Hiding in the yolk: a unique feature of *Legionella pneumophila* infection of zebrafish

Flávia Viana[1,§], Laurent Boucontet[2,§], Valerio Laghi[2], Daniel Schator[1,3], Marine Ibranosyan[4], Sophie Jarraud[4,5], Emma Colucci-Guyon[2§*] and Carmen Buchrieser[1§*]

[1]Institut Pasteur, Université Paris Cité, Biologie des Bactéries Intracellulaires and CNRS UMR 6047 75724, Paris, France, [2]Institut Pasteur, CNRS UMR 3738, Paris, France, [3]Sorbonne Université, Collège doctoral, 75005 Paris, France, [4]National Reference Centre of *Legionella*, Institute of Infectious Agents, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France, [4] Hospices Civils de Lyon, Centre National de Référence des Legionella, Lyon, France, [5]Centre International de Recherche en Infectiologie, Université Lyon 1, UMR CNRS 5308, Inserm U1111, ENS de Lyon, Lyon, France

§ These authors contributed equally

Key words: *Legionella pneumophila*, zebrafish, yolk sac, innate immune response; live imaging; neutrophils; macrophages

*For correspondence:

Carmen Buchrieser
Institut Pasteur
Biologie des Bactéries Intracellulaires
28, rue du Dr. Roux, 75724
Paris Cedex 15
France
E-mail: *cbuch@pasteur.fr*

Emma Colucci-Guyon
Institut Pasteur
CNRS UMR 3738
25, rue du Dr. Roux, 75724
Paris Cedex 15
France
E-mail: *emma.colucci@pasteur.fr*

Abstract

The zebrafish has become a powerful model organism to study host-pathogen interactions. Here, we developed a zebrafish model of *Legionella pneumophila* infection to dissect innate immune responses. We show that *L. pneumophila* cause zebrafish larvae death in a dose dependent manner, and that macrophages are the first line of defence, with neutrophils cooperating to clear the infection. When either macrophages or neutrophils are depleted, these "immunocompromised" larvae become lethally sensitive to *L. pneumophila* similar to what is known for humans that develop pneumonia. Also as observed in human infections, the adaptor signalling molecule Myd88 is not required to control disease in the larvae. Furthermore, proinflammatory cytokine genes *il1β* and *tnfα* were upregulated during infection, recapitulating key immune responses seen in human infection. Strikingly, we uncovered a previously undescribed infection phenotype in zebrafish larvae, whereby bloodborne, wild type *L. pneumophila* invade and grow in the larval yolk region, a phenotype not observed with a type IV secretion system deficient mutant that cannot translocate effectors into its host cell. Thus, zebrafish larva represents an innovative *L. pneumophila* infection model that that on one hand mimics important aspects of the human immune response to *L. pneumophila* infection and that on the other hand will allow to elucidate the mechanisms by which type IV secretion effectors allow *L. pneumophila* to cross membranes and to obtain nutrients from nutrient rich environments.

INTRODUCTION

Legionella pneumophila, a gram negative, facultative intracellular bacterium inhabits natural, freshwater sources [1, 2]. As an environmental, aquatic microbe *L. pneumophila* replicates intracellularly in aquatic protozoa [3]. Most interestingly, in contrast to other intracellular pathogens *L. pneumophila* is not adapted to a single host, but it exhibits a broad host range including Amoebozoa (amoebae), Percolozoa (excavates) and Ciliophora (ciliated protozoa) [3, 4]. In the environment *L. pneumophila* can also be found within biofilms where it acquires nutrients from this mixed community, but it can also survive in a planktonic form for a certain time [5]. As fresh water and man-made systems are connected, *L. pneumophila* can also contaminate artificial water systems. Protected within its protozoan hosts *L. pneumophila* survives water disinfectants and may infect humans *via* aerosols produced by different man-made structures and devices. The inhalation of *L. pneumophila*-contaminated aerosols can cause a severe pneumonia, the so-called Legionnaires' disease [6]. However, not every infection leads to disease. Disease outcome is determined by virulence of the bacterial strain, the bacterial burden in the inhaled aerosols and most importantly by the host immune status. Host factors determining susceptibility include age above 50, smoking and/or having chronic lung disease, being immunocompromised and genetic factors that alter the immune response [2, 7, 8].

Once the bacteria reach the lungs of susceptible individuals, they can infect alveolar macrophages and replicate therein. After being phagocytosed *L. pneumophila* avoids lysosomes and establishes an endoplasmic reticulum derived vacuole named the *Legionella* containing vacuole (LCV) [9, 10]. The LCV, a safe haven for bacterial replication, is established by utilizing the Dot/Icm type IV secretion system (T4SS) that injects over 330 proteins into the host cell [9-11]. These effector proteins manipulate a myriad of host pathways to recruit vesicles derived from the endoplasmic reticulum to the LCV, to supply the bacteria with nutrients, restrain autophagy and supress apoptosis and to subvert the host cell immune response [9-11]. A surprising high number of these effectors mimic host proteins and encode eukaryotic functions helping *L. pneumophila* to modulate numerous host pathways to its own benefit in remarkable diverse ways [11-13]

Intracellular replication of *L. pneumophila* and innate immune responses to this pathogen have been studied *in vitro* using both murine and human cell lines and *in vivo* using different animal models of infection. However, results obtained with these models cannot be easily extrapolated to what is observed in human disease. Studies in invertebrate models, such as *Galleria mellonella* and *Caenorhabditis elegans*, [14, 15] require further validation in more developed models as their immune system greatly differs from that of vertebrates. Interestingly, mouse infection fails to recall the human disease phenotype, as most inbred mice strains are naturally resistant to *L. pneumophila* [16]. Very early after the discovery of *L. pneumophila* the guinea pig model of Legionnaires' disease

was developed as these are highly susceptible to *L. pneumophila* when infected through injection into the peritoneum [6] or when exposed to *L. pneumophila* containing aerosols [6]. Several studies thereafter have shown that the guinea pig infection model recalls human disease and allows to study the immune response to *L. pneumophila* infection [17, 18]. However, the guinea pig model is rarely used due to the limited availability of specific immunological reagents for these animals and the demanding laboratory and husbandry requirements.

The above-mentioned models, including the widely used murine models, present limitations for studying *L. pneumophila* infection *in vivo* and discrepancies exist between results obtained in mouse or human cells, as for example mouse macrophages restrict *L. pneumophila* growth via caspase 1 and caspase 7 activation whereas human macrophages do not activate caspase 1 and 7 and thus allow growth of *L. pneumophila* [19, 20]. Thus, we sought to develop a new, alternative model for *Legionella* infection. The zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) originally introduced as a model organism in developmental biology has emerged in recent years as a powerful non-mammalian model to study nearly every aspect of biology, including immune cell behaviour and host-pathogen interactions [21, 22]. Zebrafish are evolutionary closer to humans than fruit flies and nematodes, easier to manipulate than mice and their immune system is remarkably similar to the one of mammals, making them an attractive laboratory model for immunology and infection biology [21, 22]. Its popularity is also due to its small size and the natural translucency of its embryos and larvae, which makes it possible to follow leukocyte behaviour and infection onset at the level of the whole organism in real-time and high resolution [23]. Additionally, although adult organisms display a fully developed immune system with both active innate and adaptive branches, studies can also be conducted at the early stages of life (embryonic or larvae) when the organism solely relies on innate immunity, allowing to dissect the mechanisms arising from different immune responses [23-25]. Here we examined whether the zebrafish could be an alternative model for analysing host-pathogen interactions and the innate immune response to *L. pneumophila* infection.

We show that *L. pneumophila* infection of zebrafish larvae recapitulate human disease onset, as infected wild-type larvae are generally able to clear the infection, but immunocompromised fish fail to do so. Both macrophages and neutrophils quickly interact and engulf injected *L. pneumophila*. Macrophage-depleted larvae show a dramatic increase of bacterial burden concomitant with host death, pointing to a crucial role of macrophages in controlling the infection. However, not all larvae are able to control the infection, but a fraction showed high bacterial burden in the yolk region, a unique zebrafish infection phenotype.

RESULTS

***L. pneumophila* infection induces mortality in zebrafish larvae in a dose dependent manner**

To analyse whether *L. pneumophila* can cause disease in zebrafish larvae we microinjected larvae 72

hours post fertilisation (hpf) intravenously in the caudal vessels near the cloaca (Fig 1A), with 10^3 or

10^4 CFU of wild type (WT) *L. pneumophila* strain Paris expressing GFP (WT-GFP) or the type IV

secretion system (T4SS) deficient isogenic mutant expressing GFP (Δ*dotA*-GFP). The infected larvae

were kept at 28°C and were monitored regularly until 72 hours post infection (hpi) to record survival

or death using a stereomicroscope. Larvae infected with doses of up to $2x10^3$ CFU of WT-GFP

(defined as low dose, LD) all survived (100% survival). In contrast, larvae infected intravenously with

doses of 10^4 CFU (defined as high dose, HD) resulted in approximately 30% of death within 72 hpi (Fig

1B). Importantly, all larvae injected with HD of the Δ*dotA*-GFP strain survived for the entire time of

observation (Fig 1B) indicating that the T4SS is crucial for replication in zebrafish larvae as it is in

other infection models and in humans.

We then set up a method to monitor the bacterial burden of the infected zebrafish larvae.

The progression of the infection was followed by analysing the bacterial load at 0, 24, 48 and 72 hpi

comparing three different methods. First, we quantified the pixel counts of GFP fluorescence of live

larvae images (Fig. S1A), secondly, we analysed the number of GFP expressing bacteria present in

lysed infected larvae by FACS (Fig. S1B) and thirdly we plated serial dilutions of homogenates of

euthanized larvae on BCYE medium (Fig S1C). The results obtained with the three methods showed a

similar trend, but the method using fluorescent pixel counts on live injected larvae seemed to most

accurately represent the bacterial load. Thus, we choose to monitor the *L. pneumophila* load of

zebrafish larvae by fluorescent pixel counts on live injected larvae, and in addition by FACS on lysed

larvae at various time points, using the GFP fluorescence of the bacteria. As shown in Fig. 1C, where

the bacterial burden was evaluated by fluorescent pixel counts on individual injected larvae followed

over 72hpi, most larvae injected with LD of WT-GFP progressively control the bacteria by 24 hpi with

only few larvae showing an increase in bacterial numbers at 72hpi. Similarly, HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP were

also progressively controlled by 24 hpi. In contrast, some zebrafish larvae injected with HD of WT-

GFP were unable to eliminate the bacteria at 72hpi, and the bacterial counts remained high and

increased by 48-72 hpi (Fig 1C). These results were corroborated by FACS analysis on lysed larvae (Fig

S2 A). We also monitored infected larvae by fluorescence microscopy. Immediately upon injection

(20 min to 2 hpi), bacteria were detectable as small foci, probably associated with professional

phagocytes (Fig. 1D). By 24 hpi, in both, larvae injected with LD of WT-GFP as well as larvae injected

with HD of the avirulent Δ*dotA*-GFP strain, the GFP signal declined becoming undetectable by 48 hpi,

suggesting that the bacteria were progressively cleared. Despite showing the same pattern at 24 hpi,

larvae injected with HD of WT-GFP showed an increase in GFP signal at 48 hpi, suggesting that

bacterial proliferation occurred in a fraction of the infected larvae. Interestingly, in these larvae,

bacterial proliferation occurred mainly in the yolk region where the bacterial foci increased

dramatically over time, with concomitant death of the infected larvae by 72 hpi (Fig 1D).

To gain insight into the progression of the infection, we analysed the bacterial presence in

the yolk or in the rest of the body (tail + trunk + head) of LD and HD WT-GFP or HD Δ*dotA*-GFP

infected larvae under the fluorescence microscope over time. A single small GFP dot (indicating few

bacteria) present in the larvae was scored as "positive for infection". We observed that about 60% of

larvae injected with HD WT-GFP and about 20% of larvae injected with LD WT-GFP showed yolk

growth at 72 hpi. In contrast, larvae injected with HD Δ*dotA*-GFP progressively cleared the bacteria,

and bacteria were never observed growing in the yolk (Fig 1E, F; Figure 3D). The presence of bacteria

in the yolk was intriguing and prompted us to investigate whether this unique feature was

dependent on the site of injection of bacteria in the larvae. Thus, we injected 72hpf zebrafish larvae

with HD WT-GFP in different closed cavities such as the otic vesicle and the hind brain ventricle. The

survival, bacterial burden, and outcome of bacterial dissemination over time compared to

bloodstream injected bacteria showed that only blood borne bacteria can successfully replicate in

zebrafish and establish a proliferative niche in the yolk. This suggests a role of the blood circulation in

the capacity of *L. pneumophila* to reach the yolk region and to replicate there (Fig S3 A-C).

