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Abstract

Cell wall biosynthesis is an important target of antimicrobial peptides (AMPs), which in light of the imminent shortage of antibiotics are considered promising candidates for future treatment of infections. Yet, numerous Gram-positive bacteria have developed specific resistance systems against many AMPs. These systems feature so-called BceAB-like ATP-binding cassette transporters consisting of ten transmembrane helices and a characteristic extracellular domain of around 200 amino acids. So far, the mechanisms behind substrate recognition and binding as well as the nature of the physiological substrate of the transporters remained elusive. This is a major impediment to our understanding of the resistance mechanism, and multiple theories have been proposed regarding these important questions. The targets of AMPs are crucial membrane-anchored intermediates of the lipid II cycle. One hypothesis suggests that the transporters expel the AMP from the membrane, in which case the physiological substrate should be the AMP itself or the AMP bound to its cellular target. Alternatively, the transporters may flip the drug target to the cytoplasmic face of the membrane to remove it from access by the AMP.

Here, we investigate the substrate specificity of the transporter BceAB of *Bacillus subtilis*. We focus on characterising the binding capacity of its large extracellular domain *in vitro* and further aim to identify the physiological substrate of BceAB using *in vivo* approaches. Combining the findings of biochemical, biophysical and physiological assays conducted for this study, we propose the complex formed between the AMP and its cellular target to be the physiological substrate of BceAB, rather than the unbound AMP or the drug target alone. Considering this result in the context of previous findings and the literature enabled us to gain valuable insights into the potential resistance mechanism of BceAB-like transporters that play such a crucial role in antimicrobial resistance.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ATP-binding cassette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu</td>
<td>aminobutyric acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>actagardine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEX</td>
<td>anion exchange chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ala</td>
<td>alanine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>antimicrobial peptide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ampR</td>
<td>resistance to ampicillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>analysis of variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS</td>
<td>8-anilino-1-naphthalenesulphonic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aPBP</td>
<td>class A PBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asn</td>
<td>asparagine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp</td>
<td>aspartate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Adenosine triphosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>bacitracin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BceB-ECD</td>
<td>extracellular domain of BceB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BceB-ECD&lt;ref&gt;</td>
<td>refolded BceB-ECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BceB-ECD&lt;sol&gt;</td>
<td>soluble BceB-ECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;15&lt;/sub&gt;-PP/FPP</td>
<td>farnesyl pyrophosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;35&lt;/sub&gt;-PP/HPP</td>
<td>heptaprenyl pyrophosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;-PP/IPP</td>
<td>isoprenyl pyrophosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>circular dichroism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFU</td>
<td>colony forming units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>competition index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>resistance to chloramphenicol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Ala</td>
<td>D-alanine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDM</td>
<td>n-dodecyl-β-D-maltoside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O</td>
<td>deionised water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dha</td>
<td>didehydroalanine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhb</td>
<td>didehydrobutyrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHNA</td>
<td>1,4-dihydroxy-2-naphthoic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS</td>
<td>dynamic light scattering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>deoxyribonucleic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dNTP</td>
<td>deoxyribonucleotide triphosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTT</td>
<td>dithiothreitol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>half maximal effective concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>extracellular domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECF</td>
<td>extracytoplasmic function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTA</td>
<td>ethylene-diamine-tetra-acetic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-G</td>
<td>elongation factor G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlcNAc</td>
<td>N-acetylglucosamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gln</td>
<td>glutamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glu</td>
<td>glutamate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gly</td>
<td>glycine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPP</td>
<td>geranyl pyrophosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His</td>
<td>histidine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>intrinsically disordered protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ile</td>
<td>isoleucine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAC</td>
<td>immobilised metal affinity chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTG</td>
<td>isopropyl-β-D-thiogalactopyranoside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>resistance to kanamycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>lysogeny broth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leu</td>
<td>leucine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lys</td>
<td>lysine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mDPA</td>
<td>meso-diaminopimelic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERS</td>
<td>mersacidin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>methionine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Müller-Hinton broth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>minimal inhibitory concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mls&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>resistance to macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoRF</td>
<td>molecular recognition feature or element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mRNA</td>
<td>messenger RNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurNAc</td>
<td>N-acetylmuramic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>nucleotide binding domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIS</td>
<td>nisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD&lt;sub&gt;600&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>optical density at 600 nm wavelength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orn</td>
<td>ornithine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;bceA-lux&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;bceA-luxABCDE&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBP</td>
<td>penicillin binding protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>polymerase chain reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phe</td>
<td>phenylalanine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>proline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDF</td>
<td>polyvinylidene fluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLU</td>
<td>relative luminescence units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA</td>
<td>ribonucleic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RND</td>
<td>resistance, nodulation, division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rRNA</td>
<td>ribosomal RNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre</td>
<td>small alpha/beta rich extracytoplasmic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>sodium dodecyl sulphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS-PAGE</td>
<td>sodium dodecyl sulphate - polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDS</td>
<td>shape, elongation, division and sporulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>serine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgRNA</td>
<td>single guide RNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>styrene-maleic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALP</td>
<td>SMA lipid particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spec'</td>
<td>resistance to spectinomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCS</td>
<td>two component system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tet'</td>
<td>resistance to tetracycline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thr</td>
<td>threonine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMH</td>
<td>transmembrane helix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tRNA</td>
<td>transfer RNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trp</td>
<td>tryptophan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyr</td>
<td>tyrosine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP-GlcNAc</td>
<td>uridine diphosphate-N-acetylgalcosamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP-MurNAc</td>
<td>uridine diphosphate-N-acetylmuramic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>undecaprenyl phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPP</td>
<td>undecaprenyl pyrophosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV</td>
<td>ultraviolet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>valine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>wild-type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Antimicrobial peptides as promising candidates to combat antimicrobial resistance.

1.1 Emerging antimicrobial resistance is a global threat.

Infectious diseases like tuberculosis, pneumonia and diphtheria were the leading causes of death in humans for a long time (Zaffiri et al., 2012). Over the course of the last century, advances in sanitation and hygiene, but mainly the development and clinical use of antibiotics and vaccinations, helped to tackle the impact of infectious diseases and majorly contributed to the extraordinary reduction of morbidity and mortality associated with those illnesses (Alanis, 2005, Zaffiri et al., 2012). Antibiotics kill bacteria by impeding vital metabolic processes including the cell wall biogenesis or nucleic acid or protein biosynthesis, thereby inhibiting their growth and replication (Anderson, 2012). Originating from naturally-occurring microbial products, more antibiotics were discovered in the 1950s and 1960s and soon chemically synthesised (Davies, 2006). This has paved the way for impactful application of antimicrobial agents against acute bacterial infections, and has increased the health and longevity of humans.

Yet, humankind is at risk of being thrown back into the dark age of the pre-antibiotic era. Naturally, bacteria continuously evolve to resist antibiotics, making treatments less powerful or often totally ineffective (Alanis, 2005). As a result, common bacterial infections like food-borne illness, let alone sepsis, meningitis and the diseases mentioned above, can become life-threatening again (World Health Organization, 2019).

Antibiotic resistance is on the rise, with new resistance mechanisms emerging and spreading globally. Every year, several hundred thousand people worldwide die because of infections caused by antimicrobial resistant bacteria (O’Neill, 2014). Future scenarios predict antimicrobial resistance to even claim around 10 million lives every year by 2050 (O’Neill, 2014). But antimicrobial resistance has the potential to undermine public health even further. To prevent bacterial infections in immuno-suppressed patients or other risk groups, antibiotics are often administered prophylactically. Secondary implications of antimicrobial resistance would thus make routine surgery like caesarean sections or joint replacements precarious procedures, and cancer treatments even more worrisome (O’Neill, 2014).
Although the development of antimicrobial resistance is evolutionarily inevitable, combatting antimicrobial resistance promptly is crucial to avoid a ‘post-antibiotic’ global health crisis (O’Neill, 2014).

### 1.2 Strategies to tackle antimicrobial resistance

To tackle the emerging threat of antimicrobial resistance, several strategy papers have been compiled (World Health Organization, 2015, O’Neill, 2016, European Commission, 2017). Some of the proposed policies aim at reducing the occurrence of antimicrobial resistance and preventing spreading of infections. Examples include improved sanitation and hygiene and better surveillance of drug resistance. To avoid unnecessary administration of antibiotics in humans and agriculture, regulations on their medical use and as food additives should be implemented and novel rapid diagnostic tools developed. Taken together, these measures are meant to maximise the life span of current antibiotics. At the same time, the action plans demand the discovery and clinical development of new antimicrobial agents as well as the further advancement of existing antibiotics and the investigations of underlying resistance mechanisms (O’Neill, 2016).

In the quest for new antibiotics, antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) have raised attention. AMPs are short, often cationic peptides that are produced by virtually all life forms, and are also known as host-defence peptides (Hancock & Sahl, 2006). In higher organisms, AMPs can modulate the innate immune response of the host to infections, while prokaryotes produce AMPs to gain an advantage over other microbes, competing for the same environmental niche and resources (Mahlapuu et al., 2016). Aiming at the development of a novel therapeutic strategy, these host-defence peptides without direct antimicrobial activity are a promising research focus. They are able to adjust the innate immunity response and thereby can potentially indirectly promote pathogen clearance (Hancock & Sahl, 2006, Mahlapuu et al., 2016).

Yet, with several in clinical trials, AMPs are first in line to potentially become future therapeutics for infection treatment (Hancock & Sahl, 2006, Mahlapuu et al., 2016). The reasons as to why AMPs are regarded as propitious are plenty. Many AMPs possess a direct and fast-acting antimicrobial potency (Hancock & Sahl, 2006). Generally, they have a broader-than-average target spectrum, preferring several low-affinity targets over a single high-affinity one. It is thus difficult for bacteria to accomplish resistance by developing only a single defence strategy (Lai & Gallo, 2009, Mahlapuu et al., 2016).
AMPs act by disrupting the physical integrity of the microbial cell envelope or by translocating across the membrane into the cytoplasm to act on intracellular targets (Hancock & Sahl, 2006, Mahlapuu et al., 2016). This membrane interference is often effectuated by the cationic and amphipathic characteristics of AMPs. Bacteria have a significant amount of anionic phospholipids displayed on the cell surface. AMPs thus mainly interfere with the negatively charged bacterial membrane via electrostatic forces (Andersson et al., 2016). Differences in lipid composition and distribution are thought to be responsible for the selectivity of AMPs for bacterial membranes. Plasma membranes of many mammalian cells have an asymmetrically-distributed lipid composition (Quinn, 2002). For example, phospholipids with negatively-charged head groups like phosphatidylserine are primarily featured in the inner leaflet of the plasma membrane of human erythrocytes. The outer face of the plasma membrane mainly consists of phospholipids with zwitterionic properties and a neutral net charge, such as phosphatidylethanolamine, phosphatidylcholine, and sphingomyelin (Quinn, 2002, Andersson et al., 2016).

Many structures of membrane and cell wall synthesis are non-proteinaceous and procedures often well-conserved, posing a challenge to bacteria to develop resistance against AMP stress while still having to secure functionality and structural integrity of the cell wall (Lai & Gallo, 2009). As the interaction with the bacterial membrane seems to be a key factor for the antimicrobial activity of AMPs, features and characteristics of the bacterial cell envelope are described in the following section.

Despite their considerable potential, there are several obstacles to overcome in the development of AMPs for clinical use (Marr et al., 2006). These drawbacks include for example the high cytotoxicity and haemolytic activity displayed by certain AMPs against human cells (Maher & McClean, 2006, Mader & Hoskin, 2006). In addition, AMPs or host-defence molecules can be immunogenic and even lead to allergic reactions (Mader & Hoskin, 2006). Further, some AMPs only display poor serum stability and show degradation by proteases or inactivation by high salt concentrations (Marr et al., 2006). Although the broad substrate activity of AMPs can be listed as an asset of AMPs, at the same time the broad-range activity can lead to complications in clinical use by disrupting the indigenous host microbiome (Aoki & Ueda, 2013).

For these reasons, most AMPs that have been applied in health care so far have found use as topical medication. Further research and development are required to target the stability, safety, and efficacy of AMPs. One example of a promising candidate from the family of lanthionine-containing antibiotics is nisin. The lantibiotic is already used as food preservative
and treatment in animal care due to its broad potency against Gram-positive bacteria, including drug-resistant microbes and the causative agents of food spoilage (Dischinger et al., 2014, Shin et al., 2016). Recent bioengineering approaches have aimed at increasing the antimicrobial activity of nisin against *Escherichia coli* and other Gram-negative bacteria (Zhou et al., 2016, Li et al., 2018) and improving nisin’s resistance against protease degradation (Field et al., 2018). Based on these and other advances, nisin is hoped to be applied in future infection treatment, oral health and possibly even cancer treatment of humans (Shin et al., 2016).

2. The cell envelope protects bacteria from the environment.

The cell envelope is a bacterium’s multi-layered, protective barrier to the environment. Based on the differences and characteristics of their complex cell envelopes, bacteria can generally be divided into two major groups, Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria (Silhavy et al., 2010). In Gram-positives, the cytoplasmic membrane is surrounded by numerous layers of peptidoglycan, forming a thick cell wall. Gram-negative bacteria in contrast only possess a few peptidoglycan layers. They are additionally surrounded and protected by another membrane containing lipopolysaccharides (Silhavy et al., 2010, Lin & Weibel, 2016). The two membranes of Gram-negative bacteria are referred to as ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ membrane, the space between them is named the periplasm.

2.1 Bacterial membranes comprise many phospholipids with anionic net charge.

The composition of bacterial membranes is not only highly variable between different species, bacteria are also able to modify their membrane composition in response to environmental changes, such as temperature, salinity and pH (Lin & Weibel, 2016). Cytoplasmic membranes of both, Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria, can be described as fluid bilayers containing oriented globular proteins and phospholipids (Singer & Nicolson, 1972). The proteins occurring in cytoplasmic membranes are either ‘peripheric’ and only weakly-attached, or ‘integral’ proteins that intercalate into the membrane and often contain a high content of α-helices (Singer & Nicolson, 1972).

The (glycerol-)phospholipids of bacterial membranes generally contain two fatty acid chains and a variable polar phosphate headgroup. The phospholipid acyl chains determine the
membrane viscosity and permeability, and by this, influence many membrane-associated functions, including transport and protein–protein interactions (Zhang & Rock, 2008). Most abundant in many bacterial species are phosphatidylethanolamine, phosphatidylglycerol and cardiolipin, but also phosphatidylinositol and phosphatidylserine, or even lipids that lack a phosphate group can be found, but usually to a lesser degree (Sohlenkamp & Geiger, 2016). While phosphatidyl-ethanolamine is zwitterionic, phosphatidylglycerol and cardiolipin are both negatively charged, causing the overall anionic net charge of the bacterial membrane. Phospholipids are heterogeneously distributed along the cytoplasmic membrane and form specific lipid domains with particular functions (Strahl & Errington, 2017). For example, it has been hypothesised that the formation of anionic phospholipid lipid domains is involved in the initiation of DNA replication and cell division (Mileykovskaya & Dowhan, 2005). Yet, this hypothesis is still subject to debate and not generally accepted. Antimicrobial compounds, like the cationic AMPs described above, can also affect the membrane environment, and vice versa, the phospholipid composition can affect the efficacy of AMPs (Epand & Epand, 2009, Epand et al., 2016).

Highly conserved in most bacteria, but prevalent to a lesser degree in the cytoplasmic membrane, are poly-isoprenoid carriers (C₅₅). Their role is the translocation of activated sugar intermediates that are required for envelope biogenesis (Raetz & Dowhan, 1990). Their structure and function will be further described in I.2.2.2.

**Gram-negative specifications: the outer membrane**

The outer membrane of Gram-negative bacteria functions as selective permeability barrier and protects the cell against harsh environmental conditions. The phospholipids of the outer membrane are restricted to the inner leaflet. The outer leaflet consists of lipopolysaccharides that extend into the extracellular space and can serve as virulence factor in pathogens (Silhavy et al., 2010, May & Silhavy, 2017). The outer membrane further contains mainly two types of proteins. These are either bilayer-anchored lipoproteins or β-barrel transmembrane proteins responsible for nutrient uptake or efflux of waste products (May & Silhavy, 2017).

**Gram-positive specifications: teichoic acids**

In contrast, Gram-positive bacteria lack an outer membrane and a distinct periplasm. The cell envelope of Gram-positive bacteria is heavily modified by the incorporation of carbohydrate-based anionic polymers, so-called teichoic acids (Weidenmaier & Peschel, 2008, Silhavy et al., 2010). Lipoteichoic acids are linked to the outer face of the membrane via a lipid anchor
(Percy & Grundling, 2014). Wall teichoic acids are covalently attached to peptidoglycan (Brown et al., 2013). Both polymer types are highly complex polysaccharides, based on either polyribitol- or polyglycerol phosphate and vary for each bacterial strain (Silhavy et al., 2010). Together, both structures extend from the bacterial cell surface beyond the outermost layers of the cell wall. Accounting for as much as 60% of the molecular composition of the cell wall, teichoic acids can influence membrane permeability and cell envelope stability majorly, and serve as scaffolds for extracytoplasmic enzymes required for cell wall growth and degradation (Weidenmaier & Peschel, 2008, Silhavy et al., 2010).

2.2 The cell wall of Gram-positive bacteria and its biosynthesis

In Gram-positive bacteria, the cell wall is the principal barrier to environmental stresses, and its integrity is of critical importance to cell viability. The cell wall ensures osmotic stability and, because of its rigidity, determines the cell shape. With between 30 and 100 nm in width, the multi-layered cell wall of Gram-positives is drastically thicker than the sometimes only single-layered cell wall of Gram-negatives (Silhavy et al., 2010). The cell wall is made up by a mesh-like polymer called peptidoglycan (Vollmer et al., 2008). The basic structure of peptidoglycan is similar in most bacteria except Mycoplasma and few other species that lack a cell wall. Peptidoglycan consists of long, about parallel glycan strands that in rod-shaped cells are thought to run perpendicularly to the long axis of the bacterium (Vollmer et al., 2008). Glycan strands are assembled and polymerised from alternating 1,4-linked N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) - N-acetylmuramic acid (MurNAc) disaccharide units (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005). Glycan strands are cross-linked with adjacent strands via the pentapeptide side chains of the MurNAc units, which connects the peptidoglycan sacculus to one very large polymer. The composition of the so-called stem peptide can vary between bacterial species, but the most common pentapeptide is L-alanine-D-glutamate-meso-diaminopimelic acid (mDPA)-D-alanine-D-alanine (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005, van Heijenoort, 2007). The cell wall synthesis is a highly complex process that can be divided into three stages. Their details will be described in the following sections.

2.2.1 Peptidoglycan precursor synthesis in the cytoplasm

The first stage of bacterial cell wall synthesis takes place in the cytoplasm where the nucleotide sugar-linked precursors are synthesised (Fig. 1.1). The leading enzymes of this stage are a series of Mur enzymes (El Zoeiby et al., 2003).
Uridine diphosphate-N-acetylglucosamine (UDP-GlcNAc) is synthesised from fructose-6-phosphate in several steps (van Heijenoort, 1998). UDP-GlcNAc is not only required for assembly of lipid II in the second stage of cell wall synthesis, it also serves as precursor for synthesis of uridine diphosphate-N-acetylmuramic acid (UDP-MurNAc). This two-step reaction is catalysed by the enolpyruvyl transferase MurA and the flavin-dependent reductase MurB (El Zoeiby et al., 2003, Bugg et al., 2011). UDP-MurNAc is then further modified by the stepwise addition of the first three amino acid residues of the stem peptide, commonly L-alanine, D-glutamic acid and meso-diaminopimelic acid (Fig. 1.1). The residues are successively added to the reduced lactyl group of UDP-MurNAc by the ATP-dependent synthetases MurC, MurD and MurE, respectively. Finally, a D-alanine-D-alanine dipeptide is linked to the UDP-MurNAc-tripeptide in a MurF-catalysed step, bringing the last soluble peptidoglycan precursor UDP-MurNAc pentapeptide to completion (Fig. 1.1, van Heijenoort, 1998, El Zoeiby et al., 2003, Bugg et al., 2011).

2.2.2 Precursor translocation via the lipid II cycle is the bottleneck of cell wall synthesis.

The next steps of the cell wall synthesis involve membrane-anchored lipid intermediates and begins at the inner leaflet of the cytoplasmic membrane, before the peptidoglycan precursors are translocated across the membrane to its outer face (Fig. 1.1). As the membrane-anchored lipid carrier is recycled to take up another peptidoglycan precursor, this stage of the cell wall synthesis is known as the lipid II cycle.

The membrane-anchored lipid carrier: undecaprenyl phosphate

The membrane carrier that accepts the UDP-MurNAc pentapeptide and later translocates it across the membrane is called undecaprenyl phosphate (UP, Fig. 1.1), also known as bactoprenol. UP belongs to the ubiquitous, functionally highly diverse family of isoprenoids (Ogura et al., 1997). The shortest isoprenoid unit is isopentenyl pyrophosphate (IPP), which consists of five carbon atoms and an allylic pyrophosphate group (C5-PP, IPP). This fundamental building block results from acetyl-CoA via the mevalonate pathway (Thorne & Kodicek, 1966), or the non-mevalonate MEP pathway (Desai et al., 2016). Isoprenoids with longer carbon chains are assembled from IPP via head-to-tail condensation reactions catalysed by prenyl transferases (Ogura et al., 1997). The synthesis of the lipid carrier takes place on the cytoplasmic face of the membrane and is catalysed by the enzyme undecaprenyl pyrophosphate synthase (UppS, Fig. 1.1, Takahashi & Ogura, 1982, Apfel et al., 1999). UppS
catalyses consecutive reactions of a farnesyl pyrophosphate ($C_{15}$-PP, FPP) with eight IPP units. The resulting undecaprenyl pyrophosphate ($C_{55}$-PP, UPP) is then dephosphorylated by undecaprenyl phosphatases to produce UP (Manat et al., 2014, Liu & Breukink, 2016).

**Lipid I formation**
In the first step of the lipid II cycle, the membrane-associated translocase MraY catalyses the ligation of the phosphoryl-MurNAc pentapeptide moiety onto the lipid carrier UP (Fig. 1.1, Bouhss et al., 2004). This results in the formation of undecaprenyl-pyrophosphoryl-MurNAc-pentapeptide, typically referred to as lipid I (van Heijenoort, 1998, Liu & Breukink, 2016).

**Lipid II formation**
The second step at the inner leaflet of the membrane is the synthesis of undecaprenyl-pyrophosphoryl-$1,4$-MurNAc-pentapeptide-GlcNAC, better known as lipid II (Fig. 1.1, Liu & Breukink, 2016). The reaction between lipid I and UDP-GlcNAC, the first precursor formed in the cytoplasm, is catalysed by the glycosyltransferase MurG. Lipid II carries the final substrate for the polymerisation of peptidoglycan strands (van Heijenoort, 1998, Manat et al., 2014).

**Lipid II translocation**
Lipid II is subsequently translocated from the inner side of the membrane to the outer face (Fig. 1.1). The identity of the flippase that is responsible for lipid II translocation has been much-debated (Young, 2014, Ruiz, 2015, Scheffers & Tol, 2015, Zhao et al., 2017). For a while, the SEDS (shape, elongation, division and sporulation) family protein FtsW was believed to be a lipid II flippase (Mohammadi et al., 2011). However, more recent evidence discounted this idea (Sham et al., 2014, Meeske et al., 2015) and supported the original hypothesis proposed by Ruiz (2008). According to these studies, MurJ in *E. coli* and MurJ and its homolog Amj in *Bacillus subtilis* serve as lipid II flippases (Sham et al., 2014, Meeske et al., 2015). Recently, insights into the underlying flipping mechanism emerged. MurJ directly binds lipid II *in vitro*, likely by recognising the GlcNAC-MurNAc-pentapeptide moiety (Bolla et al., 2018). The crystal structure of MurJ in the absence of its substrate revealed 14 transmembrane helices that form a closed-gate, inward-open conformation with a distinct central cavity (Zheng et al., 2018). MurJ was thus proposed to translocate lipid II across the membrane according to an alternating-access mechanism, in which MurJ alternates between an inward-open, then outward-open conformation. Structure-guided cysteine crosslinking indicated that MurJ is able to adopt both conformations, supporting the rocker-switch model for lipid
II transport (Kumar et al., 2018, Zheng et al., 2018). Once on the outer face, the GlcNAc-MurNAc-pentapeptide moiety of lipid II is incorporated into already existing glycan strands as described in 2.2.3.

**Lipid carrier recycling**

When the GlcNAc-MurNAc-pentapeptide moiety of lipid II is incorporated, the lipid carrier is released as undecaprenyl pyrophosphate (UPP). This is the same pyrophosphate form of the lipid carrier that results from *de novo* synthesis (Manat et al., 2014). To be recycled for membrane translocation of peptidoglycan precursors, UPP is dephosphorylated to UP. This reaction is catalysed by UPP phosphatases (El Ghachi et al., 2005, Manat et al., 2014). In *B. subtilis*, two phosphatases can catalyse this reaction, UppP and BcrC (Bernard et al., 2005, Zhao et al., 2016). Both enzymes are located in the cytoplasmic membrane, but it is currently unknown whether their catalytic activity takes place at the inner or outer face of the membrane. UppP and BcrC form a synthetic lethal pair, which means that one phosphatase becomes essential in the absence of the other, suggesting that their function is interchangeable to some degree (Zhao et al., 2016, Radeck et al., 2017a). Yet, BcrC seems to play a more important role during growth and particularly when facing antimicrobial stress, whereas UppP was found to be crucial for sporulation (Radeck et al., 2017a).

Further, UPP is localised in the outer membrane leaflet, and thus needs to translocate back into its cytoplasmic face (Manat et al., 2014). Not much is known about this reverse flippase reaction. Due to the chemical properties of UP, the translocation of the lipid carrier is thought to be actively facilitated (Zhao et al., 2017). A spontaneous flipping reaction of UP across the membrane is considered too slow for the high turnover rates of the lipid II cycle (de Kruijff et al., 2008). It is further unknown if such a flippase would translocate UP, UPP, or potentially would be able to translocate both forms of the lipid carrier (Manat et al., 2014).
**Figure 1.1: The three stages of bacterial cell wall synthesis.** I: Cell wall synthesis begins in the cytoplasm with the assembly of peptidoglycan precursors. These precursors are transferred onto membrane-anchored lipid carriers and translocated across the cytoplasmic membrane in the so-called lipid II cycle (II). III: The incorporation of peptidoglycan precursors into the existing glycan strands and the cross-linking between stem peptides takes place in the extracellular space. Glycan strands can be further modified, e.g. by incorporation of wall teichoic acids. These modifications are not depicted in this schematic. The lipid carrier UPP is recycled by dephosphorylation to UP and imported back into the cell. UPP can also be formed by *de novo* synthesis, which is catalysed by UppS. Enzymatic reactions are indicated by enzyme names in turquoise boxes, where known. Enzymes involved in transglycosylation and transpeptidation are not listed individually for clarity. Green hexagon: N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc), yellow hexagon: N-acetylmuramic acid (MurNAc), black circle: phosphate group, two black circles: pyrophosphate group, orange circle: amino acids that form the stem pentapeptide. UP: undecaprenyl phosphate, UPP: undecaprenyl pyrophosphate, Lipid I: undecaprenyl-pyrophosphoryl-MurNAc-pentapeptide, Lipid II: undecaprenyl-pyrophosphoryl-1,4-MurNAc-pentapeptide-GlcNAc.
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The lipid II cycle as bottleneck of cell wall synthesis

Efficient lipid carrier recycling and quick re-introduction into the cell wall synthesis are crucial to ensure growth and cell wall integrity. UP and its derived lipid II cycle intermediates exist only in very limited amounts in bacterial membranes (van Heijenoort, 1998). The lipid II cycle is thus thought to have an extremely high turnover rate, with one to three transits per second per molecule (van Heijenoort, 1998, Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006). The lipid carrier is further involved in other cell wall pathways, like wall teichoic acid synthesis and capsular polysaccharide synthesis (Manat et al., 2014, Liu & Breukink, 2016). The synthesis of the different intermediates is thus tightly regulated and temporally coordinated (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Liu & Breukink, 2016). Nevertheless, the rate-limiting factor seems to remain UP availability.

Direct measurement of these pool levels remains challenging. Hence, indirect measurements like the analysis of in vivo peptidoglycan synthesis using radiolabelled UDP-GlcNAc were used to approximate the number of lipid intermediates (Kramer et al., 2004). In E. coli, pool levels of UPP are estimated to lie around $1.2 \times 10^5$ molecules per cell (Barretea et al., 2009), the peptidoglycan precursor-carrying lipid I and lipid II are thought to be very small with maximal 700 and 2000 molecules per cell, respectively (van Heijenoort et al., 1992). Further, the ratio between the soluble precursor UDP-MurNAc pentapeptide and lipid I is greater than 100:1 (van Heijenoort, 1998), stressing that the availability of the lipid carrier is the limiting factor of cell wall synthesis.

Pool levels of lipid carrier intermediates seem to vary between bacterial species. The cell wall of Gram-positive bacteria contains higher amount of peptidoglycan. In agreement, the pool levels of lipid carrier intermediates are increased in Gram-positives (van Heijenoort, 2007). *Listeria monocytogenes* and *Micrococcus sp.* were found to contain around $2 \times 10^5$ molecules per cell of the lipid carrier forms UP or UPP (Storm & Strominger, 1974, Kramer et al., 2004). *Staphylococcus aureus* was shown to contain maximal $5 \times 10^4$ lipid II molecules per cell (van Heijenoort, 2007). In comparison, the rod-shaped *Bacillus subtilis* has even lower lipid II levels (Qiao et al., 2017) and the lipid II levels of *Bacillus megaterium* were estimated to lie around $3.4 \times 10^4$ molecules per cell (van Heijenoort, 2007).

The lipid II cycle is therefore considered to be the bottleneck of the cell wall synthesis. Due to low lipid carrier pool levels and high turnover rates, even small discontinuities can lead to major disruptions of cell wall synthesis. The lipid II cycle is thus particularly susceptible to antimicrobial action (Schneider & Sahl, 2010, Bugg et al., 2011). Amongst all enzymes and lipid intermediates involved, lipid II is regarded as the Achilles’ heel of the cycle, due to the
particularly small pool size and the (at least at times) localisation at the extracellular face of the membrane. Numerous antibiotics and AMPs have been described to directly recognise and bind lipid II, thereby inhibiting its action (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, de Kruijff et al., 2008, Scheffers & Tol, 2015, Ng & Chan, 2016). The group of lanthionine-containing antibiotics (lantibiotics) seem to comprise particularly many lipid II-binding agents and will be discussed in the next main section of the introduction (I 3.1).

2.2.3 Peptidoglycan polymerisation and cross-linking in the extracellular space

The third stage of the cell wall biosynthesis takes place at the outer side of the cytoplasmic membrane and involves the incorporation of the peptidoglycan precursors from lipid II into the growing cell wall mesh via two reactions called transglycosylation and transpeptidation (Fig. 1.1).

The principal enzymes of this stage are penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs) that belong to the family of acyl serine transferases (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005). PBPs can be subdivided into high molecular weight PBPs and low molecular PBPs (Sauvage et al., 2008, Sauvage & Terrak, 2016). The latter are mono-functional peptidases required for transpeptidation. High molecular weight PBPs are composed of two modules. The C-terminal module harbours the penicillin-binding domain, which catalyses the transpeptidase reaction. The N-terminal domain of this type of PBPs links it to the outer face of the cytoplasmic membrane. The catalytic properties of this domain allow the subdivision high molecular weight PBPs further into two major groups, simply termed class A and class B PBPs. While class B PBPs only possess peptidase activity, class A PBPs (aPBPs) are bi-functional enzymes (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005, Sauvage et al., 2008). Their N-terminal module comprises a transglycosylase site, which enables aPBPs to perform both, transglycosylation and transpeptidation (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005, Sauvage et al., 2008).

Transglycosylation: glycan strand formation

In the first extracellular step of cell wall synthesis, the reducing end of MurNAc of a nascent glycan strand is connected with the lipid II-linked GlcNAc-MurNAc-pentapeptide moiety. Hereby, the peptidoglycan precursor gets polymerised into the glycan strand and the lipid carrier is released (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005). Until recently, this step called transglycosylation was known to be performed by two classes of enzymes, mono-functional transglycosylases and aPBPs, with aPBPs considered as the principle transglycosylases (Zhao et al., 2017).
The amount of different aPBPs varies between bacterial species, depending on the availability of proteins with redundant function and cell shape (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005, Sauvage et al., 2008). The Gram-positive model organism B. subtilis was shown to possess four aPBPs (PBP1a, PBP4, PBP2c, PBP2d, McPherson & Popham, 2003, Scheffers & Pinho, 2005). Despite some differences in their membrane localisation, these aPBPs seem to be functionally redundant to a certain degree (Pedersen et al., 1999, Scheffers & Pinho, 2005).

Recently, the SEDS protein RodA of B. subtilis was shown to possess transglycosylase activity (Meeske et al., 2016, Emami et al., 2017). This also answered the long-standing question as to why B. subtilis was viable when all aPBPs had been removed, despite the lack of traditional mono-functional transglycosylases (McPherson & Popham, 2003).

**Transpeptidation: cross-linking of glycan strands via their stem peptides**

During the second step, transpeptidation, the newly built glycan strands are cross-linked via their stem peptides. Peptidases recognise and form a complex with the D-Ala-D-Ala amino acids of the stem peptide. A serine residue in the enzyme’s active site interacts with a carbon atom of the terminal D-Ala, which leads to an acyl-enzyme intermediate and the concomitant release of the C-terminal D-Ala residue (Sauvage et al., 2008). This is followed by the deacylation of the enzyme, by which a peptide bond between the penultimate D-Ala residue and the amino acid at position 3 of a different stem peptide (often meso-diaminopimelic acid or L-lysine) is formed. The transpeptidation reaction can be mediated by both, bi-functional aPBPs or mono-functional transpeptidases of class B PBP (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005, Sauvage et al., 2008). The peptide bonds cross-link the glycan strands with their neighbouring ones in all directions, resulting in a mesh-like network that is responsible for the shape and rigidity of the bacterial cell (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005, Silhavy et al., 2010).
3. The cell wall synthesis is a major target for antibiotics.

The cytoplasmic membrane and the membrane-embedded cell wall biosynthesis are major targets for numerous classes of antibiotics (Schneider & Sahl, 2010, Mahlapuu et al., 2016). Localised on the extracellular side of the membrane, and thus first in line as antibiotic targets are penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs). PBPs serve as targets for most commercially available β-lactam antibiotics, including cephalosporins, carbapenems, monobactams, and the famous group of penicillins (Sauvage & Terrak, 2016). As the name ‘penicillin-binding protein’ implies, PBPs can bind to β-lactam antibiotics, because the antibiotics have a high structural similarity to the C-terminal D-Ala-D-Ala moiety of the peptidoglycan stem peptide (Tipper & Strominger, 1965). In doing so, the antibiotics seem to irreversibly bind to the serine residue of the active site of the transpeptidase domain, resulting in inhibition of peptidoglycan cross-linking (Sauvage et al., 2008).

Further, the moenomycin family of antibiotics was shown to inhibit PBP function (Ostash & Walker, 2010). In contrast to penicillins, moenomycin A binds to the enzymatic cavity of the transglycosylase module of bi-functional aPBPs (Lovering et al., 2007). This leads to the blocking of conserved consensus motifs that are important for substrate recognition and thus, prevents cell wall biosynthesis at the step of transglycosylation (Sauvage & Terrak, 2016).

3.1 Lipid II serves as a target for numerous classes of AMPs.

3.1.1 Non-ribosomally synthesized antimicrobial peptides that bind lipid II.

Highly conserved membrane-embedded lipid II cycle intermediates, like lipid II, are also among popular targets of antibiotics, including numerous antimicrobial peptides (AMPs). AMPs fall into two different classes, based on whether they are synthesised by standard transcription and translation on the ribosome or whether the AMPs are produced non-ribosomally on multi-enzyme complexes (Hancock & Chapple, 1999). The vast class of non-ribosomally synthesized AMPs contains many examples that interfere with lipid II (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Oppedijk et al., 2016). Members of the mannopeptimycins and katanosins AMP subfamilies have been shown to directly interact with lipid II (Ruzin et al., 2004, Lee et al., 2016). Another example is the glycopeptide vancomycin that was shown to bind lipid II at its C-terminal D-Ala-D-Ala moiety (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Wang et al., 2018). Furthermore, the recently discovered teixobactin directly binds to lipid II (Ling et al., 2015).
The lipoglycopeptide ramoplanin was shown to target any variant of lipid II cycle intermediates, as long as they contained a pyrophosphate (Walker et al., 2005).

### 3.1.2 Ribosomally-synthesised AMPs that target lipid II.

The other major class of antimicrobial peptides are ribosomally-synthesised and often undergo extensive post-translational modifications (Hancock & Chapple, 1999). These modifications lead to the introduction of characteristic features that are often essential for the antimicrobial activity of the AMPs and are used for their further classification (Cotter et al., 2013).

Amongst those heavily-modified AMPs that often interfere with lipid II cycle intermediates is the subgroup of lanthionine-containing antibiotics. These so-called lantibiotics (Schnell et al., 1988) are heat-stable molecules with a molecular weight below 4 kDa that were shown to be active in a nanomolar range (Cotter et al., 2005). Yet, their main distinction from other ribosomally-synthesised AMPs is due to their high content of unusual amino acids, synthesized by extensive post-translational side-chain modifications. The most prominent and name-giving examples are the thioether amino acids lanthionine and β-methyllanthionine (Bierbaum & Sahl, 2009, Cotter et al., 2013). These unusual residues form covalent thioether bridges between amino acids, which result in internal ‘rings’ and give lantibiotics their characteristic structural features (Cotter et al., 2005). Additionally, many lantibiotics contain other rare amino acids, like didehydroalanine or didehydrobutyrine.

Lantibiotics are mainly produced by Gram-positive bacteria of the Firmicutes or Actinomycetes phyla and target other microbes, while the producer is protected by specific immunity mechanisms (Colin et al., 2008, Alkhatib et al., 2012). The activity spectra of lantibiotics are mainly directed against other low-GC content Gram-positive species, including multi-resistant bacterial strains (Dischinger et al., 2014). Numerous lantibiotics are known to directly interact with lipid II (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006). Yet, the mode of target binding and the mechanism by which certain groups of lantibiotics inhibit the cell wall synthesis differ.
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Class I lantibiotics: lipid II binding and subsequent pore formation.

Class I lantibiotics often have a dual mode of action, based on target binding and subsequent pore formation (Wiedemann et al., 2001, Parisot et al., 2008). They can form pores and increase membrane permeability by interacting non-specifically with negatively charged phospholipids or via a highly specific, lipid II-targeted mechanism (Kordel et al., 1989, Brötz et al., 1998b, Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006).

The class I lantibiotic nisin was first described over 90 years ago (Rogers, 1928). Since then it has been studied extensively and is a well-known lantibiotic representative due to its application as a food preservative (Dischinger et al., 2014). Nisin is a 34-residue-long, elongated lantibiotic that is produced by Lactococcus lactis. It contains five lanthionine or β-methyllanthionine rings and exhibits an overall positive charge (+5, Fig. 1.2 A, Draper et al., 2015). The lantibiotic is the holotype for other nisin-like lantibiotics, including nisin derivatives and the B. subtilis ATCC6633-produced AMP subtilin (Fig. 1.2 B). All nisin-like lantibiotics are very similar in size and charge, and contain several highly conserved and structurally important residues (Dischinger et al., 2014).

At high concentrations, nisin was shown to interact non-specifically with phospholipids of the cytoplasmic membrane, likely due to its highly cationic nature (Wiedemann et al., 2001). In doing so, nisin leads to the deformation the membrane, destabilising membrane curvature, symmetry and lipid packing density and pore formation (Wiedemann et al., 2001, Prince et al., 2016). In addition to these unspecific effects, nisin was shown to specifically interact with lipid II. In vitro binding experiments with phospholipids and model membrane vesicles showed that the affinity of nisin for lipid II was much higher (2 × 10⁷ M⁻¹, Breukink et al., 1999) than for membranes containing anionic phospholipids (1.8 × 10³  M⁻¹,Breukink et al., 2000). In addition, membrane permeability assays using vesicles with and without lipid II revealed a 1000-fold higher nisin activity in the presence of lipid II (Breukink et al., 1999, Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006).

By binding lipid II, nisin inhibits the sequestration of lipid II to the cell division site and block the cell wall biosynthesis (Wiedemann et al., 2001, Hasper et al., 2006). Nisin recognises and binds to the pyrophosphate group, the MurNAc moiety and the first isoprene unit of lipid II (Hsu et al., 2004). The interaction is mediated via the structurally well-conserved N-terminus. The lanthionine rings A and B of nisin are thought to interact with the pyrophosphate via hydrogen bonds, and in doing so form a pyrophosphate cage which explains why nisin also interacts with lipid I (Fig. 1.2 A). Except for some well-conserved amino acids, the backbone scaffold of the cyclic structures seems to play a more important role than the side chain...
composition of nisin (Hsu et al., 2004). The pyrophosphate cage-binding mechanism thus also applies to other lipid II binding class I lantibiotics (Fig. 1.2 A).

