

## Emergence and global spread of Listeria monocytogenes main clinical clonal complex

Alexandra Moura, Noémie Lefrancq, Alexandre Leclercq, Thierry Wirth, Vítor Borges, Brent Gilpin, Timothy J. Dallman, Joachim Frey, Eelco Franz, Eva M. Nielsen, et al.

## ▶ To cite this version:

Alexandra Moura, Noémie Lefrancq, Alexandre Leclercq, Thierry Wirth, Vítor Borges, et al.. Emergence and global spread of Listeria monocytogenes main clinical clonal complex. 2020. pasteur-03696138v1

## HAL Id: pasteur-03696138 https://pasteur.hal.science/pasteur-03696138v1

Preprint submitted on 10 Jun 2021 (v1), last revised 15 Jun 2022 (v2)

**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.

## 1 Emergence and global spread of *Listeria monocytogenes* main clinical clonal complex

2

## 3 Alexandra Moura<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Noémie Lefrancq<sup>4,†</sup>, Alexandre Leclercq<sup>1,2</sup>, Thierry Wirth<sup>5,6</sup>, Vítor Borges<sup>7</sup>,

4 Brent Gilpin<sup>8</sup>, Timothy J. Dallman<sup>9</sup>, Joachim Frey<sup>10</sup>, Eelco Franz<sup>11</sup>, Eva M. Nielsen<sup>12</sup>, Juno Thomas<sup>13</sup>,

5 Arthur Pightling<sup>14</sup>, Benjamin P. Howden<sup>15</sup>, Cheryl L. Tarr<sup>16</sup>, Peter Gerner-Smidt<sup>16</sup>, Simon

- 6 Cauchemez<sup>4</sup>, Henrik Salje<sup>4,†,#</sup>, Sylvain Brisse<sup>17,#</sup>, Marc Lecuit<sup>1,2,3,18,#,\*</sup> for the *Listeria* CC1 Study
- 7 Group
- 8
- <sup>9</sup> <sup>1</sup> Institut Pasteur, Biology of Infection Unit, Paris, France
- <sup>2</sup> Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Centre and WHO Collaborating Centre *Listeria*, Paris, France
- <sup>3</sup> Inserm U1117, Paris, France
- <sup>4</sup> Institut Pasteur, Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases Unit, UMR2000, CNRS, Paris, France.
- <sup>5</sup> Institut Systématique Evolution Biodiversité (ISYEB), Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, CNRS,
- 14 Sorbonne Université, Université des Antilles, EPHE, Paris, France
- <sup>6</sup> PSL University, EPHE, Paris, France
- <sup>7</sup> National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge, Department of Infectious Diseases, Lisbon, Portugal
- <sup>8</sup> Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited, Christchurch Science Centre, Christchurch,
   New Zealand
- <sup>9</sup> Public Health England, London, UK
- 20 <sup>10</sup> Vetsuisse, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
- 21 <sup>11</sup>National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Centre for Infectious Disease Control,
- 22 Bilthoven, Netherland
- 23 <sup>12</sup> Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark
- <sup>13</sup> National Institute for Communicable Diseases, Division of the National Health Laboratory Service,
- 25 Johannesburg, South Africa
- <sup>14</sup> Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, U.S. Food and Drug
- 27 Administration, College Park, Maryland, United States
- <sup>15</sup> Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory, Department of Microbiology and
- 29 Immunology, The Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, University of Melbourne, Victoria,
- 30 Australia; Infectious Diseases Department, Austin Health, Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia
- <sup>16</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States
- <sup>17</sup> Institut Pasteur, Biodiversity and Epidemiology of Bacterial Pathogens Unit, Paris, France
- <sup>18</sup> Université de Paris, Necker-Enfants Malades University Hospital, Division of Infectious Diseases and
- 34 Tropical Medicine, Institut Imagine, APHP, Paris, France
- 35
- <sup>†</sup>Current address: Department of Genetics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
- 37 # Shared senior authorship
- 38 \* Correspondence: amoura@pasteur.fr; marc.lecuit@pasteur.fr

## 39 Abstract

Retracing microbial emergence and spread is essential to understanding the evolution and 40 dynamics of pathogens. The bacterial foodborne pathogen Listeria monocytogenes clonal 41 complex 1 (Lm-CC1) is the most prevalent clonal group associated with listeriosis, and is 42 strongly associated with cattle and dairy products. Here we analysed 2,021 Lm-CC1 43 isolates collected from 40 countries, since the first Lm isolation to the present day, to 44 define its evolutionary history and population dynamics. Our results suggest that *Lm*-CC1 45 spread worldwide from North America following the Industrial Revolution through two 46 47 waves of expansion, coinciding with the transatlantic livestock trade in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the rapid growth of cattle farming in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Lm*-CC1 then 48 firmly established at a local level, with limited inter-country spread. This study provides 49 an unprecedented insight into Lm-CC1 phylogeography and dynamics and can contribute 50 to effective disease surveillance to reduce the burden of listeriosis. 51

Listeria monocytogenes (Lm) is a foodborne bacterial zoonotic pathogen that can 52 cause listeriosis, a severe infection with a high case-fatality rate in immunocompromised 53 individuals<sup>1,2</sup>. Molecular studies have shown the clonal population structure of  $Lm^{3,4}$  and 54 the worldwide distribution of clonal complex 1 (Lm-CC1, initially called epidemic clone 55 ECI<sup>5,6</sup>), a serotype 4b cosmopolitan clonal group defined by multilocus sequence typing 56 (MLST), which was first isolated from an Italian soldier with meningitis during the first 57 world war (WWI)<sup>7,8</sup>. Interestingly, *Lm*-CC1 has been reported as the most prevalent 58 clinical clonal complex in several countries<sup>9-14</sup>, and data collected on NCBI Sequence 59 Read Archive also support this conclusion (Supplementary Figure S1). 60

While there is no inter-human transmission of listeriosis, it was only in the mid 61 1980's that the foodborne origin of human listeriosis was formally proven<sup>15</sup>. Since then, 62 *Lm*-CC1 has been reported in different food matrixes, including dairy products<sup>16-18</sup> which 63 can be heavily contaminated<sup>19</sup> and constitute a major source of human listeriosis<sup>20,21</sup>. 64 Previous studies have also demonstrated the hypervirulence of *Lm*-CC1<sup>9</sup>, and its higher 65 efficiency in gut colonization and fecal shedding, compared to hypovirulent Lm 66 clones  $^{16,17,22,23}$ . Moreover, increasing evidence suggests that cattle, which are frequent Lm 67 asymptomatic carriers<sup>24–28</sup> and contribute to Lm enrichment in soils<sup>25</sup>, may constitute a 68 reservoir for Lm-CC1. In addition to Lm subclinical infections that may contaminate 69 milk<sup>23,26</sup>, the long-term persistence of Lm in cattle manure-amended soils<sup>29</sup> also poses 70 serious risks of transmission to fresh produce. 71

Understanding the global evolution of Lm-CC1, which is now spread over all continents<sup>6</sup>, as well as its emergence and dissemination across different spatial levels is critical to understand Lm population dynamics and to develop better control strategies, especially in countries with ageing and/or immunosuppressed populations who are most at risk for severe infection. However the complex movement of livestock and food

products associated with asymptomatic intestinal colonization complicates traditional
epidemiological investigations aimed to decipher *Lm* epidemiology by linking isolates in
space and time.

Here we took a population biology approach to fill this knowledge gap and conducted the largest genomic *Lm*-CC1 study to date, combining genomic and evolutionary approaches to decipher its evolutionary history and pattern of emergence and spread.

84

## 85 **Results**

*Lm*-CC1 is composed of 3 sublineages of uneven prevalence. We analyzed 2,021 genomes, including 1,230 newly sequenced isolates, originating from 40 countries in 6 continents and diverse sources (Figure 1a; Supplementary Table S1). We covered a time span of 98 years, from the first *Lm* isolation to the present time (1921-2018), and included all contemporary clinical isolates collected between 2012 and mid-2017 within the surveillance framework of 7 countries over 3 continents (Figure 1a,b).

*Lm*-CC1 genome sizes ranged from 2.77 to 3.25 Mbp, with an average number of 92 2,879±77 coding sequences and G+C content of 37.7-38.3% (Supplementary Figure 93 S2). On the basis of  $MLST^4$ , 58 sequence types (STs) could be distinguished, with ST1 94 representing 91% (n=1838) of isolates. On the basis of core genome MLST (cgMLST)<sup>30</sup>, 95 we identified within Lm-CC1 867 cgMLST types, 92% of which were country-specific 96 (Supplementary Figure S3). Rarefaction analysis based on cgMLST resampling did not 97 reach an asymptote (Supplementary Figure S3), indicating that despite the high number 98 of sequences obtained in this study, a significant amount of Lm-CC1 diversity remains 99 undetected. 100

To better understand the phylogenetic diversity of *Lm*-CC1, we built maximum 101 likelihood phylogenies and identified 3 sublineages (SL1, SL404 and SL150, named 102 based on their smallest ST number). These sublineages have highly uneven frequency 103 (Figure 1c,d; Supplementary Figure S4), with SL1 (n=2002, isolated worldwide) 104 representing 99.1% of the isolates, while 0.1% are SL404 (n=2, found in Europe and 105 North America) and 0.8% represent SL150 (n=17, found in North America, Africa and 106 Asia). Within SL1, we further identified 8 distinct genetic clades, which we named GC1 107 to GC8 by decreasing prevalence (Figure 1; Supplementary Figure S4). The average 108 genetic distance was 1166±134 wgSNPs (and 478±20 cgMLST alleles) between Lm-CC1 109 sublineages, and 76±16 wgSNPs (and 40±9 cgMLST alleles) within SL1 clades 110 (Supplementary Table S2; Supplementary Figure S5). The finding that SL1 is by far 111 the major sublineage in Lm-CC1 is consistent with either its increased virulence and/or 112 transmission or that SL404 and SL150 are restricted to some yet unknown ecological 113 niches. Within SL1, all different genetic clades were well represented, with strong spatial 114 structure: GC1 is the most prevalent clade in Europe (48%, 593/1237), Asia (68%, 17/25) 115 and South America (64%, 14/22); GC2 is the most prevalent clade in North America 116 (29%, 150/512) and Oceania (52%, 84/163), while GC3 is the most prevalent clade in 117 Africa (80%, 43/54) (Figure 1e; Supplementary Figure S6). 118

119

The *Lm*-CC1 pangenome is diverse. Analysis of *Lm*-CC1 pangenome identified 10,789 orthologous coding sequences (BlastP identity cut-off of  $\geq$ 95%), 2,649 of which (92% of the average isolate genome content) present in at least 95% of isolates (core genome) (**Supplementary Figure S7**). The accessory genome included 8,140 gene families, of which 2,844 (35%) were unique to one isolate, and was enriched in transcription, replication/repair and cell wall functions, as well as in gene families of unknown function