Secondly, we tested if a natural route of uptake could cause infection in zebrafish. As in its

usual habitat *L. pneumophila* lives in freshwater and replicates in protozoan hosts [26] it is possible

that fish get infected in the environment by taking up infected amoeba. Indeed, amoebae are prey of

zebrafish larvae. To test this hypothesis, we infected *A. castellanii* with *L pneumophila* and exposed

120hpf zebrafish larvae (start of autonomous feeding) to *L. pneumophila* infected amoebae and

evaluated bacterial survival (Fig S4 A) and bacterial dissemination (Fig S4 B-D) in the larvae over time.

While zebrafish larvae engulfed the infected amoebae, as shown by the GFP signal detectable in the

exposed larvae at 48 hours post contact bath (Fig S4C), no permanent infection was established and

the engulfed bacteria were evacuated with other faecal content without impact on larvae survival,

suggesting that this might not be an important route of infection in the environment.

Collectively these results indicate that only bloodstream injected WT *L. pneumophila* induce

a dose dependent death of zebrafish larvae. Larvae that were unable to control infection by 48 hpi,

showed a unique infection phenotype, a high increase of the bacterial burden in the yolk region.

Legionella pneumophila replication in the yolk of zebrafish larvae is T4SS dependent

The replication of *L. pneumophila* in the yolk region of infected zebrafish larvae was strictly

dependent on a functioning T4SS as Δ*dotA*-GFP failed to reach the yolk. To investigate whether the

secretion mutant can grow in the yolk cell when reaching it, we injected LD and HD of WT-GFP or of

Δ*dotA*-GFP *L. pneumophila* directly into the yolk cell cytoplasm of 72hpf zebrafish larvae (Fig. 2A).

Surprisingly, Δ*dotA*-GFP did not replicate in the yolk even when injected directly although it persisted

over 48hpi (Fig 2B, C, Fig S2B). WT-GFP replicated in the yolk region both, upon LD and HD injections

resulting in an increased bacterial proliferation in the yolk and subsequent death of the larvae

whereby 100% of the larvae dying have bacteria replicating in the yolk. (Fig 2B, C, Fig S2B). These

observations suggest that T4SS system is not only crucial for reaching the yolk region but likely that

some of its effectors are necessary for the bacteria to obtain nutrients from the yolk environment to

allow replication. To further analyse this hypothesis, we selected a mutant in the gene encoding a

sphingosine-1 phosphate lyase, (WT, Δ*spl)* [27] as we reasoned that this enzyme might be implicated

in degrading sphingolipids present in the yolk of zebrafish larvae and thereby might aid

L. pneumophila to obtain nutrients. Injection of Δ*spl* in the yolk sac region*,* and analyses of larvae

death as compared to WT or Δ*dotA* showed that survival of zebrafish larvae injected with the Δ*spl*

was slightly but significantly higher than with WT injected larvae (Fig. S5A)*,* suggesting that the T4SS

effector *Lp*Spl might be implicated in nutrient acquisition in the yolk environment.

Interestingly, the first isolation of *L. pneumophila* was achieved by inoculating the yolk region

of embryonated eggs probably due to the richness in nutrients provided by the yolk [6]. Thus, we

decided to investigate the infection phenotype of *L. pneumophila* WT and Δ*dotA* in the yolk sac

further using as model embryonated chicken eggs (ECE). We inoculated ECE directly in the yolk

region with WT and with the Δ*dotA* strain at a concentration of 9.2 $\log_{10}$ CFU/mL and 9.1 $\log_{10}$

CFU/mL, respectively and assessed mortality of the embryos daily. The survival curves were

significantly different (p=0.0111). The total mortality during the 6-day observation period was

significantly higher in WT-GFP infected eggs (88.9%) than in the Δ*dotA*-infected eggs (14.3%) or PBS

inoculated control eggs (28.6%) (Fig. S5C). The highest mortality was observed at 2 days post

infection in WT inoculated eggs with 55.6% mortality *versus* 0% in Δ*dotA* or 28.6% mortality in PBS

inoculated eggs. Quantification of *L. pneumophila* in the yolk sac region at the day of mortality or at

day 6 post infection revealed that the number of bacteria in the yolk sac of WT-infected ECE, was

significantly higher than that in the yolk sac of those infected with the Δ*dotA* strain (7.8 $\log_{10}$ CFU/mL

and 5.9 $\log_{10}$ CFU/mL, respectively, p=0.0127) (Fig. S5D). Controls inoculated with PBS (n=2) showed

no *L. pneumophila* growth. Thus, like in zebrafish larvae only the WT strain can replicate in the yolk

region and of inducing mortality in the embryos, while the T4SS mutant strain persists but is not able

to replicate and does not induce high embryo mortality. This result further supports the finding that

the T4SS system is crucial for obtaining nutrients when lipids are the major available energy source.

Taken together, these results suggest that the *L. pneumophila* T4SS plays a crucial role for

the bacteria to pass from the blood circulation into the yolk and that T4SS effectors play an

important role to obtain nutrients for bacterial proliferation in the yolk.

Bloodstream L. pneumophila establishes a proliferative niche in the yolk region causing a persistent

infection

To characterise the *L. pneumophila* foci identified in the yolk region of zebrafish larvae, we used high

resolution fluorescence microscopy of HD of WT-GFP *L. pneumophila* injected in the bloodstream of

72hpf zebrafish larvae and analysed them at 72hpi. This analysis confirmed that these bacterial

structures localize in the yolk and or in the yolk tube region (Fig. 2D, Movie S1). *L. pneumophila* foci

in the yolk region are highly complex, aggregate-like structures of long, filamentous bacteria.

Moreover, upon injection of HD WT-GFP in Tg(*kdrl*::mCherry)[is5] (red blood vessels) larvae, we showed

that the fast growing bacterial aggregates localize close to the blood vessels, mostly below and

probably above the yolk cell. Single bacteria near the aggregates localized within the blood vessels,

indicating that the bacteria can cross the endothelial barrier to reach the yolk region (Fig 2E, Movie

S2). To analyse macrophage and neutrophil interactions with the bacterial aggregates in the yolk

region, we injected HD WT-GFP in Tg*(mfap4::mCherryF)* (herein referred as *mfap4*:mCherryF) (red

macrophages) or Tg(*Lyz::DsRed)*[nz50] (herein referred as *lyz*:DsRed)(red neutrophils) or

Tg(*kdrl*::mCherry)[is5] (red blood vessels) zebrafish larvae. At 72hpi macrophages accumulated around

the yolk region containing *L. pneumophila* but did not seem to be able to engulf the bacterial

aggregates. (Fig. 3A, Movie S3). Similarly, upon injection of HD of WT-GFP in *lyz*:DsRed larvae (red

neutrophils), at 72hpi neutrophils accumulated around the growing bacterial aggregates, but seemed

also unable to engulf them (Fig 3B, C, Movie S4). Strikingly, quantification analyses showed that

bacterial colonisation of the yolk of zebrafish larvae injected with the T4SS deficient Δ*dotA* mutant

strain, did never take place, suggesting that zebrafish susceptibility to *L. pneumophila* infection and

yolk penetration depends on a functional T4SS system (Fig. 3D). It should be noted that the yolk is

the only food source of the larvae during this developmental stage. The fast proliferation of the

bacteria in the yolk region probably depletes its nutritional content, leading to larvae death.

To gain deeper insight into the exact anatomical localisation of the bacteria in the yolk

region, we performed high resolution confocal time lapse acquisitions of HD of WT-GFP bloodstream

injected larvae harbouring red macrophages between 48 and 72hpi. We observed that

L. pneumophila foci seem to localize both above but also below the plasmatic yolk membrane,

suggesting that they can cross it, and that professional phagocytes remain above the growing

bacterial aggregates failing to engulf them (Fig 3E, Movie S5). Live imaging showed that both

macrophages and neutrophils accumulated around bacteria proliferating in the yolk region. To

investigate if professional phagocytes were recruited to the bacteria from other sites, or if only the

population located on the yolk was involved, we quantified macrophages and neutrophils in the body

and in the yolk of the whole larva overtime, focusing on HD WT-GFP infected larvae. We then

separated the larvae with bacterial burden in the yolk from the total population of infected larvae, to

specifically analyse the recruitment of professional leukocytes to the bacteria growing in the yolk. Following the same criteria as above, we quantified the bacterial burden of the infected larvae over time. This quantitative analysis showed that macrophages and neutrophils that accumulated where the bacteria are seen in the yolk by 48hpi, were the ones located on the yolk surface, and that no professional phagocyte population was recruited in the other parts of the body (Fig 3F; Fig S6). Moreover, this analysis confirmed that the bacterial burden increased in the yolk while decreasing in the body (Fig 1E) and it also revealed a decrease of professional phagocyte populations in infected larvae upon HD WT-GFP injection overtime.

Thus, blood-borne *L. pneumophila* can invade the yolk sac of zebrafish larvae, a previously undescribed phenotype of bacterial infection in this model. Once in the yolk, the bacteria replicate extensively, forming complex, organized, aggregate-like structures that cannot be removed by macrophages and neutrophils, thereby avoiding the host's immune control and clearance, and eventually causing the death of the larvae.

Infection of zebrafish larvae with high doses of L. pneumophila leads to macrophage and neutrophil death

In human infection, alveolar macrophages are the primary cell type infected by *L. pneumophila* supporting its intracellular replication. Following infection, neutrophils are recruited to the lung and are key players for controlling infection as they possess antimicrobial activity and kill *L. pneumophila* [28]. Moreover, the analysis of the recruitment of professional leukocytes to the bacteria in the yolk of HD WT-GFP infected larvae revealed a decrease of professional phagocyte populations overtime (Fig 3F). Thus, to analyse whether zebrafish infection mirrors human infection, we monitored the behaviour of zebrafish macrophages or neutrophils over time. The transgenic zebrafish larvae *mfap4*:mCherryF and *lyz*:DsRed were injected with low or high doses of WT-GFP or with high doses of Δ*dotA*-GFP. Infected live larvae were monitored using widefield fluorescence microscopy and the number of leukocytes per larva was assessed by counting fluorescent macrophages and neutrophils over time until 72hpi. We observed that upon injection of high dose WT-GFP, the macrophage count decreased dramatically at 24hpi and 48hpi, but started to increase at 72hpi (Fig. 4A). Neutrophil counts gave similar results at 24 and 48hpi upon injection of high doses of WT bacteria, as there was a dramatic decrease observed in neutrophil numbers by 24hpi. However, the neutrophil counts were still decreased at 72hpi (Fig. 5A). In contrast macrophage and neutrophil counts remained unaffected upon injection of equal amounts of the avirulent Δ*dotA* strain, with a slight increase of neutrophil numbers at 72hpi, suggesting that phagocyte death is linked to a functional T4SS system (Fig 4A, 5A).

Taken together, these results show that high dose *L. pneumophila* infection leads to a

decrease in the number of professional phagocytes dependent on the T4SS, like what is seen during

human infection by *L. pneumophila* or *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* [28, 29]

Macrophages are the primary cells to phagocytise blood-borne L. pneumophila and neutrophils co-

operate to decrease bacterial load

As macrophages and neutrophils are the phagocytes known to firstly interact with *L. pneumophila* we

analysed phagocyte-*L. pneumophila* interactions *in vivo* by injecting *mfap4*:mCherryF or *lyz*:DsRed

72hpf larvae with WT-GFP or Δ*dotA*-GFP and recorded phagocyte-*L. pneumophila* interactions using

high resolution confocal microscopy. This showed that upon injection of LD WT-GFP, macrophages

immediately contacted and engulfed blood-borne bacteria. Macrophages were continuously

recruited to the site of injection and by 16hpi the bacteria were mostly undetectable while

macrophage numbers increased (Fig. 4B top panel, Movie S6). Macrophages that had engulfed a

large amount of *L. pneumophila* stopped moving and rounded-up. Similarly, the inhibition of the

migration of phagocytes by *L. pneumophila* has been observed previously during infection of RAW

264.7 macrophages and the amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum* and *Acanthamoeba castellanii*, [30,

31]. In contrast, zebrafish injected with HD of WT-GFP were not able to restrict the bacterial growth

by 16hpi. Injection of HD of *L pneumophila* led to the formation of big bacterial aggregates, that were

not easily engulfed and cleared by macrophages, as previously shown for bacterial aggregates

proliferating in the yolk region (Fig 4B, second panel, Movie S6). Remarkably, macrophages were very

efficient in engulfing and rapidly clearing high doses and big bacterial aggregates of blood-borne

Δ*dotA*-GFP bacteria. By 10hpi most of the Δ*dotA* bacteria and bacterial aggregates had been engulfed

and cleared as suggested by the diffuse GFP staining in phagocytes (Fig. 4B, bottom panel, Movie S6).

