A Novel Family of RNA-Binding Proteins Regulate Polysaccharide Metabolism in

Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron

Amanda N.D. Adams[a], Muhammad S. Azam[a,b], Zachary A. Costliow[a,c], Xiangqian Ma[a],

Patrick H. Degnan[d#] and Carin K. Vanderpool[a#]

[a]Department of Microbiology, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois, USA

[b]Present address: Department of Microbiology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA

[c]Present address: The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

[d]Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology, University of California-Riverside, Riverside,

California, USA

[#]Correspondence to: Patrick H. Degnan, patrickd@ucr.edu; or Carin K. Vanderpool,

cvanderp@illinois.edu

Running Title: *Bacteroides* RBPs regulate polysaccharide metabolism

Abstract

Human gut microbiome composition is constantly changing, and diet is a major driver of these changes. Gut microbial species that persist in mammalian hosts for long periods of time must possess mechanisms for sensing and adapting to nutrient shifts to avoid being outcompeted. Global regulatory mechanisms mediated by RNA-binding proteins (RBPs) that govern responses to nutrient shifts have been characterized in Proteobacteria and Firmicutes but remain undiscovered in the Bacteroidetes. Here we report the identification of RBPs that are broadly distributed across the Bacteroidetes, with many genomes encoding multiple copies. Genes encoding these RBPs are highly expressed in many *Bacteroides* species. A purified RBP, RbpB, from *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* binds to single-stranded RNA *in vitro* with an affinity similar to other characterized regulatory RBPs. *B. thetaiotaomicron* mutants lacking RBPs show dramatic shifts in expression of polysaccharide utilization and capsular polysaccharide loci, suggesting that these RBPs may act as global regulators of polysaccharide metabolism. A *B. thetaiotaomicron* Δ*rbpB* mutant shows a growth defect on dietary sugars belonging to the raffinose family of oligosaccharides (RFOs). The Δ*rbpB* mutant had reduced expression of *BT1871*, encoding a predicted RFO-degrading melibiase, compared to the wild-type strain. Mutation of *BT1871* confirmed that the enzyme it encodes is essential for growth on melibiose and promotes growth on the RFOs raffinose and stachyose. Our data reveal that RbpB is required for optimal expression of *BT1871* and other polysaccharide-related genes, suggesting that we have identified an important new family of global regulatory proteins in the Bacteroidetes.

Importance

The human colon houses hundreds of bacterial species, including many belonging to the genus *Bacteroides,* that aid in breaking down our food to keep us healthy. *Bacteroides* have many genes responsible for breaking down different dietary carbohydrates and complex regulatory mechanisms ensure that specific genes are only expressed when the right carbohydrates are available. In this study, we discovered that *Bacteroides* use a family of RNA-binding proteins as global regulators to coordinate expression of carbohydrate utilization genes. The ability to turn different carbohydrate utilization genes on and off in response to changing nutrient conditions is critical for *Bacteroides* to live successfully in the gut, and thus the new regulators we have identified may be important for life in the host.

Key words RRM-1, RNA-binding protein, Hfq, melibiose, PUL, CPS

Introduction

The human gut microbiome is an important player in host health, with diet being

one of the principal drivers of gut microbial composition and function (1–3). Dietary

carbohydrates, including complex polysaccharides and oligosaccharides are not readily

absorbed by the host and reach the distal gut where they are broken down and

metabolized by a consortium of microbes with diverse enzymatic capabilities (4).

Members of the dominant bacterial phylum Bacteroidetes can readily switch between

carbohydrate types as they become available due to dozens of substrate-specific

polysaccharide utilization loci (PUL) that encode proteins responsible for sensing and

catabolizing diverse polysaccharides (5–7). Characterized PULs are tightly regulated by

several distinct families of transcriptional regulators so that they are only abundantly

expressed when their substrates are available (5, 8–17). However, accumulating

evidence suggests that post-transcriptional regulation also plays an important part in gut

colonization and preferential use of carbohydrates through control of PULs (18–20).

Post-transcriptional regulation can be mediated by multiple regulators. In

Bacteroides species, the roles of small RNA (sRNA) regulators (19, 21) and other RNA

regulatory elements like riboswitches (22–24) in control of carbohydrate and vitamin

metabolism are beginning to be recognized. In well-studied Firmicutes and

Proteobacteria, post-transcriptional regulation of carbon metabolism and other systems

often occurs through the actions of sRNAs and their helper RNA chaperones (25).

Three of the most well-studied RNA chaperones include Hfq, CsrA, and ProQ.

Collectively, these three RNA-binding proteins (RBPs) regulate the bulk of the RNA

regulatory interactome in organisms like *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella enterica*, and

each RBP has its own distinct RNA targets (26, 27). Hfq in particular functions as a

global post-transcriptional regulator of gene expression (28, 29). It binds to both mRNAs

and sRNAs, facilitating their interactions through short stretches of complementarity (30,

31). These interactions result in a variety of different regulatory outcomes, primarily

resulting from changes in translation initiation or mRNA stability (28). In many

organisms, mutation of *hfq* causes global changes in gene expression and pleiotropic

phenotypes (32–34).

Though regulatory RNA chaperones have not been characterized in the

Bacteroidetes, post-transcriptional regulation has been implicated in control of gene

expression in *Bacteroides* species (21, 35), including regulation of PUL expression (19).

In particular, the cis-antisense PUL-associated sRNA DonS in *B. fragilis* as well as

several PUL-associated cis-antisense sRNAs in *B. thetaiotaomicron* (19, 21) have been

implicated in modulation of PUL function through repression of carbohydrate transporter

gene expression. A recent study identified dozens of sRNAs encoded throughout the

genome of *B. thetaiotaomicron* with many being PUL-associated, suggesting that

sRNA-mediated regulation of PUL function may be a common phenomenon in

Bacteroides (21). Additionally, there are a growing number of examples of regulatory

effects in *Bacteroides* mediated by sequences in mRNA untranslated regions (UTRs)

(18, 36) and these may be mediated by as yet unidentified sRNAs or RNA chaperones.

To better understand the scope of RNA-mediated regulatory mechanisms in the

Bacteroidetes, we sought to identify and characterize RBPs that may act as regulatory

RNA chaperones.

Here we report the identification of a family of genes commonly found in

Bacteroidetes genomes, which encode RBPs with a single RNA Recognition Motif 1

(RRM-1) domain. These genes are conserved, often exist in multiple copies per

genome, and are highly expressed in many human gut *Bacteroides* isolates. We

demonstrate that a member of this family, RbpB, is a single-stranded (ss) RNA-binding

protein that binds with some specificity and affinities similar to other characterized RNA

chaperones. *B. thetaiotaomicron* mutants lacking one or more of these RBPs have

large-scale changes to their transcriptomes compared to the wild-type strain, with genes

belonging to PUL and capsular polysaccharide (CPS) loci being the most differentially

regulated. *B. thetaiotaomicron rbpB* mutants have growth defects on the common

dietary plant sugars raffinose family oligosaccharides due to decreased expression of

BT1871, an essential melibiase encoded in PUL24. Our findings suggest that this family

of RBPs play an important role in global regulation of polysaccharide metabolism in

Bacteroides.

Results

Identification of a conserved family of RNA-binding proteins in the phylum

Bacteroidetes

To identify putative RNA-binding proteins that may act as global regulators in the

Bacteroidetes, we compared a set of 313 human gut-associated microbial genomes

representing major phyla commonly found in gut microbial communities (37). We first

searched for canonical RNA chaperones – Hfq, ProQ, and CsrA, which are involved in

post-transcriptional regulation of gene expression in Proteobacteria. Using hidden

Markov models (HMMs) with trusted cutoffs, we identified Hfq in 23% (72/313) of the

genomes (a total of 79 Hfq homologs) mostly in the Proteobacteria, although there were

some identified in Firmicutes genomes (Fig.1A and Dataset S1). ProQ homologs (a total

of 40 across 36 genomes) were entirely restricted to the Proteobacteria, with the

majority being found in γ-proteobacterial genomes. CsrA homologs were identified in

25% (79/313) of genomes with a total of 93 CsrA homologs distributed across the

Proteobacteria and Firmicutes. We did not identify any Hfq, ProQ, or CsrA homologs

among Bacteroidetes genomes suggesting that if RNA chaperone regulators are

present in this phylum, they do not belong to these canonical families.

To identify other putative RNA chaperones in our model organism, we searched

the *B. thetaiotaomicron* VPI-5482 genome for proteins with conserved RNA-binding

domains. This yielded three intriguing candidates comprised of a single RNA

Recognition Motif 1 (RRM-1; PF00076) domain, here named RbpA (BT0784), RbpB

(BT1887), and RbpC (BT3840). The small, ~70 amino acid RRM-1 domain is one of the

most common RNA-binding domains in eukaryotes where it is typically found in

multidomain proteins involved in post-transcriptional RNA processing events including

regulation of RNA stability, translation, and turnover (38). Though poorly characterized,

many bacterial genomes appear to encode RRM-1 domain-containing proteins (39, 40).

Given the characterized roles of RRM-1 domain-containing proteins in post-

transcriptional RNA regulatory processes, we chose to focus on these homologs for

further characterization.

Expanding our search for RRM-1 domain-containing proteins to our larger set of

gut microbial genomes identified homologs of *B. thetaiotaomicron* RBPs in 69 of 313

genomes (Fig. 1A and Dataset S1). These proteins were widely distributed among

Bacteroidetes genomes accounting for 86% (149/174) of the total number of RRM-1

domain proteins identified. We also identified homologs in a small subset of

Proteobacterial genomes (Fig. 1A, Dataset S1). In contrast to eukaryotes, the bacterial

RRM-1 proteins we identified are small, single-domain proteins ranging in size from 60-

132 amino acids (aa), with the majority being 80-100 aa. Each protein contains a single

ferredoxin-like fold RRM-1 motif followed by a predicted disordered C-terminus of

varying lengths. This structure is reminiscent of the disordered C-termini of Hfq and

other RNA chaperones that plays a role in RNA-binding and cycling among various

binding partners (41–45). CsrA, Hfq, and ProQ homologs were largely encoded in single

copy with only a few instances of more than one copy in individual genomes (Dataset

S1). In contrast, RRM-1 genes frequently occurred in multiple copies per genome in

Bacteroidetes genomes (Table S1, Fig. 1B). Of the Bacteroidetes genomes we

analyzed, 50 of 58 contained one to four copies of genes encoding RRM-1 domain

proteins, with the majority of genomes containing three (Fig. 1B).

