De novo **determination of mosquitocidal Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba structures from**
naturally-occurring nanocrystals

Authors:

Guillaume Tetreau[1,18], Michael R. Sawaya[2,18], Elke De Zitter[1,18], Elena A. Andreeva[1,3,19], Anne-
Sophie Banneville[1,19], Natalie Schibrowsky[2,4,19], Nicolas Coquelle[5], Aaron S. Brewster[6], Marie
Luise Grünbein[3], Gabriela Nass Kovacs[3], Mark S. Hunter[7], Marco Kloos[3,8], Raymond G.
Sierra[7], Giorgio Schiro[1], Pei Qiao[9], Myriam Stricker[3], Dennis Bideshi[10,11], Iris D. Young[6], Ninon
Zala[1], Sylvain Engilberge[1], Alexander Gorel[3], Luca Signor[1], Jean-Marie Teulon[1], Mario
Hilpert[3], Lutz Foucar[3], Johan Bielecki[8], Richard Bean[8], Raphael de Wijn[8], Tokushi Sato[8], Henry
Kirkwood[8], Romain Letrun[8], Alexander Batyuk[7], Irina Snigireva[12], Daphna Fenel[1], Robin
Schubert[8], Ethan J. Canfield[13], Mario M. Alba[14], Frédéric Laporte[15], Laurence Després[15], Maria
Bacia[1], Amandine Roux[16], Christian Chapelle[17], François Riobé[16], Olivier Maury[16], Wai Li Ling[1],
Sébastien Boutet[7], Adrian Mancuso[8], Irina Gutsche[1], Eric Girard[1], Thomas R. M. Barends[3],
Jean-Luc Pellequer[1], Hyun-Woo Park[10,11], Arthur D. Laganowsky[9], Jose Rodriguez[2,4], Manfred
Burghammer[12], Robert L. Shoeman[3], R. Bruce Doak[3], Martin Weik[1], Nicholas K. Sauter[6], Brian
Federici[10], Duilio Cascio[2], Ilme Schlichting[3], Jacques-Philippe Colletier[1*].

Abstract (150 words)

Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba are the two most potent toxins produced by mosquitocidal *Bacillus*
thuringiensis subsp. *israelensis* and *jegathesan*, respectively. The toxins naturally crystallize
within the host; however, the crystals are too small for structure determination at synchrotron
sources. Therefore, we applied serial femtosecond crystallography at X-ray free electron lasers
to *in vivo*-grown nanocrystals of these toxins. The structure of Cry11Aa was determined *de*
novo using the single-wavelength anomalous dispersion method, which in turn enabled the
determination of the Cry11Ba structure by molecular replacement. The two structures reveal
a new pattern for *in vivo* crystallization of Cry toxins, whereby each of their three domains
packs with a symmetrically identical domain, and a cleavable crystal packing motif is located
within the protoxin rather than at the termini. The diversity of *in vivo* crystallization patterns
suggests explanations for their varied levels of toxicity and rational approaches to improve
these toxins for mosquito control.

Affiliations:

[1]Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, CEA, Institut de Biologie Structurale, 71 Avenue des martyrs, F-38000 Grenoble, France.

[2]UCLA-DOE Institute for Genomics and Proteomics, Department of Biological Chemistry, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1570.

[3]Max-Planck-Institut für medizinische Forschung, Jahnstrasse 29, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany.

[4]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095

[5]Large-Scale Structures Group, Institut Laue-Langevin, F- 38000 Grenoble, France.

[6]Molecular Biophysics and Integrated Bioimaging Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720.

[7]Linac Coherent Light Source, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, CA 94025.

[8]European XFEL GmbH, Holzkoppel 4, 22869, Schenefeld, Germany.

[9]Department of Chemistry, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77845.

[10]Department of Entomology and Institute for Integrative Genome Biology, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA.

[11]Department of Biological Sciences, California Baptist University, Riverside, California 92504, USA.

[12]European Synchrotron Radiation Facility (ESRF), BP 220, 38043 Grenoble, France.

[13]Mass Spectrometry Core Facility, School of Pharmacy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA.

[14]Department of Pharmacology and Pharmaceutical Sciences, School of Pharmacy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA.

[15]Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, LECA, F-38000, Grenoble, France.

[16]Univ. Lyon, ENS de Lyon, CNRS UMR 5182, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Laboratoire de Chimie, F69342 Lyon, France.

[17]Polyvalan SARL, 15 parvis René Descartes, 69342 Lyon

[18]These authors contributed equally

[19]These authors contributed equally

*Correspondance : colletier@ibs.fr (J-P.C.)

Introduction (797 words)

The most commonly used biological insecticide for controlling mosquito vector populations is produced by the bacterium *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *israelensis* (*Bti*) [1]. Its highly potent mosquitocidal activity is due to three nanocrystalline forms of four protoxins, viz. Cyt1Aa, Cry11Aa, and co-crystallized Cry4Aa and Cry4Ba. These are produced during sporulation and are remarkably stable in a variety of conditions, but dissolve after ingestion under the high alkaline pH levels characteristic of the larval mosquito midgut [2]. Solubilized protoxins are activated by insect gut proteases enabling binding to gut cell membranes, subsequent oligomerization, and ultimately gut cell lysis leading to larval death [2]. *Bti* toxins are environmentally safe because they are much more specific for target mosquitoes than broad-spectrum chemical larvicides.

The most potent of the four *Bti* toxins is Cry11Aa, but it is poorly understood, in large part because unlike Cry4Aa, Cry4Ba, and Cyt1Aa, its structure is unknown. A related toxin produced by *Bt* subsp. *jegathesan* (*Btj*) is Cry11Ba, which is seven to thirty-seven times more toxic than Cry11Aa against major mosquito vector species belonging to the genera *Aedes*, *Anopheles*, and *Culex* [3], and in some bacterial hosts appears to form slightly larger crystals. Cry11Ba's structure is also unknown, although it has been used in recombinant strains of *Bti* to improve mosquitocidal activity significantly [3,4]. Thus, our goal was to determine the structures of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba protoxins to help understand their mechanisms of crystallization that result in environmental stability and could possibly yield structural insights for increasing the efficacy of these proteins for mosquito control. Structure determination of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba protoxins from natural nanocrystals requires cutting-edge technology. Conventional crystallography is limited to projects in which crystals are sufficiently large to mount and oscillate individually in a synchrotron X-ray beam. In the past, crystals of activated Cry4Aa [5], Cry4Ba [6] and Cyt1Aa [7] attained sufficient size by growing these *in vitro* from toxins dissolved from natural nanocrystals and activating the toxins enzymatically. However, Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba do not recrystallize *in vitro* from dissolved nanocrystals [8]. Moreover, enzymatic activation is unwanted since our goal is to understand the pH-controlled mechanism of natural crystal dissolution. To observe the protoxin state in natural nanocrystals produced in bacterial cells, we applied serial femtosecond crystallography (SFX) at X-ray free electron lasers (XFEL) [9–11]. In the SFX experiment, high brilliance XFEL beam pulses, each lasting only ~10-50 fs, intercept a series of nanocrystals, one pulse-per-crystal, eliciting the strongest possible diffraction signal from each tiny crystal before it vaporizes, and producing a series of diffraction snapshots, later assembled into a full data set. Feasibility of this strategy had been demonstrated by the recent elucidation of the full bioactivation cascade of Cyt1Aa [12].

Our success in determining the structures of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba protoxins highlights the capability of XFEL sources to overcome limits of small crystal size. We relied on *de novo*

phasing of the native SFX data because all attempts at molecular replacement (MR) failed
despite detectable sequence similarity with ten structurally-determined members of the three-
domain Cry δ-endotoxin family [13–15]. We opted to derivatize our Cry11Aa nanocrystals with a
recently-introduced phasing-agent, a caged-terbium compound, Tb-Xo4 [16,17]. The phases
obtained from single wavelength anomalous dispersion (SAD) were sufficient to reveal the
Cry11Aa protoxin structure at 2.6 Å resolution and subsequently enable phasing of the
Cry11Ba protoxin structure at 2.3 Å resolution by molecular replacement. In hindsight, we
attribute the failure of early MR attempts to three extra β-strands in domain II which alter the
relative orientation of the three domains in Cry11 toxins.

Our studies of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba crystals reveal a new paradigm of molecular
packing among Cry δ-endotoxins reported thus far. In particular, the cleavable peptides that
constitute important crystal contacts are located near the middle of the toxin sequence, rather
than at the termini. Molecules pack in tetramer units, exhibiting D2 symmetry; these tetramers
in turn pack in a body centered pattern (like a 3-dimensional brick-wall in which successive
rows are offset by half a brick). To achieve this pattern, each of the three domains in a Cry11
molecule packs with an identical domain from a symmetry related molecule: domain I packs
with domain I, II with II, and III with III. Thus, each Cry11 domain fulfills two biological roles: a
dimer interface manifested in the crystalline state, and a functional role manifested in the
soluble state: target recognition (domain II), oligomerization (domain III) and pore formation
(domain I) [18]. Differences in the size and composition of the three packing interfaces explains
shape and size differences between Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba nanocrystals. Structure-guided
site-directed mutagenesis verifies which residues affect crystal size, pH sensitivity of the
crystal, and toxin folding. Our results elucidate the Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba bioactivation
cascade and enable development of new, rational strategies for improved mosquito control.
125
126

Results (4407 words)

De novo phasing of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba structures by SFX

In vivo-grown crystals of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba protoxins exhibit distinct morphologies, which initially concealed a surprising conservation of their crystal packing patterns. Cry11Aa crystallizes as hexagonal plates and Cry11Ba crystallizes as larger bipyramidal crystals (Fig. 1 a,b) as reported earlier [4]. These morphological distinctions cannot be attributed to differences in crystallization mechanisms in their parent organisms, *Bti* and *Btj*, since both protoxins were recombinantly produced in the same host organism, an acrystalliferous strain of *Bti* (4Q7). Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba protoxins are expected to share structural resemblance to each other since the two sequences share 54% identity; however, 46% non-identity at the molecular level could easily produce large differences at the macroscopic level of crystal morphology. Moreover, the sequence of Cry11Ba is extended by 77-residues at its C-terminus, potentially also affecting differences in crystal packing (Supplementary Fig. 1). Interestingly, this extension has been identified as a low complexity region (LCR) by both CAST [19] and SEG [20] computational methods, which implicates the extension in the mechanism of crystal nucleation. At this point in our studies, the balance of evidence suggested that sequence divergence was likely to have erased the crystal packing pattern that early ancestors of today's Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba presumably once shared.

