ([15]). As can be seen in Figure 4, from the gene blocks we studied, gene blocks whose function is information or protein complex tend to be more conserved, and those dealing with stress response are less conserved. Gene blocks whose primary function was identified as metabolism were found at all levels of conservation. We conclude that there may be a relationship between gene block conservation and function, and that gene blocks having to do with information or molecular complexes are more conserved than those dealing with stress response and/or environmental response.

## 5 Discussion and Conclusions

We introduce a method to examine gene block and operon evolution in bacteria. This method, coupled with the visualization we present, enables the interrogation of the evolution of gene blocks in a bacterial clade. The event-driven approach we use allows for the quantification of evolutionary conservation of any gene block. Most importantly, the event-driven method does not attempt to present a predictive evolutionary model such as the models reviewed in the introduction. Rather, it allows for these models to be examined in specific gene blocks with specific taxa. The event-driven method is agnostic to any model predicting how an operon or gene block evolved.

To determine the conservation of gene blocks, a choice needs to be made for the proper orthologs between genomes. Identifying orthologs is a challenging problem that has been studied extensively. Several methods have been developed to do so including use of inter-species clusters ([35, 25, 29]), reciprocal best hits ([35]), or phylogenetic methods ([9]). Here we used genomic context and strict similarity criteria to choose which genes are orthologous, and are likely to have the same function. The ortholog choice method we use here assumes that evidence for orthology is strengthened by genomic context. This assumption has been shown to be useful for a more precise assignment of orthologs ([14, 36]) and has been implemented in computational resources ([34, 2, 23]) to resolve ortholog ambiguities.

We choose gene blocks on the basis that, at least in one species (*E. coli*), the genes are co-transcribed. The initial motivation for this study was the observation that orthoblocks have been shown to be useful in inferring common function, even when co-transcription




Figure 4: Relative conservation of operons and their primary biological functions. Each bar shows the cumulative number of events per genome pair per orthoblock. The orthoblocks are numbered as in Table S1. Conserved orthoblocks have shorter bars, operons are ordered top-to-bottom left-to-right from most conserved to least conserved.

has not been determined ([22, 5]). We have shown that tracking gene block evolution in bacteria through the tallying of simple events provides an objective, quantifiable method for understanding their evolutionary conservation, relative to a reference species. We have shown examples of two highly conserved orthoblocks (atp and ydc) and two less-conserved orthoblocks (paa and hyf). We have also related overall conservation to the type of orthoblock function, although a larger survey of orthoblocks is needed to obtain a more reliable picture.

**Funding:** This work is supported, in part, by the US National Science Foundation under Grant Number ABI-1146960. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

## References

- [1] Simon C. Andrews, Ben C. Berks, Joseph McClay, Andrew Ambler, Michael A. Quail, Paul Golby, and John R. Guest. A 12-cistron *escherichia coli* operon (hyf) encoding a putative proton-translocating formate hydrogenlyase system. *Microbiology*, 143(11):3633–3647, November 1997.
- [2] Ramy K. Aziz, Daniela Bartels, Aaron A. Best, Matthew DeJongh, Terrence Disz, Robert A. Edwards, Kevin Formsma, Svetlana Gerdes, Elizabeth M. Glass, Michael Kubal, Folker Meyer, Gary J. Olsen, Robert Olson, Andrei L. Osterman, Ross A. Overbeek, Leslie K. McNeil, Daniel Paarmann, Tobias Paczian, Bruce Parrello, Gordon D. Pusch, Claudia Reich, Rick Stevens, Olga Vassieva, Veronika Vonstein, Andreas Wilke, and Olga Zagnitko. The rast server: rapid annotations using subsystems technology. *BMC genomics*, 9(1):75+, February 2008.
- [3] M.O. Dayhoff. *Atlas of Protein Sequence and Structure: supplement 3 1978*. Number v. 5. National Biomedical Research Foundation, 1978.
- [4] Willa L. Downing and Patrick P. Dennis. Transcription products from the rplkajl-rpobc gene cluster. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 194(4):609–620, April 1987.
- [5] Francois Enault, Karsten Suhre, and Jean M. Claverie. Phydbac ”gene function predictor” : a gene annotation tool based on genomic context analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 6(1):247+, 2005.
- [6] Renato Fani, Matteo Brilli, and Pietro Liò. The origin and evolution of operons: the piecewise building of the proteobacterial histidine operon. *Journal of molecular evolution*, 60(3):378–390, March 2005.
- [7] H. FERNANDEZ MORAN, T. ODA, P. V. BLAIR, and D. E. GREEN. A macromolecular repeating unit of mitochondrial structure and function. correlated electron microscopic and biochemical studies of isolated mitochondria and submitochondrial particles of beef heart muscle. *The Journal of cell biology*, 22:63–100, July 1964.
- [8] Marco Fondi, Giovanni Emiliani, and Renato Fani. Origin and evolution of operons and metabolic pathways. *Research in Microbiology*, 160(7):502–512, September 2009.
- [9] Debra Fulton, Yvonne Li, Matthew Laird, Benjamin Horsman, Fiona Roche, and Fiona Brinkman. Improving the specificity of high-throughput ortholog prediction. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 7(1):270+, May 2006.
- [10] Andrey M. Grishin, Eunice Ajamian, Limei Tao, Linhua Zhang, Robert Menard, and Miroslaw Cygler. Structural and functional studies of the *escherichia coli* phenylacetyl-coa monoxygenase complex. *The Journal of biological chemistry*, 286(12):10735–10743, March 2011.

