

Metagenome-Assembled Genome Binning Methods Disproportionately Fail for Plasmids and Genomic Islands

This manuscript ([permalink](#)) was automatically generated from [fmaguire/mag_sim_paper@009d332](#) on April 15, 2020.

Authors

- **Finlay Maguire***

 [0000-0002-1203-9514](#) ·  [fmaguire](#) ·  [finlaym](#)

Faculty of Computer Science, Dalhousie University · Funded by ['Genome Canada', 'Donald Hill Family Fellowship']

- **Baofeng Jia***

·  [imasianxd](#)

Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Simon Fraser University

- **Kristen Gray**

 [0000-0002-1962-189X](#)

Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Simon Fraser University

- **Wing Yin Venus Lau**

Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Simon Fraser University

- **Robert G. Beiko**

Faculty of Computer Science, Dalhousie University

- **Fiona S.L. Brinkman**

Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Simon Fraser University

Introductory Paragraph

Metagenomic methods are a key, and increasingly popular, tool in the life sciences, as they enable simultaneous characterization of all microbes in a community without time-consuming and bias-inducing culturing. Metagenome-assembled genome (MAG) binning methods have emerged as a promising approach to recover individual resolved genomes from metagenomic data. However, MAG binning has not been well assessed for its ability to recover key sequences of clinical/agricultural/environmental significance such as mobile genetic elements (MGEs), like plasmids and genomic islands (GIs). Certain antimicrobial resistance (AMR) genes and virulence factor (VF) genes are noted to be disproportionately associated with mobile sequences, making studying their transmission a public health priority. However, the variable copy number and sequence composition of MGEs relative to the host genome makes them potentially problematic for MAG binning methods. To systematically investigate this, we simulated a low-complexity metagenome comprising 30 GI-rich and plasmid-associated bacterial genomes. MAGs were then recovered using 12 current MAG prediction pipelines and evaluated for recovery of MGE-associated AMR/VF genes. Here we show that while 82-94% of chromosomes could be correctly recovered and binned, only 38-44% of GIs were recovered and, even more notably, only 1-29% of plasmid sequences were found. Most strikingly, no plasmid-borne VF or AMR genes were recovered and within GIs, only between 0-45% of AMR or VF

genes were identified. We therefore conclude that short-read MAGs are particularly not well suited for the analysis of mobile genes, including those of public-health importance like AMR and VF genes. We propose that microbiome researchers should instead utilise unassembled read-based and/or long-read approaches to more accurately analyze metagenomic data.

Metagenomics, the sequencing of DNA from within an environmental sample, is widely used to characterise the functional potential and identity of microbial communities [1,2]. These approaches have been instrumental in developing our understanding of the distribution and evolutionary history of AMR genes [3,4,5], as well as tracking pathogen outbreaks [6]. Although long-read DNA technologies (e.g., Oxford Nanopore [7], PacBio [8]) are now being used for metagenomic sequencing [9,10], high-throughput sequencing of relatively short reads (150-250bp) in platforms such as the Illumina MiSeq still dominates metagenomics. These reads can be directly analysed using reference databases and a variety of homology search tools (e.g., [11,12,13,14]). Since these reads are shorter than most genes, however, read-based methods provide very little information about the genomic organisation of genes. This lack of contextual information is particularly problematic in the study of AMR genes and VFs as the genomic context plays a role in function [15], selective pressures [16], and likelihood of lateral gene transfer (LGT) [17].

Sequence assembly using specialised metagenomic de Bruijn graph assemblers (e.g., metaSPAdes [18], IDBA-UD [19], and megahit [20]) is often used to try to recover information about genomic context [21]. To disentangle the resulting mix of assembled fragments, there has been a move to group these contigs based on the idea that those from the same source genome will have similar relative abundance and sequence composition. These resulting groups or “bins” are known as metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs). A range of tools have been released to perform this binning including CONCOCT [22], MetaBAT 2 [23], MaxBin 2 [24], and a tool which combines their predictions: DAS Tool [25]. These MAG binning methods have been used in unveiling previously uncharacterised genomic diversity [26,27,28], but metagenomic assembly and binning results in the loss of some information. This compounded data loss means as little as 24.2-36.4% of reads [29,30] and ~23% of genomes [30] are successfully assembled and binned in some metagenomic analyses. The Critical Assessment of Metagenome Interpretation (CAMI) challenge's (<https://data.cami-challenge.org/>) Assessment of Metagenome BinnERs (AMBER) [31] benchmarks different MAG recovery methods in terms of global completeness and bin purity. However, to the best of our knowledge, there has not been a specific assessment of MAG-based recovery of mobile genetic elements (MGEs) like genomic islands (GIs) and plasmids, despite their health and research importance.

Genomic islands (GIs) are clusters of genes that are known or predicted to have been acquired through LGT events. GIs can arise following the integration of MGEs, such as integrons, transposons, integrative and conjugative elements (ICEs) and prophages (integrated phages) [32,33]. They are of high interest since VFs are disproportionately associated with mobile sequences [34] as well as certain AMR genes [35,36]. GIs often have differing nucleotide composition compared to the rest of the genome [32], a trait exploited by GI prediction tools such as SIGI-HMM [37], IslandPath-DIMOB [38], and integrative tools like IslandViewer [39]. GIs may also exist as multiple copies within a genome [40] leading to potential assembly difficulties and biases in the calculation of coverage statistics.

Plasmids are circular or linear extrachromosomal self-replicating pieces of DNA with variable copy numbers and repetitive sequences [41,42]. Similar to GIs, the sequence composition of plasmids are often markedly different from the genome with which they are associated [43,44]. Plasmids are also of high interest as a major source of the lateral dissemination of AMR genes throughout microbial ecosystems [35,45].

These varying composition and relative abundance features mean that GIs and plasmids pose significant challenges in MAG recovery. As these MGEs are key to the function and spread of

pathogenic traits such as AMR and virulence, and with MAG approaches becoming increasingly popular within microbial and public-health research, it is both timely and vital that we assess the impact of metagenome assembly and binning on the recovery of these elements. Therefore, to address this issue we performed an analysis of GI and plasmid (and associated AMR/VF genes) recovery accuracy across a set of 12 state-of-the-art methods for short-read metagenome assemblies. We show that short-read MAG-based analyses are not suitable for the study of mobile sequences, and find that unassembled read-based methods perform significantly better.

Materials and Methods

In keeping with FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable data), all analyses presented in this paper can be reproduced and inspected with the associated github repository github.com/fmaguire/MAG_gi_plasmid_analysis and data repository osf.io/nrejs/.

Metagenome Simulation

Thirty RefSeq genomes were selected using IslandPath-DIMOB [38] GI prediction data collated into the IslandViewer database www.pathogenomics.sfu.ca/islandviewer [39] (Supplemental Table 1). The selected genomes and associated plasmids (listed in Supplemental Table 2 and deposited at osf.io/nrejs/ under “data/sequences”) were manually selected to satisfy the following criteria:

1. 10 genomes with 1-10 plasmids.
2. 10 genomes with >10% of chromosomal DNA predicted to reside in GIs.
3. 10 genomes with <1% of chromosomal DNA predicted to reside in GIs.

In accordance with the recommendation in the CAMI challenge [46] the genomes were randomly assigned a relative abundance following a log-normal distribution ($\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 2$). Plasmid copy number estimates could not be accurately found for all organisms. Therefore, plasmids were randomly assigned a copy number regime: low (1-20), medium (20-100), or high (500-1000) at a 2:1:1 rate. Within each regime, the exact copy number was selected using an appropriately scaled gamma distribution ($\alpha = 4$, $\beta = 1$) truncated to the regime range.