However, upon infection with a HD WT-GFP, bacteria were not completely cleared and at 72hpi live

L. pneumophila were found in macrophages, suggesting that the bacteria are also replicating in

macrophages of zebrafish larvae. Indeed, high resolution confocal microscopy showed that at 72hpi,

L. pneumophila can also be found inside of macrophages in structures resembling replicative

vacuoles (Fig. 4C).

The analyses of *L. pneumophila*-neutrophil interactions showed that these cells engulfed the

bacteria trapped in the mesenchyme around the site of injection, but they were less efficient at

clearing blood-borne bacteria. This has also been previously observed for infection of zebrafish

larvae with *Escherichia coli* or *Shigella flexneri* [24, 32]. Indeed, upon injection with a HD of WT-GFP,

neutrophil failed to restrict *L. pneumophila*, leading to massive death of infected neutrophils, they

rounded up and lost their fluorescence (Fig. 5B, second panel; Movies S7; Fig 5C; Movie S8). In sharp

contrast, neutrophils very efficiently engulfed and cleared large amounts of Δ*dotA*-GFP aggregated

and trapped in the mesenchyme (Fig. 5B, lower panel, Movie S7) as well as low doses of WT-GFP (Fig

5B upper panel, Movie S7).

Altogether this shows that upon low dose bloodstream injection of *L. pneumophila*,

macrophages and neutrophils efficiently cooperate to eliminate most of the injected bacteria within

20-24 hpi, with macrophages playing the primary role. However, *L. pneumophila* seems to persist

upon high dose WT-GFP injection, and the observation of structures resembling large vacuoles

containing live *L pneumophila* at 72hpi suggests that they can replicate in zebrafish macrophages. In

contrast, neutrophils interact with *L. pneumophila* by quickly engulfing bacteria trapped in the

mesenchyme near the site of injection but are less efficient in clearing blood-borne bacteria.

Macrophages are the first line defence restricting L. pneumophila infection

In humans, innate immune responses, based essentially on the activity of professional phagocytes

and the induction of pro-inflammatory cytokine genes, are the key players to control and restrict

L. pneumophila proliferation. Hence, human disease develops primarily in immunocompromised

individuals [10]. To investigate whether the phagocytes of the innate immune system, macrophages

and neutrophils, are also responsible for controlling *L. pneumophila* infection in zebrafish larvae, we

selectively and transiently depleted macrophages or neutrophils, and infected these

"immunocompromised" larvae with *L. pneumophila*. Depletion of macrophages was achieved by

knocking down the expression of s*pi1b*, a transcription factor involved in early myeloid progenitor

formation. A low dose of s*pi1b* morpholino was reported to impact macrophages without affecting

neutrophils [33]. We monitored the effect of low doses s*pi1b* morpholino injection on macrophage

and neutrophil populations in double transgenic larvae with green neutrophils (*mpx*:GFP) and red

macrophages (*mfap4*:mCherryF). The specific depletion of macrophages was confirmed by counting

macrophages and neutrophils at 72hpf (Fig S7A).

We then infected macrophage depleted larvae (s*pi1b* knockdown) by intravenous injection of

LD or HD of WT-GFP. Regardless of the infection dose, a dramatic decrease in larvae survival was

observed, as even injection of low doses of WT-GFP resulted in the death of 30% of the larvae (Fig

6A). When injecting high doses of WT-GFP nearly all the infected larvae died by 72hpi, with the

earliest deaths starting 48hpi (Fig 6A). In contrast, s*pi1b* knockdown larvae injected with high doses

of Δ*dotA*-GFP did not show impaired survival (Fig 6A). The increased mortality correlated with an

increased but not significantly different bacterial burden in the s*pi1b* knockdown larvae compared to

control larvae (Fig 6B, Fig S2C). Intravital imaging of infected s*pi1b* knock down larvae also showed

that both low and high doses of WT-GFP failed to be cleared and that the bacteria established a

replicative niche in the yolk, where they proliferated extensively (Fig 6C). This highlights, that

macrophages are critical to restrict the onset of infection and *L. pneumophila* proliferation *in vivo*.

Furthermore, these results also suggest that neutrophils, which are not depleted in s*pi1b* knockdown

larvae, fail to control *L. pneumophila* infection in the absence of macrophages.

To analyse the role of neutrophils in controlling the infection, neutrophil development was

disrupted by knocking down the G-CSF/GCSFR pathway using *csf3R* morpholino, previously reported

to decrease up to 70% of the neutrophils present [34-36]. We monitored the efficiency of the *csf3R*

morpholino knockdown in double transgenic larvae confirming that 75% of the neutrophil population

was depleted, while macrophage numbers were only slightly decreased (Fig S7B). When HD Δ*dotA*-

GFP was injected, neutrophil-depleted larvae survived, and the bacterial burden remained

unchanged, like what we had observed in infections of macrophage-depleted larvae (Fig. 6D, E).

However, when neutrophil-depleted larvae were injected with HD WT-GFP, larvae survival

significantly decreased and bacterial burdens slightly increased by 48hpi (Fig. 6D, E; FigS2D).

Intravital imaging showed that *csf3R* knockdown larvae that were unable to control *L. pneumophila*

infection showed bacterial proliferation in the yolk comparable to WT control larvae (Fig 6F).

These results show that both macrophages and neutrophils are required for restricting and

controlling *L. pneumophila* infection in the zebrafish model, but macrophages play the main role.

Although neutrophils contributed less to clear the bacteria upon bloodstream injection, neutrophils

might impact the infection outcome through cytokine release that can modulate macrophage

activity.

Key pro-inflammatory cytokine genes are induced upon L. pneumophila infection of zebrafish

larvae

Proinflammatory cytokines produced by infected and bystander cells during *L. pneumophila* infection

of humans and mice play crucial roles in orchestrating host defences to control infection [37, 38].

Infected cells produce IL-1α and IL-1β through a mechanism involving MyD88-dependent

translational bypass. In contrast, bystander cells produce IL-6, TNF-α and IL-12 in an IL-1 receptor (IL-

1R) dependant way [37, 39]. To determine the pro-inflammatory responses of zebrafish larvae during

L. pneumophila infection, we analysed *il1b*, *tnfa*, and *ifng1/2* (orthologues of mammalian *Ifng*) gene

expression levels over time by qRT-PCR on RNA isolated from individual infected larvae. We found

that infection of zebrafish larvae with LD or HD of WT-GFP induced a rapid (by 6hpi) and robust

induction of *il1b* and *tnfa* gene expression. In larvae injected with low doses of WT-GFP the

expression levels started to decrease by 24hpi, and gradually became undetectable at 72hpi. In

contrast, larvae injected with HD of WT-GFP, expression of *il1b* and *tnfa* did not decrease over time

(Fig. 7A and B) and a significant induction of *ifng1* was observed at 48hpi (Fig. 7C) but not of *ifng2*

(Fig. 7D). In parallel, we scored the bacterial burden of the infected larvae before the measurement

of pro-inflammatory cytokine gene induction at each time point under the microscope, which

consistently showed that larvae with increased *il1b* and *tnfa* induction had also high bacterial burdens in the yolk and were not controlling the infection (Fig S8A). These pro-inflammatory responses were T4SS dependent, as zebrafish larvae infected with HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP did not show significant induction of transcription of *tnfa*, *il1b* and *ing1/2* (Fig. 7 A-D).

Collectively, these results reveal, that key pro-inflammatory cytokines known to orchestrate the host response during *L. pneumophila* infection in humans are also induced in zebrafish larvae, and that cytokine gene induction is sustained when uncontrolled *L. pneumophila* proliferation occurs.

The immune response of zebrafish larvae to L. pneumophila infection is independent of MyD88 signalling

In innate immunity, the myeloid differentiation factor 88 (MyD88) plays a pivotal role in immune cell activation through Toll-like receptors (TLRs). MyD88-deficient mice are highly susceptible to *L. pneumophila* infection [40-43], however this is not the case when human macrophages are depleted of MyD88 [44]. Therefore, we sought to analyse which role MyD88 plays in zebrafish larvae during *L. pneumophila* infection. We injected *myd88-/-* and control larvae with LD or HD of WT-GFP, or with HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP and monitored larvae survival and bacterial burden over time as described in Figure 1. Our results show that susceptibility to infection of *myd88-/-* larvae injected with HD of WT-GFP was comparable to that of WT larvae, as only a very slight, but no significant increase of the bacterial burden was observed in *myd88-/-* larvae by 24hpi. *L. pneumophila* Δ*dotA*-GFP did not establish an infection, and the bacterial burden decreased over time indicating that bacteria were cleared (Fig. 7E, F; Fig S2E). To determine if pro-inflammatory responses were affected in the absence of MyD88 signalling, we analysed *il1b*, *tnfa* and *ing1/2* gene expression levels over time in control and *myd88-/-* larvae. Our results showed that *il1b, tnfa* and *ing1/2* gene expression levels were comparable in control and *myd88-/-* infected larvae for all tested conditions (LD WT-GFP and HD Δ*dotA*-GFP (Fig S8B, C).

Taken together, our results suggest that MyD88 signalling is not required for the innate immune response against *L. pneumophila* infection in the zebrafish larvae, similar to what is seen in human cell infection models. However, MyD88 signalling may also be functionally compensated by other immune signalling pathways.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we developed a zebrafish larva infection model for *L. pneumophila* and have analysed host pathogen interactions as well as the host innate immune response to infection. We have found that a successful infection of zebrafish larvae by *L. pneumophila* depends on the infection site, the infection dose, the T4SS Dot/Icm and the innate immune response of the host, in particular on the

action of macrophages and neutrophils. Wild type zebrafish larvae are susceptible to infection in a

dose dependent manner, as larvae injected in the bloodstream with increasing doses of bacteria

developed an infection with bacterial dissemination and replication, concomitant with host death

proportional to the initial injected bacterial load. However, the fact that only about 30% of the larvae

displayed this phenotype, indicates that the innate immune defence of the larvae against

L. pneumophila infection is relatively efficient. Thus, the establishment of infection is determined not

only by the infection dose but also by the capacity of the host immune system to quickly and

efficiently fence off the infection.

Like in several other zebrafish infection models, only blood borne bacteria can proliferate

and induce mortality in zebrafish larvae (Emma do you have some papers we could cite?). Once in

the blood circulation, bacteria are engulfed and are eliminated by both macrophages and neutrophils

in a dose-dependent manner. However, T4SS competent *L. pneumophila* are also able to reach the

yolk region, cross the endothelium of the yolk vessels and enter the yolk sac region. Once there,

L. pneumophila gains a significant advantage in the pathogen-host arms race and establishes a

replicative niche where it proliferates extensively, forming complex, aggregated bacterial structures,

located below and above the yolk cell membrane, that professional phagocytes fail to clear. In the

yolk sac region *L. pneumophila* is protected from the host immune system, when it reaches the yolk

cell, as professional phagocytes are unable to enter in the yolk. Extensive proliferation of the bacteria

eventually leads to host death, likely due to exhaustion of the nutrients present in the yolk, which are

key in supporting the larvae development. Interestingly, we have also observed that in few cases

(less than 5%) the infected larvae were able to extrude the bacterial aggregates growing in the yolk

and survived. This host defence mechanism has also been reported in a caudal fin model of

Mycobacterium marinum infection, where infected zebrafish larvae extruded the bacteria-containing

granuloma and during infection with *Aspergillus fumigatus* [45, 46] .