To analyze phylogenetic relationships among novel RRM-1 domain proteins

found in Bacteroidetes genomes, we used MCL (Markov cluster algorithm) with a 70%

amino acid identity cutoff and compared the resulting clusters to a species phylogeny of

the Bacteroidetes (Dataset S1). Clustering was chosen because the extent of

divergence among the homologs and their short lengths makes phylogenetic

reconstruction unreliable. The clustering revealed a complicated history of divergence

and duplication resulting in 10 clusters designated *rbpA–rbpJ.* It is notable that the three

loci represented in *B. thetaiotaomicron*, *rbpA, rbpB,* and *rbpC* represent the most

widespread clusters. Even within these clusters we identified evidence of likely

duplications or horizontal gene transfer among particular lineages, resulting in genomes

that encode two genes belonging to a single cluster. For example, the *Bacteroides*

fragilis 3_1_2 genome contains *rbpA* and *rbpA'* which share 84% amino acid identity.

The well-characterized RNA chaperone Hfq is an abundant protein in

Proteobacteria (46). To determine whether genes encoding *Bacteroides* RBPs show

similarly high levels of expression, we analyzed available RNA-seq data for *B.*

thetaiotaomicron (generated by us (see Materials and Methods) and others (23)) and

eight additional species – *Bacteroides caccae* (47)*, Bacteroides cellulosyliticus* (48)*,*

Bacteroides dorei (49)*, Bacteroides massilensis* (18)*, Bacteroides uniformis* (24)*,*

Bacteroides vulgatus (24)*,* and *Bacteroides xylanisolvens* (50) that were grown under a

variety of *in vitro* conditions. Virtually all of the genes encoding RBP homologs were

highly expressed in these datasets. Most *Bacteroides rbp* genes (represented by

colored triangles, Fig. 1C, 1D) were expressed at levels placing them among the top

10% of most highly expressed genes (represented by grey dots, Fig. 1C, 1D). Looking

specifically at *B. thetaiotaomicron rbpA, rbpB,* and *rbpC*, we observed that these genes

are highly expressed both *in vitro* (minimal medium with glucose and TYG medium) and

in vivo in monocolonized mice (51) or mice colonized with a synthetic consortium (47)

(Fig. 1D).

B. thetaiotaomicron RbpB is a single-stranded RNA-binding protein

To test the RNA-binding activity of a representative of this family of *Bacteroides*

RBPs, we conducted electrophoretic mobility shift assays (EMSAs). We overexpressed

and purified *B. thetaiotaomicron* RbpB and tested binding to a series of *in vitro*

transcribed single-stranded RNA (ssRNA) "pentaprobes" (52). The twelve ssRNA

pentaprobes are each 100-nucleotides (nts) in length and collectively contain all

possible 5-nt sequence combinations (Table S1). RbpB shifted ten of the twelve probes

to varying degrees, indicating that RbpB binds ssRNA *in vitro* and suggesting that it

does so with some degree of sequence specificity (Figs. 2A and S1A). RbpB showed no

evidence of binding to two of the pentaprobes PP6 and PP12 (Figs. S1A and 2B).

Probes PP2 and PP3 shifted at lower concentrations of RbpB compared with other

probes (Figs. 2A and S1A). The calculated K_D of RbpB binding to PP3 is 10.5 µM (Fig.

2C), a dissociation constant similar to those previously reported for RRM domains (38,

53). RRM domains can interact with a variable number of nts in the binding pocket, with

binding motifs that are typically 5-8 nts in length (54). To identify candidate RbpB

binding motifs in the pentaprobes, we used MEME motif discovery tool (55) to identify

sequence motifs (<9-nt in length) that occurred in RbpB-binding pentaprobes but were

absent in non-binding pentaprobes (Fig. S1B). MEME identified 10 such motifs in RbpB-

binding pentaprobe sequences. Motif 1, comprised of G, U, and A residues was the

most common motif found exclusively in the bound pentaprobes (Figs. 2D and S1B). A

C/U-rich motif, motif 9 (Fig. 2E and S1B), was present in probes PP2 and PP3, which

bound RbpB with higher affinity than other pentaprobes (Fig. 2A and C and S1A). To

test whether RbpB would bind specifically to motif 1 (5'-GUAGGAUA-3') or motif 9

(5'UCCUGUGC-3'), we conducted EMSAs using new RNA oligonucleotide probes

containing three repeats of each motif. RbpB shifted the probe containing three copies

of motif 1 with a K_D of 5.1 µM (Fig. 2D). In contrast, RbpB did not shift a probe

containing three copies of motif 9 (Fig. 2E). Overall, these results demonstrate that

RbpB binds ssRNA with some degree of specificity at affinities comparable to known

RNA-binding proteins (56–58).

Loss of RBPs leads to altered expression of PUL and CPS loci

To assess possible functions of RBPs in *B. thetaiotaomicron*, we made mutant

strains lacking *rbpA* and *rbpB*. We generated three strains: Δ*rbpA (BT0784)*, Δ*rbpB*

(BT1887), and Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB*. We were unable to generate a Δ*rbpC* mutant. We

performed RNA-seq on RNA samples from Δ*rbpA,* Δ*rbpB,* and Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* strains

grown to mid-log or stationary phase in rich medium (TYG). Among protein coding

genes, 12.3% (587/4,778) were significantly differentially regulated (q-value <0.06, $\log_2$

fold-change of $\geq$+1 or $\leq$-1) in at least one condition (Dataset S2A), with Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB*

having the greatest number of differentially regulated genes among the three mutants.

To identify functional classes of differentially expressed genes, Gene Set Enrichment

Analysis (GSEA) (59) was used with *B. thetaiotaomicron*-specific custom gene sets (see

Materials and Methods). Differentially regulated genes that were not categorized in

GSEA were further grouped according to Gene Ontology (Dataset S2A and Materials

and Methods). Considering all differentially regulated genes across all strains, enriched

functional groups included CPS loci, PULs, hypothetical proteins, transmembrane

transport, redox activities, B-vitamin metabolism, transcription, translation, and a variety

of other metabolic pathways (Fig. 3A). The largest functional group of differentially

regulated genes was CPS genes, accounting for 17% (98/587) of differentially regulated

genes across all six wild-type to mutant comparisons (Fig. 3A, B). CPS loci encode

functions that produce the polysaccharide coats that surround the *Bacteroides* cell

surface (10, 17, 60). Of the eight CPS loci in *B. thetaiotaomicron* VPI-5482, five were

differentially regulated across the three mutant strains including CPS2, CPS4, CPS5,

CPS6, and CPS7 loci (Fig. 3B). CPS4 and 6 loci were downregulated in all three

mutants compared to wild-type in both conditions, whereas CPS2, 5, and 7 loci were

upregulated in some mutants compared to wild-type in a subset of conditions. CPS2

was upregulated in both Δ*rbpA* and Δ*rbpB* mutants in mid-log and stationary phase, but

was unchanged in the Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* mutant in either growth condition, implying a genetic

interaction between *rbpA* and *rbpB* in the regulation of the CPS2 locus. Expression

patterns for all mutants were similar between mid-log and stationary phase conditions,

except for the CPS7 locus. CPS7 was upregulated in Δ*rbpA* and Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* mutants

compared to wild-type in mid-log cells but only the Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* mutant showed a

difference with wild-type in stationary phase.

PULs were the second most abundantly represented functional group among

differentially regulated genes (Fig. 3A). Of the 88 annotated PULs (5), 29 (33%) had at

least one differentially regulated gene in *rbp* mutant strains compared to wild-type,

accounting for 29% (75/263) of genes across the 29 PULs (Fig. 3C). In contrast to CPS

expression, PUL expression differences in mutant strains frequently varied according to

growth phase. PUL56 was downregulated in all three mutant strains exclusively during

stationary phase. In contrast, PUL71 was downregulated in all three mutant strains

during stationary phase but in mid-log was only downregulated in single mutants Δ*rbpA*

and Δ*rbpB* (Fig. 3C). Similar to the CPS loci, several PULs demonstrated expression

patterns indicative of a genetic interaction between *rbpA* and *rbpB*, including PUL22.

PUL22 was upregulated in the Δ*rbpB* mutant but downregulated in Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* double

mutant during mid-log growth. In contrast, in stationary phase, PUL22 was upregulated

in Δ*rbpA* and downregulated in Δ*rbpB* and Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* mutant strains. Several PULs

including PUL08, 10, 14, 51, 59, 75, 80, and 81, were differentially regulated in specific

single mutant strains but not differentially regulated in the Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* double mutant.

We also saw some expression patterns that may be indicative of redundant regulation

by RbpA and RbpB – PULs 36, 45, 54, 72, 73, and 82 were not differentially expressed

in the single deletion mutants but were differentially expressed in the Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB*

double mutant. Collectively, these results suggest that RbpA and RbpB play global roles

in *B. thetaiotaomicron* gene expression, and in particular suggest that they coordinate

capsular polysaccharide production and carbohydrate utilization through control of CPS

and PUL genes, respectively.

The Δ*rbpB* mutant is defective for growth on raffinose family oligosaccharides

To determine whether *B. thetaiotaomicron* RBPs are required for growth on

specific carbohydrates, we carried out an initial screen of Δ*rbpA*, Δ*rbpB*, and

Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* strains for growth defects on Biolog plates containing a variety of carbon

sources (Fig. S2 and Dataset S3). All three strains were defective for utilization of a

number of dietary and host-associated glycans (Fig. S2 and Dataset S3). As observed

for the transcriptome, phenotypes for the double mutant Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* strain did not

recapitulate all growth defects observed in single mutant Δ*rbpA* or Δ*rbpB* strains,

implying a genetic interaction between *rbpA* and *rbpB*. For example, the Δ*rbpA* strain

showed faster growth than the wild-type strain on maltotriose, α-methyl-D-galactoside,

α-D-lactose, and lactulose while showing slower growth on sucrose, D-trehalose,

turanose, D-mannose, and palatinose as compared to wild-type. Defects on turanose,

D-trehalose, and palatinose were recapitulated in the Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* strain, but the other

growth changes seen in the Δ*rbpA* strain were not observed in the Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* strain.

