Experimental Evolution as a Tool to Investigate Natural Processes and Molecular Functions

Philippe Remigi, Catherine Masson-Boivin, Eduardo P C Rocha

► To cite this version:

Philippe Remigi, Catherine Masson-Boivin, Eduardo P C Rocha. Experimental Evolution as a Tool to Investigate Natural Processes and Molecular Functions. Trends in Microbiology, 2019, 27 (7), pp.623-634. 10.1016/j.tim.2019.02.003 . hal-02329724

HAL Id: hal-02329724

<https://hal.science/hal-02329724>

Submitted on 23 Oct 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Experimental evolution as a tool to investigate natural processes and molecular functions

Philippe Remigi^{1*}, Catherine Masson-Boivin¹ and Eduardo P.C. Rocha^{2,3}

1. Laboratoire des Interactions Plantes-Microorganismes (LIPM), Université de Toulouse, INRA, CNRS, 31326 Castanet-Tolosan, France.

2. Microbial Evolutionary Genomics, Institut Pasteur, 25-28 rue Dr. Roux, 75015 Paris, France.

3. CNRS, UMR3525, 25-28 rue Dr. Roux, 75015 Paris, France

*Correspondance: philippe.remigi@inra.fr (P. Remigi)

Keywords: Experimental evolution, gene regulation, antibiotic resistance, host-microbe interactions.

Abstract

Experimental evolution of microbes has allowed evolutionary biologists to examine adaptive processes in real time, generating novel insights into fundamental laws of evolution. Much less appreciated is the potential of this approach to advance the understanding of microbial cells and molecular processes in complement of traditional molecular genetics. The tracking of mutations underlying phenotypic changes offers the opportunity for detailed molecular analyses of novel phenotypes. This provides a breadth of information on diverse biological systems and may retrace key past events of natural history. Here, we highlight how the field has advanced our understanding of gene regulation, antibiotic resistance and host-microbiome interactions to exemplify how experimental evolution can be employed to provide new light on microbial systems.

Highlights

- Experimental evolution (EE) can complement traditional molecular genetic studies on microbial systems.
- The diversity of EE approaches enabled progresses in many fields of microbiology, including molecular mechanisms of gene regulation, antibiotic resistance, and host-microbiome interactions.
- Under specific conditions, EE can parallel the evolution of natural systems.
- EE offers exciting perspectives to discover the function of new genes and probe evolution within communities.

Glossary

Bow-tie network: architecture of a signalling network where one (or a few) core central regulator is controlled by multiple proteins (input signal) and controls multiple targets (output).

Collateral susceptibility: resistance to one antibiotic increases sensitivity to another.

Cross-resistance: resistance to one antibiotic increases resistance to another.

Experimental evolution: propagation of living organisms in a controlled environment – the laboratory or the field - for several generations (typically, from tens to thousands) allowing to witness the action of natural selection and to investigate evolutionary processes

Functional promiscuity: the ability of a protein to perform a secondary activity, often mediated by the inability to distinguish between target molecular substrates (metabolite, DNA, RNA, protein) that have a similar structure.

Fruiting body: multicellular, aggregative structures formed by myxobacteria during nutrient starvation and that contain spores resistant to heat, desiccation or freezing.

Mutators: bacteria with unusually high mutation rates, often as a result of loss of DNA repair genes or expression of error-prone DNA polymerases.

Noise in gene expression: stochastic variations in gene expression level over time and between isogenic cells growing in a homogeneous environment.

Pervasive transcription: describes the fact that large portions of genomes are transcribed, including intergenic regions.

sRNA: small non-coding RNA with regulatory function

Sub-MIC concentrations: conditions where bacterial growth is not completely stopped by antibiotics.

Outstanding questions:

- Can we exploit mutations found in EE to characterise genes of unknown function?
- Can EE enlighten mechanisms slowing down the evolution of resistances?
- Can the EE of microbial communities bring new insights into their functional characteristics?
- Can we use within-host EE to identify host factors (and other environmental factors) shaping bacterial evolutionary trajectories during infection?
- Can EE reproduce the emergence of major intracellular symbiotic associations (such as mitochondria in eukaryotic cells, plastids in the green lineage, association between fungi and land plants, obligate endosymbionts of insects)?

Experimental evolution: beyond evolutionary biology

Artificial breeding of plants and animals played a key role in the maturation of Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection, but also in the rise of modern human societies (from agriculture to recreational breeding of plants and pets). Non-professional evolutionary biologists performing (sometimes unwittingly) evolution experiments have successfully improved the yield of many biological processes. In contrast, although some evolutionary biologists contemporary of Darwin turned to **experimental evolution** (EE; see **Glossary**), the influence of this approach in the development of evolutionary biology only came to prominence in the last few decades [1]. Applied to microbes with short generation times in various conditions (Box 1), EE generated unique biological material (Fig. 1) that was used to probe the evolutionary dynamics of microbial phenotypes [2, 3], to decipher the genetic bases of adaptation [4] and to optimize microbial traits for industrial use [5].

In spite of these successes, many biologists remain unaware or unconvinced of the relevance of EE approaches to their research programs. Typical criticisms of EE include the artificial nature of the experimental setups or their simplicity in terms of biotic and abiotic interactions

[6]. However, this is also true for many excellent lines of research in molecular biology, which depend on the construction of simplified and well-controlled setups. In this article, we argue that experimental evolution has matured into a rich field with a varied set of tools that can help microbiologists to unravel molecular processes underlying adaptive phenotypes. This is independent of the relevance of experimental evolution to reproduce natural adaptive processes, since laboratory phenotypes can be interesting on their own. For example, improving growth rate, yield and recombinant protein production in the laboratory has obvious biotechnological interest [7]. Contemporary microbes can also be used to experiment on the ecological conditions and evolutionary patterns that might have accompanied the evolution of multicellularity millions of years ago [8]. Here, instead of aiming at providing an exhaustive overview of the field (for which we refer the interested reader to recent reviews [2-4, 7-12]), we use a few selected examples on gene regulation, antibiotic resistance and host-microbiome interactions to illustrate how EE contributes to understand fundamental aspects of molecular biology and helps manipulating natural ecosystems. As the natural inclination of most biologists is to understand if the phenotypes observed in laboratory-evolved mutants are relevant to understand natural processes, we present examples of discrepancies (Box 2), but also increasing evidence of meaningful parallels (Box 3), between EE and natural evolutionary processes. While this review focuses on bacteria, concepts discussed here are also relevant to other organisms, especially viruses or unicellular eukaryotes.

Gene regulation

A major challenge for modern biology has been to map and understand the logics of gene regulatory networks (GRNs). Outstanding enigmas in molecular biology tackled by EE include how the interactions of transcription factors (TF) with DNA arise and evolve, why they are so hard to identify correctly, and how they form complex networks [13].