Our diffraction experiments yielded the first hint that Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba shared a conserved crystal packing pattern. We collected diffraction data from Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba nanocrystals injected in the vacuum chamber of the CXI-SC3 micro-focused beamline at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS) [21] using a microfluidic electrokinetic sample holder (MESH) [22] (Cry11Ba crystals) or a gas-dynamic virtual nozzle (GDVN) [23] (Cry11Aa crystals). The underlying similarity in the packing of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba became evident when their diffraction patterns were collected and indexed, revealing similarly sized unit cells (a~58; b~155; c~171 Å; α=β=γ=90°), albeit belonging to two different space groups: $I222$ and $P2_12_12$, respectively (Table 1). Conservation of unit cell parameters hinted that this crystal packing pattern is special, evolved to perform a function more intricate than just storing protein.

To gain further insight into Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba crystal packing, we depended on *de novo* methods to solve the crystallographic phase problem. Initial attempts to acquire phases from homologous structures by molecular replacement (MR) failed, suggesting Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba contained novel features, not present in the PDB. Our search models included structures of Cry δ-endotoxins homologs (exhibiting up to 26% sequence identity to our two targets) and homology models produced using Robetta [24] (http://robetta.bakerlab.org/) and SwissProt [25] (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/uniprot/). After MR failed, we turned to *de novo* phasing methods. We soaked Cry11 nanocrystals with conventional heavy atom derivatives including

gadolinium, gold, platinum, and mercury salts, but they failed to produce interpretable
isomorphous or anomalous difference Patterson peaks. Finally, a recently introduced caged-
terbium compound [16,17], Tb-Xo4, produced a successful derivative of Cry11Aa (after a 30h
soak at 10 mM concentration), and phases were determined by the single wavelength
anomalous dispersion (SAD) method at 2.6 Å resolution (using anomalous signal up to 3.5 Å).
Two Tb-Xo4 molecules were identified bound to the single Cry11Aa molecule in the
asymmetric unit (isomorphous peaks at 23 and 9 σ, and anomalous peaks at 33 and 8.1 σ,
respectively; Supplementary Fig. 2a). The success of Tb-Xo4 can be partly ascribed to the
dramatically high anomalous dispersion signal (*i.e.* f' and f'') of terbium, but likely also stems
from stronger binding of TbX04 to the protein owing to presence of an organic cage; indeed, f'
and f'' of Gd and Tb are similar at the X-ray energy used for data collection (9 keV). Regardless,
phases were of sufficient quality to reveal all Cry11Aa residues from N13 to the C-terminal
K643.
The Cry11Ba structure was thereafter phased successfully by MR using the Cry11Aa
structure as a search model. *A posteriori*, we discovered that two of the heavy atom
compounds that we used for soaking actually did bind Cry11Ba (Supplementary Fig. 2b-c).
Difference Fourier maps revealed 7-8 σ peaks indicating Pt bound near Met 19 and 200, and
Gd bound near Asp83 and Asp427 (Supplementary Fig. 2b). Surprisingly, however, there were
no peaks in the anomalous difference Fourier maps. We speculate that if we had achieved
higher heavy-atom occupancy and/or higher multiplicity in our measurements, the anomalous
signal would have been strong enough to detect and perhaps used for phasing. Our MR-phase
2.3 Å resolution map reveals two Cry11Ba molecules in the asymmetric unit. All residues are
visible except for the N-terminus (residues M1-N16), two loops (residues G330-E340, and
D352-I358) and the C-terminal extension (residues T654-K724). The lack of order in this
extension is not surprising given the low complexity of its sequence.
189
Cry11 domain organization is similar to δ-endotoxins, but exhibits some *non-canonical features*
Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba structures maintain the three-domain organization characteristic
of Cry δ-endotoxins [13,26] (Fig. 1c, Supplementary Fig. 3). Domain I is implicated to form a pore
in the target membrane. Like other Cry δ-endotoxins it forms a seven-α-helix bundle; at the
center of the bundle is α5 (residues 146-170), surrounded by the remaining six helices. Domain
II is implicated to recognize mosquito-specific receptors. It forms a β-prism composed of three-
β-sheets, wherein the first two β-sheets (β4-β3-β2-β5 and β8-β7-β6-β9) each adopts a Greek-
key topology while the third β-sheet is three-stranded (β1-β10-β11). Domain III is implicated to
oligomerize. It forms a β-sandwich of two antiparallel five-stranded β-sheets (viz. $\beta20 - \beta19 -$
$\beta22 - \beta17 - \beta4 - {}^{\beta12}/_{\beta14}$ and $\beta15 - {}^{\beta13}/_{\beta16} - \beta23 - \beta18 - \beta21$) forming a jelly-roll

topology, whereby $^{\beta 12}/_{\beta 14}$ and $^{\beta 13}/_{\beta 16}$ are interrupted β-strands contributed by two non-

consecutive shorts β-strands, which appose and intercalate one after the other onto β4 and

between β15 and β23, respectively (Figure 1d).

The closest homolog of known structure to Cry11 toxins is *Bt kurstaki* (*Btk*) Cry2Aa

(PDBid: 1i5p), with a sequence identity of 26.6 and 23.6 % and main-chain rmsd of 3.7 and

4.0 Å, with respect to Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba, respectively. As with Cry2Aa, the Cry11Aa toxins

feature a long insert (27 residues in Cry2Aa; 21 residues in the Cry11 toxins) between strands

β10 and β11, which together with domain-I β1, form the third β-sheet of the domain-II β-prism.

This insert, which features a short α-helix (α_h) and a β-strand (β_h), folds like a handle, and is

therefore referred to as the $\alpha_h\beta_h$-handle, throughout the manuscript (Fig. 1c, Supplementary

Fig. 3). The αhβh-handle fastens domain II onto domain III through direct (e.g. in Cry11Aa,

D443(OD2)-R502(NH2); D443(O)-R502(NH1); L447(N)-S503(O)) and water mediated H-

bonds (T446(OG1)/T448(O)-Wat72(O)-R502(N); T448(OG1)/V499(O)-Wat308(O)-

D501(OD1); T448(N)/L447(N)-Wat65(O)-S503(OG)/(O)), and enables the burying of domain-

II α8 at an interface formed by $\alpha_h\beta_h$, α6-α7 (domain I), β10-β11 (domain II), β15 and the β13-

β14 and β15-β16 loops (domain III), and the α9 helix connecting domain II and domain III

(D469-K478 in Cry11Aa) (Supplementary Fig. 4). The firm hold of α8 enables the three

domains to be more tightly packed in Cry2Aa and Cry11 toxins than in other Cry toxins (e.g.

Btt Cry3Aa or *Btk* Cry1Ac). Additionally, strand β_h lays aside strand β4 thereby expanding –

and consequently, stabilizing – the first β-sheet of domain II (β_h-β4-β3-β2-β5). Also, alike

Cry2Aa, the Cry11 toxins feature a smaller β-prism due to deletions in the second constitutive

β-sheet, namely between β7 and β8 (6 and 10 residues missing in Cry2Aa and Cry11 toxins,

respectively), and between β9 and β10 (14 and 15 residues missing in Cry2Aa and Cry11

toxins, respectively; Supplementary Fig. 3). The Cry11 toxin structures are, however, specific

in that a 36 to 38 residue insertion is observed between strands β4 and β5, contributing an

additional β-strand to the first β-sheet of domain-II – thereafter referred to as the β_{pin} (Fig. 1c).

As the β_{pin} lays along a two-fold axis, two large β_h-β4-β3-β2-β_{pin} – β_{pin}-β2-β3-β4-β_h sheet are

formed between symmetry related dimers (AC or BD, interface #3), yielding the crystallizing

tetramer (Fig. 2b, e). We noted earlier that the BSA at the tetramerization interface is 33%

lower in Cry11Ba, pointing to higher flexibility; this hypothesis is supported by the absence of

interpretable electron density for residues at the N-terminus (330-340) and C-terminus (352-

360) of the β_{pin} in the Cry11Ba structure. Also noteworthy is that Cry11 toxins feature a

conserved N/D-DDLGITT insertion between β21 and β22, and deletions (>3 residues) between

α3 and α3 (-5 and -8 residues with respect to *Btk* Cry2Aa and *Bt tenebrionis* (*Btt*) Cry3Aa),

and β20 and β21 (-10 and -9 residues with respect to *Btk* Cry2Aa and *Btt* Cry3Aa). Altogether,

these changes render Cry11 toxins uniquely large from the structural standpoint, with predicted

radii of gyration of 27.5 and 26.7 Å for Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba, compared to 25.0 and 25.6 Å
for *Btk* Cry2Aaa and *Btt* Cry3aa, respectively.
238
All domains engage in producing the in vivo crystal lattice.
Examination of packing interfaces reveal that all three domains are involved in the
formation and stabilization of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba nanocrystals. The *in vivo* crystallization
pathway can be best trailed from Cry11Aa crystals, which feature a single monomer per
asymmetric unit and build on six packing interfaces burying a cumulated surface area (BSA)
of 3514.5 Å^2, corresponding to 13.1 % of the total protein area. The main building block of
Cry11Aa crystals consists of a tetramer with a total BSA of 9663.0 Å^2 and a predicted binding
energy of -12.5 kcal.mol^{-1} at pH 7 by PISA [27] (Fig. 2a,b). Supported by two of the six packing
interfaces, the tetramer builds from the cross-association (AC or BD; interface #3) of two
dimers (AB or CD) along the 2-fold axis contributed by domain II (Fig. 2b). Each dimer is itself
composed of monomers associated along another 2-fold axis contributed by domain III and by
strand β4 and the β10-β11 hairpin (P433-P457) in domain II. The tetramer is further stabilized
by a minor interface between apices from domain II (interfaces AD or BC; interface #6).
Crystals grow from the piling in a honey-comb brick-wall fashion of such tetramers, as a result
of a face-to-back interaction between domains I from symmetry-related molecules (interface
#2; Fig. 2c). Cry11Aa crystals are further cemented by two additional minor interfaces. The
first involves the apex of the second β-sheet of domain II (interface #5) from facing monomers
in each dimer (AD or BC) of the stable tetramer. The second occurs between the α3-α4 loop
of domain I in one tetramer and the apex of the second β-sheet of domain II in another tetramer
(interface #4).
The similarity between the packing of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba crystals makes it
reasonable to propose that the latter also forms from the assembly of tetramers (Fig. 2d, e, f),
despite failure of PISA to identify the tetramer as a (meta-)stable building block for Cry11Ba
crystals. In these, two molecules are found in the asymmetric unit, associated through the face-
to-back interface between domains described above for Cry11Aa monomers (interface #2; Fig.
2f). The BSA at this interface is 1429.0 Å^2, *i.e.* 53% higher than in Cry11Aa (Fig. 2g). However,
BSAs at the interface formed by domains III and II, which associates monomers into a dimer
is 38% lower than the homologous interfaces in Cry11Aa (Fig. 2e, g). Thus, the intermolecular
contact between piled tetramers is larger in the Cry11Ba crystals, despite an overall looser
packing of monomers in the crystals, with an average BSA at crystal contacts of 3385.1 Å^2 per
monomer, corresponding to 12.6 % of the total protein area. The increased BSA between
tetramers (contributed by the large face-to-back interface between domains I), and the
presumably higher flexibility in the Cry11Ba tetramers, could be at the origin of Cry11Ba
packing into larger three-dimensional crystals. Regardless, our structures evidence that each

domain exhibits a dual role in Cry11 toxins, namely the formation and stabilization of *in vivo-*

grown nanocrystals, and execution of a domain specific function. The latter comprises pore

formation (domain I), receptor-recognition and membrane-insertion (domain II), and

oligomerization and stabilization of the toxic pore conformation (domain III) [26].