The Δ*rbpB* strain grew slower than wild-type on D-melibiose, β-methyl-D-galactoside,

palatinose, and mannan, and defects on β-methyl-D-galactoside, palatinose, and

mannan were also observed for the Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* strain. Interestingly, all three strains

were defective for growth on palatinose and a methylated galactoside. Unique to

Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* was slow growth on gentiobiose and N-acetyl-D-galactosamine. Overall,

these results are consistent with transcriptome results that suggest that both *rbpA* and

rbpB play a role in regulation of carbohydrate utilization.

One of the carbohydrates on which the Δ*rbpB* mutant alone had substantial

growth defects was D-melibiose, a subunit of the raffinose family oligosaccharides

(RFOs) (Fig. S2). Since RFOs are prevalent in the human diet and are available to

organisms that can metabolize them in the distal gut, we chose this phenotype for

further evaluation. RFOs consist of the disaccharide sucrose (α-1,2-glucose-fructose)

bound to repeating α-1,6-galactosyl residues producing the trisaccharide raffinose and

the tetrasaccharide stachyose (Fig. 4A), along with the pentasaccharide verbascose. In

addition to sucrose, the α-1,6-galactose-glucose disaccharide melibiose is an RFO

subunit. When grown in minimal medium with RFOs or their subunits as the sole carbon

source, the Δ*rbpB* strain displayed growth defects on melibiose, raffinose, and

stachyose (Fig. 4B). The doubling time of the wild-type strain on minimal medium with

melibiose as the sole carbon source was 2.86 hours compared to twice that for the

Δ*rbpB* strain (5.76 hours). The Δ*rbpA* and Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB* strains did not have growth

defects on these substrates, again consistent with possible genetic interactions between

RbpA and RbpB with respect to growth on RFOs. Δ*rbpA*, Δ*rbpB*, and Δ*rbpA*Δ*rbpB*

strains showed no growth defects on monosaccharide subunits of RFOs, including

glucose, galactose, and fructose, or on the disaccharide sucrose (Fig. 4B-C),

suggesting that the Δ*rbpB* growth defect is due to the inability of this strain to utilize

sugars containing the α-1,6-galactose-glucose linkage.

Complementation of the Δ*rbpB* strain was attempted with two different constructs

(Fig. S3A). Neither complementation construct restored growth of the Δ*rbpB* mutant on

RFOs (Fig. S3B). We measured *rbpB* mRNA levels from wild-type (*rbpB*[+]), Δ*rbpB,* and

both complementation strains and found that levels of *rbpB* mRNA in complementation

strains were significantly lower than in the wild-type strain (Fig. S3C), which may

account for the inability to restore growth on melibiose.

Upon further inspection of the *rbpB* (*BT1887*) native locus in our TYG RNA-seq

data, we noticed reduced expression of the immediately adjacent genes *BT1886*,

BT1885, and *BT1884* in the Δ*rbpB* strain, especially in mid-log phase, suggesting a

possible polar effect of the *rbpB* mutation on *BT1886-BT1884* (Fig. S4A). We also

observed a single transcription start site upstream of *rbpB-BT1884* in TYG (21)*, a

terminator prediction after the *rbpB* ORF, and a terminator prediction after *BT1884* (21),

suggesting *rbpB* may be expressed as both a monocistronic mRNA and polycistronic

with *BT1886-BT1884* (Fig. S4B). To determine if we could detect *rbpB* co-transcription

with *BT1886-BT1884* under conditions relevant to the *rbpB* mutant phenotype we

conducted RT-PCR on RNA samples harvested from wild-type (*rbpB*^{+}) cells grown to

mid-log phase on minimal media with glucose or melibiose. Primer sets spanning

junctions between each gene in the putative operon yielded PCR products (Fig. S4C),

suggesting that *rbpB* and *BT1886-BT1884* are expressed as an operon. *BT1886*,

BT1885, and *BT1884* encode a putative RhlE DEAD-box RNA helicase, a hypothetical

protein, and a cold shock domain containing protein, respectively. The operon structure

suggests the functions of these proteins are linked. One other possibility that may

explain the inability to complement the *rbpB* mutant melibiose growth phenotype is that

the appropriate stoichiometry of these proteins was not restored by the

complementation constructs.

Loss of RbpB leads to decreased expression of an essential melibiase in PUL24

Given the inability of Δ*rbpB* to utilize α-1,6 linked RFOs, we hypothesized that a

gene (or genes) encoding an α-galactosidase would be differentially regulated in the

Δ*rbpB* mutant strain compared to wild-type. Although there are several α-galactosidases

annotated in the genome (7), none of them were significantly differentially regulated in

our TYG RNA-seq, suggesting differential regulation may be specific to growth in

minimal medium with melibiose. We therefore performed more RNA-seq to identify

candidate genes responsible for this phenotype. We compared transcriptome profiles of

wild-type and Δ*rbpB* strains grown in minimal media with glucose or melibiose. To

identify genes that are uniquely transcriptionally responsive to the α-1,6 linkage in

melibiose, we also compared the glucose- and melibiose-grown cells' transcriptomes to

that of cells grown in minimal medium with a 1:1 mixture of glucose and galactose, the

monosaccharides that makeup melibiose.

Comparing wild-type and Δ*rbpB* transcriptomes in all three media, we identified

genes in PUL24 that were strongly differentially regulated (Fig. 5A and Dataset S2B).

PUL24 (genes *BT1871-BT1878*) contains a SusC/D-like pair (BT1874-BT1875), a

σ/anti-σ factor pair (BT1876-BT1877), and four putative glycosyl hydrolases belonging

to families GH3 (BT1872), GH43 (BT1873), GH76 (BT1878), and GH97 (BT1871).

Genes *BT1873-BT1878* were expressed at very low levels in wild-type and Δ*rbpB*

strains in all of the conditions we tested (Fig. 5A, Dataset S2B) suggesting that these

genes are not involved in glucose, galactose, or melibiose metabolism. However,

BT1871 and *BT1872* were highly expressed in the wild-type strain growing in glucose

and melibiose (Fig. 5A) (and the glucose-galactose mixture, Dataset S2B) but were

expressed at barely detectable levels in the Δ*rbpB* strain. In contrast, *BT1871* and

BT1872 were not differentially expressed between wild-type and Δ*rbpB* strains grown in

TYG (Dataset S2A).

Previous work showed that BT1871 has *in vitro* melibiase activity (61)*,* and

transposon insertions in *BT1871* led to decreased fitness in melibiose in a carbohydrate

utilization screen (62). To confirm that BT1871 was important for *B. thetaiotaomicron*

utilization of RFOs including melibiose as a sole carbon source, we deleted *BT1871* and

cultured the Δ*BT1871* and wild-type strains in minimal media with melibiose, raffinose,

stachyose, and sucrose (Fig. 5B). The Δ*BT1871* strain showed no growth defect on

sucrose compared to the wild-type strain, which is expected based on its predicted

melibiase activity. In contrast, the Δ*BT1871* mutant could not grow on melibiose,

indicating *BT1871* is essential for melibiose utilization. Additionally, the Δ*BT1871* mutant

showed reduced growth on raffinose and stachyose compared to wild-type (Fig. 5B),

indicating that *BT1871* is required for metabolism of RFOs in general. Residual growth

of the Δ*BT1871* mutant on raffinose and stachyose is presumably due to the ability to

utilize fructose from the α-1,2 sucrose linkage.

We constructed three different complementation strains to confirm that BT1871 is

responsible for the melibiose growth defect. There is a single predicted promoter

upstream of *BT1872* (21) and the *BT1872* and *BT1871* open reading frames are

separated by only 32 bp suggesting that they are co-expressed. Complementation

strain 1 (compl1, Fig. 5C) carried the native promoter upstream of *BT1872* followed by a

deletion of the *BT1872* ORF and the intact *BT1871* gene. Complementation strain 2

(compl2, Fig. 5C) carried the intact promoter and *BT1872* and *BT1871* genes.

Complementation strain 3 (compl3, Fig. 5C) carried the promoter and *BT1872* only. The

compl1 construct partially restored growth on melibiose, raffinose, and stachyose (Fig.

5D). The compl2 construct improved growth on RFOs compared to the compl1

construct, whereas the compl3 construct (*BT1872* alone) failed to complement (Fig. 5D)

Taken together these results indicate that *BT1871* is an essential melibiase required for

RFO utilization and the decrease in *BT1871* mRNA in the Δ*rbpB* strain is responsible for

the melibiose growth defect.

Discussion

Though it is well established that rapid nutrient shifts affect the composition and

metabolic activities of gut microbes (47, 63–65), the regulatory mechanisms that allow

them to sense and rapidly adapt to use of different nutrient sources are poorly

understood. Canonical mechanisms for global transcriptional regulation of carbon

source utilization in model organisms from the phyla Proteobacteria and Firmicutes(66)

are absent in the Bacteroidetes (67–69). Likewise, RNA chaperones and RNA-mediated

post-transcriptional regulatory mechanisms that coordinate metabolism and responses

to changing environmental conditions (28, 70–73) are commonly found in

Proteobacteria and Firmicutes but have not been described in Bacteroidetes. In this

study, we identify a family of conserved RNA-binding proteins that is broadly distributed

among members of the Bacteroidetes and some Proteobacteria that lack canonical

RNA chaperone regulators. These RBPs occur in multiple copies in a given genome

and are highly expressed in a number of *Bacteroides* species from the human gut in

culture and in mouse models. At least one of these proteins from *B. thetaiotaomicron*,

RbpB, is able to bind ssRNA *in vitro* in a sequence specific manner. Deletion of *rbpA*

and *rbpB* in *B. thetaiotaomicron* leads to global dysregulation of CPS loci and PULs and

perturbed growth on a variety of carbohydrate sources. Overall, these results suggest

that this family of RBPs may play global regulatory roles in carbohydrate metabolism in

the *Bacteroides*.

While our study provides strong evidence for the importance of these RBPs in

global regulation of gene expression, the mechanisms by which RBPs mediate these

effects are still unknown. We hypothesize that RBPs act as RNA chaperones that

control mRNA stability and translation by binding to target mRNAs and modulating

ribosome association or access of RNases (Fig. 6). RBP modulation of mRNA

translation or stability may be through direct interaction of RBPs with target mRNAs

(Fig. 6A) or through facilitating base pairing of sRNAs to mRNAs (Fig. 6B), either of

which could result in changes to mRNA structure that alter accessibility to ribosomes or

RNases. Little is known about RNA chaperone function in the Bacteroidetes, but in the

case of RbpB, its role in RNA metabolism is supported by its genomic location.

