Novel amiloride derivatives that inhibit bacterial motility across multiple strains and

stator types

MI Islam[1]*, JH Bae[1]*, T Ishida[2]*, P Ridone[1], J Lin[1], MJ Kelso[3,4], Y Sowa[2,5], BJ Buckley[3,4],

MAB Baker[1,6].

*joint contribution – joint author names are listed in order of chronological involvement in this

project.

1. School of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences, University of New South Wales,
Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.
2. Department of Frontier Bioscience, Hosei University, Tokyo, Japan.
3. Molecular Horizons and School of Chemistry and Molecular Bioscience, University of
Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia
4. Illawarra Health and Medical Research Institute, Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia.
5. Research Center for Micro-Nano Technology, Hosei University, Tokyo, Japan.
6. CSIRO Synthetic Biology Future Science Platform, Brisbane, Australia.
Correspondence: matthew.baker@unsw.edu.au

Keywords:

Bacterial motility, bacterial flagellar motor, amiloride, sodium channel blocker, stator.

Abstract:

The bacterial flagellar motor (BFM) is a protein complex that confers motility to cells and

contributes to survival and virulence. The BFM consists of stators that are ion-selective

membrane protein complexes and a rotor that directly connects to a large filament, acting as a

propeller. The stator complexes couple ion transit across the membrane to torque that drives

rotation of the motor. The most common ion gradients that drive BFM rotation are protons (H^+)

and sodium ions (Na^+). The sodium-powered stators, like those in the PomAPomB stator

complex of Vibrio spp, can be inhibited by sodium channel inhibitors, in particular, by

phenamil, a potent and widely used inhibitor. However, relatively few new sodium-motility

inhibitors have been described since the discovery of phenamil. In this study, we characterised

two possible motility inhibitors HM2-16F and BB2-50F from a small library of previously

reported amiloride derivatives. We used three approaches: effect on rotation of tethered cells,

effect on free swimming bacteria and effect on rotation of marker beads. We showed that both

HM2-16F and BB2-50F stopped rotation of tethered cells driven by Na^+ motors comparable to

phenamil at matching concentrations, and could also stop rotation of tethered cells driven by

H$^+$ motors. Bead measurements in presence and absence of stators confirmed that the
compounds did not inhibit rotation via direct association with the stator, in contrast to the
established mode of action of phenamil. Overall, HM2-16F and BB2-50F stopped swimming
in both Na$^+$ and H$^+$ stator types, and in pathogenic and non-pathogenic strains.
40
Importance:
Here we characterised two novel amiloride derivatives in the search for antimicrobial
compounds that target bacterial motility. Our two compounds were shown to inhibit flagellar
motility at 10 µM across multiple strains, from non-pathogenic *E. coli* with flagellar rotation
driven by proton or chimeric sodium-powered stators, to proton-powered pathogenic *E. coli*
(EHEC/UPEC) and lastly in sodium-powered *Vibrio alginolyticus*. Broad anti-motility
compounds such as these are important tools in our efforts control virulence of pathogens in
health and agricultural settings.
49
Introduction:
Motility is essential for many bacteria to find nutrients and escape unfavourable conditions (1).
Bacterial cells move through liquids or over moist surfaces using rotating flagella, which are
driven by the bacterial flagellar motor (BFM) (2). In peritrichous bacteria such as *E. coli*, when
the majority of BFMs rotate counter-clockwise, bacteria move linearly (i.e., run) and when one
or more BFM rotates clockwise, the helical filament-bundle unravels and bacteria change
direction (i.e., tumble) (3). The BFM contains the stator proteins (e.g., MotA and MotB in *E.*
coli and PomA and PomB in *Vibrio* spp.), which form an ion transporter on the inner cell
membrane, and the rotor proteins (e.g., FliG, FliM, and FliN), that are driven to rotate by torque
generation between the stator and rotor (4). Rotation of the BFM is powered by translocation
of specific ions (e.g., H$^+$ in *E. coli* and Na$^+$ in *Vibrio* spp.) across the cell membrane through
the stator complex (4).
Beside locomotion, motility is crucial during the initial infection and colonisation processes of
different pathogenic bacteria (5). Locomotion reduces repulsion between the bacterial cell wall
and host tissues, promoting attachment to host cells (6). The importance of motility as a
virulence factor was first noted in *Campylobacter jejuni,* when only the motile strain of *C.*
jejuni was recovered from an infection site where a mixture of motile and non-motile *C. jejuni*
phase variants were used to initiate infection (7). It has since been demonstrated that flagellum-
mediated motility promotes the virulence of several gram-negative pathogens, such as for
Bordetella bronchiseptica, B. pertussis (8)*, Helicobacter sp.* (9)*, Legionella pneumophila* (10),

pathogenic *E. coli* strains (11), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (12), *Salmonella typhimurium* (13),

and *Vibrio cholerae* (14). Aside from host attachment, flagella also contribute to the formation

of biofilms by multiple bacterial pathogens, which promote the development of persistent and

chronic infections and antibiotic resistance (1).

Amiloride is a diuretic drug and well-characterised inhibitor of the Na^+ bacterial flagellar motor

(15). Amiloride inhibits rotation of the sodium-powered flagellar motor by blocking the

translocation of Na^+ ions through the channel in a competitive and rapidly reversible manner

(16). However, amiloride is of limited utility due to its weak anti-motility activity and adverse

effects on other metabolic processes (17). The *N*-phenyl substituted amiloride analogue,

phenamil, has been identified as a better inhibitor of sodium-powered flagellar motors (17).

Phenamil is markedly more potent than amiloride and shows non-competitive inhibition of

bacterial motility with slow dissociation (18). Phenamil stops flagellar rotation by binding to a

site predicted to lie at the cytoplasmic face of the PomAPomB stator complex (19). Phenamil

is a useful tool for flagellar research, but requires high concentrations (>20 µM) and resistant

stators can arise from a single point mutation (20, 21). More potent and specific compounds

may assist research into stator function and potentially offer leads for new antivirulence drugs.