The co-option or modulation of bacterial regulatory responses provide a multitude of opportunities for adaptation to new environmental challenges. Indeed, most adaptive mutations in EE are found in regulatory regions or in regulatory genes [4]. Detailed molecular analyses of the associated transcriptional rewiring can reveal new components from signalling

networks, new connections between known regulatory components and new cross-talk between signalling and metabolic pathways. These trends emerged from some of the very early studies in experimental evolution [14, 15]. A prominent example includes the evolution of a new lactose fermentation system in *Escherichia coli*, via mutations in the *egbA* β -galactosidase and its regulator [16]. More recently, EE has uncovered a novel **sRNA** regulating *Myxococcus xanthus* **fruiting body** development. *M. xanthus* responds to nutrient starvation by generating fruiting bodies containing stress-resistant spores. This behaviour was lost during EE in nutrient-rich liquid medium, but was subsequently re-evolved in alternating cycles of starvation and non-starvation [17]. The point mutation responsible for the re-evolution of fruiting-body formation was found in a previously un-annotated intergenic region, leading to the discovery of the novel sRNA controlling this developmental pathway [18]. Another study established a link between pyrimidine metabolism and the Gac/Rsm signalling pathway, a major determinant of lifestyle switch in *Pseudomonas* spp. [19] that controls the production of extracellular capsules in *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. Evolution of *P. fluorescens* under fluctuating environments gave rise to a strain that produces a sub-population of capsulated cells [20]. This phenotype is underpinned by a mutation that decreases pyrimidine biosynthesis [21] and increases ribosome production [22]. That both increased ribosome levels and functional Gac/Rsm signalling are required for heterogeneous capsule production shows that central metabolism (pyrimidine biosynthesis) can alter the output of a two-component signalling system [22].

The plasticity of regulatory regions and transcription factors observed in EE can be recruited to understand fundamental properties of transcriptional control. Low affinity TF-DNA interactions appear to play a critical role in the evolution of GRNs. Yona *et al.* [23] replaced the *lac* promoter with random DNA sequences of the same size in *E. coli* and observed that bacterial growth in the presence of lactose rapidly led to the evolution of functional promoters. A single mutation in synthetic promoters was sufficient to induce substantial expression in most cases (Fig. 2A). The rapid *de novo* evolution of promoters and the **functional promiscuity** of transcription factors may explain the intriguing **pervasive transcription** observed in bacterial genomes [24]. It may also explain the evolutionary plasticity of gene expression in bacteria, since an initially weak binding of a TF on a regulatory region can be reinforced by mutations in the DNA-binding domain. This was observed during

the re-evolution of motility in *P. fluorescens* following the deletion of the master regulator of flagellar synthesis *fleQ* [25]. Under selection for motility, flagellin expression was restored within 96h in a two-step process involving (i) the increased phosphorylation (and thus, activation level) of a nitrogen-related transcriptional regulator with weak (promiscuous) activity on flagellar genes and (ii) a switch-of-function mutation that re-directed transcriptional activity of this regulator from nitrogen uptake to flagellar genes. The plasticity of regulatory interactions can also be associated with **noise in gene expression**, which has attracted interest in the recent years because it can contribute to phenotypic variability in clonal populations [26]. Wolf *et al.* [27] showed that libraries of random promoters evolved to produce GFP at high or intermediate expression levels had lower average noise than natural *E. coli* promoters. This suggests that noise is a selected trait in nature. When the average production of a protein is not optimal in a given environment, a broad (i.e. noisy) distribution of gene expression levels increases the likelihood that some cells of the population express an appropriate amount of this protein. Mathematical modelling suggests that noise can act as a primitive form of gene regulation and pave the way towards more precise regulation [27]. Altogether, these studies illustrate that what may appear to be ‘non-optimality’ in transcriptional regulation – functional promiscuity and noise – actually drives the evolution of GRNs.

EE enables to directly probe systems-level properties of GRNs in an evolutionary context. Witnessing how GRNs are gradually built by evolutionary tinkering (rather than by optimized design) is key to understand their complex architecture and emergent properties, such as robustness, resilience or evolvability [28]. In many cases, transcriptional changes induced by genetic or environmental perturbations are reverted during the early steps of adaptation by adaptive mutations in global regulators that restore cellular homeostasis [29-32]. These results support the idea that transcriptional stability is essential for optimal fitness and can be restored by minimal genetic modifications in global regulators, thus highlighting the resilience of GRNs. However, the topology of GRNs architecture can also benefit bacterial evolvability. Studying the evolution of the **bow-tie network** controlling flagellar production in *E. coli*, Ni *et al.* [33] found that motility in a porous environment (the trait under selection in their experiment) can increase via mutations in multiple target genes. Yet, all adaptive mutations commonly modified the activity of a core sigma-factor checkpoint controlling flagellar gene

expression. By allowing multiple mutations in independent genes to target the same central regulator of motility, the bow-tie architecture provides evolutionary flexibility for the fine-tuning of bacterial behaviours. These examples show that EE is a powerful tool to analyse evolutionary properties of GRNs.

Antibiotic resistance

The emergence of antibiotic resistant bacteria is a remarkable example of human-induced evolutionary process. Resistant bacteria emerge systematically within a few years of the introduction of every novel antibiotic. The consequences are dramatic: 700,000 deaths per year, estimated to increase to over 10 million in the incoming decades (<https://amr-review.org/Publications>). EE is particularly well-suited to decipher the mechanisms of acquisition of antibiotic resistance given the timescale and intensity of selection in this process. This has produced unexpected novel lines of research. For example, very early studies on the EE of antibiotic resistance kick-started the study of microbial mutagenesis by identifying the first *E. coli* **mutators** [34]. The simplicity of tracking resistant bacteria, the societal relevance of the topic, and its implications to molecular genetics and physiology have stimulated research on the mechanisms of acquisition of resistance, on multiple resistance, and on the compensation of the fitness costs of resistance.

Most resistances studied from clinical isolates are strong, because of the obvious medical interest of such cases. EE provides complementary information about resistance in controlled setups where pathways to resistance can be tracked, selection forces tuned, and physiological states controlled for. Notably, EE revealed the important role of low (below the minimum inhibitory concentration; MIC) antibiotic concentrations on the evolution of resistance. These concentrations can be encountered in many types of environments and do not result in cell death, but provide sufficient pressure for the selection of resistant variants and even the evolution of novel mechanisms of resistance [35]. They also accelerate the acquisition of resistance by selecting for mutators [36], and increasing the rates of horizontal gene transfer [37]. Lindsey *et al.* [38] evolved hundreds of populations of *E. coli* under variable rates of increase in concentration of rifampicin. By assessing fitness of genetically engineered combinations of mutations from isolates evolved under low rates of environmental change,

they could show that certain genotypes were evolutionarily inaccessible to evolution under rapid environmental changes. Wistrand-Yuen *et al.* [39] then showed that *Salmonella enterica* exposed to **sub-MIC levels** of streptomycin evolved high-level resistance via mechanisms different from those observed under above-MIC conditions. Sub-MIC resistance evolved through small-effect mutations that combined to confer high-level resistance.