Annotations for BT1885 (DEAD-box RNA helicase) and BT1884 (cold-shock protein)

suggest that *rbpB-BT1884* may be an RNA metabolism operon. To date, we do not

have evidence supporting or refuting a role for RBPs in modulation of sRNA function.

However, recent literature suggests that sRNAs may play an important role in

modulation of carbohydrate metabolism in *Bacteroides* (19, 21). One recent study

described an N-acetyl-D-glucosamine-inducible sRNA called GibS that binds *in vitro* to

mRNAs involved in carbohydrate metabolism. Mutant strains lacking GibS had nine

differentially-regulated genes compared to the wild-type parent strain. Two of these

were *BT1871-BT1872,* where expression was reduced in the Δ*gibS* compared to the

wild-type strain. GibS binding to *BT1871* mRNA was predicted *in silico* but could not be

demonstrated *in vitro*. The authors speculated that GibS binding to *BT1871* mRNA

required an unidentified RNA chaperone. To test whether RbpB facilitates RFO

utilization by a GibS-dependent mechanism, we generated deletion mutants Δ*gibS* and

Δ*rbpB*Δ*gibS* and grew these strains alongside wild-type in the presence of melibiose

(Fig. S5A). The Δ*gibS* mutant grew similarly to wild-type and the Δ*rbpB*Δ*gibS* mutant

grew similarly to the Δ*rbpB* parent strain on melibiose (Fig. S5A). RT-qPCR showed that

levels of *BT1871* mRNA were also similar between wild-type and Δ*gibS* strains (Fig.

S5B), suggesting that GibS does not play a major role in modulating *BT1871* mRNA

levels in our growth conditions. Overall, these results suggest that under our growth

conditions, RbpB regulates *BT1871* independently of GibS.

We have yet to explore the role of RBPs in helping *B. thetaiotaomicron* colonize

or be maintained in the host gut. In a recent study (62) screening transposon (Tn)

mutants for a wide variety of *in vitro* and *in vivo* phenotypes, there were no reported

insertions in *rbpA* or *rbpB*. Insertions in *rbpC* led to reduced fitness on glucose-

containing media (62), possibly explaining our inability to generate Δ*rbpC* mutants in our

standard glucose-rich media. The *rbpC* mutants also had an increased growth on

melibiose suggesting that *rbpC* also plays a role in utilization of RFOs. In the same

study (62), colonization of germ-free mice fed a plant polysaccharide-rich diet with the

B. thetaiotaomicron Tn-mutant pool led to increased fitness of *rbpC* mutants. *BT1871*

mutants showed decreased fitness over time, whereas Tn-insertions into several other

PUL24 genes led to increased fitness *in vivo*. Overall, these data indicate that RBPs

and the PULs they regulate may be important for *in vivo* fitness.

Regulation by RBPs may represent a critical mechanism for coordination of

carbohydrate utilization and production of cell surface capsular polysaccharides.

Differential regulation of PULs and CPS loci in *rbp* deletion strains is consistent with

several reports indicating a regulatory link between these polysaccharide metabolic

processes in *B. thetaiotaomicron* (17, 74, 75). Our RNA-seq data showed that deletion

of RBPs leads to reduced expression of CSP4 and CPS6 and increased expression of

CPS5. In *B. thetaiotaomicron,* CPS4 is normally the most highly expressed locus *in vitro*

and in mouse models when dietary glycans are present (64, 75, 76), and disruption of

CPS4 expression leads to decreased fitness in mouse competitions (77, 78). In a study

monitoring CPS expression in a mouse model over time, it was observed that even

when the *B. thetaiotaomicron* inoculum expressed one dominant CPS locus, expression

over time varied between mice (75). While CPS4 was most often highly expressed in

mice fed a high-fiber diet, mice on fiber-free diets typically expressed CPS5 or CPS6. *B.*

thetaiotaomicron mutants that could only express a single CPS locus had a decreased

ability to recover from antibiotic-induced stress (75). These studies along with our

present work collectively suggest that the ability to shift among different CPS types is

advantageous in the host and that this regulation may be mediated in part by RBPs.

Further characterization of the RBPs and their regulatory mechanisms may provide

critical insight into how *Bacteroides* coordinately control carbohydrate availability with

cell surface properties. This could reveal key principles governing mechanisms in host

dynamics.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial culturing and genetic manipulation

B. thetaiotaomicron VPI-5482 strains were grown anaerobically in a Coy

Laboratory Products vinyl anaerobic chamber with an input gas of 20% CO_2, 10% H_2,

70% N_2 balance. Routine culturing of *B. thetaiotaomicron* was done in Tryptone-Yeast-

Extract-Glucose (TYG) (79) broth and on Difco Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) agar plates

with 10% defibrinated Horse Blood (HB) (Quad Five) at 37˚C. *Escherichia coli* strains

were grown aerobically at 37˚C on BHI-10%HB for conjugations and Luria Broth for all

other applications. Minimal medium (22) was supplemented with B_{12} [3.75nM final]

(Sigma) and carbohydrates as needed at the following final w/v concentrations unless

otherwise indicated: 4.0% stachyose (Sigma), 2.0% D-(+)-raffinose (Sigma), 0.5% D-

(+)-melibiose (Sigma), 0.5% α-D-glucose (Sigma), 0.5% D-(+)-galactose (Sigma), 0.5%

β-D-(-)-fructose (MP Biomedicals), and 0.5% sucrose (MP Biomedicals). When needed,

antibiotics were added at the following final concentrations: 100 µg/ml ampicillin

(Sigma), 200 µg/ml gentamicin (Goldbio), 25 µg/ml erythromycin (VWR), 200µg/ml 5'-

fluoro-2'-deoxyuridine (VWR), 100ng/ml anhydrotetracycline (Sigma), 25 µg/ml

kanamycin (Fisher). All strains, vectors, and primers are listed in Table S1. For all

experiments, wild-type *B. thetaiotaomicron* is Δ*tdk* (strain AA0014 in Table S1).

Markerless deletions were made in *B. thetaiotaomicron* using the

pExchange_*bla_tdk_ermGb* (80) and the pLGB13_*bla_ermG* (81) suicide vector-based

allelic exchange methods. Upstream and downstream regions of the gene to be deleted

were amplified using Kappa HiFi (Kappa Biosystems) and cloned into

pExchange_*bla_tdk_ermGb* using standard restriction digest and ligation methods and

splicing by overlap exchange (SOE) (22). Alternatively, inserts were cloned into Q5

(NEB) amplified pExchange_*bla_tdk_ermGb* using restriction digest and ligation of a

gBlock insert (IDT). GibS flanks were Q5 amplified and ligated to restriction-digested

pLGB13_*bla_ermG.* Complete vectors were conjugated into *B. thetaiotaomicron* with *E.*

coli S17 λ-pir using established methods (22). Complementation pNBU2_*bla_ermGb*

vectors (5, 82) were cloned using standard restriction digest and ligation methods and

conjugated into *B. thetaiotaomicron* as done with pExchange. pNBU2_*bla_ermGb*

vectors were PCR screened for insertion into a single attachment site as done

previously (5). The pET-28a-*rbpB* protein expression vector was generated by inserting

the *rbpB* (*BT1887*) ORF 5' to the thrombin cleavage site and 6xHis tag in the pET28a

backbone. pET-28a-*rbpB* was cloned using Q5 PCR amplification and NEBuilder

assembly (NEB) in *E. coli* XL10-Gold competent cells (Agilent) before being moved into

E. coli BL21 (DE3) for protein expression.

Computational identification of RNA regulators in human gut-associated

microbial genomes

To identify genomes containing CsrA, ProQ, RRM-1, and Hfq in the human gut

microbiome, we utilized a custom database of 313 human gut-associated microbial

genomes containing a single representative genome for a species (22, 37). Candidate

RNA regulator genes were identified using hmmer v3.3 (hmmer.org) with trusted cutoffs

and the individual hidden Markov model from each protein queried: Hfq, PF17209.4;

CsrA, PF02599.17; ProQ, PF04352.14; RRM-1, PF00076.23 (39). The resulting gene

list was then run against Pfam-A.hmm version 33.1 using hmmer to verify that the query

PFAM was the top hit for the target domain using trusted cutoff values. ProQ

PF04352.14 gene hits that also contained an N-terminal FinO_N domain (PF12602.9)

were removed from the final annotation list. RRM-1 PF00076.23 gene hit list was limited

to less than 150 amino acids to remove a few genes containing transmembrane

domains. The maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree in Fig. 1A was built using a

multisequence alignment of 13 conserved core genes (AspS, Ffh, FusA, GltX, InfB,

LeuS, RplB, RpsE, RpsH, RpsK, TopA, TufA, RpoB) identified and described previously

(83). Briefly, protein sequences for each group of orthologs were individually aligned

with MUSCLE (84), concatenated, and subjected to phylogenetic reconstruction with

RAxML(85). The phylogeny was visualized using FigTree

(http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/).

RBP expression in publicly available RNA-seq datasets

Publicly available RNA-seq datasets were downloaded from NCBI (see Table S2)

for sample IDs. RNA-seq reads were quality filtered with Trimmomatic v0.36 (86). Read

mapping and sample normalization was calculated with Rockhopper v2.03 (87, 88) and

normalized expression values were graphed using JMP v15 (89).

RbpB EMSAs and motif identification

Purification of RbpB. *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) cells with the pET-*rbpB* vector were

grown to late exponential phase (0.6-0.8 OD_{600} as measured on an Ultraspec 2100 Pro,

Amersham) and protein expression induced with 1 mM final IPTG (Goldbio) for 4 hr at

37 ºC. Cells were harvested by centrifugation and pellets resuspended in 30 ml of

extraction buffer (1X PBS, 0.5M NaCl, pH 7.2) before being lysed in a French press.

Supernatant was collected after centrifugation at 16,000 × g for 10 min at 4ºC. The

supernatant was then fractionated using a HiTrap Ni^{2+} column (GE Healthcare)

following the manufacturer's instructions. Fractions containing RbpB were dialyzed

overnight in TGED buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 5% glycerol, 0.1mM EDTA, and DTT

0.015 mg/mL) and loaded onto a HiTrap-Q column (GE Healthcare). The column was

washed with TGED buffer, and protein was eluted with a linear gradient of NaCl (0.1 M

to 1 M) in TGED buffer. The fractions containing the protein were pooled, dialyzed, and

concentrated using Centricon 10 concentrators (Millipore-Sigma), mixed with an equal

volume of 100% glycerol and stored at -20ºC.