(Supplementary Figure S7). Plasmids were present in 6% (120/2021) of isolates, and 126 were more prevalent in GC7 (83%, Supplementary Figure S7). Intact prophages were 127 present in 62% isolates (1263/2021), and were distributed across the breadth of CC1 128 phylogeny, except in SL404 (Supplementary Figure S7). In contrast to Listeria 129 pathogenic islands LIPI-1<sup>31</sup> and LIPI-3<sup>32</sup> which were present in all isolates, the *Listeria* 130 genomic island LGI2-1<sup>33</sup>, previously identified in CC1 isolates encoding resistance to 131 cadmium and arsenic, was present in 14% (277/2021) isolates and only in GC3 (80%, 132 225/283), GC5 (60%, 38/63) and SL150 (82%, 14/17; Supplementary Figure S7). 133 Sublineage-specific genes were detected (n=81; Supplementary Tables S3 and S4) and 134 pangenome-wide association analyses identified 24 genes that are associated with a 135 clinical origin (Supplementary Table S5). The impact of these traits on isolates' 136 differential ecology or virulence remains to be studied, yet the presence of human isolates 137 in all sublineages and clades shows that pathogenic isolates are not restricted to a specific 138 *Lm*-CC1 clade. 139

140

Emergence and worldwide spread of *Lm*-CC1 main sublineage (SL1) occurred in the 141 last 200 years. To understand Lm-CC1 evolution and spread, we performed temporal and 142 phylogeographic analyses on a subset of 200 genomes representative of Lm-CC1 genetic 143 and geographic diversity using BEAST<sup>34</sup>, and on the full dated dataset (1.972 Lm-CC1 144 genomes) using Treedater<sup>35</sup> (Supplementary Figures S8 and S9) and PastML<sup>36</sup>, under 145 an uncorrelated relaxed clock model (see Material and Methods for details). We estimate 146 a core genome substitution rate of 1.95x10<sup>-7</sup> substitutions/site/year (95% CI: 1.75x10<sup>-7</sup>-147  $2.15 \times 10^{-7}$ ; Supplementary Figure S8), consistent with previous findings<sup>30</sup>. We estimate 148 that Lm-CC1 originated about 1,800 years ago (date: 197 AD; 95% CI: 860 BC - 1045 149 AD; Figure 2b) and infer that its last common ancestor evolved in North America 150

(Supplementary Figure S10), long before European colonization and the introduction of 151 cattle in the Americas at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century<sup>37</sup>. Even though the low number of 152 genomes available for Asia, Africa and South America could bias this estimation, the 153 estimated origin was also supported by the measures of population variability, which 154 showed higher genetic diversity within North America (Supplementary Figure S5; 155 Supplementary Table S2), and by the basal position of North American Lm-CC1 156 isolates in the phylogeny (Figure 2b, Supplementary Figure S10). Whether Bison bison 157 populations, which are phylogenetically and ecologically related to bovine and dominated 158 North American prairies prior to colonization by the Europeans and their livestock, 159 played a role in its dispersion remains unknown. 160

Demographic analyses performed using the Bayesian Skyline Plot method<sup>38</sup> 161 (Figure 2a) show that *Lm*-CC1 effective population size was stable up to the middle of 162 the 19<sup>th</sup> century, followed by two waves of expansion: the first in the late 1880s and the 163 second in the 1930s, coinciding with the first and second ages of globalization, 164 respectively. Tajima's D statistic<sup>39</sup> also supported a recent CC1 population expansion and 165 SL1 emergence (D<0; Supplementary Table S2). SL1 emerged in North America 166 approximately 160 years ago (date: 1859, 95% CI: 1821-1889), thus closely following the 167 start of the Industrial Revolution (Figure 3). The first SL1 introductions into Europe 168 occurred around 1868 (GC6/GC8 ancestor, 95% CI: 1827-1890), 1871 (GC3/GC7 169 ancestor, 95% CI: 1838-1905) and 1889 (GC2, 95% CI: 1852-1909), concomitant with 170 the 1870 North Atlantic Meat trade agreement<sup>40</sup>. Under this agreement, surplus cattle in 171 North America were shipped to Europe, which had experienced severe livestock 172 shortages due to widespread disease outbreaks (contagious bovine pleuropneumonia and 173 foot and mouth disease), leading to an unprecedented man-made 1000-fold increase in 174 cattle movement From North America to Europe<sup>41</sup>. Within the same period, intra-175

continental diversification also took place, likely driven by cattle movements across
North America and railway expansion in North America and Europe. The first SL1
introductions that occurred in Oceania (1903, GC2) followed the 'Great Drought' of
1895-1903, which severely affected livestock<sup>42</sup>.

In the following decades and after WWI, multiple CC1 introductions continued 180 from North America into Europe (GC1, GC4, GC5 and GC8) and Asia (GC3) and from 181 Europe to Africa (GC3) (Figure 3a-b). The rate of intercontinental bacterial movement 182 declined after 1930s (Figure 3c), concomitant with the protectionist trade policies that 183 followed the 'Great Depression', which led to a sharp reduction of livestock exports from 184 the USA during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century<sup>43</sup>. A second wave of SL1 expansion 185 occurred after this period, likely driven by a new increase in intercontinental movements 186 favoured by the industrialization of food production and globalization of the food and 187 cattle trades (Figures 2a; Supplementary Figure S11). Other important human 188 pathogens that have a zoonotic reservoir such as Escherichia coli O157:H7<sup>44</sup> and 189 Campylobacter jejuni ST6145, have been estimated to have most recent common 190 ancestors (MRCA) at similar times and to have undergone population expansions in the 191 context of animal trade or intensive cattle farming, respectively. 192

A stabilization and relative decline of Lm-CC1 population is observed after 1984 (Figure 2a), coincident with the major advances in infectious diseases' prevention in dairy cattle<sup>46</sup> and with the relative decrease of the dairy cattle population in Western countries, in particular Europe (**Supplementary Figure S11**). It also coincides with the time when human listeriosis foodborne origin was formally proven<sup>15</sup>, which led to the implementation of surveillance programs in North America and Europe<sup>47–50</sup>, in particular in the dairy sector following cheese and milk related Lm-CC1 outbreaks<sup>51</sup>. Whether these findings can be observed in other dairy-associated L. monocytogenes clonal complexes,

such as CC6 (lineage I) or CC37 and CC101 (lineage II)<sup>17,52</sup> will deserve future studies.

202

Recent SL1 transmission chains are mostly local. To further analyze more recent strain 203 transmission dynamics, we compared the genetic diversity of SL1 isolates from 2010-204 2018 (n=1,266) across different spatial scales. To avoid oversampling isolates from 205 outbreak investigations, we excluded all non-clinical isolates from confirmed outbreaks 206 (n=91 isolates from 19 outbreaks). We find that pairs of isolates present within the same 207 2-year period and the same country are 18.7 times (95% CI: 4.7-190.7) more likely to 208 have their MRCA within the past 5 years than pairs of isolates coming from other intra-209 continental countries >1,000 km apart (Figure 4a). Furthermore, we observe no 210 difference in the probability of having a recent MRCA in isolates coming from nearby 211 intracontinental countries (<1,000km) than from further apart. Isolates coming from 212 different continents are about 100 times less likely to have an MRCA within the past 5 213 years (0.2; 95% CI: 0.01-2.9) than isolates from the same countries (18.7; 95% CI: 4.7-214 190.7) (Figure 4a). This strong local spatial structure persists for very long time periods, 215 with complete mixing of isolates within a continent appearing only after 50 years (Figure 216 4a). At a finer spatial scale, available for France ("départements", sub-regional 217 administrative division in France, Supplementary Figure S12), a strong local spatial 218 structure is also evident, with the proportion of genetically close pairs of clinical cases 219 being higher between isolates coming from the same French department (4.4%, 95% 220 CI: 1%-10.6%) than between isolates coming from different departments (0.2%, 95% CI 221 0.04%-0.5%), with no effect of distance between them (Figure 4b). As expected, in 222 densely urban areas with no farming, such as the city of Paris, clinical strains are 223 significantly less likely to share a recent MRCA than in rural areas or other departments 224

(0.0%, 95% CI: 0.0%-4.4% vs. 3.9%, 95% CI: 1.0%-9.5%) (Figure 4c). This result is
consistent with urban infections being driven by unrelated *Lm* introductions originating
from across the country. Spatial dependence between French isolates persists for 20 years
(Supplementary Figure S13), with on average 20 (1/0.05) different sources of human
infection present at any one time per department (Figure 4b).

230

## 231 Discussion

Understanding pathogen evolutionary history is essential to understand the population 232 233 dynamics and biodiversity of microbial infectious agents, and for effective disease surveillance. Here, we have shown that Lm-CC1 has spread worldwide following the 234 Industrial Revolution, and that genotypes are now firmly established at a local level, with 235 decades-long localized persistence. These results are consistent with the establishment of 236 separate, locally entrenched sources of Lm-CC1 with limited flow of bacteria either 237 within or between countries, in line with cgMLST analyses in which 92% of clusters are 238 country-specific. 239

In the absence of inter-human transmission, this observation likely represents persistent infection sources, *i.e.* individual herds and/or production facilities, in which *Lm* can reside for several years<sup>28,53</sup>. Outbreak investigations performed at local scale, including in farm environments, would therefore likely improve the identification of contaminating sources, which remain unknown in about 80% of clusters of human cases<sup>54</sup>. Identifying and eradicating sources along the food chain, from the farm to the fork, could lead to significant long-term reductions in the transmission of the *Lm*-CC1.

The current scarcity of genomes available for Asia, Africa and South America, and from natural and animal reservoirs may overlook other CC1 clades and could have biased our phylogeographic analyses. Nevertheless, this study sheds unprecedented light

onto the evolutionary history, epidemiology and population dynamics of *Lm*-CC1. Similar approaches targeting other major globally distributed clonal complexes will allow clarifying their transmission dynamics and uncovering epidemiological specificities of *Lm* clones. Deciphering the dynamics and drivers of *Lm* sublineages across time and space will inform infection control policies and ultimately reduce the burden of listeriosis.