Finally, the effective plasmid relative abundance was determined by multiplying the plasmid copy number with the genome relative abundance. The full set of randomly assigned relative abundances and copy numbers can be found in Supplemental Table 3. Sequences were then concatenated into a single FASTA file with the appropriate relative abundance. MiSeq v3 250bp paired-end reads with a mean fragment length of 1000bp (standard deviation of 50bp) were then simulated using `art_illumina` (v2016.06.05) [47] resulting in a simulated metagenome of 31,174,411 read pairs. The selection of relative abundance and metagenome simulation itself was performed using the “data_simulation/simulate_metagenome.py” script.

MAG Recovery

Reads were trimmed using `sickle` (v1.33) [48] resulting in 25,682,644 surviving read pairs. The trimmed reads were then assembled using 3 different metagenomic assemblers: `metaSPAdes` (v3.13.0) [18], `IDBA-UD` (v1.1.3) [19], and `megahit` (v1.1.3) [20]). The resulting assemblies were summarised using `metaQUAST` (v5.0.2) [49]. The assemblies were then indexed and reads mapped back using `Bowtie 2` (v2.3.4.3) [12].

Samtools (v1.9) was used to sort the read mappings, and the read coverage was calculated using the MetaBAT2 accessory script (jgi_summarize_bam_contig_depths). The three metagenome assemblies were then separately binned using MetaBAT2 (v2.13) [23], and MaxBin 2 (v2.2.6) [24]. MAGs were also recovered using CONCOCT (v0.4.2) [22] following the recommended protocol in the user manual. Briefly, the supplied CONCOCT accessory scripts were used to cut contigs into 10 kilobase fragments (cut_up_fasta.py) and read coverage calculated for the fragments (CONCOCT_coverage_table.py). These fragment coverages were then used to bin the 10kb fragments before the clustered fragments were merged (merge_cutup_clustering.py) to create the final CONCOCT MAG bins (extra_fasta_bins.py). Finally, for each metagenome assembly the predicted bins from these three bidders (Maxbin2, MetaBAT 2, and CONCOCT) were combined using the DAS Tool (v1.1.1) meta-binner [25]. This resulted in 12 separate sets of MAGs (one set for each assembler and binner pair).

MAG assessment

Chromosomal Coverage

The MAG assessment for chromosomal coverage was performed by creating a BLASTN 2.9.0+ [50] database consisting of all the chromosomes of the input reference genomes. Each MAG contig was then used as a query against this database and the coverage of the underlying chromosomes tallied by merging the overlapping aligning regions and summing the total length of aligned MAG contigs. The most represented genome in each MAG was assigned as the “identity” of that MAG for further analyses. Coverage values of less than 5% were filtered out and the number of different genomes that contigs from a given MAG aligned to were tallied. Finally, the overall proportion of chromosomes that were not present in any MAG was tallied for each binner and assembler.

In order to investigate the impact of close relatives in the metagenome on ability to bin chromosomes we generated a phylogenetic tree for all the input genomes. Specifically, single copy universal bacterial proteins were identified in the reference genomes using BUSCO v4.0.2 with the Bacteria Odb10 data [51]. The 86 of these proteins that were found in every reference genome were concatenated and aligned using MAFFT v7.427 [52] and masked with trimal v1.4.1-3 [53]. A maximum-likelihood phylogeny was then inferred with IQ-Tree v1.6.12 [54] with the in-built ModelFinder determined partitioning [55]. Pairwise branch distances were then extracted from the resulting tree using ETE3 v3.1.1 [56] and regressed using a linear model against coverage and contamination in seaborn v0.10.0 [57].

Plasmid and GI Coverage

Plasmid and GI coverage were assessed in the same way. Firstly, a BLASTN database was generated for each set of MAG contigs. Then each MAG database was searched for plasmid and GI sequences with greater than 50% coverage. All plasmids or GIs which could be found in the unbinned contigs or MAGs were recorded as having been successfully assembled. The subset of these that were found in the binned MAGs was then separately tallied. Finally, we evaluated the proportion of plasmids or GIs that were correctly assigned to the bin that was maximally composed of chromosomes from the same source genome.

Antimicrobial Resistance and Virulence Factors Assessment

Detection of AMR/VF Genes

For the reference genomes, as well as 12 sets of MAGs, prodigal [58] was used to predict open reading frames (ORFs) using the default parameters. AMR genes were predicted using Resistance Gene Identifier (RGI v5.0.0; default parameters) and the Comprehensive Antibiotic Resistance Database (CARD v3.0.3) [59]. Virulence factors were predicted using the predicted ORFs and BLASTX

2.9.0+ [50] against the Virulence Factor Database (VFDB; obtained on Aug 26, 2019) with an e-value cut-off of 0.001 and a minimum identity of 90% [60]. Each MAG was then assigned to a reference chromosome using the above mentioned mapping criteria for downstream analysis.

AMR/VF Gene Recovery

For each MAG set, we counted the total number of AMR/VF genes recovered in each metagenomic assembly and each MAG and compared this to the number predicted in their assigned reference chromosome and plasmids. We then assessed the ability for MAGs to correctly bin AMR/VF genes of chromosomal, plasmid, and GI origin by mapping the location of the reference replicon's predicted genes to the location of the same genes in the MAGs.

Protein subcellular localization predictions

We then sought to assess what the impact of a protein's predicted subcellular localization was on its recovery and binning in MAGs. The MAG bins from megahit-DAS Tool assembler-binner combination were selected (as generally best performing) and ORFs predicted using prodigal [58] as above. Subcellular localisation of these proteins were then predicted using PSORTb v3.0 with default parameters and the appropriate Gram setting for that bin's assigned taxa [61].

Results

Recovery of Genomic Elements

Chromosomes

The overall ability of MAG methods to recapitulate the original chromosomal source genome results varied widely. We considered the "identity" of a given MAG bin to be that of the genome that composes the largest proportion of sequence within that bin. In other words if a bin is identifiably 70% species A and 30% species B we consider that to be a bin of species A. Ideally, we wish to generate a single bin for each source genome comprised of the entire genome and no contigs from other genomes. Some genomes are cleanly and accurately binned regardless of the assembler and binning method used (see Fig. 1). Specifically, greater than 90% of *Streptomyces parvulus* (minimum 91.8%) and *Clostridium baratii* (minimum 96.4%) chromosomes are represented in individual bins across all methods. However, no other genomes were consistently recovered at >30% chromosomal coverage across methods. The three *Streptococcus* genomes were particularly problematic with the best recovery for each ranging from 1.7% to 47.49%. Contrary to what might be expected, the number of close relatives to a given genome in the metagenome did not clearly affect the MAG coverage (Fig. 8).




Figure 1: Top genome coverage for input genomes across MAG binners. Each dot represents the coverage of a specified genome when it comprised the plurality of the sequences in a bin. The binning tool is indicated by the colour of the dot as per the legend. Genomes such as *Clostridium baratti* were accurately recovered across all binner-assembler combinations whereas genomes such as *Streptococcus macedonicus* were systematically poorly recovered.