- [11] Andrey M. Grishin, Eunice Ajamian, Linhua Zhang, Isabelle Rouiller, Mihnea Bostina, and Miroslaw Cygler. Protein-protein interactions in the -oxidation part of the phenylacetate utilization pathway. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 287(45):37986–37996, November 2012.
- [12] S. Henikoff and J. G. Henikoff. Amino acid substitution matrices from protein blocks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 89(22):10915–10919, November 1992.
- [13] N. H. Horowitz. On the evolution of biochemical syntheses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 31(6):153–157, June 1945.
- [14] Jin Jun, Ion Mandoiu, and Craig Nelson. Identification of mammalian orthologs using local synteny. *BMC Genomics*, 10(1):630+, 2009.
- [15] Ingrid M. Keseler, Amanda Mackie, Martin Peralta-Gil, Alberto Santos-Zavaleta, Socorro Gama-Castro, César Bonavides-Martínez, Carol Fulcher, Araceli M. Huerta, Anamika Kothari, Markus Krummenacker, Mario Latendresse, Luis Muñoz Rascado, Quang Ong, Suzanne Paley, Imke Schröder, Alexander G. Shearer, Pallavi Subhraveti, Mike Travers, Deepika Weerasinghe, Verena Weiss, Julio Collado-Vides, Robert P. Gunsalus, Ian Paulsen, and Peter D. Karp. Ecocyc: fusing model organism databases with systems biology. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 41(D1):D605–D612, January 2013.
- [16] Morgan Langille, William Hsiao, and Fiona Brinkman. Evaluation of genomic island predictors using a comparative genomics approach. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 9(1):329+, August 2008.
- [17] Morgan G. I. Langille and Fiona S. L. Brinkman. Islandviewer: an integrated interface for computational identification and visualization of genomic islands. *Bioinformatics*, 25(5):664–665, March 2009.
- [18] M. A. Larkin, G. Blackshields, N. P. Brown, R. Chenna, P. A. McGettigan, H. McWilliam, F. Valentin, I. M. Wallace, A. Wilm, R. Lopez, J. D. Thompson, T. J. Gibson, and D. G. Higgins. Clustal w and clustal x version 2.0. *Bioinformatics*, 23(21):2947–2948, November 2007.
- [19] J. G. Lawrence and J. R. Roth. Selfish operons: horizontal transfer may drive the evolution of gene clusters. *Genetics*, 143(4):1843–1860, August 1996.
- [20] Fergal Martin and James McInerney. Recurring cluster and operon assembly for phenylacetate degradation genes. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 9(1):36+, February 2009.
- [21] Marina Omelchenko, Kira Makarova, Yuri Wolf, Igor Rogozin, and Eugene Koonin. Evolution of mosaic operons by horizontal gene transfer and gene displacement in situ. *Genome Biology*, 4(9):R55+, 2003.
- [22] R. Overbeek, M. Fonstein, M. D’Souza, G. D. Pusch, and N. Maltsev. The use of gene clusters to infer functional coupling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 96(6):2896–2901, March 1999.
- [23] Ross Overbeek, Robert Olson, Gordon D. Pusch, Gary J. Olsen, James J. Davis, Terry Disz, Robert A. Edwards, Svetlana Gerdes, Bruce Parrello, Maulik Shukla, Veronika Vonstein, Alice R. Wattam, Fangfang Xia, and Rick Stevens. The seed and the rapid annotation of microbial genomes using subsystems technology (rast). *Nucleic acids research*, 42(Database issue):D206–D214, January 2014.
- [24] Csaba Pál and Laurence D. Hurst. Evidence against the selfish operon theory. *Trends in Genetics*, 20(6):232–234, June 2004.