Lipid II binding is also the first step towards the second mode of action of this type of lantibiotics: specific lipid II-mediated pore formation (Brötz et al., 1998b, Wiedemann et al., 2001). Once bound, four lipid II-nisin complexes assemble together and recruit four additional nisin molecules (Breukink et al., 2003, Hasper et al., 2004). This very stable ‘pore complex’ enables nisin to insert perpendicularly into the membrane and span the phospholipid bilayer via its C-terminus (Willey & van der Donk, 2007, Oppedijk et al., 2016). During this process, nisin undergoes drastic conformational changes. Recent studies demonstrated the configuration of the C-terminal and the hinge region between lanthionine ring C and D seem to be particularly flexible and responsive to environmental changes (Fig. 1.2 A), indicating their importance to adapt to the target membrane of a given bacterium (Medeiros-Silva et al., 2018). Pore formation leads to an immediate efflux of cytoplasm followed by rapid cell death (Wiedemann et al., 2001, Hasper et al., 2004).

**Class II lantibiotics: inhibition of cell wall biosynthesis by lipid II-binding**

Class II lantibiotics usually also target lipid II to inhibit the cell wall synthesis, but they often lack a nisin-like targeted pore formation mechanism. The paradigm of this group is mersacidin. The peptide is a 19 amino acid long lantibiotic, which contains four lanthionine ring structures and is produced by B. subtilis HIL Y-85,54728 (Fig. 1.2 C, Bierbaum et al., 1995). Unlike class I lantibiotics, mersacidin is a globular peptide and does not possess a positive net charge. In contrast, a conserved, functionally crucial glutamate residue at position 17 within lanthionine ring C gives mersacidin an anionic net charge (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006). Structurally similar to mersacidin, also actagardine and its derivatives that are produced by Actinoplanes liguriae contain the conserved negatively-charged residue (Fig. 1.2 D, Dischinger et al., 2014). Thus, they were classified as mersacidin-like lantibiotics.

Mersacidin was shown to inhibit the cell wall synthesis at the stage of transglycosylation by binding to lipid II, albeit with a lower affinity than nisin (Brötz et al., 1997, Brötz et al., 1998a). However, this interaction does not lead to pore-formation. As mersacidin binding includes the GlcNAc moiety of lipid II, it specifically recognises lipid II but not lipid I (Oppedijk et al., 2016).

A lipid II-binding motif is conserved in all mersacidin-like lantibiotics, comprising the lanthionine-ring structure around the glutamate residue (Fig. 1.2 C, D, Brötz et al., 1998a). As lipid II is mostly negatively charged, direct charge interactions between mersacidin and lipid
II seem unlikely. Mersacidin-like lantibiotics were found to be more active in a calcium-rich environment (Böttiger et al., 2009). These divalent cations are thought to form a bridge between the glutamate of the peptide and lipid II.

Despite the lack of perpendicular membrane insertion, the conformation of mersacidin was found to be highly flexible and crucial for its antimicrobial activity (Hsu et al., 2003). A small hinge region (Ala-12-Abu-13) allows the lantibiotic to modulate the accessibility of the charged residues upon lipid II binding (Fig. 1.2 C, Hsu et al., 2003). This reinforces the indications that electrostatic interactions play an important role in the lantibiotic-target interaction (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Oppedijk et al., 2016).
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3.2 The cyclic dodecapeptide bacitracin targets undecaprenyl pyrophosphate.

The peptide antibiotic bacitracin was shown to disturb the cell wall synthesis by interfering with the lipid carrier intermediates. Yet, bacitracin does not target lipid II, but the lipid carrier in its undecaprenyl pyrophosphate form (Stone & Strominger, 1971).

Bacitracin is a cyclic peptide antibiotic, produced by *B. subtilis* or *B. licheniformis* strains (Johnson *et al.*, 1945). It is active against many Gram-positive bacteria, including pathogens of the *Staphylococcus*, *Streptococcus* and *Clostridium* genera (Ming & Epperson, 2002). It is thus not surprising that bacitracin has been applied in human and veterinary medicine as topical ointment to prevent infection or administered orally against gastrointestinal infections (Ming & Epperson, 2002).

Bacitracin is synthesised by non-ribosomal peptide synthases as mixture of closely related derivatives (bacitracin A, B, D, F and variations thereof), with bacitracin A being the most antimicrobially potent, and the oxidised form, bacitracin F, being the least active (Storm & Strominger, 1973). Bacitracin A consists of twelve amino acid residues (L-Ile1-L-Cys2-L-Leu3-D-Glu4-L-Ile5-L-Lys6-D-Orn7-L-Ile8-D-Phe9-L-His10-D-Asp11-L-Asn12), of which residue 1 and 2 form a thiazoline ring at the N-terminus (Fig. 1.3 A). The condensation of the C-terminal asparagine and the lysine at position 6 results in a lariat-shaped structure, typical for cyclic peptides (Ming & Epperson, 2002).

The antimicrobial activity of bacitracin is based on specifically binding the undecaprenyl pyrophosphate lipid carrier (UPP), and in turn preventing its dephosphorylation (Stone & Strominger, 1971, Storm, 1974). This inhibits the recycling of the lipid carrier and arrests the lipid II cycle. While bacitracin binds UPP and other pyrophosphate-containing isoprenoids with a $K_d$ of around 1 μM, it has much lower affinity to the dephosphorylated form, UP (Storm & Strominger, 1973).

Bacitracin requires divalent metal cations for its antimicrobial activity. Its activity has been shown to increase in the presence of Mg$^{2+}$, Ca$^{2+}$ and Cu$^{2+}$ ions, amongst others. In complex with Zn$^{2+}$ ions, bacitracin was shown to be in its most active state (Stone & Strominger, 1971).

The crystal structure of bacitracin in complex with both, zinc ions and the shorter geranyl pyrophosphate as surrogate for UPP, was solved recently giving an excellent insight into the target recognition and binding (Economou *et al.*, 2013). Bacitracin binds tightly to the pyrophosphate moiety by forming a closed, dome-like structure around it (Fig. 1.3 C). Direct interactions between bacitracin and the phosphate groups of the lipid, as well as indirect interactions mediated via Zn$^{2+}$ and Na$^+$ ions were observed. Upon UPP binding, bacitracin
undergoes an extensive conformational change (Economou et al., 2013). Remarkably, target-bound bacitracin has a truly amphipathic configuration, with almost all polar residues interacting with the pyrophosphate group and facing the membrane surface (Fig. 1.3 B). All non-polar residues are buried towards the membrane environment and some of them are thought to interact with the adjacent isoprenoid unit (Economou et al., 2013). The structural insights also give an explanation as to why, in contrast to other antimicrobial peptides, bacitracin does not target lipid II. The sugar and peptide moieties attached to the pyrophosphate are simply too large to fit into the tight amphipathic shell formed by bacitracin (Fig. 1.3 C, Economou et al., 2013).
Figure 1.3: Bacitracin adopts an amphipathic configuration upon target binding. A: Schematic structure of bacitracin A, indicating the amino acid residues. Grey: no charge, red: negatively charged, blue: positively charged. Leu: leucine, Glu: glutamate, Ile: isoleucine, Lys: lysine, Orn: ornithine, Phe: phenylalanine, His: histidine, Asp: aspartate, Asn: asparagine. B: Amphipathic configuration of bacitracin. The peptide backbone is coloured yellow, hydrophilic side chains are coloured blue, and hydrophobic side chains are coloured red (Economou et al., 2013). C: Opaque surface representation of bacitracin bound to geranyl pyrophosphate from different angles. This depiction highlights the almost complete burial of the pyrophosphate group (Economou et al., 2013).
4. Resistance and self-protection against AMPs in Firmicutes

Similar to resistance against other classes of antibiotics, bacteria have evolved different defence strategies to circumvent growth inhibition or even death caused by antimicrobial peptides. Further, the producer strains of AMPs of course need to protect themselves from the antimicrobial action of their products. Among these adaptations are modifications of the cell wall and the cell membrane or the destruction of AMPs. Furthermore, different variants of transporters or specific resistance proteins have been described (Draper et al., 2015, Revilla-Guarinos et al., 2014, Joo et al., 2016). Numerous mechanisms of immunity and resistance against AMPs could be discussed, but the following paragraphs focuses on examples of resistance mechanisms of low GC content Gram-positive bacteria, also known as Firmicutes.

4.1 Modifications of cellular targets to evade AMP action

Modifications of the cellular targets of AMPs can include alterations of membrane charge or fluidity or structural modifications of the targets to avoid interaction with AMPs. One example of phospholipid modifications is the lysinilation of membrane phospholipids (Peschel et al., 2001). In S. aureus and other Gram-positives, the phosphatidylglycerol lysyltransferase MprF modifies the membrane lipid phosphatidylglycerol with L-lysine, thereby neutralising the anionic net charge of the membrane (Draper et al., 2015). MprF-mediated AMP resistance is thus most likely based on repulsion of cationic AMPs. Another well-described example is the D-alanylation of lipo- and wall teichoic acids (Neuhaus & Baddiley, 2003, Revilla-Guarinos et al., 2014). Facilitated by the dltABCD operon, a D-alanine residue is added onto a free hydroxyl group of the repeating sugars of lipo- and wall teichoic acids (Perego et al., 1995). The D-Ala esterification leads to the incorporation of positive residues into the cell envelope and higher resistance against many cationic AMPs (Draper et al., 2015). Moreover, also vancomycin resistance in several Gram-positive strains is caused by target alteration. These strains contain operons encoding enzymes that are able to modify the stem peptide of lipid II (Courvalin, 2006). In the presence of vancomycin stress, these enzymes are produced and alter the C-terminal D-Ala residue to D-lactate or D-serine. As vancomycin only targets the D-Ala-D-Ala moiety of the lipid II stem peptide (Wang et al., 2018), it has much lower affinity to the modified stem peptide, and thus cannot block the cell wall synthesis anymore (Courvalin, 2006).
Target alteration further plays a role in bacitracin resistance. Bacitracin targets the pyrophosphate moiety of undecaprenyl pyrophosphate (UPP), but has significantly lower affinity to UP (Storm & Strominger, 1973). In *B. subtilis*, the dephosphorylation reaction of UPP to UP is catalysed by the UPP phosphatases BcrC and UppP (Bernard *et al.*, 2005, Zhao *et al.*, 2016, Radeck *et al.*, 2017a). By removing a phosphate group the phosphatases contribute to resistance against bacitracin. To adjust the levels of UPP dephosphorylation, BcrC production is regulated by the extracytoplasmic function (ECF) σ factors, σ^M and σ^X (Cao & Helmann, 2002). In the presence of antimicrobial stress, including bacitracin, the production of BcrC is upregulated, providing additional protection against bacitracin.

### 4.2 Inactivation or degradation of AMPs in the extracytoplasmic space

While the just described resistance mechanisms focus on modifications of the cellular target, most more specific defence strategies involve a direct interaction with the AMP. In many cases, resistance determinants neutralise the AMP by degradation or inactivation in other ways.

An example for inactivation of an AMP in the extracellular space is the phospholipid-shedding mechanism, observed in Agr-defective *Staphylococcus aureus* mutants, resulting in resistance against the last-resort lipopeptide antibiotic daptomycin (Pader *et al.*, 2016). Daptomycin targets the bacterial cell membrane and leads to inhibition of the cell wall synthesis and decrease of the membrane potential by rearrangement of lipid domains (Muller *et al.*, 2016). In response to daptomycin, *S. aureus* cells are thought to release phospholipids from the membrane that bind daptomycin, and thereby inactivate the antibiotic (Pader *et al.*, 2016).

As an alternative to inactivation via binding the AMPs in the extracellular space, many Gram-positive bacteria produce extracellular proteases that degrade the AMPs by proteolysis. In general, AMP degrading proteases possess a broad substrate range and can either be secreted into the extracellular space or attached to the outer face of the cytoplasmic membrane (Nawrocki *et al.*, 2014).

The nisin resistance protein NSR is an example for peptidases that specifically provide resistance against nisin and potentially also closely-related lantibiotics (Sun *et al.*, 2009). Conserved *nsr* operons are present in various Gram-positive species, including human pathogens (Khosa *et al.*, 2013, Khosa *et al.*, 2016b). NSR is a 35 kDa lipoprotein and anchored
to the cytoplasmic membrane via an N-terminal hydrophobic transmembrane helix (Khosa et al., 2013).

Nisin and other lantibiotics are generally well-protected against proteolysis by their stable lanthionine and methyllanthionine rings. Nevertheless, NSR peptidases that belong to the family of C-terminal processing serine peptidases inactivate the AMPs by degradation. The mechanism of nisin degradation has been revealed for NSR of Lactococcus lactis TS1640 (Sun et al., 2009). NSR cleaves the peptide bond between the methyllanthionine residue at position 28 that builds the methyl-lanthionine ring E and the serine at position 29. In doing so, nisin loses its six amino acids-long C-terminal tail, and in turn its antimicrobial potency decreases 100-fold (Sun et al., 2009).

The structure of NSR of Streptococcus agalactiae has recently been revealed and showed that NSR forms a central, hydrophobic tunnel, which likely harbours both, the substrate binding domain and the active site required for peptidase activity (Khosa et al., 2016a). The core domain of NSR exhibits a ‘TASSAEM’ motif, which is highly conserved within the NSR superfamily and contains the catalytically active serine at position 236, facing the inside of the tunnel. The serine residue lies in close vicinity of a conserved histidine residue, and jointly they form the active site responsible for nisin cleavage (Khosa et al., 2016a). A structural model suggests the C-terminal lanthionine rings D and E of nisin to play a major role in substrate recognition as well as for the orientation and accurate positioning of the peptide in the active site of NSR. Accordingly, residues asparagine, methionine and isoleucine at positions 172 to 174 seem to form a hydrophobic pocket to accommodate rings D and E of nisin (Khosa et al., 2016a).

4.3 Transport of AMPs as immunity and resistance strategy

A well-known strategy to mediate resistance against antibiotics as well as AMPs is by transport. In the superfamily of ATP-binding cassette (ABC) transporters, several subgroups contain members involved in either resistance or immunity against AMPs in Firmicutes (Gebhard, 2012). Here, ‘resistance’ is defined as the protection against exogenously-produced compounds, while ‘immunity’ describes the self-protection of producer strains against their own product.
4.3.1 LanFEG-type transporters mainly mediate self-protection in lantibiotic producers.

LanFEG transporters consist of two permeases of 200 to 250 amino acids. Each permease comprises six transmembrane helices and is linked to one ATPase (Fig. 1.4 A, Gebhard, 2012). Most of the transporters described in this family are involved in self-protection of producer strains against lantibiotics, and co-produced in the biosynthesis gene cluster of the corresponding lantibiotic (Colin et al., 2008, Alkhathib et al., 2012). Well-studied examples include the immunity to nisin in *L. lactis*, conferred by NisFEG (Stein et al., 2003) and self-protection against subtilin in *B. subtilis* ATCC6633 provided by SpaFEG (Stein et al., 2005). Generally, the substrate specificity of LanFEG transporters was found to be very narrow and specifically directed against the endogenously produced lantibiotic or structurally very closely related derivatives (Gebhard, 2012). The transporter EpiFEG can recognise the highly similar class I lantibiotics epidermin and gallidermin, but does not confer protection against nisin (Otto et al., 1998). Consistently, no cross-immunity has been observed for nisin and subtilin by SpaFEG and NisFEG, respectively (Stein et al., 2003, 2005).

In contrast to immunity-conferring transporters, the transporter CprABC of *Clostridium difficile* is not associated with a biosynthesis cluster typical for lantibiotics, and thus it provides resistance to exogenously-produced antimicrobial peptides rather than self-protection (McBride & Sonenshein, 2011, Gebhard, 2012). Interestingly, the substrate range of CprABC seems to be broader than observed for lantibiotic immunity transporters. CprABC confers resistance to nisin and gallidermin (McBride & Sonenshein, 2011).

The direction of substrate transport has been determined for several LanFEG-type transporters. Studies using peptide release assays or transport studies with fluorescently-labelled lantibiotics concluded unambiguously that the substrate is exported away from the membrane, where the targets of lantibiotics, lipid II cycle intermediates, are located (Otto et al., 1998, Stein et al., 2003, Stein et al., 2005, Okuda et al., 2008).

4.3.2 BcrAB-type transporters are ancestors of LanFEG-type transporters.

BcrAB-like transporters consist of one permease of around 230 amino acids with six predicted transmembrane helices and one ATPase (Fig. 1.4 B, Gebhard, 2012). To be functional, this type of transporters forms an $A_2B_2$ dimeric transporter. A well-characterised member is BcrAB of *B. licheniformis* ATCC10716, a bacitracin producer strain. The genes encoding BcrAB are clustered within the bacitracin biosynthesis locus (Neumüller et al., 2001). Thus, it is not surprising that BcrAB confers immunity against the antimicrobial peptide bacitracin.
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(Padlesek et al., 1995, Padlesek et al., 2000). A second characterized transporter is BcrAB of Enterococcus faecalis (Manson et al., 2004). In this case, BcrAB is not associated with bacitracin production, but confers high levels of resistance against the cyclic peptide in numerous Enterococcus species including clinical isolates (Manson et al., 2004, Matos et al., 2009).

The transport mechanism of this group remains elusive. BcrAB of B. licheniformis was proposed to act akin to the mammalian multidrug transporter P-glycoprotein, which binds its substrate directly in the hydrophobic membrane environment and expels it from the membrane into the extracellular space (Higgins & Gottesman, 1992, Gottesman & Pastan, 1993, Padlesek et al., 1995). This hypothesis, however, has never been proven experimentally for BcrAB. Experimental evidence for AMP expulsion from the membrane is only available for LanFEG-type transporters that have been shown to descend from BcrAB transporters (Gebhard, 2012). Thus, a similar transport mechanism is likely.

4.3.3 BceAB-like transporters confer resistance against a broader substrate range.

BceAB-like transporters comprise two proteins, one ATPase and one large permease of approximately 650 amino acids (Fig. 1.4 C, Gebhard, 2012). The permease consists of ten predicted transmembrane helices with a large extracellular domain of around 200 amino acids, located between helices 7 and 8 (Fig. 1.4 C). In contrast to other ABC transporters, the permeases of BceAB-like transporters do not further dimerise. Yet, BceB-like permeases possibly form ‘pseudo heterodimers’ with themselves, as they were found to contain conserved domains (TMH1-4, TMH7-10, Khwaja et al., 2005, Dintner et al., 2014).

BceAB-like transporters are, with some exceptions, not associated with the biosynthesis gene clusters of AMPs (Gebhard, 2012). In contrast to the described LanFEG- and BcrAB-type transporters, BceAB-like transporters were shown to generally possess a broader substrate range by conferring resistance against several AMPs (Gebhard, 2012). The substrates of BceAB-like transporters are often structurally very different from each other and not restricted to the group of lantibiotics, but can also include cyclic peptides, glycopeptides or β-lactam antibiotics. Furthermore, BceAB-like transporters provide protection against defensins and cathelicidins of mammalian origin (Dintner et al., 2011, Gebhard & Mascher, 2011, Staron et al., 2011, Gebhard, 2012).

For this type of transporter, the transport mechanism remains puzzling. Several opposing hypotheses have been proposed, but only a few are supported by direct experimental data.
Furthermore, the molecular mechanism of substrate recognition and specificity are currently unknown. The characteristic large extracellular domain of BceAB-like transporters poses a major difference to the domain architectures of the other here described transporters that confer resistance or immunity against AMPs in Firmicutes (Fig. 1.4 C). As BceAB-like transporters showed a much broader substrate range, this extracellular domain could be responsible for substrate recognition and specificity. The extracellular domain was shown to be essential for transporter function (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Coumes-Florens et al., 2011). Further, domain swap experiments between two S. aureus transporters led to an exchange of substrate specificity and indicated that the domain was likely responsible for the determination of the substrate specificity (Hiron et al., 2011).

4.4 Sequestration of AMPs by resistance and immunity proteins

In an alternative mechanism to transport, many Gram-positives produce proteins that sequester AMPs in the extracellular space to counteract their antimicrobial effect on the cell surface.

One example of a protein that is secreted into the extracellular environment and confers resistance against AMPs by sequestration is SIC (Streptococcal inhibitor of complement) of Streptococcus pyogenes (Neuhaus & Baddiley, 2003). This hydrophilic protein acts by binding AMPs, including α-defensin and LL-37. In doing so, SIC keeps the AMPs away from the membrane, and in turn inhibits their antimicrobial activity against the bacterium (Frick et al., 2003).

Other proteins that bind specific AMPs in the extracytoplasmic space, but are anchored or at least tethered to the membrane, are LanI or LanH immunity proteins. As described before, self-protection against lantibiotics is generally conferred by LanFEG-type ABC transporters. In addition, lantibiotic biosynthesis loci regularly contain genes encoding LanI or LanH lipoproteins (Fig. 1.4 A, Colin et al., 2008, Alkhatib et al., 2012).

4.4.1 The LanI proteins SpaI and NisI directly bind their substrates.

Among the best-described LanI immunity proteins are NisI and SpaI, which protect their corresponding lantibiotic producer strains against nisin or subtilin, respectively. Both proteins mediate some level of immunity when produced in the absence of the LanFEG.
transporters, but full protection was only achieved when Nisl or Spal and the cognate immunity transporter were both present (Stein et al., 2003, Stein et al., 2005). As the effect of both immunity determinants was additive, the immunity is thought to be provided by two independent protection mechanisms, rather than by a cooperative mode of action (Stein et al., 2003, 2005).

Nisl and Spal both interact directly with their substrate (Stein et al., 2003, Takala et al., 2004, Stein et al., 2005). They were not shown to modify or degrade the lantibiotic and are thus thought to confer immunity by sequestration of the lantibiotic (Khosa et al., 2016b). Although subtilin and nisin are similar peptides, no cross-immunity against the other lantibiotic is provided by either of the proteins, pointing towards a highly specific mode of substrate recognition. Additionally, the two LanI proteins seem to differ significantly in size and were found to only have little sequence homology (Christ et al., 2012a, Hacker et al., 2015b).

Spal is a 16.8 kDa lipoprotein that is attached to the surface of the cytoplasmic membrane via a covalent diacylglycerol anchor (Fig. 1.4 A). The positively-charged N-terminus forms a flexible linker between the lipid anchor and the Spal core domain. When in the membrane environment, the N-terminus is thought to form an amphipathic helix. The structured part of Spal mainly consists of \( \beta \)-strands and \( \alpha \)-helices that assemble to a novel three-dimensional fold. They form a twisted antiparallel \( \beta \)-sheet, which is flanked by an unusually long \( \beta \)-hairpin (Christ et al., 2012a, 2012b).

The exact subtilin binding site of Spal remains puzzling. Two possibilities have been proposed: a hydrophobic patch surrounded by negatively charged residues facing the periplasm, or the surprisingly negatively charged surface in vicinity to the likewise negatively charged membrane. This anionic surface is thought to bind the overall positively charged subtilin, either by competing with the pyrophosphate moiety of lipid II as alternative target for subtilin or by binding the two positively charged residues within the C-terminus of lipid II-bound subtilin (Christ et al., 2012a, 2012b). In agreement, also the structures of the LanI homologs EntI and EriI revealed this negatively charged surface, indicating it is important for binding the positively charged lantibiotics, entianin and ericin, respectively (Christ et al., 2012a).

Nisl consists of two independent domains (12.7 and 14 kDa), connected by a flexible linker (Fig. 1.4 A, Hacker et al., 2015a, Hacker et al., 2015b). Interestingly, the three-dimensional fold of both domains is highly similar to each other, and to the core domain of Spal. Despite their structural similarity, the two Nisl domains possess quite different surface properties. Similar to Spal, the surface of the N-terminal domain is positively charged and was shown to interact with the membrane. The C-terminal domain of Nisl is highly negatively charged, as
is the core region of SpaI. The anionic C-terminal domain was shown to harbour the nisin binding site (Hacker et al., 2015b). The amino acids thought to be responsible for nisin binding are located in proximity to the N-terminal domain and are involved in interaction between the domains in the absence of nisin. NisI binds nisin with a $K_d$ in the micromolar range (Takala et al., 2004). The low-affinity interaction is surprising, considering that nisin has antimicrobial activity in the low nanomolar range. This finding led to the idea that the immunity mechanism of NisI might not be the simple sequestration of nisin from the extracellular environment, but might involve the membrane-anchored target, lipid II (Hacker et al., 2015b). Supporting this argument, a possible lipid II binding site of NisI was determined recently (Jeong & Ha, 2018).

### 4.4.2 NukH and NukFEG use a cooperative immunity mechanism.

A direct binding interaction between substrate and the extracytoplasmic immunity determinant was also observed for the LanH immunity protein, NukH (Colin et al., 2008). With three predicted transmembrane helices, NukH is located at the cytoplasmic membrane (Fig. 1.4 A), and structurally different from the LanI proteins described above (Okuda et al., 2005). NukH provides protection against the class II lantibiotics nukacin ISK-1 and lacticin 481 and was shown to directly recognise and capture nukacin ISK-1 via its C-terminus (Okuda et al., 2008). Interestingly, NukH in combination with the LanFEG-type transporter NukFEG provided a much higher degree of immunity than the sum of both together, suggesting a cooperative immunity mechanism (Aso et al., 2005). It was thus proposed that NukH acts as substrate binding protein for NukFEG, and that nukacin ISK-1 is being transported away from the membrane by NukFEG after being sequestered by NukH (Okuda et al., 2008).
4.4.3 **Pepl seems to sequester the cellular target rather than the lantibiotic.**

Yet, not all Lan immunity proteins seem to work by sequestration of the lantibiotic (Colin et al., 2008). Immunity of Pep5-producer *Staphylococcus epidermidis* against this class I lantibiotic is solely mediated by Pepl, as it has not been found to be associated with a LanFEG-type transporter. Pepl is located and functions at the outer face of the cell membrane (Fig. 1.4 A, Reis et al., 1994, Hoffmann et al., 2004). It consists of a hydrophobic, likely membrane-associated N-terminus, and a hydrophilic C-terminus that is essential for mediation of immunity (Fig. 1.4 A, Hoffmann et al., 2004). The C-terminal region contains multiple positively charged residues, which makes it unlikely to directly interact with the likewise cationic Pep5 (Kaletta et al., 1989). Instead, Pepl was proposed to bind the cellular target of the lantibiotic, shielding the target from the inhibitory effect of Pep5. The exact target of Pep5 has not yet been determined (Oppedijk, 2017), but it is likely to be an anionic compound of the cell envelope, which could then directly be bound by the positively charged stretches of Pepl (Hoffmann et al., 2004, Colin et al., 2008).

While the described LanI and LanH immunity proteins all seem to either sequester the lantibiotic or bind the cellular target to shield it from inhibition by the AMP, their structural and other characteristic features are highly variable and also the immunity mechanisms seem to differ between Lan immunity proteins. These examples demonstrate the enormous variety of resistance and immunity strategies bacteria are able to develop to confer resistance, even against AMPs, the promising candidates for new therapeutics.
Figure 1.4: Schematic domain architectures of ABC transporters subfamilies that mediate resistance or immunity against AMPs. A: LanFEG-like transporters are encoded in a lanFEG operon and are composed of two ATPase units (LanF) and two permeases (LanE and LanG), containing six TMHs each. LanFEG-like transporters are often co-produced with LanI or LanH immunity proteins. These proteins have variable domain architectures with some examples depicted. These immunity proteins are not in all cases associated with LanFEG transporters. B: BcrAB-like transporters are encoded in a bcrAB operon and are composed of two ATPase units (BcrA) and two permeases (BcrB), containing six TMHs each. C: BceAB-like transporters are encoded in a bceAB operon and are composed of two ATPase units (BceA) and one permease (BceB), containing ten TMHs. A characteristic large extracellular domain (around 200 amino acids) is located between TMH7 and TMH8.
5. Substrate recognition of regulatory and resistance proteins

It is of great importance to investigate and understand the immunity and resistance mechanisms bacteria already have developed, including the molecular details behind substrate recognition. AMPs can then be modified to escape the resistance determinants, while still maintaining their antimicrobial potency. A recent example is the development of a nisin variant in which the serine residue at position 29 was replaced with a proline. The nisin variant S29P upheld the level of antimicrobial activity against a variety of target strains, and revealed increased activity against strains producing the NSR resistance protein (Field et al., 2018). The reason for the decrease in resistance of the NSR producing strain is that the serine peptidase NSR could not cleave off the six C-terminal amino acids as it requires the serine for this action (Sun et al., 2009). Thus, NSR could not confer its usual level of resistance against nisin S29P.

5.1 How do regulatory proteins sense AMPs in the extracytoplasmic space?

Substrate recognition is the initial step of any resistance mechanism that involves direct interaction with AMPs. Additionally, many resistance determinants are regulated by sensory proteins, which can perceive their stimulus by direct binding of the AMPs, and subsequently facilitate the production of the resistance determinant. This task is often performed by two-component regulatory systems, comprising a sensor kinase and a response regulator, or regulators that combine both functions in a single protein. When stimulus perception and signal transfer of these regulatory proteins are impaired, the response of bacteria against antimicrobial stress cannot be upregulated, leaving the cell vulnerable. Understanding the mechanistic details of substrate recognition of regulatory proteins is thus as important as understanding the resistance mechanism itself. As most AMPs target the cell envelope of bacteria, the following focusses on stimulus perception in the extracytoplasmic space or membrane interface.
5.1.1 Prototypical periplasmic-sensing histidine kinases detect AMPs via an extracytoplasmic domain.

Many LanFEG-type transporters like NisFEG or SpaFEG are associated with and their production regulated by LanRK systems (NisRK and SpaRK, respectively, Alkhatab et al., 2012). The sensor kinases LanK have been shown to act by auto-inducing lantibiotic biosynthesis and immunity in response to the extracellular lantibiotic itself (Kleerebezem, 2004, Gebhard, 2012). The induction of LanK is highly-specific to the corresponding lantibiotic, and with detection of the lantibiotic in the picomolar range, also highly sensitive (Kuipers et al., 1995). LanK kinases are classified as prototypical periplasmic-sensing histidine kinases (Mascher et al., 2006, Gebhard, 2012). The N-terminal stimulus-perceiving input domain of these kinases consists of two transmembrane helices, connected via a 50 to 300 amino acid-long extracytoplasmic domain. Their C-terminal cytoplasmic transmitter domain contains a conserved histidine residue for autophosphorylation, followed by the highly conserved catalytic domain (Mascher et al., 2006). The extracellular domain has been shown to be important for substrate recognition and specificity by domain swap experiments between SpaFEG and NisFEG (Kleerebezem, 2004). The domains are thought to directly bind the lantibiotic, but the details behind the binding mechanism remain enigmatic (Kleerebezem, 2004).

The related prototypical periplasmic-sensing histidine kinase PhoQ is involved in regulation of antimicrobial peptide resistance in many Gram-negative bacteria (Bader et al., 2005, Mascher et al., 2006). The substrate binding mechanism of PhoQ, mediated by its periplasmic sensory domain, is well-understood and serves as example of substrate recognition of AMP-sensing kinases. PhoQ is activated by low concentrations of cations and upon increasing concentrations of various AMPs, yet is repressed when divalent cations are abundant in high amounts (Bader et al., 2005). The periplasmic sensory domain of PhoQ does not contain a cavity or discrete binding pocket for substrate binding, but a rather flat and negatively charged surface on one side of the protein. This anionic surface is located in close proximity to the likewise negatively charged cytoplasmic membrane. In its repressed state, the sensory domain of PhoQ is tethered to the membrane by ionic interactions mediated by divalent cations (Bader et al., 2005). Recognition of cationic AMPs that often target the cell membrane disrupt the bond between the membrane and the kinase domain, as does the decrease of cations to low levels. As a result, the periplasmic domain is lifted off the negatively charged membrane. The concomitant structural rearrangement is transmitted via the
transmembrane helices and ultimately results in auto-phosphorylation of PhoQ and subsequent signal transfer (Bader et al., 2005, Mascher et al., 2006).

5.1.2 The formation of hydrophobic pockets allows substrate recognition in the membrane.

Two-component regulatory systems containing kinases that lack such periplasmic sensory domains often perceive the stimulus at or within the membrane interface (Mascher et al., 2006). In the phylum of Firmicutes, several types of such ‘intramembrane’-sensing kinases were found to be involved in AMP sensing (Gebhard, 2012). These kinases can be responsible for regulation of resistance determinants (I 6.2). However, some examples instead regulate AMP production, often by a quorum sensing regulatory mechanism.

Quorum sensing-based systems enable communication within a bacterial species, which is used to coordinate their collective behaviour (Miller & Bassler, 2001). The involved histidine kinases are thus classified as peptide quorum sensor kinases and contain six transmembrane helices, but lack a prominent extracellular domain (Mascher et al., 2006). When a certain threshold concentration of AMPs in the extracellular environment is reached, the corresponding kinase can detect them. Stimulus detection by these quorum sensor kinases involve substrate binding and recognition in the membrane environment. The transmembrane helices of such kinases form a hydrophobic pocket between them, in which a first non-sequence specific interaction with the substrate takes place. Subsequently, a sequence-specific interaction with one of the kinase’s extracellular loops triggers the signalling cascade (Mascher et al., 2006, Gebhard, 2012). Via the cognate response regulator, AMP production is upregulated, which ultimately results in a positive feedback loop (Mascher et al., 2006).

In multiple cases, the production of antibiotic resistance is regulated by members of the xenobiotic response elements (XRE) regulator family, which include DNA-binding transcriptional regulators containing a helix–turn–helix motif (Gebhard, 2012). Bacitracin resistance of E. faecalis conferred by BcrAB, for example, is regulated by such a one-component regulatory system. The transcriptional repressor BcrR is responsible for both, direct stimulus perception and signal transfer to the DNA-binding domain, which then facilitates the appropriate response to counteract the antimicrobial stress (Manson et al., 2004, Gebhard et al., 2009). The N-terminus of BcrR contains the DNA binding domain. This region of BcrR was shown to be constitutively bound to two inverted repeat regions of the
bcrA promotor DNA in vitro, irrespective of the presence or absence of the stressor (Gauntlett et al., 2008). The C-terminus is located in the cytoplasmic membrane and predicted to comprise four transmembrane helices, but lacks longer extracellular domains (Gauntlett et al., 2008). BcrR thus seems to be associated with its target DNA while localised in the membrane. This would require the respective DNA locus to be pulled towards the cell membrane. Yet this hypothesis has not been addressed further.

BcrR was shown to directly bind the AMP bacitracin when it is in complex with Zn$^{2+}$ ions (Gebhard et al., 2009). As bacitracin is unlikely to be imported into the cell due to its amphipathic nature, and because of BcrR’s lack of obvious input domains, bacitracin binding was suggested to potentially take place at the membrane interface (Gebhard et al., 2009). In agreement, a recent study suggested the putative bacitracin binding site in the second extracellular loop of the C-terminal transmembrane domain (Darnell et al., 2019). Further investigations are required to shed light on the details of the binding interaction between BcrR and bacitracin. Yet, also here substrate recognition in a hydrophobic pocket, formed between membrane-spanning helices, seems plausible.

5.2 How do transporters recognise and bind AMPs in the extracytoplasmic space?

On the grounds of recent structural studies, we have gained valuable insights into the substrate recognition of LanI-type immunity proteins (I 4.4.1) and other resistance proteins (I 5.1, Christ et al., 2012a, Hacker et al., 2015b, Khosa et al., 2016a, Jeong & Ha, 2018). However, little is known about how the resistance transporters described above recognise and bind their substrates in the extracytoplasmic environment, nor about which factors influence substrate specificity or binding affinity. Similar to prototypical periplasmic-sensing kinases, extracytoplasmic domains also seem to play an important role in substrate recognition and specificity of other resistance transporters.
5.2.1 The periplasmic domains of RND-type multi-drug efflux pumps harbour the substrate binding sites.

A well-described example is the resistance-nodulation-division (RND)-type multidrug efflux pump AcrB of *E. coli* (Pos, 2009, Du *et al.*, 2018). *acrB* encodes a membrane-embedded transporter that forms a tripartite efflux pump by interacting with the periplasmic adapter protein AcrA (Murakami *et al.*, 2002). The adapter molecule in turn stabilises the interaction with the outer membrane channel TolC, granting efflux across the outer membrane. Characteristically for multidrug pumps, AcrAB confers resistance against a vast number of lipophilic and amphipathic molecules including drugs, dyes and detergents (Elkins & Nikaido, 2002). Conversely, the RND-family multidrug efflux pump AcrD has a fairly narrow substrate range and transports mainly hydrophilic substrates like aminoglycosides (Aires & Nikaido, 2005).

Both efflux pumps possess two characteristic large extracellular domains per protomer (Elkins & Nikaido, 2002). In domain swap experiments, in which the periplasmic loops of AcrB and AcrD were exchanged, Elkins and colleagues (2002) demonstrated that AcrDloop(AcrB) acquired the broader AcrB-like substrate specificity, while the substrate range of AcrBloop(AcrD) narrowed down to substrates characteristic for AcrD, confirming that the periplasmic loops were responsible for substrate specificity in RND-type multidrug efflux pumps.

The periplasmic loops of AcrB form a so-called ‘pore’ domain on top of the central cavity that is located between the transmembrane domains (Murakami *et al.*, 2002). The four subdomains of the pore harbour the main substrate binding sites. Access to these binding pockets is possible through several channel pathways, allowing the transporter to bind substrates directly from the periplasm, the periplasm-membrane interface or through the central cavity (Aires & Nikaido, 2005, Zwama *et al.*, 2018). Proximal and distal binding pockets of this highly flexible domain are equipped with various polar, aromatic and hydrophobic residues, which makes them eminently suitable for binding a wide range of substrates (Nakashima *et al.*, 2011). Conformational changes driven by the proton-motive force lead to substrate extrusion to the extracellular space via a funnel-like structure and the outer membrane channel TolC (Pos, 2009, Du *et al.*, 2018), and thus to resistance against the transported molecule. The pore domain of the AcrB transporter is an excellent example for extracytoplasmic substrate binding domains that recognise substrates located in the membrane and feature a broad substrate range due their conformational flexibility.
5.2.2. Extracytoplasmic domains of ABC transporters are important for substrate interactions.

Stressing their importance in substrate recognition and binding even further, extracytoplasmic binding domains are also important in ATP-binding cassette (ABC) transporters, which are closer related to the AMP resistance and immunity transporters described above (I.4.3).

The ABC transporter MacB is known to form a tripartite efflux pumps with its adapter molecule MacA and the outer membrane channel TolC in various Gram-negative bacteria (Rouquette-Loughlin et al., 2005, Fitzpatrick et al., 2017, Crow et al., 2017, Okada et al., 2017). With only four transmembrane helices and dimerisation instead of trimer formation, MacB has a very different membrane architecture to AcrB-type tripartite efflux pumps described above. Further, MacB contains only one large periplasmic domain between TMH1 and TMH2. MacB confers resistance against macrolide antibiotics like erythromycin (Kobayashi et al., 2001) and is involved in secretion of enterotoxins (Yamanaka et al., 2008). Recently, MacB was also shown to mediate resistance against the AMPs bacitracin and colistin (Crow et al., 2017). Extensive site-directed mutagenesis revealed a cluster of mutations in the periplasmic domain that reduced antibiotic resistance to erythromycin as well as bacitracin and colistin in vivo. The mutation of eight polar and aromatic residues that lie in close proximity to each other and are located at the interior interface of the dimeric periplasmic domains had the most prominent effect on antibiotic resistance (Crow et al., 2017). This region was therefore concluded to play a role in substrate recognition and binding. ATP-dependent dimerisation of the nucleotide binding domains (NBD) of MacB induces the opening and closing of the periplasmic domains via conformational changes of the transmembrane segments (Crow et al., 2017). By this, the substrate is thought to be extruded from its binding domains into the extracellular space, via the MacA-TolC efflux duct.

Yet, extracytoplasmic domains are not only involved in AMP recognition and binding. LolCDE is an ABC transporter comprising a homodimer of the ATPase subunit LolD and one of each membrane-located proteins LolC and LolE forming a heterodimer (Yakushi et al., 2000). LolC and LolE both possess four transmembrane helices with a large extracellular domain between TMH1 and TMH2. In contrast to MacB, LolCDE does not form a tripartite drug efflux pump. Instead, LolCDE is crucial for the extraction of lipoproteins that are specific for the outer membrane of Gram-negative bacteria from the cytoplasmic membrane (Yakushi et al., 2000, Narita & Tokuda, 2017). Substrate binding of particular lipoproteins by LolCE was shown to
take place in the outer leaflet of the inner membrane. While the exact mechanism is controversial (Okuda & Tokuda, 2009, Mizutani et al., 2013, Crow et al., 2017), it is known that the hydrophobic lipoprotein is passed on to the periplasmic chaperone LolA (Taniguchi & Tokuda, 2008). The lipoprotein is then transferred to LolB, which facilitates its incorporation into the outer membrane. The recently determined structure of the periplasmic domain of LolC revealed a similar fold to the MacB substrate binding domain (Crow et al., 2017). Further, ATP binding by LolD, but not its hydrolysis, was shown to release the substrate from the LolCDE-substrate complex (Ito et al., 2006, Narita & Tokuda, 2006). These analogies to MacB suggest a similar role of the periplasmic domains in substrate binding and similarities in the transport mechanism.