Antibiotics stimulate a set of core responses in bacterial physiology [40], which contributes to explain why resistance to one antibiotic can change the cell's susceptibility to others [41]. Several recent studies detailed the network of **cross-resistance** and **collateral susceptibility** resulting from EE of resistance to each of a large range of antibiotics [42-44]. Evolution involving cross-resistance and collateral sensitivity is frequently convergent in *E. coli*, meaning that one can predict to a reasonable extent the antibiotic resistance phenotypes from the genome sequences of the laboratory-evolved lines [45]. Treatments based on alternating drugs with compatible collateral sensitivity profiles could thus be more efficient and lead to slower development of resistances (Fig. 2B; [44]). Several of these studies observed that populations adapted to resist to aminoglycosides show systematically lower fitness in the presence of other types of antibiotics. In molecular terms, this could be the consequence of selection for alterations in the inner membrane potential reducing the uptake of aminoglycoside-related antibiotics, which would simultaneously lower the activity of efflux pumps using proton-motive force [42]. Interestingly, the comparison of interaction networks evolving in conditions of weak and high antibiotic concentration revealed that the strength of selection shapes the acquisition of resistance: cross-resistance tends to be stronger under higher antibiotic concentrations [46]. The stochasticity of evolutionary trajectories leading to resistance to one antibiotic can influence the occurrence of collateral sensitivity [47], calling for a careful assessment of the robustness of this phenomenon when wanting to exploit it in a clinical setting. Together with the studies on the effect of sub-MIC conditions, this suggests that the path towards resistance, involving exposure to high or low antibiotic concentrations, will shape the network of collateral effects of antibiotics.

The many evolution experiments detailing the mutational landscape of antibiotic resistance have systematically revealed rapid partial compensatory evolution of the initial fitness costs of resistance [48-50]. Compensation facilitates the spread and fixation of antibiotic resistant

lineages. For example, rifampicin resistance in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* is costly in laboratory-derived mutants, but multidrug-resistant clinical strains often show no fitness defects [51], because of compensatory mutations [52]. The study of mutants arising in *E. coli* in the presence of fluoroquinolones showed that compensation of fitness cost associated to antibiotic resistance can lead to bacteria that are as fit as the wild-type susceptible bacteria in the absence of antibiotics [53]. Prolonged colonization of chickens with fluoroquinolone-resistant *Campylobacter jejuni*, a somewhat less controlled evolution experiment, revealed that resistant bacteria were also fitter pathogens [54]. Genes that simultaneously increase virulence and resistance may actually be quite common. They were observed in several other pathogens, including *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Acinetobacter baumannii* and *Vibrio cholerae* [55]. Even costly resistance mutations can coexist with other genotypes for hundreds of generations when their high adaptive potential counteracts their initial cost [56]. This means that a multi-step process of slow accumulation of mutations conferring resistance and cost compensation, as expected under sub-MIC conditions, can result in bacteria that are both resistant and fit. This process is strongly dependent on the genetic context of the mutations (epistasis) [57-60]. For example, a comparison of streptomycin and rifampicin double-resistant *E. coli* with single-resistant clones obtained through EE showed that low-fitness double-resistant bacteria compensate their cost faster than single-resistant strains thanks to the acquisition of compensatory mutations with larger effects [61]. Surprisingly, some mutations only compensate for double resistance, being neutral or deleterious in single-resistant backgrounds. This means that multiple resistances may not rapidly go away with pauses in the use of the corresponding antibiotics.

Host-microbe interactions

Plants and animals are persistently inhabited by microbes, whose contribution in host health, nutrition and development is increasingly recognized [62, 63]. Elucidating the functional mechanisms and evolutionary potential of host-microbiome interactions is crucial to manipulate this ecosystem and improve host health.

Most bacterial pathogens have the remarkable ability to alternate between external environments and specialized host niches. Rapid and coordinated shifts in metabolism, physiology, and virulence factor production in response to environmental changes are

orchestrated by multilayered and highly complex circuitries that are very difficult to decipher [64]. Adaptation to new hosts, which is generally very rapid in laboratory conditions [65], has the potential to reveal new components of virulence pathways. This was recently highlighted in an evolution experiment aiming at adapting the plant pathogen *Ralstonia solanacearum* to different host plants [66]. Beneficial mutations improving *in planta* colonization mainly occurred in a gene, which was named *efpR* (for enhanced fitness in plants). The *efpR* gene was shown to encode a transcriptional regulator acting as both a central player of the *R. solanacearum* virulence network and a global catabolic repressor down-regulating the expression of multiple metabolic pathways [67]. Experimental adaptation of *R. solanacearum* to a non-host legume further identified other components of the *efpR* pathway [68]. Although the genetic bases of virulence in *R. solanacearum* had been amply dissected [69], this pathway had not been previously identified, illustrating how EE coupled with genome resequencing allows identifying novel molecular players of biological functions.

Many ecological transitions towards pathogenic or mutualistic symbiosis include an initial acquisition by horizontal gene transfer (HGT) of mobile genetic elements (MGE) that can provide complex novel traits in a single event of transfer [70, 71]. Profound changes in lifestyle may require the remodeling of the metabolic and signaling networks in the recipient genome, a process that may take hundreds to millions of years *in natura* [72]. The study of this process by the analysis of extant microorganisms can be complemented by EE to pinpoint specific molecular mechanisms that ensure the full expression of acquired traits. This is illustrated by the study of nitrogen-fixing legume symbionts (rhizobia), which evolved through the acquisition of a set of essential symbiotic genes [73]. An experiment was designed to evolve a plant pathogenic bacterium (*R. solanacearum*) into a legume symbiont under plant (*Mimosa*) selection pressure. (Fig. 2C). This experiment showed that control mechanisms developed by the host progressively shape bacteria via the multistep selection of compatible bacterial traits [74]. The gradual activation and improvement of the first symbiotic properties, *i.e.* the induction of root nodules where bacteria fix nitrogen and the infection of these nodules, occurred via the inactivation of the *R. solanacearum* pathogenic type III secretion system and via regulatory rewiring [75-77], demonstrating the requirement of post-HGT modifications to achieve symbiosis in the case of horizontal transfer between distantly related bacteria. Upon experimentally replaying rhizobia evolution, a genetic mechanism was discovered to

accelerate symbiotic evolution [78]. Evolved *R. solanacearum* underwent a transient hypermutagenesis stage that occurred at every inoculation cycle before the cells entered the plant. Investigating the role of *imuABC* error-prone DNA polymerases present on the transferred symbiotic plasmid provided evidence that this mutagenesis cassette is expressed in stress conditions (outside the host plant), thus increasing genetic diversity and offering more phenotypic diversity to plant selection. *imuABC* cassettes were found on *c.a.* 50% of the symbiotic plasmids supporting the hypothesis that this hypermutagenesis mechanism has facilitated the evolution of new rhizobia *in natura*. After 400 generations, mutualistic nitrogen fixation was not achieved, possibly because time was too short. Yet another evolution experiment performed with the natural symbiont of *Mimosa* (*Cupriavidus taiwanensis*) showed that, thanks to host sanctions occurring at the post-infection level, rare nitrogen-fixing symbionts (that may arise via mutation during evolution) progressively invade a population dominated by non-fixing bacteria, with a probability that depends on ecological factors [79]. This provided a better understanding of the spread of the mutualistic trait during natural evolution [73].