255

256 Methods

Bacterial isolates and genome sequencing. A total of 2,021 high quality Listeria 257 *monocytogenes* clonal complex 1 (CC1) genomes collected by this study group (n=1,230)258 and from NCBI repositories (n=791, as of 14 March 2018) were analyzed. These were 259 part of an initial dataset of 2,154 CC1 genomes, from which 133 were discarded due to 260 low sequencing coverage (<40X after read trimming, n=62) or low assembly quality 261  $(>200 \text{ contigs and/or N50}<20\text{Kb}, n=71)^{30}$ . The 2,021 isolates originated from human 262 (n=1.453; 72%) and animal hosts (n=44; 2%), food (n=387; 19%), food-processing 263 environments (n=88; 4%), feed (n=11; 0.5%), natural environments (n=11; 0.6%) or 264 from unknown sources (n=27; 1%) (Figure 1; Table S1). Isolates were sampled in 40 265 countries from 6 continents, between 1921 and 2018 (Figure 1; Table S1). Between 2012 266 and mid-2017, exhaustive sampling was obtained for 7 countries in 3 continents in the 267 context of listeriosis national surveillance programs in Australia (n=75), Denmark 268 (n=42), France (n=395), The Netherlands (n=53), New Zealand (n=34), the United 269 Kingdom (n=106) and the United States (n=317). Sequencing reads were obtained using 270 Illumina sequencing platforms (Illumina, San Diego, US) and 2x50 bp (n=110), 2x75 bp 271 (n=2), 2x100 bp (n=233), 2x125 bp (n=9), 2x150 bp (n=1,145), 2x250 bp (n=351), 272 2x300 bp (n=138) paired-end runs (**Table S1**). 273

Sequence analysis. Whole genome sequencing reads were available for 1,988 out of 275 2,021 isolates. Reads were trimmed from adapter sequences and non-confident bases 276 using AlienTrimmer v.0.4<sup>55</sup> (minimum read length of 30 bases and minimum quality 277 Phred score 20, i.e. 99% base call accuracy) and corrected with Musket v.1.1<sup>56</sup>, 278 implemented in fqCleaner v.3.0 (Alexis Criscuolo, Institut Pasteur). FastQC v.0.11.5<sup>57</sup> 279 was used to assess sequence quality before and after trimming. Assemblies were obtained 280 from paired-ended trimmed reads  $\geq$ 75 bp (*n*=1,878 isolates) by using SPAdes v.3.11.0<sup>58</sup> 281 with the automatic k-mer, --only-assembler and --careful options. For paired-ended 282 283 trimmed reads of 50 bp (n=111), assemblies were built using CLC Assembly Cell v.5.0.0 (Qiagen, Denmark), with estimated library insert sizes ranging from 50 to 850 bp. Contigs 284 smaller than 500 bp were discarded from both SPAdes and CLC generated assemblies. 285

286

Pangenome analysis. Gene prediction and annotation was carried out from the draft 287 assemblies using Prokka v.1.12<sup>59</sup>. Functional classification was carried out with EGGnog-288 mapper  $v2^{60}$  using DIAMOND (Double Index Alignment of Next-generation sequencing) 289  $Data)^{61}$ . The presence of plasmids, intact prophages and *Listeria* genomic regions was 290 inferred from the assemblies using MOB-suite v.2.0.1<sup>62</sup>, PHASTER (https://phaster.ca/)<sup>63</sup> 291 and BIGSdb-*Lm* (http://bigsdb.pasteur.fr/listeria/)<sup>30,64</sup>, respectively. Pangenome analyses 292 were carried out using Roary  $v.3.12^{65}$  with an amino acid identity cut-off of 95% and 293 splitting homologous groups containing paralogs into groups of true orthologs. Venn 294 diagrams were obtained using Venny 2.1 (Oliveros, 2007). Pangenome-wide association 295 analyses were performed using treeWAS v.1.0<sup>66</sup>, to control for phylogenetic structure, 296 using a significance threshold of  $p < 10^{-5}$ . 297

In silico molecular typing. PCR-serogrouping (5 loci)<sup>67</sup>, MLST (7 loci)<sup>4</sup> and cgMLST 299 (1748 loci)<sup>30</sup> profiles were extracted from draft assemblies using the BIGSdb-Lm 300 platform (http://bigsdb.pasteur.fr/listeria/) as previously described<sup>30</sup>. Profiles were 301 compared using the single linkage clustering method implemented in BioNumerics v.7.6 302 (Applied-Maths). cgMLST profiles were classified into cgMLST types (CT) and 303 sublineages (SL) using previous defined cut-offs (7 and 150 allelic mismatches, 304 respectively, out of 1748 loci)<sup>30</sup>. Rarefaction curves were computed with vegan v. 2.5-6<sup>68</sup> 305 package, estimated the rarefaction function (Joshua R with Jacobs. 306 joshuajacobs.org/R/rarefaction) using 100 random samples per point. 307

308

Phylogenetic analyses. Core genome multiple sequence alignments were built from the 1748 cgMLST loci concatenated sequences<sup>30</sup>. Briefly, individual allele sequences were translated into amino acids, aligned separately with MUSCLE v.3.8.31<sup>69</sup> and backtranslated into nucleotide sequence alignment. Concatenation of the 1748 loci alignments resulted in a multiple sequence alignment of 1.57 Mb.

In parallel, whole genome SNP (wgSNP)-based alignments were built from trimmed 314 reads **NCBI** assemblies the Snippy and using v.4.1.0 pipeline 315 (https://github.com/tseemann/snippy). The closed CC1 genome F2365 (accession no. 316 NC 002973.6), from the 1985 Canadian cheese outbreak<sup>70</sup> was used as reference in read 317 mapping, resulting in an alignment of 2.29 Mb. 318

Gubbins v.2.2.0<sup>71</sup> was used to detect recombination regions in both core and wholegenome alignments, using default parameters and a minimum of 3 base substitutions required to identify recombination. Alignment regions positive for recombination were then completely removed from the original alignments, resulting in recombination-free core- and whole-genome alignments of 1.29 Mb and 2.28 Mb, respectively. Maximum

likelihood phylogenies were obtained from the recombination-purged alignments using 324 IO-tree  $v.1.6.7.2^{72}$  under the determined best-fit nucleotide substitution model 325 (GTR+F+G4<sup>73</sup>, as determined by ModelFinder<sup>74</sup>) and ultrafast bootstrapping of 1000 326 replicates<sup>75</sup>. Trees were visualized and annotated with ggtree v.1.14.6<sup>76</sup> and iTol v.4.2<sup>77</sup>. 327 To measure the degree of genetic variation within sublineages, genetic clades and 328 geographic locations, the pairwise allelic and SNP distance matrices were calculated from 329 the cgMLST profiles and multiple sequence alignments, respectively. SNP distances were 330 computed taking into account only the ATGC polymorphic positions, extracted from the 331 alignments using SNP-sites v.2.4.178. 332

The nucleotide diversity and the Tajima's D statistics per alignment were calculated using the R package PopGenome v.2.6.1<sup>79</sup>.

335

Demographic and spatio-temporal analysis. To infer the population size changes, 336 Bayesian skyline plots were obtained with BEAST v1.10.4<sup>34</sup>. The coalescent Bayesian 337 skyline model was chosen due to its flexibility to allow a wide range of demographic 338 scenarios, avoiding the biases of pre-specified parametric models in the estimates of 339 demographic history<sup>38</sup>. Analyses were performed on a random subset of 200 isolates 340 selected out a subset of 422 isolates representative of genomic and geographic diversity 341 of the full dataset (1 isolate per country per cluster of 99% core genome similarity). 342 Sampling times were positively correlated with the genetic divergence (p < 0.05, F-343 Statistic test; Supplementary Figure S6), as observed using TempEst v1.5.1<sup>80</sup>. BEAST 344 estimations were made using the nucleotide evolutionary model GTR+F4 and a default 345 gamma prior distribution of 1, under an uncorrelated relaxed clock model, to allow each 346 branch of the phylogenetic tree to have its own evolutionary rate<sup>81</sup>. Runs were performed 347 in triplicates, each consisting of MCMC chains of 400 million iterations, with a 25% 348

burn-in. Parameter values were sampled every 10,000 generations. The effective sample 349 size (ESS) values were confirmed to be higher than 200 for all parameters using Tracer 350 v.1.7<sup>82</sup>. The time of the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) and 95% highest posterior 351 densities (95% HPDs) were inferred from the nodes of the maximum clade credibility 352 tree. To assess the significance of the temporal signatures observed, 10 randomized tip 353 date datasets run under the same parameters were used as controls<sup>83</sup>. To assess the 354 robustness of the population size inference to changes in the dataset, a second non-355 overlapping subset of 200 genomes obtained from the same representative subset of 422 356 isolates was analyzed using BEAST with the same parameters as described above. 357 Estimations of the effective population size along the years were computed using Tracer 358 v.1.7<sup>82</sup>. 359

Phylogeography analyses were then extended to the 1972 CC1 genomes for which 360 country and year of isolation were available. Time-calibrated phylogenies were inferred 361 from the maximum likelihood core genome trees (obtained with IQ-tree, as described 362 above) using either Bactdating v1.0.1<sup>84</sup>, Treetime v0.5.2<sup>85</sup> or Treedater v0.3.0<sup>35</sup>, assuming 363 a relaxed clock model and the estimated substitution rate of  $1.954 \times 10^{-7} \pm 2.0152 \times 10^{-8}$ 364 substitutions/site/year (obtained with BEAST as described above). Cophenetic 365 correlations between BEAST and the three alternative large-scale dating methods were 366 evaluated and better  $R^2$  coefficient scores were obtained for Treedater (Supplementary 367 Figure S7). For this reason, the latter dated tree was used in further downstream analyses. 368 Ancestral geographic reconstruction was performed with PastML<sup>36</sup> using the MPPA 369 method with an F81-like model and estimated ancestral state probabilities were mapped 370 onto the full time-calibrated phylogeny using the R package ape  $v5.3^{86}$ . 371

SL1 global transmission dynamics. To infer the transmission dynamics at a recent time 373 scale (Figure 4a and supplementary Figure S12), we focused on the CC1 main sublineage, 374 and we analyzed the genetic similarity of SL1 isolates from 2010-2018 (n=1,266) across 375 different temporal and spatial scales, as described before<sup>87</sup>. To avoid oversampling 376 isolates from outbreak investigations, we excluded all non-clinical isolates from 377 confirmed outbreaks (n=91 isolates from 19 outbreaks). We computed the probability  $P_1$ 378 that a pair of isolates that satisfy a given location criteria that were sampled within two 379 years of each other had a MRCA in a specific range (0-5 years, 5-20 years, 20-50 years, 380 >50 years), relative to the probability **P**<sub>ref</sub> that a pair isolates), sampled within two years 381 of each other, had an MRCA within that particular range. The location criteria used were: 382 i) within countries (both isolates come from the same country); ii) between countries 383  $\leq$ 1000 km (isolates come from distinct countries, separated by less than 1000 km, from 384 the same continent); iii) between countries >1000km (isolates come from distinct 385 countries, separated by more than 1000 km, from the same continent; used as reference); 386 and iv) between continents (isolates come from distinct continents). Spatial relationships 387 between isolates were calculated using the centroid coordinates of the countries or regions 388 of origin. 389

## 390 We estimated these probabilities using:

$$P_{l} = \frac{\# \text{ pairs } \{\text{MRCA} \in \text{ window \& sampled within 2 years \& given location criteria} \}}{\# \text{ pairs} \{\text{sampled within 2 years \& given location criteria} \}}$$

$$P_{ref} = \frac{\# pairs\{MRCA \in window \& sampled within 2 years \& distant countries\}}{\# pairs\{sampled within 2 years \& distant countries\}}$$

<sup>391</sup> Finally, the relative risk (RR) was given by:

$$RR = \frac{P_1}{P_{ref}}$$

To measure uncertainty, we used a combination of bootstrapping observations and sampling trees from the Treedater v0.3.0 package<sup>35</sup> to incorporate both sampling and tree <sup>394</sup> uncertainty. Over repeated resamples, we first selected a random tree and calculate the <sup>395</sup> evolutionary distance separating all pairs of sequences. Then, we resampled all the <sup>396</sup> isolates with replacement and recalculate RR each time. The 95% confidence intervals are <sup>397</sup> the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles from the resultant distribution from 1000 resampling <sup>398</sup> events.