Moreover, FtsEX is a widely conserved protein among bacteria. Although it possesses an ABC transporter-like structure (Schmidt et al., 2004), FtsEX does not seem to play a role in drug efflux or substrate transfer. Its responsibility revolves around the coordination of peptidoglycan hydrolysis with cell division in numerous Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria (Yang et al., 2011, Sham et al., 2013, Meisner et al., 2013, Mavrici et al., 2014) or sporulation initiation in B. subtilis (Garti-Levi et al., 2008). FtsX contains a large extracytoplasmic loop, located between TMH1 and TMH2 of its four transmembrane helices. Several in vitro and in vivo studies of FtsX of various bacteria have shown that this domain directly interacts with its respective binding partner, proteins involved in peptidoglycan hydrolysis (Yang et al., 2011, Sham et al., 2013, Mavrici et al., 2014). Structures of FtsX of Mycobacterium tuberculosis revealed that the extracellular domain forms two flexible lobes with a hydrophobic cleft between them (Mavrici et al., 2014). Exposing four phenylalanine residues, the cleft was proposed to be the interaction site with the binding partner. Due to flexible hinge regions, the domain can acquire different conformations, thereby opening and closing the cleft (Mavrici et al., 2014). The signal inducing the structural readjustment to an activated state of FtsX is thought to be passed on from the ATPase FtsE (Mavrici et al., 2014).
6. The Bce system of *B. subtilis* is the paradigm for AMP resistance in Firmicutes.

6.1 The Bce-like systems of the Gram-positive model organism *B. subtilis*

To gain further insights into the substrate specificity of ABC transporters in Firmicutes and to ultimately elucidate their resistance mechanism against AMPs, we here focus on investigations on a resistance system of *Bacillus subtilis* 168 (from here onwards referred to as *B. subtilis*, if not further specified).

*B. subtilis* serves as model organism of the phylum of low-GC content Gram-positive bacteria. The rod-shaped, soil-dwelling organism is amongst the best-characterised prokaryotes with regards to molecular and cell biology (Graumann, 2007). *B. subtilis* is non-pathogenic, and thus safe to work with, while closely related *Bacillus* species like *B. cereus* or *B. anthracis* are the cause of food-borne illness or anthrax, respectively. Full genome sequences (Kunst *et al.*, 1997, Barbe *et al.*, 2009), and lists of essential genes and correlating gene deletion libraries of non-essential genes are available (Kobayashi *et al.*, 2003, Peters *et al.*, 2016, Koo *et al.*, 2017), as well as databases from other systems approaches (Moszer *et al.*, 2002, Michna *et al.*, 2014, Zhu & Stulke, 2018). Several ever-developing vector systems and toolboxes have been established for *B. subtilis*, facilitating molecular work (Radeck *et al.*, 2013, Popp *et al.*, 2017, Radeck *et al.*, 2017b, Liu *et al.*, 2018). *B. subtilis* has thus also drawn attention as a chassis for synthetic biology approaches and as workhorse in biotechnology. Over decades, endless studies have shed light on the physiology, metabolic processes and the numerous differentiation strategies of *B. subtilis*, which include sporulation, cannibalism and competence (Lopez & Kolter, 2010). It is thus not surprising that also the resistance against AMPs via BceAB-like resistance transporters is best understood in *B. subtilis*.

Three AMP sensing and resistance transporters of this type were found in *B. subtilis*. The YxdLM transporter is induced by the cathelicidin LL-37, while PsdAB mainly responds to lantibiotics, including nisin, subtilin, gallidermin and actagardine, but also the non-lantibiotic enduracidin (Staron *et al.*, 2011). The name-giving paradigm of these transporters is BceAB, which senses and confers resistance against mersacidin, actagardine and the fungal AMP plectasin (Staron *et al.*, 2011). Yet, the transporter is mainly known to act as the primary resistance determinant in the bacitracin resistance network of *B. subtilis* (Radeck *et al.*, 2016b).
6.2 The flux-sensing mechanism of BceAB-BceRS ensures need-based supply of resistance.

Production of BceAB-like transporters is regulated via two-component regulatory systems. More than 200 BceAB-like transporters were found to be associated with such systems, consisting of a BceS-like histidine kinase and a BceR-like response regulator (Dintner et al., 2011). A phylogenetic analysis classified BceB-like permeases and BceS-like kinases and revealed that they have co-evolved to form unique, self-sufficient resistance systems against AMPs in Firmicutes bacteria (Dintner et al., 2011). Yet, the distribution of resistance systems into phylogenetic groups did not allow further predictions of the function or substrate range of uncharacterised transporters, neither did the sequence analysis of their extracellular domains (Dintner et al., 2011).

Signalling within the BceAB-BceRS system of *B. subtilis* operates according to a flux sensing mechanism (Fritz et al., 2015). The transmembrane segment of BceS-like kinases consists of two transmembrane helices, but lacks an obvious extracellular input domain (Mascher et al., 2006). Classified as ‘intramembrane’ sensing histidine kinase, BceS cannot perceive the stimulus directly (Mascher et al., 2006, Mascher, 2014). Its N-terminus instead acts as a signal transfer domain. Even in the absence of antimicrobial stress, the kinase BceS interacts directly with the transport permease BceB, forming a sensory complex for the detection of AMPs (Dintner et al., 2014). As BceB was shown to directly bind bacitracin *in vitro*, the transporter is thought to have dual function and acts as both, the true sensor of AMPs as well as the resistance-mediating determinant against them (Dintner et al., 2014).

In this novel way of sensing, the monitored parameter is the transport activity of BceAB resistance transporters. BceAB acts as a ‘flux sensor’, which passes information on its current transport rate on to the kinase BceS, rather than sensing the antibiotic concentration or downstream effects on the bacterial physiology (Fritz et al., 2015). BceAB transmits the signal onto BceS, which leads to intramolecular signal conversion and enables the ATP-dependent auto-phosphorylation of the highly conserved histidine residue of the kinase (Mascher, 2014).

Subsequently, the phosphate group is transferred onto an aspartate residue of the cognate response regulator BceR, which in turn binds to its target promotor $P_{bceA}$. By this, expression of the *bceAB* operon is initiated and the ABC transporter BceAB is produced and incorporated into the cell membrane. This flux sensing mechanism allows the cell to constantly assess its current detoxification capacity and cost-efficiently adjust its level of transporter *de novo*
synthesis to the required level of protection (Fritz et al., 2015). The BceAB-BceRS system is the paradigm for more than 200 systems (Dintner et al., 2011) and recently other BceS-like kinases have been found to directly interact with their associated transporters (Randall et al., 2018). It is thus likely that this type of signalling is wide spread in the regulation of antimicrobial resistance among the phylum of Firmicutes.
Figure 1.5: The BceAB-BceRS resistance system operates according to a flux-sensing mechanism. The schematic depicts the auto-regulation of the BceAB-BceRS system. The transporter BceAB (blue) and the histidine kinase BceS (red) form a sensory complex in the membrane (grey). BceAB acts as flux sensor and perceives the stimulus by a not yet understood mechanism (question mark). BceAB passes the signal on to BceS, which in turn triggers a signal cascade and activates its cognate response regulator BceR (red). BceR binds to the $P_{bceA}$ promotor region and activates transcription of $bceAB$ (operon indicated by black and blue arrows), resulting in adjusted resistance levels. Dark blue crescent: bacitracin, UPP: undecaprenyl pyrophosphate. Arrows indicate the signal transfer and de novo production of BceAB.
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6.3 The resistance mechanism and substrate specificity of BceAB remain unclear.

While the insights into the communication between BceB and BceS taught us a lot about the regulation of BceAB-like transporters, the mechanism of resistance is not yet understood. Several different hypotheses have been proposed, which range from BceAB acting as an importer that internalises the AMP for degradation to BceAB exporting the AMP (Ohki et al., 2003, Rietkötter et al., 2008). Recently, first indications were obtained that another BceAB-like system might confer resistance by expulsion of the AMP away from the membrane into the extracellular space (Reiners et al., 2017). If and how such a mechanism could effectively provide protection from antimicrobial action has been subject to debate.

It is further not known how the resistance transporters recognises or binds its substrate, and which features allow them to distinguish between them. While many BceAB-like systems are known to confer resistance against several AMPs, the basis of their substrate specificity remains elusive, with no pattern detected or prediction possible so far.

The PsdAB-PsdRS system of *B. subtilis* is, for example, able to recognise structurally different AMPs like the lantibiotic nisin and the lipoglycopeptide enduracidin, but not ramoplanin, which is closely related to enduracidin (Gebhard & Mascher, 2011, Staron et al., 2011). PsdAB further confers resistance against actagardine, but not mersacidin, which is structurally very similar to actagardine. Within the same bacterial strain, however, BceAB recognises both, actagardine and mersacidin, but is not induced by nisin. Then again, BceAB also provides protection against bacitracin, which even targets a different molecule in the cell (Gebhard & Mascher, 2011, Staron et al., 2011). In contrast, a BceAB-like transporter of *S. aureus* has been found to mediate resistance against both, bacitracin and nisin (Hiron et al., 2011).

To add to the confusion, it has been proposed that the transporter might not actually use the AMP as its physiological substrate. Instead, the transporter may import the cellular target of AMPs (Kingston et al., 2014), or was suggested to recognise the AMP in complex with its cellular target only (Mascher et al., 2003, Bernard et al., 2007).

Extracytoplasmic domains often seem to play a key role in substrate recognition by kinases and resistance transporters that sense membrane-targeting AMPs. Due to its exposed location at the extracellular face of the membrane and its requirement for bacitracin sensing and resistance, the large extracellular domain of BceAB was proposed as potential binding domain (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Coumes-Florens et al., 2011). In *S. aureus*, this domain was shown to be responsible for the substrate specificity (Hiron et al., 2011). Yet, sequence analysis of all known extracellular domains did not reveal any correlations to a certain
substrate specificity (Dintner et al., 2011). Hence, the molecular bases and mechanisms behind substrate specificity and AMP binding remain unclear.

The goal of this study was to understand the substrate specificity of BceAB and to test the role of its extracellular domain as the substrate binding domain. We also aimed to identify the true physiological substrate of BceAB. In doing so, we hope to shed light onto the controversies around the mechanism of the AMP resistance transporter BceAB.
7. Aims and objectives of this study

The overall aim of my PhD project was to explore the substrate specificity of the antimicrobial resistance transporter BceAB of *B. subtilis*. Deciphering the underlying substrate specificity and recognition is enormously valuable to ultimately understand the resistance mechanism by which BceAB-like transporters confer resistance against AMPs. This knowledge can be used as a stepping stone to develop AMPs that are able to escape this type of resistance determinant as future therapeutics. The development of potent antimicrobial agents combined with tighter regulations of their use is crucial to counteract the emerging antimicrobial crisis, and to implement and secure global health.

As we here investigate the substrate specificity of BceAB using both *in vitro* and *in vivo* approaches, the study was divided into two main sections, based on the nature of the experiments involved.

7.1 *In vitro* characterisation of the binding capacity of BceB-ECD

In the first part of this study, we focussed on the characterisation of the binding capacity of the putative binding domain of BceAB, its large extracellular domain (ECD). To this end, we used *in vitro* biochemical and biophysical techniques. The main objectives were:

- To gain further insights into the predicted structural features and potential substrate binding sites by conducting an *in silico* analysis of BceB-ECD.
- To facilitate the *in vitro* characterisation of BceB-ECD by establishing an optimised protocol for the overproduction and purification of this domain.
- To examine the substrate binding ability of isolated and purified BceB-ECD *in vitro* by using biophysical approaches.
- To investigate the substrate specificity and binding affinities of BceB-ECD for several antimicrobial peptides, as well as their cellular targets or surrogates thereof.
7.2 In vivo determination of the physiological substrate of BceAB

In the second part of this study, we aimed to identify the physiological substrate of BceAB using *in vivo* approaches. To this end, we had the following objectives:

- To examine the effect of BceAB on growth of *B. subtilis* and whether the transporter has an affinity to undecaprenyl pyrophosphate by performing growth and competition assays in the presence of different levels of BceAB.
- To determine the variables that lead to changes in BceAB transport activity by using a $P_{bceA}$ luminescence reporter assay as proxy for transport activity and monitoring its response to varying concentrations of antimicrobial peptides, alterations of the amounts of cellular targets of AMPs available in the cell, or both.
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Material and Methods
1. Chemicals

Media and buffer components and other materials used in this project were purchased from Merck, Sigma-Aldrich®, VWR® or Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., if not stated otherwise. The antibiotics used in this study were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich®. Reagents used for molecular microbiological techniques (e.g. enzymes) were purchased from New England BioLabs Inc., unless stated otherwise.

2. Bacterial strains and growth conditions

*E. coli* and *B. subtilis* strains were routinely grown at 37 °C with agitation (180 – 200 rpm) in lysogeny broth medium (LB; 1 % (w/v) tryptone, 0.5 % (w/v) yeast extract, 1 % (w/v) sodium chloride, Bertani (1951)) or Müller-Hinton medium (MH, 0.2 % (w/v) beef extract, 1.75 % (w/v) acid hydrolysate of casein, 0.15 % (w/v) starch). Solid media contained 1.5 % (w/v) agar. Where required, *B. subtilis* strains were supplemented with 0.2 % (w/v) xylose.

Selective media for *E. coli* strains contained ampicillin (100 µg/ml), chloramphenicol (30 µg/ml) or spectinomycin (20 µg/ml). For *B. subtilis* strains chloramphenicol (5 µg/ml), kanamycin (10 µg/ml), spectinomycin (100 µg/ml), tetracycline (10 µg/ml) or erythromycin (1 µg/ml) and lincomycin (25 µg/ml, macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B, MLS) were used for selection.

Bacitracin was purchased as zinc-salt from Sigma-Aldrich®. Mersacidin and deoxyactagardine B (for convenience hereafter actagardine) were kindly provided by Cantab Anti-infectives Ltd. Stock solutions of antimicrobial peptides used for this study were prepared in dH₂O+HCl (bacitracin), dH₂O (nisin) or 100 % methanol (mersacidin, actagardine) at concentrations of 10 mM for *in vitro* and 10 mg/ml for *in vivo* experiments.

Determination of the optical density at 600 nm wavelength (OD₆₀₀) of liquid cultures was performed using a spectral photometer (Jenway 6320D, Bibby Scientific Limited) in cuvettes with a 1 cm light path length. All bacterial strains used in this study are listed in tables S1 and S2 (supplement).
3. DNA manipulations and transformations

Vectors, plasmids and oligonucleotides involved in this study are depicted in tables S3, S4 and S5 (supplement).

3.1 Polymerase chain reaction

Polymerase chain reactions (PCRs) for general cloning were performed using Q5® High-Fidelity DNA polymerase (0.02 U/µl) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The PCR reaction contained final concentrations of 1 x reaction buffer, 200 µM dNTPs, 0.5 µM forward primer, 0.5 µM reverse primer and up to 1 ng of plasmid DNA, when filled to final volume of 50 µl with deionised H2O. PCR reactions were carried out in a PCR cycler (Biometra TPersonal, LABGENE Scientific SA) with a typical reaction cycle of: 30 s at 98 °C for initial denaturation, 35 cycles of 10 s at 98 °C, 30 s at 58-60 °C and 30 s/kb at 72 °C. A final extension step was performed for 2 minutes at 72 °C. The resulting DNA fragments were separated by agarose gel electrophoresis (1 % w/v) in 0.5 x TAE buffer (20 mM Tris, 10 mM acetic acid, 0.5 mM EDTA, pH 8.0) containing 0.1 µl SYBR® Safe DNA gel stain (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.) per ml agarose solution for detection of bands using the ChemiDocTM XRS imaging system (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.). PCR products were purified using the E.Z.N.A® Cycle-Pure Kit (Omega Bio-tek) or extracted from an agarose gel using Monarch® DNA Gel Extraction Kit (New England BioLabs Inc.). Where genes were commercially synthesised, the procedure was performed by GenScript®. The downstream cloning was carried out as usual.

3.2 DNA digest and ligation

PCR products and vectors were digested with the respective enzymes as instructed by the manufacturer. Incubation was carried out at 37 °C for at least one hour. To avoid re-ligation, digested vector fragments were dephosphorylated by addition of alkaline phosphatase and incubated at 37 °C for another hour. Digested DNA fragments were purified using E.Z.N.A® Cycle-Pure Kit (Omega Bio-tek). Concentrations of purified DNA fragments and vectors were quantified by agarose gel electrophoresis. Generally, ligations were performed for one to two hours at room temperature or overnight at 4 °C in an at least 3:1 ratio of insert to vector and by using T4 DNA Ligase (final amount 400 units/reaction) following to the manufacturer’s instructions.
3.3 Plasmid extraction and verification of cloning

Plasmids were extracted using a GeneJET Plasmid MiniPrep Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.) or via alkaline lysis. For this, cells were harvested from an overnight culture and resuspended in 300 μl buffer P1 (50 mM Tris/HCl, 10 mM EDTA, 100 μg/ml DNase-free RNase, pH 8.0). 300 μl lysis buffer were added (P2, 0.2 M NaOH, 1 % (w/v) SDS) as well as after inversion of the tubes, 300 μl buffer P3 for precipitation of chromosomal DNA (3 M potassium acetate, 5 % formic acid). The mixture was centrifuged and the supernatant transferred into a fresh tube. For precipitation of plasmid DNA, 0.7 volumes of 100 % isopropanol were added and after another centrifugation step, the pelleted DNA was washed with 70 % ethanol, air-dried and dissolved in dH2O.

The correct insertion of the fragment was either verified by colony PCRs using OneTaq® 2 × Master Mix, following the manufacturer’s instructions or by restriction digest. Sequencing of plasmid DNA was performed by Eurofins Genomics GmbH, according to the instructions. The resulting sequences were analysed in silico using the freewares BioEdit (version 7.0.0, Hall, 1999, Hall et al., 2011) and SerialCloner (version 2.5).

3.4 Bacterial transformations

3.4.1 Transformation of *E. coli* strains

For transformations regarding general cloning, chemically competent cells of *E. coli* DH5α from the laboratory stock were used. Transformations for protein overproduction was carried out using *E. coli* BL21(DE3), purchased commercially from New England BioLabs Inc. Cells were gently defrosted and incubated with ~150 ng plasmid DNA on ice for at least 20 minutes. A heat shock was performed at 42 °C for 90 s, followed by 2 minutes recovery on ice. Cells were further incubated in 1 ml LB for roughly 1 hour at 37 °C with agitation. Cells were gently harvested, the cells resuspended and plated on selective medium. Plates were incubated overnight at 37 °C.

3.4.2 Transformation of *B. subtilis*

*B. subtilis* transformations were performed using a modified version of the Paris protocol (Kunst & Rapoport, 1995). Overnight cultures of recipient strains were grown in 500 μl Paris medium (60 mM K₂HPO₄, 44 mM KH₂PO₄, 1 mg/ml trisodium citrate, 1 % (w/v) glucose, 0.4 % (w/v) potassium L-glutamate, 0.1 % (w/v) casamino acids, 2.2 μg/ml ferric ammonium
citrate, 3 mM MgSO₄, 25 µg/ml tryptophan) at 37 °C with aeration (180 rpm). Day cultures were inoculated 1:50 in fresh, pre-warmed Paris medium and grown for 3 hours (37 °C, 180 rpm). 50 µl of isolated genomic DNA were added to each transformation reaction. Genomic DNA was isolated by mixing an overnight culture 1:1 with SC buffer (150 mM NaCl, 10 mM sodium citrate, pH 7.0) and harvesting the cells by centrifugation (5 min, 13000 × g). The pellet was resuspended in SC buffer and incubated with lysozyme at 37 °C for 15 minutes. The solution was mixed 1:1 with 5 M NaCl and filter sterilised. Transformation cultures were grown for another 5 hours and plated on selective media. For MLS or chloramphenicol resistance, cultures were pre-induced to a 1:40 final concentration of the respective antibiotic one hour before plating.

4. Overproduction and purification of BceB-ECD

4.1 Overproduction of BceB-ECD

Overnight cultures were inoculated in LB with fresh transformants and grown at 37 °C shaking incubation. Cultures for overproduction of BceB-ECD were inoculated 1:100 from an overnight culture of *E. coli* BL21(DE3) carrying the respective plasmid. Cells were incubated at 37 °C with agitation (180 – 200 rpm). Gene expression was induced with 1 mM isopropyl β-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG, Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.) during the exponential growth phase (OD₆₀₀ of 0.5 – 0.6). The cultures were further incubated at 16 °C, 180 – 200 rpm for 18 – 24 h. Depending on the culture size, cells were either harvested at by centrifugation in an Avanti® J-25 centrifuge ( Beckman Coulter, Inc., JLA-10.500) at 18,600 × g for 10 min or in a Centrifuge 5804R (Eppendorf AG, A-4-44) at 4500 × g for 20 min. Both centrifugation steps were performed at 4 °C. Pellets were stored at -80 °C until further use.

4.2 Cell lysis

Cell pellets were defrosted in lysis buffer (1 ml/g pellet; 50 mM Tris/Cl [pH8], 0.5 M NaCl, 5 mM dithiothreitol (DTT), 0.1 mM n-dodecyl-β-D-maltoside (DDM, GLYCON Biochemicals GmbH), 0.2 U/ml Benzonase® nuclease (Sigma-Aldrich®), lysozyme and protease inhibitor cocktail (cOmplete™ ULTRA Tablets, EDTA-free, Roche). Cells were lysed by sonication (30 s for every 5 ml of cell suspension). The supernatant was separated from debris by centrifugation using an Avanti® J-25 centrifuge (Beckman Coulter, Inc., JA-25.50, 75600 × g,
30 min, 4 °C). The pellet was stored at -80 °C and used for SDS PAGE and attempts of refolding protein from inclusion bodies. The supernatant was filtered (0.45 µm) and immediately used for downstream purification steps.

4.3 Refolding BceB-ECD from inclusion bodies

Pellets of lysed cells were defrosted and resuspended in wash buffer (4 ml/g pellet, 50 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 0.5 M NaCl, 1 % (v/v) Triton X-100). Inclusion bodies were harvested using a pre-cooled centrifuge at 4500 × g for 20 min. The wash and centrifugation steps were repeated until the pellet appeared white. The pellet was split and transferred into microcentrifuge tubes labelled with the weight of the sample. Inclusion bodies were stored at -40 °C until further use. For refolding attempts, the pellets were resuspended in solubilisation buffer (50 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 50 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM DDM, 8 M urea) to a concentration of 100 mg/ml and incubated at room temperature for 30 - 60 minutes. The suspension was centrifuged (17000 × g, 30 min, 4 °C) to remove any insoluble parts. The supernatant was diluted 1:10 – 1:100 in solubilisation buffer and dialysed overnight at 4 °C into refolding buffer (20 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 20 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM DDM) using SnakeSkin™ (7 kDa molecular weight cut off). Purity and presence of BceB-ECD were confirmed by SDS-PAGE and mass spectrometry.

4.4 Protein purification techniques

4.4.1 Immobilized metal affinity chromatography

The first purification step was an immobilized metal affinity chromatography (IMAC) using a 1 ml HisTrap FF column (GE Healthcare Life Sciences) connected to an ÄKTAstart purification system (GE Healthcare Life Sciences). All buffers were freshly prepared and filtered (0.45 µm). Buffers and protein samples were kept at 4 °C or on ice at all times. Buffers A and B contained 50 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 0.5 M NaCl, 0.1 mM DDM and 10 mM imidazole or 1 M imidazole, respectively. All purification and wash steps were performed at a flow rate of 1 ml/min and attention was paid to pressure limits. The sample was loaded using a 50 ml superloop (GE Healthcare Life Sciences). The protein was washed and eluted with 0, 10, 20, 30 and 100 % buffer B over 10 column volumes per concentration at a flow rate of 1 ml/min. The collected fractions were analysed by SDS-PAGE. Fractions containing the protein of interest were
dialysed (SnakeSkin™, 7 kDa molecular weight cut off) into 20 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 20 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM DDM overnight at 4 °C.

4.4.2 Anion exchange chromatography

Where necessary, further purification by anion exchange (AEX) chromatography was performed using a HiTrap Q HP column (1 ml, GE Healthcare Life Sciences). Buffers QA and QB contained 20 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 20 mM NaCl or 1 M NaCl, respectively, 0.1 mM DDM. Proteins were eluted in a 20 column volumes gradient from 0 % to a final concentration of 100 % buffer QB at a flow rate of 1 ml/min and analysed by SDS-PAGE. The samples containing pure protein were dialysed (SnakeSkin™, 7 kDa molecular weight cut off) overnight at 4 °C into 20 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 20 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM DDM.

5. Protein visualisation and quality determination

5.1 Sodium dodecyl sulphate - polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis

Sodium dodecyl sulphate - polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE) was performed using precast polyacrylamide gels (10 %; RunBlue, Expedeon) and 1 × RunBlue SDS Running Buffer (Expedeon). Gels were run at 120 V for roughly 60 minutes. For visualisation of protein bands, gels were stained with Coomassie staining solution (45 % (v/v) methanol, 10 % (v/v) acetic acid, 0.25 % (w/v) Coomassie Brilliant Blue G-250) and destained by using destaining solution (45 % (v/v) methanol, 10 % (v/v) acetic acid). Alternatively, InstantBlue™ Protein Stain (Expedeon) was used.

5.2 Western blot

Western blot analysis was performed using polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) membranes (Merck Millipore, activated in 100 % MetOH). Membranes, SDS-PAGE gels and Whatman filter paper were soaked in transfer buffer (1 × RunBlue SDS Running Buffer, Expedeon, 20 % (v/v) methanol) prior to blotting. The transfer was performed at 75 mA for 70 minutes using a PerfectBlue™ Sede™ Semi-Dry Electroblotter (Peqlab). For Western Blot analysis of His•tag®-constructs, the membrane was blocked with 7.5 % (w/v) skimmed milk powder in PBST (137 mM NaCl, 2.7 mM KCl, 10 mM Na2HPO4, 1.8 mM KH2PO4 [pH7.4], 0.1 % (v/v) Tween 20) overnight at 4 °C, gently shaking. Membranes were washed three times with PBST (15
ml), each step taking 5 to 10 minutes with gentle shaking. Subsequently, the PDVF membrane was incubated for two hours at room temperature in 10 ml 1 % (w/v) bovine serum albumin containing the primary antibody (Penta-His Antibody, QIAGEN®, 1:4000 dilution). After another three wash steps with PBST, the membrane was incubated in milk containing the secondary antibody (Peroxidase-AffiniPure Goat Anti-Rabbit IgG, Jackson ImmunoResearch Europe Ltd, 1:4000) for at least an hour at room temperature and washed three times with PBST (see above). Pierce™ ECL Western Blotting Substrate (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.) was used as enhanced chemiluminescence substrate to enable detection of peroxidase activity. The Western blots were exposed for 3 s using a Qiagen CCD camera with Fusion software.

5.3 Mass spectrometry

Sample preparation and mass spectrometry analysis of protein bands cut out of SDS-PAGE gels were performed by the proteomics unit of the Chemical Characterisation and Analysis Facility of the University of Bath. The protein ID was determined by nanoLC-MS/MS and results were compared to both E. coli and B. subtilis database entries.

5.4 Determination of protein concentration

Protein concentrations were determined by absorbance spectroscopy using a 1 cm optical pathway quartz cuvette. According to the Beer-Lambert law \( A = \varepsilon \cdot c \cdot l \), the absorbance \( A \) at 280 nm wavelength and the molar extinction coefficient for BceB-ECD \( \varepsilon = 7450 \, M^{-1} \, cm^{-1} \) were used to determine the protein concentration.

5.5 Dynamic light scattering

Protein solutions were filtered (0.45 μM) or centrifuged to remove contaminants like dust and insoluble aggregates prior to experiments. Protein solutions (100 μl) transferred into a black quartz cuvette. Dynamic light scattering (DLS) experiments were performed using a Zetasizer Nano S controlled by the Malvern Panalytical Software (Malvern Panalytical Ltd). Measurements were taken at 20 °C. Measurements with a count rate (kcps) below 200 were disregarded due to poor quality of the result. Z-average and polydispersity index were provided by the Malvern Panalytical Software. The reported average diameter in nm was the result of at least three independent measurements based on the size distribution by volume rather than by intensity.
6. In vitro characterisation of BceB-ECD using biophysical methods

6.1 8-Anilino-naphthalene-1-sulphonic acid fluorescence spectroscopy

8-Anilino-naphthalene-1-sulphonic acid (ANS) and protein solution were diluted from stock solutions into buffer (20 mM Tris/HCl [pH8], 20 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM DDM) to a final concentration of 100 µM ANS and 4 µM protein (1 ml volume). Substrates were added gradually from 10 mM stock solutions to final concentrations between 0 and 50 µM. Where substrate was administered in a single step, final concentrations of 50 µM bacitracin, 500 µM GPP or a premixture of 50 µM bacitracin and 500 µM GPP were used. To ensure steady-state measurements, samples were left to equilibrate in a quartz cuvette (optical pathway: 10 mm) for at least three minutes before initial measurements and after every addition of substrate. Fluorescence measurements were performed at 20 °C using the fluorescence spectrometer LS 55 (PerkinElmer®). The following settings of the FL WinLab software were used: Excitation wavelength: 380 nm, slit width: 3 nm, mean of three repeats. Where substrate concentrations were added in a single step, the mean of ten measurements was used for further analysis. Spectra were determined from 400 – 640 nm and exported into the freeware Spekwin32 (Menges, 2016) and Microsoft Excel for further analysis. Fluorescence emission was determined by addition of the intensity values of the spectra. To measure specific rather than total binding, the spectra were buffer corrected (Motulsky & Christopoulos, 2004). Results were set relative to 1 = 0 µM substrate and averaged across independent measurements as indicated in figure legends. Non-linear single site binding curves were plotted to the equation:

\[ 1 + \frac{B_{\text{max}} \cdot x}{K_d + x}, \]

where possible, using Graphpad Prism® (Motulsky & Christopoulos, 2004). \( K_d \) values were determined using the same software. Where applicable, data were approximated with a linear regression fit (Motulsky & Christopoulos, 2004).

6.2 Circular dichroism spectroscopy

Circular dichroism (CD) spectroscopy experiments were performed at 10 °C using a Chirascan qCD spectrometer (Applied Photophysics Ltd.). Purified protein at a final concentration of 4.5
µM in 20 mM Tris/H$_2$SO$_4$ [pH8], 20 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM DDM was either measured alone or in the presence of a potential substrate. Bacitracin and nisin were added to a final concentration of 50 or 90 µM, respectively. GPP and premixed [GPP-BAC] were added to final concentrations of 500 µM GPP, or 50 bacitracin and 500 µM GPP, respectively. To ensure steady-state measurements, samples were left to equilibrate in a quartz cuvette (optical pathway: 1 mm) for at least three minutes before initial measurements. Spectra of the ellipticity (mdeg) were obtained from 195 or 200 to 260 nm wavelength with a spacing of 1 nm and five repeats per cuvette. Experiments were carefully performed without exceeding an HT (voltage) value of 700 V. Spectra were buffer corrected and moving averages (n=5) were applied manually. Spectra obtained from independent measurements were averaged. For the secondary structure estimation, the online circular dichroism analysis tool Dichroweb was used. (Whitmore & Wallace, 2004, Whitmore & Wallace, 2008). CD spectra of BceB-ECD were approximated using the CONTIN-LL algorithm (Provencher & Glockner, 1981) and the reference set 4 (Sreerama & Woody, 2000).

For determination of the 222/208 nm ratios the values at 222 were divided by the respective value at 208 nm. The ratios were averaged across independent measurements and the standard deviation determined. Values were set relative to 222/208 nm ratio of BceB-ECD. Statistical analyses were performed using Graphpad Prism®.
7. **In vivo** characterisation of the physiological substrate of BceAB.

7.1 **Growth assays for determination of the fastest doubling time.**

For the determination of the fastest doubling time, overnight cultures of the strains of interest were diluted 1:1000 into fresh LB. 100 μl of each diluted culture were dispensed into 96-well microtiter plates. All wells around the edge of the plates were filled with water to reduce evaporation. Cultures were grown at 37 °C with shaking incubation (180 rpm) using a Tecan® Spark® microplate reader controlled by the SparkControl™ software (Tecan Trading AG, Switzerland). The optical density (OD$_{600}$) was measured every 5 min at 600 nm over 8 hours. Growth curve measurements were corrected against blank wells that only contained media. log(OD$_{600}$) values were plotted against time using Microsoft Excel. From this, the fastest doubling time ($t_d$) during exponential growth phase was calculated for each strain using the equation:

$$t_d = \frac{\ln(2)}{k},$$

where $\ln$ is the natural logarithm and $k$ is the growth rate (Powell, 1956). Doubling times of independent measurements were averaged from at least six biological replicates. Mean and standard deviation are depicted in results figures and specific values given in accompanying tables.

7.2 **Competition assays as measure of relative fitness**

To compare the relative fitness of strains in competition assays, overnight cultures of each strain to be competed were grown and their optical density was determined. Based on the OD$_{600}$ measurements, two strains were mixed in a 50:50 ratio. 1:1000 dilutions of the mixed cultures were prepared in 2 ml of LB broth, and cultures were incubated at 37 °C with agitation (180 rpm). To determine the initial amount of colony forming units (CFUs) in the cultures, serial dilutions of the mixed culture were plated onto selective and non-selective LB agar plates in two technical replicates. After 24 h of incubation of the plates at 37 °C, colonies were counted and CFUs/ml determined. Experiments in which the initial 50:50 ratio deviated more than 40:60 were excluded. Every 24 hours, the mixed cultures of the competing strains were diluted 1:1000 into fresh LB and further incubated. The CFUs were determined after 24
and 72 hours of growth as described. The CFU concentrations were used to calculate the competition index (CI) of the competing pairs after 24 hours and 72 hours incubation.

\[
CI = \frac{cfu \text{ ml}^{-1} \text{ of mutant } (t_f)}{cfu \text{ ml}^{-1} \text{ of reference } (t_f)} - \frac{cfu \text{ ml}^{-1} \text{ of mutant } (t_i)}{cfu \text{ ml}^{-1} \text{ of reference } (t_i)}
\]

The mutant strain refers to the deletion mutant which contains an extra gene for antibiotic selection over the reference strain in the competing pair. \( t_i \) refers to the initial CFU concentration, \( t_f \) refers to the CFU concentration after 24 hours of incubation (Auerbuch et al., 2001, Wiser & Lenski, 2015).

### 7.3 Determination of the minimal inhibitory concentration of bacitracin

The sensitivity of \( B. \ subtilis \) strains to bacitracin was determined using the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC). For this, dilutions of \( \text{Zn}^+\text{-bacitracin} \) were prepared in 2 ml of Müller-Hinton medium and inoculated 1:500 from overnight cultures. Cultures were incubated overnight (37 °C, 180 rpm) and examined for growth after 24 h. The MIC was determined as the lowest concentration at which no visible growth was detected. All experiments were performed in biological triplicates.

### 7.4 Luminescence reporter assay for determination of BceAB transport activity

LB or MH (10 ml) were inoculated 1:1000 from overnight cultures of each strain to be tested. Day cultures were grown at 37 °C with agitation (180 rpm) to an optical density at OD\(_{600}\) of around 0.5, to ensure exponential growth. Cultures were then diluted to an OD\(_{600}\) of 0.01 and dispensed into 96 well microplates (Corning®, black, clear flat bottom), with 100 \( \mu l \) culture volume per well. All wells around the edge of the plates were filled with water to reduce evaporation. Luciferase activity of strains was determined in a Tecan® Spark® microplate reader controlled by the SparkControl™ software (Tecan Trading AG, Switzerland). Cells were grown in the microplate reader for 5 hours with continuous shaking incubation (37 °C, 180 rpm, circular motion, intensity: 3). After 1 hour of incubation, cells were challenged with 5 \( \mu l \) of freshly diluted antibiotic stock solutions per well to make up the desired concentration. The OD\(_{600}\) and the corresponding luminescence (relative luminescence units, RLU) were
measured every 5 minutes. Luminescence output was normalized to cell density by dividing each data point by its corresponding blank-corrected OD$_{600}$ value (RLU/OD). For dose response curves, RLU/OD values were determined from the average of three measurements (25, 30 and 35 min). Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates.
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*In vitro* characterisation of the binding capacity of BceB-ECD
1. Introduction

The mechanism by which the BceAB-BceRS detoxification system confers resistance against AMPs is still not entirely understood. It is however known that the regulatory two-component system (TCS) BceRS requires the active transporter BceAB for the detection of the AMP (Bernard et al., 2007). In the absence of BceAB, or when transport activity was impaired, the resistance system did not only lose its ability to provide protection against AMPs, but also could not induce the signalling cascade through the TCS (Bernard et al., 2007, Rietkötter et al., 2008). The histidine kinase BceS lacks an extracellular input domain, which is a characteristic feature for sensor kinases to perceive their stimulus (Mascher, 2014). Instead, the kinase was shown to form a sensory complex with the transporter even in the absence of bacitracin (Dintner et al., 2014). The transporter BceAB was therefore proposed to be entirely responsible for substrate recognition and interaction. In recent work, Dintner and colleagues (2014) showed that purified BceB was able to bind bacitracin with a steady-state $K_d$ of 60 nM, using surface plasmon resonance spectroscopy. However, the exact site of interaction between the transporter and its substrate remains unknown.

One conserved feature of all BceB-like permeases is a large extracellular domain located between transmembrane helices (TMH) 7 and 8 (Dintner et al., 2011). Generally, these domains were found to consist of approximately 180 to 230 amino acids (Dintner et al., 2011). The extracellular domain of BceB (BceB-ECD) was shown to be essential for resistance against and sensing of bacitracin, as replacing the ECD with a truncated version resulted in a non-functional protein (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Coumes-Florens et al., 2011) and thus, was suggested as the substrate binding domain of BceB. In support of this, Hiron and colleagues (2011) found these large extracellular domains of resistance transporters to be responsible for substrate specificity in S. aureus. A domain-swap experiment between the ECDs of the closely related permeases VraG and VraE was performed, resulting in a chimeric VraFG transporter that had its native ECD replaced by the VraE-ECD (VraFGloop(VraE)). Interestingly, the hybrid transporter conferred resistance against bacitracin, which is usually the substrate of VraDE, but not any longer against colistin, the original substrate of VraFG. In other words, the resistance conferred by the transporter changed accordingly to its ECD, suggesting the ECD to be responsible for substrate recognition.

In a phylogenetic analysis of all known Bce-like detoxification systems, the transporters could be distributed into eight different groups. However, the ECD sequences had been removed...
for this analysis. Less than 10% pairwise sequence identity and low sequence similarity had led to very poor alignments across that region (Dintner et al., 2011). Similar results were found in an independent study by Coumes-Florens and colleagues (2011). The extracellular domains of the most closely related transporters were their least conserved regions. Further, no correlation between the phylogenetic group of the transporter and their substrate specificity could be drawn (Dintner et al., 2011). Even when ECDs of transporters that provide resistance against the same AMP, for example bacitracin, were aligned, hardly any sequence conservation was found (Fig S3.1, blue box). When comparing the secondary structure predictions of the ECDs however, Dintner and colleagues (2011) discovered a conserved arrangement of α-helices and β-sheets across all phylogenetic groups, according to α-β-α-β₂

₃-α-β₃₊₁-α-β₁₂ pattern. Despite the poor sequence alignments, some conserved residues could be identified. These were mainly hydrophobic residues and found in close proximity of the central α-helix or the penultimate β-sheet (Dintner et al., 2011).

Our analysis of this domain’s secondary structure revealed that parts of the ECD lack a fixed or ordered three-dimensional structure, which suggested that regions of the protein are intrinsically disordered (Fig. 3.1). An analysis of BceB using several different disorder prediction tools showed the extracellular domain to be comparatively flexible in contrast to the transmembrane domains of BceB and also its other loops (III 2.1). Unanimously, the region between amino acid residues 370 to 385 was found to be particularly disordered (see below for details).