To our knowledge, the tropism, and the establishment of a replicative niche in the yolk upon

pathogen injection in the bloodstream is a unique feature of *L. pneumophila.* Our results have shown

that, when macrophages and neutrophils are depleted, blood-borne *L. pneumophila* can still reach

the yolk cell. It seems that *L. pneumophila* can cross the venous endothelium of the yolk and reach

the nutrient-rich content of the yolk cell. Interestingly, direct yolk cell injection revealed that also

only the WT but not the T4SS knockout strain is able to replicate and establish a persistent infection

in the yolk, irrespective of the dose injected. This result points towards the involvement of the T4SS

system and its secreted effectors in infection and replication but also nutrient uptake in the yolk

environment. Yolk sac injection has already been used previously for the analyses of *Candida*

albicans infection or the study of streptococcal infections, however in this case the pathogens

disseminated from the yolk sac into the animal [47, 48], a phenotype not observed when

L. pneumophila was injected in the yolk sac. Further analyses of the phenotype of yolk sac replication in embryonated chicken eggs showed again that only WT L. pneumophila can replicate in the yolk region, further supporting the importance of the T4SS in nutrient uptake in addition to its known role in infection (Fig. S5A, B, C). L. pneumophila is known to mainly use amino acids as carbon and energy sources for growth [49] and secreted T4SS effectors have been shown to aid in amino acid uptake [50]. However, fatty acids, glucose and/or glycerol also serve as carbon sources during the later stages of the life cycle of L. pneumophila [51, 52], but effectors connected to the uptake of these nutrients have not been identified yet. The yolk cell is composed of a complex and dynamic mixture of different lipids on which the zebrafish larvae rely on for nutrition throughout development in the early larva phase. Cholesterol and phosphatidylcholine are the main constituents until 120hpf, with triacylglycerol, phosphatidylinositol, phosphatidylethanolamine, diacyl-glycerol, cholesteryl esters and sphingomyelins also present in significant concentrations [53]. L. pneumophila is known to secrete several effectors with lipolytic activity through its T4SS which could be important for growth in a lipid rich environment like the yolk [54]. In a first attempt to identify one of these effectors we analysed the growth of a L. pneumophila mutant for a gene encoding a sphingosine-1 phosphate lyase (LpSpl) [27]. When compared to the WT strain after direct injection in the zebrafish larvae yolk sac a small but significant difference in larvae mortality was observed for the Δspl strain, suggesting that LpSpl is one of several effectors that might participate in nutrient acquisition from lipids (Fig. S5A). However, further analyses are needed to characterize the involvement of LpSpl in nutrient acquisition during infection of the yolk region and to identify other effectors potentially implicated in this phenotype.

Studies of Legionella infection in humans, guinea pigs and mouse lungs have shown that L. pneumophila interacts closely with neutrophils and mononuclear phagocytes [55, 56]. Professional phagocytes are the main replication niche for L. pneumophila with monocytes and macrophages, and in particular alveolar macrophages, representing the main cells for replication in the lungs [57-60]. In vivo studies in mice have shown that upon lung infection with L. pneumophila neutrophils, cDCs, monocytes, and monocyte-like cells are rapidly recruited to the infection site, but although all these cells seem to engulf the bacteria, L. pneumophila can only translocate effectors into neutrophils and alveolar macrophages. In zebrafish macrophages appear during the first days of development, followed by neutrophils a day later, with both forming an efficient immune system that protects the developing fish [25, 61-63]. Therefore, the zebrafish larva offers a unique possibility to interrogate the role of innate immune responses to infection [23]. Indeed, macrophage depleted larvae showed a dramatically increased susceptibility to L. pneumophila infection as nearly 100% of larvae inoculated with HD of WT and 30% of larvae inoculated with LD of L. pneumophila died from the infection. Hence, macrophages are the first line of infection control against L. pneumophila and are

essential for restricting and controlling blood-borne infections, similar to what was observed for

Burkholderia cenocepacia or Staphylococcus aureus zebrafish infection [64, 65]. In contrast, when

neutrophils were depleted, the innate immune response was less affected, suggesting that

neutrophils are also required to ensure an effective innate immune response and, that macrophages

alone are not able to contain high burdens of *L. pneumophila* infection (Fig. 6).

Human innate immune signalling relies strongly on activation of Toll-like receptors (TLRs) and

respective adaptor molecules, all of which are highly conserved in the zebrafish [66, 67]. One of

these adaptors is MyD88, known as a central player in interleukin 1 receptor (IL-1R) and TLR

signalling in humans and mammalian models [68]. MyD88 signalling is crucial for mice to combat

L. pneumophila infection, as it triggers the early secretion of inflammatory cytokines, neutrophil

recruitment, and the host immune response to the infection. Consequently, mice that lack MyD88

are highly susceptible to infection [39-42]. However, in MyD88 depleted human macrophages

L. pneumophila replication is not different to replication in WT cells [44] Here we show, Myd88

signalling does not play a crucial role or may be redundant in the control of the innate immune

response to *L. pneumophila* infection of zebrafish larvae, suggesting that zebrafish infection mirrors

human infection better than the mouse model. In the mouse model infected macrophages are

incapable of producing cytokines, such as tumour necrosis factor (TNF) and interleukin-12 (IL-12),

which are necessary to control infection. In contrast, infection of zebrafish larvae with WT *L.*

pneumophila induced a rapid (by 6hpi) and robust induction of *il1b* and *tnfa* gene expression.

However, it is thought that IL-1 released initially by *L. pneumophila*-infected macrophages drives the

production of critical cytokines by bystander cells [37]. Infection of zebrafish larvae with HD of WT

L. pneumophila induced a rapid (by 6hpi) and robust induction of *il1b* and *tnfa* gene expression

whereas WT LD infection leads only to a short induction of *Il1b* transcript levels at 6hpi before

declining to CTRL levels at later time points, suggesting that a short boost of IL-1β is sufficient to

control LD of *L. pneumophila*. However, for a high load of *L. pneumophila* even a high and long-term

induction of IL-1β is not sufficient to warrant infection control, suggesting that the self-regulation of

the immune response may be abrogated leading to a constant activation of IL-1β expression.

Moreover, gene expression analyses also confirms that Myd88 has no influence on the control of the

inflammatory response, as no statistically significant difference in the transcript levels of *il1b*, *tnfa,*

ifng1 or infg2 was observed further suggesting that activation of the IL1R and certain TLR pathways

are not crucial for *L. pneumophila* clearance in zebrafish larvae. It is even possible that IL-1β release

is beneficial for *L. pneumophila* replication, as it was shown that IL-1β may also indicate an activation

of the metabolic state of the bystander cells as it was shown that IL-1β induces a shift towards more

metabolically active cells and increased cellular glucose uptake [69], which could aid *L. pneumophila*

replication.

In conclusion, the zebrafish infection model for *L. pneumophila* mimics the immune response

known of human infection and recalls the essentiality of the type IV secretion system for virulence of

this pathogen. The unique advantages of the zebrafish model provide now exciting possibilities to

further explore *L. pneumophila* host interactions and to interrogate at the molecular level the

bacterial determinants and host factors involved in the dynamics of bacterial dissemination, the

molecular basis of yolk region invasion and the interactions of the bacteria with macrophages and

neutrophils.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethics Statement. Animal experiments were performed according to European Union guidelines for

handling of laboratory animals

(http://ec.europa.eu/environment/chemicals/lab_animals/home_en.htm) and were approved by the

Institut Pasteur Animal Care and Use Committee. and the French Ministry of Research

(APAFIS#31827). The inoculation of embryonated chicken eggs is a standard procedure in diagnostics

for multiplication and antigen production of *Legionella* and is not covered by the national law for

animal experiments in France (Décret n° 2013-118 du 1er février 2013).

Zebrafish care and maintenance. Wild-type AB fish, initially obtained from the Zebrafish

International Resource Center (Eugene, OR), Tg(*Lyz::DsRed)*[nz50] [70]*,* Tg(*mfap4::mCherryF*) (ump6Tg)

[36] Tg(mpx:GFP)[i114] [71] , Tg(kdrl::mCherry)[is5] [72] and *myd88[hu3568]* mutant line (obtained from the

Hubrecht Laboratory and the Sanger Institute Zebrafish Mutation Resource) [73], were raised in our

facility. Eggs were obtained by natural spawning, bleached according to standard protocols, and kept

in Petri dishes containing Volvic source water and, from 24 hours post fertilization (hpf) onwards

0.003% 1-phenyl-2-thiourea (PTU) (Sigma-Aldrich) was added to prevent pigmentation. Embryos

were reared at 28°C or 24°C according to the desired speed of development; infected larvae were

kept at 28°C. Timings in the text refer to the developmental stage at the reference temperature of

28.5°C. Larvae were anesthetized with 200µg/ml tricaine (Sigma-Aldrich) during the injection

procedure as well as during *in vivo* imaging and processing for bacterial burden evaluation or

cytokine expression studies.

Bacterial strains and growth conditions. *Legionella pneumophila* strain Paris carrying the pNT28

plasmid encoding for green fluorescent protein (constitutive GFP) [74], wild-type (WT-GFP) or Δ*dotA*-

GFP were plated from -80°C glycerol stocks on N-(2-acetamido)-2-aminoethanesulfonic acid (ACES)-

buffered charcoal yeast-extract (BCYE) medium supplemented with 10 µg/ml of chloramphenicol and

cultured for 3 days at 37°C. Suspensions were prepared by resuspending bacteria in sterile 1x

Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) and adjusting the OD 600 according to the desired bacterial

concentrations for injection.

Morpholino injections. Morpholino antisense oligonucleotides (Gene Tools LLC, Philomath, OR, USA)

were injected at the one to two cell stage as described [75]. A low dose (4ng) of *spi1b* (previously

named pu1) translation blocking morpholino (GATATACTGATACTCCATTGGTGGT) [76] blocks

macrophage development only but can also block neutrophil development when it is injected at a

higher dose (20ng in 2nl). The csf3r translation blocking morpholino

(GAACTGGCGGATCTGTAAAGACAAA) (4ng) [34] was injected to block neutrophil development.

Control morphants were injected with 4ng control morpholino, with no known target

(GAAAGCATGGCATCTGGATCATCGA).

Amoebae infections. *Acanthamoebae castellanii* was infected with *L. pneumophila* wild type

expressing GFP and then used to assess if zebrafish develop an infection when ingesting infected

amoebae. *A. castellanii* was seeded in a flask with infection buffer (4 mM $MgSO_4$, 0.4 M $CaCl_2$, 0.1%

sodium citrate dihydrate, 0.05 mM $Fe(NH_4)_2(SO_4)_2 \times 6H_2O$, 2.5 mM NaH_2PO_3, 2.5 mM K_2HPO_3), and

after 1 hour of attachment the cells were infected with the bacteria at MOI 1. After one hour of

infection, the amoebae were washed three times with PBS and fresh infection buffer was added.

After 48 hours of infection, the amoebae were carefully washed, detached, and used for the bath

immersion experiment.

Bath immersion. Experiments were performed using the AB or Tg(mfap4::mCherryF) zebrafish lines

maintained at 28 °C under standard conditions in Volvic water. Bath immersion infections were done

with 120hpf larvae that already had a developed swim bladder. Groups of 10 larvae were distributed

into 6-well plates containing 4.0 ml/well of Volvic spring water and either 1ml of bacterial

suspension, 1ml of *L. pneumophila*-containing amoebae, or 1ml of non-infected amoebae, all in PBS.

The plates were incubated at 28 °C for 24 hours, and then larvae were individually distributed in an

individual well in 24 wells culture plates and monitored by imaging using a fluorescence

stereomicroscope.

Zebrafish injection. The volume of injected suspension was deduced from the diameter of the drop

obtained after mock microinjection, as described in [75]. Bacteria were recovered by centrifugation,

washed, resuspended at the desired concentration in PBS. 72h post-fertilization (hpf) anesthetized

zebrafish larvae were microinjected iv or in closed cavities, or the yolk with 0.5-1nl of bacterial

suspension at the desired dose (~10^3 bacteria/nl for Low Dose (LD) and ~10^4 bacteria/nl for High Dose (HD) as described [24, 32]. Infected larvae were transferred into individual wells (containing 1ml of Volvic water + 0.003% PTU in 24-well culture plates), incubated at 28°C and regularly observed under a stereomicroscope, twice a day overtime up to 72hpi.

Evaluation of the bacterial burden in infected larvae. The bacterial burden was measured routinely by counting the total number of fluorescent pixels corresponding to the GFP channel using the Metavue software 7.5.6.0. Briefly, images corresponding to the GFP channel were adjusted to a fixed threshold that allowed to abrogate the background of the autofluorescence of the yolk. The same threshold was used for all images. The histogram in the "Analyze" menu was used to obtain the number of black and white pixels. As shown in figure S1A, the percentage of white pixels in each image corresponding to *L. pneumophila* was plotted using GraphPad Prism® software. This method was chosen to routinely quantify bacterial burden as it allows to follow each infected larva overtime (individual larvae were imaged with the fluorescence stereomicroscope daily using the same settings from 0 to 72hpi).