Drastic conformational changes drive crystal dissolution

We sought to characterize the conformational changes that ensue pH elevation,

preceding dissolution of the crystals in the mosquito larvae gut [28]. As the crystals are naturally

labile at pH 11, we aimed at collecting data from crystals soaked at a lower pH, hypothesizing

that early conformational changes would show but the crystal packing still hold. In the case of

Cry11Aa crystals, diffraction quality was decreased dramatically at pH values of 9.5 (CAPS

buffer, glycerol 30%) and above, preventing collection of a sufficiently large number of

diffraction patterns to produce a high-pH dataset. Hence, large conformational changes occur

in Cry11Aa at pH as low as 9.5, opposing diffraction quality, despite crystals dissolving as of

pH 11 only (Fig. 3a). In the case of Cry11Ba, ~3 Å diffraction was preserved up to pH 10.4

(Table 1). Comparison between the refined 'pH10.4' and 'pH6.5' structures points to large inter-

domain rearrangements induced by pH increase. Detailed analysis of structural changes at

the side chain level was yet prevented by the limited resolution of the 'pH10.4' dataset. A 1%

unit cell contraction, and hence tighter crystal packing, was observed in the 'pH10.4' crystals

in comparison to the pH 6.5 crystals. However, because a higher glycerol concentration was

used for injection of Cry11Ba crystals at pH 10.4, we cannot exclude that unit cell contraction

might be caused by crystal dehydration.

Crystals are made of full-sized monomers of Cry11 toxins

In both Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba toxins, the β_{pin} (residues E339-Q350 and I341-Y350,

respectively) is a ~10-residue long β-strand that hydrogen-bonds with a two-fold related

symmetry mate, contributing the interface that assembles dimers (AC and BD) into stable

tetramers. This strand is bordered on each side by the only two loops that have disordered

electron density in Cry11Ba (missing residues G330-E340 and D352-I358) and are

comparatively difficult to interpret in Cry11Aa (F330-D334 and Q350-E355), respectively. As

Cry11Aa N335-Y349 and Cry11Ba I341-N351 regions match the enzymatic cleavage site

known to generate the two activated fragments of ~32 and ~36 kDa [29,30] upon proteolytic

activation in the mosquito larvae gut, we asked whether disorder in the F330-D334 (G330-

E340) and Q350-E355 (D352-I358) loops serves the purpose of enabling facilitated access of

proteases to Cry11Aa (Cry11Ba) cleavage sites or if each monomer occurs in natural crystals

as two polypeptide chains cleaved prior or during crystal formation. SDS PAGE analysis of

Cry11Aa (12% gels, heating at 95°C for 5 min, presence of DTT and SDS; Supplementary Fig.

5) resulted in a major band ~70 kDa, in line with previous reports [31–33]. As the denaturing

treatment would have broken any disulfide-bridge or non-covalent interactions that could

maintain cleaved fragments together, this result suggests that Cry11Aa occurs in crystals as

a full monomer. We further verified this hypothesis by use of MALDI TOF mass spectrometry.

In MALDI mass spectra collected after direct solubilization of the natural crystals in sinapinic

acid matrix in presence or absence of DTT, we observed main peaks at m/z of 72246 and

72235 (mass error: ± 100 Da) and 36154 and 36129 Da, respectively, in agreement with

expected molecular masses for singly- and doubly- charged ions of a full-size monomer

(expected mass: 72.349 kDa) (Uniprot accession number: P21256; Supplementary Fig. 6).

However, because proteolytic activation is as well expected to yield a 36 kDa fragment, in

addition to a 32 kDa fragment for which a minor peak was present in the MALDI-TOF mass

spectra, we resorted to native mass spectrometry to assert that the ~72.240 and ~36.140 kDa

peaks originated from the same species – rather than being indicative of the crystallization of

proteolytic products. With this approach, we could confirm that upon dissolution of Cry11Aa

crystals, a 72.345 kDa fragment is released, corresponding to the full-size monomer

(Supplementary Fig. 7a). Moreover, both incubation of solubilized toxin at room temperature

(RT) for 2 h (Supplementary Fig. 7b) and use of increased collision energy (Supplementary

Fig. 7c, d) failed at yielding a signature for the two polypeptides that would have been

generated if cleavage at position 329 had occurred. We conclude that natural crystals of

Cry11Aa, and possibly Cry11Ba, grow from the addition of full-size monomers, and that

disorder in the F330-D334 (G330-E340) and Q350-E355 (D352-I358) loops could serve the

purpose of enabling facilitated access of proteases to Cry11Aa (Cry11Ba) cleavage sites.

Considering proteinase K as a surrogate analogue for mosquito larvae gut proteases [34], one

would expect the β_{pin} to be released upon proteolytic activation, suggesting that the role of the

latter is to promote *in vivo* crystallization. We note that other cleavage sites are predicted,

which would release the first six residues and last two β-strands (β22-β23), as well as rescind

the covalent association between domain I and domains II and III, thereby leaving non-covalent

interactions surfaces as the sole glue between them.

Mutagenesis to alter crystal formation and dissolution

We proposed earlier that the packing of Cry11Ba into slightly larger crystals than

Cry11Aa could stem from differences in the extent and nature of the interfaces which support

dimerization, tetramerization and piling of tetramers into crystals (Fig. 2). Considering recent

evidence linking LCR regions with diverse functions including chaperoning [35] and reversible

oligomerization, we further asked whether or not presence of the 77-residue LCR region at the

C-terminus of Cry11Ba plays a complementary role in the promotion of crystal formation. A

chimera was therefore designed, coined C11AB, wherein the LCR region of Cry11Ba was

fused to the C-terminal end of Cry11Aa (Material and Methods; Supplementary Fig. 8a).

C11AB was produced at the expected size but at a lower yield than Cry11Aa WT

(Supplementary Fig. 8b). Atomic force micrographs (AFM) revealed the presence of multiple

needle-like inclusions in the parasporal envelope encasing the crystals, suggesting that

presence of Cry11Ba-LCR at the C-terminal end of Cry11Aa favors nucleation, but not crystal

growth (Supplementary Fig. 8c).

Seven Cry11Aa mutants were additionally designed with the aim to probe the

involvement of Cry11Aa intra- and inter-molecular interfaces in toxin stability, crystal formation

and dissolution. Each mutant was designed to challenge a specific interface and served as a

coarse proxy to evaluate its pH sensitivity and putative participation in the crystal dissolution

mechanism. First, we asked whether the intra-chain stabilization of α8 at an interface

contributed by the three domains (namely, $\alpha_h\beta_h$, α6-α7, α9, β10, β11, β15 and the β13-β14

and β15-β16 loops) could play a role in crystal dissolution. Residues central to this interface

are Y272, D514 and D507, which H-bond to one another and to Y203, R222, T249, S251

through direct and water-mediated interactions (W253 and W267), connecting the three

domains (Supplementary Fig. 9a, Supplementary Table 1a). Upon pH elevation, Y272, D514

and D507 are all expected to be deprotonated, which should result in electrostatic repulsion

and thence dissociation of the three domains. To test the hypothesis, we produced three

Cry11Aa mutants intended to eliminate pH sensitivity of the above-described H-bonds. Neither

did the Y272Q nor D507N-D514N mutations impact the overall stability of the toxin, in the

soluble or crystalline form (Fig. 3b), but their combination in the triple Y272Q-D507N-D514N

mutant resulted in an unexpected abolishment of the ability of Cry11Aa to form crystals *in vivo*

– possibly due to improper folding (Supplementary Fig. 10). The Y272Q mutation had no effect

on the pH sensitivity of Cry11Aa crystals, while only a minor effect was seen with the

D507N+D514N mutant (Fig. 3a). Thus, pH-induced deprotonation of amino acids involved in

the stabilization of α8 at the interface between the three domains does not play a role in the

initial steps of crystal dissolution, possibly because of their deep burial at the interface. We

note that the above-mentioned residues and their interactions are all strictly conserved in

Cry11Ba (viz. Y273, D518, D511, Y203, R222, T249, S251, W253 and W268).

We then focused on Cry11Aa E583, a residue sitting at the intramolecular interface

between domain I and domain III. This β21 residue, condemned to be anionic at higher pH,

takes part in the water-mediated hydrogen bond network that connects α6 and α7 from domain

I with domain III (Supplementary Fig. 9b, Supplementary Table 1b). We therefore asked

whether or not suppression of the pH-sensitivity of the network would stabilize the monomer

at high pH, thereby reducing the pH sensitivity of the crystals. This was indeed the case, with

an SP_{50} (pH at which 50% of crystals are dissolved) of 12.6 ± 1.0 for crystals of the E583Q

mutant, compared to 11.2 ± 1.0 for WT Cry11Aa crystals (Fig. 3a), and a dissolution profile

characterized by a reduced slope with no visible plateau up to pH 14. Thus, the alteration of protonation state of residues and water molecules at the intramolecular interface between domain I and domain III may be involved in the early step of Cry11Aa crystal dissolution. In Cry11Ba (G587), which displays a similar SP50 of 11.5 (Supplementary Fig. 11), this residue is substituted for glycine suggesting a different mechanism of pH-induced intramolecular separation of domain I and domain III, in Cry11Ba – or at least the involvement of additional residues at the interface.