Only over the last few decades, our understanding of binding interactions deviated from the traditional linear sequence-to-structure-to-function paradigm and intrinsically disordered proteins (IDPs) moved into focus (Wright & Dyson, 1999). Many IDPs were characterised, and their importance in signalling and regulatory pathways through specific protein-protein, protein-nucleic acid and protein-ligand interactions became clear (Dunker et al., 2008b). Numerous IDPs were shown to fold in a disorder-to-order transition manner upon binding their substrate (Wright & Dyson, 2009). The substrate-induced coupled folding and binding mechanism of IDPs has several advantages over binding mechanisms of structurally-ordered proteins. Benefits include the binding diversity that is mediated by high conformational flexibility. Their unstructured regions allow flexible domains to interact with a variety of targets, whereas ordered enzymes are thought to select their substrates based on the classic key-lock theory (Fischer, 1894, Koshland Jr., 1995). Yet, disorder-to-order transitions that IDPs can undergo upon substrate binding still assure a high substrate specificity (Kriwacki et al., 1996). As BceB-ECD contains intrinsically disordered regions, a substrate-induced coupled
folding and binding mechanism is also conceivable for BceAB. Such a mechanism could also explain the broad but highly specific substrate range of BceAB. Aside from bacitracin, BceAB also confers resistance against other AMPs, including plecasin, mersacidin and actagardine, but not to the lipid II-binding AMP nisin (Staron et al., 2011).

For IDPs, high substrate specificity is complemented by low affinity binding (Kriwacki et al., 1996, Huang & Liu, 2009). Specific protein-ligand interactions can thus easily come apart, which is not only important in regulatory interactions (Dunker & Obradovic, 2001), but might also be advantageous in transport reactions.

While some IDPs have been described to be entirely unstructured prior to and during the binding event, most IDPs were suggested to comprise so-called molecular recognition features or elements (MoRFs, Mohan et al., 2006, Dunker et al., 2008a). With around 10 – 70 amino acid residues, these relatively short amphipathic motifs are found within longer regions of disorder. Upon interaction with their substrate, these motives can obtain helical, β-strand or different non-regular structures. Often IDPs even acquire a different structure on binding different substrates (Wright & Dyson, 2009). Short MoRFs were identified in the unstructured regions of BceB-ECD (III 2.1), which highlighted this region again as potential binding domain of the transporter.

The so-called ‘fly casting’ model suggests the flexible region of some IDPs to comprise a greater capture radius than orderly-structured proteins do (Shoemaker et al., 2000, Huang & Liu, 2009). That way, the IDP can partially and weakly bind to targets from a larger distance. The IDP then fully ropes its substrate in while simultaneously undergoing a disorder-to-order structural transition. This model is based on the observations that IDPs generally have faster binding rates than structured proteins and encounter a substrate less often before they can bind it (Huang & Liu, 2009). In addition, IDPs possess lower binding energy barriers, which makes it easier for them to reach transition state (Shoemaker et al., 2000, Huang & Liu, 2009). A fly-casting mechanism, in which the highly flexible BceB-ECD reels in bacitracin thereby removing it from its target, is also imaginable for substrate binding by BceAB.

Thus, we hypothesise that the highly-flexible extracellular domain of BceB acts as the substrate binding domain and hypothesise that the binding mechanism functions according to a ‘fly-casting’ mechanism, in which BceB-ECD undergoes conformational changes upon substrate binding. To test this, we overproduced and purified BceB-ECD using different protein purification strategies, including immobilised metal affinity and anion exchange chromatography and refolding BceB-ECD from inclusion bodies. We then characterised the binding reaction between BceB-ECD and its substrate using biochemical and biophysical in
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*In vitro* methods, including fluorescence spectroscopy and circular dichroism spectroscopy. As no interaction was measured between the BceB-ECD and the AMPs alone, our approaches re-focussed on BceB-ECD potentially binding the AMPs in complex with their cellular target as suggested previously (Bernard et al., 2007, Kingston et al., 2014).

2. Results

2.1 *In silico* characterisation reveals high flexibility and partial intrinsic disorder of BceB-ECD.

To begin investigations on BceB-ECD, we performed *in silico* analyses to find out the characteristics of the protein. The domain architecture of BceB was analysed using SMART database (Letunic et al., 2015, Letunic & Bork, 2018). As described before (Rietkötter et al., 2008), the large extracellular domain of BceB is located between the transmembrane helices 7 and 8 and predicted to consist of 213 amino acids from S313 to G525. The molecular weight (24043.27 Da) and further parameters, including the theoretical isoelectrical point and the extinction coefficient were determined using the ExPASy ProtParam tool (Fig. 3.1 A, Gasteiger E., 2005). These parameters were used to select suitable purification methods and determine the protein concentration via absorbance spectroscopy.

Alignments of the ECD revealed low sequence conservation in a phylogenetic analysis (Dintner et al., 2011, Coumes-Florens et al., 2011). Even within their phylogenetic groups, the ECDs showed very low sequence identity. Here, we aligned the BceB from *B. subtilis* with sequences of several BceB-like permeases that were known to either sense bacitracin or confer resistance against it (Fig. S3.1). Permeases from *Staphylococcus aureus* (Hiron et al., 2011, Yoshida et al., 2011), *Listeria monocytogenes* (Collins et al., 2010), *Streptococcus mutans* (Tsuda et al., 2002, Ouyang et al., 2010), *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (Becker et al., 2009) and *Enterococcus faecalis* (Gebhard et al., 2014) were included in the analysis. The alignment was performed using the integrated ClustalW application (Thompson et al., 2003) of the sequence alignment editor BioEdit (Hall, 1999, Hall et al., 2011). A threshold of 75% was set for shading of identical residues and or amino acids with similar characteristics. Although the permeases were not part of the same phylogenetic groups, the transmembrane domains were comparatively well-conserved (8% sequence identity, 27% sequence similarity, Fig. S3.1). In contrast to this, hardly any identical or even similar residues were
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found within the ECD. A proline (P) residue at position 340 seems best-conserved but is missing in BceB. Most other shaded amino acids have hydrophobic side chains like tyrosine (Y), valine (V), and isoleucine (I, Fig S3.1), which agreed with previous findings (Dintner *et al.*, 2011).

The secondary structure of BceB-ECD was predicted using Jpred4 (Drozdetskiy *et al.*, 2015) and I-TASSER (Roy *et al.*, 2010). Our results confirmed the conserved α-β-α-β3-α-β2-3-α-β3-4-α-β-α1 secondary structure pattern described previously (Dintner *et al.*, 2011). The secondary structure of BceB-ECD was predicted to comprise a combination of α-helices (22.8 %) and β-strands (25 %), with a considerable amount of unstructured regions (52.2 %).

I-TASSER and UCSF Chimera were used to predict a 3D model of the BceB-ECD secondary structure (Fig. 3.1 B, Roy *et al.*, 2010, Yang & Zhang, 2015, Zhang *et al.*, 2017, Pettersen *et al.*, 2004). In this model, the blue and red residues depict the beginning and the ending of the ECD, where the extracellular region would usually be linked to transmembrane helices (Fig. 3.1 B). This model also clearly illustrated non-structured elements within the extracellular domain (Fig. 3.1 B, particularly disordered regions are highlighted in green and yellow). The flexibility of BceB was analysed using several disorder prediction tools (IUPred (Dosztányi *et al.*, 2005a, Dosztányi *et al.*, 2005b), DisEMBL (Linding *et al.*, 2003), PONDR® (Molecular Kinetics, Inc.), prDOS (Ishida & Kinoshita, 2007)). The disorder probability of the ten transmembrane regions was consistently under 5 %, thus these domains were concluded to be fairly rigid. The flexibility of the shorter cytoplasmic and extracellular domains was also not increased, with the exception of the cytoplasmic linker between TMH 8 and 9 that had disorder probabilities of up to 30 % (amino acid residues 544 – 580).

The large ECD between TMH 7 and 8 was found to be the most flexible region of BceB, with one major peak at residue 381 (Fig. 3.1 C). The region between amino acid 370 and 385 was predicted to be intrinsically disordered (threshold: > 0.5). Two minor peaks of high flexibility were found to lie at amino acid residues 432 and 471. In further agreement with this, the domain architecture prediction tool SMART describes the region between residues 386 and 401 as region of low complexity (Letunic *et al.*, 2015, Letunic & Bork, 2018).

Proteins with intrinsically disordered regions often contain so-called molecular recognition features (MoRFs). These short elements are involved in the molecular recognition of binding partners and undergo disorder-to-order transitions upon binding (Mohan *et al.*, 2006). Further supporting the idea of BceB-ECD comprising the substrate binding domain of the resistance transporter, BceB-ECD was also predicted to contain such MoRFs. The MoRF
prediction tool found potential binding sites from amino acid residues 377 to 384 and between residues 432 and 435 (Fig. 3.1 B, green, yellow, Disfani et al., 2012).
Taken together, the findings of the in silico characterisation suggested BceB-ECD to contain some unstructured regions that might be involved in the substrate binding mechanism and potentially undergo a conformational change upon binding. Therefore, the protein domain was further investigated in vitro using techniques that are typical for the characterisation of intrinsically disordered proteins, including circular dichroism and fluorescence spectroscopy (Dunker et al., 2001, Wright & Dyson, 2009).
Figure 3.1: *In silico* characterisation reveals BceB-ECD to be highly flexible with an intrinsically disordered region. **A:** Characteristics of the extracellular domain of BceB determined by the ProtParam prediction tool. **B:** I-TASSER secondary structure model predicted BceB-ECD to consist of mainly α-helices, some β-strands and unstructured regions. The N- and C-terminal domains that were membrane-bound in native BceB are coloured in blue and red, respectively. The disordered regions that contain a molecular recognition feature (MoRF) are shown in green and yellow. **C:** Analysis of flexibility and intrinsic disorder of full-length BceB (top) and BceB-ECD (bottom) using several disorder prediction tools. The consensus of the prediction is depicted in blue. The extracellular domain was found to be highly flexible compared to any other domains of BceB. The peak around amino acid residue 380 suggested this part of BceB-ECD to be intrinsically disordered.
2.2 *In vitro* characterisation of purified BceB-ECD does not imply bacitracin binding activity.

2.2.1 Initial attempts of overproduction and purification of BceB-ECD using plasmid pSG1601

To characterise the isolated ECD, we first needed a strategy to overproduce and purify the BceB-ECD. Previous work had pointed out plasmid pSG1601 (pET-16b-bceB-ECD) as a suitable starting point for overproduction of BceB-ECD (Fig. 3.2 A). This plasmid contained the nucleotide sequence for BceB-ECD, encoding amino acids A310 to G525 of BceB. Expression from the vector pET-16b led to a fusion protein with an N-terminal histidine decapetide (His$_{10}$-tag, Franke & Hruby, 1993). First overproduction attempts were made using the expression strain *E. coli* BL21(DE3) (Wood, 1966). Exponentially growing cells were induced with 1 mM IPTG. After overnight growth at 16 °C, cells were lysed and protein purified from the soluble fraction using immobilised metal affinity chromatography (IMAC) purification with a linear elution gradient. Fractions were then analysed by SDS-PAGE. Most of the overproduced BceB-ECD was found in the insoluble pellet fraction, displayed as a single band at 26 kDa (Fig. 3.2 B). This was consistent with the predicted molecular weight of this construct of 26.7 kDa (ExPASy ProtParam, Gasteiger E., 2005). Some BceB-ECD was eluted at around 200 mM imidazole, alongside other proteins (not shown). As the BceB-ECD produced from pSG1601 had a theoretical isoelectric point of 6.52 (ExPASy ProtParam, Gasteiger E., 2005) and hence, probably possessed a negative surface charge at pH 8.0, the second purification method used was an anion exchange (AEX) chromatography. SDS-PAGE analysis of the eluted fractions showed BceB-ECD as a double band at around 26 kDa (Fig. 3.2 B). Although mass spectrometry analysis of the two bands confirmed the presence of BceB-ECD in both bands (not shown), comparison with the insoluble fraction led to the conclusion that the lower band resulted from a degraded version of BceB-ECD or a contaminant. With around 1 mg of purified protein per 10 L of culture also the yield of the overproduction and purification was poor and restricted the *in vitro* characterisation of BceB-ECD.
Figure 3.2: Initial purification attempts of BceB-ECD from pSG1601 result in a double band on SDS-PAGE. A: Schematic of the plasmid pSG1601. bceB-ECD was expressed with an N-terminal His$_{10}$-tag from the IPTG-inducible vector pET-16b. B: SDS-PAGE analysis of pellet fraction and supernatant after cell lysis. kDa: kilodalton, M: marker, P: pellet (diluted, 1:10 or 1:100), S: supernatant (diluted, 1:10). BceB-ECD purification from soluble fraction by IMAC (not shown) and AEX chromatography resulted in double band (red box) at around 25 kDa on a Coomassie-stained SDS-PAGE gel.
2.2.2 Improvements on the purification of BceB-ECD and refolding the ECD from inclusion bodies

To obtain higher quantities of BceB-ECD and an improved degree of purity, improvements on the purification protocol or even alternative strategies were required.

As shown in Fig. 3.2 B, most of the overproduced BceB-ECD was found in the insoluble pellet fraction after cell lysis. The large amounts of non-native protein that result from overproduction of recombinant plasmid-encoded proteins in heterologous systems like *E. coli* often induce a stress response in the host (Villaverde & Carrio, 2003). This consequently leads to production of heat-shock proteins or other chaperones and often also results in the aggregation of the encoded protein in inclusion bodies. These are particles of insoluble and densely-packed denatured or partially folded protein molecules. Generally, the recombinant protein aggregated in inclusion bodies was shown to be highly enriched and homogenous with only few other contaminants like chaperones (Singh & Panda, 2005, Singh *et al.*, 2015).

Refolding of inclusion bodies to recover the bio-active forms of protein *in vitro* has therefore been regarded as alternative strategy for protein overproduction and purification (Rudolph & Lilie, 1996, Villaverde & Carrio, 2003).

To obtain higher amounts of BceB-ECD, refolding of BceB-ECD from inclusion bodies was attempted using a protocol based on the considerations of Tsumoto *et al.* (2003), and Singh *et al.* (2015). The recovery included the isolation of inclusion bodies by centrifugation with several wash steps, followed by the denaturation and solubilisation of the protein by chaotrophic reagents, in this case 8 M urea. The solution was then diluted and BceB-ECD refolded by slowly removing the denaturants by dialysis.

SDS-PAGE analysis of the refolded samples revealed large quantities of BceB-ECD (Fig. 3.3 A). The main band at 29 kDa was confirmed to contain BceB-ECD by mass spectrometry (data not shown). BceB-ECD was found to be almost pure even before further purification steps had been performed, with only one other band at 26 kDa. This double band was observed before (2.2.1). The slight up-shift in protein mass is likely an artefact due to the use of a different protein standard. While refolding of proteins from inclusion bodies brings several advantages over soluble expression of proteins, this method can result in poor recovery of the bio-active form of the protein, as the protein might not take on its native fold after harsh treatment. To resolve this concern, we aimed to compare and validate the secondary structure of the refolded protein with the soluble version.
For this, we sought to improve overproduction and purification of soluble BceB-ECD in a parallel approach. To this end, we first focussed on improvements of cell lysis. Longer sonication pulses and the use of different types and higher amounts of DNAse or Benzonase® seemed particularly efficient. This led to enhanced overall protein yield and also simplified the sample handling during centrifugation and purification steps. These changes, however, affected the purity of protein after IMAC and AEX chromatography. To counteract, the culture volume was reduced from 10 L to 2 L, while maintaining the same volumes for cell lysis buffers and purification buffers, and higher salt concentrations were used in all purification buffers. Further, several changes to the purification protocol were undertaken to retain pure protein, e.g. the use of increased amount of protease inhibitor cocktail (cOmplete™ ULTRA Tablets). It also seemed beneficial to use freshly transformed cells and to not store the cell pellet longer than overnight at – 80 °C. These modifications to the purification protocol resulted in a split of the elution of the protein that made up the typically observed BceB-ECD double band on SDS-PAGEs (Fig. 3.2 B). The protein of the former top band was eluted as faint band in a pure fraction at a concentration of 200 mM imidazole or higher (29 kDa, red box). The protein that made up the lower band (26 kDa, blue box) was eluted earlier from the column, together with other proteins. Downstream purification using AEX chromatography led to a fairly pure and concentrated protein sample. Mass spectrometry was used to confirm the identity of the proteins. Only the former top band (red box) seemed to contain the desired BceB-ECD, whereas the second analysed band (blue box) was found to result from the *E. coli* protein SlyD. SlyD is a well-described enzyme that is ubiquitous in bacteria and has dual function (Löw, 2012). Aside from acting as peptidyl-prolyl cis-trans isomerase, SlyD also possesses chaperone activity (Scholz *et al.*, 2006). Chaperones assist in the folding mechanism of other proteins. In SlyD, this chaperone activity is performed by a so-called ‘inserted-in-flap’ domain that was shown to have high affinity to unfolded polypeptide chains (Weininger *et al.*, 2009). During overproduction of recombinant proteins, the host cells often upregulate chaperone production to deal with the large amount of unfolded protein (Villaverde & Carrio, 2003). Production of BceB-ECD might have acutely induced this stress response. In agreement with this, SlyD seemed far less abundant in expression trials using an empty pET-16b vector that did not contain the *bceB*-ECD coding region (data not shown). SlyD consists of 196 amino acids, which results in a molecular weight of around 22 kDa (P0A9K9, UniProtKB, Boutet *et al.*, 2007). Its size and molecular weight were similar to BceB-ECD, which led to the narrow double band on SDS-PAGE gels (Fig. 3.2 B).
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Intriguingly, SlyD was categorised as metallochaperone and shown to be highly enriched in histidine (Löw, 2012). The C-terminal tail that harbours the metal binding domain (amino acids 150 to 196 in E. coli) contains a total of 15 histidine residues and can bind divalent cations via a conserved HGHXH motif. The chaperone was shown to bind Ni\(^{2+}\) ions with a \(K_d\) of 1.8 \(\mu\)M (Hottenrott et al., 1997, Kaluarachchi et al., 2009). This characteristic explained why SlyD is so often co-purified as contaminant during IMAC purification of recombinant proteins (Bolanos-Garcia & Davies, 2006). Just like the His\(^{10}\)-tagged BceB-ECD, SlyD could bind the nickel-charged IMAC column and co-purify. Due to a comparable theoretical isoelectric point to BceB-ECD (4.81, ExPASy ProtParam, Gasteiger E., 2005), SlyD was eluted at a similar salt concentration to BceB-ECD during AEX chromatography (Fig. 3.2 C).

Refolding BceB-ECD from inclusion bodies and the described improvements to the purification protocol were two successful approaches to obtain higher quantities of BceB-ECD with a higher degree of purity. Hence, the in vitro characterisation of a potential binding reaction between bacitracin and BceB-ECD\(^{\text{apo}}\) or BceB-ECD\(^{\text{hol}}\), respectively, could proceed. The AMP bacitracin was shown to require zinc ions in a 1:1 ratio for biological activity (Stone & Strominger, 1971), and thus was applied as bacitracin zinc-salt throughout this study. In metal selectivity studies, SlyD was shown to also bind Zn\(^{2+}\) ions with high affinity in the sub-micromolar range (Kaluarachchi et al., 2011). This makes SlyD likely to also bind the Zn\(^{2+}\) ion of bacitracin and the metallochaperone was therefore included in our in vitro assays as a positive control.
Figure 3.3: Improvements on overproduction and purification BceB-ECD from pSG1601 and refolding from inclusion bodies lead to increased yield and purity. A: SDS-PAGE analysis of diluted BceB-ECD samples, refolded from inclusion bodies using urea and slow removal thereof by dialysis. A clear band at 29 kDa was detected and confirmed as BceB-ECD by mass spectrometry. A minor band was revealed just below. M: marker, dilutions of refolded protein: 1:10, 1:50, 1:100. B: Improved cell lysis and changes to the purification protocol resulted in the separation of the usually observed double band by SDS-PAGE. IMAC purification using a 1 ml HisTrap led to elution of pure BceB-ECD at concentrations higher than 100 mM imidazole (former top band, red box). Follow-up AEX chromatography of the 100 mM fraction led to almost pure elution of SlyD, a metallochaperone with metal ion binding capacity (former bottom band, blue boxes). kDa: kilodalton, M: marker, S: supernatant, FT: flow through, W: wash, 100: 100 mM imidazole elution step. Proteins were visualised on SDS-PAGE gels using Coomassie staining solution or InstantBlue™ Protein Stain as indicated in II 5.1.
2.2.3 ANS fluorescence spectroscopy experiments suggest no conformational change of BceB-ECD in the presence of bacitracin.

A common approach to investigate binding reactions of highly dynamic proteins in vitro is the use of fluorescence spectroscopy (Wright & Dyson, 2009). To examine whether BceB-ECD comprised the substrate binding domain of the resistance transporter that interacts with the AMPs, ANS-based fluorescence assays were performed. 8-anilino-1-naphthalenesulphonic acid (ANS) is an organic compound with fluorescing properties that binds to hydrophobic regions on the surface of proteins (Gasymov & Glasgow, 2007). The dye has been extensively used to monitor conformational changes upon substrate binding. One example is the induced-fit binding mechanism between MurA, a crucial enzyme of the cell wall biosynthesis, and its substrate UDP-GlcNAc (Schonbrunn et al., 1998). Upon conformational changes during substrate binding, the hydrophobic residues on the surface of the protein of interest alter their position. These hydrophobic residues are likely to be either more or less exposed to ANS, which results in an increase or quenching of the fluorescence signal during steady-state spectroscopy. Hence, experiments with BceB-ECD in the presence and absence of the substrate should allow conclusions on changes in the protein conformation, and thus on a binding interaction. This indirect assay was chosen as BceB-ECD does not contain any tryptophan residues and thus lacks sufficient auto-fluorescent properties to do direct measurements (Chen & Barkley, 1998). Yet, the indirect ANS measurement has potential drawbacks. The substrates to be tested in this assay are peptides and if they expose hydrophobic patches, they might also interact with ANS. This can lead to unspecific signal, and in case the substrate undergoes conformational changes upon binding, further experiments are required to investigate whether it is the AMP or BceB-ECD that rearranged its conformation.

Purified refolded or soluble BceB-ECD (BceB-ECD<ref>, BceB-ECD<sol>) or SlyD, respectively, were pre-mixed with ANS, before different AMPs were added in a stepwise fashion up to a concentration of 50 µM. The emission spectra were determined from 400 – 640 nm after excitation at 380 nm, and buffer corrected. Representative spectra of BceB-ECD<ref>, BceB-ECD<sol> and SlyD without substrate (0 µM) and at 50 µM for each substrate are depicted in Fig. 3.4 A, B, C. As expected from its previously described Zn<sup>2+</sup>-binding ability, addition of Zn<sup>2+</sup>-bacitracin resulted in an increased fluorescence emission for SlyD. The increased signal served as an indicator for the conformational changes that SlyD underwent upon binding Zn<sup>2+</sup>-bacitracin, from which we concluded that our ANS fluorescence assay was functional.
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and suitable to detect binding reactions. The relative change in fluorescence emission was plotted against the substrate concentration and the data were modelled according to a saturating single-site binding curve (Fig. 3.4 D). From this, the dissociation constant $K_d$ for Zn$^{2+}$-bacitracin was determined to be 9.89±2.45 µM. As nisin is not a substrate of BceAB and neither has divalent cations bound for biological activity, the lantibiotic served as negative control in these assays to identify potential unspecific binding. In agreement with our expectations, nisin did not cause any change in fluorescence emission, and therefore no binding reaction was detected when added to SlyD. Also the binding properties to mersacidin and actagardine were tested as they are substrates of BceAB. Their addition did not lead to changes in fluorescence emission which suggested no binding interaction between the AMPs and SlyD. Both AMPs require Ca$^{2+}$ ions for biological activity, but SlyD was not shown to have affinity to calcium ions during metal selectivity studies (Kaluarachchi et al., 2011).

Addition of bacitracin to BceB-ECD$^{\text{ref}}$ and BceB-ECD$^{\text{sol}}$ did not result in changes of the fluorescence emitted by ANS that could be fitted with a saturating single-site binding curve (Fig. 3.4 E, F). Although the fluorescence signal of the sample containing BceB-ECD$^{\text{sol}}$ decreased upon addition of bacitracin the data was best approximated with a linear regression fit (Fig. 3.4 E). A non-saturating, linear proportionality equates a non-specific binding reaction (Motulsky & Christopoulos, 2004). The data for BceB-ECD$^{\text{ref}}$ could also be approximated with a linear regression fit.

The graphs of panels E and F indicate that BceB-ECD$^{\text{sol}}$ and BceB-ECD$^{\text{sol}}$ potentially show different behaviour. This can however be redeemed, as BceB-ECD$^{\text{ref}}$ and a shorter version BceB-ECD$^{\text{sol}}$ showed highly similar CD spectra in III 2.2.3. The decline of ANS signal in panel E is likely an artefact caused by subtracting the buffer control containing only ANS and bacitracin. This distortion can be caused by inaccurate ANS or bacitracin concentrations in the cuvette, or a slightly different positioning of the cuvette in the spectrometer. Further, the graphs result from only two independent experiments each. Additionally, no decline or unspecific binding was observed in experiments with the shorter version of BceB-ECD$^{\text{sol}}$ (III 2.2.3), supporting the linear decline in panel E to be an artefact.

These results suggested that BceB-ECD did not undergo a conformational change upon addition of bacitracin or that the ANS based assay was not able to reveal this interaction.
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Figure 3.4: ANS fluorescence spectroscopy experiments suggest no conformational change of BceB-ECD in the presence of bacitracin. Soluble or refolded BceB-ECD, SlyD or buffer, respectively, were pre-mixed with 100 μM ANS in a 1 cm quartz cuvette (4 μM protein concentration). Potential substrates were added to final concentrations of 5, 10, 15, 20, 30 and 50 μM. To ensure steady-state measurements, cuvettes were incubated in the spectrometer at 20 °C for 3 minutes after mixing and prior to each measurement. ANS fluorescence emission was measured every 0.5 nm wavelength over a spectrum from 400 to 640 nm, after excitation at 380 nm. Measurements were taken in triplicates with an automated average calculated. For each spectrum, the ANS emission at each determined wavelength was added up. Buffer measurements containing the respective concentration of substrate were subtracted from protein-containing samples. A+B+C: Representative buffer-corrected ANS fluorescence spectra of A: SlyD, B: BceB-ECDsol and C: BceB-ECDref (grey) before stepwise addition of AMPs to a final concentration of 50 μM (bacitracin: blue, nisin: green, mersacidin: red, actagardine: orange). Spectra generally comprised a single emission peak at wavelength of 470 nm. Specific protein-substrate interaction that result in a conformational change should alter the ANS emission, as observed for the positive control SlyD in the presence of bacitracin. Spectra were smoothed with LOWESS smoothing for illustration. D: Dose response curve showing the relative change of ANS fluorescence in the presence of SlyD upon addition of AMPs. Bacitracin data were fit with a non-linear single-site binding curve, while all other data were approximated with a linear regression fit. E+F: Dose response curve of E: BceB-ECDsol and F: BceB-ECDref showing the relative change of ANS fluorescence upon addition of bacitracin. Best fits of data were approximated with linear regression. Bacitracin data result from at least two independent measurements.
2.2.4 CD spectroscopy experiments with refolded BceB-ECD do not show conformational changes upon addition of bacitracin.

As a non-ANS based alternative approach to investigate the potential binding reaction between BceB-ECD and its substrate, circular dichroism (CD) spectroscopy experiments were performed.

CD spectroscopy is a frequently used method to examine intrinsically disordered proteins. Aside from conformational changes upon substrate binding, far-UV CD spectroscopy also gives insights into structural properties of proteins in solution (Dunker et al., 2001). CD spectroscopy provides information on the secondary structure of a compound based on its ability to absorb left- and right-handed circularly polarized light (Kelly et al., 2005, Greenfield, 2006). The difference in absorption of UV-light by the compounds is recorded in CD spectra. From the characteristic CD spectra of proteins with representative secondary structures, approximations of the secondary structure of a protein can be made. Far-UV CD spectra of prominent structural elements have been reported and representative spectra are depicted in Fig S3.2, modified from Greenfield (2006). An all-α-helical protein was reported to have two minima of similar magnitude at 222 and 208 nm, while it possesses very positive ellipticity at around 190 nm (black). A protein consisting of only antiparallel β-sheet has its minimum between 210 and 220 nm (red), and a maximum at around 195 nm. Random coils and intrinsically disordered proteins were described to have a very negative minimum at around 200 nm (green, Greenfield, 2006). According to secondary structure predictions in III 2.1, BceB-ECD was expected to contain a combination of all structural elements mentioned. A potential binding reaction between BceB-ECD and bacitracin should lead to a change of this secondary structure disclosed by a change in the CD spectra.

The experiments were performed on refolded BceB-ECD in absence and presence of AMPs, again using the E. coli protein SlyD as a positive control. The far-UV CD spectra were recorded from 195 or 200 to 260 nm wavelength and the respective spectra of buffer controls with or without AMPs were subtracted.

The spectra of purified SlyD without AMPs revealed the maximum of the spectrum at 195 nm with an extended minimum between 210 and 220 nm (Fig. 3.5 A, grey). Comparison with the exemplary spectra (Fig. S3.2) suggested a high content of antiparallel β-sheet, which is in agreement with the reported solution structure of SlyD obtained by nuclear magnetic resonance and CD spectroscopy (Weininger et al., 2009, Martino et al., 2009). As expected, the addition of nisin did not result in changes to the CD spectra. Also addition of mersacidin
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and actagardine did not lead to changes of the CD spectra (data not shown). Upon addition of bacitracin, the ellipticity of SlyD increased at around 208 nm to a less negative value (Fig 3.5 A, blue). The minimum at 220 nm remained unaltered. The ellipticity at 222 and 208 nm is known to serve as an indicator for helicity (Hirst & Brooks, 1994, Wang *et al.*, 2006). A change of ellipticity towards a more positive value implies a loss, a more negative value suggests an increase of helicity. The comparison of the 222/208 nm ratio of a protein in the absence and presence of the substrate could thus be used to identify conformational changes upon substrate binding. For SlyD, the 222/208 nm ratio changed to a value significantly higher than 1 in the presence of bacitracin (Fig. 3.5 B), which suggested a loss in helicity. This finding is consistent with CD data for SlyD, which were interpreted as an increase of β-turn upon binding Ni$^{2+}$ ions (Hottenrott *et al.*, 1997, Martino *et al.*, 2009). As the performed assay showed the structural rearrangements of SlyD upon binding the Zn$^{2+}$ ions of bacitracin and did not suggest unspecific binding activity, we concluded the assay to be suitable for investigations on binding reactions that involve conformational changes.

The CD spectra recorded for refolded BceB-ECD displayed two minima at 208 and 222 nm (Fig. 3.5 grey). While the minima indicated some α-helical content, the minimum at 208 nm was more negative than the shoulder at 222 nm, which likely resulted from the predicted disordered content (III 2.1). CD measurements of BceB-ECD$^{\text{ref}}$ in the presence of bacitracin resulted in a slight overall shift of the spectra to more positive values. However, the comparison of the 222/208 nm ratio of BceB-ECD without and with bacitracin did not result in a significant change of helicity. The shift might be the result of inaccuracies in protein or substrate concentrations in the cuvettes. This suggested that the secondary structure of refolded BceB-ECD was not altered in the presence of bacitracin.

These results were consistent with the findings of the ANS fluorescence assays (III 2.2.3), and indicated that refolded BceB-ECD did not undergo a conformational change upon addition of bacitracin. A possible explanation for the observed results was that refolding BceB-ECD from inclusion bodies did not recover biological activity during the failure-prone refolding process.

CD spectra for BceB-ECD$^{\text{ref}}$ were not obtained, as ANS fluorescence assays (III 2.2.3) suggested that there was no bacitracin binding activity. In contrast to refolded BceB-ECD, the amounts of pure BceB-ECD$^{\text{ref}}$ were very low and restricted further experiments.
Figure 3.5: CD spectroscopy experiments with refolded BceB-ECD do not show conformational changes upon addition of bacitracin. Protein solutions (4 µM) or buffer were freshly mixed with potential substrates (90 µM) or buffer in a 1 mm quartz cuvette. Far-UV CD spectra were measured between wavelengths 195 or 200 and 260 nm. Five technical repeats were taken for each cuvette and averaged. The respective buffer controls were subtracted to unveil changes in the spectra of the protein sample. Vertical dotted lines mark the wavelengths 222 nm and 208 nm that are important indicators for helicity of a protein.

A+C: Representative spectra of SlyD and refolded BceB-ECD in the absence (grey) or presence of bacitracin (blue) or nisin (green). B+D: The 222/208 nm ratio was determined from CD spectra and depicted relative to the 222/208 nm ratio of the protein sample without any potential substrates. Depicted are mean and standard deviation of three (SlyD) or two (refolded BceB-ECD) independently measured repeats.
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2.3 A shortened version of BceB-ECD does not possess bacitracin binding capability *in vitro*.

2.3.1 Reduction of flexible ends increases yield and solubility of recombinant BceB-ECD.

The ECD of BceB as encoded on the so far used plasmid pSG1601 started at residue A310, which according to the *in silico* characterisation of BceB-ECD conducted for this chapter, was still predicted to be located in the membrane (III 2.1). In the full-length protein, the ends of the ECD are attached to transmembrane helices anchored in the membrane. The newly-acquired flexibility (Fig. 3.1 C) might lead to unspecific interactions and result in aggregation of the protein. This was possibly not only a cause for poor soluble production of BceB-ECD, but also could have resulted in preventing the binding activity of this domain. To exclude that the highly-mobile ends interfered with biological activity, we produced shorter versions of BceB-ECD. We shortened the BceB-ECD encoding sequence of pSG1601 on both sides by taking away the nucleotides that encoded for either five or ten amino acids. This resulted in four different His\textsuperscript{10}-tagged constructs (pCKET1601, pCKET1602, pCKET1603, pCKET1604, schematic depicted in Fig. 3.6 A).

Overproduction in *E. coli* and cell lysis were performed according to the improved protocol described in III 2.2.2. Analysis of the cell lysate using SDS-PAGE revealed an additional band above the 25 kDa marker in the fractions of all shortened constructs (Fig. 3.6 B (3, 4, 5, 6)). The analysed lysate of the empty vector control and the original construct did not show any obvious additional bands (Fig. 3.6 B (E, B)).

For further work on BceB-ECD, the construct encoding BceB-ECD-3 was chosen (pCKET1601), which lacked the first and last five amino acids. Culture volumes for overproduction of BceB-ECD-3 were reduced to 50 – 200 ml and only a single IMAC purification step was performed. The eluted fractions resulted in a clear single band at 28 kDa, when analysed by SDS-PAGE (Fig. 3.6 C). Mass spectrometry (data not shown) and Western blot analysis (Fig. 3.6 D) confirmed that this band resulted from BceB-ECD. Taken together, shortening the flexible ends of BceB-ECD led to around 40-times higher yields of the protein, while maintaining high purity in a simple one-step purification. Reducing the length of the ECD also decreased the aggregation of BceB-ECD into inclusion bodies and greatly increased solubility.

To further investigate the quality of the protein, dynamic light scattering (DLS) experiments were performed. DLS is an established technique for the determination of particle size and homogeneity of a sample and therefore suitable to investigate protein aggregation (Li et al., 2011, Stetefeld *et al.*, 2016). DLS on BceB-ECD led to a single peak that suggested the average
diameter of BceB-ECD to lie at around 20 nm (volume distribution, data not shown). If the BceB-ECD was a perfectly globular protein, with its predicted size of 26 kDa (including His<sub>10</sub>-tag), it should theoretically have a minimal diameter of around 4 nm (Erickson, 2009). While the high flexibility of BceB-ECD indicated that BceB-ECD could have a larger diameter, it was still likely that BceB-ECD aggregated to a low degree in solution. Yet, the polydispersity index (Pdi) was determined to be 0.270, which suggested a monodisperse size distribution of BceB-ECD with few bigger aggregates, and thus can be considered as homogenous sample.

While protein aggregates might have reduced or no biological function, aggregation is often reversible (Cromwell <em>et al.</em>, 2006). Soluble aggregates in particular have generally only weak interactions with each other that can be reversed when encountering a binding partner with higher binding affinity. As the aggregates were formed in a purified sample, the aggregation of BceB-ECD is likely the result of self-association, which describes the non-specific interaction with the same type of protein (Wang <em>et al.</em>, 2010). Self-associating proteins are likely to directly aggregate or oligomerise in their folded state, without any unfolded intermediates. We concluded from these considerations that despite low degree aggregation, purified BceB-ECD could be tested for its binding activity.
Figure 3.6: Reducing the length of flexible ends of BceB-ECD increases yield and solubility drastically. A: Schematic of the N- and C-terminal amino acid sequence of original and shortened BceB-ECD constructs. B: original BceB-ECD sequence as produced from pSG1601. 3-6: Nucleotide sequence of bceB-ECD was shortened to encode five or ten fewer amino acids on either side of the ECD (3: pCKET1601, 4: pCKET1602, 5: pCKET1603, 6: pCKET1604). B: Overproduction of shortened BceB-ECD proteins. Unpurified cell lysate supernatants of E: empty vector control, B: original construct, 3-6: shorter versions of BceB-ECD as depicted in A. Additional bands can be identified in fractions 3-6, but are absent in E and B. C: SDS-PAGE of samples after IMAC purification of BceB-ECD-3 resulted in a pure band in fractions containing 200 mM imidazole or more. Proteins were visualised on SDS-PAGE gels using InstantBlue™ Protein Stain as described in II 5.1. D: Western blot analysis of samples described in C using an α-His antibody. kDa: kilodalton, M: marker, E+: empty vector control, IPTG-induced, 3+, lysate of cells with construct BceB-ECD-3, FT: flow through, W: wash, 100, 200, 300: imidazole concentration in mM, 1M: 1 M imidazole.
2.3.2 Spectroscopy experiments on BceB-ECD with increased solubility do not unveil bacitracin-induced conformational changes.

To investigate the bacitracin-binding properties of the shortened construct, the steady-state ANS fluorescence spectroscopy assay was repeated. As described before, purified BceB-ECD was pre-mixed with ANS, and bacitracin was added in steps until a final concentration of 50 µM was reached. Addition of bacitracin to the BceB-ECD-ANS solution did not result in a change of fluorescence emission (Fig. 3.7 A + B).

This particular experiment was only performed once. Further measurements on purified BceB-ECD were conducted at a final concentration of 50 µM only (III 2.4.1). As these experiments did also not indicate conformational changes of BceB-ECD in the presence of bacitracin, the step-wise titration performed here was not repeated.

Further, the potential interaction between BceB-ECD and bacitracin was examined by far-UV CD spectroscopy in the presence and absence of bacitracin. The spectra of soluble BceB-ECD revealed a shoulder at 222 nm and an absolute minimum at 208 nm (Fig. 3.7 C). With an ellipticity value of 0.68 mdeg, the spectra hardly reached into positive ellipticity at 195 nm.

To calculate the secondary structure content from experimental data, the spectra were analysed using DichroWeb (Whitmore & Wallace, 2004, Whitmore & Wallace, 2008). The experimental data were approximated using the CONTIN-LL algorithm (Provencher & Gloeckner, 1981, Sreerama & Woody, 2000). BceB-ECD was found to consist of 10.5 % helical content, 34 % β-strand and of 55.5 % non-regular, unordered structures. The high percentage of disordered content (> 50 %) is consistent with the in silico predictions of the secondary structure of BceB (II 2.1). The values found for regular structures differed from predictions (α-helix: 10.5 % versus 22.8 %, β-strand: 34 % versus 25 %). Explanations for the difference could be deviations in the approximations of the data (NRMSD (normalised root mean square deviation): 0.106), and only few known similar structures that online tools can base their secondary structure predictions on.

The addition of nisin, which was used as negative control, did not result in changes of the CD spectra of Bce-ECD (Fig. 3.7. C, green). In the presence of bacitracin, the BceB-ECD spectra (Fig. 3.7 C, blue) were found to be almost identical to the ‘BceB-ECD only’ spectra (Fig. 3.7 C, grey). Also the 222/208 nm ratio did not show significant changes (Fig 3.7 D). These findings indicate that BceB-ECD did not undergo a conformational change. This led to the conclusion that also the shorter version of BceB-ECD was unlikely to bind bacitracin, unless the binding mechanism did not involve structural changes.
It is also possible that the quality of purified BceB-ECD was too poor and the protein could not adopt its native, biologically-active fold. Increased solubility and monodispersity argue against this explanation. Further, the recorded far-UV CD spectra of the refolded and the soluble BceB-ECD were not significantly different and reproducible throughout different protein samples.

Another explanation for the lack of apparent binding could be that free bacitracin was not the physiological substrate of BceAB. It has been shown previously that the full-length BceAB transporter bound bacitracin (Dintner et al., 2014). Nevertheless, it could not be excluded that bacitracin was recognised as it was bound to its target in the outer face of the membrane, co-solubilised undecaprenyl pyrophosphate (UPP). A direct interaction of BceAB with the UPP-bacitracin ([UPP-BAC]) complex has been discussed by several studies (Mascher et al., 2003, Bernard et al., 2007) and even UPP alone was proposed to be the physiological substrate of BceAB (Kingston et al., 2014).
Figure 3.7: Spectroscopy experiments on BceB-ECD with increased solubility do not exhibit bacitracin-induced conformational changes. ANS fluorescence and CD spectroscopy experiments were performed as described before (Fig. 3.4 + Fig. 3.5), but with the shortened version of BceB-ECD. A: ANS fluorescence spectra of BceB-ECD in the presence or absence of different concentrations of bacitracin, as indicated. Spectra were smoothed with LOWESS smoothing or illustration. B: Dose response curve of ANS emission upon addition of bacitracin to BceB-ECD. Data points were approximated using a linear regression fit. C: Representative spectra of BceB-ECD in the absence (grey) or presence of bacitracin (blue) or nisin (green). B+D: The 222/208 nm ratio was determined from CD spectra and depicted relative to the 222/208 nm ratio of the protein sample without any potential substrates. Depicted are mean and standard deviation of three independently measured repeats.
2.4 The complex formation of [GPP-BAC] masks a potential binding reaction of BceB-ECD.