While classical uncouplers can be used to inhibit proton-powered motors, they also have

adverse effects on cells resulting from collapse of the membrane potential. For example the

commonly used uncoupler, carbonyl cyanide *m*-chlorophenyl hydrazone (CCCP), is toxic to

both prokaryote and eukaryote cells (22). Here, we report that two recently reported 6-

substituted amiloride analogues, BB2-50F and HM2-16F(23, 24) (Fig. 1A), inhibit motility in

known phenamil-resistant strains and affect both Na^+- and H^+-powered flagellar motors.

Results:

Inhibition of motility

We initially evaluated the anti-motility activity of BB2-50F and HM2-16F (Fig. 1A) along with

the control compounds 5-(*N*,*N*-hexamethylene)amiloride (HMA) and phenamil using a

tethered cell assay (Fig. 1B). We examined the effect of each compound on rotational speed at

increasing concentrations (0, 1, 10 and 100 µM) against Na^+-powered stator, PomAPotB in *E.*

coli SYC35 (Δ*motAmotB fliC*^*sticky*^) strains. Both BB2-50F and HM2-16F inhibited rotation

speed in a dose-dependent manner and showed complete inhibition at 10 µM and above (Fig.

1B). The positive control for Na^+-inhibition, phenamil showed similar dose-dependency, with

complete inhibition at 10 µM (Fig. 1B). HMA was less potent, with 65% of cells still rotating

at 10 µM (Fig. 1B), in agreement with previous findings for other 5-substituted amiloride

analogues (16).

We further characterised the activity of BB2-50F and HM2-16F alongside phenamil over the

concentration range 0−10 µM (Fig. 1C). BB2-50F showed a 2% reduction in the number of

rotating cells at 1 µM, 4% at 2.5 µM, 12% at 5 µM, 20% at 7.5 µM and 79% at 10 µM (Fig

1C). HM2-16F showed a 6% reduction in the number of rotating cells at 1 µM, 15% at 2.5 µM,

28% at 5 µM, 62% at 7.5 µM and 100% at 10 µM (Fig. 1C). In comparison, phenamil produced

a 27% reduction in the number of rotating cells at 1 µM, 36% at 2.5 µM, 51% at 5 µM, 58% at

7.5 µM and 74% at 10 µM (Fig. 1C). The effect of each compound was reversed following

washing with motility buffer.

Effect on bacterial growth

We measured the growth of *E. coli* SYC35 cells expressing sodium-powered stators

(PomAPotB) and proton-powered stators (MotAMotB), and on EHEC and UPEC strains in the

presence of 10 µM and 100 µM BB2-50F and HM2-16F (Supplementary Fig. 1). The rate of

growth in both strains was not inhibited relative to vehicle controls for either HM2-16F or

BB2-50F at 10 µM (Supplementary Fig. 1). However, at 100 µM the compounds differed in

toxicity. HM2-16F reduced the growth rate relative to control over the first five hours in both

strains, but did not significantly decrease growth at 15 h, while BB2-50F completely inhibited

growth at 100 µM.

Effect of Na^+ concentration on motility inhibition

We evaluated the inhibition of rotation for BB2-50F, HM2-16F and phenamil while varying

the concentration of external sodium to test for Na^+-competitive effects (17). Compounds were

tested at concentrations of 1−10 µM using motility buffers containing 1, 5, 20, and 85 mM Na^+.

No significant differences in inhibition were observed for HM2-16F and BB2-50F at the Na^+

concentrations tested (Fig. 1D). Inhibition was generally flat for BB2-50F between 0-7.5 µM,

with a sharp drop seen at 10 µM, whereas HM2-16F inhibition showed a more gradual effect

across the range of concentrations tested. In contrast, an exponential decay was seen for

phenamil across the concentration range, with the fitted decay constant indistinguishable at all

sodium concentrations (Fig 1D, left).

Activity against phenamil-resistant variants and the proton powered MotA/MotB complex

To assess whether the inhibition of rotation was affected by point mutations known to confer

resistance to phenamil, we tested BB2-50F and HM2-16F against known phenamil-resistant

mutant constructs at 1, 10 and 100 µM using the tethered cell assay. Four different stator

mutants were tested in SYC35: PomA(D148Y)/PotB, PomA/PotB(P16S),
PomA(D148Y)/PotB(P16S) and PomA/PotB(F22Y/L28Q) (68, 69). Phenamil at 10 µM
exhibited no significant effect on the resistant strains (Fig. 2A). In contrast, both compounds
showed significant inhibition, completely stopping motility at 10 µM in all phenamil-resistant
strains (Fig. 2B & C).
To further profile the specificity of the inhibitors, we evaluated BB2-50F and HM2-16F against
the proton-powered stator complex (MotAMotB) in SYC35. Both HM2-16F and BB2-50F
reduced rotation of the proton-powered motor at 10 µM and completely inhibited rotation at
100 µM (Fig. 2). In contrast, phenamil did not inhibit MotAMotB stators at concentrations up
to 100 µM (Fig. 2).

Inhibition of motility in other bacterial strains
Inhibition of motility by BB2-50F and HM2-16F was tested in three additional bacterial strains
using a free swimming assay that measures the speed of individual cells by videography(25).
We first demonstrated inhibition of swimming in MotAMotB and PomAPotB expressing cells
(Fig. 3AB), followed by three additional strains: uropathogenic *E. coli* (UPEC)(26) (Fig. 3C),
an attenuated enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* (EHEC)(27, 28) (Fig. 3D) and a native sodium
swimmer *Vibrio alginolyticus* (29) (Fig. 3E). Both BB2-50F and HM2-16F significantly
reduced swimming speed at 10 µM in all strains (p < 0.05 in all cases).