Crystal contacts were also investigated. We first tampered with the interface enabling the honey-comb brick-wall piling of Cry11Aa tetramers (Fig. 2c, interface #2), by introducing a F17Y substitution, intended to induce electrostatic repulsion with the negatively charged D180 (distance D180(OD1) - F17(CZ) of 3.3 Å), due to deprotonation of its hydroxyl group upon pH increase (Supplementary Fig. 9c). As expected, crystals of the F17Y mutant were found to be more sensitive to increases in pH, with crystals starting to dissolve at pH as low as ~9.5 and an SP_{50} of 10.6 ± 1.0 (Fig. 3a). The dissolution profile of F17Y crystals is again characterized by a reduced slope, as compared to WT crystals, explaining that the plateau is nonetheless reached at the same pH (~pH 11.6). Nevertheless, the result suggests that dissolution of Cry11Aa crystals can be accelerated by separation of the tetramers associated through interface #2. The F17Y mutation was also found to challenge crystal formation, yielding crystals far smaller than their WT counterparts. We note that F17, D180 and the H-bond between them are strictly conserved in Cry11Ba; hence, the importance of interface 2 for crystal formation and dissolution could be extendable to crystals formed by Cry11Ba.

Next, we challenged the role of the dimerization interface (Fig. 2b interface #1). Recall that BSA at this interface, contributed by domain III from facing monomers, is 38% lower in Cry11Ba than in Cry11Aa. Furthermore, only 8 hydrogen bonds and 2 salt bridges support the interface in Cry11Ba, compared to 20 hydrogen bonds and 10 salt bridges in Cry11Aa. Y449 is positioned in the central part of the interface, and while not involved in direct H-bonding to other protein residues, supports a large H-bond network that interconnects waters and residues from facing monomers in the dimer (Supplementary Fig. 9d, Supplementary Table 1c). Hence, we investigated whether deprotonation of Y449 in the middle of the interface would significantly affect crystal dissolution by engineering of a Y449F mutation. Only a minor effect on crystal dissolution was observed (Fig. 3a), yet the mutation was detrimental to the protein stability (Fig. 3b), resulting in the growth of crystals of different size and shape (Fig. 3c).

Finally, we introduced a Y349F mutation in the β_{pin}, hypothesizing that suppression of its pH-sensitive H-bond to E295(OE1) in the adjacent strand β2 would disturb the β_{pin} fold and destabilize the tetramerization interface (Fig. 2b interface #3, Supplementary Fig. 9e, Supplementary Table 1d), thereby triggering crystal dissolution. This expected effect was not observed, with crystals of the mutant displaying the same pH-induced dissolution profile as

those of the WT. Nonetheless, smaller crystals were observed whose thermal stability was affected (Figure 3 and Supplementary Fig. 12), indicating that reduced stabilization of the turn preceding the β_{pin} not only impacts folding and stability of the toxin, but as well its piling into crystals – probably due to reduced tetramerization. Of note, Y349 is conserved in Cry11Ba where it H-bonds to P362(O).

Of all the single and double mutants we investigated, the Y349F mutation is that which results in the smallest crystals, closely followed by F17Y and E583Q. The Y449F mutant, however, exhibits the most noticeable change in shape compared to WT Cry11Aa. To evaluate the significance of these changes, we characterized the distribution in size of crystals of Cry11Aa-WT, Y449F, F17Y and E583Q using AFM (Fig. 3d). All three mutants had a significantly reduced volume compared to WT Cry11Aa, due to a reduced thickness of the crystals (Fig. 3d).

Probing crystalline order of the Cry11Aa mutants by SFX

The presence of crystals does not necessarily infer that molecules are well arranged within them. We therefore used SFX to assess the level of crystalline order in crystals of the mutants that displayed modified solubilization or shape. Data were collected at the SPB/SFX beam line of the EuXFEL (Hamburg, Germany) from crystals delivered across the X-ray beam using a liquid microjet focused through a gas-dynamic virtual nozzle GDVN [23] (Table 2). All crystals were kept in water at pH 7 for the GDVN injection, and pulses were delivered at the MHz repetition rate (1.1 MHz) [89,89,90] using 10 Hz trains of 160 pulses, with a spacing of 880 ns apart. Data was collected on the AGIPD detector at its maximum rate of 3.52 kHz [36]. With the notable exception of Y349F, crystals of all four single point mutants diffracted, yet unequal amounts of data were collected from each, and none from WT crystals, due to technical difficulties that arose during the experiment. This impeded a thorough comparison of the diffraction power of the various mutants, and prevented structure determination for the Y272F mutant. The structures of the other three mutants were determined, using the WT structure as a molecular replacement model for the phasing of diffraction data. We found that neither overall packing, tertiary structure nor interface formation is affected in the tested mutants at neutral pH (Supplementary Fig. 13). Of important note, these data demonstrate the feasibility of macromolecular nano-crystallography at MHz pulse rate using the brilliant micro-focused beam available at the SPB/SFX beamline of the EuXFEL.

The needle shape inclusions formed by C11AB were also investigated by SFX and found to present some crystalline order, as evidenced by diffraction rings up to ~6 Å resolution in the powder diagram calculated from the maximum projection of 395656 hits (Supplementary Fig. 8d). It is clear, however, that a high-resolution structure is not readily practicable with these

457   crystals, either because their small size makes them unsuitable for diffraction using a micro-

458   focused XFEL beam or due to intrinsic disorder.

Discussion (2219 words)

We here report the previously-unknown structures of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba, the two

most potent Cry δ-endotoxins expressed by mosquitocidal *Bti* and *Btj*, respectively. Both toxins

occur as natural nanocrystals that are produced during the sporulation phase of the bacteria,

and dissolve upon elevation of pH in the mosquito larvae gut. Proteolytic activation enables

binding to their specific receptors [37], including a membrane embedded alkaline phosphatase[38]

but as well the co-delivered Cyt1Aa [12,39–41], triggering insertion in gut cell membranes and

subsequent oligomerization into pores that will eventually kill the cells. Both toxins are of

industrial interest due to their environmental safety, explained by the multi-step activation

outlined above, and to their high stability as crystals. Our results shed light on the mechanisms

of *in vivo* crystallization, pH-induced dissolution and proteolytic activation, and on structural

features that support the toxins specificity with respect to other Cry toxins. Thereby, our work

offers a foundation for further improvement of the toxic activity or crystal size by rational design.

Additionally, we demonstrate the feasibility of *de novo* structure determination of a previously-

unknown protein-structure by SFX, from nanocrystals only 10,000 unit-cells across, using a

single caged-terbium (TbXo4) derivative. Below, we recapitulate these findings and discuss

their implications.

In vivo *crystallization pathway of Cry11 toxins*

The building block of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba crystals is a tetramer formed by the interaction of

two dimers, via their domain II. The dimers are themselves assembled from the interaction of

two monomers, via their domains II and III. Crystals form from the honey-comb brick-wall piling

of tetramers, as enabled by the face-to-back interaction of domain I from symmetry-related

tetramers (Figure 2). Thus, all three domains are involved in the *in vivo* crystal packing of

Cry11 toxins, each contributing a two-fold axis. This observation contrasts with other toxin

structures determined from *in vivo* grown crystals, wherein either propeptide(s) (e.g.

Lysinibacillus sphaericus BinAB [28] and *Bti* Cyt1A [12]) or a specific domain (e.g. domain I in *Btt*

Cry3Aa from [42,43]) serves as the major contributor to crystallization. Expanding to previously

determined Cry δ-endotoxins [12,28,42,44] structures, solved from *in vitro* grown macrocrystals

obtained following dissolution of the natural crystals at high pH, the same trend is observed –

i.e., crystallization mostly depends on a dedicated portion of the protein, either it be a N-

terminal and/or C-terminal propeptide (e.g., the ~650 C-terminal residues in *Btk* Cry1Ac) or a

specific domain (e.g. domain II in *Btk* Cry2Aa). Thus, the Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba structures

illustrate a yet unobserved pathway for *in vivo* crystallization, wherein all domains act on a

specific step of the coalescence process, viz. dimerization (domains II and III from two Cry11

monomers), tetramerization (domains II from two Cry11 dimers) and tetramer-piling (domains

I in each tetramer). With Cry11Aa featuring a larger dimerization interface, and Cry11Ba a

larger interface between piled tetramers, the two structures underline different levels of tradeoff
between packing *into* tetramers and packing *of* the tetramers.

The difference in thickness of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba crystals is of interest. Considering that
all crystals were produced in *Bti*, we could exclude the possibility that the slightly larger size of
Cry11Ba crystals originates from a more efficient crystallization machinery in *Btj* than *Bti*.
Puzzled by the presence of a 77-residue long low complexity region at the C-terminus of
Cry11Ba (LCR-Cry11Ba), which is absent in Cry11Aa, we asked whether or not a C-terminal
fusion of LCR-Cry11Ba with Cry11Aa would result in larger crystals. LCR regions have indeed
been shown to support a variety of functions, including chaperoning [35] and reversible
oligomerization [45,46] so that a role in crystal nucleation and/or growth could not be excluded.
Support of the first, but not the second hypothesis was obtained. Indeed, the C11AB chimera,
consisting of a fusion of LCR-Cry11Ba to the C-terminus of Cry11Aa, yields smaller crystals
that poorly diffract, even when exposed to high intensity XFEL pulses. This observation is in
line with previous results which showed that substitution of Cry11Ba domain III for that of
Cry11Aa leads to limited expression and comparatively small inclusions [47]. Thus, the LCR
region of Cry11Ba is unlikely to account for the difference in size between Cry11Aa and
Cry11Ba crystals. Instead, we favor the hypothesis that it is the larger surface of interaction
between piled tetramers that accounts for the larger size of the Cry11Ba crystals. Given the
absence of electron density for LCR-Cry11Ba residues in the Cry11Ba structure, and the
abundance of needle-like inclusions in the parasporal body enveloping the C11AB crystals, it
is reasonable to assume that they do not engage in structurally important interactions with
functional domains, but rather favor nucleation of crystals. This aid-to-nucleation would be
required for Cry11Ba, which features a reduced dimerization interface, but not for Cry11Aa,
wherein this interface is 62 % larger. In line with this hypothesis, four regions are predicted to
form short adhesive motifs of the Low Complexity, Amyloid-like Reversible Kinked Segments
(LARKS) type (Supplementary Fig. 3).

