In *Mycobacterium abscessus*, the stringent factor Rel regulates metabolism, but is not the

only (p)ppGpp synthase.

Augusto César Hunt-Serracín[1], Misha I. Kazi[1], Joseph M. Boll[1], Cara C. Boutte[1]

[1]Department of Biology, University of Texas, Arlington

Abstract

The stringent response is a broadly conserved stress response system that exhibits

functional variability across bacterial clades. Here, we characterize the role of the

stringent factor Rel in the non-tuberculous mycobacterial pathogen, *Mycobacterium*

abscessus (*Mab*). We found that deletion of *rel* does not ablate (p)ppGpp synthesis, and

that *rel* does not provide a survival advantage in several stress conditions, or in antibiotic

treatment. Transcriptional data show that Rel$_{Mab}$ is involved in regulating expression of

anabolism and growth genes in stationary phase. However, it does not activate

transcription of stress response or antibiotic resistance genes, and actually represses

transcription of many antibiotic resistance genes. This work shows that there is an

unannotated (p)ppGpp synthetase in *Mab*.

Importance

In this study, we examined the functional roles of the stringent factor Rel in

Mycobacterium abscessus (Mab). In most species, stringent factors synthesize the

alarmone (p)ppGpp, which globally alters transcription to promote growth arrest and

survival under stress and in antibiotic treatment. Our work shows that in *Mab,* an emerging

pathogen which is resistant to many antibiotics, the stringent factor Rel is not solely

responsible for synthesizing (p)ppGpp. We find that Rel*Mab* downregulates many

metabolic genes under stress, but does not upregulate stress response genes and does

not promote antibiotic tolerance. This study implies that there is another critical but

unannotated (p)ppGpp synthetase in *Mab,* and suggests that Rel*Mab* inhibitors are unlikely

to sensitize *Mab* infections to antibiotic treatment.

Introduction

Bacteria must adjust their physiology to permit survival in fluctuating conditions.

The stringent response is a conserved signaling system that promotes survival of many

species in stress and antibiotics by altering the transcription of about a quarter of the

genome (1–5). In this work, we profile the role of Rel, the sole annotated stringent factor,

in the non-tuberculous, rapidly-growing *Mycobacterium abscessus* (*Mab*). *Mab* is an

opportunistic pathogen that both lives in the environment, and causes skin and respiratory

infections which are increasingly prevalent in Cystic Fibrosis patients (6). *Mab* infections

are difficult to treat due to intrinsic resistance to many antibiotics (7), and high tolerance

under stress to almost all antibiotics tested (8, 9). One proposed strategy to help treat

such antibiotic-recalcitrant infections is to inhibit regulatory systems, like the stringent

response, which promotes antibiotic tolerance (10–13).

The conserved aspect of the stringent response is the synthesis, upon stress, of

the hyperphosphorylated guanine (p)ppGpp. Once made, (p)ppGpp affects transcription

in different ways (14–17) and also directly modulates replication (18, 19), nucleotide

metabolism (20–22), ribosome maturation (23, 24) and translation (25–27).

There are a handful of different protein families that synthesize (p)ppGpp across bacterial clades. The most widely conserved are the Rel/Spo Homolog or RSH proteins, which contain, from N-terminus to C-terminus, a (p)ppGpp hydrolase domain, a (p)ppGpp synthase domain, and regulatory TGS and ACT domains (28). Some RSH proteins associate with the ribosome and sense amino acid starvation by detecting when ribosomes have stalled due to an uncharged tRNA being in the A site (29, 30). Some RSH proteins detect other types of stress or nutrient deprivation via other mechanisms (31–34). Many species have only one RSH-type protein, which is competent for both (p)ppGpp hydrolysis and synthesis (28). Many species encode Small Alarmose Synthetase (SAS) and Small Alarmone Hydrolase (SAH) proteins, which contain only (p)ppGpp synthetase and hydrolase domains respectively (30, 35–38). Because SAS proteins do not have regulatory domains, they are typically controlled transcriptionally (30). There are a few other (p)ppGpp synthesizing domains that have been preliminarily studied. ToxSAS proteins are part of toxin-antitoxin systems and synthesize (p)ppGpp as a toxin - these are found in both phage and bacterial genomes (39). *Streptomyces antibioticus* has a polynucleotide phosphorylase (PNPase) which can also synthesize (p)ppGpp (40–43).

The physiological outputs of the stringent response vary across species, but there are conserved themes. First, the stringent response generally downregulates genes required for growth, such as ribosome and cell wall synthesis factors, and it alters transcription of central metabolism to prioritize survival rather than construction of new cells (2, 3, 17, 44). Stringent inhibition of growth (44–50) indirectly protects against some stresses and antibiotics that interfere with growth factors. In many species, the stringent

response upregulates stress response genes such as heat shock proteins, hibernation

factors, and stress-specific transcription factors (3, 51, 52) and promotes survival in stress

(13). The stringent response also helps many bacteria survive through antibiotic treatment

by promoting antibiotic tolerance (12).

The stringent response has been studied in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (*Mtb*) and

Mycobacterium smegmatis (*Msmeg*). *Mtb* has one major (p)ppGpp synthetase, Rel$_{Mtb}$

which makes (p)ppGpp when respiration is inhibited, in stationary phase, and in total

carbon and nitrogen starvation (46, 53). Rel$_{Mtb}$ also promotes survival of *Mtb* during

nutrient and oxygen starvation, stationary phase (46) and chronic infection of mice (1)

and guinea pigs (54, 55). Importantly, Rel$_{Mtb}$ also makes *Mtb* more tolerant to the first-

line clinical antibiotic isoniazid during starvation and infection in mice (11). A PNPase

enzyme in *Mtb*, Rv2783, has been shown to have weak (p)ppGpp synthetase activity (56),

and the *Mtb* genome contains another gene with a predicted GTP pyrophosphokinase

domain, Rv1366. However, the Δ*rel*$_{Mtb}$ strain does not synthesize measurable (p)ppGpp

in starvation conditions (46), so these other potential synthetases are either inactive or

not activated in the conditions tested.

Msmeg has an RSH protein, Rel$_{Msmeg}$, which can both synthesize and hydrolyze

(p)ppGpp (57–60). Although the Δ*rel*$_{Msmeg}$ strain showed defects in biofilm formation and

stationary phase viability, it can still synthesize (p)ppGpp (57, 61). The secondary

(p)ppGpp synthetase, RelZ$_{Msmeg}$, has an RNaseHII domain in addition to the conserved

SAS ppGpp synthetase domain (59), and also synthesizes pGpp (62). Strains missing

both synthetases have further biofilm and aggregation defects, but can still synthesize

some (p)ppGpp (62), indicating that there is a third, uncharacterized synthetase in

Msmeg.

In this study we examined the Δ*rel* strain of *Mab.* Rel$_{Mab}$ is an RSH protein. There

are no other RSH genes, and no SAS genes in the *Mab* genome. We found that the

Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ strain still makes (p)ppGpp. The Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ strain does not exhibit survival defects in

several stress conditions including antibiotic treatment, but has a growth defect relative

to wild type. We measured transcriptional changes in Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ relative to wild type and

found it helps downregulate many metabolic pathways in stationary phase.