2.4.1 A potential increase of ANS fluorescence emission upon addition of [GPP-BAC] is subject to high variation.

We thus investigated the proposal that the bacitracin-target complex in the membrane was the physiological substrate of BceAB (Bernard et al., 2007, Fritz et al., 2015), rather than free bacitracin. Further, we sought to examine whether the cellular target alone could act as substrate (Kingston et al., 2014) and characterise a potential BceB-ECD binding activity in vitro.

In a previous study, bacitracin was shown to bind tightly around the pyrophosphate group and to interact with only the first prenyl group (Economou et al., 2013). The crystal structure of bacitracin was obtained in complex with geranyl pyrophosphate (GPP). With only two isoprenoid units (C\textsubscript{10}), GPP has a shorter lipid chain compared to UPP (C\textsubscript{55}), and thus better solubility in the aqueous buffers used in our experiments. We therefore chose GPP as artificial bacitracin target to examine a potential binding reaction between BceB-ECD and either the GPP-bacitracin ([GPP-BAC]) complex or GPP alone.

Bacitracin undergoes a conformational change when binding its membrane-located target (Economou et al., 2013). Hence, to avoid an overlay of signal, we had to make sure that most bacitracin in the assay was already in complex with its target. To test at which concentration the complex formation between bacitracin and its target GPP was saturated, ANS fluorescence-based titration assays were performed.

Titration of GPP or bacitracin alone to an ANS-containing buffer resulted in a linear increase of the ANS fluorescence signal (Fig. S3.3 A, B), which corresponds to a non-specific binding reaction (Motulsky & Christopoulos, 2004). When GPP was gradually added to 50 µM bacitracin that had been pre-incubated with ANS, the fluorescence signal plateaued from around 150 µM GPP onwards. The data could be approximated with a non-linear regression fit, indicating the specific binding interaction between bacitracin and GPP and the saturation of the [GPP-BAC] complex formation ($K_D = 90$ µM, Fig. S3.3 C). Thus, for the reverse experiment, a GPP concentration of 200 µM was chosen. Bacitracin was gradually added to the GPP and showed saturation of the fluorescence signal at around 50 µM bacitracin (Fig S3.3 D). Again, the data could be approximated with a non-linear single site binding curve. These findings suggested that at concentrations of 50 µM bacitracin and 200 µM GPP, most bacitracin is in complex with GPP. Addition of bacitracin to concentrations higher than 50 µM
led to a linear increase in fluorescence (Fig S3.3 D grey, linear regression fit), which resulted from the unspecific binding between excess free bacitracin and ANS. As we aimed to avoid free bacitracin in our assays, we ensured an excess of GPP by using 500 µM GPP for further experiments.

Rather than a gradual increase of the substrate concentration as described in III 2.2.3, the steady-state ANS fluorescence assay was performed in the absence and presence of final concentrations of bacitracin (50 µM), GPP (500 µM) or the premixed [GPP-BAC] complex (50 µM + 500 µM GPP).

As shown before (III 2.3.2), ANS fluorescence experiments between BceB-ECD and free bacitracin did not result in a significant change of the fluorescence intensity (Fig. 3.8). Further, the addition of GPP did not affect the signal, suggesting that BceB-ECD did not undergo a GPP binding-induced conformational change. In the presence of the premixed [GPP-BAC] complex, the ANS fluorescence signal was seemingly increased (Fig. 3.8 A). However, statistical analysis of the relative ANS fluorescence did not show a significant difference between the fluorescence emission of the BceB-ECD sample without and with [GPP-BAC] added (Fig. 3.8 B). The measurements in the presence of [GPP-BAC] were subject to high variation in both, samples containing BceB-ECD and respective buffer controls. Despite efforts to account for the variations, they were likely caused by structural changes resulting from the complex formation between GPP and bacitracin. It is therefore unclear whether this non-significant trend was caused by a conformational change of BceB-ECD upon binding [GPP-BAC] or whether it was an artefact from [GPP-BAC] complex formation.
Figure 3.8: Potential increase of ANS fluorescence emission upon addition of [GPP-BAC] is subject to high variation. Steady-state ANS fluorescence experiments of BceB-ECD and potential substrates were performed as described in Fig. 3.4. In this assay, ten technical repeats were measured and averaged for each cuvette. Rather than gradual addition, substrates were administered in a single step to a final concentration of 50 μM bacitracin, 500 μM GPP or 50 μM + 500 μM pre-mixed [GPP-BAC]. A: Representative ANS fluorescence spectra of BceB-ECD (grey) before addition of potential substrates (bacitracin: blue, GPP: red, [GPP-BAC]: purple). Spectra were smoothed with LOWESS smoothing for illustration. B: Change in ANS emission relative to the signal for BceB-ECD without any potential substrates added. Bar graphs show the mean ± standard deviation of at least two independent measurements, BceB-ECD alone and in the presence of [GPP-BAC] were measured at least in four independent repeats.
2.4.2 CD spectra of BceB-ECD remain inconclusive due to high variation of the [GPP-BAC] signal.

To further examine the potential binding reaction between the shortened BceB-ECD and the [GPP-BAC] in a non-ANS based assay, far-UV CD spectroscopy was used. CD spectra of BceB-ECD in the absence of any potential substrate were found to be consistent with the spectra described in 2.3.2 (Fig. 3.9 A, grey). Addition of free GPP or free bacitracin, respectively, resulted in similar curves to the spectra without any potential substrates added (Fig. 3.9 A, blue, red). In line with the findings of ANS fluorescence spectroscopy, these observations did not indicate any conformational change induced by GPP or bacitracin. Slight changes in the spectra as displayed in the representative curves for bacitracin lie within experimental error and were not reproducible. In agreement with this, the analysis of the 222/208 ratio did not show significant changes (Fig. 3.9 B).

The addition of [GPP-BAC] to BceB-ECD resulted in highly variable CD spectra (spectra of eight independent measurements are depicted in Fig. 3.9 C). The shapes of the spectra differed considerably from spectra that had been determined for BceB-ECD before. Instead of the absolute minimum at 208 nm and a shoulder 222 nm, the spectra measured in the presence of [GPP-BAC] comprised a minimum at 222 nm and a peak at 200 nm, or an absolute minimum at 200 nm (Fig. 3.9 C, purple). At wavelength 200 nm, CD spectra for BceB-ECD-[GPP-BAC] even fluctuated between minimal and maximal ellipticity values of -5 and 5 mdeg.

This variation could be explained by the structural change bacitracin undergoes upon complex formation with GPP (Economou et al., 2013). CD spectra of free GPP and unbound bacitracin by themselves only showed little or moderate CD signal intensity, respectively (Fig. 3.9 D, red, blue). CD spectra of the [GPP-BAC] complex revealed a stark increase in amplitude, with positive ellipticity of almost 5 mdeg at 222 nm and a negative absolute minimum of nearly -20 mdeg at 200 nm wavelength (Fig. 3.9 D, purple). The combination of GPP and bacitracin ([GPP-BAC]) clearly resulted in a larger ellipticity signal than simple addition of the spectra determined for free bacitracin and free GPP. This super-additive effect confirmed the changes of the secondary structure upon [GPP-BAC] complex formation.

Due to the increased magnitude of the around 5-times stronger ellipticity signal, variations of the protein and substrate concentrations in the cuvette were more pronounced. Even slightest differences in [GPP-BAC] concentration between buffer controls and cuvettes containing the BceB-ECD-[GPP-BAC] mix or between repeats led to substantial variation of the spectra and inaccurate buffer subtractions. As this variation masked any potential
conformational change of BceB-ECD, we could not conclude on whether this domain interacted with the [GPP-BAC] complex.

Figure 3.9: CD spectra of BceB-ECD remain inconclusive due to high variation of the [GPP-BAC] signal. Far-UV CD spectroscopy experiments were performed as described before (Fig. 3.5) at a final concentration of 50 μM bacitracin, 500 μM GPP or 50 μM + 500 μM pre-mixed [GPP-BAC]. A: Representative CD spectra of BceB-ECD alone (grey) and after addition of potential substrates (bacitracin: blue, GPP: red). B: The 222/208 nm ratio was determined from CD spectra and depicted relative to the 222/208 nm ratio of the protein sample without any potential substrates. Depicted are mean and standard deviation of six independently measured repeats. C: CD spectra of eight independent measurements of BceB-ECD in the presence of [GPP-BAC] after buffer subtraction. D: Representative CD spectra of the potential substrates (blue: bacitracin, red: GPP, purple: [GPP-BAC]), normalised against buffer.
3. Discussion

In this chapter, we focussed on investigating whether the large extracellular domain of BceB (BceB-ECD) is the binding domain of the resistance transporter. Due to low sequence conservation of BceB-ECD (Dintner et al., 2011, Coumes-Florens et al., 2011), the function of BceB-ECD, which is thought to be responsible for substrate specificity (Hiron et al., 2011), is likely to be conserved on a structural level rather than by sequence. This idea was reinforced by the in silico analysis of BceB-ECD performed in this chapter (III 2.1). BceB-ECD was found to contain an intrinsically disordered region with a so-called molecular recognition feature (MoRF). MoRFs have been shown to play an important role in binding interactions, which often involve a conformational change with a disorder-to-order transition (Mohan et al., 2006). We therefore proposed BceB-ECD to undergo substrate-induced coupled binding and folding, similar to a ‘fly-casting’ mechanism (Shoemaker et al., 2000). To test this hypothesis using biochemical and biophysical methods, we first successfully established an optimised protocol for the overproduction and purification of BceB-ECD. The isolated domain was then tested for in vitro binding activity using ANS fluorescence and far-UV circular dichroism (CD) spectroscopy techniques.

3.1 BceB-ECD does not undergo a conformational change in the presence of bacitracin or GPP.

ANS fluorescence and CD spectroscopy-based experiments were performed on refolded and soluble recombinant BceB-ECD. Despite the use of several techniques and different BceB-ECD constructs, the domain did not seem to undergo a significant conformational change in the presence of bacitracin. These results suggested that purified BceB-ECD did not bind bacitracin in vitro, unless the highly-flexible domain did not undertake a detectable structural transition upon binding bacitracin. As an alternative to assays that were mainly based on the detection of conformational changes, preliminary isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) experiments were performed. This powerful method is based on the direct measurement of the heat absorbed or released by a binding event and can not only give information on the binding constant ($K_d$) but also on enthalpy, entropy and reaction stoichiometry (Pierce et al., 1999, Leavitt & Freire, 2001). However, the results were inconclusive (data not shown), due to technical challenges including problems to equalise the buffer concentrations and pH.
between the cell containing the protein solution and the concentrated bacitracin in the injection syringe, which required a more acidic pH to stay soluble. Although the quality and solubility of the recombinant BceB-ECD seemed suitable for an *in vitro* binding characterisation, no binding activity between BceB-ECD and bacitracin was discovered with the methods used. It was, however, possible that free bacitracin alone was not the physiological substrate of BceAB. It is well-known that BceAB confers resistance against bacitracin (Ohki *et al*., 2003), and it has also been demonstrated that the full-length BceB transport permease interacted with bacitracin (Dintner *et al*., 2014). However, the experiments could not exclude that the physiological substrate was bacitracin in complex with its target undecaprenyl pyrophosphate (UPP) in the outer face of the membrane. The identity of the true substrate of BceAB has been a much-debated question, with various proposed hypotheses. While recognition and transport of the free AMP seemed most intuitive, the UPP-bacitracin ([UPP-BAC]) complex as physiological substrate has been discussed by several studies (Mascher *et al*., 2003, Bernard *et al*., 2007). Furthermore, a computational analysis of the signalling dynamics in the Bce system by Fritz and colleagues (2015) was based on the hypothesis that BceAB only recognised target-bound bacitracin or the complex between bacitracin and UPP as a whole. Kingston and colleagues (2014) took this line of reasoning a step further and proposed transport of UPP rather than AMPs.

ANS fluorescence and CD spectroscopy experiments did not reveal any conformational changes of BceB-ECD in the presence of geranyl-pyrophosphate (GPP), which was used as surrogate for the cellular target of bacitracin, undecaprenyl pyrophosphate (UPP). These findings suggested that also the cellular target alone was not recognised as substrate and bound by BceB-ECD *in vitro*.

Similar experiments were performed in the presence of the [GPP-BAC] complex. Attention was paid to pre-mix both compounds at a ratio that should saturate complex formation. Yet, the conformational change that bacitracin undergoes when binding its target led to enormous variation in the measurements, even in the absence of BceB-ECD. While ANS fluorescence measurements might have indicated a slight conformational change of BceB-ECD (III 2.4.1), the results derived from CD spectroscopy were too variable to analyse (III 2.4.2). This made firm conclusions on a potential binding interaction between BceB-ECD and the [GPP-BAC] complex impossible. Based on the results of this chapter, also bacitracin in complex with UPP could be neither confirmed nor excluded as physiological substrate of BceAB.
As we sought to investigate if BceB-ECD was the binding domain and worked according to a ‘fly-casting mechanism’ (Shoemaker et al., 2000, Huang & Liu, 2009), the techniques chosen for this chapter were based on detecting conformational changes. Although the methods were functional and generally suitable to investigate substrate binding, they were seemingly not optimal for BceB-ECD binding assays that included the [GPP-BAC] complex, due to the variable background signal during GPP binding by bacitracin.

We thus attempted to measure binding between BceB-ECD and bacitracin, when it is in its amphipathic, ‘bound’ configuration, but in the absence of its target. For this, high pressure ANS fluorescence experiments with BceB-ECD and free bacitracin were envisaged. The high pressure was thought to potentially constrain bacitracin to the conformation that it adopts in complex with GPP (Lullien & Balny, 2002, Maeno & Akasaka, 2015). However, preliminary experiments were unsuccessful as the high pressure resulted in irreversible precipitation of bacitracin and BceB-ECD (data not shown).

3.2 The membrane environment might be required for recognition of AMPs.

The idea that proteins require the membrane-association of antimicrobial peptides to be able to recognise them as substrate is not unprecedented. Other than potential bacitracin recognition by BceAB when in complex with its membrane-bound target (Bernard et al., 2007, Kingston et al., 2014), several other examples of substrate recognition in the membrane environment have been discussed that stand in direct context with this study.

SdpC (sporulation delaying protein) is an antimicrobial peptide intrinsically-produced by B. subtilis (González-Pastor et al., 2003). Described as a cannibalism toxin, SdpC production is activated upon nutrient limitation during stationary growth phase in order to kill neighbouring B. subtilis cells. As toxin-producing cells are protected by the immunity protein SpdI (Ellermeier et al., 2006), survivors can take up the nutrients released by their lysed siblings (González-Pastor et al., 2003). The production of SdpI is regulated by the presence of the SdpC toxin. SdpC was shown to form a complex with the membrane protein Sdpi. In turn, the autorepressor SdpR is recruited to the membrane, and expression of the sdpRI operon is de-repressed (Ellermeier et al., 2006). It has recently been discovered that SdpC production intrinsically activates the Bce system of B. subtilis (Hofler et al., 2016). Despite strong induction of the BceR target promoter \( P_{\text{bceA}} \) by such cannibalism toxins, no contribution of BceAB to resistance or immunity against SdpC could be detected (Hofler et al., 2016). Although expression of \( \text{spdC} \) and production of the toxin seemed unimpaired, removal of the
immunity protein SdpI resulted in the total loss of the signalling response through BceAB-BceRS. This indicated that complex formation between SdpI and the toxin in the membrane environment is potentially required for SdpC perception by the Bce system (Hofler et al., 2016), similar to our hypothesis that bacitracin may only be recognised in complex with UPP. Moreover, the transcription regulator BcrR of *E. faecalis* is known to activate transcription of the bacitracin resistance operon *bcrABDE* (I 5.1.2, Manson et al., 2004, Gauntlett et al., 2008). In contrast to BceRS-BceAB-like resistance systems, where the stimulus is perceived indirectly via the BceAB transporter, here the regulator BcrR directly binds Zn\(^{2+}\)-bacitracin (Gebhard et al., 2009). Though, the distinct AMP binding site has not yet been identified. BcrR is localised in the membrane and its four predicted transmembrane helices are connected by short extracellular and cytoplasmic linkers, lacking an obvious binding site (Manson et al., 2004, Gebhard et al., 2009). Also binding via the cytoplasmic N-terminal DNA binding domain was unlikely, as the targets of bacitracin are generally located in the outer face of the membrane. Bacitracin was shown to affect the cell membrane not only by interactions with cell wall synthesis precursors (Hancock & Fitz-James, 1964, Ming & Epperson, 2002). It was therefore proposed that BcrR might recognise and bind bacitracin when the AMP is associated with or inserted into the membrane (Gebhard et al., 2009), even in the absence of UPP.

Further, the LanI-type immunity proteins SpaI and NisI of *B. subtilis* and *L. lactis*, respectively were discussed to recognise their corresponding substrates in the membrane environment (I 4.4.1). The exact resistance mechanism by Lan proteins remains puzzling, yet direct binding interactions with their substrates subtilin (SpaI) and nisin (NisI) have been demonstrated (Stein et al., 2003, 2005, Takala et al., 2004). Both proteins are brought in close contact with the negatively charged membrane via their highly positively charged N-terminal domains. The substrate binding sites of NisI and SpaI seem to be located on the extracellular regions of the lipoproteins, which exhibit negatively charged patches proximal to the membrane (Christ et al., 2012a, Hacker et al., 2015b). The immunity proteins might thus sequester their substrates when they are associated with the membrane. It is therefore conceivable that also substrate binding of BceAB operates according to a similar principle and recognises the membrane-bound substrate via its extracellular domain.

With a binding affinity in the micromolar range, the interaction between NisI and nisin was shown to be rather weak (Takala et al., 2004). Considering that nisin is biologically active in a nanomolar range, the low affinity raised doubts about how NisI could effectively provide resistance. It has therefore been proposed that lipid II might be required in addition (Hacker et al., 2015b). The affinity of NisI to its membrane-bound substrate has not yet been
determined. In agreement with the potential requirement of lipid II, the crystal structure of NisI revealed a deep cleft formed between the N- and C-terminal domains and the flexible linker region (Jeong & Ha, 2018). This cleft was proposed to bind the pyrophosphate moiety of lipid II, indicating that NisI can specifically recognise both components of the [lipid II-nisin] complex. The core domain of the immunity protein SpaI was shown to possess a very negatively charged surface, which directly faces the likewise negatively charged cytoplasmic membrane (Christ et al., 2012a). Homology models of the LanI-type proteins EriI and EtnI that confer immunity to ericin S and entianin, respectively, revealed the same membrane-orientated negative patches. As their respective substrates have an overall positive charge, it was conceivable that the negatively charged surface was responsible for possible interactions with membrane-associated lantibiotics (Christ et al., 2012a). It was therefore speculated that upon target binding via the N-terminal lanthionine rings, the C-terminal positive residues of subtilin are exposed and might serve as binding sites for SpaI (Christ et al., 2012a). These examples demonstrate that it is indeed likely that AMPs can be recognised when associated with their membrane bound targets rather than in their free form. A common feature of bacitracin and class I lantibiotics like nisin and subtilin is that the peptides undergo major structural rearrangements when binding their targets (Economou et al., 2013, Hsu et al., 2004, Medeiros-Silva et al., 2018). These adjusted ‘bound’ conformations might expose structural cues that allow resistance and regulatory proteins to recognise them as substrate. Many other AMPs undergo a conformational change when binding their target, membrane-based lipid II cycle intermediates (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Oppedijk et al., 2016). Depending on the surrounding environment, the class II lantibiotic mersacidin can acquire various conformations (Hsu et al., 2003). When bound to its target lipid II, the structure of mersacidin is distinctly different from its free form. Similar to nisin (Medeiros-Silva et al., 2018), mersacidin was shown to contain a hinge region with which it can adjust the exposure of charges upon binding and in that way adapt to its environment. Containing the same hinge-region, similar conformational flexibility was also suggested for actagardine and its derivatives (Hsu et al., 2003, Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006). Further, NMR solution structures suggest two distinct conformations for the class II lantibiotic nukacin ISK-1 (Fujinami et al., 2018). In only one of the states nukacin ISK-1 is capable of binding lipid II. It is therefore possible that certain resistance proteins are able to distinguish between the free and target-bound form of the AMPs. This would bring the advantage that the resistance determinant removes the AMP directly from its inhibited target, rather than binding free
AMPs in the periphery. When UPP and lipid II are released from the inhibitory grip of the AMP, they can be transmitted to the next stage in the lipid II cycle. The AMP is often unable to recognise the resulting lipid II cycle intermediate or only binds it with much lower affinity, and hence the cell wall synthesis can be kept intact.

Analogously to these resistance proteins, it is quite possible that also BceAB can differentiate between the two configurations of its substrates. This would explain, why the data in this chapter suggested no interaction between BceB-ECD and bacitracin in its free form, but indicated a possible affinity to the [UPP-BAC] complex. Bacitracin might not have adopted the correct amphipathic configuration required for binding by BceB-ECD, when it was not associated with its target.

3.3 ECDs can combine substrate recognition in the membrane environment with a broad substrate range.

Most of the BceAB-like resistance transporters described so far were shown to confer resistance against several substrates (Staron et al., 2011, Gebhard, 2012). LanFEG-type transporters were shown to mediate resistance against the same type of substrates as BceB-like transporters, mostly antimicrobial peptides (AMPs). Yet, LanFEG transporter were generally found to only confer resistance against a single specific substrate (Gebhard, 2012). Only few exceptions are described where the transporter also binds almost identical derivatives of a certain AMP, e.g. EpiFEG that recognises both, gallidermin and epidermin (Otto et al., 1998). One explanation for this substrate exclusivity is that LanFEG transporters usually protect their host against a specific endogenously produced AMP, and thus confer immunity rather than resistance against exogenously stimuli (Stein et al., 2003, 2005, Okuda et al., 2008). Notably, LanFEG transporters lack an obvious binding site, while the large extracellular domain between TMH7 and TMH8 is one of the main characteristics of the BceAB family (Gebhard, 2012, Dintner et al., 2011). It is thus plausible that the large, flexible ECD of BceB enables recognition of a broader substrate range, as it is shown for multidrug efflux pumps like AcrAB (Chapter I). In this type of transporters, the periplasmic domains are responsible for substrate recognition and binding. The conformational flexibility of these binding domains facilitates the characteristic broad substrate range of AcrB-like efflux pumps (Yu et al., 2003).

Extracytoplasmic domains also play an important role in the substrate binding of MacB-like transporters (for details, refer to Chapter I). MacB is an efflux pump in several Gram-negative
bacteria that provides resistance against macrolide antibiotics and AMPs like bacitracin and colistin. The ECDs of MacB were suggested to be the substrate binding domains (Crow et al., 2017). A similar role has been proposed for the ECDs of the lipoprotein extractor LolCDE (Crow et al., 2017). Furthermore, the ECDs of FtsEX, prevalent in many Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria, were shown to be responsible for the direct interaction with the respective binding partner of FtsX, after the ECDs have acquired their active conformation (Mavrici et al., 2014, Sham et al., 2013).

These insights suggest that it is also very likely that BceB-ECD acts as the substrate binding domain of the resistance transporter, in a similar way to the here described examples. In this study, we probably could not show this interaction, as the ECD might have not bound free bacitracin, or because the ECD was not functional in isolation without the TMHs.

The MacB-like proteins described here are all classified as part of the type VII ABC transporter family, of which MacB is the holotype. With four transmembrane helices and one large extracytoplasmic the described transporters feature a homologous topology (Fig. 3.10). Further homologues are found amongst Gram-positive as well as Gram-negative bacteria, as recently reviewed by Greene and colleagues (2018).

Also BceAB of *B. subtilis* has been proposed to be a member of this family (Greene et al., 2018). BceAB was shown to consist of two conserved ATPase units (BceA), but only a single transmembrane subunit (BceB) with ten predicted transmembrane helices (Dintner et al., 2014). Some homologues of MacB harbour more than the ‘basal unit’ of four transmembrane helices with one large ECD between TMH1 and TMH2 in one monomer (Greene et al., 2018). Transmembrane domains with eight or ten transmembrane helices per monomer have been described to be the result of gene duplication (Khwaja et al., 2005). Each large monomer contains two repeat ‘basal units’ (TMH1-4, TMH5-8). The two additional helices of the transmembrane domain with ten predicted TMH seem to have inserted centrally between the functional units (TMH5 and TMH6). Further dimerisation of the transmembrane domain is not expected, and in the case of BceAB not observed (Dintner et al., 2014), as the two basal units were suggested to form a pseudo-heterodimer (Khwaja et al., 2005). In the case of BceB-like transporters, a rare intragenic deletion is thought to have led to the loss of the first large ECD between TMH1 and TMH2 (Khwaja et al., 2005). Generally, the C-terminal repeat unit was found to be better conserved than its N-terminal equivalent. In agreement with this, the hydropathy profile of BceB TMH7-10 suggests BceB to have the same topology to MacB-like transporters (Fig. 3.10).
Crystal structures and secondary structure predictions of the extracytoplasmic domain revealed a conserved pattern for most MacB-like transporters. The ECDs seem to comprise two so-called ‘Porter’ subdomains (β-α-β) at their N- and C-termini, across all tested type VII ABC transporters (Crow et al., 2017). All but FtsX-like domains showed a conserved Sabre (Small alpha/beta rich extracytoplasmic) subdomain between the Porter domains (Crow et al., 2017). Comparison with the predictions for BceB-ECD (Fig. 3.10) and the previously discovered secondary structure pattern for most BceB-like extracellular domains (Dintner et al., 2011), revealed a very similar secondary structure to MacB. We thus propose that also BceB-like ECDs can be differentiated into Porter and Sabre subdomains. The N- and C-terminal helices predicted in this study and the phylogenetic analysis by Dintner and colleagues (2011), are likely the continuation of TMH7 and TMH8 (or TMH1 and TMH2 in MacB, respectively) that form the so-called stalk of MacB-like transporters (Crow et al., 2017). Indeed, secondary structure predictions of full-length BceAB revealed a continuation of the membrane-spanning helices 7 and 8 into the extracellular regions (data not shown). The homology of the transmembrane regions and the potential structural similarity of BceAB and MacB-like transporters indicate a potential mechanistic similarity. This means that BceAB possibly recognises its substrate at the interface between the membrane and the extracellular space via its large extracellular domain akin to MacB-like proteins.
Figure 3.10: BceB (TMH7-10) has the characteristic features of type VII ABC transporters.
A: Hydropathy profile of members of the type VII ABC transporter family, modified from Crow et al. (2017). B: Hydropathy profile of TMH 7-10 of BceB using the online tool TMPred (Hofmann, 1993). C: Comparison of the secondary structure of BceB-ECD and the periplasmic domain of MacB. Secondary structures were predicted using the JPred online prediction tool (Drozdetskiy et al., 2015). Visualisation: red: α-helix, blue: β-sheet, grey: unstructured/coil. Porter and Sabre domains are indicated by grey and blue boxes.
3.4 The isolated extracellular domain might not be functional in vitro.

Although seemingly predestined for substrate binding, BceB-ECD could not be confirmed as the binding domain in vitro. Despite successful characterisations of in vitro binding by similar isolated domains (Mavrici et al., 2014), it was possible that BceB-ECD, overproduced and purified as described above, was not functional.

The requirement of the extracellular domain to sense and confer resistance against bacitracin, as it is described in the literature (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Coumes-Florens et al., 2011), does not necessarily mean that the ECD alone is responsible for substrate binding. It is thus possible that BceB-ECD requires another extracellular loop of BceB to recognise and bind the substrate together. This is for example the case for protein-protein interactions by FtsEX in S. pneumoniae. Extracellular activation of the peptidoglycan hydrolase PcsB does not only require the large extracellular domain, which is located between transmembrane helices (TMH) 1 and 2. Also the shorter extracellular loop between TMH3 and TMH4 is needed to bind the coiled-coil region of PcsB (Sham et al., 2013).

Random mutagenesis of BceAB has identified several mutations that abolish resistance and or signalling activity of BceAB. Two of these mutations are located at the membrane interface of two shorter extracellular loops of BceB (Kallenberg et al., 2013). These mutations lie between TMH6 and TMH7, and TMH9 and TMH10, respectively. As bacitracin resistance was found to be moderately reduced, these extracellular loops might be additionally required for substrate binding.

Alternatively, it is plausible that BceAB interacts with its substrate in the membrane, or requires a combination of both, intramembrane interactions and recognition by BceB-ECD. The physiological substrate of BceAB has been proposed to consist of the AMP bound to its membrane-located target or even to be the target alone (Bernard et al., 2007, Kingston et al., 2014). Interactions between BceAB and isoprenoids are likely to take place in the membrane, potentially mediated by one or several transmembrane helices. To investigate this hypothesis, truncated versions of BceB could be produced as membrane proteins and tested for binding activity. Truncation studies are often used to identify the minimal functional unit of proteins (Lee et al., 2002, Mavrici et al., 2014, Hacker et al., 2015b).

Furthermore, the membrane environment was shown to affect in vitro activity of membrane proteins (Lee, 2004, Shen et al., 2013). BceB-ECD is natively the soluble domain of a membrane-protein, and thus in close proximity to the cytoplasmic membrane. Production of BceB-ECD as an isolated soluble protein might have affected its biological activity. To address
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this issue, BceB-ECD could be reattached to the membrane. So far, we have designed and synthesised BceB-ECD hybrid proteins that anchor BceB-ECD onto the membrane by unrelated transmembrane helices (TMH) as described in Fig. S3.5 (GenScript, NJ, USA). In doing so, we hoped to re-create the natural environment of the ECD, but could still exclude other parts of BceB interacting with the substrate. Such a fusion protein has successfully been used for the characterisation of a periplasmic loop of similar length to BceB-ECD before (Saaf *et al.*, 1995). Initial attempts at overproduction, solubilisation of the membrane proteins in detergent and Strep-Tactin®-based purification of one of the BceB-ECD hybrid proteins according to a protocol modified from Dintner and colleagues (2014) were successful. However, no further binding experiments were performed due to time restrictions. Recently, solubilisation of integral membrane proteins using styrene-maleic acid (SMA) copolymers has become a widely used method in membrane protein research (Dorr *et al.*, 2016).

In contrast to solubilisation of membrane proteins with detergent, SMA copolymers have the advantage that they can preserve the native membrane environment around the protein (Dorr *et al.*, 2016, Pollock *et al.*, 2018). SMA copolymers form so-called nanodiscs, which are SMA lipid particles that encompass the membrane protein and the lipid bilayer. This often secures biological activity and stabilises the protein for *in vitro* characterisation (Stroud *et al.*, 2018). Attempts to solubilise BceAB or the hybrid proteins in SMA copolymers have not yet been successful. Once established, this approach could also be used to investigate whether BceAB has affinity to and interacts with certain lipid II cycle intermediates.

In the ABC transporter superfamily, successful substrate transport is driven by ATP-hydrolysis (Locher, 2016). In agreement, various members of the Type VII ABC transporter family were found to be non-functional when key motifs of their nucleotide binding domains (NBD) were mutated (Frelet & Klein, 2006, Tikhonova *et al.*, 2007, Yang *et al.*, 2011, Crow *et al.*, 2017). Conformational changes of FtsX in *M. tuberculosis* seem to be driven by ATP hydrolysis performed by the nucleotide binding domains (NBD) of FtsE. This allows the large extracellular domain of FtsX to adopt its active conformation FtsX, which enables it to interact with its binding partner (Mavrici *et al.*, 2014).

BceAB activity was also found to depend on functional NBDs. *B. subtilis* cells carrying mutations in the conserved Walker A motif of BceA, which disturbs ATP-binding as well as the hydrolysis thereof, were not able to sense bacitracin or confer resistance against it (Rietkötter *et al.*, 2008). A BceAB-Walker B mutant, which can bind ATP but not further process it, showed minimal *in vivo* activity in our study (data not shown). Although purified
BceB alone was seemingly able to bind bacitracin in vitro (Dintner et al., 2014), ATP binding or hydrolysis might be required for the substrate recognition of BceB-ECD (Rietkötter et al., 2008).

Taken together, the work in this chapter was based on the in vitro characterisation of the extracellular domain of BceAB. Because no interaction between BceB-ECD and free bacitracin could be detected, BceB-ECD could not be confirmed as the binding domain of BceA and no further investigations into a potential fly-casting binding mechanism could be performed (Shoemaker et al., 2000). The target of bacitracin, UPP, had been discussed to potentially be at least part of the substrate (Bernard et al., 2007, Kingston et al., 2014). However, due to high background signal, in vitro analyses on the [GPP-BAC] complex remained ambiguous. The lipid carrier UPP is membrane-bound, and thus also the [UPP-BAC] complex would natively be located in the membrane. If the [UPP-BAC] complex was the physiological substrate of BceAB, it is possible that substrate recognition happens directly in the hydrophobic membrane environment (Mascher et al., 2003, Bernard et al., 2007), according to a ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ mechanism (Podlesek et al., 1995). Recently, extensive evidence has been published demonstrating that extracytoplasmic domains function as substrate binding domains in transporters homologous to BceAB (Crow et al., 2017, Greene et al., 2018). Despite their extracytoplasmic location, these domains are able to recognise and bind substrates from the membrane. A ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ hypothesis would thus be compatible with the indications that BceB-ECD may play a role in substrate recognition, but not of free bacitracin itself, which explains the lack of binding activity observed in this chapter (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Hiron et al., 2011). Hydrophobic vacuum cleaners basically confer resistance by shifting the equilibrium of the AMP binding reaction from the membrane more towards the extracellular environment. If BceAB acted according to such a mechanism, the ability to differentiate between free bacitracin and the [UPP-BAC] complex would be crucial. To gain further insights into the potential mechanism, the in vivo identification of the physiological substrate will be addressed in the following chapter.
Chapter IV

*In vivo* determination of the physiological substrate of BceAB
1. Introduction

While it has been shown that BceAB successfully confers resistance against certain AMPs, including bacitracin, mersacidin and actagardine (Staron et al., 2011, Ohki et al., 2003), the question of the resistance mechanism remains puzzling, and even the physiological substrate is still subject to debate. When first described, the transporter was named Bce for bacitracin efflux (Ohki et al., 2003), although no evidence for the direction of transport was given. This assumption was based on the suggested self-protection mechanism of the Bcr transporter of *B. licheniformis* ATCC10716 (Podlesek et al., 1995, 2000). The transporter of the bacitracin producer was thought to work according to a ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ model akin to the human multidrug resistance transporter P-glycoprotein (Higgins & Gottesman, 1992, Gottesman & Pastan, 1993). As it was difficult to envision how a membrane-located ABC-transporter could effectively confer resistance against AMPs that target molecules at the outer face of the membrane, BceAB was speculated to import bacitracin into the cytoplasm, where it is subsequently degraded (Rietkötter et al., 2008). This idea was based on the differences in protein architecture of the permeases BceB and BcrB. BceB comprises ten predicted transmembrane helices and a large extracellular domain, whereas the permease BcrB consists of six transmembrane helices, but lacks the extracellular domain (I 4.3.2, Podlesek et al., 1995, Rietkötter et al., 2008, Gebhard, 2012). In general, ATP-binding cassette (ABC) transporters that are involved in substrate uptake were shown to require extracytoplasmic binding proteins (Davidson & Chen, 2004, Dawson et al., 2007). Particularly in low GC-content Gram-positive bacteria, these substrate-binding proteins can be fused to the transmembrane segments of the transporter (van der Heide & Poolman, 2002). In contrast, efflux pumps seem to lack external substrate-binding proteins and acquire their substrate directly from the cytoplasm or the inner leaflet of the membrane (Dawson et al., 2007, Du et al., 2018).

More recently, several suggestions for the physiological substrate, and subsequently the resistance mechanism, have been made. Kingston and colleagues (2014) proposed that the transporter acted as a undecaprenyl pyrophosphate (UPP) translocase. BceAB was thought to confer resistance by transporting UPP and/or UP (undecaprenyl phosphate) across the membrane to the cytoplasmic face, thereby removing the cellular target for bacitracin rather than transporting bacitracin itself. In the presence of bacitracin, BceAB was hypothesised to bind the [UPP-BAC] complex, which was proposed to act as a transport inhibitor and lead to
activation of signalling through the BceRS regulatory two-component system (Kingston et al., 2014).

In contrast, Dintner and colleagues (2014) showed that purified BceB was able to bind bacitracin with a steady-state $K_d$ of 60 nM using surface plasmon resonance (SPR) spectroscopy, which was similar to the bacitracin threshold concentration required to induce the target promotor $P_{bceA}$ in vivo. Without excluding the possibility of BceAB recognising the [UPP-BAC] complex, this finding stressed the likelihood of the transporter directly interacting with and possibly transporting the AMP rather than the lipid carrier. When revealing that signalling through BceRS worked according to a novel flux-sensing mechanism, the original hypothesis of BceAB acting as a ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ was proposed again (Ohki et al., 2003, Fritz et al., 2015). This model suggests that BceAB recognises the [target-AMP] complex in the membrane (Mascher et al., 2003, Bernard et al., 2007), and in turn removes the AMP and releases it in the extracellular space. By this, the cellular targets, which are usually lipid II cycle intermediates, are freed from the inhibitory grip of the AMP. This unblocks the lipid II cycle, enables recycling of the lipid carrier and secures an intact cell wall. For a mechanism like this to work, the transporter would need to be able to specifically recognise the [target-AMP] complex and distinguish it from the unbound versions of both, the AMP and the cellular target.

This would be possible if BceAB specifically bound both components of the [target-AMP] complex as it has been proposed for [lipid II-nisin] binding by the immunity protein NisI of L. lactis (Jeong & Ha, 2018). As discussed in Chapter III, many AMPs including the AMPs BceAB confers resistance against (bacitracin, actagardine and mersacidin) were shown to undergo extensive conformational changes upon target binding (Hsu et al., 2003, Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Economou et al., 2013). This rearrangement might expose structural cues that can serve as binding site by BceAB.

It is becoming more apparent that bacterial cells respond differently to antimicrobial stress depending on the physiological context and the metabolic state of the cells. Recently, aspartate deficiency was shown to reduce peptidoglycan synthesis and to increase the susceptibility to cell wall-active antibiotics (Zhao et al., 2018). Further, genetic manipulations that disturb the levels of lipid II cycle intermediates were shown to affect antibiotic sensitivity. Lee and Helmann (2013) described a mutation in the ribosome-binding site of the promoter $P_{uppS}$, which was proposed to result in lower levels of UppS in the cell, the enzyme that catalyses assembly of UPP. Lower levels of UPP led to an increased resistance to
antibiotics that target early stages in the cell wall synthesis, whereas the cells responded more sensitively to antimicrobial compounds that target later stages, including bacitracin (Lee & Helmann, 2013). It is also well-known that the removal of the UPP phosphatases BcRc and UppP leads to increased bacitracin susceptibility in *B. subtilis* (Cao & Helmann, 2002, Bernard *et al.*, 2005, Zhao *et al.*, 2016, Radeck *et al.*, 2017a). As both are redundant in function to some degree and catalyse the dephosphorylation of UPP to UP, this change can likely be explained by an accumulation of the pyrophosphate form of the lipid carrier. In addition, Kingston and colleagues (2014) found that accumulation of heptaprenyl pyrophosphate (C35-PP) sensitises *B. subtilis* to bacitracin. This effect was observed following deletion of *ytpB*, when MenA activity was limited at the same time. Both enzymes use C35-PP as their substrate. C35-PP was suggested to compete with UPP for translocation by BceAB and to potentially inhibit signalling through the two-component system BceRS (Kingston *et al.*, 2014). In a previous study, bacitracin was shown to bind tightly around the pyrophosphate group and to interact with only the first prenyl group (Economou *et al.*, 2013). The association constant between UPP and bacitracin was determined to be 1.05 µM⁻¹, but also the shorter farnesyl pyrophosphate (C15-PP) was shown to bind bacitracin at a comparable association constant (Kₐ = 0.83 µM⁻¹, Storm & Strominger, 1973). Therefore, it is very likely that bacitracin also targets C35-PP.

If the cellular target of the AMPs was at least part of the physiological substrate of BceAB, the described changes in lipid II-cycle intermediate levels should change the effective substrate concentration, and thus alter BceAB activity. In this chapter, we aimed to reveal the identity of the physiological substrate and the potential role of both, the cellular target and the AMPs, by monitoring growth behaviour and BceAB transport activity in cells with such variation.