Radiolabeled pentaprobe synthesis. Twelve pentaprobes containing all the

possible 5-nt combinations were prepared based on a published protocol with some

modifications (52). All oligonucleotides used in pentaprobe synthesis are listed in Table

S1. Single-stranded oligonucleotides for PP1-PP6 were Q5 PCR amplified with a 5' T7

promoter for either the Watson strand or the Crick strand, generating twelve dsDNA

templates with a single T7 site, two each for PP1-PP6. The Watson strand of PP1

dsDNA is identical to the coding strand of the PP1 pentaprobe, and the Crick strand is

identical to the coding strand of the PP7 pentaprobe. These dsDNA fragments were

then used to produce twelve different ssRNA pentaprobes by *in vitro* transcription from

the T7 promoter with a MEGAscript T7 kit (Ambion). Transcribed RNA fragments were

5´end-labeled with ATP [γ^{32}P] (PerkinElmer) using the KinaseMax kit (Ambion) following

the manufacturer's protocol.

Electrophoretic mobility shift assay and motif prediction. RNA-protein gel

electrophoretic mobility shift assays were performed using 0.01 pmol of ^{32}P-labeled

pentaprobe RNA and the indicated amounts of RbpB in binding buffer (10mM Tris-HCl

pH 8.0, 0.5 mM DTT, 0.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 10mM KCl, 5mM Na_2HPO_4–NaH_2PO_4 pH 8.0). The

mixture was incubated at 37 ºC for 30 minutes, and non-denaturing loading buffer (50%

glycerol and 0.1% bromophenol blue) was added. The samples were resolved on a

4.6% native polyacrylamide gel for 1.5 hours at 10 mA. The fraction of RbpB bound was

determined using a Fluorescent Image Analyzer FLA-3000 (FUJIFILM) to quantify the

band intensities. K_D values were calculated using Sigmaplot software based on a

published method (90). The MEME program (55) was used to predict conserved motifs

for the positive pentaprobe sequences with the following parameters: maximum number

of motifs, 10; minimum motif width, 4; and maximum motif width, 8. K_D was calculated

for RbpB binding to PP3 and motif 1 using three technical replicates as done previously

(56).

RNA sequencing sample prep and processing

For rich media RNA-seq, strains were cultured in 5 ml of TYG in biological

triplicate to stationary phase overnight. Each culture was then sub-cultured 1:100 into

two 5 ml TYG cultures. One tube was cultured to mid-log (0.35-0.6 OD_{600}) and the

second tube was cultured to early stationary phase (1.2-1.4 OD_{600}) as measured in a

Thermo Spectronic 200 (Thermo Fisher Scientific brand, referred to as ThermoSpec

below). Then 500 µl of cells were then spun down at 7,500 x g for 3 min at room

temperature, supernatant removed, and pellets re-suspended in 600 µl of TriReagent

(Sigma). RNA was then isolated from the re-suspensions using the Zymo Direct-Zol

RNA Mini-Prep kit (Zymo) which includes on-column DNaseI treatment. RNA quality

was evaluated using a Qubit 2.0 fluorometer (Invitrogen) and Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer

(UIUC Biotechnology Center). Total RNA was then submitted to the W. M. Keck Center

for Comparative and Functional Genomics at UIUC for rRNA depletion, library

construction, and sequencing. Briefly, ribosomal RNAs were removed from total RNA

with an Illumina Ribo-Zero rRNA Removal Kit for Bacteria. RNA-seq libraries were

produced with a ScriptSeq v2 kit (Illumina) and cleaned with AMPure beads (Beckman

Coulter) to remove any fragments <80 nt. Libraries were sequenced on an Illumina

HiSeq2500 using HiSeq SBS sequencing kit v4 to give 160 nt single-end reads. Results

were de-multiplexed with bcl2fastq v2.17.1.14 (Illumina). Reads were quality filtered and

trimmed using Bioconductor package ShortRead (91) to first remove reads with >1 N or

if ≥75% of a read is a single nucleotide and then the first 2 nucleotides were removed

from each sequence read. Sequencing adapters were removed with fastx_clipper

(http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/index.html). Residual rRNAs were removed

using bowtie2 (92, 93) and final reads mapped to the genome and analyzed using

Rockhopper v2.03. All raw Rockhopper calculated expression values were increased by

1 and fold changes (FC) calculated as $\log_2$(mutant expression value + 1/wild-type

expression value +1). RNA-seq processing statistics are summarized in Dataset S2C.

For RNA-seq of cultures grown in minimal media, a single colony/strain was

smeared onto half a 100 mm BHI-10%HB agar plate with a cotton swab and cultured for

24 hours. Lawns were then re-suspended in 5 ml of minimal medium + glucose (MMG)

and spun down at 4000g x 5 min. Cell pellets were washed three times with 1 ml of

MMG and then diluted to 0.07 OD_{630} in 200 µl of MMG, as measured on a Biotek

Synergy HT plate reader (referred to as Biotek below). Cells were then diluted 1:1000 in

25 ml of MMG and cultured overnight to 0.35-0.50 OD_{600} (ThermoSpec). Cells were

then spun down and re-suspended in 1 ml of minimal medium without a carbon source

per every 5 ml of culture. For each biological replicate, these suspensions were then

diluted to 0.1 OD_{600} (ThermoSpec) in 5 ml of MMG, minimal medium + melibiose

(MMM), or minimal medium + 0.25% w/v glucose + 0.25% w/v galactose (MMGG).

Cultures were then grown to 0.45-0.65 OD_{600} (ThermoSpec), and then stabilized in

Qiagen RNA protect. Briefly, 4 ml of culture was combined with 8 ml of RNA protect,

vortexed, and then incubated at room temperature for 5 min. Suspensions were then

spun at 4,000 x g for 10 minutes at 4ºC. Supernatants were decanted and pellets stored

at -80 ºC. Cell pellets were thawed, and RNA prepped using a Qiagen RNeasy Mini Kit.

RNA was sequenced and analyzed as done above with the RNA-seq for cells grown in

TYG, with the exception that libraries were sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq4000 to

produce 150 nt single-end reads.

RNA-seq protein functional and pathway analyses

RNA-seq data from each mutant strain ($\Delta rbpA$, $\Delta rbpB$, $\Delta rbpA\Delta rbpB$) was

compared to wild-type in rich medium at mid-log and stationary phase, yielding six

comparisons. All genes with a $log_2FC \geq +1$ or ≤ -1 with a q-value <0.06 were assigned

to functional groups using the following framework. GSEA was used on each of the six

differentially expressed gene sets individually to identify enriched functional groups. *B.*

thetaiotaomicron-specific functional gene sets used included: KEGG pathways, CPS

loci, PULs, and corrinoid transport (22). GSEA identified enriched gene sets

corresponding to PULs, CPS loci, TCA cycle (KEGG pathway bth00020), corrinoid

transport, and microbial metabolism in diverse environments (bth01120). Since these

were identified as enriched categories, if one of the significantly differentially regulated

genes in Dataset S2A was part of one of these gene sets, it was assigned that as a

category identifier with the exception of "microbial metabolism in diverse environments."

GSEA-identified enriched genes in this KEGG category were further split into sub-

categories including TCA cycle and glyoxylate and dicarboxylate metabolism

(bth00630). If genes were associated with both TCA cycle and glyoxylate and

dicarboxylate metabolism, they were assigned TCA cycle since this category was

identified as enriched by GSEA directly, but glyoxylate and dicarboxylate metabolism

was not. Since corrinoid transport was enriched in our differentially expressed genes,

any gene associated with B_{12} metabolism that was in our differentially regulated genes

was assigned a "B-vitamin metabolism" category. Remaining gene functions were

assigned using gene ontology (GO) from QuickGO. Briefly, gene names were used to

extract UniprotKB identifiers that were then used to pull GO biological process

annotations from QuickGO when available. Only the first reported GO assignment was

used for each gene. GO terms were further grouped into custom functional categories to

make a more tractably sized list of functional categories for visualization. Genes without

any of the above functional assignments were labeled as either "hypothetical protein" if

they were annotated as such or "miscellaneous" if the gene had a putative functional

annotation that was not captured by the other functional categories. All resulting

functional groups are listed in Dataset S2A.

Biolog carbon utilization assays

Biolog carbon utilization assays were conducted according to manufacturer

recommendations as follows. Biolog carbon source PM1 and PM2A MicroPlates were

brought to room temperature to avoid condensation prior to opening the seals. Plates

were then cycled into the anaerobic chamber and maintained in an anaerobic desiccant

box for 24 hours. Single colonies of each strain were swabbed onto BHI-10% horse

blood plates and cultured overnight to produce a lawn of cells. Cells were aerobically

suspended into 5 ml of reduced minimal medium without a carbon source to 40%

turbidity (OD_{590}, ThermoSpec) using a cotton swab. Suspensions were cycled into the

chamber and 1.5 ml combined with 22 ml of anoxic, reduced minimal medium without a

carbon source. Each carbon source plate was then inoculated with 100 µl of diluted

cells and statically incubated for 30 minutes at room temperature to facilitate compound

dissolution before measuring time point zero. Plates were statically incubated at 37 ºC

with manual OD_{630} readings taken every hour in the plate reader for the first 11 hours of

growth. Plates were then left in the chamber overnight and optical density readings

were resumed after 24 hours of growth. Time points were then taken every 3 hours to a

final time point of 36 hours of growth. Linear regression and prediction curves were

calculated using Prism. Negative control wells and Xylitol (PM2A) were removed from

linear regression calculations. Xylitol was removed due to an unknown occlusion

(potentially condensation or precipitation) causing transiently high OD_{630} readings. In

the absence of these transient values, *B. thetaiotaomicron* could not grow on Xylitol as

a sole carbon source in these experiments.

Minimal media growth assays

677  Strains were cultured from a colony in 5 ml of TYG for 24 hours and then sub-

678 cultured 1:1000 into 5 ml of MMG for 24 hours. 1 ml of stationary phase MMG cultures

679 were spun down 4000 g x 10 min at room temperature. Supernatants were removed

680 and pellets resuspended in 1 ml of minimal medium without a carbon source. 2 µl of

681 cells were then sub-cultured into 198 µl of minimal media containing carbon sources to

682 appropriate final concentrations in flat bottom, 96 well Corning Costar tissue culture-

683 treated plates (Sigma). Plates were sealed with a Breathe-Easy gas permeable

684 membrane (Sigma) and statically cultured in the Biotek plate reader for 48 hours with

685 optical density recorded every 30 minutes.