Results

In order to explore the role of *rel*$_{Mab,}$ we built a strain of *Mab* ATCC19977 with a deletion

of the *rel* gene (MAB_2876), which has the canonical RSH gene structure, including a

(p)ppGpp hydrolase domain, a (p)ppGpp synthetase domain, a TGS domain and an ACT

domain. We measured (p)ppGpp in both the wild-type *Mab* and Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ strains, in

logarithmic phase and carbon starvation (Fig. 1). We found that both the wild-type and

Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ strain produce (p)ppGpp in both log. phase and starvation, and the amount of

ppGpp is increased in both strains in starvation.

In many species, *rel* orthologues promote survival during stress conditions, such as

stationary phase, acid stress, starvation, or oxidative stress (5, 35, 46, 49, 63, 64). To

evaluate the physiological role of *rel* in *Mab*, we assayed survival of wild-type, Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ and

complemented strains upon and after transfer to either carbon starvation (Fig. 2A), salt

stress (Fig. 2B), oxidative stress, (Fig. 2C) or acidic media (Fig. 2D). Treatment with these

stressors did not induce measurable differences in growth or survival of Δrel_{Mab} relative

to wild-type and the complemented strain. Thus, Rel$_{Mab}$ does not regulate responses to

these stresses under the conditions tested, or at least not enough to affect growth or

survival. We also found that Rel$_{Mab}$ does not promote survival in stationary phase (Fig.

3A). Robust survival in the Δrel_{Mab} in all stress conditions is likely aided by the continued

synthesis of (p)ppGpp under stress (Fig. 1). Growth curves showed that Δrel_{Mab} had a

significant growth defect relative to wild type and complemented strains (Fig. 3B).

Because the stringent response is a major activator of antibiotic tolerance and

persistence in many species (5, 65, 66), we sought to assess how Rel contributes to

antibiotic tolerance in *Mab.* First, we treated *Mab* cultures in logarithmic phase with

amikacin, clarithromycin and cefoxitin, which are commonly prescribed to treat *Mab*

infections (67). We found that clarithromycin and cefoxitin alone were ineffective against

all of the strains (Fig. 4A). However, amikacin treatment resulted in 10-100-fold decrease

in viability of wild-type and complemented strains, but had no effect on Δrel_{Mab}.

Antibiotic tolerance increases in stationary phase in most bacterial species relative

to logarithmic phase (5, 68). We repeated the antibiotic survival experiments on cultures

in stasis and found that Rel$_{Mab}$ does not affect tolerance to clarithromycin or cefoxitin (Fig.

4B). Similar to amikacin treatment in growth, Rel$_{Mab}$ increased susceptibility relative to

wild type and the complemented strains in stasis.

A major function of the stringent response in other bacteria is to regulate

transcription (4). To determine the effects of Rel$_{Mab}$ on transcription, we compared the

trancriptome of wild-type and Δrel_{Mab} in both logarithmic and stationary phases using

RNASeq. We found that Rel$_{Mab}$ represses many more genes than it activates (File. S1).

In logarithmic phase (OD=0.5), when Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ grows more slowly relative to wild

type (Fig. 3B), we found 150 genes repressed by *rel*$_{Mab}$ in the wild-type strain at least 3-

fold, and only 7 genes were activated. The only annotated upregulated genes are an

efflux pump (MAB_0677) and a major facilitator superfamily (MFS) transporter

(MAB_0069). We found several *mce* family genes that were repressed by *rel*$_{Mab}$ (Table

S2). Mce proteins are typically lipid transporters, but they also play roles in host cell entry

and immune modulation (69). We also found two antibiotic resistance genes that are

repressed by *rel*$_{Mab}$ in logarithmic phase (Table 1).

Even though there was no apparent difference in survival between the wild-type

and Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ strains in stationary phase, we observed significant differences in

transcription. We isolated RNA from stationary phase cultures that were shaken for 48

hours after being diluted to OD=0.05. We found hundreds of genes that were repressed

by *rel*$_{Mab}$ in the wild type strain in stationary phase, but none that were activated by *rel*$_{Mab}$

3-fold or more. We found many genes in the WhiB7 regulon (Table 1) which are repressed

in stationary phase, though they are mostly unaffected in logarithmic phase. WhiB7 is a

transcription factor that activates many antibiotic resistance genes and promotes

resistance to many classes of antibiotics in *Mab* (70). It is notable that these antibiotic

resistance genes are repressed by *rel*$_{Mab}$ in stasis, which would imply that wild type *Mab*

would be more susceptible to antibiotics in this condition, which is what we see in

amikacin treatment. In the case of clarithromycin and cefoxitin, increased tolerance

through downregulation of target expression may counterbalance the repression of the

antibiotic resistance genes, resulting in no differences in susceptibility in our assays (Fig.

4).

We also found several cell wall biosynthetic genes that are downregulated by *rel*$_{Mab}$

in stationary phase (Table S2). Downregulation of growth factors is typical in stringent

responses across many bacterial species (3, 47, 66, 71, 72). We see that *rel*$_{Mab}$

downregulates many central metabolism genes in stationary phase (Fig. 5, Table S3),

which shows that when Rel is present, it contributes to the decrease in central carbon

metabolism during stress. However, it is notable that not all the genes in a given pathway

are downregulated equally. We hypothesize that this uneven regulation of certain

pathways may allow certain metabolites to accumulate and be re-directed to other

pathways. In a metabolic pathway where most of the enzymes are downregulated, we

expect that the product of a single gene that is not downregulated will accumulate. We

note that many of the metabolites we expect to accumulate converge on the NAD

synthesis pathway. In addition, none of the genes in the NAD synthesis pathway are

downregulated by *rel*$_{Mab}$, which implies that continued metabolism of NAD, which is a

critical cofactor in many pathways, may be important in stationary phase.

From our preliminary analysis, it is clear that Rel$_{Mab}$ helps regulate growth and

central metabolism, and affects expression of antibiotic resistance genes; however, it

does not seem to upregulate specific stress responses in the conditions tested.

Discussion

Mtb, Msmeg and *Mab* all have a stringent response, but they have evolved use of different

sets of genes to synthesize the same alarmone. The *Mab* genome encodes only one

annotated RSH gene, *rel*$_{Mab}$ (MAB_2876), and no homologs of SAS or SAH genes. *rel*$_{Mab}$

is homologous to RSH genes in *Mtb* and *Msmeg*. We found that the Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ strain could

still produce (p)ppGpp, consistent with the presence of an unannotated (p)ppGpp

synthase. *Mab* does not have a homolog of the SAS-RNaseHII *relZ*, which has been

characterized in *Msmeg* (57, 59, 62). Despite this, *Msmeg* and *Mab* are similar in having

significant (p)ppGpp synthesis in the absence of the RSH gene (Fig. 1) (53), and in

exhibiting greater survival with some antibiotics (Fig. 4) (61, 68). *Mab* does have a

homolog of the PNPase which has been shown to be capable of (p)ppGpp synthesis in

Mtb (MAB_3106c) (56). MAB_3106c is transcriptionally upregulated 4-fold in the Δ*rel*

strain compared to wild-type in stationary phase, indicating that the presence of Rel may

decrease the need for transcription of this gene. In the wild-type strain, this gene is also

upregulated ~7 fold in stationary phase compared in log. phase, indicating that this gene

is used in stress. We therefore propose MAB_3106c as a possible additional (p)ppGpp

synthase.