Plant and animal microbiomes are composed of complex and dynamic bacterial consortia whose interspecific interactions have implications for the host [80]. The importance of bacterial antagonism for the evolution of infection was demonstrated in a tri-partite interaction between *Caenorhabditis elegans* and two bacterial pathogens. In a first EE, King *et al.* [81] showed that mildly pathogenic bacteria (*Enterococcus faecalis*) living in worms rapidly evolved increased competitiveness against a more virulent pathogen (*Staphylococcus aureus*). This reduced the mortality caused by *S. aureus* infections. The mechanistic basis for protection was an increased production by *E. faecalis* of antimicrobial reactive oxygen species directly affecting pathogen growth. Although this broad-spectrum defense mechanism was not novel, it showed that microbes living within a host can become mutualists in response to infection by other pathogens. A subsequent EE showed that microbe-microbe interactions within hosts can drive the evolution of pathogens. To limit *E. faecalis* colonization, which exploits the costly siderophores of *S. aureus*, the latter evolved to produce less siderophores [82]. Since siderophore production contributes to virulence by improving pathogen growth in iron-limited hosts, its diminution leads to less virulent clones. Hence, bacterial antagonistic

interactions can modulate the production of virulence factors, and consequently influence how the microbiome impacts the host.

Concluding remarks and future perspectives

EE has already provided a wealth of information on the molecular events (see [83] for additional examples) and the conditions driving phenotypic adaptation in a number of model biological systems. We expect that many more discoveries will follow. For practical purposes, characterisation of adaptive mutations has usually focused on known genes and pathways. A large number of adaptive mutations found in genes of unknown function remains to be analysed, representing a challenging untapped reservoir of new discoveries. The development of cross-experiments databases (such as the recent ALEdb [84]) may help identifying promising candidate genes to initiate such studies. Moreover, the introduction of novel non-model bacteria allows EE to tackle different biological questions, *e.g.* studying the evolution and functioning of microbial communities (see Outstanding Questions). EE can also provide an alternative to genetic screens for organisms that are not genetically amenable.

EE can be used to study mechanisms of evolution, and their underlying molecular biology, independently of the events that actually took place in the natural history of the species. Yet, it would be of remarkable interest to use EE as a tool to test hypothesis about evolution in nature, especially in cases where the study of natural populations only provides limited insights into ancient processes. EE is not necessarily relevant in this context because of its simplified setups, and numerous reports revealed differences between EE and natural processes (Box 2). Nevertheless, there is a growing number of reported parallels between natural and EE, especially in studies where the latter tried to match more closely the conditions of natural evolution (Box 3). The extent to which EE studies can mirror the natural evolution of bacterial traits is likely to be a fertile area for future research.

On the technological side, recent genome editing technologies, including CRISPR-Cas or ‘deep mutational scanning’, tremendously accelerate the exploration of genotype-phenotype landscapes [10]. Moreover, new cultivation procedures (particularly those based on micro/millifluidics [85, 86]) will allow large scale, automated evolution experiments, and their genetic analysis can be facilitated by DNA barcoding [10]. With continuously decreasing sequencing cost, the EE field is therefore ripe for appropriation by molecular microbiologists coming with imaginative selective regimes, original microbial strains or communities, and

novel biological questions. More generally, the adoption of EE by a wider community of microbiologists could accelerate the march towards the much-needed synthesis of molecular and evolutionary approaches [87-89].

Box 1: The many faces of experimental evolution

Experimental evolution can be performed under a wide range of experimental settings adapted to the biological question of interest. Details on the design of these studies were reviewed elsewhere [3, 90]. As an attempt to classify the most common EE practices, one can distinguish levels of complexity along two criteria: environmental conditions and starting biological material (Fig. 1).

Starting biological material: Wild-type bacterial strains are commonly used to start evolution experiments. Although in theory any cultivable strain can be used, most works focus on fast-growing genetically tractable model bacteria. Other studies employ modify-and-evolve approaches where genetic engineering is used to delete [32], introduce a trait [23, 27, 75] or modify a gene or the whole genome [91, 92], and is followed by EE to understand how the system evolves. These approaches profit enormously from the recent developments in synthetic biology and CRISPR-based technologies. Comparative evolution studies are typically performed by evolving several independent lines from the same ancestor in parallel, but can also involve different strains/species exposed to the same conditions [93]. Complexity in starting material can be increased by putting together different bacterial species [94, 95], or complex communities [96]. In these cases, experimentalists can follow either the evolution of one of the organisms or the co-evolution of multiple organisms.

Environmental complexity: Following the trends set by the long-term evolution experiment (LTEE), most microbial evolution experiments are performed in very simple growth conditions, e.g. in shaken Erlenmeyer flasks [97] or in chemostats [98], with a variety of volumes, time delay and volume of transfer between subsequent cycles (flasks) or dilution rates (chemostats). A number of studies used more complex environments. Spatially structured environments are generated in static liquid cultures (creating an oxygen gradient [99]), on solid supports within liquid medium [100] or on solid surfaces (agar plates [25]). In this case, micro-organisms deplete resources locally, leading to differences between patches. Growth on solid media or in liquid meta-populations also helps manipulating genetic assortment

between neighbouring cells, a condition often used to explore the evolution of social behaviours [101-103]. The strength of selective pressures can be adjusted during the experiment by varying antibiotic concentrations in a continuous culture [58], creating chemical gradients in agar plates [104], or by varying conditions between successive growth cycles [20, 43]. Finally, some studies mimic natural conditions more closely by employing more complex settings, such as eukaryotic hosts, to study the evolution of mutualists or pathogens [66, 77, 81, 105-107].

Box 2: Divergences between EE and natural evolution.