In contrast to most assays used in Chapter III, in which we focussed on the *in vitro* characterisation of the substrate binding domain, this chapter describes *in vivo* approaches to identify the physiological substrate of BceAB. We used physiological assays, including growth and competition assays, to investigate the effect of BceAB on growth to identify a potential affinity to UPP. Further, we used a *PbceA-lux* reporter assay to investigate the BceAB transport activity in response to genetic manipulations of genes important to the lipid II cycle. Previous data on bacitracin transport assays were used to gain further insights into the potential resistance mechanism. Our data suggest that the complex formed between the antimicrobial peptide and its corresponding cellular target acts as physiological substrate of
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BceAB and are in support of a hydrophobic vacuum cleaner-like substrate recognition at the membrane interface.

## 2. Results

### 2.1 Investigating a potential interaction between BceAB and UPP using growth assays

#### 2.1.1 Presence of BceAB does not alter the fastest doubling time.

The lipid II cycle is known to be the bottle neck of cell wall synthesis, with the availability of the lipid carrier being the rate-limiting step (van Heijenoort, 1998). It is further thought that lipid carrier recycling instead of *de novo* synthesis is the pacemaker of the lipid II cycle (Piepenbreier, Fritz, unpublished). Impairment of UPP recycling thus potentially affects the doubling time of during the exponential growth phase of bacteria. In agreement with this, Radeck *et al.* (2016b) found a *B. subtilis* ΔbcrC mutant to have a higher doubling time than the WT and also detected a growth difference between *bceAB*+ and *bceAB*− strains, supporting the hypothesis that cell wall synthesis is growth-limiting.

In several of the proposed resistance mechanisms of BceAB against antimicrobial stress, the transporter was suggested to interact with UPP. For example, BceAB was proposed to act as UPP importer (Kingston *et al.*, 2014). According to this hypothesis, the lipid carrier would serve as the true physiological substrate and even in the absence of bacitracin, the transporter should increase the turnover of the lipid II cycle.

Furthermore, also the ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ model indicates that BceAB can recognise the complex of the cellular target and the AMP (Mascher *et al.*, 2003, Bernard *et al.*, 2007). This could mean that BceAB has a certain affinity to UPP alone (Radeck *et al.*, 2016b). This potential binding interaction might help the transporter to monitor the UPP levels in the absence of AMP stress. By interacting with the lipid carrier, BceAB might withhold some UPP from cell wall biogenesis. When bound to BceAB, the lipid carrier is unlikely to be dephosphorylated and recycled. The interaction between BceAB and the lipid II cycle intermediate might therefore lead to a delay in UPP turnover in the absence of bacitracin. Thus, the absence of BceAB might be beneficial to growth when resistance to bacitracin is not required, as all available UPP can be directly recycled. Supporting this hypothesis, a ΔbceAB mutant was shown to have faster doubling times in the absence of...
bacitracin (Radeck et al., 2016b). While in vitro binding assays between the extracellular domain of BceAB and GPP did not indicate such an interaction (Chapter III), it seemed reasonable to investigate this interaction in vivo with the whole transporter and the lipid carrier in its natural environment. To test if the potential interaction between BceAB and UPP leads to benefits or disadvantages for the cell, growth and competition assays were performed by a project student (Laura Richardson) under my supervision.

Growth curves of the wild-type *B. subtilis* W168 (WT) and a ∆bceAB (SGB575) and a ∆bcrC mutant (TMB297), as well as a ∆bceAB ∆bcrC double mutant (SGB01) were obtained by recording the OD_{600}. The fastest doubling time (t_{d}) during exponential phase was determined for each of the strains (Fig. 4.1 A, B). For the WT, a doubling time of 23.50±1.77 minutes was calculated. In contrast to observations by Radeck and colleagues (2016b), deletion of ∆bceAB did not lead to a significantly different doubling time (23.23±2.28 minutes, p = 0.9913). The effect of BceAB on the growth rate was also tested in a ∆bcrC background. Deletion of bcrC is expected to lead to UPP accumulation and might highlight a potential interaction between BceAB and UPP. In the ∆bcrC mutation strain the doubling time was found to be 25.23±1.51 minutes, and the doubling time of the ∆bceAB ∆bcrC mutant was recorded as 25.95±1.93 minutes, which again did not show a significant difference (p = 0.8576). This suggests that removal of BceAB had no detectable impact on the fastest doubling times. A possible explanation for this was that in the absence of activity-inducing antimicrobial stress, the basal level of BceAB might simply be too low to cause a difference. To investigate this further, bceAB was expressed ectopically under xylose-inducible control. We hypothesised that if BceAB withheld some of the UPP from cell wall synthesis, increasing the amounts of BceAB upon xylose induction should lead to slower growth. If BceAB was able to import the lipid carrier, it should lead to faster growth.

Growth behaviour of the WT, a BceAB overproduction strain (SGB576, WT P_{xylose}-bceAB), and a BceAB complementation strain (SGB577, ∆bceAB P_{xylose}-bceAB) were re-tested as described above. MIC assays showed increased bacitracin resistance when ectopically producing BceAB in the presence of 0.2 % xylose (MIC: ∆bceAB P_{xylose}-bceAB -xylose: 16 µg/ml, ∆bceAB P_{xylose}-bceAB +xylose: 64 µg/ml, WT P_{xylose}-bceAB: 128 µg/ml) confirming the successful production of BceAB. Doubling times of all tested strains revolved around 23 minutes (Fig. 4.1 C, detailed t_{d} in Fig. 4.1 D). None of the tested strains showed any significant difference in their doubling time when compared to their corresponding controls that did not overproduce BceAB. These findings show that even in the presence of ectopically produced BceAB the growth rate of *B.
subtilis does not change in the tested conditions. This indicates that BceAB might not interact with free UPP.

**Figure 4.1:** The doubling time of exponentially growing *B. subtilis* seems unaffected by presence of absence of BceAB. *B. subtilis* strains were grown in LB medium at 37 °C shaking incubation over 8 hours in a 96-well microplate reader. OD_{600} measurements were taken every 5 minutes. The fastest doubling time for each strain was determined. Bar graphs show means ± standard deviation from at least 6 biological replicates. **A:** Comparison of doubling times (t_d) of WT (W168), a ΔbceAB (SGB575) and a ΔbcrC mutant (TMB297), as well as a ΔbceAB ΔbcrC double mutant (SG801), values are listed in panel **B. C:** Doubling times of BceAB overproduction (SGB576, centre) and BceAB complementation strains (SGB577, right) in the presence (+) or absence (-) of 0.2 % xylose compared to WT doubling times (left), values are listed in panel **D.** Statistical analysis using a Tukey’s multi comparisons test did not show a significant difference upon removal of BceAB. Displayed data were obtained in collaboration with Laura Richardson.
2.1.2 Absence of BceAB seems beneficial to growth in competition assays when recycling of UPP is impaired.

An interaction between BceAB and UPP in the absence of bacitracin might only cause minor differences in the doubling times, and it is possible that growth in the 96-well plate might be insufficient to resolve these. As a more sensitive approach to investigate if the presence of BceAB is beneficial or even a burden on growth, competition assays were performed (Laura Richardson).

In contrast to comparison of the maximal growth rate ($V_{max}$) or the fastest doubling time ($t_d$), which measure the absolute fitness of a bacterial strain, competition assays are based on competing two bacterial strains directly against each other (Wiser & Lenski, 2015). By this, the relative fitness of a mutant to its wild type strain is determined and smaller differences have a better chance to be established. We hypothesised that if BceAB had an affinity to free UPP and withheld some of the lipid carrier from cell wall synthesis, a $\Delta bceAB$ strain would outcompete strains containing BceAB, like the WT. If BceAB acted as UPP importer and accelerated UPP turnover, the WT should outcompete the $\Delta bceAB$ strain. To test this, *B. subtilis* strains (WT versus $\Delta bceAB$ (SGB575), and $\Delta bcrC$ (TMB297) versus $\Delta bceAB \Delta bcrC$ (SGB01)) were inoculated in a 50:50 ratio. A WT versus $\Delta bcrC$ pair was used as control, as the WT was expected to outcompete the UPP phosphatase deletion mutant (Radeck *et al.*, 2016b). Mixed cultures were grown in LB medium at 37 °C shaking incubation, and diluted 1:1000 into fresh broth every 24 hours. Viable cells were counted and the competition index (CI) determined for each of the pairs (Auerbuch *et al.*, 2001, Wiser & Lenski, 2015). The CI gives indication on whether one strain outcompetes the other, with CI = 1 implying equal growth rates, CI < 1 meaning the mutant strain was outcompeted and a CI value > 1 to be interpreted as the mutant outcompeting the wild type strain. The WT versus $\Delta bcrC$ pair revealed a mean CI of 0.76±0.06 after 24 hours, and 0.08±0.52 after 72 hours (Fig. 4.2). These results confirm that the WT strain had a growth benefit over the $\Delta bcrC$ mutant. It further validated the assay to be more sensitive, as this difference in fitness was not observed when comparing doubling times (IV 2.1.1). For the $\Delta bcrC$ versus $\Delta bceAB \Delta bcrC$ pair, the CI lies at 1.52±0.24 after 24 hours and at 3.47±0.31 after 72 hours, suggesting a clear growth advantage of the $\Delta bceAB \Delta bcrC$ double mutant over the $\Delta bcrC$ single mutant (Fig. 4.2). The CI values of the WT versus $\Delta bceAB$ mutant were 1.42±1.08 after 24 hours and 1.16±0.16 after 72 hours, which did not result in a significant growth difference upon $\Delta bceAB$ deletion (Fig. 4.2). The removal of $bceAB$ appeared to be mainly advantageous when competing in a UPP-
accumulated environment, but seemed to have little to no impact in the wild-type background. This could be explained by BceAB having a low affinity to UPP alone, and upon accumulation of UPP it is more likely that this interaction happens. It became apparent that the CI became more veritable in the assays performed over 72 hours for both the WT versus ΔbcrC and the ΔbcrC versus ΔbceAB ΔbcrC pairs. It is possible that a growth difference between the WT and a ΔbceAB would take even longer to become detectable. Additionally, biological repeats and technical replicates of the CFUs will help to detect smaller differences. In the way the assay was conducted, it is not entirely clear whether the observed fitness advantage of the ΔbceAB ΔbcrC double mutant over the ΔbcrC single mutant is a result of faster growth, as the cells are only transferred into fresh medium after 24 h. This means that cells will enter various growth stages and accordingly experience alterations of growth rate as well as the underlying metabolism. It is thus possible that the competition benefit is a result of differential stationary phase survival or differences in outgrowth behaviour from lag-phase. To ensure the fitness advantage is due to faster growth, competing cells should be constrained to exponential growth as much as possible, rather than being allowed to transit into stationary phase. This could for example be achieved by dilution into fresh medium every two to three hours.
Figure 4.2: The absence of BceAB seems only beneficial upon accumulation of UPP. For competition assays, *B. subtilis* strains were inoculated pairwise in a 50:50 ratio and grown in test tubes containing LB medium at 37 °C shaking incubation. Cultures were diluted 1:1000 into fresh LB medium every 24 h. Samples were taken, diluted and plated on LB agar with and without the appropriate selection after 0, 24 and 72 h. CFUs were counted after 24 h of incubation at 37 °C. A: Bar graphs show means ± standard deviation from at least 2 biological replicates. Comparison of CI values of the following pairs: WT versus a ΔbcrC mutant (TMB297, dark blue), WT versus ΔbceAB (SBG575, centre) and ΔbcrC versus ΔbceAB ΔbcrC (SGB01, lightest blue) after 24 and 72 h, values are listed in panel B. Displayed data were obtained in collaboration with Laura Richardson.
2.2 Changing amounts of the [target-AMP] complex has impact on BceAB activity.

In a second set of studies, we investigated whether the physiological substrate of BceAB was the complex of the AMP bound to its cellular target. For this, we first required a strategy to quantify transport activity in living cells. It has recently been shown that signalling within the Bce system is directly proportional to BceAB transport activity (Fritz et al., 2015). As the signalling cascade ultimately leads to activation of the promoter controlling bceAB expression (P_{bceA}), the activity of a P_{bceA}-luxABCDE reporter fusion can be taken as a proxy for BceAB activity (SGB73, Fig. 4.3 A). Using this approach, we monitored BceAB activity in the WT strain under several sub-inhibitory bacitracin concentrations. In agreement with previously reported data (Fritz et al., 2015), the threshold concentration to elicit detectable BceAB activity was 0.1 µg/ml bacitracin, and the activity gradually increased until maximum levels were reached at 30 µg/ml (Fig. 4.3 B). While this experiment showed that the transport activity increased with higher bacitracin concentrations, it did not directly allow us to distinguish whether the physiological substrate is free bacitracin or the complex between bacitracin and its cellular target UPP ([UPP-BAC]). This is because the concentration of [UPP-BAC] changes proportionally to the concentration of bacitracin added to the culture (Fig. 4.3 C).
Figure 4.3: The flux-sensing mechanism as suitable strategy to monitor BceAB activity. A: Schematic of the BceAB-BceRS resistance system. In the presence of bacitracin, the transporter BceAB confers resistance against bacitracin. BceAB forms a sensory complex with the kinase BceS and the transport activity of BceAB induces a signalling cascade through the two component regulatory system BceRS, which ultimately activates transcription from the target promotor \( P_{bceA} \). This results in increased production of BceAB, and therefore adjusted levels of resistance. As this signalling cascade is directly proportional to the transport activity, we can use the target promotor \( P_{bceA} \) upstream of a luciferase reporter to monitor the transport activity of BceAB. B: Using luciferase activity as a proxy, BceAB activity of wild-type \( B. subtilis \) W168 carrying the reporter fusion (SGB73) was determined as average of three measurements taken 25, 30 and 35 minutes after challenging the cells with sub-inhibitory concentrations of bacitracin. Measurements were performed during exponential growth phase in LB medium at 37 °C in a microplate reader. All data are depicted as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. C: Binding reaction between free bacitracin and its cellular target UPP.
2.2.1 Accumulation of UPP increases BceAB activity at low concentrations of bacitracin.

To distinguish whether it was [UPP-BAC] or free bacitracin that triggered BceAB activity, we required a strategy to change the concentration of [UPP-BAC], while keeping the concentration of bacitracin constant. This should be possible by changing the UPP levels in the cell. If the [UPP-BAC] complex was the physiological substrate of BceAB, increased amounts of UPP should result in higher BceAB activity at the same bacitracin concentration.

To achieve such an increase in the level of UPP displayed on the extracellular face of the membrane, we deleted the UPP phosphatase encoding gene \( bcrC \), which plays a prominent role in recycling of UPP to UP during exponential growth (Bernard et al., 2005, Radeck et al., 2017a, Zhao et al., 2016). By this, we should reduce the rate of UPP dephosphorylation, and thus accumulate UPP. This assumption was supported by a computational model prediction by our collaborators (Piepenbreier & Fritz, data not shown). As expected from previous data (Radeck et al., 2016b), deletion of \( bcrC \) resulted in an increased sensitivity to bacitracin, indicating an increased amount of UPP available for bacitracin to target. The MIC decreased from 160±20 µg/ml in the wild-type to 67±12 µg/ml in the \( \Delta bcrC \) strain (SGB649).

Re-testing BceAB activity in the \( \Delta bcrC \) strain showed that increasing the UPP concentration in the cell led to a more than 10-fold reduction in the minimal bacitracin concentration required to trigger transport activity (0.003 µg/ml, Fig. 4.4 A, turquoise). Likewise, maximum BceAB activity was observed at 0.3 µg/ml bacitracin (Fig. 4.4 A, turquoise), which is 100-fold less bacitracin than is required in the WT strain (SGB73) to reach similar activity (Fig. 4.4 A, dark blue). Between 0.3 and 30 µg/ml bacitracin the transport activity seemed to have reached a plateau. A seemingly decrease of activity with increasing bacitracin concentration was not statistically significant (one-way ANOVA with post-hoc test). A two-way ANOVA confirmed the variation observed between the two strains was significant (\( p = 0.0075 \)). The huge disparity in BceAB activity between the \( \Delta bcrC \) and the WT strain became particularly clear when comparing activity levels in the presence of 0.1 to 3 µg/ml bacitracin, as the post-hoc test performed showed \( p \)-values lower than 0.0001 at these concentrations. Further, a non-linear regression dose response curve was fitted on the normalised BceAB activity of each of the strains, allowing determination of the half maximal effective concentration of bacitracin (\( EC_{50} \), Fig. 4.4 B). As the maximal activity of the WT strain has been previously determined to lie at a concentration around 30 µg/ml bacitracin (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Fritz et al., 2015), we assumed this concentration as a suitable end point.
The EC_{50} values, which describe the bacitracin concentration at which the BceAB activity is half its maximum, were 3.86 µg/ml in the WT and 0.059 µg/ml in the ΔbcrC mutant (p < 0.0001). This significant difference further confirmed the increased sensitivity upon UPP accumulation.

To explore if UPP alone could serve as the physiological substrate of BceAB, the activity was also compared in the absence of bacitracin. There was no detectable BceAB activity in either of the tested strains, which suggested that accumulation of UPP alone was not sufficient to trigger transport by BceAB.

To exclude that the observed sensitivity shift upon UPP accumulation was a result of an additional unknown regulatory effect on the P_{bceA} promoter, we uncoupled BceAB production from its native regulation. We re-tested the effect of UPP accumulation on BceAB activity in a strain lacking the native copy of bceAB, but carrying a xylose-inducible copy of bceAB. Ectopic expression of bceAB ensured equal BceAB production levels in all strains, independent of signalling activity and other regulatory influences. In agreement with previous observations (Kallenberg et al., 2013), bacitracin resistance increased in a ΔbceAB single mutant (SGB218) as well as in the ΔbceAB ΔbcrC double mutant background (SGB677) upon xylose-induction of P_{xyLA}-bceAB (MICs: ΔbceAB P_{xyLA}-bceAB -xylose: 20 µg/ml, +xylose: 43.3±15.3 µg/ml; ΔbceAB ΔbcrC P_{xyLA}-bceAB -xylose: < 1 µg/ml, +xylose: 13.3±5.8 µg/ml). This confirmed successful BceAB production. The minimal bacitracin concentration to induce detectable BceAB activity as well as the concentration at which maximal activity was observed were 30-fold lower in the ΔbceAB ΔbcrC double mutant than in the ΔbceAB background (Fig. 4.4 C). These findings suggest that the more sensitive response in BceAB activity upon UPP accumulation is independent of the level of BceAB produced, and the observed activity change therefore unlikely to be due to regulatory effects.

To further explore the effect of altered UPP levels on BceAB activity, we sought to decrease the pool of UPP displayed on the outer face of the membrane. To this end, we overproduced BcrC by placing an additional copy of bcrC under control of the xylose-inducible promoter P_{xyLA} (SGB758). While the difference was not as pronounced as in the ΔbcrC strain, overproduction of BcrC still led to a small but consistent increase in MIC (WT: 160±20 µg/ml, P_{xyLA}-bcrC + xylose: 173±12 µg/ml). Reduction of UPP levels in this way led to overall lower BceAB activities (Fig. 4.4 D, turquoise). The threshold concentration required to trigger detectable activity was increased three-fold, and even at the maximal concentration tested, the activity was less than half of that in the wild type.
The dose response curve fitted on the normalised data did not reveal a difference in sensitivity. However, the concentrations tested did not allow an adequate conclusion on whether 30 µg/ml bacitracin resulted in maximal BceAB activity for the BcrC overproduction strain, or if higher activities may have been achieved at even higher but still sub-lethal concentrations (Fig. 4.4 E). Therefore, the difference between the P_{xylA-bcrC} and the WT strain was shown by a two-way ANOVA ($p = 0.0075$). Post-hoc analysis revealed a significant difference between the WT and the BcrC overproduction strains at the concentrations of 10 µg/ml ($p = 0.004$) and 30 µg/ml bacitracin ($p < 0.0001$, Fig. 4.4 D). This suggests that BcrC overproduction and, therefore, reduced levels of the cellular target, are likely to lead to decreased BceAB activity. These findings were a first indication that the concentration of [UPP-BAC] complexes rather than bacitracin or UPP alone is the critical parameter determining BceAB activity.

Figure 4.4: Varying the cellular UPP concentration affects BceAB transport activity in the presence of bacitracin. Exponentially growing cells were challenged with varying concentrations of bacitracin, as indicated. Luminescence activity (RLU/OD) was determined as average of three measurements taken 25, 30 and 35 minutes after addition of AMPs. Experiments were performed in LB medium at 37 °C shaking incubation in a microplate reader. All data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. A: Comparison of activities in the WT (SGB73, dark blue) and ΔbcrC strain (SGB649, turquoise) with varying bacitracin concentrations. B: Best-fit of dose response of BceAB activity for a ΔbcrC strain (turquoise) and the respective WT activity (dark blue). Non-linear regression curves were fitted on normalised activity data. The EC$_{50}$ (half maximal effective concentration) was determined and statistical analyses performed on the log$_{10}$EC$_{50}$ (****: $p < 0.0001$). C: Effect of ΔbcrC on BceAB activity in strains that carry a xylose-inducible copy of bceAB (P_{xylA-bceAB}), instead of the native copy (ΔbceAB). Experiments were performed in presence of 0.2 % xylose. D: BceAB activity of the BcrC overproduction strain (SGB758, P_{xylA-bcrC}) in the presence of 0.2 % xylose (turquoise) compared to WT activity (dark blue). For data displayed in panel A and D, a Bonferroni’s multiple comparisons test was performed as post-hoc analysis after a two-way ANOVA (****: $p < 0.0001$, ***: $p < 0.001$, **: $p < 0.01$, *: 0.01 < $p < 0.05$). E: Best-fit of dose response of BceAB activity for a P_{xylA-bcrC} strains and the respective WT activity. Non-linear regression curves were fitted on normalised activity data.
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2.2.2 UPP accumulation does not affect transport activity upon addition of lipid II binding AMPs.

To exclude that the changed susceptibility of the cell caused by varying the levels of UPP phosphatase had general effects on BceAB activity, we had to ensure that the observed activity was indeed due to changes the amount of [UPP-BAC] in the cell. Therefore, we wanted to test if bcrC deletion or overexpression also altered BceAB activity in response to AMPs that do not interfere with UPP. To this end, we tested BceAB activity in response to two lipid II-binding AMPs, mersacidin and actagardine. If the changed BcrC levels had a specific effect on UPP concentrations, the BceAB activity should be the same as in the wild-type strain when mersacidin or actagardine were added. In contrast, more global effects on the cell envelope should result in a change of activity, regardless which AMP was used.

When re-testing the WT and the ΔbcrC strains (SGB73, SGB649), a gradual increase of BceAB activity could be observed with increasing amounts of mersacidin or actagardine (Fig. 4.5 A, C). Comparing the activities between the WT and ΔbcrC strains at each AMP concentration showed that changing the UPP levels in the cell had no effect on BceAB activity for these two AMPs. Statistical analysis using a two-way ANOVA confirmed the significant effect that the increased concentration of each AMP had on BceAB activity (p < 0.0001), but further showed that there was no significant variation between the two strains tested (p = 0.7466 and p = 0.9987 for mersacidin and actagardine, respectively).

As an additional control, the activity of the related B. subtilis transporter PsdAB upon UPP accumulation was tested. This transporter is a BceAB paralog and responds to and confers resistance against nisin, another lipid II-binding AMP. PsdAB activity was determined using the same luminescence-reporter assay as for BceAB, but with P_{psdA} activity as a proxy for transport. As before, transport activity increased significantly with concentration of nisin (p < 0.0001, Fig. 4.5 E). The minimal nisin concentration to induce PsdAB activity was 0.1 µg/ml, whereas the maximal activity was observed at 10 µg/ml. No difference between the WT (SGB74) and ΔbcrC (SGB681) strains at each AMP concentration could be determined (p = 0.3530). These findings indicate that bcrC deletion only affected the complex formation between UPP and bacitracin and did not have a general effect on BceAB or PsdAB function.

Re-testing transport activity upon addition of mersacidin and actagardine in a BcrC overproducing strain seemed to result in an overall decreased BceAB activity compared to WT levels (SGB758, SGB73, Fig. 4.5 B, D), similar to the effect seen upon bacitracin addition (Fig. 4.4 D). Statistically significant differences between WT and the P_{xyl}-bcrC strain at each
tested concentration were only found at 1 and 3 µg/ml mersacidin ($p < 0.0001$) using post-
hoc analysis. These findings imply that overproduction of BcrC seemed to have a more global
effect on BceAB activity. For example it could have affected not only UPP but also lipid II
levels displayed on the extracellular face of the cell. Nevertheless, the largest difference in
BceAB activity between the WT and the BcrC overproducing strain was seen in the presence
of bacitracin (IV 2.2.1), hinting towards that the more prominent effect of BcrC
overproduction is on the UPP pool.
The findings so far indicate that BceAB activity does not depend on the concentration of free
antibiotic, but seemed to vary with the amount of the cellular target. This makes it more
likely that $[UPP\cdot BAC]$, or more general the complex of cellular target and antimicrobial
peptide is the physiological target rather than the AMP alone.
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Figure 4.5: Accumulation of UPP does not affect BceAB nor PsdAB transport activity in the presence of mersacidin, actagardine or nisin, respectively. Exponentially growing cells were challenged with varying concentrations of mersacidin, actagardine or nisin, as indicated. Luminescence activity (RLU/OD) was determined as average of three measurements taken 25, 30 and 35 minutes after addition of AMPs. All data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. Bonferroni’s multiple comparisons test was performed as post-hoc analysis after a two-way ANOVA (****: $p < 0.0001$, ***: $p < 0.001$, **: $p < 0.01$, *: $0.01 < p < 0.05$). A+C: Comparison of WT activities (SGB73, dark red/orange) and ΔbcrC strain (SGB649, light red/orange) with varying mersacidin or actagardine concentrations. B+D: BceAB activity of the BcrC overproduction strain (SGB758, P_{xylA}-bcrC) in the presence of 0.2 % xylose (light red/orange) compared to WT activity (dark red/orange). E: Comparison of PsdAB activities in the WT (dark green) and ΔbcrC strain (light green) with varying concentrations of nisin. PsdAB activity was obtained in the same manner as BceAB activity.
2.2.3 Accumulation of C$_{35}$-PP in the cell does not alter BceAB activity.

Manipulations of the isoprenoid biosynthesis pathway have previously been demonstrated to lead to accumulation of heptaprenyl diphosphate (C$_{35}$-PP). This effect occurs upon deletion of ytpB, a tetraprenyl-beta-curcumene synthase (Sato et al., 2011), when the activity of MenA, a key enzyme in the menaquinone pathway, is simultaneously limited (Kingston et al., 2014). C$_{35}$-PP was hypothesised to act as a competitive inhibitor and to block BceAB transport activity (Kingston et al., 2014). In this case, BceAB activity should decrease upon C$_{35}$-PP accumulation.

As bacitracin has been shown to tightly bind the pyrophosphate of GPP (Economou et al., 2013), the shorter precursor of UPP, it was expected that bacitracin would also bind C$_{35}$-PP. If [UPP-BAC] was the physiological substrate of BceAB, also [C$_{35}$-PP-BAC] is likely to be recognised by BceAB. Then, BceAB activity should not be affected.

To this end, we re-tested the BceAB activity of a ∆ytpB strain in the presence of bacitracin and compared it to wild type activity (SGB73, SGB798, Fig. 4.6). As the available a ∆ytpB MenA depletion strain was incompatible with our current luminescence reporter strain, BceAB activity experiments as well as MIC assays were performed in MH medium. In contrast to LB medium, MH contains lower amounts of tryptophan. In the tryptophan auxotroph B. subtilis W168 strain (trpC2), tryptophan depletion de-represses the biosynthesis thereof. Tryptophan biosynthesis in this strain is only disabled at the second-to-last step. This leads to a higher consumption of the central precursor chorismate, which in turn is thought to lead to reduced 1,4-dihydroxy-2-naphthoic acid (DHNA) biosynthesis. MenA uses DHNA as co-substrate of C$_{35}$-PP (Suvarna et al., 1998). Depletion of DHNA reduces the activity of MenA, which thus mimics a genetic depletion strategy and should lead to C$_{35}$-PP accumulation (Kingston et al., 2014).

As before, BceAB activity increased gradually with the bacitracin concentration added. The minimal concentration to trigger transport activity was 0.1 µg/ml bacitracin, maximal activity was observed at 30 µg/ml. There was no detectable difference in BceAB activity between the ∆ytpB strain and the WT at the same bacitracin concentration (Fig. 4.6).

This implies that under these conditions, C$_{35}$-PP or [C$_{35}$-PP-BAC] did not inhibit BceAB activity and suggests that BceAB cannot distinguish between [UPP-BAC] and [C$_{35}$-PP-BAC]. If BceAB is able to recognise both [UPP-BAC] and [C$_{35}$-PP-BAC] as substrate, the transporter is also likely to remove the bacitracin from the heptaprenyl diphosphate. In such case, the transport
activity was not expected to decrease. Taken together, these findings contradict that $\text{C}_{35}\text{-PP}$ acts as a competitive inhibitor of BceAB.

Figure 4.6: Accumulation of $\text{C}_{35}\text{-PP}$ in the cell does not affect BceAB activity in presence to bacitracin, but leads to decrease in resistance. Comparison of activities in the WT (SGB73, dark blue) and $\Delta ytpB$ strain (SGB798, turquoise) in the presence of varying bacitracin concentrations. BceAB activities were determined as described in Fig. 4.4, but experiments were performed in MH media. Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. A two-way ANOVA did not show any significant contribution to variation by the strains.
3. Discussion

In this chapter, we aimed to identify the nature of the physiological substrate of the antimicrobial resistance transporter BceAB in the context of the living cell. Using in vivo assays combined with genetic manipulations that were expected to alter the levels of key players in the lipid II cycle, we intended to investigate changes in the interaction between the physiological target with BceAB and effects on its transport activity. The physiological substrate of BceAB had previously been proposed to be the \([\text{target-AMP}]\) complex or either the AMP or the cellular target alone.

3.1 Our experimental data do not support a ‘UPP import’ model for BceAB.

A potential interaction between BceAB and the lipid carrier UPP was investigated using comparisons of the fastest doubling times and competition assays between strains that produced different levels of BceAB or lacked the transporter. In addition, this effect was tested in a UPP accumulation background. The absence of BceAB was expected to slow down growth in case the transporter acted as UPP importer, because slowed recycling of the lipid carrier reduces the rate of cell wall synthesis. In case UPP binding by the transporter could branch away some UPP from being recycled by UPP phosphatases, the removal of BceAB would facilitate faster growth. Deletion of \(bceAB\) imparted neither a benefit nor disadvantage on growth as determined by the fastest doubling times. It also did not cause any significant difference upon UPP accumulation. We were not able to reproduce the difference in growth observed by Radeck and colleagues (2016b) when comparing the fastest doubling time upon deletion of \(\Delta bceAB\). This can likely be explained by the fact that in the previous study the tested strains contained a \(P_{bcea}\) luminescence reporter. Luciferase catalyses the oxidation of reduced flavin mononucleotides (FMNH\(_2\)) and fatty aldehydes in the presence of molecular oxygen, which might come at a cost for the cell (Park et al., 2013). A strain lacking BceAB might have therefore had a growth advantage. In support of this, we consistently observed growth differences between the WT (SGB73, \(bceAB^+\)) and \(\Delta bceAB\) strains containing the \(P_{bcea}^{lux}\) reporter during routine growth for transport activity assays in this study (data not shown). This is would also be consistent with the hypothesis that cell wall synthesis itself is not rate-limiting during exponential growth. Cell wall synthesis, cell division, DNA replication and other mechanisms in the cell need to be tightly regulated and spatially and temporarily coordinated to ensure impeccable growth. Yet, fast-growing bacterial cells were found to
have elongated cell shapes (Chien et al., 2012). In *B. subtilis*, fast-growing cells were only elongated and not increased in diameter, which results in a higher surface-to-volume ratio (Chien et al., 2012). This indicates that the cell wall synthesis is not growth-limiting. Yet, it is unclear if the cell wall consists of as many layers of peptidoglycan as during slower growth, or whether fast-growing cells have a thinner cell wall.

The findings of the more sensitive competition assays suggested the deletion of *bceAB* to be advantageous over a *bceAB*+ strain when competing in a UPP-accumulated environment, in which UPP recycling is diminished (Fig. 4.2). The absence of BceAB did not seem to make an obvious difference in the wild type background. This supports an interaction between BceAB and UPP, in which the transporter withholds some of the lipid carrier from being recycled. As this potential interaction seems to slow UPP turnover mainly when UPP recycling is impaired, we suspected a rather low affinity interaction.

Additionally, accumulation of UPP did not seem to trigger BceAB activity in the absence of AMPs, when BceAB transport activity was monitored using a luminescence reporter assay. This finding suggests that UPP alone is not enough to induce a signalling response of BceAB. This is consistent with the lipid carrier possibly being part of the physiological substrate as it is suggested for a ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ mechanism (Bernard et al., 2007).

The recycling reaction of the lipid carrier, in which it is transported back across the membrane to the cytoplasmic face, is still far from understood. Cytosolic undecaprenyl phosphate (UP) stands as lipid carrier at the start of both, peptidoglycan and wall teichoic acid synthesis. Both pathways are known to release the lipid carrier in its pyrophosphate form (UPP) in the outer leaflet of the membrane after their respective cell wall building blocks have been incorporated into the cell wall (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005, Brown et al., 2013). Because of its size and charge, UPP is thought to be imported actively rather than to flip spontaneously (Zhao et al., 2017). Yet, the identity of the potential flippase remains unknown. It is further unclear if the lipid carrier is dephosphorylated before or after it is flipped across the membrane. In the search for answers to these fundamental questions, the membrane-based transporter BceAB seemed like a suitable candidate for UPP import. BceAB confers resistance against the UPP-targeting AMP bacitracin. Importing the lipid carrier back into the cell would effectively shelter it from the inhibitory grip of the AMP (Kingston et al., 2014).

The growth advantage in the absence of BceAB stands against the hypothesis that the transporter acts as UPP or UP importer, which was proposed by Kingston et al. (2014). As importer, BceAB would increase UPP recycling and therefore lead to accelerated growth.
lack of the transporter should have therefore resulted in a fitness cost, if this hypothesis was true.

Furthermore, BceAB also confers resistance against other AMPs, namely mersacidin, actagardine and the fungal defensin plectasin (Staron et al., 2011, Mygind et al., 2005). Instead of binding the lipid carrier, these AMPs were found to target lipid II (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Schneider et al., 2010). Import of UPP is not an appropriate strategy to provide resistance against them. Of course, import of lipid II before its peptidoglycan precursor is incorporated into the cell wall is a plausible way to shelter the molecule from AMPs. However, import of lipid II runs counter the process of cell wall biosynthesis, where PG precursors are required on the surface of the membrane. Lipid II import is therefore a not an effective way of protecting the cell from antimicrobial stress.

Taken together, our data suggest that UPP alone is unlikely to be the true physiological substrate of BceAB. Our experimental data and support from previous studies further argue against the hypothesis that BceAB acts according to a ‘UPP import’ model. Yet, the findings of this chapter are in support of a possible low-affinity interaction between BceAB and UPP in the absence of bacitracin. Even if not the signal-inducing agent or transported substrate, specific interactions between membrane-based transporters and their phospholipid environment are not unusual.

The tripartite drug efflux pump MacB was shown to specifically bind phosphatidylethanolamine molecules (Barrera et al., 2009). The physiological role of this interaction is entirely unclear. It could be speculated whether also MacB recognised its substrates in a membrane-associated state, as macrolide antibiotics like erythromycin may weakly associate with phospholipids of biological membranes (Montenez et al., 1999). Further, the surrounding phospholipid environment was shown to affect substrate affinity and ATP hydrolysis of integral membrane proteins (Romsicki & Sharom, 1999, Miyamoto & Tokuda, 2007). Changes of the phospholipid environment as caused by bacitracin action or UPP phosphatase impairment could thus affect BceAB activity in some way. Because BceAB likely recognises the [UPP-BAC] complex, an affinity to the lipid carrier part alone is plausible, particularly under UPP accumulating conditions. It is also conceivable that the low affinity to the lipid carrier UPP could help BceAB with localisation near cell wall biogenesis sites. Further work needs to be carried out to understand the role of this potential interaction.
3.2 The [target-AMP] complex is likely the physiological substrate of BceAB.

After excluding UPP alone as physiological substrate of BceAB, we sought to determine whether the AMP alone was enough to trigger BceAB activity or whether the [target-AMP] complex was the physiological substrate of BceAB. To this end, we monitored the BceAB activity not only upon addition of the AMP, but also when levels of lipid carrier in the cells were altered by genetic manipulations. Both approaches are thought to alter the amount of [target-AMP] complex formed. We showed that addition of bacitracin as well as changing levels of UPP in the presence of bacitracin were able to alter BceAB activity (Fig. 4.4). We found this effect on BceAB activity to be specific for [UPP-BAC], as accumulation of UPP did not alter BceAB activity in the presence of the lipid II-binding AMPs (Fig. 4.5). These findings indicated that the physiological substrate is not bacitracin alone. As the activity changed according to two variables, the physiological substrate was suspected to be the complex of the AMP and its respective cellular target.

In an approach independent of alterations of the UPP phosphatase activity in the cell, we accumulated C35-PP in the cell by deleting ytpB in an environment where MenA activity was reduced by substrate limitation (Sato et al., 2011, Kingston et al., 2014). Heptaprenyl diphosphate was expected to be a target of bacitracin, as it was shown that bacitracin only requires the pyrophosphate group and one adjacent isoprenoid moiety to bind its target with high affinity (Storm & Strominger, 1973, Economou et al., 2013). Previously, C35-PP or [C35-PP-BAC] were proposed to interact with BceAB and to inhibit its activity (Kingston et al., 2014). Our experimental data suggested that BceAB activity did not decrease significantly upon C35-PP accumulation (Fig. 4.6). From this, we excluded C35-PP or [C35-PP-BAC] to have inhibitory function on BceAB. Our data rather indicated that BceAB cannot distinguish between [UPP-BAC] and [C35-PP-BAC] and therefore might also recognise and process [C35-PP-BAC] as a substrate. In contrast to BceAB being inhibited by C35-PP, we thus propose that upon recognition of [C35-PP-BAC], BceAB removes bacitracin from C35-PP according to a ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ mechanism (Ohki et al., 2003, Bernard et al., 2007). Removal of bacitracin from the lipid II cycle intermediate UPP helps towards the turnover of the lipid II cycle and thus, towards cell wall biosynthesis. Releasing of C35-PP from the grip of bacitracin, however, does not contribute to resistance against AMPs, as it is involved in sesquiterpene synthesis (Sato et al., 2011). In agreement with this, deletion of ytpB led to an increased sensitivity to bacitracin (Kingston et al., 2014). The effect was most prominent when the ΔytpB strain was tested on solid medium, where bacitracin had a bacteriolytic
effect and led to early lysis. A moderate decrease of MIC was also observed in liquid culture (Kingston et al., 2014). Our own MIC data from liquid cultures showed no noticeable difference between the ΔytpB and the WT strain. The OD₆₀₀ measurements from plate reader experiments, however, confirmed a slightly higher susceptibility of the ΔytpB strain to bacitracin (data not shown).

The changes in sensitivity to bacitracin indicate that at the C₃₅-PP accumulated at the outer face of the membrane, where it is accessible to bacitracin. Membrane localisation of C₃₅-PP is expected due to its long isoprenoid chain. This is further supported, as C₃₅-PP is a precursor for some membrane-associated sesquiterpenes and menaquinone-7 (Bramkamp & Lopez, 2015, Farrand & Taber, 1974). Yet, it remains puzzling whether C₃₅-PP is abundant at either face of the membrane or distributed asymmetrically.

Hence, it is possible that the ΔytpB strain did not have enough C₃₅-PP accumulated at the outer face of the membrane at time the experiment was performed. It is therefore recommended to repeat the assay in a minimal medium containing even less tryptophan. Alternatively, BceAB activity should be re-tested in a ΔytpB menA depletion strain, in which MenA activity is reduced by lower gene expression levels, rather than limited by substrate availability (Kingston et al., 2014).

The findings of this chapter suggest the physiological substrate of BceAB to be the complex of cellular target and the AMP, rather than the free AMP or the target alone. Alternatively, it is also possible that the transporter only interacts with the bound version of the AMP alone, as these peptides are known to undergo conformational changes upon binding their target (Hsu et al., 2003, Economou et al., 2013). These structural changes might expose certain features required for substrate recognition by BceAB. The approaches used in this chapter were not laid out to distinguish between those two options.
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3.3 The ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ model as proposed mechanism for BceAB.

The conclusions of this chapter are in support of a ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ model of BceAB action (Ohki et al., 2003, Bernard et al., 2007). Our proposed hypothesis is consistent with all previously published data on the mechanism of BceAB that we are aware of. Nevertheless, the identification of the physiological substrate does still not allow unwavering conclusions on the resistance mechanism, as, for example, the direction of transport is still unclear. Although the ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ hypothesis suggests export into the extracellular space, import of the substrate for degradation has not yet been ruled out experimentally. Upon recognition of the [target-AMP] complex, several alternative resistance mechanisms that have not been discussed in the literature, yet are plausible, might apply for BceAB. Rather than freeing the cellular target from the AMP, it is for example possible that the whole [target-AMP] complex is extracted from the membrane and released into the extracellular space. The resulting inactivation of the AMP would also prevent the re-attachment of the antimicrobial compound onto the membrane. In an alternative mechanism, BceAB could recognise the [target-AMP] complex, and in response export polyisoprenoids from the membrane to the extracellular space, where the AMPs could be bound and inactivated. Although such a mechanism seems very costly for the cell, a recent study suggested a similar mechanism for daptomycin resistance in S. aureus (Pader et al., 2016). Upon daptomycin stress, S. aureus releases the phospholipid phosphatidylglycerol, which is the target of daptomycin in the membrane (Tran et al., 2015). In doing so, the antibiotic is inactivated in culture supernatants (Pader et al., 2016).

To further investigate these possibilities, bacitracin transport assays from previous work by our laboratory were taken into account (Emenegger & Gebhard, unpublished data). These experiments were modified from the peptide release assays established by Otto and colleagues (1998) and were used in other studies to determine direction of AMP transport (Stein et al., 2003, Stein et al., 2005, Reiners et al., 2017). The assay is based on the quantification of the AMP concentration that remains in the culture supernatant after incubating strains carrying or lacking the respective resistance determinant with the AMP. No significant differences in the concentrations of residual biologically-active bacitracin could be determined between the culture supernatant of strains containing or lacking BceAB (bceAB+ or ΔbceAB) and a control without cells (Fig. S4.1). An initial bacitracin concentration of 5 µg/ml was used and a slight reduction of bacitracin was observed even in the control without cells. This was likely due to oxidative deamination of bacitracin A to bacitracin F that...
possesses lower antimicrobial activity (Storm & Strominger, 1973). As the remaining bacitracin in the supernatant did not decrease compared to this ‘buffer-only’ control, it was concluded that BceAB neither imported bacitracin into the cell nor led to inactivation or degradation of the AMP in the extracellular space. These findings make the alternative resistance mechanisms described above unlikely.

Further, a higher concentration of residual bacitracin was expected in the supernatant of the bceAB+ strain compared to the ΔbceAB strain, if BceAB worked according to hydrophobic vacuum cleaner and expelled bacitracin from the membrane. However, no difference in concentration could be determined between them (Fig. S4.1). Notably, the bacitracin concentration of the cell suspensions did not seem to be decreased, compared to the buffer control. This implied that there was too little bacitracin attached to the cells to be detected. Therefore, we could not further confirm the expulsion of bacitracin from the membrane experimentally.

The idea of conferring resistance against lipid II-binding antibiotics via export of the AMP from the membrane to the extracellular space has previously been described for several LanFEG-type transporters. Otto and colleagues (1998) suggested the EpiFEG transporter of S. epidermidis to work by expelling epidermin and gallidermin derivatives from the membrane. Resistance against nisin in Lactococcus lactis is mediated by the transporter NisFEG, while B. subtilis ATCC6633 is protected against subtilin by SpaFEG. The self-protection mechanism provided by the transporters against both lantibiotics was shown to involve the transport of the lantibiotics from the membrane into the extracellular space (Stein et al., 2003, 2005).

Additionally, immunity against the lantibiotic nukacin ISK-1 in the producer Straphylococcus warneri ISK-1 was shown be conferred by NukFEG. Again, this transporter is thought to relocate the AMP away from the membrane, which was revealed by a transport assay using fluorescence-labelled nukacin ISK-1 (Okuda et al., 2008). Recently, also the BceAB-like transporter NsrFG of Streptococcus agalactiae COH1 was shown to confer resistance by transporting nisin from the membrane to the extracellular space (Reiners et al., 2017). In most studies, the remaining lantibiotic concentration was determined using HPLC, but none mentioned an increased amount of lipid II in the supernatant. These observations further supported that BceAB could provide resistance using a mechanism that recognises its substrate in the membrane and releases it into the extracellular space.
3.4 The challenges of manipulating the lipid II cycle intermediate levels of the cell wall biosynthesis

In Gram-positive bacteria, the cell wall is the outmost layer of protection against the environment, and thus cell wall biosynthesis is a main target for many antibiotics (Breukink & de Kruijff, 2006, Schneider & Sahl, 2010). In turn, bacteria have evolved to protect this mechanism by producing proteins with redundant function and by developing several stress response strategies that upregulate expression of alternative genes and pathways (Mascher et al., 2003, Radeck et al., 2016a, Helmann, 2016).

Most experiments described in this chapter focussed on the most prominent substrate of the BceAB transporter, bacitracin in complex with its cellular binding partner UPP. The extracellular UPP pool serves as an excellent target for antimicrobial action, yet we were seemingly able to alter the lipid carrier levels in the outer face of the membrane using genetic manipulations. This could potentially be explained by B. subtilis possessing alternative pathways to obtain the crucial lipid II cycle intermediate UP, when UPP recycling is impaired by the lack of the main UPP phosphatase BcrC or blocked by bacitracin. The bioneogenesis of UPP is catalysed by the undecaprenyl pyrophosphate synthetase UppS (Apfel et al., 1999). Followed by dephosphorylation performed by functionally redundant UPP phosphatases (Zhao et al., 2016, Radeck et al., 2017a), this could still lead to lipid II formation and compensate for some of the deficiency. Further, Gram-positive bacteria are thought to store free undecaprenyl (C55-OH) as a reserve pool of the lipid carrier (Bouhss et al., 2008). In B. subtilis, UP shortage leads to increased phosphorylation of C55-OH to UP by the undecaprenyl kinase DgkA (Jerga et al., 2007, Radeck et al., 2017a). Also recycling of UP from wall teichoic acid biosynthesis can potentially compensate for impaired UPP dephosphorylation (Brown et al., 2013).

From the work presented in this chapter, we concluded that the [target-AMP] complex in general is the physiological target of BceAB. This means also the lipid II-binding AMPs, like mersacidin and actagardine, should be only recognised by BceAB when they are bound to their cellular target ([lipid II-AMP]). As a consequence, BceAB transport activity should also depend on the amount of [lipid II-AMP] complexes, which in turn should alter with varying lipid II levels in the cell. To test if the [target-AMP] complex principle also applies for lipid II-binding AMPs, it would be important to measure BceAB activity upon lipid II accumulation or reduction in the presence of mersacidin. Several alternative strategies to accumulate lipid II in the outer leaflet of the membrane have already been attempted for this study. These
included the deletion of *ponA*, which encodes penicillin binding protein 1. PBP1 is a class A PBP that possesses both, transglycosylation as well as transpeptidase activity during cell wall biosynthesis (Scheffers & Pinho, 2005). Deletion of *ponA* was shown to lead to slower growth, altered cell morphology (Popham & Setlow, 1995) and potentially to a decreased transglycosylation rate.

In an alternative strategy, we tried to accumulate lipid II without using genetic manipulations. A recent study showed that addition of moenomycin led to accumulation of lipid II in *S. aureus* and the same study successfully used vancomycin to accumulate lipid II in *B. subtilis* (Qiao *et al.*, 2017). Vancomycin binds to the terminal D-Ala-D-Ala residues of the peptidoglycan precursors stem peptide (Wang *et al.*, 2018). The glycopeptide should not affect the pyrophosphate and sugar moieties of lipid II that are recognised by mersacidin and actagardine and thus, not block their binding site. Therefore, we attempted to accumulate lipid II by combining the AMPs with vancomycin. A similar combinatory approach was performed using ampicillin.

BceAB activity was tested as described previously in this chapter, but now using these potentially lipid II-accumulating strains and conditions and upon the addition of mersacidin. None of the tested conditions resulted in significant changes of BceAB activity (∆*ponA*: Fig. S4.2, vancomycin: Fig. S4.3, A, B, ampicillin: data not shown).

As we currently cannot measure the levels of lipid II cycle intermediates on the outer face of the membrane, no unwavering conclusions could be drawn from these experiments on whether the [lipid II-AMP] complex also serves as physiological substrate for BceAB. It is possible that BceAB can recognise bacitracin in complex with its cellular target UPP, but lipid II-binding AMPs might be recognised and dealt with in a different mechanism. In such a case, even successful alterations of the [lipid II-AMP] levels would have not led to changes in BceAB activity. However, lipid II, when located in the outer face of the membrane, is regarded as the Achilles’ heel of cell wall synthesis and therefore should be particularly well-protected.

*B. subtilis* possesses three further PBPs with redundant transglycosylation activity (PBP2c, PBP2d, PBP4, Scheffers & Pinho, 2005). Even in absence of all of them, *B. subtilis* is able to grow (McPherson & Popham, 2003). A recent study revealed the transglycosylation activity of the RodA that can compensate for the loss of class A PBPs (Meeske *et al.*, 2016). This redundancy of function stresses the challenge to accumulate lipid II on the outer face by removal of just one PBPs. The cell seems to have several strategies to compensate for their loss and to secure the immediate incorporation of peptidoglycan precursors after ‘just-in-time’ delivery of lipid II.
When combining the AMPs with vancomycin, the growth of *B. subtilis* was analysed for potential synergistic interactions between the drug combinations that could point towards successful lipid II accumulation (Fig. S4.3, C, D). Although an antagonistic effect of the drug combinations can be excluded, the recorded data is not sufficient to conclude whether the antibiotics had additive or synergistic (super-additive) effects (Tallarida, 2001, Tallarida, 2006, Weinstein et al., 2017). It is therefore still unclear if combining the two antibiotics led to alteration of the [lipid II-AMP] levels. Notably, the vancomycin concentration used for lipid II accumulation by Qiao et al. (2017) corresponded to eight-times the MIC, whereas our experiment required viable *B. subtilis* cells. Combining the AMPs with ampicillin could have potentially not led to successful accumulation of lipid II, as the beta-lactam irreversibly inhibits the transpeptidase activity of the PBPs, whereas their glycosyltransferase activity might remain functional. This implied that peptidoglycan precursors were taken off lipid II and incorporated into the glycan strands.

These experiments suggested accumulation of lipid II on the extracellular face of the membrane to be particularly challenging. The basal level of lipid II in *B. subtilis* was found to be comparatively low (Qiao et al., 2017). In further support of this, our collaborators established a computational model for the lipid II cycle in *B. subtilis* (Piepenbreier & Fritz, unpublished). This model simulated the changes in cell wall synthesis upon addition of various AMPs and used the findings to deduce the AMP concentrations required to inhibit growth. For lipid II-binding AMPs a particularly large disparity between *in vitro* and *in vivo* activity was found (210-fold difference for nisin, *in vitro* $K_d$: 0.05 µM, Wiedemann et al. (2001), *in vivo* MIC: 11 µM). This was explained by the very small pool size of lipid II. With 1000 lipid II molecules per cell compared to 110 000 UPP molecules per cell, the model described the lipid II levels in the cell to be over 100-times lower than the UPP levels (Piepenbreier & Fritz, unpublished). This argues that *B. subtilis* is very good at protecting the lipid II pool on the extracellular face of the membrane and therefore the lipid II accumulation attempts so far might have not been successful.

Thus, we aimed to alter the levels of both, UPP and lipid II displayed on the outer face of the membrane. The cell wall synthesis is protected by several extracellular function (ECF) sigma factors (Helmann, 2016). The $\sigma^M$ stress response is activated by conditions that disturb peptidoglycan synthesis, including antimicrobial stress caused by bacitracin. $\sigma^M$ upregulates genes that are responsible for expression of the core machinery for cell wall biosynthesis, including PBPs (PBP1 and PbpX) and the UPP phosphatase BcrC (Eiamphungporn & Helmann, 2008, Helmann, 2016). Deletion of $\text{sigM}$ was expected to cause changes in the lipid II cycle...
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intermediate levels and hence, alter the amounts of [target-AMP] complexes. Removal of σ^M did not lead to significant changes in BceAB activity upon addition of bacitracin or mersacidin (Fig. S4.4). Again, it was unclear whether the lipid II cycle intermediates levels on the outer face of the membrane were altered. The σ^M regulon comprises over 60 genes that potentially affect the lipid II cycle at different stages, which made accurate predictions difficult. Further, several genes are regulated by multiple σ factors, which could have compensated for the loss of σ^M. Particularly the σ^W and the σ^x stress response overlap to a significant degree with the σ^M regulon, which can be explained by highly similar consensus sequences in their respective promotor regions (Mascher et al., 2007, Helmann, 2016). A well described example for this is the activation of expression of bcrC by both, σ^M and σ^x (Cao & Helmann, 2002). Double or even triple deletion strains might have clearer effects on the lipid II cycle intermediate levels. Although many of the described proteins and ECF σ factors seem functionally redundant and dispensable, other core genes of the cell wall synthesis are essential (Kobayashi et al., 2003). An alternative strategy to alter the total amount of lipid II cycle intermediates in the cell aimed at the manipulation of the undecaprenyl pyrophosphate synthetase, UppS. This enzyme catalyses the assembly of UPP from isoprenoid precursors (Apfel et al., 1999). Overproduction of UppS was expected to lead to an increased amount of all lipid II cycle intermediates available to the cell, which should lead to increased amounts of [target-AMP]. However, overproduction of UppS did not lead to a significant change in BceAB activity upon addition of bacitracin (Fig. S4.5).

UPP assembly might not have been the rate limiting step of the lipid II cycle and thus, might have not led to accumulation on the extracellular face of the membrane. It is still open to debate whether de novo synthesised UPP is transported to the outer leaflet of the membrane before it is dephosphorylated to UP and imported back in, as the localisation of UPP phosphatases remains puzzling (Zhao et al., 2016, Radeck et al., 2017a). Overproduction of UppS therefore might have only resulted in small effects. In agreement with this, only a slight increase in resistance to bacitracin was found in a ΔytpB strain upon overproduction of UppS (Kingston et al., 2014).

To make availability of the lipid carrier the rate-limiting step of the lipid II cycle, we aimed to reduce UppS levels in the cell. By this, the lipid carrier levels should be decreased throughout all lipid II cycle pool levels, leading to lower amounts of [target-AMP] complexes. uppS is not only essential, but also transcribed as a polycistronic mRNA together with several other essential genes (Zhu & Stulke, 2018). Modifications of uppS were therefore challenging and
likely to impair transcription of the other genes in the operon. Deletion of the native upps gene in a strain carrying an ectopic inducible copy of the gene failed, even in the presence of the inducer. Decreasing the translation levels of upps as previously described by Lee and Helmann (2013) seemed promising at first, but problems with the control strain led us to disregard the data for now (not shown). The strain contained an antibiotic marker in the non-coding region before the upps promoter region, which might have altered read-through of upps and other essential downstream genes. To this end, other approaches, including conditional expression and CRISPRi (Hawkins et al., 2015, Peters et al., 2016) were attempted but failed due to technical reasons.

Aside from tackling technical issues, more work is required to understand changes of lipid II cycle intermediate levels more accurately and efficiently. Based on their to-date unpublished model of the lipid II cycle, predictions were attempted by our collaborators (Piepenbreier & Fritz, unpublished). While predictions of the lipid II cycle intermediate pool levels can forecast UPP accumulation on the outer face upon bcrC deletion, the model still has too many unknown parameters to allow accurate predictions of the less intuitive steps of cell wall synthesis. To accurately determine the rate limiting steps and alterations of pool sizes, the model would have to take resistance determinants and other stress responses into account. Analysing the global pattern of changes in promoter activities in response to genetic manipulations affecting the lipid II cycle would be a helpful step towards this goal.

All in all, this chapter described in vivo approaches to identify the physiological substrate of BceAB. Physiological assays, including growth and competition assays, identified a potential low-affinity interaction between BceAB and UPP when UPP dephosphorylation is impaired. Further, a P_{bceA-lux} reporter assay was used to investigate the BceAB transport activity in response to genetic manipulations of genes important to the lipid II cycle. Our data suggested the complex formed between the antimicrobial peptide and its corresponding cellular target as the physiological substrate of BceAB. Bacitracin transport assays argued against the import of bacitracin or its inactivation in the supernatant. This is in support of a ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ hypothesis as the resistance mechanism of BceAB, as it has been proposed before (Ohki et al., 2003).
Chapter V

Conclusions and future perspectives
1. Summary and main conclusions

The overall aim of this thesis was to study the mechanisms of substrate recognition of the antimicrobial peptide resistance transporter BceAB of *B. subtilis*. The objectives of Chapter III were the purification and characterisation of the large extracellular domain of BceB (BceB-ECD), the putative binding domain. Further, the binding mechanism of this domain was investigated *in vitro*. The objectives of Chapter IV were aimed at the identification of the physiological substrate of BceAB using *in vivo* growth and luminescence reporter assays.

In Chapter III, we established an optimised strategy for the overproduction and purification of BceB-ECD, which led to greatly increased yield and solubility as well as high purity in only one purification step. As the *in silico* analysis suggested BceB-ECD to be highly flexible with intrinsically disordered regions, a substrate-induced coupled folding and binding process was proposed for BceB-ECD. Using steady-state ANS fluorescence and circular dichroism spectroscopy, the binding capacities of several refolded and soluble purified BceB-ECD samples were investigated. Yet, no binding activity between BceB-ECD and bacitracin alone could be detected. The cellular target of bacitracin, undecaprenyl pyrophosphate (UPP), had been proposed to be part of the physiological substrate of BceAB. Thus, investigations in the presence of geranyl pyrophosphate (GPP), which was used as surrogate for UPP, were performed. *In vitro* analyses did not reveal binding interactions between BceAB and GPP alone. The characterisation of a binding event between BceB-ECD and the [GPP-BAC] complex did not lead to unwavering conclusions, as the complex formation between GPP and bacitracin resulted in highly variable background signal.

Our investigations in Chapter IV therefore focussed on the identification of the physiological substrate *in vivo*. Accumulation of UPP alone did not induce BceAB activity. Additionally, a potential low-affinity binding event between BceAB and UPP was indicated by competition assays in the absence of bacitracin. By interacting with UPP, BceAB might withhold some UPP from dephosphorylation. These findings argued against a ‘UPP importer’ mechanism for BceAB.

A P\textsubscript{bceA} luminescence reporter assay used as proxy for BceAB transport activity revealed that transport activity did not only vary with the amount of bacitracin but also when UPP levels were changed in the presence of bacitracin. Both variables specifically affected the amount of [UPP-BAC] complexes formed in the membrane. From this, we concluded that the most
likely physiological substrate is the complex between bacitracin and UPP or bacitracin alone, but in its target-bound conformation.

Combining our findings, we propose that BceAB recognised the [UPP-BAC] complex as its substrate, but seemed to only have little or no affinity to the components of the complex separately. Bacitracin undergoes an extensive conformational change when binding its target, adopting a truly amphipathic configuration (Economou et al., 2013). Our data suggest that BceAB can differentiate between the ‘free’ and ‘bound’ form of bacitracin. The [UPP-BAC] complex is located at the membrane-interface; this is therefore likely where the substrate binding of BceAB takes place.

We thus propose that BceAB acts according to a hydrophobic vacuum cleaner, which takes up its substrate directly from the hydrophobic membrane environment and then expels it to the extracellular space. By this, the cellular target is released from the inhibitory grip of the AMP and can be processed by the next enzymatic step of the cell wall synthesis.

2. BceAB removes bacitracin from its membrane-bound target and releases the AMP into the extracellular space.

Taking the results and conclusions of this study into context with previous findings and the literature, we here propose a possible resistance mechanism of BceAB to bacitracin. Generally, the resistance transporter BceAB is located in the membrane with its large domain facing the extracellular space (Rietkötter et al., 2008). Upon antimicrobial stress, we propose that BceAB does not interact primarily with free bacitracin, nor with its cellular target UPP (Fig. 5.1 A). This is consistent with our in vitro data, in which no interaction between purified BceB-ECD and bacitracin or GPP alone was shown (Chapter I II). Previously, a direct in vitro binding interaction between full-length BceB and bacitracin had been suggested (Dintner et al., 2014). However, the study could not exclude the possibility that BceAB recognised the complex formed between bacitracin and its target UPP that was possibly co-solubilised. Instead of free bacitracin, our in vivo studies (Chapter IV) suggest that BceAB recognises the [UPP-BAC] complex bacitracin as the physiological substrate and binds bacitracin in the membrane as suggested for a hydrophobic vacuum cleaner (Fig. 5.1 C, Mascher et al., 2003, Ohki et al., 2003).
When binding its membrane-anchored target, bacitracin undergoes a conformational change and adopts a truly amphipathic, dome-shaped configuration (Fig. 5.1 B, Economou et al., 2013). Our ANS fluorescence and far-UV spectroscopy experiments in Chapter III confirmed the complex formation between bacitracin and its target and the associated conformational changes.

Substrate recognition and binding happen by a to-date unknown mechanism. We could not further confirm or exclude BceB-ECD as the substrate binding domain in this study. Large extracytoplasmic domains have been demonstrated to determine substrate specificity and mediate substrate binding of transporters that are homologous to BceAB (Mavrici et al., 2014, Crow et al., 2017, Greene et al., 2018). Based on previous work (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Coumes-Florens et al., 2011, Hiron et al., 2011) and the in silico predicted characteristics of BceB-ECD (III 2.1), we still assume that BceB-ECD acts as the binding domain (Fig. 5.1 C). We speculate that the large extracellular domain of BceAB undergoes a substrate-induced conformational change, as is characteristic for intrinsically disordered proteins (Wright & Dyson, 2009, Mittag et al., 2010). It is possible that after a first weak interaction, BceB-ECD reels in its substrate according to a fly-casting mechanism (Shoemaker et al., 2000, Huang & Liu, 2009).

BceAB removes bacitracin from its target, thereby releasing UPP (Fig. 5.1 D). This step is likely to be the ATP-dependent step of the resistance mechanism. Lacking the hydrophobic membrane environment and without its negatively charged target, bacitracin might lose its amphipathic configuration and changes its conformation back to its unbound form. BceB-ECD has much lower affinity to this conformation of bacitracin. In turn, bacitracin is released into the extracellular space (Fig. 5.1 E). By this, bacitracin is effectively ‘transported’ away from the membrane and UPP is unblocked. The proposed mechanism is consistent with findings on the BceAB-like transporter NsrFG of S. agalactiae COH1, in which the translocation of nisin by NsrFG from membrane-bound lipid II into the culture supernatant was shown (Reiners et al., 2017).

As previous work showed no BceAB-mediated inactivation or degradation of bacitracin in the extracellular environment (Emenegger & Gebhard, unpublished), the AMP could now re-attach to its target in the membrane. However, UPP phosphatases are important resistance determinants themselves, and in the case of BcrC are also upregulated upon cell envelope stress (Cao & Helmann, 2002, Bernard et al., 2005, Zhao et al., 2016, Radeck et al., 2017a). These enzymes dephosphorylate UPP to UP. Bacitracin has a much lower affinity to the single phosphate group (Storm & Strominger, 1973). Hence, UP no longer serves as target for
bacitracin (Fig. 5.1 F). The lipid carrier can therefore be recycled and cell wall synthesis can go forward.

**Figure 5.1: BceAB is proposed to remove bacitracin from its target and to release the AMP into the extracellular space.**

A: BceAB is located in the membrane with its large domain facing the extracellular space. Flexibility of BceB-ECD is indicated by a dashed arrow. B: BceAB has very low affinity to unbound bacitracin. Upon binding its target, bacitracin undergoes a conformational change. C: BceAB recognises the bound form of bacitracin, potentially via its flexible extracellular domain. D: Bacitracin is removed from its target by an unknown mechanism. Substrate binding might and ATP hydrolysis induce conformational changes of BceAB. E: Without its target, bacitracin loses its amphipathic configuration. BceAB no longer has high enough affinity to bacitracin and releases the AMP into the extracellular space. F: Re-attachment of bacitracin to UPP is prevented by dephosphorylation of UPP to UP by UPP phosphatases. Grey: cell membrane, black: lipid carrier in its phosphorylated (UP) or pyrophosphorylated form (UPP), dark blue crescent: bacitracin, light blue: BceAB, red: molecular recognition feature within intrinsically disordered region, turquois: UPP phosphatase. Movements are indicated by dashed lines and arrows.
3. BceAB is a mechanotransducer

3.1 Mechanotransmission rather than ‘classic’ transport

We here proposed that BceAB acts as a hydrophobic vacuum cleaner and takes up its substrate directly from the interface with the hydrophobic membrane environment (Gottesman & Pastan, 1993, Ohki et al., 2003). BceAB then confers resistance by expelling bacitracin from the membrane into the extracellular space. Yet, this mechanism does not involve transportation of the AMP across any lipid bilayer, and thus should not be classified as transport in the ‘classic’ sense (Davidson & Chen, 2004).

This lack of transmembrane transport seems to be a characteristic feature of the type VII ABC superfamily (Greene et al., 2018). This type of membrane protein from both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria is known to be involved in lipoprotein trafficking (Ito et al., 2006), regulation of cell division (Yang et al., 2011, Mavrici et al., 2014), toxin secretion (Yamanaka et al., 2008), detoxification, or antibiotic resistance (Crow et al., 2017, Greene et al., 2018). While functionally highly variable, none of the so-far described transporters of this group were found to facilitate transport across the cytoplasmic membrane (Greene et al., 2018). When transport across the outer membrane was reported at all, it was not mediated by the type VII ABC transporter located in the inner membrane alone. Some MacB-like transporters assemble to tripartite efflux pumps, for which adapter proteins and outer membrane channel proteins are required to span both, inner and outer membrane (Fitzpatrick et al., 2017, Crow et al., 2017, Yang et al., 2018).

Instead of ‘classic’ import or export across the phospholipid bilayer (Davidson & Chen, 2004), the ‘transporters’ of the type VII ABC superfamily were proposed to act via mechanotransmission (Greene et al., 2018). Mechanotransmission is defined as a mechanism in which ATP hydrolysis is coupled to conformational changes that lead to the performance of useful work in periplasm (Crow et al., 2017, Greene et al., 2018).

This definition of mechanotransmission instead of transport matches our proposed model for the resistance mechanism of BceAB. BceAB was shown to belong to the type VII superfamily (Chapter III, Greene et al., 2018) and due to its homology to MacB, also mechanistic similarity seems evident. We thus conclude that BceAB is most likely a mechanotransducer rather than a classic transporter.
3.2 Could BceAB work according to an ‘ATP-switch’ model?

Our model proposed here does not yet include notions on the energy supply and ATP-usage required for the mechanotransmission mechanism of BceAB. Active transport or mechanotransmission of most ABC transporters is driven by ATP hydrolysis (Higgins & Linton, 2004, Locher, 2016), and also BceAB activity was abolished when conserved regions in the nucleotide binding domains were mutated (Rietkötter et al., 2008). The homology of BceAB to MacB-like mechanotransducers might give first insights into the link between ATP binding and hydrolysis, and mechanotransmission.

MacB was proposed to use an ‘ATP-switch’ for its mechanotransmission mechanism (Higgins & Linton, 2004, Crow et al., 2017, Greene et al., 2018). ATP binding to the nucleotide binding domains (NBD) of MacB is thought to induce their dimerisation, with the nucleotides bound between the NBDs. In turn, the linked transmembrane domains undergo extensive conformational changes. This leads to the zip-like closing of the periplasmic domains, by which the substrate is thought to be extruded. In contrast, ATP hydrolysis drives disassociation of the NBD dimer (Higgins & Linton, 2004) and resets the closed conformation of the transmembrane and periplasmic domains back to their relaxed open state (Crow et al., 2017). As this conformation revealed an interior cavity close to the substrate binding site, the substrate is thought to first associate with MacB in the relaxed state (Crow et al., 2017).

Although not nearly as well understood as MacB, the energy supply of lipoprotein extractor LolCDE might function in a similar way. Upon ATP binding by its NBDs, LolCDE seemed to release its substrate, while in the absence of ATP or similar compounds the substrate was associated with the transporter (Ito et al., 2006).

We thus wondered whether such an ‘ATP switch’ was a common feature of the type VII ABC superfamily and compatible with our current model for BceAB mechanotransmission. BceAB was shown to possess two conserved NBDs (BceA), and one large transmembrane segment (Dintner et al., 2014). Based on recent experimental data from our laboratory, the BceA NBDs are thought to link to BceB at the cytoplasmic regions, between TMH2 and 3, and TMH8 and 9, respectively (M. Gibbon, unpublished). Further investigations have pointed out several residues located on one face of TMH8 (F538, S542, L546, Q550; M. Gibbon, unpublished). Mutations of these residues resulted in a hypersensitive signalling response through BceRS and are thought to have relaxed the coupling between substrate binding and ATP binding and hydrolysis. The correspondent region was identified to be the major coupling helix of MacB (Crow et al., 2017).
Based on these similarities to MacB, the two BceA NBDs could also undergo dimerisation upon ATP binding in an ATP-switch-like manner (Higgins & Linton, 2004), thereby inducing conformational changes in the transmembrane segment and the ECD. This hypothesis is solely based on the homology to MacB-like transporters and requires further experimental evidence.

TMH8 (M526 to L548) is the direct link between the ECD and the ATPase. Thus, conformational changes induced by ATPase dimerisation are likely to be transferred by this transmembrane helix. A random mutagenesis approach had previously revealed the C-terminal half of BceB and TMH8 in particular as hotspot for amino acid replacements that affect either bacitracin signalling or resistance, or both (Kallenberg et al., 2013). Topological analyses and experimental studies suggested that BceB does not undergo dimerisation, but rather forms a ‘pseudo hetero-dimer’ between its MacB-type repeat units (Khwaja et al., 2005, Greene et al., 2018). It is thus likely that TMH1 and TMH8 as well as TMH2 and TMH7 interact and potentially undergo a zip-like transition, similar to the one observed for MacB transmembrane and periplasmic segments (Crow et al., 2017). To further investigate this, crosslinking experiments of the corresponding TMHs could be attempted.

While ‘pseudo heterodimerisation’ and an ATP switch-like mechanism seem to be a plausible scenario, it is unclear which effect the conformational changes would have on substrate binding. In a MacB-like scenario, the bellow movement of the transmembrane segments and periplasmic domains would actively expel bacitracin from the binding sites (Crow et al., 2017). It is, however, presumable that initial substrate recognition by BceB-ECD is not enough to remove bacitracin from its target. The structural rearrangement of BceB-ECD induced by ATP binding could then facilitate dislodging bacitracin from UPP, while keeping bacitracin attached to the BceB-ECD binding site. As proposed in Fig. 5.1, in the absence of its membrane target bacitracin might lose its amphipathic configuration. In this case, BceB-ECD would rather passively release its substrate and BceAB would be reset into its initial conformation by ATP hydrolysis. In between such transport or mechanotransmission cycles, the ‘ATP switch’ model requires an initial step to facilitate ATP-binding and closed dimer formation in the first place. This signal is believed to be substrate binding (Higgins & Linton, 2004).

In Chapter III, we revealed that BceB-ECD has a highly similar predicted secondary structure pattern to MacB-like extracytoplasmic domains and that accordingly BceB-ECD can be subdivided in ‘Porter’ and ‘Sabre’ subdomains. For MacB, these periplasmic domains were proposed to harbour the substrate binding sites. Yet, one major difference between BceB
and MacB is that BceB only possesses one extracellular domain, without further dimerisation. MacB-like substrate binding at the interface between the heterodimeric periplasmic domains is thus rather unlikely.

Because of its predicted high flexibility and intrinsically-disordered regions (III), we proposed BceB-ECD to undergo conformational changes or potentially even a disorder-to-order transition upon substrate binding (Wright & Dyson, 2009). Such or similar substrate binding mechanisms are thought to transmit a conformational change to the NBDs, thereby enhancing ATP binding and lowering the activation energy for closed dimer formation of the NBD (Higgins & Linton, 2004). Several ABC transporters revealed substrate-induced conformational changes and concomitant increased affinity to ATP (Higgins & Linton, 2004). Amongst them is the hydrophobic vacuum cleaner P-glycoprotein for which both conformational changes and increased affinity to ATP were shown upon substrate binding (Liu & Sharom, 1996, Sonveaux et al., 1999, Qu et al., 2003, Higgins & Linton, 2004). As hardly any structures of transporters or mechanotransducers in complex with their substrates have been published, exact substrate binding sites and induced conformational changes remain puzzling, and more work is required to elucidate the underlying mechanisms.

3.3 Mechanotransmission directly couples transport activity with flux sensing.

The mechanotransmission mechanism proposed for BceAB further fits with our current understanding of bacitracin sensing and signalling through the two-component system BceRS. Unlike traditional histidine kinases, BceS lacks an obvious extracellular input domain (Mascher et al., 2006). Even in the absence of bacitracin, BceB is known to form a complex with BceS (Dintner et al., 2014). In agreement with this, the complex formation between the BceB-like mechanotransducer BraE and the BceS-like kinase NsaS of S. aureus was demonstrated recently (Randall et al., 2018). While the interaction between BceB and BceS is thought to happen in the membrane (Mascher, 2014), the exact interaction sites are yet to be identified.

According to the flux-sensing mechanism described by Fritz and colleagues (2015), BceAB acts as sensor that directly signals its transport activity to BceS. The proposed mechanotransmission mechanism likely couples ATP hydrolysis with conformational changes that lead to the removal of bacitracin from its target. As the kinase is permanently attached to BceB (Dintner et al., 2014), the conformational change of the BceB transmembrane segments is thought to affect the transmembrane helices of BceS. Recent work in our group
suggests that the transmembrane region of the kinase undergoes a piston-like displacement movement (A. Koh, unpublished). This is thought to lead to a rotation of the dimerisation histidine phosphotransfer (DHp) domain and to autophosphorylation of the kinase (A. Koh, unpublished, Mascher, 2014). In turn, the response regulator BceR that upregulates expression through $P_{bceA}$ is activated and enables need-based production of BceAB (Fritz et al., 2015).

Figure 5.2: Mechanotransmission of BceAB can couple ATP-driven bacitracin resistance with flux-sensing response through BceRS. Schematics of BceAB-BceRS resistance system in its nucleotide-free (A) and ATP-bound (B) conformation. ATP-driven conformational changes of the BceB transmembrane segment are thought to lead to rotation and auto-phosphorylation of the attached histidine kinase BceS. Grey: cell membrane, black: lipid carrier in its pyrophosphorylated form (UPP), dark blue crescent: bacitracin, light blue: TMH3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 of BceAB, purple: TMH1 and TMH2, with corresponding ATPase unit, green: TMH7 and TMH8, with corresponding ATPase unit, red: BceRS two component regulatory system. Stars indicate the signal transduction between BceB and BceS and the resulting flux-sensing cascade through BceRS, which eventually leads to expression of bceAB. Potential movements are indicated by arrows.
4. Target protection as resistance strategy

4.1 BceAB confers resistance by protecting its target

At a first glance, the proposed mechanotransmission mechanism of BceAB seems like a rather counter-intuitive strategy to confer bacitracin resistance. In contrast to canonical resistance mechanisms (Blair et al., 2015, Andersson et al., 2016, Du et al., 2018), the antimicrobial peptide is not inactivated or degraded, nor is it imported or exported across a membrane, which could impede its reattachment. The resistance determinant itself does not modify the target of the AMP. By removing bacitracin from its cellular target UPP, BceAB increases the disassociation rate of bacitracin and shifts the equilibrium towards unbound bacitracin in the environment. By this, BceAB facilitates the operability of the lipid II cycle, even if it is only for another round. The progression of the cell wall synthesis is under most conditions crucial for the viability of the bacterial cell. In *B. subtilis*, the upregulation of key enzymes of the lipid II cycle, like UPP phosphatase or PBPs, by ECF σ factors contributes to the effectiveness of this resistance mechanism (Helmann, 2016).

Based on current knowledge, this is the best model for the BceAB resistance mechanism. We thus believe that BceAB operates simply by protecting UPP and lipid II, respectively, from inhibition by AMPs. Such a resistance mechanism, called ‘target protection’, has been previously recognised but is widely underappreciated (Sharkey & O’Neill, 2018). Target protection seems particularly useful as measure of last resort to protect essential features of the cell or when traditional resistance mechanisms are limited in the first place. Modifications of the well-conserved intermediates of the lipid II cycle are uncommon, as the progress of the lipid II cycle should not be compromised. In agreement with this, the examples of target protection mechanisms described so far all focussed on safeguarding essential mechanisms of bacterial metabolism that involve well-conserved structures.

To the present day, the paradigm of target protection is the protection of the ribosome against the inhibitory actions of tetracyclines. The bacterial ribosome is responsible for the translation of genetic information from messenger RNAs into proteins and consists of structurally well-conserved subdomains. It thus serves as excellent target for antibiotics (Poehlsgaard & Douthwaite, 2005). Amongst others, tetracycline binds the A (aminoacyl) site and thereby sterically prevents tRNAs from access (Brodersen et al., 2000).

Ribosomal protection proteins (RPRs) like Tet(O) and Tet(M) were shown to actively release tetracycline from ribosome in a GTP-driven mechanism (Trieber et al., 1998, Burdett, 1996).
Both Tet(O) and Tet(M) binding sites of the ribosome overlap partly with the binding site of tetracycline and chase the antibiotic off by inducing conformational changes of the ribosome (Connell et al., 2003b, Donhofer et al., 2012). In doing so, the dissociation rate of tetracycline from the ribosome is effectively increased, which mediates resistance against tetracycline and secures protein biosynthesis (Connell et al., 2003a).

In a similar drug displacement mechanism, also Antibiotic Resistance ATP-Binding Cassette-F (ARE ABC-F) proteins were recently shown to secure the functionality of the translational machinery (Sharkey et al., 2016, Sharkey & O’Neill, 2018). ARE ABC-F proteins confer resistance against a vast range of antibiotic classes that target the 50 S subunit of the ribosome. Conversely for a protein previously classified as transporter (Dean et al., 2001), this type of resistance proteins does not comprise any transmembrane segments. Its two ATPase domains are solely connected via an approximately 80 amino acid long linker. Akin to homologous regulatory proteins, ARE ABC-F proteins seem to recognise and bind the exit (E) site of the ribosome (Boel et al., 2014, Chen et al., 2014). Compared to regulatory proteins, the extended linker region of ARE ABC-F proteins enables them to reach into the peptidyl (P) site. The linker is thought to allosterically modulate the drug binding site by rRNA or P-site tRNA interactions (Sharkey et al., 2016, Sharkey & O’Neill, 2018). By this, the binding affinity of the drug changes and the drug is dislodged from the ribosome, enabling protein biosynthesis.

In another ribosomal target protection mechanism, the ribosome is safeguarded from obstruction by fusidic acid (Cox et al., 2012, Tomlinson et al., 2016). Fusidic acid binds elongation factor G (EF-G) and inhibits the release thereof from the ribosome, after EF-G catalysed the translocation of peptidyl–tRNA from the A site to the P site (Tanaka et al., 1968, Bodley et al., 1969). Even in the absence of antibiotic stress, FusB-type proteins bind to EF-G and induce conformational changes which accelerate the disassociation of EF-G from the ribosome In the presence of fusidic acid, the FusB-induced release of EF-G from the ribosome directly counteracts the antibiotic’s activity (Cox et al., 2012, Tomlinson et al., 2016). In doing so, FusB mediates resistance against fusidic acid and secures integer protein biosynthesis.

Other than ribosomal protection to ensure functionality of the translational machinery, also key players of the DNA replication seem to be protected by such a resistance mechanism in Gram-negative bacteria. Here, Qnr (quinolone resistance) proteins physically protect DNA gyrase and topoisomerase IV from quinolone inhibition (Ruiz, 2003, Tran et al., 2005, Correia et al., 2017).
Where mechanistic details are known, target protection mechanisms generally seem to lead to direct release of the target from the inhibitory action of the antibiotic. Yet, none of the protection determinants physically transfers the antibiotic across a membrane or inhibits its re-attachment in a similar way. By dislodging the antibiotics, the resistance determinants shift the equilibrium from target-bound towards the unbound antibiotic. Thereby, they facilitate proper accessibility and regular functionality of the target for at least one more time before the antibiotic could bind its target again, which is exactly what we expect BceAB to do. These examples stress that the proposed mechanotransmission mechanism for BceAB is both plausible and sufficient to effectively confer resistance against antimicrobial peptides.

