

Deliverable 2.9 ARG dynamics in an agricultural testing area: Response of ARG concentrations according to different fertilisation techniques and crops over an annual growth period

Workpackage 2

Responsible Partner: 36-INSA, 2-AGES Contributing partners: 7-SZU, 14-UT, 23-UoS, 25-NUIG, 33-NVI

GENERAL INFORMATION

DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

D-JRP15-FED-AMR-WP2.9

ARG DYNAMICS IN AN AGRICULTURAL TESTING AREA: RESPONSE OF ARG CONCENTRATIONS ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT FERTILISATION TECHNIQUES AND CROPS OVER AN ANNUAL GROWTH PERIOD (WP2)

Introduction:

WP2 aims at determining the naturally occurring Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) genes (ARG) background load and the microbial biodiversity in the tested environmental compartments.

The deliverable WP2.9 belongs to the WP2 and is associated to task JRP17-R2-WP2-T7: *"Isolate and assess quantity, diversity and stability of free extracellular ARG encoding DNA in the tested environments. Sequence comparisons."*

Due to the number of samples, and the short time and the computation resources needed for the analysis, as well as because the participating institutes could not pre-analyse and preformat their own samples/sequences, we opted for a harmonized analysis that was mostly carried out by a statistician and mathematician and the remaining "WP2 analysis team", which as a whole comprised 4 countries.

Aim:

The main aim of this deliverable was to answer to the following question: Which and how many ARG exist in the different countries and compartments?

Strategy for analysis:

The strategy for the statistical analysis was the following:

- Prepare the data for analysis.
- Separate analysis was performed for 16S and ARG data. For the ARG data, we used a clustering methodology proposed by Lanza et al. (Lanza et al., 2018) to improve the sensitivity and specificity of the metagenomics analysis.
- All analysis was performed for extracellular and total DNA separately.
- Separate analysis was performed for differences between countries and compartments.
- Organize the data into a Phyloseq object (McMurdie & Holmes, 2013). Because Ares Genetics did not provide the sequence alinement we could not include a phylogenetic tree in the Phyloseq object and preform analysis that depend in it.
- Characterize of the data retrieving information like number of samples per country and compartment, bacterial species and ARG detected in the different samples, compartments and countries, reads per sample and basic statistics, among others.
- The analysis of alpha-diversity was performed with and without rarefication to try to account for library sizes differences. We studied the richness using Chao1, ACE and Fisher indexes; evenness using the Pielou index; and diversity using Shannon and Simpson indexes. We used Anova, Kruskal-Wallis and the Wilcoxon test to access differences.
- For ordination and differential abundance analysis we first performed a centred log ratios (CLR) transformation to the data, which removes the compositional constraints to make the standard multivariate techniques suitable for analysis (Quinn et al., 2019).
- For ordination analysis we used Aitchison distance and principal component analysis. We used Permanova, Permadist and Tukey's honest significant differences test to infer the significance of the differences of the observed clusters.

- For differential abundance analysis, as recommended by Nearing et al. (Nearing et al., 2022), we used multiple differential abundance methods to help ensure robust biological interpretations. We used ALCOM-BC, DEseq2, ALDEx2 and the Wilcoxon test with CLR transformation.
- In correlation analysis we used three methods: Pearson correlation, Spearman correlation and sparCC (Friedman & Alm, 2012).
- We used Benjamini-Hochberg and Bonferroni p-value corrections for multiple testing when necessary throw-out the study.

Here we present some data:

ARG were searched in all samples. We start with 435646 rows, 5070 genes and variants in 535 samples in the AMR data. The 471 samples in 16S and AMR sets after cleanup are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Samples in 16S and AMR sets after cleanup.

Regarding the number of reads per samples, most samples have less than 1000000 reads (Fig. 1). AMR

Fig 1. – Distribution of the number of reads per sample.

Indeed, 1044 of the ARG are common to all countries. United Kingdom and Portugal share 496 genes. 405 genes are excusive of one of the 6 countries, which suggests that most genes are shared by two or more countries.

Among all, 249 ARG are exclusive from waste treatment plant water. The highest number of ARG were 445 that are common to manure, feeds and soil from forests, meadows, controls and baselines. Waste treatment plant water and feeds presented the highest ARG counts, reinforcing the diversity of ARG in these compartments.

Fig. 2. – Number of ARG, A) by country and B) by compartment.

The ARG identified conferred resistance through different resistance mechanism as represented in Fig. 3 (analysis RPG by Country).

Globally, we notice that feeds present high richness. Except for tDNA in Estonia, feeds have a richness comparable to manure, farmers and pigs. Concerning farmers they show high richness. Pairwise Wilcoxon reinforce these conclusions, we did not found significant differences between feeds, wild animals and waste water, both in eDNA and tDNA. Also, no significant differences in richness between waste water and farmers. There are significant differences between the forest and fields without manure fertilization and the fields with manure. Much more significant differences in richness in tDNA. Both DNA types show significant differences in richness between countries in crops and pigs. There is much more variation on the ARG comparing to 16S analysis.

Publication:

These results and all related ones will be part, in 'detail', of a manuscript to be submitted and that will also be available to the international scientific community.

References:

Friedman, J., & Alm, E. J. (2012). Inferring Correlation Networks from Genomic Survey Data. PLoS Computational Biology, 8(9), e1002687. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002687

Lanza, V. F., Baquero, F., Martínez, J. L., Ramos-Ruíz, R., González-Zorn, B., Andremont, A., Sánchez-Valenzuela, A., Ehrlich, S. D., Kennedy, S., Ruppé, E., van Schaik, W., Willems, R. J., de la Cruz, F., & Coque, T. M. (2018). In-depth resistome analysis by targeted metagenomics. Microbiome, 6(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-017-0387-y

McMurdie, P. J., & Holmes, S. (2013). phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. PLoS ONE, 8(4), e61217. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061217

Nearing, J. T., Douglas, G. M., Hayes, M. G., MacDonald, J., Desai, D. K., Allward, N., Jones, C. M. A., Wright, R. J., Dhanani, A. S., Comeau, A. M., & Langille, M. G. I. (2022). Microbiome differential abundance methods produce different results across 38 datasets. Nature Communications, 13(1), 342. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28034-z

Quinn, T. P., Erb, I., Gloor, G., Notredame, C., Richardson, M. F., & Crowley, T. M. (2019). A field guide for the compositional analysis of any-omics data. GigaScience, 8(9), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz107