Fungal dual-domain LysM effectors undergo chitin-induced intermolecular, and not intramolecular, dimerization

Hui Tian[1,2], Gabriel L. Fiorin[2], Anja Kombrink[2], Jeroen R. Mesters[3, #], Bart P.H.J. Thomma[1,4, #, *]

[1]University of Cologne, Institute for Plant Sciences, 50674 Cologne, Germany; [2]Laboratory of Phytopathology, Wageningen University and Research, Droevendaalsesteeg 1, 6708PB Wageningen, The Netherlands; [3]Institute of Biochemistry, University of Lübeck, Ratzeburger Allee 160, 23538 Lübeck, Germany; [4]University of Cologne, Institute for Plant Sciences, Cluster of Excellence on Plant Sciences (CEPLAS), 50674 Cologne, Germany.

[#]These authors contributed equally

[*]To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: bthomma@uni-koeln.de

Running head: Dual-domain LysM effectors undergo polymerization.

SUMMARY

Chitin is a homopolymer of β-(1,4)-linked *N*-acetyl-D-glucosamine (GlcNAc) and a major structural component of fungal cell walls. In plants, chitin acts as a microbe-associated molecular pattern (MAMP) that is recognized by lysin motif (LysM)-containing plant cell surface-localized pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) that activate a plethora of downstream immune responses. In order to deregulate chitin-induced plant immunity and successfully establish infection, many fungal pathogens secrete LysM domain-containing effector proteins during host colonization. It was previously shown that the LysM effector Ecp6 from the tomato leaf mould fungus *Cladosporium fulvum* can outcompete plant PRRs for chitin binding because two of its three LysM domains cooperate to form a composite groove with ultra-high (pM) chitin-binding affinity. However, most functionally characterized LysM effectors contain only two LysMs, including *Magnaporthe oryzae* MoSlp1, *Verticillium dahliae* Vd2LysM, and *Colletotrichum higginsianum* ChElp1 and ChElp2. Here, we performed modelling, structural and functional analyses to investigate whether such dual-domain LysM effectors can also form ultra-high chitin-binding affinity grooves through intramolecular LysM dimerization. However, our study suggests that intramolecular LysM dimerization does not occur. Rather, our data support the occurrence of intermolecular LysM dimerization for these effectors, associated with a significantly lower chitin binding affinity than monitored for Ecp6. Interestingly, the intermolecular LysM dimerization allows for the formation of polymeric complexes in the presence of chitin. Possibly, such polymers may precipitate at infection sites in order to eliminate chitin oligomers, and thus suppress the activation of chitin-induced plant immunity.

INTRODUCTION

Chitin is a homopolymer of β-(1,4)-linked *N*-acetyl-D-glucosamine (GlcNAc) and a major structural component of fungal cell walls (Lenardon et al., 2010; Free, 2013). In plants, chitin has been characterized as a fungal microbe-associated molecular pattern (MAMP) that can be recognized by cell surface-localized pattern recognition receptors that contain extracellular lysin motif (LysM) domains (LysM-PRRs) (Zhang et al., 2007; Zipfel, 2008; Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2015; Rovenich et al., 2016). Upon recognition of chitin by such receptors, plants evoke a broad range of immune responses, including the generation of ion fluxes, the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS), the activation of mitogen-associated protein kinases (MAPKs) and the expression of defence-related genes that include those encoding hydrolytic enzymes, such as chitinases, in order to halt fungal invasion (Felix et al., 1993; Jones and Dangl, 2006; Altenbach and Robatzek, 2007; Boller and Felix, 2009; Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2015). LysM-PRRs have been functionally characterized in several plants, including the model plant Arabidopsis (*Arabidopsis thaliana*) in which the LysM receptor AtLYK5 was reported to bind chitin with high affinity (1.72 μM) and form a tripartite receptor complex with AtLYK4 and AtCERK1 to initiate chitin signalling (Cao et al., 2014). AtCERK1 was found to bind chitin directly as well, albeit with significantly lower affinity than AtLYK5 (Miya et al., 2007; Petutschnig et al., 2010; Cao et al., 2014).

To overcome chitin-induced immunity, successful fungal pathogens evolved various strategies to either protect fungal cell wall chitin against hydrolysis by host enzymes, or prevent the activation of plant immunity by fungal cell wall-derived chitin oligomers (de Jonge et al., 2010; Rovenich et al., 2014; Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2015). For the fungus *Cladosporium fulvum*, causal agent of leaf mould disease of tomato, several strategies to deal with chitin-triggered immunity have been characterized. During host

colonization, *C. fulvum* secretes the effector protein Ecp6 that contains three LysMs and

binds chitin oligosaccharides with ultra-high affinity, leading to the suppression of

chitin-induced plant immune responses (Bolton et al., 2008; de Jonge et al., 2010). A

crystal structure of Ecp6 revealed that two of its three LysMs cooperate to form a

composite chitin-binding groove that binds chitin through intrachain LysM dimerization

(Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2013). *Zymoseptoria tritici*, the causal agent of Septoria tritici

blotch (STB) of wheat, secretes the LysM effector Mg3LysM, a close homolog of Ecp6,

that similarly suppresses chitin-triggered immunity (Marshall et al., 2011). Additionally,

Z. tritici secretes two effectors that comprise a single LysM only, Mg1LysM and

Mgx1LysM that were both characterized to protect hyphae against hydrolysis by plant

chitinases and to suppress chitin-triggered immunity in plants (Marshall et al., 2011;

Tian et al., 2021). An Mg1LysM crystal structure showed that two Mg1LysM monomers

form a chitin-independent homodimer via the β-sheet in the *N*-terminus of Mg1LysM

(Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2019). Furthermore, Mg1LysM homodimers were shown to

undergo ligand-induced polymerization in the presence of chitin, leading to a polymeric

structure that is able to protect fungal cell walls (Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2019). Similar

chitin-induced homopolymer formation was shown for Mgx1LysM (Tian et al., 2021).

Suppression of chitin-triggered immunity by secreted fungal effectors that carry

no other recognizable domains than LysM domains, collectively referred to as LysM

effectors, has been demonstrated for various phytopathogenic fungi. For instance,

Magnaporthe oryzae, the causal agent of rice blast disease, secretes the LysM effector

Slp1 to bind chitin and suppress chitin-triggered immune responses (Mentlak et al.,

2012). Similarly, the Brassicaceae anthracnose fungus *Colletotrichum higginsianum*

secretes ChElp1 and ChElp2, while the broad host-range vascular wilt fungus

Verticillium dahliae secretes Vd2LysM (Takahara et al., 2016; Kombrink et al., 2017).

While these examples are from plant-associated Ascomycete fungi, also plant-associated fungi that belong to other phyla utilize LysM effectors to suppress chitin-triggered immunity. For instance, the Basidiomycota soil-borne broad host-range pathogen *Rhizoctonia solani* secretes RsLysM, while the Glomeromycota arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* secretes RiSLM to suppress chitin-triggered immunity (Dolfors et al., 2019; Zeng et al., 2020). The latter example demonstrates that also non-pathogenic fungi utilize LysM effectors in their interactions with host plants. Moreover, the finding that LysM effectors contribute to the virulence of the Ascomycete fungus *Beauveria bassiana* by evasion of immune responses in insect hosts demonstrates that LysM effectors play roles in fungal interactions beyond plant hosts (Kombrink and Thomma, 2013; Cen et al., 2017).

Based on the functional analysis of *C. fulvum* Ecp6, it has been proposed that the ability to suppress chitin-triggered immunity resides in the ability to form a composite chitin-binding groove through intrachain LysM dimerization to bind chitin with ultrahigh affinity, such that host chitin receptors are outcompeted for substrate binding (Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2013; Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2015). However, most LysM effectors that are functionally characterized today contain only two LysMs; so-called dual-domain LysM effectors. It has remained unclear thus far whether these dual-domain LysM effectors are able to undergo intramolecular LysM dimerization, like in Ecp6, to establish ultrahigh affinity chitin-binding sites, or whether chitin binding by these effectors is based on another mechanism.

RESULTS

Structural prediction precludes intrachain LysM dimerization

It has previously been determined that *M. oryzae* MoSlp1, *V. dahliae* Vd2LysM, and *C. higginsianum* ChElp1 and ChElp2 comprise two LysM domains, bind chitin and suppress chitin-induced host immunity (Mentlak et al., 2012; Takahara et al., 2016; Kombrink et al., 2017). Their length ranges from 145 aa (for Vd2LysM) to 176 aa (for ChElp2), with the molecular weight of the mature proteins ranging from 14.24 to 16.14 kDa (Fig. 1A). An amino acid sequence alignment of their LysM domains with those of *C. fulvum* Ecp6 displayed significant conservation of the domains, and of the residues involved in chitin binding in particular (Fig. 1B). LysM domains are compact modules that display a β-α-α-β secondary structure motif (Bateman and Bycroft, 2000) in which the termini of the beta sheets are typically kept together by a disulfide bond at the LysM domain borders. In Ecp6, three disulfide bonds are found within the individual LysM domains (LysM1: C7-C61; LysM2: C80-C134; LysM3: C139-C191) and a fourth bond (C35-C69) locates in between LysM1 and the linker between the two LysMs (Fig. 1C). Accordingly, in MoSlp1, Vd2LysM, ChElp1 and ChElp2 the cysteines to form a disulfide bond within each of the individual LysM domains are conserved and, similar to Ecp6, those to generate another disulfide bond in between LysM1 and the linker between the two LysM domains (MoSlp1: C46-C80; Vd2LysM: C31-C69; ChElp1: C56-C90; ChElp2: C62-C96) are conserved as well (Fig. 1C). Intriguingly, these latter disulfide bonds will anchor a significant part of the linker between the two LysM domains to the beginning of the second α-helix of LysM1 in each of these effectors, severely limiting the part of the linker that remains free to rotate. This is the most extreme for Vd2LysM, for which ten of the 19 amino acids of the linker between the two LysMs become fixed and a flexible stretch of only nine amino acids remains (Fig. 1C).

To assess whether intramolecular LysM dimerization can occur in the dual-

domain LysM effectors, all four proteins were modelled based on the LysM1-LysM3

composite chitin binding groove of Ecp6 using Phyre2, I-TASSER and AlphaFold (Roy et

al., 2010; Yang and Zhang, 2015; Kelley et al., 2015; Jumper et al., 2021). Phyre2

successfully superposed the LysM domains of each of the effectors on LysM1 and LysM3

of Ecp6. Moreover, the software successfully predicted the disulfide bond that anchors a

significant part of the linker between the two LysM domains to the beginning of the

second α-helix of LysM1 for all LysM effectors but Vd2LysM (Fig. 2). However, all four

structure predictions displayed a disruption of the linker between the LysM domains

(Fig. 2), suggesting that (the flexible part of) the linkers of MoSlp1, Vd2LysM, ChElp1 and

ChElp2 are too short to accommodate intramolecular LysM dimerization. Accordingly,

an artificial insertion of a 5-amino acid sequence (GGSGG) in the linker of ChElp2 led to

predicted intramolecular LysM dimerization in a structure model with an uninterrupted

loop and a root-mean-square deviation (r.m.s.d.) value of 0.16 Å for 499 atom pairs (Fig.

2).

The I-TASSER prediction did not result in the display of disrupted linkers.

However, whereas the modelling was attempted on the composite binding groove of

Ecp6 composed by LysM1 and LysM3, I-TASSER modelled the structure of the LysM

effectors on LysM2 and LysM3 of Ecp6 (Fig. 2), r.m.s.d. values ranging from 0.49 Å (442

atom pairs) for ChElp2, 0.60 Å (470 atom pairs) for ChElp21, 0.64 Å (508 atom pairs) for

MoSlp1 to 1.67 Å (395 atom pairs) for Vd2LysM. Thus, like Phyre2, also the I-TASSER

modeling suggests that intramolecular LysM dimerization is not likely.

Also the third prediction software, AlphaFold, yielded structure models that were

not compatible with intramolecular chitin binding, with r.m.s.d. values as high as 2.62 Å

(567 atom pairs) and 5.42 Å (602 atom pairs) for ChElp2 and MoSlp1, respectively (Fig.

2). The ChElp1 structure model appeared compatible with intramolecular chitin binding

displaying an overall r.m.s.d. value of 0.153 Å (541 atom pairs). However, the low r.m.s.d.

value was only attainable because none of the anticipated disulfide bonds (C28-C83,

C56-C90 and C99-C152) materialized in the model. Especially C99 appears completely

out of position because the last three C-terminal amino acids including C152 are lacking

in the model (Fig. 2). The overall lack of cystins in the model permitted the flexible loop

between the two LysM domains to take a shortcut route, thereby ending in a dubious

model abandoning the basic features of a LysM domain. Surprisingly, in the Vd2LysM

model a different cysteine pair occurred, C5-C59, C31-C101 and C69-C124, resulting in a

model in which the two chitin binding motifs are pointing in opposite directions. Taken

together, all predictions based on the various software packages do not support

intramolecular chitin binding.

Crystallization attempts for the LysM effectors failed

The most direct method to reveal the chitin-binding mechanism of a LysM effector is by

determination of a three-dimensional protein structure in the presence of chitin, for

instance by X-ray crystallography, as previously performed for the single-domain LysM

effector Mg1LysM (Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2020) and the three-domain LysM effector Ecp6

(Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2013). Thus, we pursued this strategy for the dual-domain LysM

effectors as well. This strategy requires a protein crystal of sufficient size and quality to

be used in an X-ray diffraction experiment, which in turn requires highly pure protein of

a sufficiently high concentration. To this end, the four dual-domain LysM effectors were

heterologously produced in the yeast *Pichia pastoris* (Fig. S1A). Whereas MoSlp1

possesses four potential glycosylation sites (N^{48}DT, N^{94}IS, N^{130}LS and N^{104}NT), ChElp1

and ChElp2 contain only a single potential glycosylation site (N^{105}TS and N^{111}TS) and

Vd2LysM is not predicted to possess any glycosylation site (Fig. 1C) which corresponds

to findings in a glycoprotein staining assay (Fig. S1B). Nevertheless, attempts to remove

potential glycan chains did not lead to decreased molecular sizes of MoSlp1, Vd2LysM

and ChElp2 while fetuin as positive control revealed a clear size shift already at 2 h after

incubation (Fig. S1C). As we have previously successfully crystallized Ecp6 protein that

was produced in the same manner despite containing two spatially close glycosylation

sites that were indeed found to be glycosylated in the crystal structure (Sanchez-Vallet

et al., 2013), we decided to continue with these protein preparations. Also, the molecular

homogeneity of the protein solutions was improved by gel filtration combined with the

treatment with the nonionic detergent decyl β-D-maltopyranoside (DM) (Fig. S2).

Subsequently, all four proteins were subjected to extensive crystallization screenings. In

addition, ChElp2 and Vd2LysM were produced in *Escherichia coli* and subjected to

crystallization screenings as well. Unfortunately, none of the conditions tested resulted

in a genuine protein crystal for any of the dual-domain LysM effectors. Although

crystallization is an empirical process and there are many reasons why no crystals are

obtained, we reasoned that the lack of intramolecular chitin binding may also hamper

crystal growth.

Chitin-induced intermolecular dimerization leads to LysM effector polymerization

As all our crystallization attempts for the four dual-domain LysM effectors failed, we

pursued other strategies to provide evidence for the mechanism of chitin binding. We

reasoned that treatment with chitin oligomers would lead to higher order oligomeric or

polymeric protein complexes if intermolecular LysM dimerization occurs (Fig. 3A,

hypothesis I), while such complexes will not be formed in case of intramolecular LysM

dimerization (Fig. 3A, hypothesis II). To address these alternative hypotheses, ChElp2

was selected as a representative and expressed in *E. coli* to obtain protein that is devoid of chitin. ChElp2 was produced either with a His-sumo-tag (14 kDa) or with a FLAG-tag (1 kDa) and both forms were incubated together in the absence and presence of chitin. His-sumo-tagged ChElp2 was pulled-down with anti-His magnetic beads and the subsequent western blot (WB) result showed that FLAG-tagged ChElp2 was associated with His-sumo-tagged ChElp2 only in the presence of chitin (Fig. 3B), indicating chitin-induced intermolecular interactions between ChElp2 monomers.

To provide further evidence for chitin-induced intermolecular interactions, we assessed the ChElp2 particle size distribution in solution upon chitin addition with dynamic light scattering (DLS). Chitin addition at a molar ratio of 1:3 (protein:chitin) shifted a portion of ChElp2 particles from around 10 nm in the absence of chitin to 100 nm in the presence of chitin (Fig. 4A). Further increase of exogenously added chitin to a molar ratio of 1:6 significantly reduced the signal at 10 nm while inducing a strong signal at 10 μm (Fig. 4A), indicative of chitin-induced polymerization of ChElp2. To demonstrate the requirement of chitin binding for the observed polymerization, we produced a ChElp2 mutant in which the threonine within each of the LysM domains that is critical for chitin binding (LysM1, T49; LysM2, T120) was replaced by tryptophan, produced the mutant in *E. coli*, and confirmed the compromised chitin binding affinity by isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) (Fig. 4B). Subsequently, the ChElp2$^{T49W-T120W}$ mutant was subjected to DLS analysis in the presence of exogenously added chitin, revealing that the particle size shift that is observed for wild-type ChElp2 was not observed for the mutant (Fig. 4A). Thus, we conclude that chitin binding is required for ChElp2 polymerization.

As an additional line of evidence, we hypothesized that if ChElp2 undergoes chitin-induced polymerization, we should be able to precipitate polymeric complexes

during centrifugation. Thus, we incubated ChElp2, and ChElp2$^{T49W-T120W}$ and Ecp6 as

negative controls, overnight with chitohexaose and subsequently centrifuged the

samples at 20,000 g in the presence of 0.002% methylene blue to visualize the protein.

As expected, a clear protein pellet appeared when ChElp2 was incubated with chitin, but

not in the control treatment without chitin, nor in the ChElp2$^{T49W-T120W}$ and Ecp6

samples (Fig. 4C; Fig. 6). Thus, we confirmed that chitin binding is required for ChElp2

polymerization.

To provide further evidence that specific chitin binding, rather than presence of

chitin or other carbohydrates, is required for ChElp2 polymerization, 100 µM ChElp2

was incubated with 1 mM diacetyl-chitobiose (Chi2), triacetyl-chitotriose (Chi3),

tetraacetyl-chitotetraose (Chi4), pentaacetyl-chitopentaose (Chi5), hexaacetyl-

chitohexaose (Chi6) or glucose. After centrifugation, protein pellets were observed for

ChElp2 incubations with Chi3, Chi4, Chi5 and Chi6, but not with Chi2 or glucose (Fig. 5A).

Arguably, given their differences in length, equimolar amounts of the various chitin

oligomers result in different final amounts of GlcNAc units. Thus, we repeated the assay

upon calibrating the various chitin oligomers such that the final amount of GlcNAc units

is the same in the various incubations. Also under these conditions, no protein pellets

formed upon incubation with Chi2 (Fig. 5B). Considering that a LysM domain binds

chitin oligomers that are composed of minimum three GlcNAc units, our findings

support that chitin binding, rather than mere chitin addition, is required for pellet

formation.