4.2 Target protection of cell wall synthesis might be more common than anticipated.

The proposed mechanotransmission mechanism of BceAB is, to our knowledge, the first target protection mechanism that has been described for cell envelope stress. As the abundance of this resistance mechanism has been underappreciated so far, it is likely to be more widely distributed than previously anticipated. Along the lines of BceAB-like mechanotransducers, we assume that also resistance against lantibiotics conferred by LanFEG transporters can be classified as a target protection mechanism. LanFEG transporters are known to extrude AMPs from its membrane-anchored target, however the mechanistic details remain puzzling (Otto et al., 1998, Stein et al., 2003, 2005, Okuda et al., 2008, Colin et al., 2008). Since lantibiotics generally bind targets in the outer face of the membrane, export across the cytoplasmic membrane is not a plausible strategy, and the Gram-positive lantibiotic producer strains do not possess an outer membrane that AMPs could be transported across. Considering that LanFEG transporters mostly confer self-protection to antimicrobial peptide producers (Colin et al., 2008, Alkhatib et al., 2012), many alternative resistance mechanisms seem rather counter-productive. Import into the cytoplasm for degradation, as well as degradation or inactivation by other means in the extracellular space are suitable strategies to confer protection against attacking AMPs. However, production of antimicrobial peptides is a cost-intensive approach to compete against other microbes (Hibbing et al., 2010). By degrading or deactivating its newly produced agents, the bacterial cell would disarm its own weapon. Also alterations of the target are only contingently suitable. The targets of many lantibiotics are well-conserved intermediates of the lipid II cycle (Willey & van der Donk, 2007, Bierbaum & Sahl, 2009).
Modifications thereof might not only prevent antibiotics from binding but also disturb the interactions with their legitimate enzymes and binding partners, which might suspend the cell wall synthesis. A notable exception are the lipid II stem peptide alterations that cause vancomycin resistance. Yet, it seems like the most effective strategy for LanFEG transporters is to release the target from the inhibitory grip of the lantibiotic in a BceAB-like manner. Again, increasing the disassociation rate would allow the lipid II cycle intermediate to progress to the next stage of the lipid II cycle. Equally, the self-protection mechanism of bacitracin-producer *B. licheniformis* which is mediated by the putative ‘hydrophobic vacuum cleaner’ BcrAB would qualify as target protection (Podlesek et al., 1995, Podlesek et al., 2000). Interestingly, members of both transporter families were found to mediate resistance against exogenously produced AMPs in non-producer strains (Gebhard, 2012, Clemens et al., 2017). Well-described examples are the bacitracin resistance conferred by BcrAB in *E. faecalis* (Manson et al., 2004, Matos et al., 2009) and the LanFEG homolog CprABC of *C. difficile* that confers resistance against nisin, gallidermin and polymyxin B (McBride & Sonenshein, 2011, Clemens et al., 2017). This indicates that these resistance determinants are derived from the original self-resistance target protection mechanism and have been acquired by non-producer strains via horizontal gene transfer (Colin et al., 2008).

Further, the resistance mechanism of most LanI-type proteins has not yet been elucidated in detail. As they do not seem to confer resistance cooperatively together with their respective LanFEG transporter, they too could mediate immunity via target protection. As described before (I 4.4.1), both SpaI and NisI immunity proteins are known to directly bind their substrate (Stein et al., 2003, 2005, Takala et al., 2004). Both proteins might remove their corresponding substrate from the membrane targets, rather than binding the unbound version of the lantibiotic in the extracellular periphery. In doing so, they would free the lipid II cycle intermediate and shift the binding equilibrium more towards the unbound lantibiotic. Immunity against the class I lantibiotic Pep5 is conferred by the PepI immunity protein (Reis et al., 1994, Hoffmann et al., 2004). PepI as well as Pep5 are highly positively charged peptides, which makes a direct binding interaction between them improbable. Instead, PepI was proposed to shield the membrane-located target from Pep5 action (Hoffmann et al., 2004).

Interestingly, the transcription of all transporters and immunity proteins described here seems tightly coupled to the presence or absence of antimicrobial stress. Expression of protection determinants is generally regulated by kinase-response regulator two-component systems or transcription regulators that directly perceive the AMP stimulus (Gebhard et al.,
2009, Gebhard, 2012). In doing so, unnecessary costly protection of the host can be avoided, leading to an efficient resistance mechanism.

5. Future Perspectives

5.1 Investigations on the physiological substrate of BceAB for lipid II-binding AMPs.

In this study, we have pursued first steps to investigate whether the physiological substrate of BceAB, here established as [UPP-BAC], can be universally stated as the AMP in complex with its cellular target. According to this statement, BceAB would also only recognise lipid II-binding AMPs together with their target or when the AMPs have adopted their target-bound conformation (Hsu et al., 2003). In Chapter IV, alterations of the lipid II pool as well as the total amount of lipid carrier in the cell were attempted, mainly using genetic manipulations. A computational model of the lipid II cycle (Fritz, unpublished) suggested the lipid II pool on the outer face of the membrane to be very small. Alterations to the amounts of lipid II in this pool, if possible at all without killing the cells, might therefore require more drastic measures than the ones tried so far.

In our study, neither removal of PBP1 to decrease the transglycosylation rate, nor attempts using antibiotic combinations resulted in obvious changes to BceAB activity. As already discussed, the redundancy in function of, in total, four class A PBPs that all possess transglycosylation activity might have prevented lipid II from accumulation (McPherson & Popham, 2003). The newly-discovered transglycosylation activity of RodA can just about compensate for the loss of all four PBPs (Meeske et al., 2016). Testing the BceAB-activity in a quadruple deletion strain that lacks PBP1, PBP2c, PBP2d and PBP4, might decrease the transglycosylation activity enough to accumulate lipid II and change BceAB activity in the presence of mersacidin. Although B. subtilis is intrinsically resistant to moenomycin due to RodA activity, addition of moenomycin could effectively lead to the same decrease of transglycosylation (Ostash & Walker, 2010, Meeske et al., 2016).

Although highly debated for a long time, recent studies suggest MurJ and Amj to be responsible for translocation of lipid II across the membrane (Sham et al., 2014, Meeske et al., 2015, Bolla et al., 2018, Kumar et al., 2018). Increasing this reaction by overproduction of the lipid II flippase could lead to the desired accumulation of lipid II on the outer face of the
membrane. Ultimately, combining increased flippase activity with reduced transglycosylation could be the key to allow changes in the level of this well-protected cell wall synthesis intermediate. On the other hand, also deletions or depletions of the lipid II flippases or enzymes crucial to lipid II assembly, like MraY or MurG, are potential strategies to affect the lipid II pool (Bouhss et al., 2004, 2008).

To make the availability of the lipid carrier the rate-limiting step of the lipid II cycle, we aimed to reduce UppS levels in the cell, which is responsible for UPP assembly from precursors (Apfel et al., 1999). While some attempts to alter UppS levels did not lead to clear results, other ideas could not be tested so far due to technical challenges (IV, 3.4).

To address this challenge in future attempts, two further strains that aim at the down-regulation of uppS expression should be tested (Sim & Fritz, unpublished). In the first strain (GFB0058), expression of uppS is uncoupled from its primary native regulation. The promoter region was replaced by the xylose-inducible P\textsubscript{xylA} promotor, which makes the strains only conditionally viable. Any potential read-through from upstream genes to the uppS locus was inhibited by insertion of a chloramphenicol resistance cassette containing a terminator. The other strain (GFB0078) takes advantage of a CRISPRi knockdown of uppS (Hawkins et al., 2015, Peters et al., 2016). The strain carries a constitutively-expressed (P\textsubscript{veg}) single guide (sg) RNA that is complementary to the uppS DNA sequence. It further contains a copy of dCas9 which encodes a catalytically inactive variant of the endonuclease protein Cas9. The expression of dCas9 is set under xylose-titratable regulation (P\textsubscript{xyl}). Upon binding its DNA target, the sgRNA-dCas9 complex sterically hinders transcription (Hawkins et al., 2015). In first trials, addition of 0.01 % xylose allowed wild-type growth of B. subtilis, while 0.1 % xylose was lethal (Sim & Fritz, personal communication).

Our current \(\text{P}_{\text{bceA}}\) luminescence reporter plasmid (Fritz et al., 2015) was incompatible with these strains, as the same antibiotic marker for selection had been used. Testing BceAB activity in these promising strains, requires reconstruction of the current reporter construct. Attempts, including the replacement of the resistance cassette using homologous recombination and the transformation of B. subtilis with \textit{de novo} assembled luminescence vectors carrying \(\text{P}_{\text{bceA}}\) were performed by a collaborator and have been unsuccessful so far (Fritz lab). A promising strategy to acquire \(\text{P}_{\text{bceA}}\) luminescence constructs with compatible antibiotic markers is the use of vectors that have been developed and evaluated for use in B. subtilis by Popp and colleagues (2017). Cloning \(\text{P}_{\text{bceA}}\) according to the BioBrick assembly standard RFC[10] (Knight, 2007) into the vectors pBS3E\textsubscript{lux} or pBS3K\textsubscript{lux} should lead to constructs very similar to our current plasmid and result in suitable \(\text{P}_{\text{bceA}}\) luminescence
reporter strains to test BceAB activity in uppS depletion strains. This approach was postponed due to time constraints, but successfully conducted after thesis submission.

When BceAB activity can successfully be tested in the strains described above, it is also advisable to re-test other mutants, for which no effect was observed in this study, but that potentially change the lipid II intermediate pool levels, in the now uppS depleted background. The potentially decreased UPP levels were found to alter the effects of other genetic manipulations related to the lipid II cycle on bacitracin sensitivity (ΔsigM, Lee & Helmann, 2013, ΔytpB, Kingston et al., 2014).

As uppS is co-transcribed with other essential genes, some of which play a role in isoprenoid biosynthesis and membrane phospholipid production, also expression of these genes would be affected by alterations of the transcription levels. To avoid such down-stream effects, mutations that solely affect the integrity and function of UppS could be exploited. The mutation of residue 86 of uppS from threonine to isoleucine was shown to increase resistance to bacitracin and is thought to alter the available UPP pool size (Inaoka & Ochi, 2012).

Without the ability to directly monitor the lipid II cycle intermediate levels on the cell surface and lacking improved predictions on effects of genetic manipulations on the lipid II cycle, the described approaches are mostly trial and error experiments and we cannot yet distinguish whether lipid II accumulation or reduction was successful or if BceAB activity is independent from the [lipid II-AMP] complex.

In an approach independent from genetic manipulations, cells could be incubated with synthesised or previously extracted lipid II as described by Breukink et al. (2003), Welzel (2005), or Qiao et al. (2017). The hydrophobic tail of lipid II is likely to escape the hydrophilic culture medium and might insert into the hydrophobic bacterial membrane, thereby increasing the lipid II pool size on the outer face of the membrane. This could lead to the desired accumulation of [lipid II-AMP] complex and in turn result in alterations of the BceAB activity. Lipid II or maybe a more soluble variant thereof, with a shorter prenyl chain, could bind lipid II-targeting AMPs like mersacidin already in the supernatant and thereby inhibit its antimicrobial activity. Nevertheless, if the extracellular domain is involved in substrate binding and under conditions in which the mersacidin binding of lipid II is saturated, the transporter might still recognise the formed [lipid II-MERS] complex and adjust transport activity. A similar approach is plausible with the [UPP-BAC] or [GPP-BAC] complex, as a positive control. Addition of UPP/GPP to cultures for membrane insertion or formation of [UPP/GPP-BAC] in the extracellular space should increase the overall amounts of [UPP-BAC]
that BceAB can recognise and thus, increase its activity. As mersacidin is not commercially available and therefore potentially the bottleneck of this approach, this hypothesis could be tested with the nisin-inducible PsdAB transporter (Staron et al., 2011). In this case, nisin and extracted lipid II would be added to exponentially growing B. subtilis cells.

5.2 In vivo investigation of potential BceB-ECD binding site for target-bound bacitracin.

An important, yet still puzzling question about BceAB-like mechanotransducers is the molecular basis of their substrate specificity. BceAB-like transporters often have a broad substrate range, but within this range only bind a specific, diverse subset of AMPs. Although indications suggest the ECD to be involved in substrate binding (Rietkötter et al., 2008, Hiron et al., 2011), this could not be confirmed in this study using in vitro binding assays. Future work targeting the molecular recognition of the substrates could therefore make use of an in vivo approach to identify binding sites.

The in silico analysis of this study (Chapter III, 2.1) suggested the extracellular domain of BceB to be highly flexible and indicated molecular recognition features (MoRF) that are often involved in binding interactions (Mohan et al., 2006). One of these predicted regions comprises the amino acids residues 370 to 384, encoding Glu-Met-Gln-Gly-Asp-Pro-Gly-Asn-Met-Gln (Chapter III, Fig. 3.1, green). This stretch contains several negatively charged (X) and polar residues (grey). Polar residues are known to form hydrogen bonds with other polar residues, while negatively charged residues can form electrostatic ionic bonds with positively charged amino acid side chains. When binding its target, bacitracin was shown to adopt a highly amphipathic configuration with polar and non-polar residues distinctly separated (Economou et al., 2013). Non-polar residues were found at the hydrophobic membrane lipid interface, while most polar residues interacted with the metals or pyrophosphate group of UPP. Amongst the polar residues are several positively charged residues (Lys, Orn, His). As these residues should be easiest to access for the large extracellularly located domain of BceAB, we suggest this MoRF as the potential bacitracin binding site within BceB-ECD.

Previous random mutagenesis approaches of BceAB did not result in any mutations in the ECD (Kallenberg et al., 2013). In future work, a site-directed mutagenesis approach could focus on this MoRF to identify potential binding interactions and to confirm BceB-ECD as binding domain. Amino acids with polar and charged side chains in particular should be replaced by neutral amino acids (e.g. alanine) to investigate their possible contribution to
recognition of bacitracin. The resulting effect on signalling can be examined using the same *in vivo* luminescence assay that was used in this study (Chapter IV). Likewise, changes in bacitracin resistance should be monitored by MIC assays. To further investigate the findings of the alanine scanning mutagenesis, residues of interest could be replaced with amino acids with similar or opposite properties. Complete or partial loss or possibly even gain of function could indicate a binding interaction between BceB-ECD and bacitracin in its amphipathic, bound form.

BceAB also confers resistance against the lantibiotics mersacidin and actagardine. Yet, both have quite different charge distribution and chemical properties to bacitracin (Staron et al., 2011). Neither of them contain any amino acids with positively charged side chains and hardly any polar residues. A glutamate residue in the lipid II-binding motif seems to be the only conserved charged residue in the peptides that are otherwise enriched in non-polar, hydrophobic residues (Böttiger et al., 2009). The binding domain of BceAB for mersacidin and actagardine might therefore differ from the one that was here suggested for bacitracin.

Another MoRF of BceB-ECD was predicted to lie around amino acid residue 432 (Lys*-Val-Lys*-Ser-Lys*-His*-Glu*-Thr-Gln-Pro, Chapter III, Fig. 3.1, yellow). This region contains some polar residues (grey), but strikingly many positively charged amino acids, like histidine and lysine (X*). Although intuitively not necessarily suitable for bacitracin binding, this domain might be important for other interactions, for example, with the negatively-charged mersacidin and actagardine.

It would be very interesting to investigate differences in the signalling response of BceAB containing mutated MoRF residues when mersacidin is administered instead of bacitracin. If the signalling response was, for example, partly impaired upon addition of bacitracin but did not alter in the presence mersacidin, this could imply that the MoRF is a binding site specific for bacitracin.

If this hypothesis held true, this would be a suitable strategy to confirm BceB-ECD as bacitracin binding-domain, while avoiding challenges that might be encountered with *in vitro* assays. The sequence alignment between bacitracin-related permeases in this study did not find the amino acid sequence of the MoRF to be conserved at all. Yet, if the MoRF was revealed as the bacitracin binding site by site-directed mutagenesis, further insights gained from the experimental data might point out a prevailing bacitracin binding motif that could be searched for in other ECDs.
5.3 Analysis of the natural membrane environment and localisation of BceAB.

The growth assays performed in Chapter IV indicated a low-affinity interaction between BceAB and UPP upon deletion of bcrC. Impaired dephosphorylation of UPP leads to a very similar effect as the addition of bacitracin, namely the accumulation of UPP. One possible explanation is that UPP is recognised by BceAB as part of the substrate, and a low binding affinity is present even in the absence of bacitracin. It is also conceivable that BceAB monitors the UPP levels in the cell or that BceAB uses the abundance of UPP for localisation in the membrane. In the absence of bacitracin, basal BceAB levels in the cell are low, yet the signalling response of BceAB to addition of bacitracin happens rapidly (Fritz et al., 2015). To further investigate this interaction, the natural lipid environment of BceAB should be examined in vitro.

The membrane phospholipid composition is under normal conditions tightly regulated. AMPs can perturb this regulation change the membrane composition and lead to the formation of lipid domains (Muchova et al., 2011, Strahl et al., 2014). Lipid domains were shown have increased lipid fluidity in vivo. This can disturb the overall lipid homeostasis and affect membrane protein localisation. Daptomycin, for example, was shown to cause an extensive rearrangement of fluid lipid domains, affecting the membrane viscosity. This leads to the detachment of the lipid II synthase MurG and thus results in the discontinuation of the cell wall synthesis (Muller et al., 2016). Further, the synthetic cyclic hexapeptide cWFW leads to the formation of distinct membrane domains and rapidly reduces the membrane fluidity of B. subtilis (Scheinpflug et al., 2017). This causes membrane protein disorganisation, which is followed by the inhibition of cell wall synthesis. These examples stress that changes of the membrane composition caused can affect the membrane viscosity or the lateral pressure onto membrane proteins (Muchova et al., 2011, Lee, 2004, van den Brink-van der Laan et al., 2004). This can have effects on the helix-helix interactions of integral membrane proteins and change their activity.

For example, the well-described multidrug efflux pump P-glycoprotein is thought to access its substrates from the membrane, according to a hydrophobic vacuum cleaner mechanism (Higgins & Gottesman, 1992, Gottesman & Pastan, 1993). However, the membrane phospholipid environment was shown to modulate the substrate interactions with P-glycoprotein (Romsicki & Sharom, 1999). The tested drugs had, for example, a substantially higher affinity when surrounded by phosphatidylcholine compared to phosphatidyli-
ethanolamine. In addition, the ATPase activity that drives P-glycoprotein efflux varied accordingly with the encompassing environment (Romsicki & Sharom, 1999).

Similarly, the activity lipoprotein extractor LolCDE seems to depend on phospholipid composition (Miyamoto & Tokuda, 2007). The common phospholipids phosphatidylglycerol, phosphatidylethanolamine and cardiolipin affected the lipoprotein sorting and release ability as well as ATPase activity of LolCDE, each in their own way. Similar effects may also affect BceAB activity.

As briefly mentioned in Chapter III, styrene maleic acid (SMA) copolymers and similar compounds have revolutionised work on bacterial membranes, and integral membrane proteins in particular, over the last decade (Knowles et al., 2009, Dorr et al., 2016). The SMA copolymers form so-called SMA lipid particles (SMALP) or SMA nanodiscs, which encompass the protein of interest and patches of the original lipid bilayer. With this method, membrane proteins can be characterised using standard biochemical and biophysical approaches (Knowles et al., 2009). Aside from often maintained functionality and increased stability of protein complexes, SMALPs also preserve the natural lipid environment of the membrane protein (Swainsbury et al., 2014). SMA copolymers have the ability to insert into membrane bilayers and extract membrane proteins directly from intact membranes, without the use of detergent (Scheidelaar et al., 2015, Stroud et al., 2018). Due to this quality, SMA co-polymers found use as tool to investigate protein-lipid interaction and lipid preferences (Dorr et al., 2014, 2016). Generally, SMA itself does not seem to have any significant preference to solubilise a certain phospholipid species (Dominguez Pardo et al., 2017). Thus, comparison between the lipid content of the SMA nanodiscs containing the protein of interest with the average abundance of phospholipids in other nanodiscs might point out specific affinities of the protein under investigation to certain types of phospholipids. The phospholipid content of nanodiscs can be analysed by several techniques including thin layer chromatography, gas chromatography, high-performance liquid chromatography or variations thereof, e.g. reverse-phase chromatography (Peterson & Cummings, 2006, Scheidelaar et al., 2015, Dominguez Pardo et al., 2017). Using this method could further test the interaction between full-length BceAB and UPP in vitro under different conditions. If the substrate recognition mechanism of BceAB is the same for lipid II binding AMPs, BceAB could also have also an affinity to lipid II alone. Successful solubilisation of the BceAB complex in SMA nanodiscs would also open the doors for structural analysis using electron microscopy (Postis et al., 2015, Parmar et al., 2018).
As key player in the cell wall synthesis, the localisation of lipid II in the cell is well-studied. In elongated cells like *B. subtilis*, de novo synthesised peptidoglycan is not only inserted around the division septum but also in domains along the lateral walls of the cell in a helical pattern (Daniel & Errington, 2003). Microscopy studies could give insights into where BceAB localises in the cell *in vivo* and whether this distribution correlates with the abundance of labelled lipid II or UPP. Localisation of fluorescent-tagged BceAB could also be studied in the presence or absence of antimicrobial stress or other conditions that disrupt cell wall synthesis. The depletion of precursors, amongst others, leads to the disorganisation of peptidoglycan synthesis and to alterations in the distributions of lipids in the membrane (Muchova *et al.*, 2011). Particularly, depletion of UPP phosphatases might be important for localisation of BceAB in the cell.
In this thesis, we shed light on the nature of the physiological substrate of the antimicrobial resistance transporter BceAB of *B. subtilis*. By identifying the most likely physiological substrate to be bacitracin in complex with its cellular target UPP, rather than unbound bacitracin, we now understand that substrate recognition and binding are likely to happen in the hydrophobic membrane environment. Thereby, we gained further insights into the resistance mechanism that has been elusive for decades. Together with experimental evidence from previous studies, these insights support the hypothesis that bacitracin is removed from its cellular target and released into the extracellular space. BceAB likely confers resistance against AMPs by shifting the equilibrium of membrane-bound AMPs towards unbound AMPs in the surrounding environment, according to a target protection mechanism. As this resistance mechanism does not involve transport of the AMP across a membrane, BceAB was classified as a mechanotransducer rather than a transporter.

Identifying the physiological substrate of the paradigm transporter BceAB and understanding the underlying resistance mechanism are of great importance to counteracting emerging antimicrobial resistance, as this and similar mechanisms are presumably widespread in immunity and resistance against AMPs in numerous bacterial genera. The ability to differentiate between the membrane-bound and free version might constitute a key concept of AMP recognition in resistance determinants beyond this and similar types of transporters. The findings of this study thus open up exciting future perspectives to further investigate BceAB-like transporters and other resistance determinants. Better understanding of resistance mechanisms will facilitate the development of AMPs for medical treatment that can circumvent these resistance determinants and reveal new targets and strategies to combat the global threat that antimicrobial resistance poses to mankind.
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**Supplement**

**Chapter II**

**Table S1: E. coli strains used in this study.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Description*</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH5α</td>
<td><em>fhuA2Δ(argF-lacZ)U169 phoA glnV44 φ80 Δ(lac-Z) M15</em>&lt;br&gt;gyrA96 recA1 relA1 end A1 thi-1 hsdR17&lt;br&gt;<em>fhuA2 [lon] ompT gal (λ DE3) [dcm] ΔhsdS</em></td>
<td>Laboratory stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL21(DE3)</td>
<td>λ DE3 = λ sBamH1o ΔEcoRI-B int::(lacI::PlacUV5::T7gene1) i21 Δnin5</td>
<td>New England BioLabs Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE09</td>
<td>DH5α pSG1601, amp'</td>
<td>Susanne Gebhard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE156</td>
<td>XL1-blue pNTSB104, amp'</td>
<td>Nicole Treichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE162</td>
<td>XL1-blue pNT2E01, amp'</td>
<td>Nicole Treichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE420</td>
<td>DH5α pCKET1601, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE421</td>
<td>DH5α pCKET1604, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE422</td>
<td>DH5α pCKET1603, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE423</td>
<td>DH5α pCKET1604, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE426</td>
<td>Top10 pCKpUC571, kan'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE427</td>
<td>Top10 pCKpUC572, kan'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE435</td>
<td>DH5α pCKBAD2404, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE436</td>
<td>DH5α pCKBAD2405, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE469</td>
<td>DH5α pCKDR1, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE507</td>
<td>DH5α pCKC301, cm'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGE508</td>
<td>DH5α pCK4501, amp'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC473</td>
<td>DH5α pANM-1_145, spec'</td>
<td>Annis Newmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC474</td>
<td>DH5α pANM-1_146, spec'</td>
<td>Annis Newmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC475</td>
<td>DH5α pANM-1_147, spec'</td>
<td>Annis Newmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*amp': resistance to ampicillin, cm': chloramphenicol, kan': kanamycin, spec': spectinomycin.
Table S2: B. subtilis strains used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W168</td>
<td>laboratory wild type strain, trpC2</td>
<td>Laboratory stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB01</td>
<td>bceAB::kan bcrC::tet, kan', tet'</td>
<td>Susanne Gebhard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB73</td>
<td>sacA::P_bceA-luxABCDE, cm'</td>
<td>(Fritz et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB74</td>
<td>sacA::P_psdA-luxABCDE, cm'</td>
<td>Sebastian Dintner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB79</td>
<td>bceAB::kan sacA::P_bceA-lux, cm'</td>
<td>(Kallenberg et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB170</td>
<td>bceAB::kan pXT-bceAB, kan', spec'</td>
<td>(Kallenberg et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB218</td>
<td>bceAB::kan sacA::P_bceA-lux lacA::P_xyl-bceAB, kan', cm', mls'</td>
<td>Nicole Treichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB575</td>
<td>bceAB::kan, kan'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB576</td>
<td>lacA::P_xyl-bceAB (pNT2E01), mls'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB577</td>
<td>bceAB::kan lacA::P_xyl-bceAB (pNT2E01), kan', mls'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB648</td>
<td>bceAB::kan bcrC::tet sacA::P_bceA-lux, kan', cm', tet'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB649</td>
<td>bcrC::tet sacA::P_bceA-lux, cm', tet'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB650</td>
<td>amyE::P_hy_spank-upps (pCKDR1), spec'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB651</td>
<td>sacA::P_bceA-lux amyE::P_hy_spank-upps, cm', spec'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB677</td>
<td>bceAB::kan bcrC::tet sacA::P_bceA-lux, kan', cm', tet'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB678</td>
<td>bcrC::tet bceAB::kan sacA::P_bceA-lux lacA::P_xyl-bceAB, tet', kan', cm', mls'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB681</td>
<td>bcrC::tet sacA::P_psdA-lux, tet', cm'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB713</td>
<td>thrC::P_xyl-uppS, spec'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB714</td>
<td>thrC::P_xyl-uppS sacA::P_bceA-lux, spec', cm'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB745</td>
<td>P_upps::kan-uppS1, kan'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB746</td>
<td>sacA::P_bceA-lux P_upps::kan-uppS1, cm', kan'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB758</td>
<td>sacA::P_bceA-lux lacA::P_xyl-bcrC, cm', mls'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB798</td>
<td>ytpB::mls sacA::P_bceA-lux, cm', mls'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB810</td>
<td>ponA::kan sacA::P_bceA-lux, cm', kan'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB812</td>
<td>sigM::kan sacA::P_bceA-lux, cm', kan'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB870</td>
<td>P_upps::kan-upps' sacA::P_bceA-lux, kan', cm'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB871</td>
<td>P_upps::kan-uppS1 sacA::P_bceA-lux, kan', cm'</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S3: Vectors used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vectors</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03 pET-16b</td>
<td>PT7, His•tag®, tT7, lacI, ori(pBR322), amp'</td>
<td>pET system manual, 11th ed., Novagen®</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 pBAD24</td>
<td>arabinose-inducible promoter pBAD; ribosome binding site on vector, amp'</td>
<td>(Guzman et al., 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 pBS4S</td>
<td>pDG1731 derived, rfp-cassette, thrC integration, amp'</td>
<td>(Radeck et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 pSB1C3</td>
<td>ori pMB1, rfp-cassette in BioBrick multiple cloning site, cm'</td>
<td>(Radeck et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 pDR111</td>
<td>Pphn_stopk–multiple cloning site, IPTG-inducible, amye integration</td>
<td>David Rudner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a amp': resistance to ampicillin, cm': chloramphenicol, kan': kanamycin, mls': macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B, spec': spectinomycin, tet': tetracycline.
Table S4: Plasmids used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmids</th>
<th>Description*</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pSG1601</td>
<td>bceB-ECD (A310-G525) in pET-16b, N-terminal His•tag® (Ndel/Xhol)</td>
<td>Susanne Gebhard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pNTSB104</td>
<td>PxylA in pSB1A3 (EcoRI/SpeI, TM2341/2342)</td>
<td>Nicole Treichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pNT2E01</td>
<td>P_{xyl}-bceAB in pBS2E (EcoRI/PstI) bceB-ECD (Y315-Q520) in pET-16b, N-terminal His•tag®</td>
<td>Nicole Treichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKET1601</td>
<td>(Ndel/BamHI, SG0183/185) bceB-ECD (Y315-Q520) in pET-16b, N-terminal His•tag®</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKET1602</td>
<td>(Ndel, BamHI, SG0184/186) bceB-ECD (Y315-Q520) in pET-16b, N-terminal His•tag®</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKET1603</td>
<td>(Ndel/BamHI, SG0183/186) bceB-ECD (T320-D515) in pET-16b, N-terminal His•tag®</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKET1604</td>
<td>(Ndel/BamHI, SG0184/185) H1-bceb-ECD (A310-G525)-Strep•tag® II in pUC57-kan, synthesized (EcoRI/PstI)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKpUC571</td>
<td>H1-bceb-ECD (A310-G525)-H2-Strep•tag® II in pUC57-kan, synthesized (EcoRI/PstI)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKpUC572</td>
<td>H1-bceb-ECD (A310-G525)-Strep•tag® II in pBAD24, synthesized (EcoRI/PstI)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKBAD2404</td>
<td>H1-bceb-ECD (A310-G525)-H2-Strep•tag® II in pUC57-kan, synthesized (EcoRI/PstI)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKBAD2405</td>
<td>H1-bceb-ECD (A310-G525)-H2-Strep•tag® II in pUC57-kan, synthesized (EcoRI/PstI)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKDR1</td>
<td>P_{hy_spank}-uppS, in pDR111 (Sall/Nhel, SG495/496)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCKC301</td>
<td>uppS in pSB1C3, (EcoRI/PstI, SG587/588)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCK4S01</td>
<td>Pxyl-ppS in pBS4S (BioBrick assembly)</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pANM-1_145</td>
<td>sacA::cat-P_{bceA}-luxABCDE (MoClo method)</td>
<td>Annis Newmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pANM-1_146</td>
<td>sacA::spec-P_{bceA}-luxABCDE (MoClo method)</td>
<td>Annis Newmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pANM-1_147</td>
<td>sacA::mls-P_{bceA}-luxABCDE (MoClo method)</td>
<td>Annis Newmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Restriction enzymes used for cloning are given in brackets (enzyme for 5’/enzyme for 3’).

Primers used for PCRs are stated in brackets, where applicable (primer for 5’/primer for 3’).
Table S5: Oligonucleotides used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primers</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Sequence (5' → 3')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG0183</td>
<td>BceB_Y315_Ndel_F</td>
<td>AATTCATATGTACTCGTGCGAAGAAGACCCGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0184</td>
<td>BceB_T320_Ndel_F</td>
<td>AATTCATATGACCGCGTAACAAAGATGACCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0185</td>
<td>BceB_Q520_BamHI_R</td>
<td>AATTTGATCTTCATTGCCAGCGCGTTGATAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0186</td>
<td>BceB_D515_BamHI_R</td>
<td>AATTTGATCTTCATCTATCTTGGAAATGCTCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0416</td>
<td>pETcheck_up</td>
<td>ATTCGTCGGCGGCTAGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0417</td>
<td>pET_check_down</td>
<td>GTAAATGGCTAACACGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0418</td>
<td>pBAD_check_up</td>
<td>ATGCATGACATTGGGACTCCAGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0419</td>
<td>pBAD_check_down</td>
<td>GTATTTAACCTGTATCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0427</td>
<td>pUC check_f (M13)</td>
<td>CCCAGGCTACGAGCTTGGAAACAAACCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0428</td>
<td>pUC check_r (M13)</td>
<td>AGCGGATAAACATCCAGCAACACCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0495</td>
<td>UppS_Sall_F</td>
<td>AATTTGCGCATGCTTCAACTCAACTCAACTCAACTCAAAATGGAAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0496</td>
<td>UppS_Nhel_R</td>
<td>ATTTGCTAGCCTTAAATTCCCGCAACACCCCTCCGGCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0506</td>
<td>AmyE check(F)</td>
<td>GTAAGCGTATACAAAAATTGTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0507</td>
<td>AmyE check(R)</td>
<td>TTATATTGGCAACACTTCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0587</td>
<td>UppS_ENX_F</td>
<td>ATGAATTGCAGCGTGCGCTTCATGATGCTTCAACTCAACTCAACTCAAAATGGAAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0588</td>
<td>UppS_SNP_R</td>
<td>AGCCCTGACGCGCGCCTGACTTAAATTCGGCCAAACCTCCGGCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0599</td>
<td>pSB1C3_seq_F</td>
<td>TGCCACCTGCAGTCTAAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0600</td>
<td>pSB1C3_seq_R</td>
<td>ATTACGCGCTTTGAGTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0601</td>
<td>pBS4S_seq_F</td>
<td>CAGTCACACCTTACCGCATTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0602</td>
<td>pBS4S_seq_R</td>
<td>CCTCCTCACTATTTTATGAGTGTCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0626</td>
<td>UppS_up_F</td>
<td>TGAAATCAGCTTGAATGATGAAACTAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0627</td>
<td>UppS_up_R</td>
<td>CCTATACACCTCAAATTGGTTGCGTTCGTTGACATAGTTTTTCTATCAAATCTCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0628</td>
<td>UppS_do_F</td>
<td>CGAGCGCTACGAGGAAATTTGTATGACTGTTGACATTGATTATCAGCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0629</td>
<td>UppS_do_R</td>
<td>GGAAATGAACTTTTTTGGTGGGACCGAGCATTCTGCTACACACCCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0637</td>
<td>menA_up_F</td>
<td>TACTCAGCTTTACCTGCGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0638</td>
<td>menA_up_R</td>
<td>CTTATACACCTCAAATTGGTTGCGTCGTTGACATGCTGCCCCCAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0639</td>
<td>menA_do_F</td>
<td>CGAGCGCTACGAGGAAATTTGTATGACTGTTGACATTGATTATCAGCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0640</td>
<td>menA_do_R</td>
<td>GAAAGCGAAGAGATCCTGACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0701</td>
<td>sigM_up</td>
<td>CGGGCCTATGACGACGTTGATAAAAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0702</td>
<td>sigM_do</td>
<td>CAACGGTTATACACAAAAAGGAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0703</td>
<td>ponA_up</td>
<td>GCGGTTATACACAAAAAGACCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG0704</td>
<td>ponA_do</td>
<td>GCACGAGCTTTGGCGCAGAAGAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S3.1: The extracellular domains of bacitracin resistance-related BceB-like permeases have only poor amino acid conservation. Sequence alignment of eight BceB-like permeases that sense bacitracin or confer resistance against the AMP. Amino acid sequences were aligned using the application ClustalW built into the sequence analysing tool BioEdit. Identical amino acid residues are shaded in back, amino acids with similar properties are shaded grey (75%). The extracellular domains are highlighted by a blue box. 1: BceB, *B. subtilis* (O34741, Ohki et al., 2003), 2: AnrB, *Listeria monocytogenes* (Q8Y5E9, Collins et al., 2010), 3: BraE, *Staphylococcus aureus*, (A0A0H3JWA4, Hiron et al., 2011), 4: VraG, *Staphylococcus aureus* (A0A0H3K6M3, Hiron et al., 2011), 5: MbrB, *Streptococcus mutans* (Q8VUH1, Tsuda et al., 2002, Ouyang et al., 2010), 6: Spr0813, *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (Q8DQ76, Becker et al., 2009), 7: EF_2049, *Enterococcus faecalis* (Q833B5, Gebhard et al., 2014), 8: EF_2751, *Enterococcus faecalis* (Q830M8, Gebhard et al., 2014). Uniprot accession numbers are given in brackets (Boutet et al., 2007).
Figure S3.2: Circular dichroism spectra of polypeptides and proteins with representative secondary structures. 1: α-helical conformation (black), 2: antiparallel β-sheet conformation (red), 3: random coil or disorder (green), 4+5: collagen in native (blue) and denatured (cyan) forms. Modified from Greenfield (2006).
Figure S3.3: Complex formation between bacitracin and GPP results in saturation at 50 µM BAC and 200 µM GPP. Steady-state ANS fluorescence experiments of bacitracin and GPP were performed as described in Fig. 3.4. No buffer spectra were subtracted. A+B: Dose response of ANS fluorescence upon addition of various concentrations of A: GPP and B: bacitracin. Data points were fit with a linear regression line. C: Dose response of ANS fluorescence signal upon gradual addition of GPP to bacitracin. Data points were fit with a non-linear single site binding curve. D: Dose response of ANS fluorescence emission upon titration of bacitracin to GPP. Data points were approximated with a non-linear single site binding curve (purple) for lower and according to a linear regression fit (grey) at higher bacitracin concentrations. Data in C+D are depicted as mean ± standard deviation of two independent measurements.
Figure S3.4. Schematic of BceB-ECD hybrid membrane proteins. Two different BceB-ECD hybrid membrane constructs were designed for gene synthesis (B and C). B: The first protein was designed to comprise two TMH (H1 + H2, orange) with the bceB-ECD encoding sequence in between (blue). C: The second hybrid protein contained a single TMH (H1, orange), followed by the bceB-ECD coding sequence. Both constructs were C-terminally-tagged with a Strep-Tag® II (green, IBA GmbH) and cloned into the same arabinose-inducible vector that were used for overproduction of full-length BceAB (A, pBAD24). The sequence of the membrane helices originated from the E. coli protein LepB. To ensure the correct topology in the membrane with the ECD located on the extracellular side of the membrane, additional positive amino acids (KKK) were added into the N-terminal region of the fusion protein, and positive residues in the native loop region of LepB were exchanged as suggested by Andersson and von Heijne (1993). The orientation of membrane proteins is based on the so-called ‘positive-inside rule’ which has been extensively studied and is used for topology predictions of membrane proteins (von Heijne, 1992, Andersson & von Heijne, 1994a, 1994b). According to this rule, bacterial inner membrane proteins contain a much higher amount of positively charged amino acid residues in their cytoplasmic regions rather than in the periplasm or extracellularly (Heijne, 1986). The correct topology of the BceB-ECD hybrid constructs was confirmed using the TOPCONS web server for consensus prediction of membrane protein topology (data not shown, Tsirigos et al., 2015).
Figure S4.1: AMP transport assay suggests bacitracin is neither imported nor inactivated by BceAB. *B. subtilis* W168 (WT) and a ΔbceAB mutant (TMB035) were grown, harvested and resuspended to an OD$_{600}$ of 10. Bacitracin was added to cultures and a control without cells to a final concentration of 5 µg/ml and incubated for 30 minutes. Supernatants were collected and the remaining bacitracin activity was determined using a bio-assay. Supernatants were filled into wells in an agar plate with a bacitracin-sensitive strain (ΔbceAB ΔbcrC double mutant, SGB01) as indicator strain. Residual bacitracin concentrations were quantified from the diameter of inhibition zones and calibrated against a series of standards.

Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. **A**: Comparison of remaining biologically active bacitracin in the supernatant of WT and ΔbceAB cultures and samples without cells. Values are stated in panel **B**. No significant difference could be determined using a one-way ANOVA.
Figure S4.2: Deletion of ponA does not lead to changes in BceAB activity. Comparison of BceAB activities in the WT (SGB73, dark red) and a ΔponA strain (SGB810, light red) in the presence of varying mersacidin concentrations. BceAB activities were determined as described in Fig. 4.4. Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. A two-way ANOVA did not reveal any significant contribution to variation by the strains.
Figure S4.3: Combination of bacitracin or mersacidin with vancomycin does not alter BceAB activity. **A+B:** BceAB activity in presence of bacitracin or mersacidin in combination with 0, 0.05, 0.1 µg/ml vancomycin (dark to lighter colour). Exponentially growing cells were challenged with varying concentrations of vancomycin and bacitracin or mersacidin, as indicated BceAB activities were determined as described in Fig. 4.4. **C+D:** Growth of the WT strain (SGB73) in presence of bacitracin or mersacidin combined with vancomycin. OD_{600} measurements taken 55, 60 and 65 minutes after addition were averaged and normalised (100% corresponding to maximum growth, darkest blue/red). All data are shown as mean of two biological replicates. Standard deviation of BceAB activity is indicated in bar graphs of panel A and B. A two-way ANOVA did not show any significant contribution to variation by the strains.
Figure S4.4: Deletion of \textit{sigM} does not result in significant changes in the BceAB activity.
BceAB activity of a \textit{ΔsigM} strain (SGB, 812turquois/light red) compared to WT activity (SGB73 darker blue/red) in the presence of sub-inhibitory concentrations of \textbf{A}: bacitracin and \textbf{B}: mersacidin. BceAB activities were determined as described in Fig. 4.4. All data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. A two-way ANOVA did not show any significant contribution to variation by the strains.
Figure S4.5: Overproduction of UppS does not alter BceAB activity. Comparison of BceAB activities in the WT (SGB73, dark blue) and IPTG-/ xylose-inducible UppS overproduction strains (SGB651, blue and light blue) in the presence of varying bacitracin concentrations. BceAB activities were determined as described in Fig. 4.4, in the presence of 1 mM IPTG or 0.2 % xylose. Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation of at least three biological replicates. A two-way ANOVA did not show any significant contribution to variation by the strains.