686 **qRT-PCR of *rbpB* and *BT1871***

687  Strains were cultured in MMG to stationary phase overnight, sub-cultured 1:100

688 into 5 ml of MMG, and then cultured to mid-log (0.38-0.52 OD_{600}, ThermoSpec). All

689 cultures for strains containing pNBU2_*ermGb* vectors contained erythromycin. Four ml

690 of cells were pelleted at 4,000 g x 10 min, supernatant decanted, and then RNA isolated

691 with a Qiagen RNeasy mini kit. Residual DNA was degraded on-column using Qiagen

692 RNase-Free DNase Set and the RNA cleaned with a Qiagen RNeasy Mini kit. First-

693 strand cDNA synthesis was done with a SuperScript II RT kit (Invitrogen) and random

694 hexamers (Invitrogen). Post reverse transcription, the SuperScript reaction was

695 incubated with 27 µl of 1N NaOH at 65 ºC for 30 min, neutralized with 27 µl of 1N HCl,

696 and cleaned up with a Qiagen MinElute PCR purification kit. cDNA was diluted and

697 *rbpB*, *BT1871*, and 16s rRNA copies amplified using 2x QX200 ddPCR EvaGreen

698 Supermix (Biorad) and quantified using the QX200 Droplet Digital PCR system (Biorad)

according to manufacturer instructions. All ddPCR consumables were supplied by

Biorad and Rainin (pipette tips only). Relative ratios were calculated by dividing the

rbpB or *BT1871* counts by the 16s rRNA counts.

Determination of operon structure of *rbpB* in *B. thetaiotaomicron*

Strains were cultured in MMG to stationary phase overnight and then sub-

cultured 1:1,000 into 4 ml of MMM and 1:10,000 into 4 ml MMG. MMG and MMM

cultures were grown to mid-log (OD$_{630}$ 0.25-0.35, Biotek), pelleted at 4,000g x 10 min at

4ºC, and supernatant removed. RNA and cDNA were prepped as done for qPCR with

the exception that residual DNA was degraded on beads using an Ambion nuclease-

free DNAse kit. Overlap end-point PCR was done with KAPA HiFi (KAPA Biosystems).

gDNA was prepped using a Qiagen DNeasy Blood and tissue kit.

Data Availability

All RNA-seq datasets corresponding to the samples listed in Dataset S2C are

publicly available on NCBI under BioProject accession number PRJNA723047.

Acknowledgements

We thank Alvaro Hernandez, Chris Wright, and staff of the Roy J. Carver

Biotechnology Center for assistance with RNA-seq. We also thank Danielle Campbell

for guidance on comparative genomics and Auroni Gupta and Saika Hossain for

assistance with EMSAs. We are grateful to Sandy Pernitzch (Scigraphix) for assistance

with model graphics. This work was funded by UIUC and the UIUC Department of

Microbiology, a Roy J. Carver Charitable Trust award (15-4501) to P.H.D. and initial

complement funding to P.H.D. from UCR. A.N.D.A. was funded by an Alice Helm

Graduate Research Excellence Fellowship and the UIUC Department of Microbiology.

A.N.D.A, M.S.A, Z.A.C., P.H.D, and C.K.V. designed research and analyzed

data. A.N.D.A., M.S.A., Z.A.C., X.M., and P.H.D. performed research. A.N.D.A., M.S.A.,

P.H.D., and C.K.V. wrote the paper.

References

1. Muegge BD, Kuczynski J, Knights D, Clemente JC, González A, Fontana L,

Henrissat B, Knight R, Gordon JI. 2011. Diet drives convergence in gut microbiome

functions across mammalian phylogeny and within humans. Science 332:970–974.

2. Carmody RN, Gerber GK, Luevano JM, Gatti DM, Somes L, Svenson KL, Turnbaugh

PJ. 2015. Diet dominates host genotype in shaping the murine gut microbiota. Cell Host

Microbe 17:72–84.

3. Wu GD, Chen J, Hoffmann C, Bittinger K, Chen YY, Keilbaugh SA, Bewtra M,

Knights D, Walters WA, Knight R, Sinha R, Gilroy E, Gupta K, Baldassano R, Nessel L,

Li H, Bushman FD, Lewis JD. 2011. Linking long-term dietary patterns with gut microbial

enterotypes. Science 334:105–108.

4. Kaoutari AE, Armougom F, Gordon JI, Raoult D, Henrissat B. 2013. The abundance

and variety of carbohydrate-active enzymes in the human gut microbiota. Nat Rev

Microbiol 11:497–504.

5. Martens EC, Chiang HC, Gordon JI. 2008. Mucosal glycan foraging enhances fitness

and transmission of a saccharolytic human gut bacterial symbiont. Cell Host Microbe

4:447–457.

6. Rogers TE, Pudlo NA, Koropatkin NM, Bell JSK, Balasch MM, Jasker K, Martens EC.

2013. Dynamic responses of *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* during growth on glycan

mixtures. Mol Microbiol 88:876–890.

7. Terrapon N, Lombard V, Drula É, Lapébie P, Al-Masaudi S, Gilbert HJ, Henrissat B.

2017. PULDB: the expanded database of Polysaccharide Utilization Loci. Nucleic Acids

Res 46:D677–D683.

8. Pereira GV, Abdel-Hamid AM, Dutta S, D'Alessandro-Gabazza CN, Wefers D, Farris

JA, Bajaj S, Wawrzak Z, Atomi H, Mackie RI, Gabazza EC, Shukla D, Koropatkin NM,

Cann I. 2021. Degradation of complex arabinoxylans by human colonic Bacteroidetes.

Nat Commun 12:459.

9. Martens EC, Lowe EC, Chiang H, Pudlo NA, Wu M, McNulty NP, Abbott DW,

Henrissat B, Gilbert HJ, Bolam DN, Gordon JI. 2011. Recognition and degradation of

plant cell wall polysaccharides by two human gut symbionts. PLoS Biol 9:e1001221.

10. Xu J, Bjursell MK, Himrod J, Deng S, Carmichael LK, Chiang HC, Hooper LV,

Gordon JI. 2003. A genomic view of the human-*Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron*

symbiosis. Science 299:2074–2076.

11. Xu J, Chiang HC, Bjursell MK, Gordon JI. 2004. Message from a human gut

symbiont: sensitivity is a prerequisite for sharing. Trends Microbiol 12:21–28.

12. Cho KH, Cho D, Wang GR, Salyers AA. 2001. New regulatory gene that contributes

to control of *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* starch utilization genes. J Bacteriol

183:7198–7205.

13. Schwalm ND, Townsend GE, Groisman EA. 2016. Multiple signals govern utilization

of a polysaccharide in the gut bacterium *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron*. mBio 7:e01342-

16.

14. Chang C, Tesar C, Li X, Kim Y, Rodionov DA, Joachimiak A. 2015. A novel

transcriptional regulator of L-arabinose utilization in human gut bacteria. Nucleic Acids

Res 43:10546–10559.

15. Ravcheev DA, Godzik A, Osterman AL, Rodionov DA. 2013. Polysaccharides

utilization in human gut bacterium *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron*: comparative genomics

reconstruction of metabolic and regulatory networks. BMC Genomics 14:873.

16. Sonnenburg ED, Zheng H, Joglekar P, Higginbottom SK, Firbank SJ, Bolam DN,

Sonnenburg JL. 2010. Specificity of polysaccharide use in intestinal *Bacteroides*

species determines diet-induced microbiota alterations. Cell 141:1241–1252.

17. Martens EC, Roth R, Heuser JE, Gordon JI. 2009. Coordinate regulation of glycan

degradation and polysaccharide capsule biosynthesis by a prominent human gut

symbiont. J Biol Chem 284:18445–18457.

18. Pudlo NA, Urs K, Kumar SS, German JB, Mills DA, Martens EC. 2015. Symbiotic

human gut bacteria with variable metabolic priorities for host mucosal glycans. mBio

6:e01282-15.

19. Cao Y, Förstner KU, Vogel J, Smith CJ. 2016. *cis*-encoded small RNAs, a

conserved mechanism for repression of polysaccharide utilization in *Bacteroides*. J

Bacteriol 198:2410–2418.

20. Townsend GE, Han W, Schwalm ND, Hong X, Bencivenga-Barry NA, Goodman AL,

Groisman EA. 2020. A master regulator of *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* gut

colonization controls carbohydrate utilization and an alternative protein synthesis factor.

mBio 11:03221–19.

21. Ryan D, Jenniches L, Reichardt S, Barquist L, Westermann AJ. 2020. A high-

resolution transcriptome map identifies small RNA regulation of metabolism in the gut

microbe *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron*. Nat Commun 11:3557.

22. Degnan PH, Barry NA, Mok KC, Taga ME, Goodman AL. 2014. Human gut

microbes use multiple transporters to distinguish vitamin B_{12} analogs and compete in

the gut. Cell Host Microbe 15:47–57.

23. Costliow ZA, Degnan PH. 2017. Thiamine acquisition strategies impact metabolism

and competition in the gut microbe *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron*. mSystems 2:e00116-

17.

24. Costliow ZA, Degnan PH, Vanderpool CK. 2019. Thiamine pyrophosphate

riboswitches in *Bacteroides* species regulate transcription or translation of thiamine

transport and biosynthesis genes. bioRxiv 867226.

25. Papenfort K, Vogel J. 2014. Small RNA functions in carbon metabolism and

virulence of enteric pathogens. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 4:1–12.

26. Smirnov A, Schneider C, Hör J, Vogel J. 2017. Discovery of new RNA classes and

global RNA-binding proteins. Curr Opin Microbiol 39:1–9.

27. Hör J, Gorski SA, Vogel J. 2018. Bacterial RNA biology on a genome scale. Mol Cell

70:785–799.

28. Vogel J, Luisi BF. 2011. Hfq and its constellation of RNA. Nat Rev Microbiol 9:578–

589.

29. Santiago-Frangos A, Woodson SA. 2018. Hfq chaperone brings speed dating to

bacterial sRNA. Wiley Interdiscip Rev RNA 9:e1475.

30. Iosub IA, Nues RW van, McKellar SW, Nieken KJ, Marchioretto M, Sy B, Tree JJ,

Viero G, Granneman S. 2020. Hfq CLASH uncovers sRNA-target interaction networks

linked to nutrient availability adaptation. eLife 9:e54655.