Many EE studies identified patterns of molecular evolution with large excesses of non-synonymous adaptive mutations, whereas natural populations systematically show a predominance of synonymous substitutions caused by purifying selection on protein sequences [108]. This may result from the joint effects of the simple continuous unidirectional selective pressures applied in many EE together with the use of conditions free from most other constraints that bacteria endure in natural environments. The same reasons may explain why core genes tend to accumulate few substitutions in natural populations, but evolve faster in the LTEE [109]. The contrast between evolutionary patterns is particularly striking for the RNA polymerase gene *rpoB* that often accumulates adaptive mutations in *in vitro* EE experiments but is extremely conserved in natural evolution [4]. Interestingly, a recent *E. coli* EE study in the mouse gut, a more natural environment, showed lower rates of evolution and no mutations in *rpoB* [110]. Similar discrepancies were found by a study where *P. aeruginosa* adaptation to the airways of cystic fibrosis patients during over 200,000 generations resulted in limited genetic diversification. In contrast with *in vitro* EE, the *in vivo* process revealed an initial period of adaptive mutations followed by a period with the more usual pattern of dominance of purifying selection [111]. Another reason for the excess of non-synonymous adaptive mutations in EE is the lack of sexual exchanges with distant strains or species in most EE setups. This prevents the income of adaptive changes by horizontal gene transfer and results in adaptive mutations touching key processes that are highly conserved in nature. For example, many traits are lost in EE because they are costly in simplified setups, but they are under selection – and thus conserved – in nature [112]. A striking example of this contrast is given by the frequent evolution of mutators during phage-bacteria co-evolution in simple

experiments, which was not observed in complex environments closer to natural conditions [113, 114].

Box 3: Parallels between EE and natural evolution.

The use of more complex setups in EE has found interesting parallels with analogous processes in natural history. For example, diversification of *M. xanthus* during EE led to genetic diversity close to those identified in natural populations sampled from small parcels in the soil [115]. EE of *Burkholderia cenocepacia* in biofilms revealed a wealth of mutations associated with its adaptation and diversification of which four broad classes were also found in clinical isolates of *Burkholderia dolosa* and *P. aeruginosa* cystic fibrosis patients, suggesting a parallelism between adaptation to the biofilm lifestyle and lung colonization [100]. A recent study aimed at comparing directly the patterns of evolution of resistance to colistin in *P. aeruginosa* using both laboratory EE and the analysis of four clinical isolates from a single cystic fibrosis patient (sampled within a period of three months) [60]. This revealed a complex, multistep adaptation process requiring epistatic mutations in several loci where parallels between the natural and experimental processes could be identified: all resistant mutants were mutators and the evolution of resistance occurred through mutations in *prmB*, part of the PrmAB two-component system. This shows that processes at comparable time scales requiring a relatively straightforward adaptation process can reveal significant parallels. Another study combining detailed phenotypic characterization and mathematical modelling showed that high mutational supply, influenced by population and bottleneck sizes, was a key parameter favoring parallelism between laboratory and natural evolution of ciprofloxacin resistance in *E. coli* [116].

More complex adaptation processes were investigated by evolving three clones of *Lactococcus lactis* from a plant isolate to the dairy niche [117]. Gene expression differences between the parental and the dairy strain were maximal at an operon encoding an ABC transporter that was 350 times more expressed in the dairy strain. Interestingly this operon was also expressed at higher level in two of the three adapted strains. An even more radical EE, leading to a change in lifestyle from a plant pathogen to a rhizobial mutualist upon acquisition of a large plasmid carrying the symbiosis genes and after a few hundreds of generations (see Main Text), also showed striking parallels to the natural process that took

place over more than 10 million years [118]. In spite of the radically different time-span of the evolutionary processes and degree of achievement of the symbioses, adaptation was accompanied in both cases by an overall pattern of purifying selection. Both natural and experimental processes showed very little signal of adaptation in the fast-evolving symbiotic plasmid, whereas many adaptive mutations took place in the genetic background of the bacteria, including mutations that led to the co-option of the same quorum-sensing system in both processes. These works show that EE reveals significant parallels to natural history when it mimics key conditions of the natural processes.

Figure legends:

Fig. 1: Experimental evolution: a source of biological material available for phenotypic and genotypic analysis.

Traditionally, only extant or very recent populations resulting from millions of years of natural evolution are available for analysis. EE allows the analysis of all steps of adaptation during years of accelerated evolution in controlled conditions, thanks to frozen fossil records. Recently, the intensive genomic sampling of variants in natural populations provides data that can be compared with that of EE. Points represent available naturally- or experimentally-evolved bacterial clones/populations.

Fig. 2. Selected evolution experiments having contributed to advances in gene regulation (A), antibiotic resistance (B) and host-microbe interactions (C).

A. Evolution of promoters [23]. Left: The *lac* promoter was replaced by random sequences in *E. coli*. Bacteria were evolved by serial dilutions in 0.05% glycerol (utilized by the strain) and 0.2% lactose (originally not utilized). Right: Following laboratory selection, ~60% of promoters having acquired a single mutation (black star) exhibit on average 50% of the wild-type (WT) activity.

B. Evolution of collateral sensitivity and its use to design new therapeutic strategies [44]. Left: Bacteria selected to resist a given antibiotic (X) reproducibly display an increased (cross-resistance), unchanged or decreased (collateral sensitivity) resistance to other antibiotics (e.g., A) compared to their WT ancestor. Right: Patterns of collateral sensitivity can be exploited by cycling antibiotic treatments that accelerate eradication of bacterial pathogens. CFU: colony forming units.

C. Evolution of new legume symbionts [77, 78]. The symbiosis plasmid of *Cupriavidus taiwanensis* was introduced into *Ralstonia solanacearum*, generating a non-nodulating proto-rhizobium (Nod⁻) that was further evolved using serial cycles of co-culture with *Mimosa pudica*, the natural host of *C. taiwanensis*. The symbiosis plasmid possesses the essential *nod* and *nif/fix* genes required for nodulation and nitrogen fixation. In addition, it contains *imuABC* genes encoding stress-responsive error-prone DNA polymerases that transiently elevated the mutation rate of bacteria growing in the rhizosphere. In only 16 cycles (c.a. 400 generations) the ancestral proto-rhizobium, which was only able to induce root hair curling (Hac⁺) allowing the formation of infection sites, successively acquired the capacity to enter the root and form nodules (Nod⁺), extracellularly infect nodules (E-Inf⁺), intracellularly invade nodules (I-Inf⁺) and massively invade nodule cells (I-Inf⁺⁺), via genome remodeling. Stars symbolize mutations. Bacteria are represented in blue in nodules. Adapted from references [74, 78].

Fig. 1 for Box 1: Experimental settings in EE

Examples of experiments using biological material or environments exhibiting increasing levels of complexity.

Acknowledgements

We apologize to colleagues whose work could not be cited here due to space limitations. PR has received the support of the EU in the framework of the Marie-Curie FP7 COFUND People Programme, through the award of an AgreenSkills+ fellowship under grant agreement n°FP7-609398. CMB, EPCR, and PR were supported by funds from the French National Research Agency (ANR-16-CE20-0011-01). CMB and PR were supported by the French Laboratory of

Excellence project 'TULIP' (ANR-10-LABX-41). EPCR thanks lab members for discussions on this topic, notably Olaya Rendueles, Antoine Frenoy, Camille Clerissi, and Jorge Moura de Sousa.