Our results show that the stringent factor Rel$_{Mab}$ does not promote survival during *in*

vitro stress, though it does promote growth during logarithmic phase (Fig. 2, 3A). Our

transcriptomics analysis corroborate these results, as they indicate that Rel$_{Mab}$ does not

upregulate stress response genes, but does alter transcription of growth metabolism

genes (Table S2, Supplemental file 1). It is possible that increases in (p)ppGpp stimulate

transcription of stress response genes in *Mab*, as is seen in other species (3, 52, 73, 74)

– our experiments did not test this because in our assays Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ synthesizes comparable

amounts of (p)ppGpp as wild-type (Fig. 1). The unannotated ppGpp synthase may

contribute to stress response signaling. Our transcriptional data show that Rel$_{Mab}$ is

involved in downregulating metabolism for growth arrest (Fig. 5, S2) even though

(p)ppGpp levels are still present in the Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ strain. There is precedent for metabolic

genes being regulated separately from stress response genes in the stringent response.

In *E. coli*, some metabolic genes are repressed at a lower (p)ppGpp level than is required

to induce a regulon of stress response genes (75). (p)ppGpp likely does not directly bind

RNAP in mycobacteria as it does in *E. coli* (76), and it is currently unknown how it exerts

its effects on transcription. Further knowledge of the functioning of the mycobacterial

stringent response will be required before we can speculate about the mechanism by

which (p)ppGpp could differentially affect transcription of metabolic and stress response

genes in *Mab.*

Mab is notorious for having resistance to many clinical antibiotics and expressing

many antibiotic resistance genes (70, 77, 78), which is why it is problematic to treat

infections in cystic fibrosis patients (79). We observed in our transcriptional data that

Rel$_{Mab}$ downregulated numerous antibiotic resistance genes in stationary phase (Table

1). In other species RSH proteins promote antibiotic tolerance (5, 11, 66) and sometimes

also increase expression of antibiotic resistance genes (80, 81). Studies are ongoing to

find drugs that would inhibit (p)ppGpp synthesis by RSH proteins (11, 13), as such drugs

are expected to increase susceptibility to clinically available antibiotics. Our results

indicate that Rel$_{Mab}$ inhibitors, should they become available, are unlikely to help treat

Mab infections. Instead, efforts should focus on identifying the other (p)ppGpp

synthetase(s) in *Mab* so that it can be explored as a drug target.

Materials and Methods

Construction of strains. Primers 1233 – 1238 (Table S3) were used to amplify a 502 bp segment upstream of *Mab rel* which included the start codon, a 448 bp segment downstream of Mab *rel* which included the stop codon, and a 788 bp ZeoR cassette. All 3 segments were stitched together by PCR to form the Δ*rel*::zeoR double stranded recombineering knockout construct. Δ*rel*_{*Mab*} was generated through double stranded recombineering, as previously described (82) (Fig. S1C). Colonies from the transformation of the Δ*rel*::zeoR construct were PCR checked by using primers 1424-761, 1235-1236, and 762-1425 (Fig. S1A). To make the complemented strain, the *rel*_{*Mab*} gene was amplified through PCR using primers 1329-1330 and inserted into pKK216 (83) with NdeI and HindIII. This new plasmid, pCB1248, was transformed into the Δ*rel*_{Mab} mutant strain in order to create the complementation strain, Δ*rel*_{Mab} *L5::rel*_{Mab}, in which *rel*_{*Mab*} expression is driven by a constitutive promoter (BN17, Fig.S1B).

Media and culture conditions. All *M. abscessus* ATCC 19977 wild-type and mutant cultures were started in 7H9 (Becton, Dickinson, Franklin Lakes, NJ) medium with 5 g/liter bovine serum albumin, 2 g/liter dextrose, 0.85 g/liter NaCl, 0.003 g/liter catalase, 0.2% glycerol, and 0.05% Tween 80 and shaken overnight at 37° C until cultures entered logarithmic phase. For starvation and other specific assays, Hartmans-de Bont (HdB) minimal medium was made as described previously (84). Cultures were inoculated to OD_{600} 0.05, unless otherwise stated. All CFU time points were plated on Luria-Bertani (LB) agar and placed in 37° C incubator for 4 days.

Mab (p)ppGpp extraction and detection. _Mab_ strains were grown until logarithmic

phase (OD_{600} 0.5) in homemade 7H9 medium. To maximize ^{32}P-labeling, 7H9 medium

with 1/25 of normal phosphate levels was used (46). Logarithmic phase _Mab_ cells were

pelleted and resuspended in 1mL of low phosphate 7H9, followed by the addition of ^{32}P-

labeled orthophosphoric acid to a final concentration of 100 µCi/mL. ^{32}P-labeled cells

were then incubated at 37° C and shaken at 200 rpm for 4 h. Following incubation, cells

were pelleted and resuspended with 100 µL of TBST (Tris-buffer saline pH 8, with 0.05%

Tyloxapol), and treated with 1 mg/mL of lysozyme on ice for 20 minutes. Equal volume 2

M Formic acid was then added to each sample, followed by a 5 minute centrifugation at

max speed. Supernatant was then collected for each sample and stored in -20° C. For

starvation cultures, a second set of log phase _Mab_ strains (OD_{600} 0.5) were washed and

resuspended in TBST. Addition of ^{32}P-labeled orthophosphoric acid, and (p)ppGpp

extraction was performed similarly as logarithmic phase cultures.. Following extraction,

20 µL of extract from all cultures were spotted on PEI-cellulose TLC plates and developed

in 1.5 M Potassium monophosphate buffer (pH 3.4). The plates were then air dried and

placed on a phosphor screen (Molecular dynamics) overnight. The phosphor screens

were scanned with a Storm 860 scanner (Amersham Biosciences) and images were

analyzed with ImageQuant software (Molecular Dynamics).

Δ_rel_$_{Mab}$ stress assays. For all stress assays, strains were prepared and grown into

logarithmic phase. Unless otherwise stated, cultures for stress assays were done in 24-

well plates and shaken at 130 rpm at 37° C. For carbon starvation, strains were inoculated

in 30 mL inkwells in HdB minimal media with no glycerol, and with Tyloxapol as a

detergent. For acid stress, strains were inoculated in 7H9 medium pH 4. For osmotic

stress, strains were inoculated in LB broth medium with 1M salt (ACS Sodium Chloride,

VWR Chemicals BDH). For oxidative stress, all strains were inoculated in complete HdB

minimal medium, which does not contain catalase, and strains were exposed to different

concentrations of tert-Butyl Hydroperoxide (Alfa Aesar). CFU time points were taken upon

inoculation, at 1, 3, and 24 h post-inoculation.