Characterising mechanism of motility inhibition
The activity of BB2-50F and HM2-16F was measured in a bead rotation assay using 1 µm
polystyrene bead attached to sticky flagellar filament of JHC36 (Δ*motAmotB* Δ*cheY fliC*^{sticky})
(Fig. 4, Supplementary Fig. 2). This approach reduced the potential for confounding factors
that may have affected the tethered cell assay, such as cell-surface adhesion, while also
allowing examination of rotation at lower load and at higher speed. Phenamil reduced
PomAPotB-driven rotation from 98 ± 7 Hz at 0 µM to 7± 3 Hz at 10 µM (Fig. 4A) but had no
effect on the proton-powered MotAMotB (Fig. 4D). In contrast, BB2-50F and HM2-16F
reduced the rotation speed of both sodium-powered (PomAPotB) and proton-powered
(MotAMotB) motors to zero at 10 µM (Fig. 4BCF).
To assess whether the effects of HM2-16F or BB2-50F were due to direct targeting of the stator
complex, we measured rotational diffusion of the bead in the presence of drug using the
statorless strain. This approach allowed interrogation of whether the compounds were targeting
another component of the flagellar motor to inhibit rotation such as the LP ring or bushing.
Rotational diffusion for statorless cells remained free in the presence of 10 µM phenamil,
indicating no effect on non-stator proteins (Fig. 4G). However, the position of the bead was

fixed with minimal rotational or spatial diffusion in the presence of 10 μM BB2-50F (Fig.4H) and HM2-16F (Fig. 4I). We confirmed that rotational diffusion of tethered cells was also restricted in the presence of 10 μM of each compound (Supplementary Fig. 3). Overall, these data suggest a difference in the mode of action of HM2-16F and BB2-50F compared to phenamil, as these compounds appeared to lock the rotational movement of a 1 μm polystyrene bead.

To reduce the possibility of measurements being influenced by lingering surface effects from these comparatively large beads, we reduced bead size and composition, and thus mechanical load, by using a 60 nm gold-nanoparticle attached directly to a straightened hook (30). Given the smaller size of the gold bead, and the straightened hook, this system removed possible bead-cell interactions that may have influenced the earlier polystyrene bead assays. Furthermore, the gold nanoparticle assay allows precise measurement of rotation speed at a load close to zero, providing more direct measure of rotor/stator dynamics free from signal damping caused by viscous drag and mechanical loading (31, 32). For this experiment, we used plasmids expressing proton-powered stator MotAMotB (either pSYC28 or pSYC409) and the sodium-powered stator PomAPotB (pSHU1234) in SHU174 ($\Delta motAmotB$ $\Delta fliC$ $\Delta cheY$ $flgE_{+GSS+3Cys}$ $fliK2798$). The gold nanoparticle measurements indicated that there was no effect of the compounds at 10 μM on motor rotation driven by either stator type (Fig 5). We further examined the effect of 10 μM of BB2-50F and HM2-16F at low load in statorless cells and observed no measurable difference in rotational diffusion (Fig. 5FG).

Rotation completely stopped at the 100 μM toxic concentration of BB2-50F for both stator types and for the statorless strains (Supplementary Fig. 4 & 5). In contrast, application of 100 μM of HM2-16F showed mixed effects (Supplementary Fig. 4 & 6). Rotation driven by PomAPotB was not affected, however rotation driven by MotAMotB saw reversible stopping (Supplementary Fig. 6C), irreversible stopping (Supplementary Fig. 6D) and no effect (Supplementary Fig. 6E). Likewise, in statorless strains rotational diffusion of gold beads was both reversibly (Supplementary Fig. 6F) and irreversibly (Supplementary Fig. 6G) stopped.

These results suggest that at non-toxic concentrations of compound (10 μM) both BB2-50F and HM2-16F do not directly target the bushing or the rod of the BFM. Upon observing this, tethered cell assays were repeated in the presence of 0.002% w/v Tween 20 to test whether detergent could remove possible hydrophobic interactions between the bead and cell surface that might underlie the broad anti-motility effect, however no reduction in drug effect was observed (Supplementary Fig. 7). This showed that the effect of the compounds was not removed by a well-validated detergent (33, 34), screening for non-specific interactions

204 between the bead and cell-surface in the presence of each inhibitor. In contrast, phenamil
205 significantly reduced the rotation speed of PomAPotB containing cells in the gold bead assay
206 at 10 µM (Fig. 5A), in accordance with its direct, non-competitive mode of inhibition described
207 previously.
208
209

Fluorescence of HM2-16F
We expected HM2-16F in particular to have improved fluorescence properties relative to
phenamil due to the additional benzofuran group conjugated to the pyrazine core. We measured
excitation and emission spectra (Supplementary Fig. 8A), and imaged cells in epifluorescence
to observe staining with 10 µM HM2-16F (Supplementary Fig. 8B). We further tested HM2-
16F using lifetime fluorescence imaging as the quantum yield appeared low (unsuitable for
single-molecule imaging). We found that the fluorescence lifetime of HM2-16F was 5.4 ± 0.1
ns, enabling clear resolution against cellular autofluorescence (1.5 ± 0.1 ns) (Supplementary
Fig. 8C).
219

Discussion
Motility is a potential target for new anti-virulence agents (35). Motility inhibitors are expected
to exert less selective pressure than current antibiotics (36), and are typically effective at
concentrations lower than those needed for the antibacterial effects of conventional antibiotics
(37). This approach may allow for more specific pathogen targeting (e.g. sodium only) as well
as lower dosage requirements. Amiloride and its analogues are the best known inhibitors of
sodium driven bacterial flagellar motors (16, 17, 38, 39). In this study, we evaluated the anti-
motility activity of two new amiloride derivatives, BB2-50F and HM2-16F using four sets of
experiments: 1) tethered cell rotation; 2) free-swimming, 3) 1 µm bead rotation, and 4) 60 nm
gold bead rotation.
Sodium-driven bacterial rotation was stopped in tethered cell and 1 µm bead assays at 10 µM
for BB2-50F, HM2-16F and phenamil, indicating that these compounds show similar potency.
The new compounds showed better anti-motility activity at lower concentrations than other
reported motility inhibitors for sodium powered motor system, e.g. amiloride and arginine (16,
40). Furthermore, the effect of both BB2-50F and HM2-16F (Fig 1D) appeared to be sodium
independent, unlike the Na^+-competitive parent amiloride (17). In addition to its activity at low
concentrations, HM2-16F also showed green fluorescence properties relative to phenamil,
enabling the use of epifluorescence and lifetime imaging to measure uptake and release of

HM2-16F in treated cells (Supplementary Fig. 8). This finding bolsters its potential applications in, for example, infection diagnostics (41).