Bacterial burden analyses by FACS. Injected zebrafish larvae were collected at 0, 24, 48 and 72hpi and lysed. Each larva was placed in a 1.5 ml Eppendorf tube and anesthetized with tricaine (200µg/ml), washed with 1ml of sterile water and placed in 150 µl of sterile water. Larvae were then homogenized using a pestle motor mixer (Argos). Each sample was transferred to an individual well of a 96 well plate, counted on a MACSQuant VYB FACS (Miltenyi Biotec) and data analysed using FlowJo version 7.6.5. as shown in Figure S1B. For CFU enumeration, serial dilutions were plated on BCYE agar plates supplemented with10ug/ml chloramphenicol and the *Legionella* Selective Supplement GVPN (Sigma) added according to the manufacturer's instructions. Plates were incubated for 4-5 days at 37°C and colonies with the appropriate morphology and colour were scored using the G-Box imaging system (Syngene) and enumerated using the Gene Tools software (Syngene) as shown in Figure S1C. Manual quantification was also performed to identify absolute absence or presence of bacteria in the different zebrafish compartments. Larvae with a single GFP dot (indicating the presence of few bacteria) were considered as infected. The resulting statistical presence map was used to follow the evolution of the infection and dissemination of *L. pneumophila* in zebrafish larvae over time (Figure 1E).

Inoculation and quantification of *L. pneumophila* strains in *in ovo* experiments. Fertilized chicken eggs purchased from a local producer (Saint-Maurice-sur-Dargoire, Rhône, France) were incubated at 35°C in an egg incubator (Maino, Italy) to maintain normal embryonic development. Eggs were

pathogen and antibiotic free. On day 0, 23 embryonated chicken eggs (ECE) were inoculated at 8

days of embryonation (DOE) with either *L. pneumophila* WT (n=9), *L. pneumophila* Δ*dotA* (n=7) or

sterile PBS as control (n=7). *L. pneumophila* concentration in WT and Δ*dotA* suspensions before ECE

injection was quantified at 9.2 $\log_{10}$ CFU/mL and 9.1 $\log_{10}$ CFU/mL, respectively. *L. pneumophila*

concentration in the yolk sac of ECE directly after injection were estimated, considering both the

measured inoculum counts and the yolk sac volumes (median (interquartile range) [IQR] volume, 30

[28.7-31.2] mL), at 7.4 and 7.3 $\log_{10}$ CFU/mL in the WT and Δ*dotA* groups, respectively. Two-day

cultures of Lpp-WT and Lpp-Δ*dotA* on BCYE at 36°C were suspended in PBS at a DO = 2.5 McFarland

(9 $\log_{10}$ CFU/mL) and 0.5 mL of suspensions or PBS (negative control) were inoculated in the yolk sac

of ECE. After inoculation, ECE were candled every 24 hours to assess embryo viability until day-6 post

infection. Embryos that died the day after inoculation (n=2, corresponding to one WT-infected and

one Δ*dotA*-infected embryo) were discarded for *L. pneumophila* quantification as death was probably

due to bad inoculation. Dead embryos were stored at 4°C overnight prior to harvesting the yolk sacs.

Remaining live embryos at 6-days post injection were euthanized by overnight refrigeration and the

yolk sacs were collected. After measuring their volume, yolk sacs were homogenized using

gentleMACS™ Octo Dissociator (Miltenyi Biotec, Germany) and 100 μL of serial dilutions at 10^{-2}, 10^{-4}

and 10^{-6} were automatically plated using easySpiral® automatic plater (Interscience, France) in

triplicates on BCYE agar. *L. pneumophila* were quantified after 5 days-incubation using Scan® 1200

Automatic HD colony counter (Interscience, France). Comparison of survival curves was performed

using Log-rank (Mantel-Cox) test. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Comparison of *L.*

pneumophila quantifications between WT- and Δ*dotA*-infected embryos was done using Mann-

Whitney test. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant (symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P <

0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05).

Live imaging, image processing and analysis. Quantification of total neutrophils and/or macrophages

on living transgenic reporter larvae upon infection was performed as previously described [32].

Briefly, bright field, DsRed and GFP images of whole living anesthetized larvae were taken using a

Leica Macrofluo™ Z16 APOA (zoom 16:1) equipped with a Leica PlanApo 2.0X lens, and a

Photometrics® CoolSNAP™ *HQ2* camera. Images were captured using Metavue software 7.5.6.0

(MDS Analytical Technologies). Then larvae were washed and transferred in a new 24 wells plate

filled with 1ml of fresh Volvic water per well, incubated at 28°C and imaged again under the same

conditions the day after. Pictures were analysed, and Tg(*lyzC::DsRed*) neutrophils or

Tg(*mfap4::mCherryF*) macrophages manually counted using the ImageJ software (V 1.52a). Counts

shown in figures are numbers of cells per image. The quantification of fluorescence images was also

done using CellProfiler™ Software (Broad Institute) using two semi-automatic batch pipelines. Both

pipelines normalize the intensity, operate image pre-processing, and use thresholding to calculate

the percentage of area positive for macrophage/neutrophils and bacteria, normalized on the whole

image area. Both pipelines also take advantage of manual editing to increase identification accuracy

and define the yolk area. The positive signal is then automatically masked to calculate the amount of

signal in the body or yolk of each zebrafish for all the experiments and produce a .csv file used for

subsequent statistical treatment (Figure 3F and Figure S6). High resolution confocal live imaging of

injected larvae was performed as previously described [77]. Briefly, injected larvae were positioned

in lateral or ventral position in 35 mm glass-bottom-Dishes (Ibidi Cat#: 81158) or in glass bottom-

8well-slides (Ibidi Cat#: 80827). Larvae were immobilized using a 1% low-melting-point agarose

(Promega; Cat#: V2111) solution and covered with Volvic water containing tricaine. A Leica SP8

confocal microscope equipped with two PMT and Hybrid detector, a 10X dry (PL Fluotar 10X

dry:0.30), 20X IMM (HC PL APO CS2 20X/0.75), or a 40x water IMM (HC PL APO CS2 40X/1.10)

objective, a X–Y motorized stage and with LAS-X software, was used to live image injected larvae. To

generate images of the whole larvae, a mosaic of confocal z-stack of images was taken with the 10X

or 20X objective using the Tile Scan tool of the LAS-X software and was stitched together using the

Mosaic Merge tool of the LAS-X software. All samples were acquired using the same settings,

allowing comparisons of independent experiments. The acquisitions were post processed with the

Lightning tool of the LAS-X software to eliminate noise (deconvolution). After acquisition, larvae were

washed and transferred in a new 24-well plate filled with 1 ml of fresh Volvic water per well,

incubated at 28°C and imaged again under the same conditions over time. A Leica SPE inverted

confocal microscope and a 40x oil IMM objective (ACS APO 40 × 1.15 UV) was also used to live image

larvae infected with *L. pneumophila* Δ*dotA*-GFP (Fig 4, 5). The 3D or 4D files generated by the time-

lapse acquisitions were processed, cropped, analysed, and annotated using the LAS-X and LAS-AF

Leica software. Acquired Z-stacks were projected using maximum intensity projection and exported

as AVI files. Frames were captured from the AVI files and handled with Miocrosoft PowerPoint ®

(Microsoft Office 365) software to mount figures. AVI files were cropped and annotated using ImageJ

software. Files generated with the LAS-X software were also processed and analysed with the Imaris

software version9.5 (Bitplane, OXFORD Instruments) for 3D or 4D reconstruction, surfacing and

volume rendering. The yolk region has been manually annotated (Movie S5).

qRT-PCR to measure gene expression of cytokine encoding genes. RNA was extracted from

individual larvae using the RNeasy® Mini Kit (Qiagen). cDNA was obtained using M-MLV H- reverse-

transcriptase (Promega) with a dT17 primer. Quantitative PCR was performed on an ABI7300

thermocycler (Applied Biosystems) using TakyonTM ROX SYBR® 2X MasterMix (Eurogentec) in a final

volume of 10 µl. Primers used: *ef1a (housekeeping gene used for normalization):*

GCTGATCGTTGGAGTCAACA and ACAGACTTGACCTCAGTGGT*; il1b*: GAGACAGACGGTGCTGTTTA and

GTAAGACGGCACTGAATCCA*; tnfa*: TTCACGCTCCATAAGACCCA and CAGAGTTGTATCCACCTGTTA*; ifng-*

1-1: ACCAGCTGAATTCTAAGCCAA and TTTTCGCCTTGACTGAGTGAA; *ifng-2:* GAATCTTGAGGAAAGTG

AGCA and TCGTTTTCCTTGATCGCCCA

Statistical analysis. Normal distributions were analysed with the Kolmogorov– Smirnov and the

Shapiro–Wilk tests. To evaluate difference between means of normally distributed data (for

neutrophil and macrophage numbers), an analysis of variance followed by Bonferroni's multiple

comparison tests was used. For bacterial burdens (CFU/FACS counts), values were Log10

transformed. For cytokine expression and bacterial burdens (evaluated by

fluorescent pixel count, or FACS) non-Gaussian data were analysed with the Kruskal–Wallis test

followed by Dunn's multiple comparison test. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant

(symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05). No symbol on graphs means that not

statistically differences were observed. Survival data were plotted using the Kaplan–Meier estimator

and log-rank (Mantel–Cox) tests were performed to assess differences between groups. Statistical

analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism® software. Statistical analyses for *in ovo*

experiments, were performed using GraphPrism version 9.4.

Author contributions

FV, LB, SJ, ECG and CB designed the experiments. FV, LB, VL, DS, MI and ECG performed the

experiments. FV, LB, VL, ECG analysed the experiments. FV drafted, and ECG and CB wrote the

manuscript with input from all authors. ECG and CB supervised the work and acquired funds.

Data Availability: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files. The

movies related to the paper are available at https://zenodo.org/deposit/7410466

Competing Interest

The authors declare there are no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Pedro Escoll and Jean-Pierre Levraud for help and ideas in the initial set up of the project

and Tobias Sahr for critical reading and helpful discussions, Philippe Herbomel for helpful scientific

advice, and Yohann Rolin for his excellent care of the fish. Work in the CB laboratory is financed by

the Institut Pasteur, the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale (FRM) grant EQU201903007847 and

the grant ANR-10-LABX-62-IBEID and ANR-22-CE15 0009 01 ZebraLegion. Work in ECG group is

financed by Institut Pasteur, CNRS, and ANR 17-CE15-0026 and 20-CE15-0024 and ANR-22-CE15 0009

01 ZebraLegion. Valerio Laghi is funded by ANR 20-CE15-0024. We acknowledge the Image analyses

Hub at Institut Pasteur for the use of the IMARIS workstation. The funders, other than the authors,

did not play any role in the study or in the preparation of the article or decision to publish.

REFERENCES

1. Fliermans CB. Ecology of Legionella: From Data to Knowledge with a Little Wisdom. Microb Ecol. 1996;32(2):203-28. PubMed PMID: 8688009.
2. Cunha BA, Burillo A, Bouza E. Legionnaires' disease. Lancet. 2016;387(10016):376-85. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60078-2. PubMed PMID: 26231463.
3. Rowbotham TJ. Preliminary report on the pathogenicity of *Legionella pneumophila* for freshwater and soil amoebae. J Clin Pathol. 1980;33(12):1179-83.
4. Boamah DK, Zhou G, Ensminger AW, O'Connor TJ. From Many Hosts, One Accidental Pathogen: The Diverse Protozoan Hosts of *Legionella*. Frontiers in cellular and infection microbiology. 2017;7:477. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2017.00477. PubMed PMID: 29250488; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5714891.
5. Mampel J, Spirig T, Weber SS, Haagensen JA, Molin S, Hilbi H. Planktonic replication is essential for biofilm formation by *Legionella pneumophila* in a complex medium under static and dynamic flow conditions. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2006;72(4):2885-95. doi: 10.1128/AEM.72.4.2885-2895.2006. PubMed PMID: 16597995; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1448985.
6. McDade JE, Shepard CC, Fraser DW, Tsai TR, Redus MA, Dowdle WR. Legionnaires' disease: isolation of a bacterium and demonstration of its role in other respiratory disease. N Engl J Med. 1977;297(22):1197-203.
7. Lanternier F, Ader F, Pilmis B, Catherinot E, Jarraud S, Lortholary O. Legionnaire's Disease in Compromised Hosts. Infect Dis Clin North Am. 2017;31(1):123-35. Epub 2017/02/06. doi: 10.1016/j.idc.2016.10.014. PubMed PMID: 28159172.
8. Naujoks J, Lippmann J, Suttorp N, Opitz B. Innate sensing and cell-autonomous resistance pathways in *Legionella pneumophila* infection. Int J Med Microbiol. 2018;308(1):161-7. Epub 2017/11/04. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmm.2017.10.004. PubMed PMID: 29097162.
9. Isberg RR, O'Connor TJ, Heidtman M. The *Legionella pneumophila* replication vacuole: making a cosy niche inside host cells. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2009;7(1):13-24. Epub 2008/11/18. doi: nrmicro1967 [pii]10.1038/nrmicro1967. PubMed PMID: 19011659.
10. Mondino S, Schmidt S, Rolando M, Escoll P, Gomez-Valero L, Buchrieser C. Legionnaires' Disease: State of the Art Knowledge of Pathogenesis Mechanisms of *Legionella*. Annu Rev Pathol. 2020;15:439-66. Epub 2019/10/29. doi: 10.1146/annurev-pathmechdis-012419-032742. PubMed PMID: 31657966.
11. Ensminger AW. *Legionella pneumophila*, armed to the hilt: justifying the largest arsenal of effectors in the bacterial world. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2016;29:74-80. doi: 10.1016/j.mib.2015.11.002. PubMed PMID: 26709975.
12. Cazalet C, Rusniok C, Bruggemann H, Zidane N, Magnier A, Ma L, et al. Evidence in the *Legionella pneumophila* genome for exploitation of host cell functions and high genome plasticity. Nat Genet. 2004;36(11):1165-73.
13. Mondino S, Schmidt S, Buchrieser C. Molecular Mimicry: a Paradigm of Host-Microbe Coevolution Illustrated by Legionella. mBio. 2020;11(5). Epub 2020/10/08. doi: 10.1128/mBio.01201-20. PubMed PMID: 33024033.