31. Melamed S, Peer A, Faigenbaum-Romm R, Gatt YE, Reiss N, Bar A, Altuvia Y,

Argaman L, Margalit H. 2016. Global mapping of small RNA-target interactions in

bacteria. Molecular Cell 63:884–897.

32. Chao Y, Vogel J. 2010. The role of Hfq in bacterial pathogens. Curr Opin Microbiol

13:24–33.

33. Richards GR, Vanderpool CK. 2011. Molecular call and response: the physiology of

bacterial small RNAs. Biochim Biophys Acta 1809:525–531.

34. Bobrovskyy M, Vanderpool CK. 2014. The small RNA SgrS: roles in metabolism and

pathogenesis of enteric bacteria. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 4:1–8.

35. Waters JL, Salyers AA. 2012. The small RNA RteR inhibits transfer of the

Bacteroides conjugative transposon CTnDOT. J Bacteriol 194:5228–5236.

36. Townsend GE, Han W, Schwalm ND, Raghavan V, Barry NA, Goodman AL,

Groisman EA. 2019. Dietary sugar silences a colonization factor in a mammalian gut

symbiont. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 116:233–238.

37. Methé BA, Nelson KE, Pop M, Creasy HH, Giglio MG, Huttenhower C, Gevers D,

Petrosino JF, Abubucker S, Badger JH, Chinwalla AT, Earl AM, FitzGerald MG, Fulton

RS, Hallsworth-Pepin K, Lobos EA, Madupu R, Magrini V, Martin JC, Mitreva M, Muzny

DM, Sodergren EJ, Versalovic J, Wollam AM, Worley KC, Wortman JR, Young SK,

Zeng Q, Aagaard KM, Abolude OO, Allen-Vercoe E, Alm EJ, Alvarado L, Andersen GL,

Anderson S, Appelbaum E, Arachchi HM, Armitage G, Arze CA, Ayvaz T, Baker CC,

Begg L, Belachew T, Bhonagiri V, Bihan M, Blaser MJ, Bloom T, Bonazzi VR, Brooks P,

Buck GA, Buhay CJ, Busam DA, Campbell JL, Canon SR, Cantarel BL, Chain PS,

Chen I-MA, Chen L, Chhibba S, Chu K, Ciulla DM, Clemente JC, Clifton SW, Conlan S,

Crabtree J, Cutting MA, Davidovics NJ, Davis CC, DeSantis TZ, Deal C, Delehaunty

KD, Dewhirst FE, Deych E, Ding Y, Dooling DJ, Dugan SP, Dunne WM, Durkin AS,

Edgar RC, Erlich RL, Farmer CN, Farrell RM, Faust K, Feldgarden M, Felix VM, Fisher

S, Fodor AA, Forney L, Foster L, Francesco VD, Friedman J, Friedrich DC, Fronick CC,

Fulton LL, Gao H, Garcia N, Giannoukos G, Giblin C, Giovanni MY, Goldberg JM, Goll

J, Gonzalez A, Griggs A, Gujja S, Haas BJ, Hamilton HA, Harris EL, Hepburn TA,

Herter B, Hoffmann DE, Holder ME, Howarth C, Huang KH, Huse SM, Izard J, Jansson

JK, Jiang H, Jordan C, Joshi V, Katancik JA, Keitel WA, Kelley ST, Kells C, Kinder-

Haake S, King NB, Knight R, Knights D, Kong HH, Koren O, Koren S, Kota KC, Kovar

CL, Kyrpides NC, Rosa PSL, Lee SL, Lemon KP, Lennon N, Lewis CM, Lewis L, Ley

RE, Li K, Liolios K, Liu B, Liu Y, Lo C-C, Lozupone CA, Lunsford RD, Madden T,

Mahurkar AA, Mannon PJ, Mardis ER, Markowitz VM, Mavrommatis K, McCorrison JM,

McDonald D, McEwen J, McGuire AL, McInnes P, Mehta T, Mihindukulasuriya KA,

Miller JR, Minx PJ, Newsham I, Nusbaum C, O'Laughlin M, Orvis J, Pagani I,

Palaniappan K, Patel SM, Pearson M, Peterson J, Podar M, Pohl C, Pollard KS, Priest

ME, Proctor LM, Qin X, Raes J, Ravel J, Reid JG, Rho M, Rhodes R, Riehle KP, Rivera

MC, Rodriguez-Mueller B, Rogers Y-H, Ross MC, Russ C, Sanka RK, Sankar P,

Sathirapongsasuti JF, Schloss JA, Schloss PD, Schmidt TM, Scholz M, Schriml L,

Schubert AM, Segata N, Segre JA, Shannon WD, Sharp RR, Sharpton TJ, Shenoy N,

Sheth NU, Simone GA, Singh I, Smillie CS, Sobel JD, Sommer DD, Spicer P, Sutton

GG, Sykes SM, Tabbaa DG, Thiagarajan M, Tomlinson CM, Torralba M, Treangen TJ,

Truty RM, Vishnivetskaya TA, Walker J, Wang L, Wang Z, Ward DV, Warren W,

Watson MA, Wellington C, Wetterstrand KA, White JR, Wilczek-Boney K, Wu YQ, Wylie

KM, Wylie T, Yandava C, Ye L, Ye Y, Yooseph S, Youmans BP, Zhang L, Zhou Y, Zhu

Y, Zoloth L, Zucker JD, Birren BW, Gibbs RA, Highlander SK, Weinstock GM, Wilson

RK, White O. 2012. A framework for human microbiome research. Nature 486:215–221.

38. Maris C, Dominguez C, Allain FHT. 2005. The RNA recognition motif, a plastic RNA-

binding platform to regulate post-transcriptional gene expression. FEBS J 272:2118–

2131.

39. El-Gebali S, Mistry J, Bateman A, Eddy SR, Luciani A, Potter SC, Qureshi M,

Richardson LJ, Salazar GA, Smart A, Sonnhammer ELL, Hirsh L, Paladin L, Piovesan

D, Tosatto SCE, Finn RD. 2019. The Pfam protein families database in 2019. Nucleic

Acids Res 47:D427–D432.

40. Herren CD, Rocha ER, Smith CJ. 2003. Genetic analysis of an important oxidative

stress locus in the anaerobe *Bacteroides fragilis*. Gene 316:167–175.

41. Voss JE, Luisi BF, Hardwick SW. 2014. Molecular recognition of RhlB and RNase D

in the *Caulobacter crescentus* RNA degradosome. Nucleic Acids Res 42:13294–13305.

42. Al-Husini N, Tomares DT, Bitar O, Childers WS, Schrader JM. 2018. α-

Proteobacterial RNA degradosomes assemble liquid-liquid phase-separated RNP

bodies. Mol Cell 71:1027–1039.

43. Santiago-Frangos A, Kavita K, Schu DJ, Gottesman S, Woodson SA. 2016. C-

terminal domain of the RNA chaperone Hfq drives sRNA competition and release of

target RNA. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 113:E6089–E6096.

44. Večerek B, Rajkowitsch L, Sonnleitner E, Schroeder R, Bläsi U. 2007. The C-

terminal domain of *Escherichia coli* Hfq is required for regulation. Nucleic Acids Res

36:133–143.

45. Santiago-Frangos A, Jeliazkov JR, Gray JJ, Woodson SA. 2017. Acidic C-terminal

domains autoregulate the RNA chaperone Hfq. eLife 6:e27049.

46. Sobrero P, Valverde C. 2012. The bacterial protein Hfq: much more than a mere

RNA-binding factor. Crit Rev Microbiol 38:276–299.

47. Desai MS, Seekatz AM, Koropatkin NM, Kamada N, Hickey CA, Wolter M, Pudlo

NA, Kitamoto S, Terrapon N, Muller A, Young VB, Henrissat B, Wilmes P, Stappenbeck

TS, Núñez G, Martens EC. 2016. A dietary fiber-deprived gut microbiota degrades the

colonic mucus barrier and enhances pathogen susceptibility. Cell 167:1339–1353.

48. Wu M, McNulty NP, Rodionov DA, Khoroshkin MS, Griffin NW, Cheng J, Latreille P,

Kerstetter RA, Terrapon N, Henrissat B, Osterman AL, Gordon JI. 2015. Genetic

determinants of *in vivo* fitness and diet responsiveness in multiple human gut

Bacteroides. Science 350:aac5992.

49. Huang Y, Sheth RU, Kaufman A, Wang HH. 2019. Scalable and cost-effective

ribonuclease-based rRNA depletion for transcriptomics. Nucleic Acids Res 48:e20.

50. Despres J, Forano E, Lepercq P, Comtet-Marre S, Jubelin G, Chambon C, Yeoman

CJ, Miller MEB, Fields CJ, Martens E, Terrapon N, Henrissat B, White BA, Mosoni P.

2016. Xylan degradation by the human gut *Bacteroides xylanisolvens* XB1AT involves

two distinct gene clusters that are linked at the transcriptional level. BMC Genomics

17:1–14.

51. Schofield WB, Zimmermann-Kogadeeva M, Zimmermann M, Barry NA, Goodman

AL. 2018. The stringent response determines the ability of a commensal bacterium to

survive starvation and to persist in the gut. Cell Host Microbe 24:120–132.

52. Bendak K, Loughlin FE, Cheung V, O'Connell MR, Crossley M, Mackay JP. 2012. A

rapid method for assessing the RNA-binding potential of a protein. Nucleic Acids Res

40:e105.

53. Teplova M, Farazi TA, Tuschl T, Patel DJ. 2016. Structural basis underlying CAC

RNA recognition by the RRM domain of dimeric RNA-binding protein RBPMS. Q Rev

Biophys 49:e1.

54. Afroz T, Cienikova Z, Cléry A, Allain FHT. 2015. One, two, three, four! How multiple

RRMs read the genome sequence. Methods Enzymol 558:235–278.

55. Bailey TL, Boden M, Buske FA, Frith M, Grant CE, Clementi L, Ren J, Li WW, Noble

WS. 2009. MEME Suite: tools for motif discovery and searching. Nucleic Acids Res

37:W202–W208.

56. Azam MS, Vanderpool CK. 2017. Translational regulation by bacterial small RNAs

via an unusual Hfq-dependent mechanism. Nucleic Acids Res 46:2585–2599.