BB2-50F and HM2-16F did not affect cellular growth at the motility-blocking concentration of 10 µM (Supplementary Fig. 1), however BB2-50F did inhibit growth at 100 µM. Restoration of motility following washing after dosage with 10 µM of BB2-50F and supported that this dose was non-lethal and that motility could be reversibly restored. In contrast, HM2-16F at 100 µM slowed bacterial growth over the first five hours but was no different from untreated cells after 15 hours (Supplementary Fig. 1). In contrast, BB2-50F was notably toxic at 100 µM, completely inhibiting growth, and likely explaining its consistent anti-motility effect at 100 µM on both stators, in multiple strains, and its irreversible stopping of rotation in the gold bead assay. This indicates a toxic effect of BB2-50F at 100 µM, likely unrelated to any effects on motility proteins. However, it is notable that stopping of rotation in tethered cell assays was seen at a concentration 10-fold lower than this, where no adverse effects on growth were observed in culture (Supplementary Fig. 1).

The dose response of phenamil showed an exponential decrease with increased concentration while BB2-50F, in particular, had a sharp effect appearing between 7.5 µM and 10 µM (Fig. 1B). These results imply that phenamil and both BB2-50F and HM2-16F have different modes of action: both new compounds stopped rotation in phenamil-resistant stator mutants in *E. coli*, and in native stators in other strains, both Na^+-and H^+-powered. This property represents an improvement over other reported proton-powered motility inhibitors that are effective only in *E. coli* and require high concentrations (up to 600 µM) (42).

The mechanism of action of these compounds and the reason(s) for their anti-motility activity across multiple bacterial strains is not clear. The tethered cell assay is a good approach for measuring variations in the response of individual cells to treatment and for initial compound screening, however it does not provide positional information for the rotor or assess performance at low load (43). Most importantly, it is also has the largest surface area in motion, which potentially increases its susceptibility to surface based affects such as increased stickiness. To examine the mechanism of inhibition, and to rule out potentially confounding cell-surface effects that may have influenced earlier experiments using tethered cells, we used a 1 µm polystyrene bead assay (44) to examine the effects of BB2-50F and HM2-16F on rotation. We observed that phenamil in some instances slowed, but did not stop, rotation, whereas BB2-50F and HM2-16F stopped rotation and fixed the location of the bead (Fig. 4). We further examined the effect on statorless constructs (Fig. 4G-I) and noted that phenamil had no effect on rotational diffusion in the absence of stators, whereas BB2-50F andHM2-16F

locked free rotational diffusion of the bead. The likely explanation is that phenamil directly associates with the stator complex, reducing active torque generation when bound, and thus has no effect in the absence of stators. In contrast, the two compounds appear to jam the motor or adhere the bead to the cell surface, creating transient pauses, or complete stops at higher concentrations.

We used the highest resolution measurement of rotation currently available, a 60-nm gold-nanoparticle affixed directly to a straightened hook (30), to further probe the possible mechanism of action of the compounds. The smaller gold nanoparticle, attached to a straightened hook of ~115 nm length, should not interact with cell surface due to the size of the particle and its distance from the cell membrane. Thus, any observed inhibition would potentially indicate drug binding to the LP ring or bushing of the flagellar motor. However, no inhibition of rotation speed were seen with BB2-50F or HM2-16F at 10 µM in the strains tested using this assay, indicating that the effect of both compounds was likely not due to an on-target interaction with the motor. At high loads there are many stators around a motor, but at low load there should only be a few(31). Our additional measurements of statorless motors at ultra-low load (Fig. 5F & G) saw no change in rotational diffusion in the presence of BB2-50F or HM2-16F at 10 µM. This excludes the possibility that our compounds alter, for example, cell membrane fluidity to interfere with rotation in a stator-dependent manner.

At higher concentrations of 100 µM, BB2-50F irreversibly inhibited motility (Supplementary Fig. 4 & 5). At 100 µM, HM2-16F exhibited the full range of effects: from no effect to reversible and irreversible stopping of rotation (Supplementary Fig. 6) This may indicate that 100 µM is a threshold concentration at which the adhesion effect can influence the gold bead assay. The use of detergent did not change the potency of BB2-50F and HM2-16F in inhibiting rotation (Supplementary Fig. 7).

Conclusions

We have identified two new amiloride analogues with anti-motility effects at 10 µM concentration in multiple bacterial strains. Whilst the exact mechanism of action of each proved elusive, both compounds were able to inhibit motility in known phenamil-resistant mutants. We have used a wide range of biophysical techniques to rule out possible mechanisms of action: these compounds do not target the stators, the LP ring, or the bushing. Future work can integrate fluorescence measurements with these compounds, and other new derivatives, for targeted drug discovery that aids flagellar research and the development of novel antimicrobials.

Material and Methods:

Chemical:

5-(N,N-hexamethylene)amiloride (HMA) (UOW), HM2-16F (UOW) and BB2-50F (UOW) were synthesised as described previously (23, 24). Phenamil methanesulfonate salt (Sigma-Aldrich), Chloramphenicol (Sigma-Aldrich), Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) (Sigma-Aldrich) and D-Arabinose (Sigma-Aldrich).

Bacterial Strains and Plasmids and Growth Conditions

The bacterial strains and plasmids used in this study are shown in full in Supplementary Table 1. The primary *E. coli* strains used in this work are SYC35 and RP6894. Pathogenic strains include *Vibrio alginolyticus,* Enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* (EHEC) and Uropathogenic *Escherichia coli* (UPEC). All the strains were cultured in LB broth and LB agar [1% (w/v) Bacto tryptone, 0.5% (w/v) Bacto yeast extract, 0.5% (w/v) NaCl, and 2% (w/v) Bacto agar for solid media] at 37°C. According to the selective antibiotic resistance pattern of the plasmids, chloramphenicol (CAM), ampicillin (AMP) or kanamycin (KAN) were added to a final concentration of 25 μg/mL, 50 μg/mL, and 25 μg/mL, respectively. The *V. alginolyticus* strain, NMB136, was grown in VPG medium (1% (w/v) polypeptone, 0.4% (w/v) K_2HPO_4, 3% (w/v) NaCl, 0.5% (w/v) glycerol) and was washed by TMN85 (85 mM NaCl, 215 mM KCl, 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5), 5 mM $MgCl_2$, 5 mM glucose) with appropriate inhibitors.