As a final experiment to substantiate the link between chitin binding,

intermolecular dimerization and polymerization, we performed limited ChELP2

digestion with thermolysin. Arguably, thermolysin will first of all target the

unstructured linker between the LysM domains rather than the highly structured LysM

domains themselves (Fig. 5C). Accordingly, after 5 min of thermolysin treatment a single

protein band that represents a single LysM domain could already be observed on

polyacrylamide gel, which increased in intensity at expense of the band that represents

the full-length LysM effector protein up to 1 h after thermolysin addition (Fig. 5D). While

a clear protein pellet was observed in untreated ChElp2 upon chitin addition followed

by centrifugation, no pellet formed for ChElp2 treated with thermolysin for 1 hr and

incubated with chitin (Fig. 5E). Thus, we conclude that the physical association of the

LysM domains is required to permit polymerization based on chitin-induced

intermolecular LysM dimerization of ChElp2.

To assess whether our conclusions for ChElp2 can be generalized and applies for

other dual-domain LysM effectors as well, the polymerization assay in the presence of

chitin was performed for *P. pastoris*-produced ChElp2, and for MoSlp1 and Vd2LysM as

well. Indeed, clear pellets were formed upon incubation of these proteins with chitin,

followed by centrifugation (Fig. 6). Collectively, our findings argue that dual-domain

LysM effectors undergo inter- rather than intramolecular dimerization upon chitin

binding, leading to polymerization of these LysM effectors.

DISCUSSION

We previously determined the mechanism for chitin binding for LysM effectors

composed of a single, or of three domains. However, many functionally characterized

LysM effectors are composed of two LysMs (Mentlak et al., 2012; Takahara et al., 2016;

Kombrink et al., 2017), and it remained unknown whether they are able to form a

composite chitin-binding groove through intrachain LysM dimerization to bind chitin

with ultrahigh affinity, such as the three-domain LysM effector Ecp6 (Sanchez-Vallet et

al., 2013; Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2015). Although our modelling studies based on three

software packages quite convincingly eliminated the possibility of intramolecular

dimerization, we set out to provide experimental evidence to support this notion and

pursued the determination of 3D-protein structures based on X-ray crystallography. We

screened the four dual-domain LysM effectors produced in *P. pastoris* as well as in *E. coli*

in different concentrations under 500 conditions in absence and presence of chitin in

different ratios, as well as with an additive screening in different buffers with a total of

nearly 200 conditions, but failed to develop protein crystals. Generally, if crystallization

of a protein fails, it can be attributed to many factors, ranging from insufficient purity

and homogeneity of the protein, to the fact that some proteins are simply naturally or

biologically unable to crystalize (Dessau and Modis, 2011; Wlodawer et al., 2017).

However, we then also considered the option that the lack of intramolecular LysM

dimerization would perhaps accommodate intermolecular LysM dimerization (Fig. 3A),

potentially leading to polymerization, which may lead to polymers of variable lengths

and, consequently, compromise protein homogeneity in solution leading to precipitation

rather than crystallization in turn. Thus, we decided to investigate the hypothesis that

exogenously added chitin induces intermolecular interaction between ChElp2

monomers (Fig. 3B), leading to polymer formation.

Through various lines of experimentation, we now provide solid evidence for the

absence of chitin-induced intramolecular dimerization, but rather the occurrence of

chitin-induced intermolecular dimerization of LysM domains of ChElp2 and other dual-

domain LysM effectors, leading to polymer formation *in vitro*. These experiments

include structural predictions, co-immunoprecipitation experiments, DLS measurements

of particle size distributions, centrifugation assays, mutant analyses and polymerization

assays with various substrates. The finding that Ecp6, in contrast to the dual-domain

LysM effectors, does not undergo chitin-induced polymerization is important, as it

demonstrates that the pellets are associated with intermolecular dimerization of LysM

effector molecules, a process that is not supposed to occur with Ecp6 that undergoes

intramolecular LysM dimerization (Sanchez-Vallet et al., 2013). Such protein pellet was

also not obtained for the mutant ChElp2$^{T49W-T120W}$ (Fig. 4C), indicating that chitin binding

is essential for ChElp2 polymerization. Yet, chitin binding in itself does not lead to

protein pellet formation, as limited protein digestion with thermolysin, that cleaves the

linker between the two LysMs and releases the individual LysM domains without

compromising their chitin-binding ability, did not lead to pellet formation (Fig. 5E).

Additionally, the polymerization assays in which ChElp2 was incubated with the chitin

dimer, trimer, tetramer, pentamer, hexamer and glucose (Fig. 5) revealed that it is not

the mere addition of chitin that leads to precipitation of protein pellets, as only those

molecules that have previously been shown to be bound by LysMs resulted in

polymerization, further implicating chitin binding as a requirement for the

polymerization to occur.

The apparent inability of dual-domain LysM effectors to undergo chitin-induced

intramolecular dimerization also implies that these LysM effectors cannot establish

ultrahigh affinity chitin-binding sites such as the one that was identified in *C. fulvum*

Ecp6 (Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2013). As this finding implies that the chitin binding

affinities of the dual-domain LysM effectors is markedly lower than that of Ecp6, it needs

to be acknowledged that these LysM effectors may not have the immediate capacity to

outcompete host immune receptors for chitin binding. Thus, we speculate that these

LysM effectors contribute to fungal virulence *in planta* through the formation of

polymeric complexes that have the propensity to precipitate in order to eliminate the

presence of freely available chitin oligomers at infection sites that may otherwise bind to

the host immune receptors. However, admittedly, experimental evidence for the

occurrence of such polymers *in planta* is currently lacking. Previously, we demonstrated

that the single LysM domain of Ecp6 that is not involved in the composite ultra-high

affinity binding groove, LysM2, can suppress chitin-triggered immunity, indicative of an

additional mechanism besides competitive chitin oligosaccharide sequestration

(Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2013). Importantly, as argued above, we demonstrated in the

current study that Ecp6 does not undergo chitin-induced polymerization. Rather, as

proposed previously, LysM2 of Ecp6, but potentially also the dual domain LysM effectors,

may perturb the immune receptor dimerization that is required for the activation of

immune signaling (Liu et al., 2012), compromising the activation of chitin-triggered

immunity in turn (Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2013). To this end, these effectors may

physically block host immune receptor dimerization by binding to chitin oligomers that

are attached to host immune receptor monomers. Thus, future efforts should be

dedicated to discriminate LysM effector precipitation upon polymerization from

receptor complex perturbation for the dual-domain LysM effectors when naturally

produced by fungi at infection sites during host colonization, momentarily a technically

very challenging undertaking.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sequence alignment and three-dimensional protein structure prediction

LysM domains of proteins were predicted by InterPro (Finn *et al.*, 2017) and the

alignment of amino acid sequences was performed by ClustalX2. Protein structures were

predicted with I-TASSER (Roy et al., 2010; Yang and Zhang, 2015), Phyre2 (Kelley *et al.*,

2015) and AlphaFold (Jumper et al., 2021) based on the composite chitin binding groove

composed of LysM1 and LysM3 of Ecp6. Structures were viewed by the PyMOL

molecular graphics system, version 2 (Schrodinger LLC, 2015).