References:

1. Adams, J. and Rosenzweig, F. (2014) Experimental microbial evolution: History and conceptual underpinnings. *Genomics* 104 (6), 393-398.
2. Lenski, R.E. (2017) Experimental evolution and the dynamics of adaptation and genome evolution in microbial populations. *ISME J.* 11 (10), 2181-2194.
3. Van den Bergh, B. et al. (2018) Experimental design, population dynamics, and diversity in microbial experimental evolution. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* 82 (3), e00008-18.
4. Long, A. et al. (2015) Elucidating the molecular architecture of adaptation via evolve and resequence experiments. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 16 (10), 567-582.
5. Chen, K.Q. and Arnold, F.H. (1993) Tuning the activity of an enzyme for unusual environments: Sequential random mutagenesis of subtilisin E for catalysis in dimethylformamide. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 90 (12), 5618-5622.
6. Buckling, A. et al. (2009) The Beagle in a bottle. *Nature* 457 (7231), 824-829.
7. Dragosits, M. and Mattanovich, D. (2013) Adaptive laboratory evolution - principles and applications for biotechnology. *Microb. Cell Fact.* 12, 64.
8. Rainey, P.B. et al. (2017) Darwin was right: Where now for experimental evolution? *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* 47, 102-109.
9. Martin, M. et al. (2016) Laboratory evolution of microbial interactions in bacterial biofilms. *J. Bacteriol.* 198 (19), 2564-2571.
10. Bruger, E.L. and Marx, C.J. (2018) A decade of genome sequencing has revolutionized studies of experimental evolution. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* 45, 149-155.
11. Hoang, K.L. et al. (2016) Experimental evolution as an underutilized tool for studying beneficial animal-microbe interactions. *Front. Microbiol.* 7, 1444.
12. Blount, Z.D. et al. (2018) Contingency and determinism in evolution: Replaying life's tape. *Science* 362 (6415), eaam5979.
13. Inukai, S. et al. (2017) Transcription factor-DNA binding: Beyond binding site motifs. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* 43, 110-119.
14. Mortlock, R.P. (1982) Metabolic acquisitions through laboratory selection. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 36, 259-284.
15. Clarke, P.H. and Drew, R. (1988) An experiment in enzyme evolution. Studies with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* amidase. *Bioscience Rep.* 8 (2), 103-120.
16. Hall, B.G. and Clarke, N.D. (1977) Regulation of newly evolved enzymes. III Evolution of *ebg* repressor during selection for enhanced lactase activity. *Genetics* 85 (2), 193-201.
17. Fiegna, F. et al. (2006) Evolution of an obligate social cheater to a superior cooperator. *Nature* 441 (7091), 310-314.
18. Yu, Y.T.N. et al. (2010) Adaptive evolution of an sRNA that controls *Myxococcus* development. *Science* 328 (5981), 993-993.
19. Lapouge, K. et al. (2008) Gac/Rsm signal transduction pathway of gamma-proteobacteria: from RNA recognition to regulation of social behaviour. *Mol. Microbiol.* 67 (2), 241-253.
20. Beaumont, H.J.E. et al. (2009) Experimental evolution of bet hedging. *Nature* 462 (7269), 90-93.
21. Gallie, J. et al. (2015) Bistability in a metabolic network underpins the de novo evolution of colony switching in *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. *PLoS Biol.* 13 (3), e1002109.
22. Remigi, P. et al. (2018) Ribosome provisioning activates a bistable switch coupled to fast exit from stationary phase. [bioRxiv. doi.org/10.1101/244129](https://doi.org/10.1101/244129)
23. Yona, A.H. et al. (2018) Random sequences rapidly evolve into de novo promoters. *Nat. Commun.* 9, 1530.

24. Wade, J.T. and Grainger, D.C. (2014) Pervasive transcription: Illuminating the dark matter of bacterial transcriptomes. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 12 (9), 647-653.
25. Taylor, T.B. et al. (2015) Evolutionary resurrection of flagellar motility via rewiring of the nitrogen regulation system. *Science* 347 (6225), 1014-1017.
26. Raser, J.M. and O'Shea, E.K. (2005) Noise in gene expression: Origins, consequences, and control. *Science* 309 (5743), 2010-2013.
27. Wolf, L. et al. (2015) Expression noise facilitates the evolution of gene regulation. *eLife* 4, e05856.
28. Sorrells, T.R. and Johnson, A.D. (2015) Making sense of transcription networks. *Cell* 161 (4), 714-723.
29. Stoebel, D.M. et al. (2009) Compensatory evolution of gene regulation in response to stress by *Escherichia coli* lacking RpoS. *PLoS Genet.* 5 (10), e1000671.
30. Carroll, S.M. and Marx, C.J. (2013) Evolution after introduction of a novel metabolic pathway consistently leads to restoration of wild-type physiology. *PLoS Genet.* 9 (4), e1003427.
31. Rodriguez-Verdugo, A. et al. (2016) First-step mutations during adaptation restore the expression of hundreds of genes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 33 (1), 25-39.
32. McCloskey, D. et al. (2018) Evolution of gene knockout strains of *E. coli* reveal regulatory architectures governed by metabolism. *Nat. Commun.* 9, 3796.
33. Ni, B. et al. (2017) Evolutionary remodeling of bacterial motility checkpoint control. *Cell Rep.* 18 (4), 866-877.
34. Treffers, H.P. et al. (1954) A factor (or mutator gene) influencing mutation rates in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 40 (11), 1064-1071.
35. Gullberg, E. et al. (2011) Selection of resistant bacteria at very low antibiotic concentrations. *PLoS Pathog.* 7 (7), e1002158.
36. Gutierrez, A. et al. (2013) β -lactam antibiotics promote bacterial mutagenesis via an RpoS-mediated reduction in replication fidelity. *Nat. Commun.* 4, 1610.
37. Lopez, E. and Blazquez, J. (2009) Effect of subinhibitory concentrations of antibiotics on intrachromosomal homologous recombination in *Escherichia coli*. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 53 (8), 3411-3415.
38. Lindsey, H.A. et al. (2013) Evolutionary rescue from extinction is contingent on a lower rate of environmental change. *Nature* 494 (7438), 463-467.
39. Wistrand-Yuen, E. et al. (2018) Evolution of high-level resistance during low-level antibiotic exposure. *Nat. Commun.* 9, 1599.
40. Mathieu, A. et al. (2016) Discovery and function of a general core hormetic stress response in *E. coli* Induced by sublethal concentrations of antibiotics. *Cell Rep.* 17 (1), 46-57.
41. Girgis, H.S. et al. (2009) Genetic architecture of intrinsic antibiotic susceptibility. *PLoS One* 4 (5), e5629.
42. Lazar, V. et al. (2013) Bacterial evolution of antibiotic hypersensitivity. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 9, 700.
43. Kim, S. et al. (2014) Alternating antibiotic treatments constrain evolutionary paths to multidrug resistance. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 111 (40), 14494-14499.
44. Imamovic, L. and Sommer, M.O.A. (2013) Use of collateral sensitivity networks to design drug cycling protocols that avoid resistance development. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 5, 204ra132.
45. Lazar, V. et al. (2014) Genome-wide analysis captures the determinants of the antibiotic cross-resistance interaction network. *Nat. Commun.* 5, 4352.
46. Oz, T. et al. (2014) Strength of selection pressure is an important parameter contributing to the complexity of antibiotic resistance evolution. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31 (9), 2387-2401.
47. Nichol, D. et al. (2019) Antibiotic collateral sensitivity is contingent on the repeatability of evolution. *Nat. Commun.* 10 (1), 334.
48. Reynolds, M.G. (2000) Compensatory evolution in rifampin-resistant *Escherichia coli*. *Genetics* 156 (4), 1471-1481.
49. Nguyen, T.N.M. et al. (1989) Effects of carriage and expression of the Tn10 tetracycline-resistance operon on the fitness of *Escherichia coli* K12. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 6 (3), 213-225.