In terms of the impact of different metagenome assemblers, megahit resulted in the highest median chromosomal coverage across all binners (81.9%) with metaSPAdes performing worst (76.8%) (Fig. 2 A). In terms of binning tools, CONCOCT performed very poorly with a median 26% coverage for top hit per bin, followed by maxbin2 (83.1%), and MetaBAT2 (88.5%). It is perhaps unsurprising that the best-performing binner in terms of bin top hit coverage was the metabinner DASTool that combines predictions from the other 3 binners (94.3% median top hit chromosome coverage per bin; (Fig. 2 A)).




Figure 2: Overall binning performance for every combination of metagenome assembler (as indicated by pane titles) and MAG binning tool (x-axis and legend colours). Diamonds in the plots represent outliers (greater or lower than the interquartile range marked by the error bars) and the boxes represent the lower quartile, median, and upper quartile respectively. **(A)** Chromosomal coverage of the most prevalent genome in each bin across binners and metagenome assemblies. Of the 3 assemblers, megahit resulted in the highest median chromosomal coverage (y-axis) across all binners (colored bars) at 81.9% with metaSPAdes performing the worst (76.8%). Of the 4 binners, CONCOCT (blue) performed poorly with a median coverage, followed by maxbin2 (yellow), MetaBAT2 (red) and DASTool (green) performing the best. **(B)** Distribution of bin purity across assemblers and binners. The total number of genomes present in a bin at >5% coverage (y-axis) was largely equivalent across assemblers (x-axis). For the binning tools, maxbin2 (orange) produced nearly twice as many bins containing multiple species compared to CONCOCT (blue), MetaBAT2 (red) and DASTool (green), which all produced chimeric bins at roughly the same rate.

Bin purity, i.e. the number of genomes present in a bin at >5% coverage, was largely equivalent across assemblers, with a very marginally higher purity for IDBA. Across binning tools maxbin2 proved an exception with nearly twice as many bins containing multiple species as the next binner (Fig. 2 B). The remaining binning tools were largely equivalent, producing chimeric bins at approximately the same rates. Unlike coverage, purity was strongly affected by the number of close relatives in the metagenome to a given input genome. Specifically, the closer the nearest relative the less pure the bin (Fig. 2).

Plasmids

Regardless of method, a very small proportion of plasmids were correctly grouped in the bin that was principally comprised of chromosomal contigs from the same source genome. Specifically, between 1.5% (IDBA-UD assembly with DASTool bins) and 29.2% (metaSPAdes with CONCOCT bins) were correctly binned at over 50% coverage. In terms of metagenome assembly, metaSPAdes was by far the most successful assembler at assembling plasmids with 66.2% of plasmids identifiable at greater than 50% coverage. IDBA-UD performed worst with 17.1% of plasmids recovered, and megahit recovered 36.9%. If the plasmid was successfully assembled, it was, with one exception, placed in a MAG bin by maxbin2 and CONCOCT, although a much smaller fraction were correctly binned (typically less than 1/3rd). Interestingly, the MetaBAT2 and DASTool binner were more conservative in assigning plasmid contigs to bins; of those assigned to bins, nearly all were correctly binned (Fig. 3).




Figure 3: The performance of metagenomic assembly and binning to recover plasmid sequences. Each plot represents a different metagenome assembler, with the groups of bars along the x-axes showing the plasmid recovery performance of each binning tool when applied to the assemblies produced by that tool. For each of these 12 assembler-binner-pair-produced MAGs the grouped bars from left to right show the percentage of plasmids assembled, assigned to any bin, and binned with the correct chromosomes. These stages of the evaluation are indicated by the bar colours as per the legend. Across all tools the assembly process resulted in the largest loss of plasmid sequences and only a small proportion of the assembled plasmids were correctly binned.

Genomic Islands

GIs displayed a similar pattern of assembly and correct binning performance as plasmids (Fig. 4). Assembly of GIs with >50% coverage was consistently poor (37.8-44.1%) with metaSPAdes outperforming the other two assembly approaches. For the CONCOCT and maxbin2 binning tools, all GIs that were assembled were assigned to a bin, although the proportion of binned GIs that were correctly binned was lower than for DASTool and MetaBAT2. DASTool, MetaBAT2 and CONCOCT did not display the same precipitous drop between those assembled and those correctly binned as was observed for plasmids. In terms of overall correct binning with the chromosomes from the same genome the metaSPAdes assembly with CONCOCT (44.1%) and maxbin2 (43.3%) binner performed best.



Figure 4: Impact of metagenomic assembly and MAG binning on recovery of genomic islands. GIs were recovered in a similarly poor fashion to plasmids. Generally, <40% were correctly assigned to the same bin majorly comprised of chromosomal contigs from the same source genome regardless of binning (x-axis) and assembly (panel) methods at >50% coverage. metaSPAdes performed the best at assembling GIs (blue). Maxbin2 and CONCOCT placed GIs in a bin majority of the time (orange) however a very small fraction was correctly binned (green). Generally, GIs were correctly binned better than plasmids with DASTool, MetaBAT2 and CONCOCT.

AMR Genes

The recovery of AMR genes in MAGs was poor with only ~49-55% of all AMR genes predicted in our reference genomes regardless of the assembly tool used, and metaSPAdes performing marginally better than other assemblers (Fig. 5 A). Binning the contigs resulted in a ~1-15% loss in AMR gene recovery with the CONCOCT-metaSPAdes pair performing best at only 1% loss and DASTool-megahit performing the worst at 15% reduction of AMR genes recovered. Overall, only 24% - 40% of all AMR genes were correctly binned. This was lowest with the maxbin2-IDBA-UDA pair (24%) and highest in the CONCOCT-metaSPAdes pipe (40%).




Figure 5: Recovery of AMR genes across assemblers, binners, and genomic context. **(A)** The proportion of reference AMR genes recovered (y-axis) was largely similar across assembly tools (panels as indicated by title) at roughly 50% with metaSPAdes performing marginally better overall. Binning tools (x-axis) resulted in a small reduction in AMR genes recovered (orange), however only 24-40% of all AMR genes were correctly binned (green). metaSPAdes-CONCOCT was the best performing MAG binning pipeline. **(B)** Percent of correctly binned AMR genes recovered by genomic context. MAG methods were best at recovering chromosomally located AMR genes (light blue) regardless of metagenomic assembler or binning tool used. Recovery of AMR genes in GIs showed a bigger variation between tools (light green). None of the 12 evaluated MAG recovery methods were able to recover plasmid located AMR genes (orange).

Moreover, focusing on only the AMR genes that were correctly binned (Fig. 5 B) we can evaluate the impact of different genomic contexts (i.e. chromosomal, plasmid, GI). Across all methods only 30%-53% of all chromosomally located AMR genes (n=120), 0-45% of GI located AMR genes (n=11) and none of the plasmid-localised AMR genes (n=20) were correctly binned.

Virulence Factor Genes

We also examined the impact of MAG approaches on recovery of virulence factor (VF) genes as identified using the Virulence Factor Database (VFDB). We saw a similar trend as AMR genes (Fig. 6 A). Between 56% and 64% of VFs were identifiable in the metagenomic assemblies (with megahit recovering the greatest proportion). The binning process further reduced the number of recovered

VFs by 4-26% with DASTool-megahit performing the worst (26%) and CONCOCT-metaSPAdes performing the best (4%). Unlike AMR genes, the majority of VF genes assigned to a bin were assigned to the correct bin (i.e. that bin largely made up of contigs from the same input genome). Overall, CONCOCT-metaSPAdes again performed best with 43% of all VFs correctly assigned.