Δ*rel*$_{Mab}$ growth curve and stationary phase survival. Log-phase cultures of all strains

were inoculated to OD 0.05 in 30 mL inkwells in 7H9 media. Cultures were then placed

in shaking incubator at 37° C and 130 rpm. CFU time points were then taken throughout

a 12-hour period. For stationary phase survival, a second set of cultures were grown into

stationary phase up to 48 h. Initial CFU time-point was taken at 48 h after dilution of

logarithmic phase samples to OD$_{600}$ 0.05, with subsequent time points taken at 5, 6, 7, 8,

9, and 10 d.

Antibiotic assays. For the logarithmic phase experiments, strains were kept in

logarithmic phase in 7H9 for t~24 h and diluted to OD$_{600}$ 0.05 and treated with either 150

μg/mL of amikacin, 200 μg/mL clarythromycin, or 80 μg/mL of cefoxitin. These antibiotic

concentrations were chosen because they were shown in a previous study to cause killing

of *Mab* in certain conditions (9). CFUs were measured upon treatment (t=0) and 48 h after

treatment (t=48). For stationary phase, logarithmic phase cells at OD$_{600}$ 0.05 were shaken

for 48 h and then treated as above. CFUs were measured upon treatment and 72 h after

treatment.

RNA isolation, library preparation and data analysis. RNA from three biological

replicates of each strain and condition was isolated as previously described (85) with

some modifications. After growth for t~24 hours in either logrithmic or stationary phase,

cells were transferred to 15 mL conical tubes and centrifuged at 4° C for 3 min at 1467 x

g. Cell pellets were immediately resuspended in 750 µl of TriZol (Invitrogen) and lysed by

bead beating. RNA was purified according to protocol with the Zymogen Direct-zol RNA

Miniprep Plus (cat. No 2070). RNA was processed for Illumina sequencing using the

TRuSeq Total RNA Library Prep from Illumina, with bacterial rRNA removal probes

provided separately by Illumina. Sequencing was performed using Illumina NovaSeq at

the North Texas Genome Center at the University of Texas in Arlington.

Between 50-300 million pair-end reads per library were mapped to the *M.*

abscessus subs. abscessus strain ATCC 19977 published genome using CLC Genomic

Workbench software (Qiagen). To minimize the skewing effect that certain PCR jackpots

had on the data, we adjusted the number of reads mapped from each library so the

median reads per gene were equivalent within an experiment. In the logarithmic phase

samples, the median reads per gene was ~600. In the stationary phase samples, the

median reads per gene was ~100. After normalization, the Reads Per Kilobase Million

(RPKM) values were determined for each gene, and the weighted proportion fold change

of RPKM between wild type and Δrel_{Mab} for each condition were calculated by CLC

Workbench. The Baggerley's test was used to generate a false discovery rate corrected

P-value. We used an arbitrary cut-off of 3-fold change with a false-discovery rate

corrected $P \leq 0.05$ to identify significantly differentially regulated genes between wild type

and Δrel_{Mab} in each condition. Because the median reads per gene for logarithmic phase

samples was 6 times higher than for stationary phase samples, we linearly scaled the

fold-change values when comparing logarithmic to stationary phase data to normalize for

this difference in read depth.

Real-time PCR (Supplemental data). For RNA-seq validation, real-time PCR (RT-PCR)

was performed with the Kapa Biosystems Sybr Fast One-Step qRT-PCR kit. RNA was

extracted in triplicates from each *Mab* strain as previously described. Primers for reverse-

transcription (RT) were designed for each gene of interest by using Primer3 (Table S3).

Each 20 µL RT reaction mixture contained 10 µL One-step SYBR green Master Mix, 1 µL

of each primer, 4.5 µL nuclease-free water, 0.5 µL of qScript One-step RT, and 3 µL of

RNA. RT-PCR was done by using Bio-Rad CFX Connect Real-time system. The relative

target levels (fold change) were calculated using the ΔΔCt method (86), with

normalization of RNA targets to TetR transcription factor gene (MAB_1638).

Acknowledgements. This work was funded by a Pilot and Feasibility Award from the

Cystic Fibrosis Foundation to CCB and by funding from the National Institutes of Health

(grant AI1468269 and GM143053 to JMB).

Table 1. Antibiotic Resistance Genes – (Under whiB7 regulon)*

Mab GENE Annotation	FC-Δrel_{Mab}/ vs. WT LOG	FDR-corrected *P* value Δrel_{Mab} / vs. WT LOG	FC-Δrel_{Mab} / vs.WT Stat.	FDR-corrected *P* value Δrel_{Mab} / vs. WT Stat.	FC-WT.stat/ WT.log	FDR-corrected *P* value WT.Log vs. WT.Stat	Mab GO. Mol. function
MAB_0163c	+2	1.1E-04	+40	5.1E-12	+2	1.7E-311	Aminoglycoside Phosphotransferase
MAB_0185c	+1	0.3	+5.4	6.4E-03	-5.4	0	Arabinosyl Transferase*
MAB_0186c	+1	0.8	+9.7	1.8E-04	-7.4	0	Arabinosyl Transferase*
MAB_1341	+1	0.45	+34	2.3E-11	-1.3	5.5E-13	Decarboxylase*
MAB_1342	+1.4	0.03	+14	0	-1	0	Acyl-CoA synthetase*
MAB_1395	+2.7	1.3E-04	+48	5.2E-10	+1	7.2E-29	Transporter*
MAB_1396	+2.5	3.7E-06	+36	0	-1	0	Multidrug MFS transporter
MAB_1846	-1.3	0.44	+28	4.2E-06	-1.4	2.9E-265	ABC transporter*
MAB_2273	+2.3	8.8E-12	+101	1.96E-08	+2.2	0	MFS transporter*
MAB_2297	+1.5	0.02	+99.2	7.1E-08	-2.1	0	Methyltransferase-erm41*
MAB_2310	+1.3	0.5	+5.7	0.03	+3.6	1.5E-50	Multidrug transporter

MAB_2355c	+2.2	1.5E-08	+17	0	+2.8	0	ABC transporter*
MAB_2396	+2.1	8.2E-03	+18	7.3E-09	+1.5	4.5E-122	Probably acetyltransferase*
MAB_2640c	+1.2	0.122	+5	5.4E-03	-2.4	0	Mmr - multidrug transport integral membrane protein
MAB_2736c	+1	0.6	+13	1.99E-10	-3.7	0	ABC transporter
MAB_2780c	+1.7	0.01	+27	1.14E-07	+3.3	0	MFS transporter*
MAB_2807	-1	0.7	+5	4.4E-03	-4.7	0	MFS transporter
MAB_2875	+5.4	9.7E-06	+38	0	+1.2	1.6E-171	Beta-lactamase
MAB_2989	+2	5.1E-04	+6.8	2.9E-05	+2.93	1.1E-222	Chloramphenicol acetyltransferase
MAB_3042c	+2.7	1.9E-12	+24	0	+1.82	0	GTpase-Hflx*
MAB_3467c	+6	2.5E-03	+21	0	+92	0	Heat shock protein*
MAB_3508c	+1.8	0.3	+31	0.08	+14	0.38	WhiB7
MAB_3762	+2	2.4E-09	+11	2.9E-10	+7.09	4.9E-143	Membrane protein*
MAB_3869c	-1.3	0.158	+6.7	5.4E-03	-1.67	0	DNA directed RNA polymerase*
MAB_4294	+1.8	3.1E-03	+28	0	+1.88	0	Aminotransferase*
MAB_4395	+2.4	0	+8	8.8E-07	+1.1	0	Aminoglycoside- 2'-N-acetyltransferase
MAB_4837	+4.6	0	+26	0	+1.84	1.9E-312	Aminoglycoside phosphotransferase

347 **Figures**

Figure 1. Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) of nucleotides extracted from _M._

abscessus strains. Guanine nucleotides extracted from ^{32}P-labeled _M. abscessus_

strains from logarithmic phase and starvation.