Tethered cell assay:

We measured the rotation speed of the test strains in the presence of different concentration of test compounds and control drugs using tethered cell assays following a previous protocol with some modifications (45). *E. coli* strain SYC35 ($\Delta motAmotB\ fliC^{sticky}$) containing plasmids encoding sodium powered PomAPotB (pSHU1234), proton powered MotAMotB (pDB108) and phenamil resistant PonAPotB (pSHU1235, pSHU1236, pSHU1237, and pSHU1249) were inoculated into TB broth [1% (w/v) Bacto tryptone, 0.5% (w/v) NaCl] containing 0.02% (w/v) arabinose and 25 µg/ml chloramphenicol and were grown overnight (17 h) with 180 rpm at 30 °C. The overnight cultures were sub-cultured with a 50-fold dilution into fresh TB broth and incubated for 5 h with 180 rpm at 30°C to get more motile cells. At OD_{600} ~0.80, the flagella of the cells were sheared by passing the culture multiple times (~35) through a 26G needle syringe. After shearing the flagella, the cells were washed three times with motility buffer [10 mM potassium-phosphate, 10 mM lactic acid, 100 mM NaCl, and 0.1 mM EDTA, pH 7.0]. Cells were then attached on tunnel slides and washed sequentially with motility buffer that contained different concentration test compounds (0, 1, 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10, and 100 µM). According to the experiment purpose we used different concentrations NaCl in the motility buffer. The rotational speed of the cells was observed using phase-contrast microscopy (Nikon) and was recorded at 20 frames per second (FPS) through the 40X objective with a camera (Chameleon3 CM3, Point Grey Research). Rotational motion of the cells was analysed using Lab view 2019 software (National Instruments).

Free swimming assay:

We measured the swimming speed of the test strains in the presence drugs following a previous protocol (46). Briefly, the *E. coli* strains were inoculated into TB broth (1% (w/v) Bacto tryptone, 0.5% (w/v) NaCl) with additional 0.02% (w/v) arabinose and 25 µg/ml chloramphenicol (where required) and were grown overnight (17 h) with 180 rpm at 30°C. NMB136 cells were inoculated in VPG medium (1% polypeptone, 0.4% K_2HPO_4, 3% NaCl, 0.5% glycerol) and were grown overnight with 180 rpm at 30°C. For *E. coli* strains, overnight cultures were subcultured with a 50-fold dilution into fresh TB broth and incubated for 5 h with 180 rpm at 30°C. At OD_{600} ~0.80, the cells were washed once with motility buffer (10 mM potassium-phosphate, 10 mM lactic acid, 100 mM NaCl, and 0.1 mM EDTA, pH 7.0). For NMB136 cells, overnight cultures were subcultured with a 100-fold dilution into fresh VPG medium and incubated for 3 h with 180 rpm at 30°C. At OD600 ~1.0, the cells were washed

twice with TMN85 (85 mM NaCl, 215 mM KCl, 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5), 5 mM $MgCl_2$, 5

mM glucose). Then, cell suspensions were mixed with equivalent volume of the inhibitor

solution (at 2x of the intended final concentration) to achieve a final concentration of 10 µM

or 100 µM of compound. Finally, 15 µL of cell-inhibitor mixtures were added to the tunnel

slide and the swimming speed of the cells was observed using phase-contrast microscopy. For

E. coli strains: 20 s was recorded at 20 frames per second (fps) through a 20x objective (Nikon)

with a camera (Chameleon3 CM3, Point Grey Research). For NMB136 cells: 10 s was recorded

at 60 fps through a 20x objective (Olympus) with a camera (DMK21AU618, IMAGING

SOURCE). The swimming speed of the cells in both cases was analysed using LabVIEW 2019

software (National Instruments).

Growth Curve Assays

Growth assays were performed in the presence of predetermined concentration of test

compound to evaluate the effect of the compounds on bacterial growth following the previous

protocol (47) with slight modification. *E. coli* strain SYC35 transformed with sodium powered

(PomAPotB) and protonpowered (MotAMotB) was used. Briefly, overnight cultures of the test

strains with OD_{600} 1.0 were diluted 1:100 in 96-well plates (Corning) with fresh LB broth

containing different concentrations of HM2-16F and BB2-50F and incubated at 37°C. Plasmid

containing strains (pSHU1234 and pDB-108) were grown in presence of 0.02% (w/v) arabinose

and 25 µg/mL chloramphenicol, whereas EHEC and UPEC were grown in LB without

arabinose or antibiotic. The OD_{600} were measured in a microplate reader (FLUOstar OPTIMA,

BMG LABTECH) every hour for 15 h with a brief shaking interval before each measurement.

Measurements in 10 µM were repeated and averaged over three measurements, measurements

for 100 µM were repeated and averaged over six measurements.

Polystyrene bead assay:

Briefly, *E. coli* strain JHC36 ($\Delta motAmotB\ \Delta cheY\ fliC^{sticky}$) transformed with plasmids encoding sodium powered (PomAPotB) and proton powered (MotAMotB) was grown overnight in TB broth and then sub-cultured with a 50-fold dilution into fresh TB broth and incubated for 5 h with 180 rpm at 30°C to get more motile cells. At OD_{600} ~0.80, the flagella of the cells were sheared by passing the culture multiple times (~35) through a 26G needle syringe. After shearing the flagella, the cells were washed three times with motility buffer [10 mM potassium-phosphate, 85 mM NaCl, and 0.1 mM EDTA, 1% DMSO, pH 7.0]. Then, the glass slide was coated with poly-L-lysine (PLL) (Sigma Aldrich) and incubated for 10 mins and washed with motility buffer and flushed with 1 μm polystyrene bead (Polysciences, Inc) solution. The sample was then washed with motility buffer containing test compound (10 and 100 μM) and the rotational speed was recorded and analyzed using Lab view 2019 software (National Instruments).