14. Brassinga AK, Kinchen JM, Cupp ME, Day SR, Hoffman PS, Sifri CD. *Caenorhabditis* is a metazoan host for *Legionella*. Cell Microbiol. 2009;12(3):343-61. Epub 2009/10/30. doi: CMI1398 [pii]10.1111/j.1462-5822.2009.01398.x. PubMed PMID: 19863556.

15. Harding CR, Schroeder GN, Reynolds S, Kosta A, Collins JW, Mousnier A, et al. *Legionella pneumophila* pathogenesis in the *Galleria mellonella* infection model. Infect Immun. 2012;80(8):2780-90. doi: 10.1128/IAI.00510-12. PubMed PMID: 22645286; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3434583.

16. Brown AS, van Driel IR, Hartland EL. Mouse Models of Legionnaires' Disease. Curr Top Microbiol. 2014;376:271-91. doi: 10.1007/82_2013_349. PubMed PMID: WOS:000330592900014.

17. Breiman RF, Horwitz MA. Guinea pigs sublethally infected with aerosolized *Legionella pneumophila* develop humoral and cell-mediated immune responses and are protected against lethal aerosol challenge. A model for studying host defense against lung infections caused by intracellular pathogens. J Exp Med. 1987;165(3):799-811. PubMed PMID: 3819647.

18. Weeratna R, Stamler DA, Edelstein PH, Ripley M, Marrie T, Hoskin D, et al. Human and guinea pig immune responses to Legionella pneumophila protein antigens OmpS and Hsp60. Infect Immun. 1994;62(8):3454-62. PubMed PMID: 7913699.

19. Akhter A, Gavrilin MA, Frantz L, Washington S, Ditty C, Limoli D, et al. Caspase-7 activation by the Nlrc4/Ipaf inflammasome restricts *Legionella pneumophila* infection. PLoS Pathog. 2009;5:e1000361. doi: doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1000361.

20. Santic M, Asare R, Doric M, Abu Kwaik Y. Host-dependent trigger of caspases and apoptosis by *Legionella pneumophila*. Infect Immun. 2007;75(6):2903-13.

21. Masud S, Torraca V, Meijer AH. Modeling Infectious Diseases in the Context of a Developing Immune System. Curr Top Dev Biol. 2017;124:277-329. doi: 10.1016/bs.ctdb.2016.10.006. PubMed PMID: WOS:000406859900009.

22. Torraca V, Mostowy S. Zebrafish Infection: From Pathogenesis to Cell Biology. Trends in Cell Biology. 2018;28(2):143-56. doi: 10.1016/j.tcb.2017.10.002. PubMed PMID: WOS:000424633500006.

23. Gomes MC, Mostowy S. The Case for Modeling Human Infection in Zebrafish. Trends in Microbiology. 2020;28(1):10-8. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2019.08.005. PubMed PMID: WOS:000503037700005.

24. Colucci-Guyon E, Tinevez JY, Renshaw SA, Herbomel P. Strategies of professional phagocytes in vivo: unlike macrophages, neutrophils engulf only surface-associated microbes. J Cell Sci. 2011;124(Pt 18):3053-9. Epub 2011/08/27. doi: 10.1242/jcs.082792. PubMed PMID: 21868367.

25. Herbomel P, Thisse B, Thisse C. Ontogeny and behaviour of early macrophages in the zebrafish embryo. Development. 1999;126(17):3735-45. Epub 1999/08/06. PubMed PMID: 10433904.

26. Hilbi H, Buchrieser C. Microbe Profile: *Legionella pneumophila* - a copycat eukaryote. Microbiology (Reading). 2022;168(3). doi: 10.1099/mic.0.001142. PubMed PMID: 35230931.

27. Rolando M, Escoll P, Nora T, Botti J, Boitez V, Bedia C, et al. *Legionella pneumophila* S1P-lyase targets host sphingolipid metabolism and restrains autophagy. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2016;113(7):1901-6. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1522067113. PubMed PMID: 26831115; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4763766.

28. Liu X, Shin S. Viewing *Legionella pneumophila* Pathogenesis through an Immunological Lens. J Mol Biol. 2019;431(21):4321-44. Epub 2019/07/29. doi: 10.1016/j.jmb.2019.07.028. PubMed PMID: 31351897.

29. Cohen SB, Gern BH, Delahaye JL, Adams KN, Plumlee CR, Winkler JK, et al. Alveolar Macrophages Provide an Early *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* Niche and Initiate Dissemination. Cell Host Microbe. 2018;24(3):439-46 e4. Epub 2018/08/28. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2018.08.001. PubMed PMID: 30146391; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6152889.

30. Mengue L, Richard FJ, Caubet Y, Rolland S, Hechard Y, Samba-Louaka A. *Legionella pneumophila* decreases velocity of Acanthamoeba castellanii. Exp Parasitol. 2017;183:124-7. Epub 2017/08/06. doi: 10.1016/j.exppara.2017.07.013. PubMed PMID: 28778742.

31. Simon S, Wagner MA, Rothmeier E, Muller-Taubenberger A, Hilbi H. Icm/Dot-dependent inhibition of phagocyte migration by *Legionella* is antagonized by a translocated Ran GTPase activator. Cell Microbiol. 2014;16(7):977-92. doi: 10.1111/cmi.12258. PubMed PMID: 24397557.

32. Mostowy S, Boucontet L, Mazon Moya MJ, Sirianni A, Boudinot P, Hollinshead M, et al. The zebrafish as a new model for the in vivo study of *Shigella flexneri* interaction with phagocytes and bacterial autophagy. PLoS Pathog. 2013;9(9):e1003588. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1003588. PubMed PMID: 24039575; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3764221.

33. Su F, Juarez MA, Cooke CL, Lapointe L, Shavit JA, Yamaoka JS, et al. Differential regulation of primitive myelopoiesis in the zebrafish by Spi-1/Pu.1 and C/ebp1. Zebrafish. 2007;4(3):187-99. Epub 2007/11/29. doi: 10.1089/zeb.2007.0505. PubMed PMID: 18041923.

34. Ellett F, Pase L, Hayman JW, Andrianopoulos A, Lieschke GJ. mpeg1 promoter transgenes direct macrophage-lineage expression in zebrafish. Blood. 2011;117(4):e49-56. Epub 2010/11/19. doi: 10.1182/blood-2010-10-314120. PubMed PMID: 21084707; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3056479.

35. Palha N, Guivel-Benhassine F, Briolat V, Lutfalla G, Sourisseau M, Ellett F, et al. Real-time whole-body visualization of Chikungunya Virus infection and host interferon response in zebrafish. PLoS Pathog. 2013;9(9):e1003619. Epub 2013/09/17. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1003619. PubMed PMID: 24039582; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3764224.

36. Phan QT, Sipka T, Gonzalez C, Levraud JP, Lutfalla G, Mai NC. Neutrophils use superoxide to control bacterial infection at a distance. Plos Pathogens. 2018;14(7). doi: ARTN e100715710.1371/journal.ppat.1007157. PubMed PMID: WOS:000440351300015.

37. Copenhaver AM, Casson CN, Nguyen HT, Duda MM, Shin S. IL-1R signaling enables bystander cells to overcome bacterial blockade of host protein synthesis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2015;112(24):7557-62. Epub 2015/06/03. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1501289112. PubMed PMID: 26034289; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4475993.

38. Friedman H, Yamamoto Y, Klein TW. *Legionella pneumophila* pathogenesis and immunity. Semin Pediatr Infect Dis. 2002;13(4):273-9. Epub 2002/12/20. doi: 10.1053/spid.2002.127206. PubMed PMID: 12491233.

39. Asrat S, de Jesus DA, Hempstead AD, Ramabhadran V, Isberg RR. Bacterial pathogen manipulation of host membrane trafficking. Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol. 2014;30:79-109. doi: 10.1146/annurev-cellbio-100913-013439. PubMed PMID: 25103867.

40. Archer KA, Alexopoulou L, Flavell RA, Roy CR. Multiple MyD88-dependent responses contribute to pulmonary clearance of *Legionella pneumophila*. Cell Microbiol. 2009;11(1):21-36. Epub 2008/09/11. doi: CMI1234 [pii]10.1111/j.1462-5822.2008.01234.x. PubMed PMID: 18782351.

41. Archer KA, Roy CR. MyD88-dependent responses involving toll-like receptor 2 are important for protection and clearance of *Legionella pneumophila* in a mouse model of Legionnaires' disease. Infect Immun. 2006;74(6):3325-33. Epub 2006/05/23. doi: 74/6/3325 [pii]10.1128/IAI.02049-05. PubMed PMID: 16714560; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1479235.

42. Hawn TR, Smith KD, Aderem A, Skerrett SJ. Myeloid differentiation primary response gene (88)- and toll-like receptor 2-deficient mice are susceptible to infection with aerosolized *Legionella pneumophila.* J Infect Dis. 2006;193(12):1693-702. Epub 2006/05/17. doi: 10.1086/504525. PubMed PMID: 16703513.

43. Sporri R, Joller N, Albers U, Hilbi H, Oxenius A. MyD88-dependent IFN-gamma production by NK cells is key for control of *Legionella pneumophila* infection. J Immunol. 2006;176(10):6162-71. Epub 2006/05/04. doi: 176/10/6162 [pii]. PubMed PMID: 16670325.

44. Mallama CA, McCoy-Simandle K, Cianciotto NP. The Type II Secretion System of *Legionella pneumophila* Dampens the MyD88 and Toll-Like Receptor 2 Signaling Pathway in Infected Human Macrophages. Infect Immun. 2017;85(4). Epub 2017/02/01. doi: 10.1128/IAI.00897-16. PubMed PMID: 28138020; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5364298.

45. Hosseini R, Lamers GE, Soltani HM, Meijer AH, Spaink HP, Schaaf MJ. Efferocytosis and extrusion of leukocytes determine the progression of early mycobacterial pathogenesis. J Cell Sci. 2016;129(18):3385-95. Epub 2016/07/30. doi: 10.1242/jcs.135194. PubMed PMID: 27469488.

46. Rosowski EE, Raffa N, Knox BP, Golenberg N, Keller NP, Huttenlocher A. Macrophages inhibit *Aspergillus fumigatus* germination and neutrophil-mediated fungal killing. PLoS Pathog. 2018;14(8):e1007229. Epub 20180802. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1007229. PubMed PMID: 30071103; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6091969.

47. Saralahti A, Ramet M. Zebrafish and Streptococcal Infections. Scand J Immunol. 2015;82(3):174-83. doi: 10.1111/sji.12320. PubMed PMID: 26095827.

48. Scherer AK, Blair BA, Park J, Seman BG, Kelley JB, Wheeler RT. Redundant Trojan horse and endothelial-circulatory mechanisms for host-mediated spread of *Candida albicans* yeast. PLoS Pathog. 2020;16(8):e1008414. Epub 20200810. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1008414. PubMed PMID: 32776983; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7447064.

49. Tesh MJ, Miller RD. Amino acid requirements for *Legionella pneumophila* growth. J Clin Microbiol. 1981;13(5):865-9.

50. Fonseca MV, Swanson MS. Nutrient salvaging and metabolism by the intracellular pathogen *Legionella pneumophila*. Frontiers in cellular and infection microbiology. 2014;4:12. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2014.00012. PubMed PMID: 24575391; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3920079.