A. Survival during carbon starvation

B. Survival in acidic medium

C. Survival during osmotic stress

D. Survival during oxidative stress

Figure 2. Contribution of rel_{Mab} to survival in various stresses. (A) Colony-forming

units (CFU) of wild type *Mycobacterium abscessus* strain ATCC19977 (blue), Δrel_{Mab}

(red), and the complemented strain Δrel_{Mab} L5::rel_{Mab} (green) in Hartman's du Bont

medium with no glycerol and Tyloxapol as a detergent. (B) CFU in 7H9 Middlebrook

medium with a pH of 4. (C) CFU in Lennox LB with 1M of NaCl. (D) CFU in Hartmans du

Bont medium with 5mM, 25mM or 60mM of tert-butyl peroxide after 24 hours. Relative

CFU is calculated by taking the ratio between each CFU value and the initial CFU value

at time zero. All data points are an average of three biological replicates. Error bars

represent standard deviation. There are no significant differences in any of these data by

a two-tailed student's t-test.

A. Survival of Δrel_{Mab} in stationary phase

B. Growth of Δrel_{Mab}

Figure 3. Growth and stationary phase survival of Δrel_{Mab}. (A) Colony-forming units
(CFU) in stationary phase in 7H9 media. The 2 day time point is 48 hours after diluting
logarithmic phase cultures to OD_{600}=0.05. (B) CFU during logarithmic phase growth in
7H9 medium. Graph is set at a log2 scale. Doubling-times ± 95% confidence interval =
wild type 2.15 h ± 0.08; Δrel_{Mab} 4.67 h ± 4.26; Δrel_{Mab} L5::rel_{Mab}; Δrel_{Mab} L5::rel_{Mab} 2.84 ±
1.85. *P*-values are for the wild-type compared to Δrel_{Mab}. *P*-values for t=4, *P* = 0.0415;
t=7, *P* = 0.00015; t=10, *P* =0.006; t=12, *P* =0.00029. *P*-values between wild-type and the
complemented strain were not significant. *P*- values between strains in stationary phase
were not significant (data not shown). Asterisks represent significance as measured by

375 the two-tailed student's *t* -test; * = *P* ≤ 0.05 ; ** = *P* ≤ 0.01 ; *** = *P* ≤ 0.001; n.s. = *P* >

376 0.05.

Figure 4. Contribution of *rel_{Mab}* to survival in antibiotic treatment. Relative Colony-forming units (CFUs) of strains treated with either 200 µg/mL of clarithromycin (Clar), 150 µg/mL of amikacin (Amk), or 80 µg/mL of cefoxitin (Fox) for either (A) 48 h in logarithmic phase or (B) 72 h in stationary phase. Relative CFUs were calculated by taking the ratio between the CFU value after treatment and the initial CFU value at time zero. The bars represent the mean of 6-9 biological replicates, the individual values are shown by the dots. Error bars represent standard deviation. Logarithmic phase *P*-values: (Amk150) WT vs. Δ*rel_{Mab}* = 0.005; WT vs. Δ*rel_{Mab}* L5::*rel_{Mab}* = 0.01; Δ*rel_{Mab}* vs. Δ*rel_{Mab}* L5::*rel_{Mab}* = 0.004 . Stationary phase *P*-values: (AMK150) WT vs Δ*rel_{Mab}* = 0.00017; WT vs. Δ*rel_{Mab}* L5::*rel_{Mab}* = 0.0217; Δ*rel_{Mab}* vs. Δ*rel_{Mab}* L5::*rel_{Mab}* = 0.0017. Asterisks represent significance as measured by the two-tailed student's *t*-test; * = $P ≤ 0.05$; ** = $P ≤ 0.01$; *** = $P ≤ 0.001$; n.s. = $P > 0.05$.

Figure 5. Repression of central metabolic genes by Rel*Mab* during stationary phase.

Genes in red are downregulated by Rel*Mab* at least 3-fold in stationary phase, $P < 0.05$.

Genes in black are not significantly regulated by Rel$_{Mab}$ in stationary phase. See Table

S4 for data.

<u>References</u>

1. Dahl JL, Kraus CN, Boshoff HIM, Doan B, Foley K, Avarbock D, Kaplan G, Mizrahi V, Rubin

H, Barry CE. 2003. The role of RelMtb-mediated adaptation to stationary phase in long-

term persistence of Mycobacterium tuberculosis in mice. Proceedings of the National

Academy of Sciences 100:10026–10031.

2. Traxler MF, Summers SM, Nguyen H-T, Zacharia VM, Hightower GA, Smith JT, Conway T.

2008. The global, ppGpp-mediated stringent response to amino acid starvation in

Escherichia coli. Molecular Microbiology 68:1128–1148.

3. Boutte CC, Crosson S. 2011. The complex logic of stringent response regulation in

Caulobacter crescentus: starvation signalling in an oligotrophic environment. Molecular

Microbiology 80:695–714.

4. Hauryliuk V, Atkinson GC, Murakami KS, Tenson T, Gerdes K. 2015. Recent functional

insights into the role of (p)ppGpp in bacterial physiology. Nat Rev Microbiol 13:298–309.

5. Harms A, Fino C, Sørensen MA, Semsey S, Gerdes K. 2017. Prophages and Growth

Dynamics Confound Experimental Results with Antibiotic-Tolerant Persister Cells. mBio 8.

6.   Johansen MD, Herrmann J-L, Kremer L. 2020. Non-tuberculous mycobacteria and the rise

of Mycobacterium abscessus. Nat Rev Microbiol https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-020-

0331-1.

7.   Nessar R, Cambau E, Reyrat JM, Murray A, Gicquel B. 2012. Mycobacterium abscessus: a

new antibiotic nightmare. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 67:810–818.

8.   Clary G, Sasindran SJ, Nesbitt N, Mason L, Cole S, Azad A, McCoy K, Schlesinger LS, Hall-

Stoodley L. 2018. *Mycobacterium abscessus* Smooth and Rough Morphotypes Form

Antimicrobial-Tolerant Biofilm Phenotypes but Are Killed by Acetic Acid. Antimicrobial

Agents and Chemotherapy 62.