50. Brandis, G. et al. (2012) Fitness-compensatory mutations in rifampicin-resistant RNA polymerase. *Mol. Microbiol.* 85 (1), 142-151.
51. Gagneux, S. et al. (2006) The competitive cost of antibiotic resistance in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *Science* 312 (5782), 1944-1946.
52. Comas, I. et al. (2012) Whole-genome sequencing of rifampicin-resistant *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* strains identifies compensatory mutations in RNA polymerase genes. *Nat. Genet.* 44 (1), 106-110.
53. Marcusson, L.L. et al. (2009) Interplay in the selection of fluoroquinolone resistance and bacterial fitness. *PLoS Pathog.* 5 (8), e1000541.
54. Luo, N.D. et al. (2005) Enhanced in vivo fitness of fluoroquinolone-resistant *Campylobacter jejuni* in the absence of antibiotic selection pressure. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 102 (3), 541-546.
55. Roux, D. et al. (2015) Fitness cost of antibiotic susceptibility during bacterial infection. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 7, 297ra114.
56. de Sousa, J.M. et al. (2015) Potential for adaptation overrides cost of resistance. *Future Microbiol.* 10 (9), 1415-1431.
57. Weinreich, D.M. et al. (2006) Darwinian evolution can follow only very few mutational paths to fitter proteins. *Science* 312 (5770), 111-114.
58. Toprak, E. et al. (2011) Evolutionary paths to antibiotic resistance under dynamically sustained drug selection. *Nat. Genet.* 44, 101-105.
59. Trindade, S. et al. (2009) Positive epistasis drives the acquisition of multidrug resistance. *PLoS Genet.* 5 (7), e1000578.
60. Jochumsen, N. et al. (2016) The evolution of antimicrobial peptide resistance in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is shaped by strong epistatic interactions. *Nat. Commun.* 7, 13002.
61. de Sousa, J.M. et al. (2017) Multidrug-resistant bacteria compensate for the epistasis between resistances. *PLoS Biol.* 15 (4), e2001741.
62. Bai, Y. et al. (2015) Functional overlap of the *Arabidopsis* leaf and root microbiota. *Nature* 528, 364-369.
63. Huttenhower, C. et al. (2012) Structure, function and diversity of the healthy human microbiome. *Nature* 486 (7402), 207-214.
64. McAdams, H.H. et al. (2004) The evolution of genetic regulatory systems in bacteria. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 5 (3), 169-178.
65. Ebert, D. (1998) Experimental evolution of parasites. *Science* 282 (5393), 1432-1435.
66. Guidot, A. et al. (2014) Multihost experimental evolution of the pathogen *Ralstonia solanacearum* unveils genes involved in adaptation to plants. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31 (11), 2913-2928.
67. Perrier, A. et al. (2016) Enhanced in planta fitness through adaptive mutations in EfpR, a dual regulator of virulence and metabolic functions in the plant pathogen *Ralstonia solanacearum*. *PLoS Pathog.* 12 (12), e1006044.
68. Capela, D. et al. (2017) Recruitment of a lineage-specific virulence regulatory pathway promotes intracellular infection by a plant pathogen experimentally evolved into a legume symbiont. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 34 (10), 2503-2521.
69. Genin, S. and Denny, T.P. (2012) Pathogenomics of the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 50, 67-89.
70. Dobrindt, U. et al. (2004) Genomic islands in pathogenic and environmental microorganisms. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 2 (5), 414-424.
71. Ochman, H. and Moran, N.A. (2001) Genes lost and genes found: Evolution of bacterial pathogenesis and symbiosis. *Science* 292 (5519), 1096-1098.
72. Lercher, M.J. and Pál, C. (2008) Integration of horizontally transferred genes into regulatory interaction networks takes many million years. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 25 (3), 559-67.
73. Remigi, P. et al. (2016) Symbiosis within ymbiosis: Evolving nitrogen-fixing legume symbionts. *Trends Microbiol.* 24 (1), 63-75.
74. Masson-Boivin, C. and Sachs, J.L. (2018) Symbiotic nitrogen fixation by rhizobia-the roots of a success story. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.* 44, 7-15.