51. Hauslein I, Manske C, Goebel W, Eisenreich W, Hilbi H. Pathway analysis using (13) C-glycerol and other carbon tracers reveals a bipartite metabolism of *Legionella pneumophila*. Mol Microbiol. 2016;100(2):229-46. doi: 10.1111/mmi.13313. PubMed PMID: 26691313.

52. Hauslein I, Sahr T, Escoll P, Klausner N, Eisenreich W, Buchrieser C. *Legionella pneumophila* CsrA regulates a metabolic switch from amino acid to glycerolipid metabolism. Open Biol. 2017;7(11). doi: 10.1098/rsob.170149. PubMed PMID: 29093212.

53. Fraher D, Sanigorski A, Mellett NA, Meikle PJ, Sinclair AJ, Gibert Y. Zebrafish Embryonic Lipidomic Analysis Reveals that the Yolk Cell Is Metabolically Active in Processing Lipid. Cell Rep. 2016;14(6):1317-29. Epub 2016/02/09. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2016.01.016. PubMed PMID: 26854233.

54. Hiller M, Lang C, Michel W, Flieger A. Secreted phospholipases of the lung pathogen *Legionella pneumophila*. Int J Med Microbiol. 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmm.2017.10.002. PubMed PMID: 29108710.

55. Brieland J, Freeman P, Kunkel R, Chrisp C, Hurley M, Fantone J, et al. Replicative *Legionella pneumophila* lung infection in intratracheally inoculated A/J mice. A murine model of human Legionnaires' disease. Am J Pathol. 1994;145(6):1537-46. Epub 1994/12/01. PubMed PMID: 7992856; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1887509.

56. Glavin FL, Winn WC, Jr., Craighead JE. Ultrastructure of lung in Legionnaires' disease. Observations of three biopsies done during the Vermont epidemic. Ann Intern Med. 1979;90(4):555-9. Epub 1979/04/01. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-90-4-555. PubMed PMID: 434634.

57. Horwitz MA. Formation of a novel phagosome by the Legionnaires' disease bacterium (*Legionella pneumophila*) in human monocytes. J Exp Med. 1983;158(4):1319-31.

58. Horwitz MA, Silverstein SC. Legionnaires' disease bacterium (*Legionella pneumophila*) multiples intracellularly in human monocytes. J Clin Invest. 1980;66(3):441-50. PubMed PMID: 7190579.

59. Jager J, Marwitz S, Tiefenau J, Rasch J, Shevchuk O, Kugler C, et al. Human lung tissue explants reveal novel interactions during *Legionella pneumophila* infections. Infect Immun. 2014;82(1):275-85. Epub 2013/10/30. doi: 10.1128/IAI.00703-13. PubMed PMID: 24166955; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3911869.

60. Copenhaver AM, Casson CN, Nguyen HT, Fung TC, Duda MM, Roy CR, et al. Alveolar macrophages and neutrophils are the primary reservoirs for *Legionella pneumophila* and mediate cytosolic surveillance of type IV secretion. Infect Immun. 2014;82(10):4325-36. Epub 2014/08/06. doi: 10.1128/IAI.01891-14. PubMed PMID: 25092908; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4187856.

61. Bennett CM, Kanki JP, Rhodes J, Liu TX, Paw BH, Kieran MW, et al. Myelopoiesis in the zebrafish, *Danio rerio*. Blood. 2001;98(3):643-51. Epub 2001/07/27. doi: 10.1182/blood.v98.3.643. PubMed PMID: 11468162.

62. Le Guyader D, Redd MJ, Colucci-Guyon E, Murayama E, Kissa K, Briolat V, et al. Origins and unconventional behavior of neutrophils in developing zebrafish. Blood. 2008;111(1):132-41. Epub 2007/09/19. doi: 10.1182/blood-2007-06-095398. PubMed PMID: 17875807.

63. Willett CE, Cortes A, Zuasti A, Zapata AG. Early hematopoiesis and developing lymphoid organs in the zebrafish. Dev Dyn. 1999;214(4):323-36. Epub 1999/04/23. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0177(199904)214:4<323::AID-AJA5>3.0.CO;2-3. PubMed PMID: 10213388.

64. Mesureur J, Feliciano JR, Wagner N, Gomes MC, Zhang L, Blanco-Gonzalez M, et al. Macrophages, but not neutrophils, are critical for proliferation of *Burkholderia cenocepacia* and ensuing host-damaging inflammation. PLoS Pathog. 2017;13(6):e1006437. Epub 2017/06/27. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1006437. PubMed PMID: 28651010; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5501683.

65. Prajsnar TK, Cunliffe VT, Foster SJ, Renshaw SA. A novel vertebrate model of *Staphylococcus aureus* infection reveals phagocyte-dependent resistance of zebrafish to non-host specialized pathogens. Cell Microbiol. 2008;10(11):2312-25. Epub 2008/08/22. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-5822.2008.01213.x. PubMed PMID: 18715285.

66. Jault C, Pichon L, Chluba J. Toll-like receptor gene family and TIR-domain adapters in *Danio rerio*. Mol Immunol. 2004;40(11):759-71. Epub 2003/12/23. doi: 10.1016/j.molimm.2003.10.001. PubMed PMID: 14687933.

67. Meijer AH, Gabby Krens SF, Medina Rodriguez IA, He S, Bitter W, Ewa Snaar-Jagalska B, et al. Expression analysis of the Toll-like receptor and TIR domain adaptor families of zebrafish. Mol Immunol. 2004;40(11):773-83. Epub 2003/12/23. doi: 10.1016/j.molimm.2003.10.003. PubMed PMID: 14687934.

68. Akira S, Takeda K. Toll-like receptor signalling. Nat Rev Immunol. 2004;4(7):499-511. Epub 2004/07/02. doi: 10.1038/nri1391. PubMed PMID: 15229469.

69. Wik JA, Phung D, Kolan S, Haraldsen G, Skalhegg BS, Hol Fosse J. Inflammatory activation of endothelial cells increases glycolysis and oxygen consumption despite inhibiting cell proliferation. FEBS Open Bio. 2021;11(6):1719-30. Epub 2021/05/13. doi: 10.1002/2211-5463.13174. PubMed PMID: 33979025; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8167874.

70. Hall C, Flores MV, Storm T, Crosier K, Crosier P. The zebrafish lysozyme C promoter drives myeloid-specific expression in transgenic fish. Bmc Dev Biol. 2007;7. doi: Artn 4210.1186/1471-213x-7-42. PubMed PMID: WOS:000246708100001.

71. Renshaw SA, Loynes CA, Trushell DM, Elworthy S, Ingham PW, Whyte MK. A transgenic zebrafish model of neutrophilic inflammation. Blood. 2006;108(13):3976-8. Epub 2006/08/24. doi: 10.1182/blood-2006-05-024075. PubMed PMID: 16926288.

72. van Leeuwen LM, Evans RJ, Jim KK, Verboom T, Fang X, Bojarczuk A, et al. A transgenic zebrafish model for the *in vivo* study of the blood and choroid plexus brain barriers using claudin 5. Biol Open. 2018;7(2). Epub 2018/02/14. doi: 10.1242/bio.030494. PubMed PMID: 29437557; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5861362.

73. van der Vaart M, van Soest JJ, Spaink HP, Meijer AH. Functional analysis of a zebrafish myd88 mutant identifies key transcriptional components of the innate immune system. Dis Model Mech. 2013;6(3):841-54. doi: 10.1242/dmm.010843. PubMed PMID: WOS:000318847400030.

74. Tiaden A, Spirig T, Weber SS, Bruggemann H, Bosshard R, Buchrieser C, et al. The *Legionella pneumophila* response regulator LqsR promotes host cell interactions as an element of the virulence regulatory network controlled by RpoS and LetA. Cell Microbiol. 2007;9(12):2903-20. Epub 2007/07/07. doi: CMI1005 [pii]10.1111/j.1462-5822.2007.01005.x. PubMed PMID: 17614967.

75. Levraud JP, Colucci-Guyon E, Redd MJ, Lutfalla G, Herbomel P. In vivo analysis of zebrafish innate immunity. Methods Mol Biol. 2008;415:337-63. doi: 10.1007/978-1-59745-570-1_20. PubMed PMID: 18370164.

76. Brannon MK, Davis JM, Mathias JR, Hall CJ, Emerson JC, Crosier PS, et al. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Type III secretion system interacts with phagocytes to modulate systemic infection of zebrafish

embryos. Cell Microbiol. 2009;11(5):755-68. Epub 2009/02/12. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-
5822.2009.01288.x. PubMed PMID: 19207728; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2933946.
77. Colucci-Guyon E, Rifflet A, Saint-Auret S, da Costa A, Boucontet L, Laval T, et al. Spatiotemporal
analysis of mycolactone distribution i*n vivo* reveals partial diffusion in the central nervous system.
PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2020;14(12):e0008878. Epub 2020/12/03. doi:
10.1371/journal.pntd.0008878. PubMed PMID: 33264290; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC7710047.
1012

 FIGURES LEGENDS

Figure 1. Zebrafish larvae are susceptible to intravenous *L. pneumophila* infection in a dose

dependent manner. **A)** Scheme of the experimental set up of bacterial infection using zebrafish. A

72hpf zebrafish larva is shown. Bacteria are injected in the bloodstream (iv) via the caudal vein

(green arrow). **B)** Survival curves (three independent experiments pooled) of zebrafish larvae

injected with WT-GFP Low Dose (WT LD) (blue curve, n=60) or High Dose (HD) (red curve, n=60), or

with Δ*dotA*-GFP Low Dose (Δ*dotA* LD) (green curve, n=12) or High Dose (Δ*dotA* HD) (green curve,

n=36), and incubated at 28°C. Control non-injected fish (CTRL, black curve; n= 72). P < 0.05 was

considered statistically significant (symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05. **C)**

Bacterial burden evaluation by quantification of % of fluorescent pixel counts from images of

individual injected larvae followed overtime from 0 to 72hpi. Each larva was imaged daily, and

images were analysed with Fiji for bacterial burden quantification. Five experiments have been

pooled, for a total of 28 larvae for WT LD and LD, 18 for Δ*dotA* HD. P < 0.05 was considered

statistically significant (symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05. No symbol on

graphs means that not statistically differences were observed. -**D)** Representative images of

L. pneumophila dissemination, determined by live imaging using a fluorescence stereomicroscope, of

zebrafish AB larvae infected with a LD or a HD of WT-GFP, or a HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP. Individual infected

larvae were followed over time by live imaging at 4h, 24h, 48h, and 72h post injection. GFP

fluorescence of the injected bacteria is shown. **E)** Quantification of bacterial dissemination overtime.

Larvae injected with LD, HD LD or Δ*dotA* HD were imaged overtime, and then scored for the GFP +

bacteria absolute presence for each larva overtime. Larvae were scored as "infected" when they

showed at least one small detectable GFP+ dot. Data obtained were plotted as % of larvae with

bacteria in the body (tail, trunk, head; blue curve), or in the yolk (pink curve). 11 independent

experiments have been plotted (representing a total of n=69 WT LD; n=58 WT HD; n=54 Δ*dotA* HD

infected larvae). **F)** Scheme of a 72hpi larva with body (light blue) and yolk (pink) region highlighted.

Green dot in the yolk represents bacteria burden.

1040

Figure 2. Bloodstream *L. pneumophila* establish a proliferative niche in the yolk causing a

persistent local infection. **A)** Survival curves (two independent experiments pooled) of zebrafish

larvae injected with WT-GFP Low Dose (WT LD) (blue curve, n=48) or High Dose (HD) (red curve,

n=48), or with Δ*dotA*-GFP Low Dose (Δ*dotA* LD) (magenta curve, n=48) or High Dose (Δ*dotA* HD)

(green curve, n=48), and incubated at 28°C. Non-injected fish (CTRL, black curve; n= 48). **B)** Bacterial

burden evaluation by quantification of % of fluorescent pixel counts on individual injected larvae

followed overtime by 0 to 48hpi. Each larva was imaged daily, and images were analysed with Fiji for

bacterial burden evaluation. One experiment plotted, 6 larvae per condition. P < 0.05 was considered

statistically significant (symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05. No symbol on

graphs means that not statistically differences were observed. **C)** Representative images of

L. pneumophila localization, determined by live imaging using a fluorescence stereomicroscope, of

zebrafish larvae infected with a LD or a HD of WT-GFP, or a LD or a HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP. Individual

infected larvae were followed over time by live imaging at 4h, 24h, 48h, and 72hpi. GFP fluorescence

of the injected bacteria is shown. Dotted circle highlights GFP bacteria in the yolk. **D)** Representative

maximum intensity projection of confocal acquisition of a 72hpi zebrafish larva injected in the

bloodstream with HD of WT-GFP, mounted laterally and live imaged using high resolution confocal

fluorescence microscope, showing bacteria growing in the yolk and yolk tube region. The x-y-z raw

data were post treated with the LEICA lighting application for reducing noise and processed with

Imaris for 3D volume rendering. Related to Movie S1. **E)** Imaris 3D reconstruction and volume

rendering of the *L. pneumophila* growth (GFP labelling) in the yolk of *kdrl:*ras-mCherry (red vessels)

infected larva at 72hpi, showed laterally. Overlay of GFP and mCherry is shown; BF is shown to help

to visualize the yolk region and host anatomy. Related to Movie S2. Scale bar = 50mm.