Cry11 toxins depart from the canonical Cry δ-endotoxins architecture

The structures of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba shed light on features that would not have
been predicted based on sequence alignments (*i.e.*, by homology modelling), and which
largely deviate from the canonical organization observed in other Cry δ-endotoxins [12,28,42,44].
The most notable difference is the presence of a ~36 to 38 residue insertion between strands
β4 and β5 in domain II, which results in an extra β-strand, coined β_{pin}. The β_{pin} not only
participates in the formation of a modified β-prism, but contributes to a two-fold axis that
supports tetramerization of Cry11 toxins through formation of two large β_h-β4-β3-β2-β_{pin} – β_{pin}-
β2-β3-β4-β_h sheets between symmetry-related dimers into a tetramer. The observation of
proteolytic cleavage sites at both the N- and C-termini of the β_{pin} suggests that it is removed

upon activation by mosquito gut proteases, in line with the observation of ~32 and ~36 kDa

fragments upon proteolytic activation of the Cry11 toxins [32]. If true, the unique role of the β_{pin}

would be to support *in vivo* crystallization and its removal would entail the dissociation of

tetramers into dimers and eventually monomers. While mutagenesis results indicate that this

interface does not play a major role in crystal dissolution (see below), it seems likely that upon

pH elevation and deprotonation of tyrosines and acidic groups, electrostatic repulsion will occur

between Y349(OH) and E295(OE2) in Cry11Aa, and between Y350(OH) and P362(O) in

Cry11Ba. Increased disorder of these regions could facilitate the access of proteases, and thus

favor the activation of the Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba toxins. This hypothesis would rationalize the

reluctance of the two toxins to recrystallize *in vitro* after pH induced dissolution, due to an

impossibility to re-form tetramers – or at least, to re-match the exact positioning of the β-pin.

The Cry11 toxins also differ from other Cry δ-endotoxins by the presence of a conserved N/D-

DDLGITT insertion between β21 and β22, contributing a short helix, and by deletions of ~5-10

residues in the α3-α4 and β20-β21 loops, respectively. Compilation of these changes likely

explains failures to phase the Cry11 structures by the molecular replacement method, even

when *Btk* Cry2Aa, which also features a $\alpha_h\beta_h$-handle, was used as a starting model.

Mapping the interfaces involved in crystal dissolution.

Our efforts to determine the structures of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba at alkaline pH were

unsuccessful, due to high sensitivity of crystals diffraction quality to pH increase. In the case

of Cry11Aa we could not collect data, while in the case of Cry11Ba, we obtained a low-

resolution structure which, while showing possible inter-domain rearrangements, did not inform

on specific side chain rearrangements. Therefore, we resorted to site-specific mutagenesis to

obtain information regarding the crystal dissolution pathway. We found that the crystal interface

most sensitive to pH elevation is the one enabling the honey-comb brick-wall piling of Cry11

tetramers, with the Cry11Aa-F17Y mutant displaying increased pH sensitivity (with an SP_{50} of

10.6 ± 1.0 compared to 11.2 ± 1.0 for WT Cry11Aa crystals). In contrast, the dimerization

(Y349F mutant) and tetramerization interfaces (Y449F mutant) appear to be less pH-sensitive.

At the monomer level, we found that the three-domain interface to which α_8 and the $\alpha_h\beta_h$-handle

contribute is not very sensitive to pH increase (Y272Q and D507N+D514N mutants), possibly

due to burying of mutated residues at the interface, preventing bulk solvent to access these

sites. Alternatively, interaction of Cry11 toxins with its membrane-bound receptors [37] could be

a required step to expose α_8, shown to play a major role in binding and toxicity [48].

The intramolecular domain I vs. domain III interface was found to be important for the

pH-induced crystal dissolution, with the Cry11A E583Q mutant displaying a reduced sensitivity

to pH (SP_{50} of 12.6 ± 1.0). Yet unlike the other tested interfaces, which are overall well

conserved, the domain I vs. domain III interface differs in Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba, suggesting

that caution is advised upon reflecting results obtained from Cry11Aa mutants onto Cry11Ba.
Indeed, E583 is substituted for glycine in Cry11Ba (G587), suggesting a different mechanism
of pH-induced separation of domain I and domain III – or at least, the participation of other
residues. Structural analysis suggests that the substitution of Cry11Ba Q247 for a glutamic
acid could compensate for the absence of E583, enabling electrostatic repulsion of V494 (β14)
– found at the opposed end of this interface – upon pH elevation. Numerous other residues at
this interface, otherwise mostly conserved between Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba, remain as
candidates to further tune the pH sensitivity. For example, Y241(OH) is H-bonded to
D586(OD1; 2.6 Å) and D590(OD2; 2.8 Å) in Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba, respectively, suggesting
that mutation of this residue into a phenylalanine (Y241F) and/or of D586/D590 into
asparagines would reduce the pH sensitivity while not affecting stability. Likewise, E234 H-
bonds to Q625(NE2; 2.6 Å) in Cry11Aa, and to K629(NZ; 2.8 Å) and R553(NH1; 2.9 Å) in
Cry11Ba, suggesting that a E234Q mutation would reduce pH sensitivity in the two toxins
whilst not affecting their folding. Inversely, the mutation into a glutamic acid of Q511/Q515,
squeezed between a tryptophan (W584/W588), an arginine (R549/R553) and a glutamic acid
(E234), would be expected to increase the pH sensitivity of the domain I vs. domain III
intramolecular interface in both Cry11Aa/Cry11Ba – and by extension, that of their crystals.
589
Implication for the future of nanocrystallography using SFX.
In this study, *de novo* phasing was required – not because of the absence of
homologous structures, but because none of those available were sufficiently close to serve
as a search model for molecular replacement. Using Tb-Xo4, a caged terbium compound, we
could phase the *Bti* Cry11Aa structure by SAD, from ~77,000 diffraction patterns collected on
crystals only 10,000 unit cell across – an achievement to compare to the determination of the
structure Ls BinAB from > 370,000 patterns (native and three derivatives) collected on crystals
100,000 unit cell across [49]. Our success in phasing the Cry11Aa structure stemmed from a
combination of advances in SFX data processing tools over the last five years and the use of
a dramatically powerful phasing agent, and should offer hope to investigators seeking to
determine the structure of proteins of which no known structural homologue exists and that
have to resort to SFX due to smallness of their crystals. It is foreseeable, however, that *de-*
novo structure determination will be helped by recent advances in comparative and *ab-initio*
modelling and the availability of programs such as RosettaFold [50] and AlphaFold2 [51], capable
of producing a decently-accurate structure for virtually all proteins and thus a good model for
phasing of crystallographic data by molecular replacement. Latest releases of the two
programs were published in the final stage of the writing of this manuscript, hence we asked
whether or not the availability of these tools would have facilitated our journey towards the
Cry11 toxins structures, and submitted the sequence of Cry11Aa to the two servers. For

RosettaFold, the rmsd to the final refined structure of the five best models was over 4 Å, with

discrepancies observed mostly in domain II. For AlphaFold2, however, the two first models

displayed rmsd of 1.2 and 1.0 Å to the final structure, respectively. Using the worst of these

two models, we could find a molecular replacement solution using Phaser, and a partial model

featuring 95% of the residues in sequence was obtained after 20 cycles of automatic iterative

model-building and refinement using Bucanneer [52] and Refmac [53]. Thus, a problem which

occupied a handful of crystallographers for several years could have been solved in less than

an hour using the new tools recently made available to the structural biology community. Based

on our results, it is tantalizing to claim that the phase problem in crystallography has been

solved, or that experimental structural biology has lived, but such assertions would likely be

shortsighted. Rather, we encourage investigators to challenge AlphaFold2 and RosettaFold

as much as humanly possible, but to not forsake *de novo* phasing as it may remain the only

route to success in difficult cases where molecular replacement based on such models does

not work [54]. It must also be emphasized that in the case of Cry11 toxins and, more generally,

naturally-crystalline proteins, the issue is not just phasing, but packing. For such proteins,

crystal formation and dissolution serve function, hence characterization of packing interfaces

is central to finely comprehend their bioactivation cascades. Without the naturally-occurring

crystals and the atomic resolution SFX structures, it would not have been possible to make

predictions on potential mutations affecting Cry11Aa crystal formation or dissolution.

Materials and Methods (4643 words)

Crystal production and purification. Crystals of Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba were produced by electrotransformation of the plasmids pWF53 and pPFT11S [55] into the acrystalliferous strain 4Q7 of *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *israelensis* (Bti; The Bacillus Genetic Stock Center (BGSC), Columbus OH, USA), respectively [56]. Colonies were selected on LB agar medium supplemented with erythromycin (25 μg/mL) and used to inoculate precultures of LB liquid medium. For Cry11Aa production, precultures were spread on T3 sporulation medium. After incubation at 30°C for 4 days, spores/crystals suspensions were collected using cell scrapers and resuspended in ultrapure water. After sonication-induced cell lysis and subsequent centrifugation at 4000 g for 45 min to discard cell and medium debris, pellets were resuspended in water and crystals were purified using a discontinuous sucrose gradient (67-72-79 %). After ultracentrifugation, crystals were recovered and several rounds of centrifugation/resuspension in ultrapure water allowed discarding as much sucrose as possible for proper downstream application. Crystal purity was verified by SDS-PAGE on 12% gels. Purified crystals were conserved in ultrapure water at 4 °C until use. For Cry11Ba, a glycerol stock of the 4Q7/pPFT11S was streaked onto 25 μg/mL erythromycin Nutrient Agar plates. From here a single colony was selected and added to a Glucose-Yeast-Salts (GYS) media culture and allowed to grow continuously at 30°C, 250 rpm for 5 days. This culture was then spun down, resuspended in ultrapure water, and the lysate was sonicated for 3 min at 50% duty. The sonicated lysate was added to the 30-65% discontinuous sucrose gradient (35-40-45-50-55-60-65 %) and spun down for 70 min at 20,000 rpm and 4°C. The sucrose gradient was then hand fractionated with Cry11Ba crystals collected around 57-60% and dialysed into ultrapure water. Crystal characterization and purity was completed by phase contrast light microscopy, X-ray powder diffraction, transmission electron microscopy, and 4-12% SDS-PAGE gels. The pure Cry11Ba crystals were stored at 4°C in ultrapure water.