Figure 6: Recovery of VF genes across assemblers, binners, and genomic context. **(A)** Percent of reference virulence factor (VF) genes recovered across assemblers and binners. The proportion of reference VF genes recovered (y-axis) exhibited a similar trend as AMR genes. Recovery was greatest after the assembling stage (blue), with megahit performing best. Binning tools resulted in a larger reduction in VF genes recovered (orange) compared to AMR genes. However, in majority of cases, VF genes that are binned are correctly binned (green). metaSPAdes-CONCOCT was again the best performing pair. **(B)** Percent of correctly binned VF genes recovered in each genomic region. Metagenome assembled genomes (MAGs) were again best at recovering chromosomally located VF genes (light blue), able to correctly bin majority of chromosomally located VFs. GIs recovered again performed very poorly (light green) and again none of the plasmid located AMR genes (orange) was correctly binned.

As with AMR genes, the genomic context (chromosome, plasmid, GI) of a given VF largely determined how well it was binned (Fig. 6 B). The majority (73%-98%) of all chromosomally located VF genes (n=757) were correctly binned. However, 0-16% of GI-localised VF genes (n=809) and again none of the plasmid-associated VF genes (n=3) were recovered across all 12 MAG pipelines.

Comparisons of Rates of Loss

We combined the performance metrics for Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6 to compare the rates of loss of different components (see Fig. 10). This highlighted that genomic components (GIs and plasmids) and plasmids in particular are lost at a disproportionately higher rate than individual gene types during MAG recovery.

Discussion

In this paper, we evaluated the ability of metagenome-assembled genome (MAG) binning methods to correctly recover mobile genetic elements (i.e. genomic islands and plasmids) from metagenomic samples. Overall, chromosomal sequences were binned well (up to 94.3% coverage and perfect bin purity by megahit-DASTool) but closely related genomes were consistently cross-contaminated (e.g. *Streptococcus* species in Fig. 8, 9). However, given the importance of MGEs in the function and spread of pathogenic traits, it is particularly noteworthy that regardless of MAG binning method plasmids and GIs were disproportionately lost compared to core chromosomal regions. At best (with metaSPAdes and CONCOCT) 29.2% of plasmids and 44.1% of GIs were identifiable at >50% coverage in the correct bin (i.e. grouped with a bin that was mostly made up of contigs from the same genome). This poor result is congruent with the intuition that the divergent compositional features and repetitive nature of these MGEs is problematic for MAG methods. The particularly poor plasmid binning performance is likely attributable to the known difficulties in assembly of plasmids from short-read data [62]. Therefore, binning efficiency might improve with use of long-read sequencing or assembly methods optimised for recovering plasmids [63] (such as SCAPP [64]). While some MGEs were likely recovered in more partial forms (<50% coverage), use of these by researchers interested in selective pressures and lateral gene transfer could lead to inaccurate inferences.

Given the growing use of MAG methods in infectious disease research and the public-health importance of the LGT of AMR and VF genes, we also specifically evaluated the binning of these gene classes. The majority of these genes were correctly assembled across assemblers but were either not assigned or incorrectly assigned to MAG bins during binning. At best across all binners, 40% of all AMR genes and ~63% of VF genes (CONCOCT-metaSPAdes) present in the reference genomes were assigned to the correct MAG. While a majority of chromosomally located VF genes (73-98%) and AMR genes (53%) were binned correctly, only 16% of GI VFs (n=809), 45% of GI AMR genes (n=11), and not a single plasmid associated VF (n=3) or AMR gene (n=20) were correctly binned. This included critical high-threat MGE-associated AMR genes such as the KPC and OXA carbapenemases. One potential caveat of this is that some AMR genes and VFs may no longer be detectable in MAGs due to issues with ORF prediction (see suppl. discussion & Fig. 7). Previous studies have observed that ORF predictions in draft genomes are more fragmented, which can lead to downstream over- or under-annotation with functional labels depending on the approach used [65].

In general, there are 3 main limitations to this study: the drawbacks of metagenome simulation, the use of a single metagenome, and not evaluating the utility of multiple metagenomic replicates in recovery of these elements. Metagenome simulation is unlikely to perfectly emulate all the noise and biases present in real metagenomic sequencing results. However, without a clear known ground truth and in the absence of an MGE/AMR-focused mock metagenomes, simulation represents the most powerful technique for evaluation of bioinformatic analyses. This is why it has been widely adopted in thorough benchmarking experiments such as the CAMI challenges [31,66]. In terms of multiple replicates, while there are indications this approach may improve binning of MGEs [67], most typical public-health and research MAG studies don't currently utilise this kind of approach. Finally, a single simulated metagenome was used in order to keep the binning performance of MGEs as clear as possible. Given the importance of this issue, there was a pragmatic decision to use this relatively low-complexity (30 species) metagenome as a "best-case" evaluation, i.e., failure to recover elements for this dataset strongly suggests they would not be recovered in a more complex metagenome.

Conclusions

Using a simulated metagenome, this study has shown that MAG-based approaches provide a useful tool to study a bacterial species' core chromosomal elements, but have severe limitations in the recovery of MGEs. The majority of these MGEs will either fail to be assembled or be incorrectly binned. The consequence of this is the disproportionate loss of key public-health MGE-associated VFs and AMR genes. As these genes have a much higher propensity for lateral gene transfer between unrelated bacteria it is critical to highlight that MAG approaches alone are insufficient to thoroughly profile them. Within public-health metagenomic research it is vital we utilize MAGs in conjunction with other methods (e.g. targeted AMR [68], plasmid specialised assembly approaches [64], and read-based sequence homology search [11]) before drawing biological or epidemiological conclusions.

Supplementals

Recovery of Specific Gene Content

We explored the ability of different approaches to find open reading frames (ORFs) within MAGs. Overall, the total number of predicted ORFs in MAGs followed a similar trend (Fig. 7) as the chromosomal coverage (Fig. ??) and purity (Fig. ??). Of the four binning tools, CONCOCT performed the worst, finding <30% of the number of ORFs in our reference genomes used to construct the synthetic data. MetaBAT2 performed second worst at ~80%. DASTool recovered a similar number to our reference and Maxbin2 detected 7-46% more genes. The Assembler method did not significantly impact the number of genes predicted with the exception of Maxbin2, in which IDBA_UD was the closest to reference and metaSPAdes predicted 46% more ORFs. Given that there is reason to suspect that there are some issues with the ORF calling in the MAGs. i.e. some tools produced more predicted ORFs than reference, it could be the case that some of these sequences are present in the assemblies (with errors/gaps), but are not being identified as ORFs, or are broken into multiple ORFs, leading to issues downstream labeling them correctly as AMR/VF genes. Regardless of different tools producing a different number of ORFs, the recovery of AMR/VF is pretty consistent regardless of how many ORFs are predicted.




Figure 7: Predicted Gene Content. The total number of open reading frames (ORF) predicted followed the same trend as chromosomal coverage and purity. The assemblers (colored bars) did not contribute to variability in the number of ORFs detected. Of the 4 binner, CONCOCT recovered <30% of our reference genome ORFs. DASTool and MetaBAT2 predicted a similar number as our reference genomes.

Impact of Related Genomes on MAG

By generating a phylogeny of universal single copy genes in our input genomes we analysed the relationship between the presence of closely related genomes and the ability of the different MAG-recovery methods to bin chromosomal sequences. Specifically, we regressed phylogenetic distance on this phylogeny with per-bin chromosomal coverage (Fig. [8](#)) and bin purity (Fig. [9](#)). This identified no clear relationship between chromosomal coverage and the phylogenetic distance to the nearest relative in the metagenome (Fig. ??), however, there did seem to be a negative correlation between phylogenetic distance to closest relative and the purity of a MAG bin (Fig. [9](#)). In other words, across all methods, a MAG bin was more likely to have multiple genomes present if there were close relatives.