399

400 **SL1 local transmission dynamics.** To assess the SL1 local transmission dynamics, we 401 used available data from France. We computed the proportion of closely related pairs of 402 French isolates (defined as having a MRCA<5years) as a function of the spatial distance 403 within and between administrative Departments (**Figure 4b**):

$$p(location) = \frac{\# \text{ pairs } \{\text{MRCA} < 5 \text{ years } \& \text{ sampled within 2 years } \& \text{ given location} \}}{\# \text{ pairs} \{\text{ sampled within 2 years } \& \text{ given location} \}}$$

The different location criteria used are: i) within Department: both isolates come from the same Department; ii) between Departments: isolates come from different Departments, separated by a distance from 50 to >500km. The French Departments are shown in the map in **Figure S11**.

As shown in Salje et al.<sup>87</sup>, the reciprocal of p(within department) represents the lower limit of the number of sources of human infection circulating within a Department.

410 To assess uncertainty, we used the bootstrapping approach as described above.

To explore possible differences between Departments, we computed the relative risk that a pair of isolates share a MRCA of less than 5 years when both come from the same department compared to when coming from different departments. We looked at 2 different groups of departments: i) Paris alone (**Figure 4c, left**): within Paris (both isolates come from Paris) and between Paris and other departments (for each pair of isolates, one of them come from Paris, and the other one from another department); ii) other departments, except Paris (**Figure 4c, right**): with other departments (both isolates 418 come from the same department, excluding Paris) and between all other departments

419 (isolates come from 2 different departments, excluding Paris). For each group, to compute

420 the relative risk *RR*, we used the same approach as explained above. We estimated:

P<sub>1</sub> =   

$$\frac{\text{# pairs {MRCA < 5 years & sampled within 2 years & same department}}{\text{# pairs{sampled within 2 years & same department}}}$$

$$\text{# pairs{MRCA < 5 years & sampled within 2 years & different departments}}$$

$$P_{ref} = \frac{\# pairs{meas} < 5 \ years \ \alpha \ sampled \ within \ 2 \ years \ \alpha \ different \ departments}{\# pairs{sampled within \ 2 \ years \ \& \ different \ departments}}$$

421 Finally, the relative risk is given by:

$$RR = \frac{P_1}{P_{ref}}$$

To determine uncertainty, we used the same bootstrapping approach as described above. To assess the statistical significance of each *RR*, we performed a one-tailed test. We set the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) as  $RR \le 1$ , and alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) as RR > 1. For each group, composed *N* bootstrap events, we computed:

$$p = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(RR_i \le 1)}{N}$$

426

427 Data availability. All sequence data will be made available in NCBI-SRA and EBI-ENA
428 public archives upon acceptation.

## 430 Acknowledgements

The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not 431 necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and 432 Prevention. The authors thank all participating laboratories and the PulseNet International 433 Network members for their contributions. The authors are also grateful to Martin 434 Wiedmann, Mark Achtman and Jana Haase for providing cultures of historical isolates, to 435 Thomas Cantinelli and Laure Diancourt for contributions to the initial sequencing of CC1 436 isolates, to Keith Jolley, Youssef Ghorbal and Bryan Brancotte for BIGSdb-Listeria 437 maintenance and software updates, to Eduardo Rocha, Etienne Simon-Lorière, Anna 438 Zhukova, Sophie Creno, Eric Deveaud, Guy Bayle and Erik Volz for insightful feedback 439 on methodological issues, and François-Xavier Weill for critical reading. This work used 440 the computational and storage services (TARS cluster) provided by the IT department at 441 Institut Pasteur, Paris. 442

443

#### 444 Funding

This study was supported financially by Institut Pasteur, Inserm, Santé Publique France, the European Research Council, the Swiss National Science Foundation (Project SINERGIA, Grant No. CRSII3\_147692), the Investissement d'Avenir program Laboratoire d'Excellence 'Integrative Biology of Emerging Infectious Diseases' (grant ANR-10-LABX-62-IBEID), and the Advanced Molecular Detection (AMD) initiative at CDC. Marc Lecuit is a member of Institut Universitaire de France.

451

#### 452 Author contributions

ML coordinated the project. ML and SB conceived and designed the study. AM,
NL, TW, SC, HS analysed the data, together with SB and ML. AL, VB, BG, TJD, JF, EF,

EMN, JT, AP, BPH, CT, PGS, SB, ML and the *Listeria* CC1 study group obtained the isolates, acquired metadata data collection and genome sequences. AM, HS and ML wrote the manuscript. All authors commented and edited the final version of the manuscript.

## 459 **References**

1. Swaminathan, B. & Gerner-Smidt, P. The epidemiology of human listeriosis, Microbes 460 Infect. 9, 1236–1243 (2007). 461 2. Charlier, C. et al. Clinical features and prognostic factors of listeriosis: the MONALISA 462 national prospective cohort study. Lancet Infect. Dis. 17, 510–519 (2017). 463 Orsi, R. H., Bakker, H. C. de. & Wiedmann, M. Listeria monocytogenes lineages: 464 3. genomics, evolution, ecology, and phenotypic characteristics. Int. J. Med. Microbiol. 301, 465 79-96 (2011). 466 4. Ragon, M. et al. A new perspective on Listeria monocytogenes evolution. PLoS Pathog. 4, 467 e1000146 (2008). 468 Cantinelli, T. et al. 'Epidemic clones' of Listeria monocytogenes are widespread and 5. 469 ancient clonal groups. J. Clin. Microbiol. 51, 3770-3779 (2013). 470 6. Chenal-Francisque, V. et al. Worldwide distribution of major clones of Listeria 471 monocytogenes. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 17, 1110–1112 (2011). 472 7. Dumont, J. & Cotoni, L. Bacille semblable au bacielle du Rouget du porc rencontré dans le 473 liquide céphalo-rachidien d'un méningitique. Ann. Inst. Pasteur (Paris). 35, 625-633 474 (1921). 475 Hyden, P. et al. Draft genome sequence of a 94-year-old Listeria monocytogenes isolate, 8. 476 SLCC208. Genome Announc. 4, e01572-15 (2016). 477 9. Maury, M. et al. Uncovering Listeria monocytogenes hypervirulence by harnessing its 478 biodiversity. Nat. Genet. 48, 308-313 (2016). 479 10. Kwong, J. C. et al. Prospective whole genome sequencing enhances national surveillance 480 of Listeria monocytogenes. J. Clin. Microbiol. 54, JCM.02344-15 (2015). 481 11. Bertrand, S. et al. Diversity of Listeria monocytogenes strains of clinical and food chain 482 origins in Belgium between 1985 and 2014. PLoS One 11, e0164283 (2016). 483 12. Toledo, V. et al. Genomic diversity of Listeria monocytogenes isolated from clinical and 484 non-clinical samples in Chile. Genes (Basel). 9, 396 (2018). 485 13. Hilliard, A. et al. Genomic characterization of Listeria monocytogenes isolates associated 486 with clinical listeriosis and the food production environment in Ireland. *Genes (Basel)*. 9, 487 488 171 (2018). 14. Scaltriti, E. et al. Population Structure of Listeria monocytogenes in Emilia-Romagna 489 (Italy) and implications on whole genome sequencing surveillance of listeriosis. Front. 490 Public Heal. 8, (2020). 491 15. Schlech, W. F. et al. Epidemic listeriosis — evidence for transmission by food. N. Engl. J. 492 Med. 308, 203-206 (1983). 493 16. Maury, M. M. et al. Hypervirulent Listeria monocytogenes clones' adaption to mammalian 494 gut accounts for their association with dairy products. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 2488 (2019). 495 496 17. Painset, A. et al. Liseq – Whole-genome sequencing of a cross-sectional survey of Listeria monocytogenes in ready-to-eat foods and human clinical cases in Europe. Microb. 497 Genomics 5, e000257 (2019). 498 Félix, B. et al. Population genetic structure of Listeria monocytogenes strains isolated from 18. 499 the pig and pork production chain in France. Front. Microbiol. 9, (2018). 500 19. Dalton, C. B. et al. An outbreak of gastroenteritis and fever due to Listeria monocytogenes 501 in milk. N. Engl. J. Med. 336, 100-5 (1997). 502 Costard, S., Espejo, L., Groenendaal, H. & Zagmutt, F. J. Outbreak-related disease burden 20. 503 associated with consumption of unpasteurized cow's milk and cheese. United States, 504 2009–2014. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 23, 957–964 (2017). 505 21. Filipello, V. et al. Attribution of Listeria monocytogenes human infections to food and 506 animal sources in Northern Italy. Food Microbiol. 89, (2020). 507 22. Dreyer, M. et al. Listeria monocytogenes sequence type 1 is predominant in ruminant 508 rhombencephalitis. Sci. Rep. 6, 36419 (2016). 509 23. Papić, B., Pate, M., Félix, B. & Kušar, D. Genetic diversity of Listeria monocytogenes 510 strains in ruminant abortion and rhombencephalitis cases in comparison with the natural 511