- [25] Sean Powell, Kristoffer Forslund, Damian Szklarczyk, Kalliopi Trachana, Alexander Roth, Jaime Huerta-Cepas, Toni Gabaldón, Thomas Rattei, Chris Creevey, Michael Kuhn, Lars J. Jensen, Christian von Mering, and Peer Bork. eggNOG v4.0: nested orthology inference across 3686 organisms. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 42(D1):D231–D239, January 2014.
- [26] Morgan N. Price, Adam P. Arkin, and Eric J. Alm. The life-cycle of operons. *PLoS Genet*, 2(6):e96+, June 2006.
- [27] Morgan N. Price, Katherine H. Huang, Adam P. Arkin, and Eric J. Alm. Operon formation is driven by co-regulation and not by horizontal gene transfer. *Genome Research*, 15(6):809–819, June 2005.
- [28] G. Ralling and T. Linn. Relative activities of the transcriptional regulatory sites in the rplkajlrpobc gene cluster of escherichia coli. *Journal of bacteriology*, 158(1):279–285, April 1984.
- [29] Maida Remm, Christian E. V. Storm, and Erik L. L. Sonnhammer. Automatic clustering of orthologs and in-paralogs from pairwise species comparisons. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 314(5):1041–1052, December 2001.
- [30] Heladia Salgado, Socorro Gama-Castro, Martín Peralta-Gil, Edgar Díaz-Peredo, Fabiola Sánchez-Solano, Alberto Santos-Zavaleta, Irma Martínez-Flores, Verónica Jiménez-Jacinto, César Bonavides-Martínez, Juan Segura-Salazar, Agustino Martínez-Antonio, and Julio Collado-Vides. Regulondb (version 5.0): Escherichia coli k-12 transcriptional regulatory network, operon organization, and growth conditions. *Nucleic acids research*, 34(Database issue), January 2006.
- [31] William T. Self, Adnan Hasona, and K. T. Shanmugam. Expression and regulation of a silent operon, hyf, coding for hydrogenase 4 isoenzyme in escherichia coli. *Journal of bacteriology*, 186(2):580–587, January 2004.
- [32] F. W. Stahl and N. E. Murray. The evolution of gene clusters and genetic circularity in microorganisms. *Genetics*, 53(3):569–576, March 1966.
- [33] K. L. Steward and T. Linn. In vivo analysis of overlapping transcription units in the rplkajlrpobc ribosomal protein-rna polymerase gene cluster of escherichia coli. *Journal of molecular biology*, 218(1):23–31, March 1991.
- [34] Damian Szklarczyk, Andrea Franceschini, Stefan Wyder, Kristoffer Forslund, Davide Heller, Jaime Huerte-Cepas, Milan Simonovic, Alexander Roth, Alberto Santos, Kalliopi P. Tsafou, Michael Kuhn, Peer Bork, Lars J. Jensen, and Christian von Mering. String v10: protein-protein interaction networks, integrated over the tree of life. *Nucleic acids research*, October 2014.
- [35] R. L. Tatusov, E. V. Koonin, and D. J. Lipman. A genomic perspective on protein families. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 278(5338):631–637, October 1997.
- [36] Natalie Ward and Gabriel Moreno-Hagelsieb. Quickly finding orthologs as reciprocal best hits with blat, last, and ublast: How much do we miss? *PLoS ONE*, 9(7):e101850+, July 2014.
- [37] Y. I. Wolf, I. B. Rogozin, A. S. Kondrashov, and E. V. Koonin. Genome alignment, evolution of prokaryotic genome organization, and prediction of gene function using genomic context. *Genome research*, 11(3):356–372, March 2001.