Gold-nanoparticle assay:

We used the 60 nm gold-nanoparticle assay to get the more accurate flagellar rotation speed at lowered load using the previous protocol (30) with slight modification. Briefly, the SHU174 *E. coli* ($\Delta motAmotB\ \Delta fliC\ \Delta cheY\ flgE_{+GSS+3Cys}\ fliK2798$) containing plasmids encoding stators was grown and washed with KPi buffer (10 mM potassium-phosphate, 0.1 mM EDTA, pH 7.0) and prepared as a cell suspension. The cell suspension was later added to the precipitation of gold nano particle (BBI solutions) and incubated for 30 min. After incubation, the cell mixture was washed with KPi buffer and put into PLL coated glass chamber. The sample was then washed with motility buffer (10 mM potassium-phosphate, 10 mM lactate-Na, 67 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM EDTA, 1% DMSO, pH 7.0) containing test compound (10 and 100 μM) and the rotational speed was recorded and analyzed using LabVIEW 2019 software (National Instruments).

Evaluation of fluorescence property of HM2-16F:

The fluorescence of HM2-16F was analysed using fluorescence microscopy. The emission and excitation spectra of the drug was measured using a spectrophotometer (Cary Eclipse). Briefly, the overnight culture of *E. coli* SYC35 strain transformed with pSHU1234 was prepared and washed with motility buffer. Later, the cell suspension was added to PLL-coated glass slide and incubated for 10 mins and again washed with motility buffer. Cells were treated with test compounds by washing with test compound (10 and 100 μM) containing motility buffer.

Finally, drug treated cells were imaged in epifluorescence mode using a Elyra Microscope
(Zeiss) using a Plan-Apochromat 63x/1.40 Oil DIC M27 objective, 405 nm illumination and
BP495-575 + L750 filter sets. Lifetime imaging was executed on Picoquant MicroTime 200
STED equipped with a PMA Hybrid Series Hybrid Photomultiplier Detector. Illumination was
provided by 405 nm laser (Diode 450), with a 60x/1.2 UPlanSApo Water Objective.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
MIM, JB, TI, PR, BJB and MABB designed and executed experiments in, medicinal chemistry,
microbiology, microscopy, and rotational measurement. MIM and JL, MJK, BJB, MABB
executed initial compound screening. TI and YS designed and executed experiments in
rotational measurement with polystyrene beads and gold nanoparticles. MABB and BJB
supervised the design, execution and writing of the project. All authors contributed to writing
and revision of the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
We would like to thank Tohru Minamino, Yong-Suk Che, Myu Yoshida and Rie Ito for helping
a construction of strains and plasmids. We would like to thank Jai Tree for providing the EHEC
and UPEC strains and thank Seiji Kojima and Michio Homma for providing the *V. alginolyticus*
strain.

FUNDING
MJK was supported by Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC)
Project Grant (APP1100432). YS was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (JP18H02475 and
JP20K06564), MEXT KAKENHI (JP19H05404) and Takeda Science Foundation. BJB
acknowledges salary support from the Illawarra Cancer Carers. MABB was supported by a
UNSW Scientia Research Fellowship, a CSIRO Synthetic Biology Future Science Platform
2018 Project Grant, and ARC Discovery Project DP190100497.

References:
1. Duan Q, Zhou M, Zhu L, Zhu G. 2013. Flagella and bacterial pathogenicity. J Basic

Microbiol 53:1–8.

2. Armitage JP. 2007. Bacterial TaxisEncyclopedia of Life Sciences.

3.   Berg HC. 2008. E. coli in Motion. Springer Science & Business Media.

4.   Sowa Y, Berry RM. 2008. Bacterial flagellar motor. Q Rev Biophys 41:103–132.

5.   Xiu P, Liu R, Zhang D, Sun C. 2017. Pumilacidin-Like Lipopeptides Derived from

Marine Bacterium Bacillus sp. Strain 176 Suppress the Motility of *Vibrio alginolyticus*.

Appl Environ Microbiol 83.

6.   Yang Q, Defoirdt T. 2015. Quorum sensing positively regulates flagellar motility in

pathogenic *Vibrio harveyi*. Environ Microbiol 17:960–968.

7.   Black RE, Levine MM, Clements ML, Hughes TP, Blaser MJ. 1988. Experimental

Campylobacter jejuni Infection in Humans. J Infect Dis 157:472–479.

8.   Josenhans C, Suerbaum S. 2002. The role of motility as a virulence factor in bacteria.

Int J Med Microbiol 291:605–614.

9.   Kao C-Y, Sheu B-S, Wu J-J. 2016. Helicobacter pylori infection: An overview of

bacterial virulence factors and pathogenesis. Biomed J 39:14–23.

10. Arslan-Aydoğdu EÖ, Kimiran A. 2018. An investigation of virulence factors of

Legionella pneumophila environmental isolates. Braz J Microbiol 49:189–199.

11. Kao CY, Lin WH, Tseng CC, Wu AB, Wang MC, Wu JJ. 2014. The complex interplay

among bacterial motility and virulence factors in different *Escherichia coli* infections.

Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 33:2157–2162.

12. Drake D, Montie TC. 1988. Flagella, Motility and Invasive Virulence of *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa. Microbiology, 134:43–52.

13.   Allen-Vercoe E, Sayers AR, Woodward MJ. 1999. Virulence of *Salmonella enterica*

472   serotype Enteritidis aflagellate and afimbriate mutants in a day-old chick model.

473   Epidemiol Infect 122:395–402.

474   14.   McCarter LL. 2001. Polar Flagellar Motility of the Vibrionaceae. Microbiol Mol Biol

475   Rev 65:445–462.

476   15.   Simchowitz L, Cragoe EJ. 1986. Inhibition of chemotactic factor-activated Na+/H+

477   exchange in human neutrophils by analogues of amiloride: structure-activity

478   relationships in the amiloride series. Mol Pharmacol 30:112–120.

479   16.   Sugiyama S, Cragoe EJ, Imae Y. 1988. Amiloride, a specific inhibitor for the Na+-

480   driven flagellar motors of alkalophilic Bacillus. J Biol Chem 263:8215–8219.

481   17.   Atsumi T, Sugiyama S, Cragoe EJ, Imae Y. 1990. Specific inhibition of the Na(+)-

482   driven flagellar motors of alkalophilic Bacillus strains by the amiloride analog

483   phenamil. J Bacteriol 172:1634–1639.