512		environment. BMC Microbiol. 19, 299 (2019).
513	24.	Garcia-Garcera, M. et al. Listeria monocytogenes faecal carriage is common and driven by
514		microbiota. <i>bioRkiv</i> (2020).
515	25.	Nightingale, K. K. et al. Ecology and transmission of Listeria monocytogenes infecting
516		ruminants and in the farm environment. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 70, 4458-4467 (2004).
517	26.	Esteban, J. I., Oporto, B., Aduriz, G., Juste, R. A. & Hurtado, A. Faecal shedding and
518		strain diversity of Listeria monocytogenes in healthy ruminants and swine in Northern
519		Spain. BMC Vet. Res. 5, (2009).
520	27.	Lyautey, E. et al. Characteristics and frequency of detection of fecal Listeria
521		monocytogenes shed by livestock, wildlife, and humans. Can. J. Microbiol. 53, 1158-1167
522		(2007).
523	28.	Borucki, M. K. et al. Genetic diversity of Listeria monocytogenes strains from a high-
524		prevalence dairy farm. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 71, 5893–5899 (2005).
525	29.	Jiang, X., Islam, M., Morgan, J. & Doyle, M. P. Fate of <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> in bovine
526		manure - Amended soil. J. Food Prot. 67, 1676–1681 (2004).
527	30.	Moura, A. et al. Whole genome-based population biology and epidemiological
528		surveillance of Listeria monocytogenes. Nat. Microbiol. 2, 16185 (2016).
529	31.	Kuenne, C. et al. Reassessment of the Listeria monocytogenes pan-genome reveals
530		dynamic integration hotspots and mobile genetic elements as major components of the
531		accessory genome. BMC Genomics 14, 47 (2013).
532	32.	Cotter, P. D. <i>et al.</i> Listeriolysin S. a novel peptide haemolysin associated with a subset of
533		lineage I Listeria monocytogenes. PLoS Pathog. 4, e1000144 (2008).
534	33.	Lee, S., Ward, T. J., Jima, D. D., Parsons, C. & Kathariou, S. The arsenic
535		resistanceassociated <i>Listeria</i> genomic island LGI2 exhibits sequence and integration site
536		diversity and a propensity for three Listeria monocytogenes clones with enhanced
537		virulence. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 83, (2017).
538	34.	Suchard, M. A. <i>et al.</i> Bayesian phylogenetic and phylodynamic data integration using
539		BEAST 1.10. Virus Evol. 4, vev016 (2018).
540	35.	Volz, E. M. & Frost, S. D. W. Scalable relaxed clock phylogenetic dating. <i>Virus Evol.</i> <b>3</b> ,
541		1–9 (2017).
542	36.	Ishikawa, S. A., Zhukova, A., Iwasaki, W. & Gascuel, O. A fast likelihood method to
543		reconstruct and visualize ancestral scenarios. Mol. Biol. Evol. 36, 2069–2085 (2019).
544	37.	Bowling, G. A. The introduction of cattle into colonial North America. J. Dairy Sci. 25,
545		129–154 (1942).
546	38.	Drummond, A. J., Rambaut, A., Shapiro, B. & Pybus, O. G. Bayesian coalescent inference
547		of past population dynamics from molecular sequences. Mol. Biol. Evol. 22, 1185–1192
548		(2005).
549	39.	Tajima, F. Statistical method for testing the neutral mutation hypothesis by DNA
550		polymorphism. Genetics 123, 585–595 (1989).
551	40.	World Trade Organization. World trade report. (World Trade Organization, 2013).
552	41.	Zimmerman, W. D. Live cattle export trade between United States and Great Britain,
553		1868-1885. Agric. Hist. 36, 46–52 (1962).
554	42.	Burroughs, W. J. & World Meteorological Organization. <i>Climate: into the 21st century</i> .
555		(Cambridge University Press, 2003).
556	43.	Groombridge, B. Global Biodiversity: status of the Earth's living resources. (Springer
557		Netherlands, 1992).
558	44.	Franz, E. et al. Phylogeographic analysis reveals multiple international transmission events
559		have driven the global emergence of Escherichia coli O157:H7. Clin. Infect. Dis. 69, 428-
560		437 (2019).
561	45.	Mourkas, E. et al. Agricultural intensification and the evolution of host specialism in the
562		enteric pathogen Campylobacter jejuni. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 117, 11018–11028 (2020).
563	46.	LeBlanc, S. J., Lissemore, K. D., Kelton, D. F., Duffield, T. F. & Leslie, K. E. Major
564		advances in disease prevention in dairy cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 89, 1267–1279 (2006).
565	47.	Cartwright, E. J. et al. Listeriosis outbreaks and associated food vehicles, United States,
566		1998-2008. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 19, 1–9 (2013).

De Valk, H. et al. Two consecutive nationwide outbreaks of listeriosis in France. October

Goulet, V. et al. Effect of prevention measures on incidence of human listeriosis, France,

1999-February 2000. Am. J. Epidemiol. 154, 944-950 (2001).

48.

49.

567

568

569

1987-1997. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 7, 983-989 (2001). 570 Tappero, J. W., Schuchat, A., Deaver, K. A., Mascola, L. & Wenger, J. D. Reduction in 50. 571 the incidence of human listeriosis in the United States. Effectiveness of prevention efforts? 572 JAMA 273, 1118-22 (1995). 573 51. Kathariou, S. Foodborne outbreaks of listeriosis and epidemic-associated lineages of 574 575 Listeria monocytogenes. in Microbial Food Safety in Animal Agriculture 243–256 (Blackwell Publishing, 2008). doi:10.1002/9780470752616.ch25 576 52. Maury, M. M. et al. Spontaneous loss of virulence in natural populations of Listeria 577 monocytogenes. Infect. Immun. 85, 1–13 (2017). 578 53. Castro, H., Jaakkonen, A., Hakkinen, M., Korkeala, H. & Lindström, M. Occurrence, 579 persistence, and contamination routes of *Listeria monocytogenes* genotypes on three 580 Finnish dairy cattle farms: A longitudinal study. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 84, (2018). 581 54. Moura, A. et al. Real-time whole-genome sequencing for surveillance of Listeria 582 monocytogenes, France. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 23, 1462–1470 (2017). 583 55. Criscuolo, A. & Brisse, S. AlienTrimmer: A tool to quickly and accurately trim off 584 multiple short contaminant sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. Genomics 585 102, 500–506 (2013). 586 56. Liu, Y., Schröder, J. & Schmidt, B. Musket: A multistage k-mer spectrum-based error 587 corrector for Illumina sequence data. Bioinformatics 29, 308-315 (2013). 588 57. Andrews, S. FastQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence data. Available 589 online at: http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc (2010). 590 58. Bankevich, A. et al. SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its applications to 591 single-cell sequencing. J. Comput. Biol. 19, 455-477 (2012). 592 Seemann, T. Prokka: Rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. *Bioinformatics* 30, 2068–2069 59. 593 (2014).594 60. Huerta-Cepas, J. et al. Fast genome-wide functional annotation through orthology 595 assignment by eggNOG-mapper. Mol. Biol. Evol. 34, 2115-2122 (2017). 596 61. Buchfink, B., Xie, C. & Huson, D. H. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using 597 DIAMOND. Nature Methods 12, 59-60 (2014). 598 62. Robertson, J. & Nash, J. H. E. MOB-suite: software tools for clustering, reconstruction 599 and typing of plasmids from draft assemblies. *Microb. genomics* 4, (2018). 600 63. Arndt, D. et al. PHASTER: a better, faster version of the PHAST phage search tool. 601 Nucleic Acids Res. 44, W16--W21 (2016). 602 64. Jolley, K. A. & Maiden, M. C. J. BIGSdb: Scalable analysis of bacterial genome variation 603 at the population level. BMC Bioinformatics 11, 595 (2010). 604 65. Page, A. J. et al. Roary: Rapid large-scale prokaryote pan genome analysis. Bioinformatics 605 **31**, 3691–3693 (2015). 606 Collins, C. & Didelot, X. A phylogenetic method to perform genome-wide association 66. 607 studies in microbes that accounts for population structure and recombination. PLoS 608 Comput. Biol. 14, e1005958 (2018). 609 Doumith, M., Buchrieser, C., Glaser, P., Jacquet, C. & Martin, P. Differentiation of the 67. 610 major Listeria monocytogenes serovars by multiplex PCR. J. Clin. Microbiol. 42, 3819-611 3822 (2004). 612 Dixon, P. VEGAN, a package of R functions for community ecology. J. Veg. Sci. 14, 927-68. 613 930 (2003). 614 69. Edgar, R. C. MUSCLE: Multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high 615 throughput. Nucleic Acids Res. 32, 113 (2004). 616 Mascola, L. et al. Listeriosis: an uncommon opportunistic infection in patients with 70. 617 acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. A report of five cases and a review of the 618 literature. Am. J. Med. 84, 162–164 (1988). 619 71. Croucher, N. J. et al. Rapid phylogenetic analysis of large samples of recombinant 620 bacterial whole genome sequences using Gubbins. Nucleic Acids Res. 43, e15 (2015). 621

622	72.	Nguyen, L. T., Schmidt, H. A., Von Haeseler, A. & Minh, B. Q. IQ-TREE: A fast and
623		effective stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies. <i>Mol. Biol.</i>
624		<i>Evol.</i> <b>32</b> , 268–274 (2015).
625	73.	Tavaré, S. Some probabilistic and statistical problems in the analysis of DNA sequences.
626		American Mathematical Society: Lectures on Mathematics in the Life Sciences (1986).
627		doi:citeulike-article-id:4801403
628	74.	Kalyaanamoorthy, S., Minh, B. Q., Wong, T. K. F., Von Haeseler, A. & Jermiin, L. S.
629		ModelFinder: Fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 14,
630		587–589 (2017).
631	75.	Minh, B. Q., Nguyen, M. A. T. & von Haeseler, A. Ultrafast approximation for
632		phylogenetic bootstrap. Mol. Biol. Evol. 30, 1188-1195 (2013).
633	76.	Yu, G., Smith, D. K., Zhu, H., Guan, Y. & Lam, T. TY. ggtree: an r package for
634		visualization and annotation of phylogenetic trees with their covariates and other
635		associated data. Methods Ecol. Evol. 8, 28–36 (2017).
636	77.	Letunic, I. & Bork, P. Interactive tree of life (iTOL) v3: an online tool for the display and
637		annotation of phylogenetic and other trees. Nucleic Acids Res. 44, W242245 (2016).
638	78.	Page, A. J. et al. SNP-sites: rapid efficient extraction of SNPs from multi-FASTA
639		alignments. Microb. genomics 2, e000056 (2016).
640	79.	Pfeifer, B., Wittelsbürger, U., Ramos-Onsins, S. E. & Lercher, M. J. PopGenome: an
641		efficient Swiss army knife for population genomic analyses in R. Mol. Biol. Evol. 31,
642		1929–1936 (2014).
643	80.	Rambaut, A., Lam, T. T., Max Carvalho, L. & Pybus, O. G. Exploring the temporal
644		structure of heterochronous sequences using TempEst (formerly Path-O-Gen). Virus Evol.
645		2, (2016).
646	81.	Drummond, A. J., Ho, S. Y. W., Phillips, M. J. & Rambaut, A. Relaxed phylogenetics and
647		dating with confidence. PLoS Biol. 4, e88 (2006).
648	82.	Rambaut, A., Drummond, A. J., Xie, D., Baele, G. & Suchard, M. A. Posterior
649		summarization in Bayesian phylogenetics using Tracer 1.7. Syst. Biol. 67, 901–904 (2018).
650	83.	Firth, C. et al. Using time-structured data to estimate evolutionary rates of double-stranded
651		DNA viruses. Mol. Biol. Evol. 27, 2038–51 (2010).
652	84.	Didelot, X., Croucher, N. J., Bentley, S. D., Harris, S. R. & Wilson, D. J. Bayesian
653		inference of ancestral dates on bacterial phylogenetic trees. Nucleic Acids Res. 46, e134
654		(2018).
655	85.	Himmelmann, L. & Metzler, D. TreeTime: an extensible C++ software package for
656		Bayesian phylogeny reconstruction with time-calibration. <i>Bioinformatics</i> 25, 2440–1
057		
657		(2009).
658	86.	(2009). Paradis, E. & Schliep, K. ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and
657 658 659	86.	(2009). Paradis, E. & Schliep, K. ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary analyses in R. <i>Bioinformatics</i> <b>35</b> , 526–528 (2019).
658 659 660	86. 87.	<ul> <li>(2009).</li> <li>Paradis, E. &amp; Schliep, K. ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary analyses in R. <i>Bioinformatics</i> 35, 526–528 (2019).</li> <li>Salje, H. <i>et al.</i> Dengue diversity across spatial and temporal scales: Local structure and the</li> </ul>
657 658 659 660 661	86. 87.	<ul> <li>(2009).</li> <li>Paradis, E. &amp; Schliep, K. ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary analyses in R. <i>Bioinformatics</i> 35, 526–528 (2019).</li> <li>Salje, H. <i>et al.</i> Dengue diversity across spatial and temporal scales: Local structure and the effect of host population size. <i>Science (80 ).</i> 355, 1302–1306 (2017).</li> </ul>

## 663 Figure legends

# Figure 1. Geographical and temporal distribution of the isolates used in this study (N=2,021) and phylogenetic analyses

a. Geographical distribution and source distribution. Sampled countries are colored in blue, with 666 hue gradient according to the number of isolates. Pie charts are proportional to the number of 667 isolates sampled in each continent and represent the repartition of sample source types, using the 668 source color key indicated in panel d. Out of 2,021 genomes, 8 isolates had unknown sampling 669 location and are not shown in the map. **b**. Temporal distribution of isolates collected in this study. 670 Darker blue bars indicate the period for which exhaustive clinical sampling was obtained for 7 671 countries spanning 3 continents (2012-2017; US, FR, UK, DK, NL, AU, NZ). c. Unrooted 672 maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of 2,021 Lm-CC1 genomes. The tree was generated from 673 analysis (GTR+F+G4 model, 1000 ultra-fast bootstraps) of a 1.29 Mb recombination-purged core 674 675 genome alignment. d. Midpoint rooted maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of 2,002 SL1 genomes based on a recombination-purged core genome alignment of 1.29 Mb. The four external 676 rings indicate the world region, year, type of infection and source type, respectively. The two 677 inner rings indicate ST1 isolates and the 8 SL1 genetic clades identified in this study, 678 respectively. e. Percentage of genomes per phylogroup and world region. Partitions are colored by 679 680 world regions (left) and phylogroups (right), using the same color code as in panel d.