Figure 8: Relationship between phylogenetic distance to closest neighbour input genome on genomic coverage in MAG majority comprised of that taxa. Each dot represents the genomic coverage of a particular taxa and the branch distance on an 86-protein concatenated phylogeny between that taxa and its nearest neighbour. Rows indicate the binning software and columns the metagenomic assembler. Regression line is a simple linear model fitted in seaborn.




Figure 9: Relationship between phylogenetic distance to closest neighbour input genome on bin purity. Each dot shows the number of other input genomes detectable in a given MAG bin in relation to the branch distance on an 86-protein concatenated phylogeny between the majority taxa in that bin and its nearest neighbour.

Comparisons of Rates of Loss

Combining the performance metrics for Figs. 3, 4, ??, and ?? to compare the rates of loss of different components emphasises some of the observed patterns (see Fig. 10). This highlights that genomic components (GIs and plasmids) and plasmids in particular are lost at a higher rate than individual gene types during MAG recovery.




Figure 10: Comparison of rates of loss for different genomic components and gene types across assemblers and binning tools. Each line represents a different component as indicated by the legend with assemblers indicated by row and binning tool by column. This shows that regardless of approach genomic components (GIs and plasmids) are lost at a higher rate than individual VF or AMR genes.

References

1. Genomic analysis of uncultured marine viral communities

M. Breitbart, P. Salamon, B. Andresen, J. M. Mahaffy, A. M. Segall, D. Mead, F. Azam, F. Rohwer
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (2002-10-16) <https://doi.org/br7jq3>
 DOI: [10.1073/pnas.202488399](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.202488399) · PMID: [12384570](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12384570/) · PMCID: [PMC137870](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC137870/)

2. Shotgun metagenomics, from sampling to analysis

Christopher Quince, Alan W Walker, Jared T Simpson, Nicholas J Loman, Nicola Segata
Nature Biotechnology (2017-09-12) <https://doi.org/gbv6nf>
 DOI: [10.1038/nbt.3935](https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3935) · PMID: [28898207](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28898207/)

3. A Systematic Analysis of Biosynthetic Gene Clusters in the Human Microbiome Reveals a Common Family of Antibiotics

Mohamed S. Donia, Peter Cimermancic, Christopher J. Schulze, Laura C. Wieland Brown, John Martin, Makedonka Mitreva, Jon Clardy, Roger G. Linington, Michael A. Fischbach
Cell (2014-09) <https://doi.org/f6k3fg>
DOI: [10.1016/j.cell.2014.08.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.08.032) · PMID: [25215495](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25215495/) · PMCID: [PMC4164201](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC4164201/)

4. Expanding the soil antibiotic resistome: exploring environmental diversity

Vanessa M D'Costa, Emma Griffiths, Gerard D Wright
Current Opinion in Microbiology (2007-10) <https://doi.org/cfbpjj>
DOI: [10.1016/j.mib.2007.08.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2007.08.009) · PMID: [17951101](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17951101/)

5. Antibiotic resistance is ancient

Vanessa M. D'Costa, Christine E. King, Lindsay Kalan, Mariya Morar, Wilson W. L. Sung, Carsten Schwarz, Duane Froese, Grant Zazula, Fabrice Calmels, Regis Debruyne, ... Gerard D. Wright
Nature (2011-08-31) <https://doi.org/b3wbvx>
DOI: [10.1038/nature10388](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10388) · PMID: [21881561](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21881561/)

6. A Culture-Independent Sequence-Based Metagenomics Approach to the Investigation of an Outbreak of Shiga-Toxigenic Escherichia coli O104:H4

Nicholas J. Loman, Chrystala Constantinidou, Martin Christner, Holger Rohde, Jacqueline Z.-M. Chan, Joshua Quick, Jacqueline C. Weir, Christopher Quince, Geoffrey P. Smith, Jason R. Betley, ... Mark J. Pallen
JAMA (2013-04-10) <https://doi.org/f5rqft>
DOI: [10.1001/jama.2013.3231](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.3231) · PMID: [23571589](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23571589/)

7. A first look at the Oxford Nanopore MinION sequencer

Alexander S. Mikheyev, Mandy M. Y. Tin
Molecular Ecology Resources (2014-11) <https://doi.org/vmt>
DOI: [10.1111/1755-0998.12324](https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12324) · PMID: [25187008](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25187008/)

8. Real-Time DNA Sequencing from Single Polymerase Molecules

J. Eid, A. Fehr, J. Gray, K. Luong, J. Lyle, G. Otto, P. Peluso, D. Rank, P. Baybayan, B. Bettman, ... S. Turner
Science (2009-01-02) <https://doi.org/cz7ndk>
DOI: [10.1126/science.1162986](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1162986) · PMID: [19023044](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19023044/)

9. Ultra-deep, long-read nanopore sequencing of mock microbial community standards

Samuel M Nicholls, Joshua C Quick, Shuiquan Tang, Nicholas J Loman
GigaScience (2019-05) <https://doi.org/gf39g3>
DOI: [10.1093/gigascience/giz043](https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz043) · PMID: [31089679](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31089679/) · PMCID: [PMC6520541](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6520541/)

10. Long-read based de novo assembly of low-complexity metagenome samples results in finished genomes and reveals insights into strain diversity and an active phage system

Vincent Somerville, Stefanie Lutz, Michael Schmid, Daniel Frei, Aline Moser, Stefan Irmeler, Jürg E. Frey, Christian H. Ahrens
BMC Microbiology (2019-06-25) <https://doi.org/gf5ffc>
DOI: [10.1186/s12866-019-1500-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12866-019-1500-0) · PMID: [31238873](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31238873/) · PMCID: [PMC6593500](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6593500/)

11. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND

Benjamin Buchfink, Chao Xie, Daniel H Huson
Nature Methods (2014-11-17) <https://doi.org/gftzcs>
DOI: [10.1038/nmeth.3176](https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3176) · PMID: [25402007](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25402007/)