484   18.   Guia A, Leblanc N, Bose R. 1995. Effects of phenamil on potassium and calcium

485   channels of guinea pig ventricular myocytes. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 274:649–656.

486   19.   Kojima S, Asai Y, Atsumi T, Kawagishi I, Homma M. 1999. Na+-driven flagellar motor

487   resistant to phenamil, an amiloride analog, caused by mutations in putative channel

488   components. J Mol Biol 285:1537–1547.

489   20.   Jaques S, Kim Y-K, McCarter LL. 1999. Mutations conferring resistance to phenamil

490   and amiloride, inhibitors of sodium-driven motility of Vibrio parahaemolyticus. Proc

491   Natl Acad Sci 96:5740–5745.

21.   Ishida T, Ito R, Clark J, Matzke NJ, Sowa Y, Baker MAB. 2019. Sodium-powered

stators of the bacterial flagellar motor can generate torque in the presence of phenamil

with mutations near the peptidoglycan-binding region. Mol Microbiol 111:1689–1699.

22.   Terada H. 1990. Uncouplers of oxidative phosphorylation. Environ Health Perspect

87:213–218.

23.   Buckley BJ, Aboelela A, Minaei E, Jiang LX, Xu Z, Ali U, Fildes K, Cheung C-Y,

Cook SM, Johnson DC, Bachovchin DA, Cook GM, Apte M, Huang M, Ranson M,

Kelso MJ. 2018. 6-Substituted Hexamethylene Amiloride (HMA) Derivatives as Potent

and Selective Inhibitors of the Human Urokinase Plasminogen Activator for Use in

Cancer. J Med Chem 61:8299–8320.

24.   Buckley BJ, Majed H, Aboelela A, Minaei E, Jiang L, Fildes K, Cheung C-Y, Johnson

D, Bachovchin D, Cook GM, Huang M, Ranson M, Kelso MJ. 2019. 6-Substituted

amiloride derivatives as inhibitors of the urokinase-type plasminogen activator for use

in metastatic disease. Bioorg Med Chem Lett 29:126753.

25.   Nishiyama M, Sowa Y. 2012. Microscopic Analysis of Bacterial Motility at High

Pressure. Biophys J 102:1872–1880.

26.   Tree JJ, Ulett GC, Ong C-LY, Trott DJ, McEwan AG, Schembri MA. 2008. Trade-off

between iron uptake and protection against oxidative stress: deletion of cueO promotes

uropathogenic Escherichia coli virulence in a mouse model of urinary tract infection. J

Bacteriol 190:6909–6912.

27.   Sy BM, Lan R, Tree JJ. 2020. Early termination of the Shiga toxin transcript generates a

regulatory small RNA. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 117:25055–25065.

28. Dahan S, Knutton S, Shaw RK, Crepin VF, Dougan G, Frankel G. 2004. Transcriptome

of enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli O157 adhering to eukaryotic plasma membranes.

Infect Immun 72:5452–5459.

29. Kojima S, Atsumi T, Muramoto K, Kudo S, Kawagishi I, Homma M. 1997. Vibrio

alginolyticus mutants resistant to phenamil, a specific inhibitor of the sodium-driven

flagellar motor. J Mol Biol 265:310–318.

30. Nakamura S, Hanaizumi Y, Morimoto YV, Inoue Y, Erhardt M, Minamino T, Namba

K. 2020. Direct observation of speed fluctuations of flagellar motor rotation at

extremely low load close to zero. Mol Microbiol 113:755–765.

31. Nord AL, Sowa Y, Steel BC, Lo C-J, Berry RM. 2017. Speed of the bacterial flagellar

motor near zero load depends on the number of stator units. Proc Natl Acad Sci

114:11603–11608.

32. Wang B, Zhang R, Yuan J. 2017. Limiting (zero-load) speed of the rotary motor of

Escherichia coli is independent of the number of torque-generating units. Proc Natl

Acad Sci 114:12478–12482.

33. Soman V, Malik KS, Nath S, Elangovan R. 2020. Effect of cell size and tethering

geometry on rotation rate, torque, and rotational bias of E.coli cells. bioRxiv

2020.05.11.088310.

34. Grognot M, Taute KM. 2021. A multiscale 3D chemotaxis assay reveals bacterial

navigation mechanisms. Commun Biol 4:1–8.

35. Allen RC, Popat R, Diggle SP, Brown SP. 2014. Targeting virulence: can we make

evolution-proof drugs? 4. Nat Rev Microbiol 12:300–308.

36. Barczak AK, Hung DT. 2009. Productive steps toward an antimicrobial targeting

virulence. Curr Opin Microbiol 12:490–496.

37. van Alphen LB, Burt SA, Veenendaal AKJ, Bleumink-Pluym NMC, van Putten JPM.

2012. The natural antimicrobial carvacrol inhibits Campylobacter jejuni motility and

infection of epithelial cells. PloS One 7:e45343.

38. Mohr K. 1993. Amiloride and Its Analogs Unique Cation Transport Inhibitors. Edward

J. Cragoe jr., Thomas R. Kleyman, Louis Simchowitz. VCH Weinheim — New York —

Basel — Cambridge — Tokyo. Date of publication: December 1992. XV, 388 pages. 62

figures. 25 tables. DM 189,—, £ 78,—. Pharm Unserer Zeit 22:273–273.

39. McCarter LL. 2004. Dual Flagellar Systems Enable Motility under Different

Circumstances. Microb Physiol 7:18–29.

40. Atsumi T, Yoshimura F, Sugiyama S. 2006. Arginine inhibits Na-driven flagellar

motors of alkaliphilic Bacillus. FEMS Microbiol Lett 256:224–228.

41. Stone MRL, Butler MS, Phetsang W, Cooper MA, Blaskovich MAT. 2018. Fluorescent

Antibiotics: New Research Tools to Fight Antibiotic Resistance. Trends Biotechnol

36:523–536.

42. Adams LA, Sharma P, Mohanty B, Ilyichova OV, Mulcair MD, Williams ML, Gleeson

EC, Totsika M, Doak BC, Caria S, Rimmer K, Horne J, Shouldice SR, Vazirani M,

Headey SJ, Plumb BR, Martin JL, Heras B, Simpson JS, Scanlon MJ. 2015. Application

of Fragment-Based Screening to the Design of Inhibitors of Escherichia coli DsbA.