Heterologous protein production in *Pichia pastoris*

Protein sequences were analysed using SignalP4.0

(http://www.cbs.dtu.dk/services/SignalP; Petersen *et al.*, 2011) and the coding

sequences of mature proteins without signal peptide were amplified with primers listed

in Table S1, fused with an N-terminal 6×His-tag and cloned into expression vector pPIC9

(Thermo Fisher Scientific, California, USA). Correctness of the resulting constructs was

confirmed by DNA sequencing prior to introduction into *Pichia pastoris* strain GS115

(Thermo Fisher Scientific, California, USA). Fermentation was conducted in

approximately 3 L of culture in a bioreactor BioFlo120 (Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany)

at 30°C for 5 days, including 3 days of methanol induction. Next, *P. pastoris* cells were

pelleted by centrifugation at 3800 g at 4°C for 50 min and the supernatant was

concentrated to 200 ml using a Vivaflow 200 Cross Flow Cassette (5000NWCO; Sartorius,

Göttingen, Germany) at 4°C for approximately 20 h. The concentrated supernatant was

purified using His60 Ni Superflow resin (TaKaRa, California, USA) on a BioLogic LP

system (Bio-Rad, California, USA). Purified protein was analysed by protein

polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis followed by staining with Coomassie Brilliant Blue

(CBB) and dialyzed against 5 L of 50 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl to remove imidazole. Finally,

proteins were further concentrated using Amicon Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filter Units

(MERCK, Carrigtohill, Ireland) and stored at -20°C. Final concentrations of the four LysM

effectors are listed in Table S2.

Heterologous protein production in *E. coli*

386 Coding sequences of mature proteins without signal peptide were amplified with

387 primers listed in Table S1 and cloned into expression vector pETSUMO (Thermo Fisher

Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). Correctness of the resulting constructs pETSUMO-ChElp2 and pETSUMO-Vd2LysM were confirmed by DNA sequencing and introduced into *E. coli* strains BL21 and Origami, respectively. FLAG-ChElp2 was amplified using primers FLAG-ChElp2-F and ChElp2-R, cloned into pETSUMO and transformed into BL21. All proteins were produced at 28°C with 0.2 mM IPTG. Cell culture was pelleted by centrifugation at 4000 g for 40 min at 4°C, and the pellet was resuspended in 20 mL lysis buffer (Table S3), shaken at 4°C for at least two hours and centrifuged at 10,000 g for 1 h. The supernatant was collected and purified using His60 Ni Superflow resin (TaKaRa, California, USA) on a BioLogic LP system (Bio-Rad, California, USA). The resulting protein was dialyzed 3 L of 20 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 5 % glycerol, pH 8.0 while 5 μL of cleavage protein ULP1 was added into the dialysis membrane to cleave-off the 6×His-SUMO tag. Next day, protein solution was collected and subjected to purification using His60 Ni Superflow resin (TaKaRa, California, USA) to remove 6×His-SUMO tag from the protein preparations. Eventually, *E. coli*-produced ChElp2 and Vd2LysM were buffer exchanged in 20 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 5% glycerol, pH 8.0 and concentrated to 5 and 4.3 mg/mL respectively.

Glycoprotein staining assay

1 μL of concentrated *P. pastoris*-produced LysM protein solution was tested using a protein polyacrylamide gel followed by CBB and glycoprotein staining with the Pierce Glycoprotein Staining Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, California, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions, including the addition of horseradish peroxidase and soybean trypsin inhibitor as positive and negative control, respectively. *E. coli*-produced ChElp2 and Vd2LysM were incubated with chitin hexamer overnight and subjected to glycoprotein staining assay as described above.

Deglycosylation assay

Deglycosylation was performed PNGase F (MERCK, New Jersey, USA) and Protein Deglycosyaltion Mix II (New England biolabs, Massachusetts, United State) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Glycosylated fetuin was used as positive control. 5 µL of MoSlp1, Vd2LysM and ChElp2 were treated with 10 µL of PNGase F at 37°C for 16 hours, or with 10 µL of Protein Deglycosylation Mix II at 25°C for 30 min followed by incubation at 37°C for 16 hours. Protein samples were collected at different time points and analysed with protein polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis followed by CBB staining.

Crystallization conditions

Commercial kits PACT premier™ (Molecular dimensions, Sheffield, UK) and Salt^{RX}, Index^{TM}, Shotgun, PEG^{RX}, PEG/Ion screen (Hampton Research, California, USA) were used for initial screening. 96-well protein crystallization plates were prepared using a Crystal Phoenix robot (Art Robbins Instruments, California, USA). Chitohexaose (Megazyme, Wicklow, Ireland) was added in molar ratios of 3:1 and 1:1. The additive screening was conducted using the Additive Screen HR2-428 (Hampton Research, California, USA) and Tacsimate pH 7.0 (Hampton Research, California, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Co-immunoprecipitation assay

ChElp2 was produced in *E. coli* with either His-sumo-tag or FLAG-tag. 20 µM His-sumo-ChElp2 and 40 µM FLAG-ChElp2 were incubated either individually or together in a total volume of 600 µL in the absence and presence of 40 µM chitohexaose (Megazyme, Wicklow, Ireland) at room temperature for 4-6 h. His-tagged ChElp2 was pulled-down

with Dynabeads™ His-Tag (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) and the subsequent western blot analyses were performed with anti-His (Sigma, Missouri, USA) or anti-FLAG antibody (Sigma, Missouri, USA).

Isothermal titration calorimetry

Isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) experiments were performed at 25°C using a MicroCal PEAQ-ITC Automated (Malvern Panalytical, Worcestershire, UK) according to the manufacturer's instructions. *E. coli*-produced LysM proteins were buffer exchanged in 50 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 5% glycerol, pH 8.0. ChElp2 (20 µM) and ChElp2$^{T49W-T120W}$ (34 µM) were titrated with a first injection of 0.5 µL chitohexaose (Megazyme, Wicklow, Ireland) with a concentration of 200 µM that was prepared in the same buffer with LysM proteins, followed by another 20 injections of 2 µL. Data were analysed using Origin (OriginLab, Northampton, MA, USA) and fitted to a one-binding-site model.