Cry11Aa mutagenesis. Based on the SFX structure of Cry11Aa, a total of 7 mutants of Cry11Aa were constructed to challenge the different crystal packing and intramolecular interfaces. The rationale behind these mutations is illustrated in Supplementary Fig. 9 and discussed in the main text. Point-mutations were inserted into *cry11aa* gene by Gibson assembly using pWF53 as a backbone [56]. Two different primer couples were used for each mutation to amplify two fragments that were complementary by their 15-18 bp overlapping 5' and 3' overhangs with a target Tm of 50°C. Point mutations were inserted in the complementary part of the overhangs of the two fragments spanning the *cyt1aa* region to be mutated. The double mutant D507N-D514N was successfully constructed in a single-step by respectively adding the D507N mutation on the non-overlapping overhang region of the forward primer, and the D514N on the non-overlapping overhang of the reverse one. The triple

mutant Y272Q-D507N-D514N was constructed by using the primers containing the Y272Q

mutation and the plasmid pWF53-D507N-D514N as a backbone. In addition to the point

mutants, a Cry11Aa-Cry11Ba chimeric toxin – coined C11AB – was also constructed. For this,

the sequence of the *cry11aa* gene was fused with the 234 bp extra 3' extension of *cry11ba*

gene, which is suggested to feature a low complexity region (LCR) based on sequence

analysis   using   the   LCR-eXXXplorer   web   platform

(http://repeat.biol.ucy.ac.cy/fgb2/gbrowse/swissprot) [57], which implements the CAST [19] and

SEG [20] computational methods to identify LCR. The C11AB chimera was constructed by

Gibson assembly following a "1 vector, 2 fragments" approach. The plasmid pWF53 containing

the *cry11aa* gene was used as a backbone and the *cry11ba* 3' fragment was amplified from

the extracted and purified plasmid of the WT strain of *Btj* containing the *cry11ba* gene. The list

of primers used for plasmids construction is available in Supplementary Table 2. For each

plasmid construction, the fragments with overlapping overhangs were assembled using the

NEBuilder HiFi DNA Assembly (New England BioLabs) as previously described [12]. Briefly, after

90 min incubation at 50°C, the constructed plasmids were transformed by heat shock into

chemically competent Top10 *Escherichia coli* (New England BioLabs). Plasmids were

extracted from colonies selected on LB agar medium containing ampicillin (100 μg mL^{-1}) using

the NucleoSpin Plasmid extraction kit (Macherey-Nagel) following the manufacturer's

instructions. The successful construction of each plasmid was assessed by double digestion

(EcoRI and BamHI) followed by migration on 1% agarose gel stained with SYBR Safe

(Invitrogen) and by Sanger sequencing of the region containing the mutation at the Eurofins

Genomics sequencing platform. Of note, the *cry11aa* gene was also fully sequenced to

validate its sequence for mutagenesis primer design and for comparing the expected toxin size

to the observed one in mass spectrometry analyses. All mutants were produced as crystals in

Bt, as described above. The presence of the mutated *cry11aa* gene sequence in the

transformed *Bt* colony used for production was verified by colony PCR using specific primers

and Sanger sequencing at the Eurofins Genomics sequencing platform. Crystals from all

mutants were analyzed by SDS-PAGE on 12% gels. For C11AB, its proper size was confirmed

by using the "gel analysis" module implemented in the software ImageJ v1.51k (*N* = 7) [58].

Crystal visualization by scanning electron microscopy (SEM). Purified crystals of Cry11Aa

WT and of the 7 mutants were visualized using either a Zeiss LEO 1530 scanning electron

microscope from the SEM facility of the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility (ESRF,

Grenoble, France), a Thermo Fisher Quanta 650 FEG environmental SEM (ESEM) available

for users at the European XFEL (EuXFEL, Hamburg, Germany) or a JEOL JSM-6700M FE-

SEM (UCLA, Los Angeles, USA). For SEM at ESRF, samples were coated with a 2 nm thick

gold layer with the Leica EM ACE600 sputter coater before imaging. For ESEM at the

European XFEL, samples were diluted (1/1000) and mixed with 25 mM of ammonium acetate.
Samples were then coated with a thin gold layer as described above using a Leica EM ACE600
sputter coater as well. Images were recorded at 15 kV acceleration voltage by collecting
secondary electrons using an Everhart-Thornley-Detector (ETD detector) in high-vacuum
mode. For SEM at UCLA, samples were diluted (1/5) and ultrapure H2O.they were then added
to 300 mesh Cu F/C grids that were positively glow discharged. These samples were then
wicked away and washed with ultrapure water, wicked, and allowed to dry overnight to ensure
all moisture had evaporated inside of a dessicator. These were then attached to a holder with
carbon tape and coated with an Anatech Hummer VI sputter coater with approximately 2 nm
of thick gold layer. Images were recorded at 5 kV acceleration voltage by collecting secondary
electrons using a Lower secondary electron (LEI) or Upper secondary electron in-lens (SEI)
detector.

Crystal visualization by transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Non-purified crystals of
Cry11Aa WT were visualized using a Thermofisher TF20 electron microscope from the IBS
electron microscopy platform. For negative staining TEM, samples were diluted 5 times in H_2O
and 4 µl of the diluted sample was introduced to the interface of an amorphous carbon film
evaporated on a mica sheet. The carbon film was then floated off the mica sheet in ~200 µl
2% sodium silicotungstate (SST) solution. The carbon film with the crystal sample was then
recovered onto a Cu 300 mesh TEM grid after 30 s, let dry, and imaged at 200 keV. Images
were recorded on a Gatan OneView CMOS detector. Non-purified crystals of Cry11Ba WT
were visualized using an FEI Tecnai T12 electron microscope within the UCLA California
Nanoscience Institute, EICN facility. For negative staining TEM, samples were prepared by
adding 5 µL of pure crystal fractions in 10 µL ultrapure H2O. 2.5 µL of this sample was added
to 300 mesh Cu F/C grids that were positively glow discharged. These samples were then
wicked away using Whatman 1 filter paper; washed with 2.5 µL ultrapure H2O, wicked; and
negatively stained with 2.5 µL 2% uranyl acetate, wicked. These were allowed to dry overnight
to ensure all moisture had evaporated and imaged at 120 keV. Images were recorded on a
Gatan 2kX2k CCD.

Crystal characterization by atomic force microscopy (AFM). Crystals of Cry11Aa were
visualized by AFM as previously described[12]. Briefly, 5 µL of crystals suspended in ultrapure
water were deposited on freshly cleaved mica. After 30 min in a desiccation cabinet (Superdry
cabinet, 4% relative humidity), crystals were imaged on a Multimode 8, Nanoscope V (Bruker)
controlled by the NanoScope software (Bruker, Santa Barbara, CA). Imaging was done in the
tapping mode (TAP) with a target amplitude of 500 mV (about 12 nm oscillation) and a variable
setpoint around 70% amplitude attenuation. TESPA-V2 cantilevers (k = 42 Nm^{-1}, Fq = 320

kHz, nominal tip radius = 7 nm, Bruker probes, Camarillo, CA, USA) were used and images were collected at ~1 Hz rate, with 512- or 1024-pixel sampling. Images were processed with Gwyddion [59], and if needed stripe noise was removed using DeStripe [60]. Measurements were performed on Cry11Aa WT and on mutants selected on the basis of their aspect in eSEM images (Y449F) or their solubilization pattern (F17Y and E583Q). Size measurements were performed on AFM images using Gwyddion [59] in a semi-automated protocol. A classical height threshold was applied to each image to select as many individual crystals as possible. Sometimes, partially overlapping crystals were individualized using the manual edition of the mask of selected crystals by adding a separation line. Finally, a filter was applied to remove very small selections (artefacts) or crystals touching the edge of the image. Measures were obtained using the 'distribution of grains' feature in Gwyddion where the crystal thickness (T) is the returned mean value, the volume (V) is the Laplacian background basis volume, and the length and width are the major and minor semi-axes of equivalent ellipses, respectively. The total number of crystals measured are: 45 for WT, 93 for F17Y, 60 for Y449F, and 94 for E583Q.

Data collection history. The Cry11Aa/Cry11Ba structure determination project was initiated in 2015. Data were collected at five different occasions, in two XFEL facilities, namely at the Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS), Stanford (USA) and EuXFEL, Hamburg (Germany). During our first LCLS-SC3 beamtime (cxi04616), we collected data from native Cry11Ba (2.3 Å resolution), and in our second (LO91), we collected data from native Cry11Aa (2.8 Å resolution). Nanocrystals grown by recombinant expression in the modified acrystalliferous 4Q7 strain of *Bti* were injected by a microfluidic electrokinetic sample holder (MESH) device[61] in the microfocus chamber of LCLS-SC3 [62]. Crystals were. After data reduction using cctbx.xfel and dials (hit-finding through merging) [63–66], we attempted phasing of both datasets by molecular replacement (MR), using sequence-alignment based multi-model approaches implemented in Mr Bump (based on MR by Molrep [67]) as well as custom-scripts testing models produced by Rosetta [68] (using the Robetta server; http://robetta.bakerlab.org/) and SwissProt [25] (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/uniprot/) servers (based on MR by Phaser [69]). Failure to find a homolog of a sufficiently-close structure led us to attempt de novo phasing of the Cry11 nanocrystalline proteins. Initially, we aimed at obtaining experimental phases for Cry11Ba, considering that its larger crystals would produce a stronger diffraction signal which in turn would facilitate phasing. Hence, we collected derivative data on Cry11Ba, from crystals soaked with Gd, Pt and Au salts (P127 experiment) before injection using a MESH device[61]. Unfortunately, the data did not allow phase determination, as indicated by very weak and absent peaks in the isomorphous and anomalous difference maps, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 2), due to low occupancy of the soaked metal ions. Hence, we shifted

focus to Cry11Aa crystals soaked with a recently introduced caged-terbium compound, Tb-Xo4 [16] (P125 experiment). Crystals were injected using a GDVN [23] liquid microjet in the microfocus chamber of LCLS-SC3 [62]. Online data processing was performed using NanoPeakCell [70] and CASS [71]. Offline data processing with NanoPeakCell [70] (hit finding) and CrystFEL [72] (indexing and merging) revealed a strong anomalous signal that enabled determination of the substructure and phasing of the SFX data, using Crank2 [73] and its dependencies in the CCP4 suite [74] (see below for more details). The Cry11Aa structure was thereafter used to phase the Cry11Ba datasets by molecular replacement, revealing *a posteriori* that the Gd, Pt and Au ions had successfully bound to the crystalline Cry11Ba in the various derivatives collected during P127, despite anomalous and isomorphous signals being too weak to enable phasing. We last attempted data collection on Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba crystals soaked at elevated pH and injected by a MESH device (P141 experiment). Only Cry11Ba crystals could sustain the pH jump and yielded usable data. From the comparative analysis of the Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba structures, we nonetheless designed mutations aimed at increasing or decreasing the resilience of crystals; these were introduced in the Cry11Aa gene, and crystals were produced by recombinant expression in *Bti*. From these, SFX data were collected at the MHz pulse rate, during experiment P2545 at the SPB/SFX beam line of EuXFEL where a GDVN was used to inject crystals. The data were also processed with NanoPeakCell [70] (hit finding) and CrystFEL [72] (indexing and merging).