Angew Chem Int Ed 54:2179–2184.

43.   Nirody JA, Sun Y-R, Lo C-J. 2017. The biophysicist's guide to the bacterial flagellar

558   motor. Adv Phys X 2:324–343.

559   44.   Kasai T, Sowa Y. 2017. Measurements of the Rotation of the Flagellar Motor by Bead

560   Assay. Methods Mol Biol Clifton NJ 1593:185–192.

561   45.   Sowa Y, Homma M, Ishijima A, Berry RM. 2014. Hybrid-fuel bacterial flagellar motors

562   in Escherichia coli. Proc Natl Acad Sci 111:3436–3441.

563   46.   Morimoto YV, Namba K, Minamino T. 2017. Measurements of Free-swimming Speed

564   of Motile Salmonella Cells in Liquid Media. Bio-Protoc 7:e2093–e2093.

565   47.   Islam MI, Lin A, Lai Y-W, Matzke NJ, Baker MAB. 2020. Ancestral Sequence

566   Reconstructions of MotB Are Proton-Motile and Require MotA for Motility. Front

567   Microbiol 11.

Fig. 1: Structures and effects of compounds on bacterial rotation in tethered cell assays.

(A) Chemical structures of controls 5-*N,N*-(hexamethylene)amiloride (HMA) and phenamil

and test compounds BB2-50F and HM2-16F. **(B)** Tethered cell rotation speed (Hz) after
treatment with drugs (μM). Cells were *E. coli* SYC35 strain with PomAPotB stators
(pSHU1234). Cells were treated with 0, 1, 10 and 100 μM of each compound. Boxes represent
the 25th and 75th percentile, with median indicated by dividing line. Whiskers cover the full
range   from   minimum   to   maximum
(n $\geq$ 30). The lime green bar = HMA, salmon = phenamil, blue = BB2-50F and violet = HM2-
16F. **(C)** Dose characterisation of compounds. Cells were treated with 0, 1, 2.5, 5, 7.5 and 10
μM of each compound. The line graphs (bottom) indicate the tracking of individual cells'
change in rotation speed. **(D)** Effects of sodium concentration ($[Na^+]$) on inhibitory activity.
Cells were treated with 0, 1, 2.5, 5, 7.5 and 10 μM drugs diluted in motility buffer containing
different Na^+ concentrations (1, 5, 20 and 85 mM). Total ionic concentration was held constant
and balanced with 85, 80, 65 and 0 mM KCl respectively.

Fig. 2: Activity of compounds against phenamil-resistant stators and proton-powered MotAMotB. Tethered cell speed (Hz) in response to 0, 1, 10, and 100 µM of: **A)** phenamil, **(B)** BB2-50F and (**C**) HM2-16F. Cell used for all assays were *E. coli* SYC35 with PomA(D148Y)/PotB (pSHU1235), PomA/PotB(P16S) (pSHU1236), PomA(D148Y)/PotB (P16S) (pSHU1237), PomA/PotB(F22Y/L28Q) (pSHU149) and MotAMotB(pDB-108), respectively. Boxes represent the 25th and 75th percentile, with median indicated by dividing line. Whiskers depict the full range from minimum to maximum ($n \geq 20$).

Fig. 3: Inhibition of swimming speed by BB2-50F and HM2-16F. Bacterial swimming speed
was measured by tracking individual cells using videography in the presence of different
concentrations (0, 10, 100 μM) of each compound. Swimming speed of: **(A)** PomAPotB
expressed via plasmid in Δ*motAB* strain, **(B)** MotAMotB expressed via plasmid in Δ*motAB*
strain, **(C)** MotAMotB in uropathogenic *Escherichia coli* (UPEC) and **(D)** MotAMotB in
enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* (EHEC), and **(E)** PomAPomB in *Vibrio alginolyticus,* all
following wash with drug. Speeds of individual cells shown in μm/s with the scattered plots,
median speed indicated by line (n ≥ 30).

Fig. 4: Bead assay results for phenamil, BB2-50F and HM2-16F. (top) 1 μm Polystyrene bead assay in *E. coli* strain JHC36 with plasmid expressing PomAPotB stator (pSHU1234) in presence of (A) phenamil, (B) BB2-50F and (C) HM2-16F. Each panel shows three X-Y scatter plots (over 1 s) of the position a bead attached to the rotating flagellar filament of a single cell before exposure to drug, after exposure to drug, and after wash to remove drug. Raw speed vs time and XY vs time plots shown in Supplementary Fig. 2. **(middle)** Bead assay in *E. coli* strain JHC36 with plasmid expressing MotAMotB stator in presence of (D) phenamil, (E) BB2-50F and (F) HM2-16F. **(Bottom)** X-Y position (over 60 s) for *E. coli* strain JHC36 with no stators expressed. The Brownian diffusion of the bead for 60-120 s is shown before and after treatment with (G) phenamil, (H) BB2-50F and (I) HM2-16F, respectively. All drugs washed in as 50 μL of 10 μM drug, washed out with 200 μL of 85MTB. All lengths in μm.

Fig. 5: Gold bead nanoparticle assay results phenamil, BB2-50F and HM2-16F. Gold nanoparticle assay was performed in SHU174 *E. coli* strain in presence of 10 µM BB2-50F

(left) and HM2-16F (right) for both PomAPotB and MotAMotB stators, with phenamil action

on PomAPotB as a positive control (top). (A) Positive control for 10 µM phenamil against

rotation driven by PomAPotB. Rotation of full circles is maintained, with slowing of cell speed

speed vs time shown in Supplementary Fig. 4). 10 µM of BB2-50F (B) and HM2-16F (C)

acting on PomAPotB stators has no effect or gold bead rotation. 10 µM of BB2-50F (D) and

HM2-16F (E) acting on MotAMotB has no effect on gold bead rotation. 10 µM of BB2-50F

(F) and HM2-16F (G) acting on statorless cells. Rotational diffusion of gold bead tracks circles

and is not impeded. Data for PomAPotB, MotAMotB and statorless strainst against 100 µM of

compound is shown in Supplementary Fig. 5 & 6. All lengths in µm.