Dynamic light scattering (DLS) measurements

LysM proteins were dialyzed against 20 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, pH 8.0 overnight and treated with 0.1% Triton X-100. Chitohexaose (Megazyme, Wicklow, Ireland) was incubated with LysM proteins in protein:chitin molar ratios of 1:0, 1:3 and 1:6 overnight. Next day, particle size distribution was measured with a Zetasizer Nano (Malvern Panalytical, Worcestershire, UK). The data was visualized with Zetasizer software.

Polymerization assays

LysM effector proteins were adjusted to a concentration of 200 µM and 200 µL of each protein was incubated with 200 µL of 2 mM diacetyl-chitobiose (Chi2), triacetyl-chitobiose (Chi3), tetraacetyl-chitotetraose (Chi4), pentaacetyl-chitopentaose (Chi5),

hexaacetyl-chitohexaose (Chi6) (Megazyme, Wicklow, Ireland), glucose (Merck,

Darmstadt, Germany), or 200 μL water as control, at room temperature overnight. The

next day, 2 μL of 0.2% methylene blue (Sigma-Aldrich, Missouri, USA) was added and

incubated for 30 min after which protein solutions were centrifuged at 20,000 g for 15

min. Photos were taken with a ChemiDoc XRS+ system (Bio-Rad, California, USA) with

custom setting for RFP or with a ChemiDoc system (Bio-Rad, California, USA) with the

setting of Coomassie Blue with white tray (Bio-rad, California, USA).

For limited digestion assay with thermolysin, 10 μL of ChElp2 (200 μM) was

incubated with 5 μL of 1 mg/ml thermolysin at 55°C for 3 hours. Protein samples were

collected at different time points and analysed with a protein polyacrylamide gel.

Subsequently, ChElp2 was digested with thermolysin for 1 h, deactivated the protease

according to manufacturer's instructions and incubated with chitin hexamer overnight.

The next day, 2 μL of 0.2% methylene blue (Sigma-Aldrich, Missouri, USA) was added

and incubated for 30 min. After centrifugation at 20,000 g for 15 min, photos were taken

with a ChemiDoc system (Bio-Rad, California, USA) with the setting of Coomassie Blue

with white tray (Bio-rad, California, USA).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

H.T. acknowledges receipt of a PhD fellowship from the China Scholarship Council (CSC)

and G.L.F acknowledges receipt of a PhD fellowship from the Coordination for the

Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) from the federal government of

Brazil. B.P.H.J.T acknowledges funding by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in

the framework of an Alexander von Humboldt Professorship endowed by the German

Federal Ministry of Education and Research, and is furthermore supported by the

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under

Germany´s Excellence Strategy – EXC 2048/1 – Project ID: 390686111. The authors

declare no conflict of interest exists.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

HT, JRM, BPHJT conceived the study; HT, JRM, BPHJT designed experiments; HT, GLF and

AK performed experiments; HT, JRM, BPHJT analyzed data and wrote the manuscript;

JRM and BPHJT supervised the project; all authors discussed the results and contributed

to the final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest exists.

REFERENCES

Altenbach D, Robatzek S (2007) Pattern recognition receptors: from the cell surface to intracellular dynamics. Mol Plant-Microbe Interact **20**: 1031–1039

Baker HM, Day CL, Norris GE, Baker EN (1994) Enzymatic deglycosylation as a tool for crystallization of mammalian binding proteins. Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr **50**: 380–384

Bateman A, Bycroft M (2000) The structure of a LysM domain from E. coli membrane-bound lytic murein transglycosylase D (MltD). J Mol Biol **299**: 1113–1119

Boller T, Felix G (2009) A renaissance of elicitors: perception of microbe-associated molecular patterns and danger signals by pattern-recognition receptors. Annu Rev Plant Biol **60**: 379–406

Bolton MD, Van Esse HP, Vossen JH, De Jonge R, Stergiopoulos I, Stulemeijer IJE, Van Den Berg GCM, Borrás-Hidalgo O, Dekker HL, De Koster CG, et al (2008) The novel Cladosporium fulvum lysin motif effector Ecp6 is a virulence factor with orthologues in other fungal species. Mol Microbiol **69**: 119–136

Cao Y, Liang Y, Tanaka K, Nguyen CT, Jedrzejczak RP, Joachimiak A, Stacey G (2014) The kinase LYK5 is a major chitin receptor in Arabidopsis and forms a chitin-induced complex with related kinase CERK1. Elife **3**: e03766

Cen K, Li B, Lu Y, Zhang S, Wang C (2017) Divergent LysM effectors contribute to the virulence of Beauveria bassiana by evasion of insect immune defenses. PLOS Pathog **13**: e1006604

Chen XL, Shi T, Yang J, Shi W, Gao X, Chen D, Xu X, Xu JR, Talbot NJ, Peng YL (2014) N-Glycosylation of effector proteins by an α-1,3-Mannosyltransferase is required for the rice blast fungus to evade host innate immunity. Plant Cell **26**: 1360–1376

Davis SJ, Puklavec MJ, Ashford DA, Harlos K, Jones EY, Stuart DI, Williams AF (1993) Expression of soluble recombinant glycoproteins with predefined glycosylation: application to the crystallization of the T-cell glycoprotein CD2. Protein Eng **6**: 229–232

Dessau MA, Modis Y (2011) Protein crystallization for X-ray crystallography. J Vis Exp **16**: 2285

Dolfors F, Holmquist L, Dixelius C, Tzelepis G (2019) A LysM effector protein from the
basidiomycete Rhizoctonia solani contributes to virulence through suppression of
chitin-triggered immunity. Mol Genet Genomics **294**: 1211–1218

Felix G, Regenass M, Boller T (1993) Specific perception of subnanomolar
concentrations of chitin fragments by tomato cells: Induction of extracellular
alkalinization, changes in protein phosphorylation, and establishment of a
refractory state. Plant J **4**: 307–316

Finn RD, Attwood TK, Babbitt PC, Bateman A, Bork P, Bridge AJ, Chang HY,
Dosztanyi Z, El-Gebali S, Fraser M, et al (2017) InterPro in 2017-beyond protein
family and domain annotations. Nucleic Acids Res **45**: D190–D199

Free SJ (2013) Fungal cell wall organization and biosynthesis. Adv Genet **81**: 33–82

Haltiwanger RS, Lowe JB (2004) Role of glycosylation in development. Annu Rev
Biochem **73**: 491–537