75. Marchetti, M. et al. (2010) Experimental evolution of a plant pathogen into a legume symbiont. *PLoS Biol.* 8 (1), e1000280.
76. Guan, S.H. et al. (2013) Experimental evolution of nodule intracellular infection in legume symbionts. *ISME J.* 7 (7), 1367-1377.
77. Marchetti, M. et al. (2014) Shaping bacterial symbiosis with legumes by experimental evolution. *Mol. Plant Microbe Interact.* 27 (9), 956-964.
78. Remigi, P. et al. (2014) Transient hypermutagenesis accelerates the evolution of legume endosymbionts following horizontal gene transfer. *PLoS Biol.* 12 (9), e1001942.
79. Daubech, B. et al. (2017) Spatio-temporal control of mutualism in legumes helps spread symbiotic nitrogen fixation. *eLife* 6, e28683.
80. Garcia-Bayona, L. and Comstock, L.E. (2018) Bacterial antagonism in host-associated microbial communities. *Science* 361 (6408), eaat2456.
81. King, K.C. et al. (2016) Rapid evolution of microbe-mediated protection against pathogens in a worm host. *ISME J.* 10 (8), 1915-1924.
82. Ford, S.A. et al. (2016) Microbe-mediated host defence drives the evolution of reduced pathogen virulence. *Nat. Commun.* 7, 13430.
83. Yi, X. (2017) Experimental evolution and proximate mechanisms in biology. *Synth. Syst. Biotechnol.* 2 (4), 253-258.
84. Phaneuf, P.V. et al. (2019) ALEdb 1.0: a database of mutations from adaptive laboratory evolution experimentation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 47(D1), D1164-D1171.
85. Rotem, A. et al. (2018) Evolution on the biophysical fitness landscape of an RNA virus. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 35 (10), 2390-2400.
86. Cottinet, D. et al. (2016) Lineage tracking for probing heritable phenotypes at single-cell resolution. *PLoS One* 11 (4), e0152395.
87. Upson, J.L. et al. (2018) The coming of age of EvoMPMI: evolutionary molecular plant-microbe interactions across multiple timescales. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.* 44, 108-116.
88. Dean, A.M. and Thornton, J.W. (2007) Mechanistic approaches to the study of evolution: the functional synthesis. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 8 (9), 675-688.
89. Alizon, S. and Methot, P.O. (2018) Reconciling Pasteur and Darwin to control infectious diseases. *PLoS Biol.* 16 (1), e2003815.
90. Cooper, V.S. (2018) Experimental evolution as a high-throughput screen for genetic adaptations. *MSphere* 3 (3), e00121-18.
91. Wannier, T.M. et al. (2018) Adaptive evolution of genomically recoded *Escherichia coli*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 115 (12), 3090-3095.
92. Kacar, B. et al. (2017) Experimental evolution of *Escherichia coli* harboring an ancient translation protein. *J. Mol. Evol.* 84 (2-3), 69-84.
93. Gifford, D.R. et al. (2018) Identifying and exploiting genes that potentiate the evolution of antibiotic resistance. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 2 (6), 1033-1039.
94. Hillesland, K.L. and Stahl, D.A. (2010) Rapid evolution of stability and productivity at the origin of a microbial mutualism. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 107 (5), 2124-2129.
95. Hansen, S.K. et al. (2007) Evolution of species interactions in a biofilm community. *Nature* 445 (7127), 533-536.
96. Barroso-Batista, J. et al. (2015) Adaptive immunity increases the pace and predictability of evolutionary change in commensal gut bacteria. *Nat. Commun.* 6, 8945.
97. Lenski, R.E. et al. (1991) Long-term experimental evolution in *Escherichia coli*. 1. Adaptation and divergence during 2,000 generations. *Am. Nat.* 138 (6), 1315-1341.
98. Notley-McRobb, L. et al. (2002) *rpoS* mutations and loss of general stress resistance in *Escherichia coli* populations as a consequence of conflict between competing stress responses. *J. Bacteriol.* 184 (3), 806-811.
99. Rainey, P.B. and Travisano, M. (1998) Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment. *Nature* 394 (6688), 69-72.

100. Traverse, C.C. et al. (2013) Tangled bank of experimentally evolved *Burkholderia* biofilms reflects selection during chronic infections. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110 (3), E250-E259.
101. Bachmann, H. et al. (2013) Availability of public goods shapes the evolution of competing metabolic strategies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110 (35), 14302-14307.
102. Hammerschmidt, K. et al. (2014) Life cycles, fitness decoupling and the evolution of multicellularity. *Nature* 515 (7525), 75-79.
103. Chao, L. and Levin, B.R. (1981) Structured habitats and the evolution of anticompetitor toxins in bacteria. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 78 (10), 6324-6328.
104. Baym, M. et al. (2016) Spatiotemporal microbial evolution on antibiotic landscapes. *Science* 353 (6304), 1147-1151.
105. Jansen, G. et al. (2015) Evolutionary transition from pathogenicity to commensalism: Global regulator mutations mediate fitness gains through virulence attenuation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32 (11), 2883-2896.
106. Giraud, A. et al. (2001) Costs and benefits of high mutation rates: Adaptive evolution of bacteria in the mouse gut. *Science* 291 (5513), 2606-2608.
107. Pankey, M.S. et al. (2017) Host-selected mutations converging on a global regulator drive an adaptive leap towards symbiosis in bacteria. *eLife* 6, e24414.
108. Rocha, E.P.C. (2018) Neutral theory, microbial practice: Challenges in bacterial population genetics. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 35 (6), 1338-1347.
109. Maddamsetti, R. et al. (2017) Core genes evolve rapidly in the Long-Term Evolution Experiment with *Escherichia coli*. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 9 (4), 1072-1083.
110. Lescat, M. et al. (2017) Using long-term experimental evolution to uncover the patterns and determinants of molecular evolution of an *Escherichia coli* natural isolate in the streptomycin-treated mouse gut. *Mol. Ecol.* 26 (7), 1802-1817.
111. Yang, L. et al. (2011) Evolutionary dynamics of bacteria in a human host environment. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 108 (18), 7481-7486.
112. Behe, M.J. (2010) Experimental evolution, loss-of-function mutations, and "the first rule of adaptive evolution". *Q. Rev. Biol.* 85 (4), 419-445.
113. Pal, C. et al. (2007) Coevolution with viruses drives the evolution of bacterial mutation rates. *Nature* 450 (7172), 1079-1081.
114. Gomez, P. and Buckling, A. (2013) Coevolution with phages does not influence the evolution of bacterial mutation rates in soil. *ISME J.* 7 (11), 2242-2244.
115. Rendueles, O. and Velicer, G.J. (2017) Evolution by flight and fight: diverse mechanisms of adaptation by actively motile microbes. *ISME J.* 11 (2), 555-568.
116. Huseby, D.L. et al. (2017) Mutation supply and relative fitness shape the genotypes of ciprofloxacin-resistant *Escherichia coli*. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 34 (5), 1029-1039.
117. Bachmann, H. et al. (2012) Microbial domestication signatures of *Lactococcus lactis* can be reproduced by experimental evolution. *Genome Res.* 22 (1), 115-124.
118. Clerissi, C. et al. (2018) Parallels between experimental and natural evolution of legume symbionts. *Nat. Commun.* 9, 2264.

Figure 1 (revised)

Figure 2 (revised)

Figure 1 for Box 1 (revised)

Highlights

- **Experimental evolution (EE)** can complement traditional molecular genetic studies on microbial systems.
- The diversity of EE approaches enabled progresses in many fields of microbiology, including molecular mechanisms of gene regulation, antibiotic resistance, and host-microbiome interactions.
- Under specific conditions, EE can parallel the evolution of natural systems.
- EE offers exciting perspectives to discover the function of new genes and probe evolution within communities.

Outstanding questions:

- Can we exploit mutations found in EE to characterise genes of unknown function?
- Can EE enlighten mechanisms slowing down the evolution of resistances?
- Can the EE of microbial communities bring new insights into their functional characteristics?
- Can we use within-host EE to identify host factors (and other environmental factors) shaping bacterial evolutionary trajectories **during infection**?
- Can EE reproduce the emergence of major intracellular symbiotic associations (**such as** mitochondria in eukaryotic cells, plastids in the green lineage, association between fungi and land plants, obligate endosymbionts of insects)?