Data collection and processing, and structure refinement. During the P125 beamtime at LCLS, where the SAD data used for the phasing of the Cry11Aa structure were collected, the X-ray beam was tuned to an energy of 9800 eV (i.e. a wavelength of 1.27 Å), a pulse duration of 50 fs, a repetition rate of 120 Hz, and a focal size of 5 μm. SAD data were collected from nanocrystals soaked for 30 hours with Tb-Xo4 at 10 mM in water, prior to GDVN injection [23]. Of 558747 images collected using the 5 μm beam available at the at LCLS-SCC, a total of 77,373 images were indexed of which 76,687, 292, 217 and 177 using Xgandalf [75], Dirax [76], taketwo [77] and Mosflm [78], respectively, in CrystFEL v.0.8.0 [79]. Post-refinement was not attempted, but images were scaled one to another using the 'unity' model in CrystFEL *partialator,* yielding a derivative dataset extending to 2.55 Å resolution. *A posteriori*, we found that simple Monte Carlo averaging using the 'second-pass' option in CrystFEL *process_hkl* would have yielded data of similar quality. A native dataset was also collected and processed in the same fashion yielding, from 792623 collected patterns of which 48652 were indexed, a dataset extending to 2.60 Å resolution. The substructure of the derivative dataset was easily determined by ShelxD (figure of merit (FOM): 0.22), prompting us to try automatic methods for structure determination. Using Crank2 [73] and its dependencies (ShelxC, ShelxD, Solomon, Bucanneer, Refmac5, Parrot) in CCP4 Online [80], the FOM was 0.52 after density modification,

and rose to 0.88 upon building of 613 residues. This first model was characterized by R_{work}/R_{free}

of 27.7/32.1 % and was further improved by automatic and manual model building in

phenix.autobuild [81] and Coot [82] until 630 residues were correctly build. This model was then

used to phase the native data. Final manual rebuilding (using Coot [82]) and refinement (using

phenix.refine [83] and Refmac5 [53]) afforded a native model characterized by R_{work}/R_{free} of

17.2/24.1 % and consisting of most of the 643 residues. Only the first 12 N-terminal residues

are missing (Table 1).

Cry11Ba data were collected during the cxi04616 and P141 beamtimes at LCLS-CXI. At both

occasions, the photon energy was 9503 eV (i.e., a wavelength of 1.30 Å), a pulse duration of

50 fs, a repetition rate of 120 Hz, and a focal size of 1 μm – *i.e.,* a similar standard configuration

(pulse length, repetition rate) than that used for Cry11Aa, notwithstanding the beam size and

wavelength. Data were collected from crystals at pH 6.5 (30% glycerol in pure water; cxi04616)

and pH 10.4 (30% glycerol in 100 mM CAPS buffer; P141), presented to the X-ray beam using

a MESH injector [22]. Of 813133 images collected for the pH 6.5 dataset, 19708 were indexed

and scaled, post-refined, and merged using cctbx.xfel[63–66] and PRIME[84], yielding a dataset

extending to 2.2 Å resolution. The Cry11Aa structure was used as a starting model to phase

the Cry11Ba pH 6.5 dataset by molecular replacement using Phaser [69] with initial R_{work}/R_{free}

being 34.4/40.4 %. Manual model building (using Coot [82]) and refinement (using Refmac [53]

and Buster [85]) afforded a model characterized by R_{work}/R_{free} of 18.9/23.8 % (Table 1). Because

the 2.55 Å resolution Cry11Ba pH 10.4 data was of limited utility, in view of absence of major

peaks in the Fourier difference map calculated with the pH 6.5 data as a reference, and of a

1% change in the unit cell volume ascribable to the use of a different glycerol concentrations

during injection of the two samples, it was not included in our PDB and CXIDB depositions.

Diffraction data on the Cry11Aa mutants at pH 7.0 was acquired on the SPB/SFX beamline at

EuxFEL during our P002545 beamtime allocation, using a GVDN injector and X-ray energy

and focal size of 9300 eV (1.33 Å) and 1.3 μm (FWHM), respectively. Technical problems

allowed us to collect only a limited number of diffraction pattern of the Cry11Aa-Y349F mutant.

3,150,500; 5,993,679 and 3,523,741 images were collected for the F17Y, Y449F and E583Q

mutant, respectively, of which 28,227; 104,359 and 21,833 could be processed using

CrysFEL0.8.0 [79] and MonteCarlo based scaling and merging. The three structures were solved

using MR with Phaser [69], using the Cry11Aa WT structure as input model. The structures were

refined using Phenix.refine [83] and Coot [82], with final R_{work}/R_{free} values of 21.2/25.1 % for

Cry11Aa-F17Y, 22.4/25.1 % for Cry11Aa-Y449F and 21.5/25.4 % for Cry11Aa-E583Q (Table

2).

Structure analysis. Figures were prepared using pymol v. 2.5[86] (Fig. 1, 2 and Supplementary Fig. 4, 9, 13) and aline (Supplementary Fig. 3) [87]. Radii of gyration were predicted using the pymol script rgyrate (https://pymolwiki.org/index.php/Radius_of_gyration). Interfaces were analyzed with PISA [88] and rmsd among structures were calculated using pymol using the 'super' algorithm. Sequence based alignment – performed using EBI laglign and ClustalW [89] – was challenged by the large gaps between Bti Cry11Aa, Btj Cry11Ba, Btk Cry2AA and Btt Cry3Aa, while structure-based alignment – performed using SSM [90] – was blurred by the varying size of secondary structure elements in the three domains of the various toxins. Hence, for Supplementary Fig. 1, 3, the alignment of Bti Cry11Aa, Cry11Ba, Cry2AA and Cry3Aa was performed using strap [91] which takes into account both sequence and structural information. Specifically, the online version of the program was used (http://www.bioinformatics.org/strap/) [92].

Structure prediction using AlphaFold2 and RosettaFold: RosettaFold [50] predictions were obtained by submitting the sequence to the Rosetta structure-prediction server (https://robetta.bakerlab.org). AlphaFold2 [51] predictions were obtained by use of the Colaboratory service from Google Research (https://colab.research.google.com/github/sokrypton/ColabFold/blob/main/beta/AlphaFold2_advanced.ipynb). The mmseq2 method [93,94] was employed for the multiple-sequence alignement instead of the slower jackhmmer method [95,96] used in [51]. Structural alignments were performed using the *align* tool in PyMOL [86]. Molecular replacements trials were carried out with Phaser [69]. Using the best five RosettaFold models, all characterized by an overall rmsd to the final structure superior to 4 Å, no molecular replacement solution could be found, due to inaccurate prediction of domain II β_{pin} and α_h-β_h regions, resulting in clashes. The best alphafold2 model was yet successful at predicting the domain II structure, which enabled successful phasing by molecular replacement, yielding a model characterized by R_{free} and R_{work} values of 0.322 and 0.292, respectively. This model was further use as a starting model for automatic model building and refinement using the buccaneer pipeline in CCP4, resulting in a model characterized by R_{free} and R_{work} values of 0.245 and 0.215, respectively, after only five automatic cycles of iterative model-building, refinement and density modification using bucaneer [52] and refmac5 [53] in the CCP4 suite [74].

Crystal solubilization assays. The solubility of crystals of Cry11Aa WT and of the mutants F17Y, Y272Q, Y349F, Y449F, D507N-D514N and E583Q was measured at different pH values as previously described [12]. Briefly, crystal suspensions were centrifuged at 11,000 g for 2 min and resuspended in 18 different buffers with pH ranging from 8.6 to 14.2. After 1h incubation in each buffer, crystals were centrifuged and the supernatant was collected. The concentration

of soluble toxin in the supernatant was quantified using a Nanodrop 2000 (Thermo Fisher
Scientist) by measuring the OD at 280 nm and by using the molar extinction coefficient and
toxin size (102,930 M^{-1} cm^{-1} and 72.349 kDa, respectively, as calculated with the ProtParam
tool of ExPASy (https://www.expasy.org) using the Cry11Aa protein sequence available under
accession number "P21256 [https://www.uniprot.org/uniprot/ P21256]"). Solubility was
measured in triplicate for each toxin (Cry11Aa WT and mutants) and each pH. Data are
normalized and represented as percentage of solubilization by dividing the concentration
measured at a given pH by the concentration at the highest pH measured. Solubility of
Cry11Aa WT and its different mutants was compared by calculating SP_{50} (pH leading to
solubilization of 50% of crystals) as previously described [12], by fitting the data using a logistic
regression model for binomial distribution using a script modified from [97]. Differences in SP_{50}
between mutants were considered significant when 95% confidence intervals (CI), calculated
using a Pearson's chi square goodness-of-fit test, did not overlap [98]. All statistics were
conducted using the software R 3.5.2 [99].

For the Cry11Ba, the crystal suspensions were centrifuged at 13,300 g for 3 min and ultrapure
H2O was removed from crystals. They were then resuspended in one of 18 buffers ranging
from pH 7 to 14.   These crystals were incubated for 1 hr, afterwards the solution was
centrifuged at 13,300 g and the supernatant was separated from the crystal pellet.   The
concentration of the supernatant was then quantified by a ThermoFisher Nanodrop One
(Thermo) by measuring the OD for 280 nm and utilizing the molar extinction coefficient and
toxin size (114600 $M^{-1}.cm^{-1}$ and 81344.18 Da respectively) that were calculated with Expasy
ProtParam using the Cry11Ba sequence available at Uniprot.org under accession number
Q45730. Solubility was measured in triplicate for the toxin at each pH measured. This was
then further tested by conducting a turbidity assay by resuspending the crystal pellet in 150 µL
ultrapure H2O and placed in a 96-well plate to be read on an NEPHELOstar Plus (BMG
Labtech) nephelometer. These counts were normalized by subtracting the background signal
and conducted in triplicate.

Proteomic characterization
For SDS-PAGE experiments, samples heated to 95 °C were migrated on 12 % SDS-PAGE
gels (1 h, 140 V) after addition of Laemmle buffer devoid of DTT. After staining by overnight
incubation in Instant*Blue* (Sigma Aldrich, France), gels were washed twice in ultrapure water
and migration results were digitalized using a ChemiDoc XRS+ imaging system controlled by
Image Lab software version 6.0.0 (BioRad, France).