57. Stein EM, Kwiatkowska J, Basczok MM, Gravel CM, Berry KE, Olejniczak M. 2020.

Determinants of RNA recognition by the FinO domain of the *Escherichia coli* ProQ

protein. Nucleic Acids Res 48:7502–7519.

58. Nithin C, Mukherjee S, Bahadur RP. 2019. A structure-based model for the

prediction of protein-RNA binding affinity. RNA 25:1628–1645.

59. Subramanian A, Tamayo P, Mootha VK, Mukherjee S, Ebert BL, Gillete MA,

Paulovich A, Pomeroy SL, Golub TR, Lander ES, Mesirov JP. 2005. Gene set

enrichment analysis: a knowledge-based approach for interpreting genome-wide

expression profiles 102:15545–15550.

60. Krinos CM, Coyne MJ, Weinacht KG, Tzianabos AO, Kasper DL, Comstock LE.

2001. Extensive surface diversity of a commensal microorganism by multiple DNA

inversions. Nature 414:555–558.

61. Gloster TM, Turkenburg JP, Potts JR, Henrissat B, Davies GJ. 2008. Divergence of

catalytic mechanism within a glycosidase family provides insight into evolution of

carbohydrate metabolism by human gut flora. Chem Biol 15:1058–1067.

62. Liu H, Shiver AL, Price MN, Carlson HK, Trotter VV, Chen Y, Escalante V, Ray J,

Hern KE, Petzold CJ, Turnbaugh PJ, Huang KC, Arkin AP, Deutschbauer AM. 2021.

Functional genetics of human gut commensal *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* reveals

metabolic requirements for growth across environments. Cell Rep 34:108789.

63. Faith JJ, McNulty NP, Rey FE, Gordon JI. 2011. Predicting a human gut

microbiota's response to diet in gnotobiotic mice. Science 333:101–104.

64. Sonnenburg JL, Xu J, Leip DD, Chen CH, Westover BP, Weatherford J, Buhler JD,

Gordon JI. 2005. Glycan foraging *in vivo* by an intestine-adapted bacterial symbiont.

Science 307:1955–1959.

65. Turnbaugh PJ, Ridaura VK, Faith JJ, Rey FE, Knight R, Gordon JI. 2009. The effect

of diet on the human gut microbiome: a metagenomic analysis in humanized gnotobiotic

mice. Sci Transl Med 1:6ra14.

66. Görke B, Stülke J. 2008. Carbon catabolite repression in bacteria: many ways to

make the most out of nutrients. Nat Rev Microbiol 6:613–624.

67. Hylemon PB, Phibbs PV. 1974. Evidence against the presence of cyclic AMP and

related enzymes in selected strains of *Bacteroides fragilis*. Biochem Biophys Res

Commun 60:88–95.

68. Barabote RD, Saier MH. 2005. Comparative genomic analyses of the bacterial

phosphotransferase system. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 69:608–634.

69. Brigham CJ, Malamy MH. 2005. Characterization of the RokA and HexA broad-

substrate-specificity hexokinases from *Bacteroides fragilis* and their role in hexose and

N-acetylglucosamine utilization. J Bacteriol 187:890–901.

70. Holmqvist E, Berggren S, Rizvanovic A. 2020. RNA-binding activity and regulatory

functions of the emerging sRNA-binding protein ProQ. Biochim Biophys Acta Gene

Regul Mech 1863:194596.

71. Kavita K, Mets F de, Gottesman S. 2018. New aspects of RNA-based regulation by

Hfq and its partner sRNAs. Curr Opin Microbiol 42:53–61.

72. Olejniczak M, Storz G. 2017. ProQ/FinO-domain proteins: another ubiquitous family

of RNA matchmakers? Mol Microbiol 104:905–915.

73. Updegrove TB, Zhang A, Storz G. 2016. Hfq: the flexible RNA matchmaker. Curr

Opin Microbiol 30:133–138.

74. Coyne MJ, Reinap B, Lee MM, Comstock LE. 2005. Human symbionts use a host-

like pathway for surface fucosylation. Science 307:1778–1781.

75. Porter NT, Canales P, Peterson DA, Martens EC. 2017. A subset of polysaccharide

capsules in the human symbiont *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* promote increased

competitive fitness in the mouse gut. Cell Host Microbe 22:494–506.

76. Bjursell MK, Martens EC, Gordon JI. 2006. Functional genomic and metabolic

studies of the adaptations of a prominent adult human gut symbiont, *Bacteroides*

thetaiotaomicron, to the suckling period. J Biol Chem 281:36269–36279.

77. Peterson DA, McNulty NP, Guruge JL, Gordon JI. 2007. IgA response to symbiotic

bacteria as a mediator of gut homeostasis. Cell Host Microbe 2:328–339.

78. Goodman AL, McNulty NP, Zhao Y, Leip D, Mitra RD, Lozupone CA, Knight R,

Gordon JI. 2009. Identifying genetic determinants needed to establish a human gut

symbiont in its habitat. Cell Host Microbe 6:279–289.

79. Holdeman L, Cato E, Moore W. 1977. Anaerobe laboratory manual, 4th Edition.

Anaerobe Laboratory, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg,

VA.

80. Koropatkin NM, Martens EC, Gordon JI, Smith TJ. 2008. Starch catabolism by a

prominent human gut symbiont Is directed by the recognition of amylose helices.

Structure 16:1105–1115.

81. García-Bayona L, Comstock LE. 2019. Streamlined genetic manipulation of diverse

Bacteroides and *Parabacteroides* isolates from the human gut microbiota. mBio

10:e01762-19.

82. Wang J, Shoemaker NB, Wang GR, Salyers AA. 2000. Characterization of a

Bacteroides mobilizable transposon, NBU2, which carries a functional lincomycin

resistance gene. J Bacteriol 182:3559–3571.

83. Brown JR, Douady CJ, Italia MJ, Marshal WE, Stanhope MJ. 2001. Universal trees

based on large combined protein sequence data sets. Nat Genet 28:281–285.

84. Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and

high throughput. Nucleic Acids Res 32:1792–1797.

85. Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-

analysis of large phylogenies. Bioinformatics 30:1312–1313.

86. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. Bioinformatics 30:2114–2120.

87. McClure R, Balasubramanian D, Sun Y, Bobrovskyy M, Sumby P, Genco CA,

Vanderpool CK, Tjaden B. 2013. Computational analysis of bacterial RNA-Seq data.

Nucleic Acids Res 41:e140.

88. Tjaden B. 2015. *De novo* assembly of bacterial transcriptomes from RNA-seq data.

Genome Biol 16:1–10.

89. 1989. JMP® Version 15. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.

90. Ryder SP, Recht MI, Williamson JR. 2008. Quantitative analysis of protein–RNA

interactions by gel mobility shift. Methods Mol Biol 488:99–115.

91. Morgan M, Anders S, Lawrence M, Aboyoun P, Pagès H, Gentleman R. 2009.

ShortRead: a bioconductor package for input, quality assessment and exploration of

high-throughput sequence data. Bioinformatics 25:2607–2608.

92. Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nat

Methods 9:357–359.

93. Langmead B, Wilks C, Antonescu V, Charles R. 2018. Scaling read aligners to

hundreds of threads on general-purpose processors. Bioinformatics 35:421–432.

1015

1016
Figure 1: RRM-1 is a conserved, abundantly expressed RNA-binding domain in
gut bacteria. (A) Maximum likelihood phylogenetic species tree of 313 human gut-
associated microbial genomes. Colored bars indicate presence of at least one copy of
the indicated RNA regulatory proteins in a given genome. (B) Histogram of total RRM-1
genes per genome in the 58 Bacteroidetes genomes represented in (A). (C-D) RNA-seq
expression plots of all genes in publicly available transcriptomes for various *Bacteroides*
species (C) or *B. thetaiotaomicron* only in various growth conditions (D). Grey dots
represent a single gene and triangles *rbp* genes. The top 10% of expressed genes lie
above the whiskers.
1026

1027
Figure 2: RbpB is a ssRNA-binding protein. (A-B) RbpB-pentaprobe EMSAs for
pentaprobes 2 (A) and 12 (B) (PP2 and PP12, respectively). RbpB [μM] increases from
left to right as follows: 0, 0.02, 0.05, 0.09, 0.19, 0.38, 0.75, 1.50, 3.00, 6.00. (C)
Pentaprobe 3 repeat EMSA with RbpB [μM] increasing from left to right in the gel as
follows: 0, 0.05, 0.10, 0.20, 0.40, 0.80, 1.60, 3.20, 6.40, 12.80. (D-E) EMSAs of a 3x
repeat of MEME motif 1 (D) or motif 9 (E) with RbpB increasing from left to right as in
(C). Asterisk * indicates the unbound radiolabeled pentaprobe.
1035

Figure 3: Loss of RBPs leads to altered expression of PULs and CPS loci.
(A) Functional categories enriched in differentially regulated genes in rich media RNA-sequencing (genes with a $\log_2 FC \geq +1$ or ≤ -1 with a q-value <0.06). (B-C) Differentially regulated genes for PULs and CPS loci. Only genes that were significantly differentially regulated are shown. Gene names listed in Dataset S2A.

1043
1044 **Figure 4: Δ*rbpB* is defective for growth on raffinose family oligosaccharides.**
1045 (A) Raffinose family oligosaccharides and their subunits. (B-C) Representative
1046 normalized growth curves in minimal media from a single biological replicate (n=3) for
1047 wild-type (WT) and *rbp* mutants with optical densities (OD_{630}) recorded every 30
1048 minutes.
1049

Figure 5: Loss of *rbpB* leads to loss of expression of an essential melibiase in PUL24. (A) Normalized expression coverage curves for mid-log phase cultures in PUL24 with putative gene annotations. (B and D) Representative growth curves in minimal media from a single biological replicate (n=3) with optical densities (OD$_{630}$) recorded every 30 minutes. (C) Genomic regions inserted into pNBU2 vectors for complementation of *BT1871-BT1872* shown in (D). (D) Empty vector (EV) controls contain integrated pNBU2 without an insert.

1059
Figure 6: Model for possible mechanisms of RBP-mediated regulation
(A) RBP binding directly to mRNAs could promote structural changes (represented by
the transition from light gray to dark gray conformation) that alters access of ribosomes
or RNases to change translation or mRNA stability. (B) RBPs could facilitate sRNA
binding to mRNA targets and alter access of ribosomes or RNases to change
translation or mRNA stability.