681

## Figure 2. Bayesian temporal and demographic analyses on a representative 200 isolate dataset

**a.** Bayesian skyline plot (BSP) with the estimation of *Lm*-CC1 effective population size (*Ne*). The y-axis refers to the predicted number of individuals (log scale) and the x-axis to the timescale (in years). The median population size is marked in blue with its 95% high posterior density (HDP) in gray. Blue vertical panels delimitate the three globalization ages (1870-1914, 1944-1971, 1989present). **b.** Bayesian time-calibrated tree. Nodes represent the estimated mean divergence times and gray bars represent the 95% HPD confidence intervals of node age. Scale indicates time (in years). Terminal branches and tips are colored by continents, as indicated in the key panel.

691

## **Figure 3. Phylogeography of sublineage SL1**

**a.** Time-calibrated phylogeny based on the 1956 SL1 genomes. Pies at the nodes represent the probability of ancestral geographical locations, estimate using PastML using the MPPA method with an F81-like model. **b.** Inferred spread of SL1 populations across continents. The first introductions of each phylogroup are represented by arrows from their estimated world region origin. **c.** Proportion of inter-continental transitions per 10-year bins, normalized by the total number of phylogenetic branches per bin.

699

## 700 Figure 4. Transmission dynamics of sublineage SL1

**a**. Each point summarizes the relative risk that a pair of isolates has a MRCA within a defined 701 timeframe and between different spatial scales: within the same country (within the same 702 continent or within different continents), relative to the risk that a pair of isolates from countries 703 separated by >1000km have a MRCA in the same range (set as the reference value, 'ref'). Error 704 bars represent the 95% confidence intervals, based on 100 bootstrap time-calibrated trees. b. 705 Proportion of pairs of isolates within the same country (France) sharing a MRCA of 5 or less 706 vears in function of the spatial distance within and between administrative departments (shown in 707 the map). The green line indicates the mean proportion of genetically close strains regardless the 708 geographical location. c. Left: relative risk for a pair of isolates to share a MRCA of 5 or less 709 years when both are coming from Paris to when coming from another department (set as reference 710 value) (p=0.43). Right: relative risk for a pair of isolates to share a MRCA of 5 or less years when 711 coming from the same department in France, except Paris, compared to when coming from 712 different departments (set as reference value) (p < 0.001, see Material and Methods for details). 713





**Figure 1. Geographical and temporal distribution of the isolates used in this study (***N***=2,021) and phylogenetic analyses a. Geographical distribution and source distribution. Sampled countries are colored in blue, with hue gradient according to the number of isolates. Pie charts are proportional to the number of isolates sampled in each continent and represent the repartition of sample source types, using the source color key indicated in panel d. Out of 2,021 genomes, 8 isolates had unknown sampling location and are not shown in the map. b. Temporal distribution of isolates collected in this study. Darker blue bars indicate the period for which exhaustive clinical sampling was obtained for 7 countries spanning 3 continents (2012-2017; US, FR, UK, DK, NL, AU, NZ). c. Unrooted maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of 2,021** *Lm***-CC1 genomes. The tree was generated from analysis (GTR+F+G4 model, 1000 ultra-fast bootstraps) of a 1.29 Mb recombination-purged core genome alignment. d. Midpoint rooted maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of 2,002 SL1 genomes based on a recombination-purged core genome alignment of 1.29 Mb. The four external rings indicate the world region, year, type of infection and source type, respectively. The two inner rings indicate ST1 isolates and the 8 SL1 genetic clades identified in this study, respectively. e. Percentage of genomes by world region (left) and phylogroup (right). Partitions are colored by world regions and phylogroup, using the same color code as in panel d.** 

Figure 2



## Figure 2. Bayesian temporal and demographic analyses on a representative 200 isolate dataset

**a.** Bayesian skyline plot (BSP) with the estimation of *Lm*-CC1 effective population size (*Ne*). The y-axis refers to the predicted number of individuals (log scale) and the x-axis to the timescale (in years). The median population size is marked in blue with its 95% high posterior density (HDP) in gray. Blue vertical panels delimitate the three globalization ages (1870-1914, 1944-1971, 1989-present). **b.** Bayesian time-calibrated tree. Nodes represent the estimated mean divergence times and gray bars represent the 95% HPD confidence intervals of node age. Scale indicates time (in years). Terminal branches and tips are colored by continents, as indicated in the key panel.

# Figure 3



## Figure 3. Phylogeography of sublineage SL1

a. Time-calibrated phylogeny based on the 1956 SL1 genomes. Pies at the nodes represent the probability of ancestral geographical locations, estimate using PastML using the MPPA method with an F81-like model. b. Inferred spread of SL1 populations across continents. The first introductions of each phylogroup are represented by arrows from their estimated world region origin. c. Proportion of inter-continental transitions per 10-year bins, normalized by the total number of phylogenetic branches per bin.

## Figure 4



## Figure 4. Transmission dynamics of sublineage SL1

**a.** Each point summarizes the relative risk that a pair of isolates has a MRCA within a defined timeframe and between different spatial scales (within the same country, within the same continent or within different continents), relative to the risk that a pair of isolates from countries separated by >1000km have a MRCA in the same range (set as the reference value, 'ref'). Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals, based on 100 bootstrap time-calibrated trees. **b.** Proportion of pairs of isolates within the same country (France) sharing a MRCA of 5 or less years in function of the spatial distance within and between administrative departments (shown in the map). The green line indicates the mean proportion of genetically close strains regardless the geographical location. **c.** Left: relative risk for a pair of isolates to share a MRCA of 5 or less years when both are coming from Paris to when coming from another department (p=0.43). Right: relative risk for a pair of isolates to share a MRCA of 5 or less years when coming from the same department in France, except Paris, compared to when coming from different departments (p<0.001, see Material and Methods for details).

1 2 3	Em con	ergence and global spread of the main <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> clinical clonal uplex	
4 5 6 7 8	Alez Gilp Pigh Salj	xandra Moura, Noémie Lefrancq, Alexandre Leclercq, Thierry Wirth, Vítor Borges, Bre bin, Timothy J. Dallman, Joachim Frey, Eelco Franz, Eva M. Nielsen, Juno Thomas, Arth ntling, Benjamin P. Howden, Cheryl L. Tarr, Peter Gerner-Smidt, Simon Cauchemez, Henr e, Sylvain Brisse, Marc Lecuit, for the <i>Listeria</i> CC1 Study Group	nt ur ik
9		SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL	
10 11	Tab	le of Contents	
12	1.	Supplementary tables	.2
13		Table S1. Isolate included in this study.	. 2
14		Table S2. Genetic characteristics of CC1 sublineages and SL1 genetic clades	. 3
15		Table S3. Sublineage-specific genes present in at least 50% of isolates.	. 4
16		Table S4. SL1 genetic clades-specific genes present in at least 50% of isolates	. 5
17		Table S5. Human-associated significant loci, as determined by treeWAS	. 6
18			
19	2.	Supplementary figures	.7
20		Figure S1. Frequency of most prevalent clonal complexes among different environments	. 7
21		Figure S2. Genome metrics of isolates included in this study.	. 8
22		Figure S3. Core genome multilocus sequence typing (cgMLST) analyses.	. 9
23		Figure S4. Phylogenetic analysis based on whole genome SNP analyses	10
24		Figure S5. Genetic diversity among <i>Lm</i> -CC1 isolates	11
25		Figure S6. Distribution of <i>Lm</i> -CC1 isolates per clade, world regions and source types	12
26		Figure S7. CC1 pangenome analysis	13
27		Figure S8. Temporal analyses on a representative dataset of 200 isolates	14
28		Figure S9. Benchmarking of dating methods	15
29		Figure S10. Phylogeography inference of <i>Lm</i> -CC1	16
30		Figure S11. Cattle demographics	17
31		Figure S12. French administrative departments (départements)	18
32		Figure S13. SL1 transmission dynamics within country (France)	19
33			

## 36 1. Supplementary tables

37

## 38 Table S1. Isolates included in this study. [xls]

## 39 Table S2. Genetic characteristics of CC1 sublineages and SL1 genetic clades and statistics by world region.

			cgMLST allelic distances	cg1748 SNP distances (1.29 Mb, 11,976 ATGC sites)			wgF2365 SNP distances (2.28 M, 29,108 ATGC sites)				
		n	mean ± stdev	mean ± stdev	Tajima's D	nucleotide diversity	haplotype diversity	mean ± stdev	Tajima's D	nucleotide diversity	haplotype diversity
Phylogroup	SL1	2002	68 ± 23.27	38 ± 14.8	-2.69	4.33	0.966	80 ± 27.4	-2.77	63.31	0.999
	SL404	2	57	50	nd	50.00	1.000	107	nd	107.00	1.000
	SL150	17	42 ± 16.90	38 ± 16.8	-1.46	33.41	1.000	86 ± 30.9	-1.70	79.62	1.000
	GC1	710	39 ± 11.16	32 ± 9.5	-2.78	10.13	0.992	67 ± 15.9	-2.82	49.05	0.997
	GC2	684	51 ± 18.03	45 ± 16.4	-2.70	14.92	0.991	92 ± 30.6	-2.80	48.27	0.997
	GC3	282	47 ± 17.41	38 ± 14.8	-2.63	12.79	0.991	85 ± 25.8	-2.77	65.25	0.999
	GC4	142	46 ± 19.97	39 ± 17.3	-2.59	24.68	0.990	100 ± 29.9	-2.73	86.73	0.992
	GC5	63	34 ± 13.23	28 ± 11.3	-2.38	22.38	0.995	73 ± 23.5	-2.51	68.35	0.999
	GC6	47	45 ± 16.00	36 ± 13.6	-2.22	32.66	0.988	79 ± 25.6	-2.29	73.67	0.990
	GC7	46	28 ± 24.28	24 ± 20.8	-1.60	19.97	0.966	63 ± 51.7	-2.03	58.94	0.998
	GC8	28	29 ± 7.94	25 ± 6.7	-2.39	23.18	0.997	50 ± 10.5	-2.47	45.31	1.000
World Region	Africa	54	66 ± 91.55	64 ± 148.7	-2.72	41.06	0.962	146 ± 220.0	-2.62	119.17	0.997
	Asia	25	85 ± 119.86	100 ± 204.3	-2.55	67.85	0.990	187 ± 332.3	-2.49	180.76	1.000
	Europe	1236	61 ± 24.50	53 ± 28.9	-2.74	13.42	0.995	110 ± 44.9	-2.78	59.04	0.999
	North America	513	92 ± 92.77	96 ± 160.3	-2.58	28.06	0.992	194 ± 232.0	-2.68	164.93	0.998
	South America	22	63 ± 31.91	52 ± 27.6	-1.39	47.01	0.987	117 ± 55.0	-1.57	114.57	0.996
	Oceania	22	63 ± 31.91	52 ± 27.6	-1.39	47.01	0.987	117 ± 55.0	-1.57	114.57	0.996