12. **Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2**
Ben Langmead, Steven L Salzberg
Nature Methods (2012-03-04) <https://doi.org/gd2xzn>
DOI: [10.1038/nmeth.1923](https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.1923) · PMID: [22388286](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22388286/) · PMCID: [PMC3322381](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC3322381/)
13. **nhmmer: DNA homology search with profile HMMs**
T. J. Wheeler, S. R. Eddy
Bioinformatics (2013-07-09) <https://doi.org/f5xm9x>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btt403](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btt403) · PMID: [23842809](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23842809/) · PMCID: [PMC3777106](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC3777106/)
14. **CLARK: fast and accurate classification of metagenomic and genomic sequences using discriminative k-mers**
Rachid Ounit, Steve Wanamaker, Timothy J Close, Stefano Lonardi
BMC Genomics (2015-03-25) <https://doi.org/gb3h2t>
DOI: [10.1186/s12864-015-1419-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-015-1419-2) · PMID: [25879410](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25879410/) · PMCID: [PMC4428112](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC4428112/)
15. **vanM, a New Glycopeptide Resistance Gene Cluster Found in Enterococcus faecium**
X. Xu, D. Lin, G. Yan, X. Ye, S. Wu, Y. Guo, D. Zhu, F. Hu, Y. Zhang, F. Wang, ... M. Wang
Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy (2010-08-23) <https://doi.org/cnpst5>
DOI: [10.1128/aac.01710-09](https://doi.org/10.1128/aac.01710-09) · PMID: [20733041](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20733041/) · PMCID: [PMC2976141](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2976141/)
16. **Co-selection of antibiotic and metal resistance**
Craig Baker-Austin, Meredith S. Wright, Ramunas Stepanauskas, J. V. McArthur
Trends in Microbiology (2006-04) <https://doi.org/fvkg6d>
DOI: [10.1016/j.tim.2006.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2006.02.006) · PMID: [16537105](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16537105/)
17. **Gene flow, mobile genetic elements and the recruitment of antibiotic resistance genes into Gram-negative pathogens**
Hatch W. Stokes, Michael R. Gillings
FEMS Microbiology Reviews (2011-09) <https://doi.org/fw543p>
DOI: [10.1111/j.1574-6976.2011.00273.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2011.00273.x) · PMID: [21517914](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21517914/)
18. **metaSPAdes: a new versatile metagenomic assembler**
Sergey Nurk, Dmitry Meleshko, Anton Korobeynikov, Pavel A. Pevzner
Genome Research (2017-05) <https://doi.org/f97jkv>
DOI: [10.1101/gr.213959.116](https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.213959.116) · PMID: [28298430](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28298430/) · PMCID: [PMC5411777](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC5411777/)
19. **IDBA-UD: a de novo assembler for single-cell and metagenomic sequencing data with highly uneven depth**
Y. Peng, H. C. M. Leung, S. M. Yiu, F. Y. L. Chin
Bioinformatics (2012-04-11) <https://doi.org/f3z7hv>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/bts174](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bts174) · PMID: [22495754](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22495754/)
20. **MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-node solution for large and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph**
Dinghua Li, Chi-Man Liu, Ruibang Luo, Kunihiro Sadakane, Tak-Wah Lam
Bioinformatics (2015-05-15) <https://doi.org/f7fb5z>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btv033](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv033) · PMID: [25609793](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25609793/)
21. **Community structure and metabolism through reconstruction of microbial genomes from the environment**
Gene W. Tyson, Jarrod Chapman, Philip Hugenholtz, Eric E. Allen, Rachna J. Ram, Paul M. Richardson, Victor V. Solovyev, Edward M. Rubin, Daniel S. Rokhsar, Jillian F. Banfield

Nature (2004-02-01) <https://doi.org/b85j5j>
DOI: [10.1038/nature02340](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02340) · PMID: [14961025](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14961025/)

22. COCACOLA: binning metagenomic contigs using sequence COmposition, read CoverAge, CO-alignment and paired-end read LinkAge

Yang Young Lu, Ting Chen, Jed A. Fuhrman, Fengzhu Sun
Bioinformatics (2016-06-02) <https://doi.org/f9x7sc>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btw290](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btw290) · PMID: [27256312](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27256312/)

23. MetaBAT 2: an adaptive binning algorithm for robust and efficient genome reconstruction from metagenome assemblies

Dongwan Kang, Feng Li, Edward S Kirton, Ashleigh Thomas, Rob S Egan, Hong An, Zhong Wang
(2019-02-06) <https://doi.org/gf5fhv>
DOI: [10.7287/peerj.preprints.27522v1](https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27522v1)

24. MaxBin 2.0: an automated binning algorithm to recover genomes from multiple metagenomic datasets

Yu-Wei Wu, Blake A. Simmons, Steven W. Singer
Bioinformatics (2016-02-15) <https://doi.org/f8c9n2>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btv638](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv638) · PMID: [26515820](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26515820/)

25. Recovery of genomes from metagenomes via a dereplication, aggregation and scoring strategy

Christian M. K. Sieber, Alexander J. Probst, Allison Sharrar, Brian C. Thomas, Matthias Hess, Susannah G. Tringe, Jillian F. Banfield
Nature Microbiology (2018-05-28) <https://doi.org/gfwwfg>
DOI: [10.1038/s41564-018-0171-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-018-0171-1) · PMID: [29807988](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29807988/) · PMCID: [PMC6786971](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6786971/)

26. Unusual biology across a group comprising more than 15% of domain Bacteria

Christopher T. Brown, Laura A. Hug, Brian C. Thomas, Itai Sharon, Cindy J. Castelle, Andrea Singh, Michael J. Wilkins, Kelly C. Wrighton, Kenneth H. Williams, Jillian F. Banfield
Nature (2015-06-15) <https://doi.org/f7h5xj>
DOI: [10.1038/nature14486](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14486) · PMID: [26083755](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26083755/)

27. Recovery of nearly 8,000 metagenome-assembled genomes substantially expands the tree of life

Donovan H. Parks, Christian Rinke, Maria Chuvochina, Pierre-Alain Chaumeil, Ben J. Woodcroft, Paul N. Evans, Philip Hugenholtz, Gene W. Tyson
Nature Microbiology (2017-09-11) <https://doi.org/cczd>
DOI: [10.1038/s41564-017-0012-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-017-0012-7) · PMID: [28894102](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28894102/)

28. The genomic and proteomic landscape of the rumen microbiome revealed by comprehensive genome-resolved metagenomics

Robert D. Stewart, Marc D. Auffret, Amanda Warr, Alan W. Walker, Rainer Roehe, Mick Watson
bioRxiv (2018-12-08) <https://doi.org/gf5fhr>
DOI: [10.1101/489443](https://doi.org/10.1101/489443)

29. Genome-centric view of carbon processing in thawing permafrost

Ben J. Woodcroft, Caitlin M. Singleton, Joel A. Boyd, Paul N. Evans, Joanne B. Emerson, Ahmed A. F. Zayed, Robert D. Hoelzle, Timothy O. Lamberton, Carmody K. McCalley, Suzanne B. Hodgkins, ... Gene W. Tyson
Nature (2018-07-16) <https://doi.org/gdth6p>
DOI: [10.1038/s41586-018-0338-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0338-1) · PMID: [30013118](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30013118/)

30. Mediterranean grassland soil C–N compound turnover is dependent on rainfall and depth, and is mediated by genomically divergent microorganisms

Spencer Diamond, Peter F. Andeer, Zhou Li, Alexander Crits-Christoph, David Burstein, Karthik Anantharaman, Katherine R. Lane, Brian C. Thomas, Chongle Pan, Trent R. Northen, Jillian F. Banfield

Nature Microbiology (2019-05-20) <https://doi.org/gf5fcx>

DOI: [10.1038/s41564-019-0449-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0449-y) · PMID: [31110364](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31110364/) · PMCID: [PMC6784897](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6784897/)

31. AMBER: Assessment of Metagenome BinnERs

Fernando Meyer, Peter Hofmann, Peter Belmann, Ruben Garrido-Oter, Adrian Fritz, Alexander Sczyrba, Alice C McHardy

GigaScience (2018-06) <https://doi.org/gdptz9>

DOI: [10.1093/gigascience/giy069](https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giy069) · PMID: [29893851](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29893851/) · PMCID: [PMC6022608](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6022608/)

32. Detecting genomic islands using bioinformatics approaches

Morgan G. I. Langille, William W. L. Hsiao, Fiona S. L. Brinkman

Nature Reviews Microbiology (2010-05) <https://doi.org/d6ss55>

DOI: [10.1038/nrmicro2350](https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2350) · PMID: [20395967](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20395967/)