9.   Hunt-Serracin AC, Parks BJ, Boll J, Boutte C. 2019. Biofilm-associated Mycobacterium

abscessus cells have altered antibiotic tolerance and surface glycolipids in Artificial Cystic

Fibrosis Sputum Media. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy AAC.02488-18.

10.   Wexselblatt E, Oppenheimer-Shaanan Y, Kaspy I, London N, Schueler-Furman O, Yavin E,

Glaser G, Katzhendler J, Ben-Yehuda S. 2012. Relacin, a Novel Antibacterial Agent

Targeting the Stringent Response. PLOS Pathogens 8:e1002925.

11.   Dutta NK, Klinkenberg LG, Vazquez M-J, Segura-Carro D, Colmenarejo G, Ramon F,

Rodriguez-Miquel B, Mata-Cantero L, Porras-De Francisco E, Chuang Y-M, Rubin H, Lee JJ,

Eoh H, Bader JS, Perez-Herran E, Mendoza-Losana A, Karakousis PC. 2019. Inhibiting the

stringent response blocks *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* entry into quiescence and reduces

persistence. Science Advances 5:eaav2104.

12.   Hobbs JK, Boraston AB. 2019. (p)ppGpp and the Stringent Response: An Emerging Threat

to Antibiotic Therapy. ACS Infect Dis 5:1505–1517.

13.   Pacios O, Blasco L, Bleriot I, Fernandez-Garcia L, Ambroa A, López M, Bou G, Cantón R,

Garcia-Contreras R, Wood TK, Tomás M. 2020. (p)ppGpp and Its Role in Bacterial

Persistence: New Challenges. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 64:e01283-20,

/aac/64/10/AAC.01283-20.atom.

14.   Barker MM, Gaal T, Josaitis CA, Gourse RL. 2001. Mechanism of regulation of

transcription initiation by ppGpp. I. Effects of ppGpp on transcription initiation in vivo

and in vitro1 1Edited by R. Ebright. Journal of Molecular Biology 305:673–688.

15.   Barker MM, Gaal T, Gourse RL. 2001. Mechanism of regulation of transcription initiation

by ppGpp. II. Models for positive control based on properties of RNAP mutants and

competition for RNAP11Edited by R. Ebright. Journal of Molecular Biology 305:689–702.

16.   Krásný L, Gourse RL. 2004. An alternative strategy for bacterial ribosome synthesis:

Bacillus subtilis rRNA transcription regulation. EMBO J 23:4473–4483.

17.   Krásný L, Tišerová H, Jonák J, Rejman D, Šanderová H. 2008. The identity of the

transcription +1 position is crucial for changes in gene expression in response to amino

acid starvation in Bacillus subtilis. Molecular Microbiology 69:42–54.

18.   Maciąg M, Kochanowska M, Łyżeń R, Węgrzyn G, Szalewska-Pałasz A. 2010. ppGpp

inhibits the activity of Escherichia coli DnaG primase. Plasmid 63:61–67.

19.   Kraemer JA, Sanderlin AG, Laub MT. 2019. The Stringent Response Inhibits DNA

466   Replication Initiation in *E. coli* by Modulating Supercoiling of *oriC*. mBio 10:e01330-19,

467   /mbio/10/4/mBio.01330-19.atom.

468   20.   Kriel A, Bittner AN, Kim SH, Liu K, Tehranchi AK, Zou WY, Rendon S, Chen R, Tu BP, Wang

469   JD. 2012. Direct Regulation of GTP Homeostasis by (p)ppGpp: A Critical Component of

470   Viability and Stress Resistance. Molecular Cell 48:231–241.

471   21.   Wang B, Dai P, Ding D, Del Rosario A, Grant RA, Pentelute BL, Laub MT. 2019. Affinity-

472   based capture and identification of protein effectors of the growth regulator ppGpp. 2.

473   Nature Chemical Biology 15:141–150.

474   22.   Wang B, Grant RA, Laub MT. 2020. ppGpp Coordinates Nucleotide and Amino-Acid

475   Synthesis in E. coli During Starvation. Molecular Cell S1097276520305487.

476   23.   Fan H, Hahm J, Diggs S, Perry JJP, Blaha G. 2015. Structural and Functional Analysis of

477   BipA, a Regulator of Virulence in Enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli*. J Biol Chem

478   290:20856–20864.

479   24.   Corrigan RM, Bellows LE, Wood A, Gründling A. 2016. ppGpp negatively impacts

480   ribosome assembly affecting growth and antimicrobial tolerance in Gram-positive

481   bacteria. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 113:E1710–E1719.

482   25.   Rojas A-M, Ehrenberg M, Andersson SGE, Kurland CG. 1984. ppGpp inhibition of

483   elongation factors Tu, G and Ts during polypeptide synthesis. Mol Gen Genet 197:36–45.

484   26.   Milon P, Tischenko E, Tomsic J, Caserta E, Folkers G, La Teana A, Rodnina MV, Pon CL,

485   Boelens R, Gualerzi CO. 2006. The nucleotide-binding site of bacterial translation

486   initiation factor 2 (IF2) as a metabolic sensor. Proceedings of the National Academy of

487   Sciences 103:13962–13967.

488   27.   Mitkevich VA, Ermakov A, Kulikova AA, Tankov S, Shyp V, Soosaar A, Tenson T, Makarov

489   AA, Ehrenberg M, Hauryliuk V. 2010. Thermodynamic Characterization of ppGpp Binding

490   to EF-G or IF2 and of Initiator tRNA Binding to Free IF2 in the Presence of GDP, GTP, or

491   ppGpp. Journal of Molecular Biology 402:838–846.

492   28.   Atkinson GC, Tenson T, Hauryliuk V. 2011. The RelA/SpoT Homolog (RSH) Superfamily:

493   Distribution and Functional Evolution of ppGpp Synthetases and Hydrolases across the

494   Tree of Life. PLoS ONE 6:e23479.

495   29.   Haseltine WA, Block R. 1973. Synthesis of Guanosine Tetra- and Pentaphosphate

496   Requires the Presence of a Codon-Specific, Uncharged Transfer Ribonucleic Acid in the

497   Acceptor Site of Ribosomes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 70:1564–1568.

498   30.   Ronneau S, Hallez R. 2019. Make and break the alarmone: regulation of (p)ppGpp

499   synthetase/hydrolase enzymes in bacteria. FEMS Microbiology Reviews 43:389–400.

500   31.   Battesti A, Bouveret E. 2006. Acyl carrier protein/SpoT interaction, the switch linking

501   SpoT-dependent stress response to fatty acid metabolism. Molecular Microbiology

502   62:1048–1063.

503   32.   Brown DR, Barton G, Pan Z, Buck M, Wigneshweraraj S. 2014. Nitrogen stress response

504   and stringent response are coupled in Escherichia coli. Nat Commun 5:4115.