Jones JDG, Dangl JL (2006) The plant immune system. Nature **444**: 323–329

de Jonge R, van Esse P, Kombrink A, Shinya T, Desaki Y, Bours R, van der Krol S,
Shibuya N, Joosten MHAJ, Thomma BPHJ (2010) Conserved fungal LysM effector
Ecp6 prevents chitin-triggered immunity in plants. Science (80-) **329**: 953–955

Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O,
Tunyasuvunakool K, Bates R, Žídek A, Potapenko A, et al (2021) Highly accurate
protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature **596**: 583–589

Kelley LA, Mezulis S, Yates CM, Wass MN, Sternberg MJE (2015) The Phyre2 web
portal for protein modeling, prediction and analysis. Nat Protoc **10**: 845–858

Kombrink A, Rovenich H, Shi-Kunne X, Rojas-Padilla E, van den Berg GCM,
Domazakis E, de Jonge R, Valkenburg DJ, Sánchez-Vallet A, Seidl MF, et al
(2017) Verticillium dahliae LysM effectors differentially contribute to virulence on
plant hosts. Mol Plant Pathol **18**: 596–608

Kombrink A, Thomma BPHJ (2013) LysM effectors: secreted proteins supporting
fungal life. PLOS Pathog **9**: e1003769

Lenardon MD, Munro CA, Gow NA (2010) Chitin synthesis and fungal pathogenesis.
Curr Opin Microbiol **13**: 416–423

Liu T, Liu Z, Song C, Hu Y, Han Z, She J, Fan F, Wang J, Jin C, Chang J, Zhou JM, Chai J.
(2012) Chitin-induced dimerization activates a plant immune receptor. Science **336**:
1160-1164

Marshall R, Kombrink A, Motteram J, Loza-Reyes E, Lucas J, Hammond-Kosack KE,
Thomma BPHJ, Rudd JJ (2011) Analysis of two in planta expressed LysM effector
homologs from the fungus *Mycosphaerella graminicola* reveals novel functional
properties and varying contributions to virulence on wheat. Plant Physiol **156**:
756–769

Mentlak TA, Kombrink A, Shinya T, Ryder LS, Otomo I, Saitoh H, Terauchi R,
Nishizawa Y, Shibuya N, Thomma BPHJ, et al (2012) Effector-mediated
suppression of chitin-triggered immunity by *Magnaporthe oryzae* is necessary for
rice blast disease. Plant Cell **24**: 322–335

Miya A, Albert P, Shinya T, Desaki Y, Ichimura K, Shirasu K, Narusaka Y, Kawakami
N, Kaku H, Shibuya N (2007) CERK1, a LysM receptor kinase, is essential for chitin
elicitor signaling in Arabidopsis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **104**: 19613–19618

Moremen KW, Tiemeyer M, Nairn A V (2012) Vertebrate protein glycosylation:
diversity, synthesis and function. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol **13**: 448–462

Nagashima Y, von Schaewen A, Koiwa H (2018) Function of N-glycosylation in plants.
Plant Sci **274**: 70–79

Petersen TN, Brunak S, von Heijne G, Nielsen H (2011) SignalP 4.0: discriminating
signal peptides from transmembrane regions. Nat Methods **8**: 785–786

Petutschnig EK, Jones AME, Serazetdinova L, Lipka U, Lipka V (2010) The Lysin
Motif Receptor-like Kinase (LysM-RLK) CERK1 is a major chitin-binding protein in
Arabidopsis thaliana and subject to chitin-induced phosphorylation. J Biol Chem
285: 28902–28911

Proteau A, Shi R, Cygler M (2010) Application of dynamic light scattering in protein
crystallization. Curr Protoc Protein Sci **Chapter 17**: Unit 17 10

Rovenich H, Boshoven JC, Thomma BPHJ (2014) Filamentous pathogen effector
functions: Of pathogens, hosts and microbiomes. Curr Opin Plant Biol **20**: 96–103

Rovenich H, Zuccaro A, Thomma BP (2016) Convergent evolution of filamentous

microbes towards evasion of glycan-triggered immunity. New Phytol **212**: 896–901

Roy A, Kucukural A, Zhang Y (2010) I-TASSER: a unified platform for automated

protein structure and function prediction. Nat Protoc **5**: 725–738

Sanchez-Vallet A, Mesters JR, Thomma BPHJ (2015) The battle for chitin recognition

in plant-microbe interactions. FEMS Microbiol Rev **39**: 171–183

Sanchez-Vallet A, Saleem-Batcha R, Kombrink A, Hansen G, Valkenburg DJ,

Thomma BPHJ, Mesters JR (2013) Fungal effector Ecp6 outcompetes host immune

receptor for chitin binding through intrachain LysM dimerization. Elife **2**: e00790

Sánchez-Vallet A, Tian H, Rodriguez-Moreno L, Valkenburg D-J, Saleem-Batcha R,

Wawra S, Kombrink A, Verhage L, de Jonge R, van Esse HP, et al (2020) A

secreted LysM effector protects fungal hyphae through chitin-dependent

homodimer polymerization. PLoS Pathog **16**: 1–21

Schrodinger LLC (2015) The JyMOL Molecular Graphics Development Component,

Version 1.8.

Takahara H, Hacquard S, Kombrink A, Hughes HB, Halder V, Robin GP, Hiruma K,

Neumann U, Shinya T, Kombrink E, et al (2016) *Colletotrichum higginsianum*

extracellular LysM proteins play dual roles in appressorial function and

suppression of chitin-triggered plant immunity. New Phytol **211**: 1323–1337

Tang J, Sun Y, Han Z, Shi W (2019) An illustration of optimal selected glycosidase for N-

glycoproteins deglycosylation and crystallization. Int J Biol Macromol **122**: 265–271

Tian H, MacKenzie CI, Rodriguez-Moreno L, van den Berg GCM, Chen H, Rudd JJ,

Mesters JR, Thomma BPHJ (2021) Three LysM effectors of *Zymoseptoria tritici*

collectively disarm chitin-triggered plant immunity. Mol Plant Pathol 1–11

Wlodawer A, Dauter Z, Jaskolski M (2017) Protein crystallography: methods and

protocols. Humana Press **1607**: 672

Xu C, Ng DT (2015) Glycosylation-directed quality control of protein folding. Nat Rev

Mol Cell Biol **16**: 742–752

Yang J, Zhang Y (2015) I-TASSER server: new development for protein structure and

function predictions. Nucleic Acids Res **43**: W174-81

Zeng T, Rodriguez-Moreno L, Mansurkhodzaev A, Wang P, van den Berg W,

Gasciolli V, Cottaz S, Fort S, Thomma B, Bono JJ, et al (2020) A lysin motif

effector subverts chitin-triggered immunity to facilitate arbuscular mycorrhizal

symbiosis. New Phytol **225**: 448–460

Zhang X-C, Wu X, Findley S, Wan J, Libault M, Nguyen HT, Cannon SB, Stacey G

(2007) Molecular Evolution of Lysin Motif-Type Receptor-Like Kinases in Plants.