33. Horizontal gene transfer: building the web of life

Shannon M. Soucy, Jinling Huang, Johann Peter Gogarten

Nature Reviews Genetics (2015-07-17) <https://doi.org/f7j3d9>

DOI: [10.1038/nrg3962](https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3962) · PMID: [26184597](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26184597/)

34. The Association of Virulence Factors with Genomic Islands

Shannan J. Ho Sui, Amber Fedynak, William W. L. Hsiao, Morgan G. I. Langille, Fiona S. L. Brinkman

PLoS ONE (2009-12-01) <https://doi.org/c7hsvv>

DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0008094](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0008094) · PMID: [19956607](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19956607/) · PMCID: [PMC2779486](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2779486/)

35. Dissemination of Antimicrobial Resistance in Microbial Ecosystems through Horizontal Gene Transfer

Christian J. H. von Wintersdorff, John Penders, Julius M. van Niekerk, Nathan D. Mills, Snehal Majumder, Lieke B. van Alphen, Paul H. M. Savelkoul, Petra F. G. Wolffs

Frontiers in Microbiology (2016-02-19) <https://doi.org/gf5fht>

DOI: [10.3389/fmicb.2016.00173](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00173) · PMID: [26925045](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26925045/) · PMCID: [PMC4759269](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC4759269/)

36. Transfer of antibiotic-resistance genes via phage-related mobile elements

Maryury Brown-Jaque, William Calero-Cáceres, Maite Muniesa

Plasmid (2015-05) <https://doi.org/f7dvxv>

DOI: [10.1016/j.plasmid.2015.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plasmid.2015.01.001) · PMID: [25597519](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25597519/)

37.:{unav)

Rainer Merkl

BMC Bioinformatics (2004) <https://doi.org/bt5x8h>

DOI: [10.1186/1471-2105-5-22](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-5-22) · PMID: [15113412](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15113412/) · PMCID: [PMC394314](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC394314/)

38. Improved genomic island predictions with IslandPath-DIMOB

Claire Bertelli, Fiona SL Brinkman

Bioinformatics (2018-07-01) <https://doi.org/gdphgs>

DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/bty095](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty095) · PMID: [29905770](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29905770/) · PMCID: [PMC6022643](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6022643/)

39. IslandViewer 3: more flexible, interactive genomic island discovery, visualization and analysis: Figure 1.

Bhavjinder K. Dhillon, Matthew R. Laird, Julie A. Shay, Geoffrey L. Winsor, Raymond Lo, Fazmin Nizam, Sheldon K. Pereira, Nicholas Waglechner, Andrew G. McArthur, Morgan G. I. Langille, Fiona S. L. Brinkman

Nucleic Acids Research (2015-07-01) <https://doi.org/f7n2xs>

DOI: [10.1093/nar/gkv401](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkv401) · PMID: [25916842](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25916842/) · PMCID: [PMC4489224](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC4489224/)

40. Microbial genomic island discovery, visualization and analysis

Claire Bertelli, Keith E Tilley, Fiona SL Brinkman

Briefings in Bioinformatics (2019-09) <https://doi.org/gdnhfv>

DOI: [10.1093/bib/bby042](https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bby042) · PMID: [29868902](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29868902/) · PMCID: [PMC6917214](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6917214/)

41. Multicopy plasmids potentiate the evolution of antibiotic resistance in bacteria

Alvaro San Millan, Jose Antonio Escudero, Danna R. Gifford, Didier Mazel, R. Craig MacLean

Nature Ecology & Evolution (2016-11-07) <https://doi.org/bs76>

DOI: [10.1038/s41559-016-0010](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-016-0010) · PMID: [28812563](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28812563/)

42. Small-Plasmid-Mediated Antibiotic Resistance Is Enhanced by Increases in Plasmid Copy Number and Bacterial Fitness

Alvaro San Millan, Alfonso Santos-Lopez, Rafael Ortega-Huedo, Cristina Bernabe-Balas, Sean P. Kennedy, Bruno Gonzalez-Zorn

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy (2015-06) <https://doi.org/f7k8bk>

DOI: [10.1128/aac.00235-15](https://doi.org/10.1128/aac.00235-15) · PMID: [25824216](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25824216/) · PMCID: [PMC4432117](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC4432117/)

43. cBar: a computer program to distinguish plasmid-derived from chromosome-derived sequence fragments in metagenomics data

Fengfeng Zhou, Ying Xu

Bioinformatics (2010-08-15) <https://doi.org/cn7486>

DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btq299](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq299) · PMID: [20538725](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20538725/) · PMCID: [PMC2916713](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2916713/)

44. Modal Codon Usage: Assessing the Typical Codon Usage of a Genome

J. J. Davis, G. J. Olsen

Molecular Biology and Evolution (2009-12-17) <https://doi.org/bhsmq5>

DOI: [10.1093/molbev/msp281](https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msp281) · PMID: [20018979](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20018979/) · PMCID: [PMC2839124](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2839124/)

45. Understanding the mechanisms and drivers of antimicrobial resistance.

Alison H Holmes, Luke SP Moore, Arnfinn Sundsfjord, Martin Steinbakk, Sadie Regmi, Abhilasha Karkey, Philippe J Guerin, Laura JV Piddock

Lancet (London, England) (2015-11-18) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26603922>

DOI: [10.1016/s0140-6736\(15\)00473-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(15)00473-0) · PMID: [26603922](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26603922/)

46. Critical Assessment of Metagenome Interpretation—a benchmark of metagenomics software

Alexander Sczyrba, Peter Hofmann, Peter Belmann, David Koslicki, Stefan Janssen, Johannes Dröge, Ivan Gregor, Stephan Majda, Jessika Fiedler, Eik Dahms, ... Alice C McHardy

Nature Methods (2017-10-02) <https://doi.org/gbzsppt>

DOI: [10.1038/nmeth.4458](https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4458) · PMID: [28967888](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28967888/) · PMCID: [PMC5903868](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC5903868/)

47. ART: a next-generation sequencing read simulator

Weichun Huang, Leping Li, Jason R. Myers, Gabor T. Marth

Bioinformatics (2012-02-15) <https://doi.org/fzf84c>

DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btr708](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr708) · PMID: [22199392](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22199392/) · PMCID: [PMC3278762](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC3278762/)