505   33.   Ronneau S, Petit K, De Bolle X, Hallez R. 2016. Phosphotransferase-dependent

506   accumulation of (p)ppGpp in response to glutamine deprivation in Caulobacter

507   crescentus. Nat Commun 7:11423.

508   34.   Germain E, Guiraud P, Byrne D, Douzi B, Djendli M, Maisonneuve E. 2019. YtfK activates

509   the stringent response by triggering the alarmone synthetase SpoT in Escherichia coli.

510   Nat Commun 10:5763.

511   35.   Nanamiya H, Kasai K, Nozawa A, Yun C-S, Narisawa T, Murakami K, Natori Y, Kawamura F,

512   Tozawa Y. 2007. Identification and functional analysis of novel (p)ppGpp synthetase

513   genes in Bacillus subtilis: Novel (p)ppGpp synthetase genes in B. subtilis. Molecular

514   Microbiology 67:291–304.

515   36.   Ruwe M, Kalinowski J, Persicke M. 2017. Identification and Functional Characterization of

516   Small Alarmone Synthetases in Corynebacterium glutamicum. Front Microbiol 8:1601.

517   37.   Ruwe M, Rückert C, Kalinowski J, Persicke M. 2018. Functional Characterization of a Small

518   Alarmone Hydrolase in Corynebacterium glutamicum. Front Microbiol 9:916.

519   38.   Yang N, Xie S, Tang N-Y, Choi MY, Wang Y, Watt RM. 2019. The Ps and Qs of alarmone

520   synthesis in Staphylococcus aureus. PLoS ONE 14:e0213630.

521   39.   Jimmy S, Saha CK, Kurata T, Stavropoulos C, Oliveira SRA, Koh A, Cepauskas A, Takada H,

522   Rejman D, Tenson T, Strahl H, Garcia-Pino A, Hauryliuk V, Atkinson GC. 2020. A

523   widespread toxin–antitoxin system exploiting growth control via alarmone signaling. Proc

524   Natl Acad Sci USA 117:10500–10510.

525   40.   Jones GH. 1994. Purification and properties of ATP:GTP 3'-pyrophosphotransferase

526   (guanosine pentaphosphate synthetase) from Streptomyces antibioticus. J Bacteriol

527   176:1475–1481.

528   41.   Jones GH. 1994. Activation of ATP:GTP 3'-pyrophosphotransferase (guanosine

529   pentaphosphate synthetase) in Streptomyces antibioticus. J Bacteriol 176:1482–1487.

530   42.   Jones GH, Bibb MJ. 1996. Guanosine pentaphosphate synthetase from Streptomyces

531   antibioticus is also a polynucleotide phosphorylase. Journal of bacteriology 178:4281–

532   4288.

533   43.   Jones GH. 2018. Novel Aspects of Polynucleotide Phosphorylase Function in

534   Streptomyces. Antibiotics (Basel) 7:25.

535   44.   Schofield WB, Zimmermann-Kogadeeva M, Zimmermann M, Barry NA, Goodman AL.

536   2018. The Stringent Response Determines the Ability of a Commensal Bacterium to

537   Survive Starvation and to Persist in the Gut. Cell Host & Microbe 24:120-132.e6.

538   45.   Cashel M, Gallant J. 1969. Two Compounds implicated in the Function of the RC Gene of

539   Escherichia coli. Nature 221:838.

540   46.   Primm TP, Andersen SJ, Mizrahi V, Avarbock D, Rubin H, Barry CE. 2000. The Stringent

541   Response of Mycobacterium tuberculosis Is Required for Long-Term Survival. Journal of

542   Bacteriology 182:4889–4898.

543   47.   Eymann C, Homuth G, Scharf C, Hecker M. 2002. Bacillus subtilis functional genomics:

544   global characterization of the stringent response by proteome and transcriptome

545   analysis. JB 184:2500–2520.

546   48.   Potrykus K, Murphy H, Philippe N, Cashel M. 2011. ppGpp is the major source of growth

547   rate control in E. coli. Environmental Microbiology 13:563–575.

548   49.   Weiss LA, Stallings CL. 2013. Essential Roles for Mycobacterium tuberculosis Rel beyond

549   the Production of (p)ppGpp. Journal of Bacteriology 195:5629–5638.

550   50.   Pulschen AA, Sastre DE, Machinandiarena F, Asis AC, Albanesi D, Mendoza D de, Gueiros-

551   Filho FJ. 2017. The stringent response plays a key role in Bacillus subtilis survival of fatty

552   acid starvation. Molecular Microbiology 103:698–712.

553   51.   Murch AL, Skipp PJ, Roach PL, Oyston PCF. 2017. Whole genome transcriptomics reveals

554   global effects including up-regulation of Francisella pathogenicity island gene expression

555   during active stringent response in the highly virulent Francisella tularensis subsp.

556   tularensis SCHU S4. Microbiology 163:1664–1679.

557   52.   Schäfer H, Beckert B, Frese CK, Steinchen W, Nuss AM, Beckstette M, Hantke I, Driller K,

558   Sudzinová P, Krásný L, Kaever V, Dersch P, Bange G, Wilson DN, Turgay K. 2020. The

alarmones (p)ppGpp are part of the heat shock response of Bacillus subtilis. PLoS Genet

16:e1008275.

53.   Stallings CL, Stephanou NC, Chu L, Hochschild A, Nickels BE, Glickman MS. 2009. CarD Is

an Essential Regulator of rRNA Transcription Required for Mycobacterium tuberculosis

Persistence. Cell 138:146–159.

54.   Klinkenberg LG, Lee J, Bishai WR, Karakousis PC. 2010. The Stringent Response Is

Required for Full Virulence of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* in Guinea Pigs. J INFECT DIS

202:1397–1404.

55.   Prusa J, Zhu DX, Stallings CL. 2018. The stringent response and Mycobacterium

tuberculosis pathogenesis. Pathogens and Disease; Oxford 76.

56.   Njire M, Wang N, Wang B, Tan Y, Cai X, Liu Y, Mugweru J, Guo J, Hameed HMA, Tan S, Liu

J, Yew WW, Nuermberger E, Lamichhane G, Liu J, Zhang T. 2017. Pyrazinoic Acid Inhibits a

Bifunctional Enzyme in Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Antimicrob Agents Chemother

61:e00070-17, e00070-17.

57.   Dahl JL, Arora K, Boshoff HI, Whiteford DC, Pacheco SA, Walsh OJ, Lau-Bonilla D, Davis

WB, Garza AG. 2005. The relA Homolog of Mycobacterium smegmatis Affects Cell

Appearance, Viability, and Gene Expression. Journal of Bacteriology 187:2439–2447.

58.   Jain V, Saleem-Batcha R, China A, Chatterji D. 2006. Molecular dissection of the

mycobacterial stringent response protein Rel. Protein Science 15:1449–1464.

59.   Murdeshwar MS, Chatterji D. 2012. MS_RHII-RSD, a Dual-Function RNase HII-(p)ppGpp

Synthetase from Mycobacterium smegmatis. Journal of Bacteriology 194:4003–4014.