## 42 Table S3. Sublineage-specific genes present in at least 50% of isolates. Gray shades

## 43 highlight genes within the same genomic context.

Remarks	Roary_family	Reference locus	Ortholog	Annotation Length (nt) No. isolates % Isolate		s %Isolates (in SL)	#Order in contig	
exclusively in SL1	group_2369	ID32421_02477	lmo0671	hypothetical protein	293	1852	93%	
exclusively in SL404	group_7853	ID31663_01719	Imo0804	hypothetical protein	176	2	100%	1067
	group_7852	ID31663_01117	LMOf2365_0494	hypothetical protein	2150	1	50%	6972
exclusively in SL150	group_897	ID32037_02878		hypothetical protein	260	16	94%	1226
	group_6423	ID32037_02875	LMOSA_10	hypothetical protein	467	16	94%	1229
	group_5149	ID32037_02874	LMOSA_20	replication-associated protein	305	14	82%	1230
	group_6471	ID32037_02873	LMOf2365_0352	hypothetical protein	284	12	71%	1231
	group_6421	ID32037_02872		hypothetical protein	314	16	94%	1232
	group_5148	ID32037_02871		hypothetical protein	116	12	71%	1233
	group_6420	ID32037_02870	lmo0339	inorganic pyrophosphatase	371	16	94%	1234
	group_6409	ID32037_00117		hypothetical protein	290	14	82%	3282
	group_2611	ID32037_00115	lmo2044	peptide ABC transporter substrate-binding protein	1664	13	76%	3284
	group_6408	ID32037_00121	lmo2749	glutamine a midotransferase	572	16	94%	3302
	group_6406	ID32037_00123	lmo2375	hypothetical protein	395	16	94%	3304
	group_6417	ID32037_01337		hypothetical protein	110	16	94%	4171
	group_6418	ID32037_01335	lmo2688	cell division protein FtsW	1130	16	94%	4175
exclusively in SL150 &	recD	ID32037_02916	LMOSA_12110	DNA helicase; RecBCD enzyme subunit RecD	1355-3608	18	95%	2391
SL404	group_5134	ID32037_02915		hypothetical protein	1061-1340	18	95%	2392
(absent in SL1)	group_6411	ID32037_02914	Imo0303	putative secreted, lysin rich protein	551	18	95%	2393
	group_6412	ID32037_02912	Imo0305	L-allo-threonine aldolase	1082	18	95%	2395
	group_6413	ID32037_02911	Imo0306	hypothetical protein	467	18	95%	2396
	group_6415	ID32037_02907	lmo0310	hypothetical protein	1076	17	89%	2400
exclusively in SL1 &	group_152	ID32421_02841	LMOf2365_0349	cell wall surface anchor family protein (LPxTG motif)	293-3221	1380	69%	2433
SL404	group_1481	ID32421_01841	LMOf2365_2341	aminotransferase, class I	221-1166	1936	97%	3295
(absent in SL150)	group_4436	ID32421_01836	lmo2375	hypothetical protein	263-392	2004	100%	3309
	group_378	ID32421_01835		reverse transcriptase	302-1385	1977	99%	3310
	group_1844	ID32421_00303	lmo2688	cell division protein FtsW	758-1130	1009	50%	4177
	group_1501	ID32421_00308	LMOf2365_2670	N-acetylmuramoyl-L-alanine amidase, family 4	1100-1775	1450	72%	4183
exclusively in SL1 & SI 150	group_1153	ID32421_02877	Imo0297	transcriptional antiterminator BgIG	593-1871	1991	99%	2373
(absent in SI 404)	sau3AIR	ID32421_02872		Type-2 restriction enzyme Sau3Al	152-1667	1990	99%	2379
(absent in serier)	group_4596	1032421_02871	LMO12365_0326	transcriptional regulator	164-206	2000	99%	2382
	group_1899	ID32421_02870	LM0f2365_0327	cytosine-specific methyltransferase	131-1409	1988	98%	2384
	group_1900	1D32421_02869	LMO12365_0328	nypothetical protein	236-854	1952	97%	2386
	group_1572	1D32421_02868	LMO12365_0329	putative lipoprotein	197-554	1993	99%	2387
	group_1901	ID32421_02867	LMO12365_0330	threonine aldolase	305-1079	2000	99%	2388
	group_3681	ID32421_02866	LMOf2365_0331	peptidase, M48 family	464-920	2001	99%	2389
	group_1542	1032421_02360	11100804	hypothetical protein	100-909	1021	59%	5058
	group_3703	1032037_01341		hypothetical protein	220 622	1021	0.0%	4107
	group_2205	1032421_00342		hypothetical protein	248-1286	1999	99%	4215
	group_390	1032421_00343		hypothetical protein	1EE 092	1797	90%	4210
	group 5708	1032421_00345		hypothetical protein	200	1001	99%	4210
	group 5709	1032421_00346		hypothetical protein	350-350	1005	99%	4222
	group_3733	ID32421_00340		hypothetical protein	407-773	1999	99%	4223
	group 3456	ID32421_00351	Imo2724	3-demethylubiquinone-9 3-methyltransferase	323-443	1986	98%	4229
	group_3450	1032421_00351	IMO2724	dihydrouridine synthase family protein	200-005	1585	79%	4765
	group_2255	ID32421_02134	LMOf2365_0495	nutative linoprotein	155-2159	1244	62%	6967
	group_01	ID32421_00615	Imo2084	aminoglycoside phosphotransferase	455-476	1862	92%	7056
	group 3057	ID32421 01316	Imo1343	competence protein ComGF	284-284	2004	99%	8031
	group 1982	ID32421 01310	LMO[2365_1365	glycine cleavage system Torotein GovT	797-1088	2009	100%	8039
	group 555	ID32421 02213	Imo1721	transcriptional regulator	788-2771	1943	96%	8392
	group 2258	ID32037_00061	LM0f2365_17/1	transcriptional regulator. TetR family	188-584	1950	97%	8398
	group 1540	ID32421 02218	lmo1715	methyltransferase	185-668	1940	96%	8399
	group 1049	ID32421 00984	Imo0738	PTS beta-glucoside transporter subunit IIABC	698-1448	1879	93%	8654
	group 5905	ID32421 00985	Imo0116	hypothetical protein ImaC phageA118	167	2015	100%	8657
	group 1669	ID32421 00989	lmo1655	vanZ-like protein	128-563	1889	94%	9030
	0.000-1000							

Table S4. SL1 genetic clades-specific genes present in at least 50% of isolates.Clades-specific genes were only found in GC3 and GC7. Gray shadows highlight genes within the same genomic context.

Remarks	Roary_family	Reference locus	Ortholog	Annotation	Length (nt)	No. isolates	% Isolates (in GC)	#Order in contig
exclusively in GC3	group_1376	ID106_01313		fibrinogen-binding protein	1562-2693	215	76%	7335
	group_5934	ID106_01309		hypothetical protein	1301	271	96%	7345
	group_5933	ID106_01308		hypothetical protein	485	271	96%	7346
	group_4885	ID106_01307		hypothetical protein	212-374	271	96%	7347
	group_5932	ID106_01306		hypothetical protein	1019	271	96%	7348
	group_5931	ID106_01305		hypothetical protein	338	271	96%	7349
	group_4884	ID106_01304		hypothetical protein	269-686	271	96%	7350
	group_3147	ID106_01302		hypothetical protein	1253-1769	269	95%	7356
	group_3146	ID106_01301		P60 protein	812-1025	271	96%	7358
	group_2504	ID106_01300		cadmium resistance protein_cadA	1403-2105	268	95%	7359
	group_4029	ID106_01299		cadmium efflux system accessory protein_cadC	236-356	267	95%	7360
	group_5930	ID106_01298		ABC transporter- permease protein	770	270	96%	7361
	group_4883	ID106_01297		ABC transporter- ATP-binding protein	278-935	271	96%	7362
	group_5929	ID106_01296		hypothetical protein	173	269	95%	7363
	group_5928	ID106_01295		dihydrolipoamide dehydrogenase	1673	271	96%	7364
	acr3_2	ID106_01293		Arsenical-resistance protein Acr3	1076	271	96%	7370
	group_5926	ID106_01291		ArsR family transcriptional regulator	365	271	96%	7379
	arsD_1	ID106_01290		Arsenical resistance operon trans-acting repressor ArsD	371	271	96%	7380
	group_5924	ID106_01289		cadmium efflux system accessory protein_cadC	293	271	96%	7381
	arsA_2	ID106_01288		Arsenical pump-driving ATPase	263-1739	271	96%	7382
	arsD_2	ID106_01287		Arsenical resistance operon trans-acting repressor ArsD	311	270	96%	7383
	group_5922	ID106_01286		cystathionine beta-lyase	1142-1142	270	96%	7384
	group_5921	ID106_01285		hypothetical protein	458	254	90%	7385
	group_4882	ID106_01284		hypothetical protein	302-404	256	91%	7386
exclusively in GC7	group_8396	ID32182_02420		hypothetical protein	326	42	91%	1150

Gene	Annotation	treeWAS score	Association type	G1P1	G0P0	G1P0	G0P1
group_1361	hypothetical protein	24	positive	1303	88	480	150
group_2465	valyl-tRNA synthetase_valS	22	positive	1300	89	479	153
group_1038	N-acetylmuramoyl-L-alanine amidase	26	positive	1265	96	472	188
group_619	hypothetical protein	23	positive	1175	138	430	278
group_10387	tRNA-Glu(ttc)	25	positive	1041	181	387	412
group_497	hypothetical protein	24	positive	1029	190	378	424
group_1926	transcriptional regulator	25	positive	1024	193	375	429
group_706	hypothetical protein	25	positive	1020	191	377	433
group_1527	hypothetical protein	24	positive	1007	186	382	446
group_209	hypothetical protein	24	positive	866	254	314	587
group_6398	tRNA-Val(tac)	-25	negative	611	246	322	842
group_10476	5S ribosomal RNA	-31	negative	520	253	315	933
group_10390	tRNA-Glu(ttc)	-33	negative	532	276	292	921
group_10432	tRNA-Lys(ttt)	-35	negative	499	289	279	954
group_10162	tRNA-Asn(gtt)	-29	negative	461	309	259	992
group_10094	hypothetical protein	-28	negative	492	362	206	961
group_10662	hypothetical protein	-30	negative	479	358	210	974
group_1927	transcriptional regulator	-25	negative	430	375	193	1023
group_499	hypothetical protein	-23	negative	404	397	171	1049
group_10488	5S ribosomal RNA	-41	negative	282	399	169	1171
group_4211	5S ribosomal RNA (partial)	-37	negative	227	398	170	1226
group_60	putative lipoprotein	-27	negative	188	476	92	1265
group_533	hypothetical protein	-22	negative	74	508	60	1379
group_6404	hypothetical protein	-22	negative	36	518	50	1417

**Table S5. Human-associated significant loci,** as determined using treeWAS, with a significance threshold of  $p < 10^{-5}$ .