48. **Sickle: A sliding-window, adaptive, quality-based trimming tool for FastQ files**
NA Joshi, JN Fass
GitHub (2011) <https://github.com/najoshi/sickle>
49. **MetaQUAST: evaluation of metagenome assemblies**
Alla Mikhchenko, Vladislav Saveliev, Alexey Gurevich
Bioinformatics (2016-04-01) <https://doi.org/f8jdjj>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btv697](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv697) · PMID: [26614127](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26614127/)
50. **BLAST+: architecture and applications**
Christiam Camacho, George Coulouris, Vahram Avagyan, Ning Ma, Jason Papadopoulos, Kevin Bealer, Thomas L Madden
BMC Bioinformatics (2009) <https://doi.org/cnjxgz>
DOI: [10.1186/1471-2105-10-421](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-10-421) · PMID: [20003500](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20003500/) · PMCID: [PMC2803857](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2803857/)
51. **BUSCO: assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs**
Felipe A. Simão, Robert M. Waterhouse, Panagiotis Ioannidis, Evgenia V. Kriventseva, Evgeny M. Zdobnov
Bioinformatics (2015-10-01) <https://doi.org/gfznpw>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btv351](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv351) · PMID: [26059717](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26059717/)
52. **Parallelization of MAFFT for large-scale multiple sequence alignments**
Tsukasa Nakamura, Kazunori D Yamada, Kentaro Tomii, Kazutaka Katoh
Bioinformatics (2018-07-15) <https://doi.org/gc4th3>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/bty121](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty121) · PMID: [29506019](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29506019/) · PMCID: [PMC6041967](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6041967/)
53. **trimAl: a tool for automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses**
S. Capella-Gutierrez, J. M. Silla-Martinez, T. Gabaldon
Bioinformatics (2009-06-08) <https://doi.org/bjhdh7>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btp348](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp348) · PMID: [19505945](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19505945/) · PMCID: [PMC2712344](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2712344/)
54. **IQ-TREE: A Fast and Effective Stochastic Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies**
Lam-Tung Nguyen, Heiko A. Schmidt, Arndt von Haeseler, Bui Quang Minh
Molecular Biology and Evolution (2015-01) <https://doi.org/f3srtf>
DOI: [10.1093/molbev/msu300](https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msu300) · PMID: [25371430](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25371430/) · PMCID: [PMC4271533](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC4271533/)
55. **PartitionFinder: Combined Selection of Partitioning Schemes and Substitution Models for Phylogenetic Analyses**
R. Lanfear, B. Calcott, S. Y. W. Ho, S. Guindon
Molecular Biology and Evolution (2012-01-20) <https://doi.org/fzgsw3>
DOI: [10.1093/molbev/mss020](https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mss020) · PMID: [22319168](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22319168/)
56. **ETE 3: Reconstruction, Analysis, and Visualization of Phylogenomic Data**
Jaime Huerta-Cepas, François Serra, Peer Bork
Molecular Biology and Evolution (2016-06) <https://doi.org/gfzpvh>
DOI: [10.1093/molbev/msw046](https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msw046) · PMID: [26921390](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26921390/) · PMCID: [PMC4868116](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC4868116/)
57. **mwaskom/seaborn: v0.10.0 (January 2020)**
Michael Waskom, Olga Botvinnik, Joel Ostblom, Saulius Lukauskas, Paul Hobson, Maoz Gelbart, David C Gemperline, Tom Augspurger, Yaroslav Halchenko, John B. Cole, ... Constantine Evans

Zenodo (2020-01-24) <https://doi.org/ggkff7>
DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.3629446](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3629446)

58. Prodigal: prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification

Doug Hyatt, Gwo-Liang Chen, Philip F LoCascio, Miriam L Land, Frank W Larimer, Loren J Hauser
BMC Bioinformatics (2010-03-08) <https://doi.org/cktxnm>
DOI: [10.1186/1471-2105-11-119](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-119) · PMID: [20211023](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20211023/) · PMCID: [PMC2848648](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2848648/)

59. CARD 2017: expansion and model-centric curation of the comprehensive antibiotic resistance database

Baofeng Jia, Amogelang R. Raphenya, Brian Alcock, Nicholas Waglechner, Peiyao Guo, Kara K. Tsang, Briony A. Lago, Biren M. Dave, Sheldon Pereira, Arjun N. Sharma, ... Andrew G. McArthur
Nucleic Acids Research (2017-01-04) <https://doi.org/f9wbjs>
DOI: [10.1093/nar/gkw1004](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw1004) · PMID: [27789705](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27789705/) · PMCID: [PMC5210516](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC5210516/)

60. VFDB 2019: a comparative pathogenomic platform with an interactive web interface

Bo Liu, Dandan Zheng, Qi Jin, Lihong Chen, Jian Yang
Nucleic Acids Research (2019-01-08) <https://doi.org/gf4zfr>
DOI: [10.1093/nar/gky1080](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky1080) · PMID: [30395255](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30395255/) · PMCID: [PMC6324032](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6324032/)

61. PSORTb 3.0: improved protein subcellular localization prediction with refined localization subcategories and predictive capabilities for all prokaryotes

Nancy Y. Yu, James R. Wagner, Matthew R. Laird, Gabor Melli, Sébastien Rey, Raymond Lo, Phuong Dao, S. Cenk Sahinalp, Martin Ester, Leonard J. Foster, Fiona S. L. Brinkman
Bioinformatics (2010-07-01) <https://doi.org/bz3q2w>
DOI: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btq249](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq249) · PMID: [20472543](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20472543/) · PMCID: [PMC2887053](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC2887053/)

62. On the (im)possibility of reconstructing plasmids from whole-genome short-read sequencing data.

Sergio Arredondo-Alonso, Rob J Willems, Willem van Schaik, Anita C Schürch
Microbial genomics (2017-08-18) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29177087>
DOI: [10.1099/mgen.0.000128](https://doi.org/10.1099/mgen.0.000128) · PMID: [29177087](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29177087/) · PMCID: [PMC5695206](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC5695206/)

63. On the (im)possibility of reconstructing plasmids from whole-genome short-read sequencing data

Sergio Arredondo-Alonso, Rob J. Willems, Willem van Schaik, Anita C. Schürch
Microbial Genomics (2017-10-01) <https://doi.org/gf6b63>
DOI: [10.1099/mgen.0.000128](https://doi.org/10.1099/mgen.0.000128) · PMID: [29177087](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29177087/) · PMCID: [PMC5695206](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC5695206/)

64. SCAPP: An algorithm for improved plasmid assembly in metagenomes

David Pellow, Maraike Probst, Ori Furman, Alvah Zorea, Arik Segal, Itzik Mizrahi, Ron Shamir
bioRxiv (2020-01-14) <https://doi.org/ggkt4f>
DOI: [10.1101/2020.01.12.903252](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.12.903252)

65. Gene fragmentation in bacterial draft genomes: extent, consequences and mitigation

Jonathan L Klassen, Cameron R Currie
BMC Genomics (2012) <https://doi.org/fzg6gg>
DOI: [10.1186/1471-2164-13-14](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-13-14) · PMID: [22233127](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22233127/) · PMCID: [PMC3322347](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC3322347/)

66. CAMISIM: simulating metagenomes and microbial communities

Adrian Fritz, Peter Hofmann, Stephan Majda, Eik Dahms, Johannes Dröge, Jessika Fiedler, Till R. Lesker, Peter Belmann, Matthew Z. DeMaere, Aaron E. Darling, ... Alice C. McHardy

Microbiome (2019-02-08) <https://doi.org/ggrncx>

DOI: [10.1186/s40168-019-0633-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-019-0633-6) · PMID: [30736849](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30736849/) · PMCID: [PMC6368784](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6368784/)

67. Necrotizing enterocolitis is preceded by increased gut bacterial replication, *Klebsiella* , and fimbriae-encoding bacteria

Matthew R. Olm, Nicholas Bhattacharya, Alexander Crits-Christoph, Brian A. Firek, Robyn Baker, Yun S. Song, Michael J. Morowitz, Jillian F. Banfield

Science Advances (2019-12-11) <https://doi.org/ggrncw>

DOI: [10.1126/sciadv.aax5727](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax5727) · PMID: [31844663](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31844663/) · PMCID: [PMC6905865](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC6905865/)

68. ARIBA: rapid antimicrobial resistance genotyping directly from sequencing reads

Martin Hunt, Alison E Mather, Leonor Sánchez-Busó, Andrew J Page, Julian Parkhill, Jacqueline A Keane, Simon R Harris

Microbial Genomics (2017-10-01) <https://doi.org/gf5fd9>

DOI: [10.1099/mgen.0.000131](https://doi.org/10.1099/mgen.0.000131) · PMID: [29177089](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29177089/) · PMCID: [PMC5695208](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC5695208/)