60.   Ojha AK, Mukherjee TK, Chatterji D. 2000. High Intracellular Level of Guanosine

Tetraphosphate in Mycobacterium smegmatis Changes the Morphology of the

Bacterium. Infect Immun 68:4084–4091.

61.   Gupta KR, Kasetty S, Chatterji D. 2015. Novel Functions of (p)ppGpp and Cyclic di-GMP in

Mycobacterial Physiology Revealed by Phenotype Microarray Analysis of Wild-Type and

Isogenic Strains of Mycobacterium smegmatis. Appl Environ Microbiol 81:2571–2578.

62.   Petchiappan A, Naik SY, Chatterji D. 2019. RelZ-mediated stress response in

Mycobacterium smegmatis : pGpp synthesis and its regulation. J Bacteriol JB.00444-19,

jb;JB.00444-19v1.

63.   Sugisaki K, Hanawa T, Yonezawa H, Osaki T, Fukutomi T, Kawakami H, Yamamoto T,

Kamiya S. 2013. Role of (p)ppGpp in biofilm formation and expression of filamentous

structures in Bordetella pertussis. Microbiology 159:1379–1389.

64.   Oh YT, Lee K-M, Bari W, Raskin DM, Yoon SS. 2015. (p)ppGpp, a Small Nucleotide

Regulator, Directs the Metabolic Fate of Glucose in *Vibrio cholerae*. J Biol Chem

290:13178–13190.

65.   Kim J-S, Liu L, Fitzsimmons LF, Wang Y, Crawford MA, Mastrogiovanni M, Trujillo M, Till

JKA, Radi R, Dai S, Vázquez-Torres A. 2018. DksA–DnaJ redox interactions provide a signal

for the activation of bacterial RNA polymerase. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences 115:E11780–E11789.

66.   Gaca AO, Kajfasz JK, Miller JH, Liu K, Wang JD, Abranches J, Lemos JA. 2013. Basal Levels

of (p)ppGpp in Enterococcus faecalis: the Magic beyond the Stringent Response. mBio

4:e00646-13.

67.   Novosad SA, Beekmann SE, Polgreen PM, Mackey K, Winthrop KL. 2016. Treatment of

Mycobacterium abscessus Infection. Emerg Infect Dis 22:511–514.

68.   Cabral DJ, Wurster JI, Belenky P. 2018. Antibiotic Persistence as a Metabolic Adaptation:

Stress, Metabolism, the Host, and New Directions. Pharmaceuticals (Basel) 11.

69.   Fenn K, Wong CT, Darbari VC. 2020. Mycobacterium tuberculosis Uses Mce Proteins to

Interfere With Host Cell Signaling. Front Mol Biosci 6:149.

70.   Hurst-Hess K, Rudra P, Ghosh P. 2017. Mycobacterium abscessus WhiB7 Regulates a

Species-Specific Repertoire of Genes To Confer Extreme Antibiotic Resistance.

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy 61.

71.   Brockmann-Gretza O, Kalinowski J. 2006. Global gene expression during stringent

response in Corynebacterium glutamicum in presence and absence of the rel gene

encoding (p)ppGpp synthase. BMC Genomics 7:230.

72.   Traxler MF, Summers SM, Nguyen H-T, Zacharia VM, Hightower GA, Smith JT, Conway T.

2008. The global, ppGpp-mediated stringent response to amino acid starvation in

Escherichia coli. Molecular Microbiology 68:1128–1148.

73.   Vercruysse M, Fauvart M, Jans A, Beullens S, Braeken K, Cloots L, Engelen K, Marchal K,

Michiels J. 2011. Stress response regulators identified through genome-wide

transcriptome analysis of the (p)ppGpp-dependent response in Rhizobium etli. Genome

Biol 12:R17.

74.   Yang H, Yu M, Lee JH, Chatnaparat T, Zhao Y. 2020. The stringent response regulator (p)

ppGpp mediates virulence gene expression and survival in Erwinia amylovora. BMC

Genomics 21:261.

75.   Traxler MF, Zacharia VM, Marquardt S, Summers SM, Nguyen H-T, Stark SE, Conway T.

2011. Discretely calibrated regulatory loops controlled by ppGpp partition gene induction

across the 'feast to famine' gradient in Escherichia coli: Architecture of the stringent

response. Molecular Microbiology 79:830–845.

76.   Ross W, Vrentas CE, Sanchez-Vazquez P, Gaal T, Gourse RL. The Magic Spot: A ppGpp

Binding Site on E. coli RNA Polymerase Responsible for Regulation of Transcription

Initiation. Molecular Cell 10.

77.   Jayasingam S, Zin T, Ngeow Y. 2017. Antibiotic resistance in Mycobacterium Abscessus

and Mycobacterium Fortuitum isolates from Malaysian patients. Int J Mycobacteriol

6:387.

78.   Luthra S, Rominski A, Sander P. 2018. The Role of Antibiotic-Target-Modifying and

635   Antibiotic-Modifying Enzymes in Mycobacterium abscessus Drug Resistance. Front

636   Microbiol 9.

637   79.   Bar-On O, Mussaffi H, Mei-Zahav M, Prais D, Steuer G, Stafler P, Hananya S, Blau H. 2015.

638   Increasing nontuberculous mycobacteria infection in cystic fibrosis. Journal of Cystic

639   Fibrosis 14:53–62.

640   80.   Koskiniemi S, Pränting M, Gullberg E, Näsvall J, Andersson DI. 2011. Activation of cryptic

641   aminoglycoside resistance in Salmonella enterica: Activation of cryptic resistance.

642   Molecular Microbiology 80:1464–1478.

643   81.   Aedo S, Tomasz A. 2016. Role of the Stringent Stress Response in the Antibiotic

644   Resistance Phenotype of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus. Antimicrob Agents

645   Chemother 60:2311–2317.

646   82.   van Kessel JC, Hatfull GF. 2007. Recombineering in Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Nat

647   Methods 4:147–152.

648   83.   Kieser KJ, Boutte CC, Kester JC, Baer CE, Barczak AK, Meniche X, Chao MC, Rego EH,

649   Sassetti CM, Fortune SM, Rubin EJ. 2015. Phosphorylation of the Peptidoglycan Synthase

650   PonA1 Governs the Rate of Polar Elongation in Mycobacteria. PLOS Pathogens

651   11:e1005010.

84.   Hartmans S, de Bont JAM, Stackebrandt E. 2006. The Genus Mycobacterium--

Nonmedical, p. 889–918. *In* Dworkin, M, Falkow, S, Rosenberg, E, Schleifer, K-H,

Stackebrandt, E (eds.), The Prokaryotes. Springer New York, New York, NY.

85.   Shell SS, Prestwich EG, Baek S-H, Shah RR, Sassetti CM, Dedon PC, Fortune SM. 2013.

DNA Methylation Impacts Gene Expression and Ensures Hypoxic Survival of

Mycobacterium tuberculosis. PLoS Pathog 9:e1003419.

86.   Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. 2001. Analysis of Relative Gene Expression Data Using Real-Time

Quantitative PCR and the 2−ΔΔCT Method. Methods 25:402–408.