1063

Figure 3. Characterization of the *L. pneumophila* foci growing in the yolk region of zebrafish larvae.

A) Scheme of 72hpf with body (light blue) and yolk region (pink) highlighted; the yolk sustaining

L. pneumophila growing has been indicated with green dots**. B**) Imaris 3D reconstruction and volume

rendering of the *L. pneumophila* growth in the yolk of 72hpi *mfap4*: mCherry larva (red

macrophages) injected in the bloodstream with HD of WT-GFP at 72hpf, shown laterally. Inset shows

the maximum intensity projection of the *L. pneumophila* foci of the same larva mounted ventrally.

Scale bar = 20mm. Related to Movie S3. **C)** Imaris 3D reconstruction and volume rendering of the

L. pneumophila growth in the yolk of *lyz*:DsRed (red neutrophils) infected larva at 72hpi, showed

laterally. Scale bar = 20mm. Related to Movie S4. **D)** Quantification of bacterial burden in the yolk

overtime. Larvae injected with LD, HD WT, or Δ*dotA* HD were imaged overtime, and then scored for

the GFP + bacteria absolute presence in the yolk for each larva overtime. Larvae were scored as

"infected" when they showed at least one small detectable GFP+ dot. Data obtained were plotted as

% of larvae with bacteria in the in the yolk upon LD (blue curve), HD (red curve) WT or Δ*dotA* HD

(green curve) injection overtime. 11 independent experiments have been plotted (representing a

total of n=69 WT LD; n=58 WT HD; n=54 Δ*dotA* HD infected larvae) **E)** Time frame extracted from a

4D acquisition of *L. pneumophila* growth in the yolk between 48 and 72hpi of *mfap4*: mCherry larva

(red macrophages) injected in the bloodstream with HD of WT-GFP shown laterally. Imaris 4D

reconstruction and volume rendering of the bacteria aggregate and interaction with macrophages.

The yolk has been manually highlighted (in blue) with Imaris. Scale bar: 10. Related to Movie S5. **F)**

Quantification of bacterial burden in the whole body, in the body or in the yolk region versus

macrophage or neutrophil quantification in the body or in the yolk region in HD WT-GFP infected

larvae followed overtime. Two independent experiments plotted for each phagocyte type (total of 11

larvae for macrophage and 11 larvae for neutrophil quantification). Quantification of the

fluorescence images (GFP bacteria and RFP leukocytes) was done using CellProfiler software. P < 0.05

was considered statistically significant (symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P <

0.05). No symbol on graphs means that not statistically differences were observed.

1090

Figure 4. *L. pneumophila* high dose injection results in (systemic) macrophage and neutrophil

death. A) Macrophage counts of control larvae (black symbols) or upon Low Dose (blue symbols) or

High Dose of WT-GFP (red symbols), or High Dose (green symbols) of Δ*dotA* -GFP injection.

Macrophages were counted manually from images taken on live infected larvae over time from T0 to

T72hpi, using ImageJ software, and results were plotted using GraphPad Prism® software.

Mean±SEM are also shown (horizontal bars). Data plotted are from two pooled independent

experiments (n=12 larvae scored for each condition). P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant

(symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05). No symbol on graphs means that not

statistically differences were observed. **B)** Frames extracted from maximum intensity projection of *in*

vivo time-lapse confocal fluorescence microscopy of 72hpf Tg(*mfap4::mCherryF*) larvae injected in

the bloodstream (iv) with a LD, HD (of WT-GFP or a HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP (upper panel) or

Tg(*LysC::DsRed)^{nz50}* in the bloodstream with a LD, HD of WT-GFP or a HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP (lower panel)

to follow macrophage bacteria interaction overtime during the first 16hpi. Overlay of green (*L.*

pneumophila) and red (leucocytes) fluorescence of the caudal area of the larvae (region boxed in the

scheme on the right of the panel) is shown. BF helps for anatomical region indication. Representative

of n= 12 to 16 injected larvae for each condition. Scale bar: 50 m. See also related Movies S6. **C)**

macrophage *L pneumophila* interaction at 72hpi captured at high resolution upon HD WT injection.

Live bacteria are inside zebrafish macrophages suggesting the establishment of a replicative niche, as

documented for cultured mammalian macrophages or amoebae. Representative of n= 15 scored

infected larvae. Overlay of green (GFP bacteria), red (mCherry macrophages) and BF is shown. Scale

bar= 10mm

1112

Figure 5. *L. pneumophila* interaction with neutrophils and neutrophil counts upon bloodstream

injection of LD, HD WT GFP or HD ΔdotA *L pneumophila*.

A) Neutrophil counts from control larvae (CTRL, black symbols) or Low Dose or High Dose of WT-GFP

(blue or red symbols), or High Dose of Δ*dotA*-GFP (green symbols) injected larvae. Data plotted in the

same way as for macrophage counts in Fig 4. Two pooled independent experiments (n=10 larvae

scored for each condition). P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant (symbols: **** P < 0.0001;

***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05). No symbol on graphs means that not statistically differences

were observed. **B)** Frames extracted from maximum intensity projection of *in vivo* time-lapse

confocal fluorescence microscopy of 72hpf Tg(*LysC::DsRed*)^{nz50} in the bloodstream (iv) with a LD, HD

of WT-GFP or a HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP (lower panel) to follow neutrophil interaction with *L. pneumophila*

immediately upon injection for 16hpi. Images were taken from time lapse at different time points

(0hpi, 2hpi, 4hpi, 8hpi and 16hpi). Overlay of green (*L. pneumophila*) and red (neutrophils)

fluorescence of the caudal area of the larvae (region boxed in the scheme on the right of the panel) is

shown. Data representative of n= 12 to 16 larvae scored. Scale bar: 50 m. See also related Movies

S7. **C)** Details of a dying phagocytosing neutrophil, progressively rounding-up and loosing

fluorescence upon HD WT injection. Arrowheads point to the dying phagocytosing neutrophils.

Representatives of n= 14 larvae scored. Scale bar=10mm. See also related Movie S8.

1130

Figure 6. Macrophages are crucial to restrict *Legionella pneumophila* dissemination

A) Survival curves of CTRL morphant zebrafish larvae injected with a Low Dose (LD) (blue dashed

curve, n=34 larvae) or a High Dose (HD) (red dashed curve, n=34) of WT-GFP, or with a HD (green

dashed curve, n=24) of Δ*dotA* -GFP, and *spi1b* morphant zebrafish larvae injected with a LD (blue

curve, n=48) or a HD (red curve, n=48) of WT-GFP, or with a High Dose (HD) (green curve, n=48) of

Δ*dotA* -GFP. Non-injected CTRL morphant fish (black dashed curve, n=48), and *spi1b* morphant fish

(black curves, n=48) were used as control. Infected and control larvae were incubated at 28°C. Data

plotted are from two pooled independent experiments. **B)** and **E**) Bacterial burden evaluation by

quantification of % of fluorescent pixel counts on individual injected larvae followed overtime by 0 to

72hpi. Each larva was imaged daily, and images were analysed with Fiji for bacterial burden

evaluation. One experiment per phagocyte type plotted, 6 larvae for each condition. **D)** Survival

curves of CTRL morphant zebrafish larvae injected with a LD (blue dashed curve, n=36) or a HD (red

dashed curve, n=36) of WT-GFP, or with a HD (green dashed curve, n=24) of Δ*dotA* -GFP, and *csf3r*

morphant zebrafish larvae injected with a LD (blue curve, n=24) or a HD (red curve, n=36) of WT-GFP,

or with a HD (green curve, n=36) of Δ*dotA* -GFP. Non-injected CTRL morphant fish (black dashed

curve, n=48), and *csf3r* morphant fish (black curve, n=36) were used as control. Data plotted are from

two pooled independent experiments. Significant differences are highlighted with stars (see

experimental procedure for statistical analysis) **C)** and **F)** Representative images of *L. pneumophila*

dissemination, determined by live imaging using a fluorescence stereomicroscope, of

Tg*(mfap4::mCherryF) spi1b* morphant larvae (**C**) and of Tg(*LysC::DsRed*)^{nz50} (**F**) *csf3r* morphant larvae

non infected, or infected with a LD or a HD of WT-GFP, or a HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP. The same infected

larvae were live imaged 4h, 24h, 48h, and 72h post *L. pneumophila* injection. Overlay of GFP and

mCherry fluorescence is shown. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant (symbols: **** P <

0.0001; ***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05). No symbol on graphs means that not statistically

differences were observed.

1156

Figure 7. Cytokine gene induction upon *L. pneumophila* infection and Zebrafish larva Immunity to

***L. pneumophila* is independent from signalling through MyD88 or compensated by other signalling**

pathways. **A-D)** Cytokine gene (*il1b*, *tnfa*, *ifng1*, *ifng2*) induction was measured from non-injected

larvae as control (CTRL, dashed black curves) and individual zebrafish larvae injected with a LD (blue

curves) or a HD (red curves) of WT-GFP, or a HD of Δ*dotA*-GFP (green curves). Data plotted are from 2

pooled experiments (n=10 larvae for each condition) for *il1b* and *tnfa,* and from 1 experiment (n=5

larvae for each condition) for *ifng1* and *ifng2*; individual values are shown, and curves correspond to

the medians. Statistical analyses are shown in the table under each graph. **E)** Survival curves of CTRL

zebrafish larvae injected with WT-GFP Low Dose (LD) (blue dashed curve) or High Dose (HD) (red

dashed curve), or with Δ*dotA* -GFP HD (green dashed curve), and *myd88^hu3568^* mutant zebrafish larvae

injected with WT-GFP LD (blue curve) or HD (red curve), or with Δ*dotA* -GFP HD (green curve). Non-

injected CTRL larvae (black dashed curves), and *myd88^hu3568^* mutant larvae (black curves) were used

as control. Infected and control larvae (n= 72 fish for *myd88^hu3568^* mutant conditions and n= 57 fish

for CTRL conditions) were incubated at 28°C. Data plotted are from 3 pooled independent

experiments. **F)** Bacterial burden evaluation by quantification of % of fluorescent pixel counts on

individual injected larvae followed overtime from 0 to 72hpi. Each larva was imaged daily, and

images were analysed with Fiji for bacterial burden evaluation. Two pooled experiments, 8 larvae for

each condition. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant (symbols: **** P < 0.0001; ***P <

0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05). No symbol on graphs means that not statistically differences were

observed.

1177

1178   Figure 1

1179
1180

1181   Figure 2

1182

1183

1187   Figure 4

1188

1189
1190

1191   Figure 5

1192

1193
1194

1195   Figure 6

1196
1197

1198   Figure 7

1199

A

	6hpi	24hpi	48hpi	72hpi
Δ*dotA* HD v/s CTRL	**	ns	ns	ns
WT HD v/s CTRL	***	ns	*	**
WT LD v/s CTRL	*	ns	ns	ns

B

	6hpi	24hpi	48hpi	72hpi
Δ*dotA* HD v/s CTRL	**	ns	ns	ns
WT HD v/s CTRL	*	ns	*	***
WT LD v/s CTRL	ns	ns	ns	ns

C

	6hpi	24hpi	48hpi	72hpi
Δ*dotA* HD v/s CTRL	ns	ns	ns	ns
WT HD v/s CTRL	ns	ns	ns	*
WT LD v/s CTRL	ns	ns	ns	ns

D

	6hpi	24hpi	48hpi	72hpi
Δ*dotA* HD v/s CTRL	ns	ns	ns	ns
WT HD v/s CTRL	ns	ns	ns	ns
WT LD v/s CTRL	ns	ns	ns	ns

E

F

1200

1201 $