G, genome; P, phenotype; O absent, 1 present.

## 2. Supplementary figures



**Figure S1. Frequency of most prevalent clonal complexes among different environments**. Data collected based on 29,349 *L. monocytogenes* genomes with associated source metadata available on NCBI Sequence Read Archive (as of October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020). MLST typing was performed from reads using the srst2 v.0.1.5 software (http://katholt.github.io/srst2) and the BIGSdb-*Lm* profiles database (https://bigsdb.pasteur.fr/listeria).





a) Distribution of isolates per sequence read length (left) and distribution of sequencing coverages after reads quality trimming (right).

b) Assembly metrics per CC1 sublineages, based on the number of contigs, N50 and N95 contig lengths, genome size, G+C content and cgMLST loci detected.



## Figure S3. Core genome multilocus sequence typing (cgMLST) analyses.

a) Rarefaction analysis of cgMLST types sampled per sublineage.

b) Number of SL1 cgMLST types per number of different world regions in which they were observed (*n*=860 types with world region information).

c) Number of SL1 cgMLST types per number of different countries in which they were observed (*n*=857 types with country information).



#### Figure S4. Phylogenetic analysis based on whole genome SNP analyses.

a) Unrooted maximum-likelihood phylogeny (GTR+F+G4 model, 1000 ultra-fast bootstraps, using IQ-Tree<sup>23,26</sup>) of 2,021 CC1 genomes based on the recombination-purged whole genome SNP alignment of 2.28 Mb.

b) Midpoint rooted maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree of 2,002 SL1 genomes based on based on the recombination-purged whole genome SNP alignment of 2.28 Mb. The four external rings indicate the world region, year, type of infection and source type, respectively. The two inner rings indicate ST1 isolates and the 8 SL1 genetic clades identified in this study, respectively. The black star highlights the phylogenetic placement of isolate F2365 (accession no. NC\_002973.6), used as reference in whole genome read mapping.



#### Figure S5. Genetic diversity among *Lm*-CC1 isolates.

Pairwise isolate distances within CC1 phylogroups (top) and world regions (bottom): a,d) pairwise cgMLST allelic distances; b,e) pairwise SNP distances in recombination-purged *Lm* core genome alignment and c,f) recombination-purged CC1 whole genome alignment. Uncalled alleles, Ns and gap alignment positions were ignored in pairwise comparisons. Each box denotes the 25% and 75% quartiles and lines represent the medians. Inter-SL, inter CC1 sublineages; GC#, within SL1 genetic clades; Afr, Africa; Asi, Asia; Eur, Europe; NAm, North America; Sam, South America; Oce, Oceania.



Figure S6. Distribution of Lm-CC1 isolates per clade, world regions and source types (N=2,021).



#### Figure S7. CC1 pangenome analysis.

a) Frequency of sampled gene families. b) Pan- and core gene families sampled. c) Venn diagram showing the number of gene families present in at least 1 sublineage member. d) Distribution of the functional categories of the clusters of orthologous genes across the CC1 pangenome. e) Differential proportion of each assigned COG category in core vs accessory genome, calculated as the difference between the ratio of each category (*n*) and the total number of hits (*N*) among each gene pool set, as in ( $n_{accessory}/N_{accessory}-n_{core}/N_{core}$ ). f) Distribution of *Listeria* genomic islands, prophages and plasmids and across CC1 phylogeny. The midpoint rooted maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree (GTR+F+G4 model, 1000 ultra-fast bootstraps) was inferred from the 1.29 Mb recombination-purged core genome alignment of 2,021 CC1 genomes. Sources, continents and SL1 clades are colored according to the color codes shown in Figure S4.



## Figure S8. Temporal analyses on a representative dataset of 200 isolates.

a) Maximum likelihood (GTR+F+G4) phylogeny of the representative 200 isolates selected randomly across the CC1 phylogeny. Tips are colored by sublineage and SL1 genetic clades as indicated in the legend. b) Regression analyses showing the root-to-tip genetic distance against sampling date (year). Statistical significance was assessed using the F-test. c) Bayesian molecular clock estimations in real and randomized tip dates (controls). Estimations based on real data were run in triplicates, whereas estimations based on randomized tip datasets were run in 10 replicates. Stars denote statistical significance of p<0.0001, assessed using t-test.



## Figure S9. Benchmarking of dating methods.

Cophenetic distances between isolates dated with BEAST and alternative large-scale methods: a) BactDating v.1.0.1, b) Treetime v.0.5.2 and c) Treedater v.0.3.0, using the CC1 estimated rate of  $1.954 \times 10^{-7} \pm 2.0152 \times 10^{-8}$  substitutions/site/year obtained with BEAST. "g200" and "g1972" refer to the number of CC1 genomes used in each analyses (*n*=200 and *n*=1,972, respectively). Red lines denote perfect positive correlation coefficients (*R*<sup>2</sup>=1).





Pies at the nodes represent the probability of ancestral geographical locations, estimate using PastML using the MPPA method with an F81-like model. The detailed view of SL1 can be found in Figure 3.



## Figure S11. Cattle demographics.

a) Cattle population per world region; b) Dairy cows per world region. Data available for 1961-2018; source: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; www.fao.org/faostat). Vertical dashed bars mark the estimated date of the stabilization of Lm-CC1 population size.



Figure S12. French administrative Departments (*départements*). Source: Global Administrative Areas, gadm.org.



**Figure S13. SL1 transmission dynamics within country** (France). Relative risk for a pair of isolates to have a MRCA within a defined period when coming from the same Department in France *versus* different ones.

## Emergence and global spread of Listeria monocytogenes main clinical clonal complex

Alexandra Moura<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Noémie Lefrancq<sup>4,†</sup>, Alexandre Leclercq<sup>1,2</sup>, Thierry Wirth<sup>5,6</sup>, Vítor Borges<sup>7</sup>, Brent Gilpin<sup>8</sup>, Timothy J. Dallman<sup>9</sup>, Joachim Frey<sup>10</sup>, Eelco Franz<sup>11</sup>, Eva M. Nielsen<sup>12</sup>, Juno Thomas<sup>13</sup>, Arthur Pightling<sup>14</sup>, Benjamin P. Howden<sup>15</sup>, Cheryl L. Tarr<sup>16</sup>, Peter Gerner-Smidt<sup>16</sup>, Simon Cauchemez<sup>4</sup>, Henrik Salje<sup>4,†,#</sup>, Sylvain Brisse<sup>17,#</sup>, Marc Lecuit<sup>1,2,3,18,#,\*</sup> for the *Listeria* CC1 Study Group

<sup>5</sup> Institut Systématique Evolution Biodiversité (ISYEB), Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, Université des Antilles, EPHE, Paris, France

<sup>6</sup> PSL University, EPHE, Paris, France

<sup>7</sup> National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge, Department of Infectious Diseases, Lisbon, Portugal

<sup>8</sup> Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited, Christchurch Science Centre, Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>9</sup> Public Health England, London, UK

<sup>10</sup> Vetsuisse, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>11</sup> National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Centre for Infectious Disease Control, Bilthoven, Netherland

Bilthoven, Netherland

<sup>12</sup> Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>13</sup> National Institute for Communicable Diseases, Division of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa

<sup>14</sup>Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, College Park, MD, United States

<sup>15</sup> Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; Infectious Diseases Department, Austin Health, Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia

<sup>16</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, United States

<sup>17</sup> Institut Pasteur, Biodiversity and Epidemiology of Bacterial Pathogens Unit, Paris, France

<sup>18</sup> Université de Paris, Necker-Enfants Malades University Hospital, Division of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, Institut Imagine, APHP, Paris, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Institut Pasteur, Biology of Infection Unit, Paris, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Centre and WHO Collaborating Centre Listeria, Paris, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Inserm U1117, Paris, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Institut Pasteur, Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases Unit, UMR2000, CNRS, Paris, France.

#### Listeria CC1 Study Group

- Caroline Charlier, Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Center and WHO Collaborating Center Listeria, Paris, France; Institut Pasteur, Biology of Infection Unit, Paris-France; Inserm U1117, Paris, France; Université de Paris, Necker-Enfants Malades University Hospital, Department of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, AP-HP, Paris, France
- Guillaume Vales, Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Center and WHO Collaborating Center *Listeria*, Paris, France
- Hélène Bracq-Dieye, Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Center and WHO Collaborating Center Listeria, Paris, France
- Nathalie Tessaud-Rita, Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Center and WHO Collaborating Center *Listeria*, Paris, France
- Pierre Thouvenot, Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Center and WHO Collaborating Center *Listeria*, Paris, France
- Viviane Chenal-Francisque, Institut Pasteur, French National Reference Center and WHO Collaborating Center *Listeria*, Paris, France

Zuzana Kucerova, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States Heather Carleton, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States Steven Stroika, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States

Anders Gonçalves da Silva, Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Karolina Mercoulia, Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Anthony Marius Smith, National Institute for Communicable Diseases, Division of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Jonas T. Björkman, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

Anna Oevermann, Division of Neurological Diseases, DCR-VPH, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

- Lisandra Aguillar-Bultet, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
- Thijs Bosch, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Centre for Infectious Disease Control, Bilthoven, Netherland
- Sjoerd Kuiling, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Centre for Infectious Disease Control, Bilthoven, Netherland
- Maaike van den Beld, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Centre for Infectious Disease Control, Bilthoven, Netherland

Anaïs Passet, Public Health England, London, United Kingdom Kathie Grant, Public Health England, London, United Kingdom

Leonor Silveira, National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge, Department of Infectious Diseases, Lisbon, Portugal Ângela Pista, National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge, Department of Infectious Diseases, Lisbon, Portugal Mónica Oleastro, National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge, Department of Infectious Diseases, Lisbon, Portugal

Sven Halbedel, Consultant Laboratory for *Listeria monocytogenes*, FG11, Robert Koch Institute, Wernigerode, Germany