Plant Physiol **144**: 623–636

Zipfel C (2008) Pattern-recognition receptors in plant innate immunity. Curr Opin

Immunol **20**: 10–16

Figure 1. Conservation of chitin binding sites and of disulfide bond formation among Ecp6 and the four dual-domain LysM effectors. (A) Schematic representation of the four fungal dual-domain LysM effectors: *Magnaporthe oryzae* MoSlp1, *Verticillium dahliae* Vd2LysM, and *Colletotrichum higginsianum* ChElp1 and ChElp2. Signal peptides (grey boxes) were predicted with SignalP 4.0 (http://www.cbs.dtu.dk/services/SignalP-4.0/) and LysM domains (green boxes) with InterPro (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/interpro/). The amino acid numbers that compose the motif are indicated in the boxes. (B) Amino acid sequence alignment of the LysM domains of MoSlp1, Vd2LysM, ChElp1 and ChElp2 in comparison with those of Ecp6. The black lines indicate chitin-binding sites. (C) Amino acid sequences of Ecp6, MoSlp1, Vd2LysM, ChElp1 and ChElp2 with signal peptides in bold, LysM domains underlined and the putative *N*-glycosylation sites highlighted in blue with the asparagines that may be N-glycosylated in blue bold font. Cysteine residues involved in disulfide bond formation are indicated red and green with those involved in disulfide bonds within individual LysM domains in red, and those involved in the bond between LysM1 and the linkers between the two LysM domains in yellow.

Figure 2. *In-silico* prediction of the three-dimensional structures of MoSlp1, Vd2LysM,

ChElp1 and ChElp2. The prediction was conducted based on the composite chitin binding

groove composed of LysM1 and LysM3 of Ecp6 (Sánchez-Vallet et al., 2013) with Ecp6 in grey,

MoSlp1 in yellow, Vd2LysM in green, ChElp1 in blue, and ChElp2 in purple. Furthermore, for the

Phyre2 prediction, ChElp2 carrying an artificial insertion of 5-amino acid (GGSGG) in the linker

between the two LysMs is indicated in cyan. Red arrowheads indicate a chitin tetramer in the

Ecp6 LysM1-LysM3 binding groove. Purple and grey arrowheads indicate predicted disulphide

bonds for MoSlp1, ChElp1 and ChElp2 and disrupted linkers for the four dual-domain LysM

effectors, respectively. The red arrows indicate the questionable offset position of C99 in the

ChElp1 AlphaFold predicted structure (blue) and of C139 in the crystal structure of Ecp6 (grey).

All structures were visualized using the PyMOL molecular graphics system (Schrodinger LLC,

2015).

Figure 3. ChElp2 binds chitin via intermolecular LysM dimerization. (A) Two hypotheses for

chitin binding by dual-domain LysM effectors that may bind chitin through: (I) intermolecular

dimerization in which LysM effectors may undergo ligand-induced polymerization, or through:

(II) intramolecular dimerization that should not lead to polymerization. (B) *Escherichia coli*-

produced His-sumo-ChElp2 and FLAG-ChElp2 were incubated either individually in the presence

of chitin or together in the absence and presence of chitin for 4-6 hours. His-sumo-ChElp2 was

pulled-down by anti-His magnetic beads and the subsequent western blot analysis was

performed with either anti-FLAG or anti-His antibody. Green and red arrow heads indicate the

molecular sizes of His-sumo-Elp2 and FLAG-Elp2 on protein polyacrylamide gel, respectively.

Figure 4. ChElp2 undergoes chitin-induced polymerization. (A) ChElp2 particle size

distribution in protein solution with diameter values in nanometers (d.nm) measured by

dynamic light scattering (DLS). (B) Raw data and integrated heat measurements from isothermal

titration calorimetry of chitohexose binding to wild-type ChElp2 and the mutant ChElp2$^{T49W\text{-}}$

^{T120W} in which the threonine within each of the LysM domains that is critical for chitin binding

(LysM1, T49; LysM2, T120) was replaced by tryptophan. Lines in the lower panel represent

best-fit curves for a one binding-site model. (C) ChElp2 and ChElp2$^{T49W\text{-}T120W}$ were incubated

with chitin hexamer or water as control. After overnight incubation, methylene blue was added

and protein solutions were centrifuged, resulting in protein pellets (red arrowheads) as a

consequence of polymerization.

Figure 5. Chitin-binding and the physical association of the two LysM domains are required for ChElp2 polymerization. (A) 100 µM ChElp2 was incubated with 1 mM diacetyl-chitobiose (Chi2), triacetyl-chitotriose (Chi3), tetraacetyl-chitotetraose (Chi4), pentaacetyl-chitopentaose (Chi5), hexaacetyl-chitohexaose (Chi6) or glucose in a total volume of 400 µL. After overnight incubation, methylene blue was added and protein solutions were centrifuged, resulting in protein pellets that are indicated by red arrowheads. (B) 100 µM ChElp2 was incubated with Chi2 (3 mM), Chi3 (2 mM) and Chi4 (1.5 mM) in a total volume of 400 µL such that the final amount of GlcNAc units is the same for all incubations. After overnight incubation, methylene blue was added and protein solutions were centrifuged, resulting in protein pellets that are indicated by red arrowheads. (C) Amino acid sequence of the ChElp2 linker between the two LysMs with putative thermolysin cleavage sites indicated by green arrowheads. (D) *P. pastoris*-produced ChElp2 was incubated with thermolysin (T) for 3 hours, protein samples were collected at different time points and analysed on protein polyacrylamide gel. (E) *P. pastoris*-produced ChElp2 incubated with or without thermolysin for 1 hour, followed by overnight incubation with chitin hexamer or water. Methylene blue was added and the protein solutions were centrifuged, resulting in protein pellets that are indicated by red arrowheads.

Figure 6. Chitin-induced polymerization of dual-domain LysM effectors. (A) The LysM

effector proteins ChElp2, MoSlp1 and Vd2LysM, together with Ecp6 as negative control, were

incubated with chitin hexamer or water. After overnight incubation, methylene blue was added

and protein solutions were centrifuged, resulting in protein pellets that are indicated by red

arrowheads.