MALDI TOF mass spectrometry

MALDI TOF mass spectra on Cry11Aa were acquired on an Autoflex mass spectrometer
(Bruker Daltonics, Bremen, Germany) operated in linear positive ion mode. External mass
calibration of the instrument, for the *m/z* range of interest, was carried out using as calibrants
the monomeric (66.4 kDa) and dimeric (132.8 kDa) ions of BSA (reference 7030, Sigma
Aldrich). Just before analysis, crystals of Cry11Aa were firstly dissolved in acetonitrile/water
mixture (70:30, *v/v*). For samples under reducing condition, DTT was added at a final
concentration of 10 mM. The obtained solutions were therefore directly mixed in variable ratios
(1:5, 1:10, 1:20, *v/v*) with sinapinic acid matrix (20 mg/mL solution in
water/acetonitrile/trifluoroacetic acid, 70:30:0.1, *v/v/v*, Sigma Aldrich) to obtain the best signal-
to-noise ratio for MALDI mass spectra. 1 to 2 µL of these mixtures were then deposited on the
target and allowed to air dry (at room temperature and pressure). Mass spectra were acquired
in the 10 to 160 kDa *m/z* range and data processed with Flexanalysis software (v.3.0, Bruker
Daltonics).

MALDI TOF mass spectra on Cry11Ba were collected at the USC Mass Spectrometry Core
Facility, Los Angeles, CA, USA. Purified Cry11Ba protein was dissolved in water (~ 5 mg/mL)
and heated at 70 °C for 10 min to facilitate dissolution. One microliter of protein solution was
spotted on a 384 Big Anchor MALDI target and let dry at room temperature. Crystallized protein
was washed on-target twice with MQ water, on top of which 0.5 µL of 2,6
dihydroxyacetophenone (DHAP) solution (30 mg/ml in 50% acetonitrile:0.1% formic acid) was
spotted and let dry at room temperature. Crystallized sample was then analyzed using Bruker
Rapiflex® MALDI-TOF MS equipped with a Smartbeam 3D, 10 kHz, 355 nm Nd:YAG laser.
The laser parameters were optimized as follows: scan range = 26 µm; number of shots per
sample = 1000; laser frequency = 5000 Hz. The mass spectrometer was calibrated for high-
mass range using Protein A and Trypsinogen standards under Linear Mode. Data were
analyzed using FlexAnalysis software and plotted using Graphpad Prism.

In-gel digestion and peptide mass fingerprinting of Cry11Aa using MALDI.
Selected bands were in-gel digested with trypsin as previously described[100]. MALDI mass
spectra of the tryptic peptides were recorded on an Autoflex mass spectrometer (Bruker
Daltonics, Bremen, Germany) in the reflectron positive ion mode. Before analysis samples
were desalted and concentrated on RP-C18 tips (Millipore) and eluted directly with 2 µl of α-
cyano-4-hydroxy cinnamic acid matrix (10 mg/ml in water/acetonitrile/trifluoroacetic acid:
50/50/0.1, *v/v/v*) on the target.

In-gel digestion and peptide mass fingerprinting of Cry11Ba using GeLC-MS/MS.
Gel Liquid Chromatography tandem mass spectrometry mass spectra collected on Cry11Ba
were acquired on a ThermoFisher Q-Exactive Plus (UCLA Molecular Instrumentation Center,

Los Angeles, CA, USA). Before analysis, the Cry11Ba crystals were diluted at a 1:5 dilution

with ultrapure H2O and 4x SDS Loading Buffer Dye. These samples were then boiled for 3

min at 98°C and were loaded on a 4-12% Bis-Tris SDS-PAGE gel. Protein embedded in gel

bands were extracted and digested with 200 ng trypsin at 37°C overnight. The digested

products were extracted from the gel bands in 50% acetonitrile/49.9% H2O/ 0.1%

trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) and desalted with C18 StageTips prior to analysis by tandem mass

spectrometry. Peptides were injected on an EASY-Spray HPLC column (25 cm x 75 µm ID,

PepMap RSLC C18, 2 µm, ThermoScientific). Tandem mass spectra were acquired in a data-

dependent manner with a quadrupole orbitrap mass spectrometer (Q-Exactive Plus Thermo

Fisher Scientific) interfaced to a nanoelectrospray ionization source. The raw MS/MS data

were converted into MGF format by Thermo Proteome Discoverer (VER. 1.4, Thermo

Scientific). The MGF files were then analyzed by a MASCOT sequence database search.

Native mass spectrometry. Crystals of Cry11Aa were centrifuged for 5 minutes at 5000 g

during the buffer wash and washed twice with ammonium acetate buffer (pH adjusted to 6.4

with acetic acid). Pelleted crystals were then dissolved in ammonium acetate buffer (pH

adjusted to 11.5 using ammonium hydroxide). Gold-coated capillary emitters were prepared

as previously described and used to load the protein sample [101]. The sample was analyzed on

a Synapt G1 mass spectrometer (Waters Corporation). The instrument was tuned to preserve

non-covalent interactions. Briefly, the capillary voltage was set to 1.60 kV, the sampling cone

voltage was 20 V, the extraction cone voltage was 5 V, the source temperature was 80 $^{\circ}$C, the

trap transfer collision energy was 10V, and the trap collision energy (CE) was set at 30 V. For

MS/MS characterization, a particular charge state was isolated in the quadrupole and the

complex was dissociated by application of 200V of CE. The data collected were deconvoluted

and analyzed using UniDec [102].

Heat stability and aggregation propensity. The thermal unfolding of Cry11Aa WT and

mutants was measured by following changes as a function of temperature (15 – 95 °C) in

tryptophan fluorescence leading to an increase of the F350/F330 ratio. Scattering was also

monitored to address aggregation propensity of Cry11Aa WT and of the mutants F17Y,

Y272Q, Y349F, Y449F, D507N-D514N and E583Q (Supplementary Fig. 12). All the

measurements were performed on a Prometheus NT.48 (Nanotemper) following

manufacturer's instructions.

Data availability

Structures and structure factor amplitudes have been deposited in the PDB databank under

accession codes 7QX4 (Cry11Aa WT, pH 7.0; 10.2210/pdb7QX4/pdb), 7QX5 (Cry11Aa

Y449F, pH 7.0; 10.2210/pdb7QX5/pdb), 7QX6 (Cry11Aa E583Q, pH 7.0;
10.2210/pdb7QX6/pdb), 7QX7 (Cry11Aa F17Y, pH 7.0; 10.2210/pdb7QX7/pdb), 7QYD
(Cry11Ba WT, pH 6.5; 10.2210/pdb7QYD/pdb), 7R1E (Cry11Ba WT, pH 10.4;
10.2210/pdb7R1E/pdb). Raw image files are deposited in cxi.db accession number 190
(https://www.cxidb.org/id-190.html). The source data for Figure 3 and for Supplementary Figs.
5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 are provided in a combined Source Data file.
1002
1003

References

1. Bravo, A., Likitvivatanavong, S., Gill, S. S. & Soberon, M. Bacillus thuringiensis: A story of a successful bioinsecticide. *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **41**, 423–431 (2011).
2. Vachon, V., Laprade, R. & Schwartz, J. L. Current models of the mode of action of Bacillus thuringiensis insecticidal crystal proteins: a critical review. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **111**, 1–12 (2012).
3. Delecluse, A., Rosso, M. L. & Ragni, A. Cloning and expression of a novel toxin gene from Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. jegathesan encoding a highly mosquitocidal protein. *Appl Env. Microbiol* **61**, 4230–5 (1995).
4. Federici, B. A., Park, H.-W. & Sakano, Y. Insecticidal Protein Crystals of Bacillus thuringiensis. in *Inclusions in Prokaryotes* (ed. Shively, J. M.) 195–236 (Springer, 2006). doi:10.1007/7171_008/Published.
5. Boonserm, P., Mo, M., Angsuthanasombat, C. & Lescar, J. Structure of the functional form of the mosquito larvicidal Cry4Aa toxin from Bacillus thuringiensis at a 2.8-Angstrom resolution. *J. Bacteriol.* **188**, 3391–3401 (2006).
6. Boonserm, P., Davis, P., Ellar, D. J. & Li, J. Crystal structure of the mosquito-larvicidal toxin Cry4Ba and its biological implications. *J. Mol. Biol.* **348**, 363–382 (2005).
7. Cohen, S. *et al.* Cyt1Aa Toxin: Crystal Structure Reveals Implications for Its Membrane-Perforating Function. *J. Mol. Biol.* **413**, 804–814 (2011).
8. Gutierrez, P., Alzate, O. & Orduz, S. A theoretical model of the tridimensional structure of Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. medellin Cry 11Bb toxin deduced by homology modelling. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz* **96**, 357–64 (2001).
9. Chapman, H. N. *et al.* Femtosecond X-ray protein nanocrystallography. *Nature* **470**, 73–77 (2011).
10. Schlichting, I. Serial femtosecond crystallography: the first five years. *IUCrJ* **2**, 246–255 (2015).
11. Boutet, S., Fromme, P. & Hunter, M. S. *X-ray Free Electron Lasers - A Revolution in Structural Biology*. vol. 1 (Springer International Publishing, 2018).
12. Tetreau, G. *et al.* Serial femtosecond crystallography on in vivo-grown crystals drives elucidation of mosquitocidal Cyt1Aa bioactivation cascade. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1153 (2020).
13. Li, J. D., Carroll, J. & Ellar, D. J. Crystal structure of insecticidal delta-endotoxin from Bacillus thuringiensis at 2.5 A resolution. *Nature* **353**, 815–821 (1991).
14. Morse, R. J., Yamamoto, T. & Stroud, R. M. Structure of Cry2Aa Suggests an Unexpected Receptor Binding Epitope. *Structure* **9**, 409–417 (2001).
15. Grochulski, P. *et al.* Bacillus thuringiensis CryIA(a) Insecticidal Toxin: Crystal Structure and Channel Formation. *J. Mol. Biol.* **254**, 447–464 (1995).
16. Engilberge, S. *et al.* Crystallophore: a versatile lanthanide complex for protein crystallography combining nucleating effects, phasing properties, and luminescence. *Chem. Sci.* **8**, 5909–5917 (2017).
17. Engilberge, S. *et al.* Protein crystal structure determination with the crystallophore, a nucleating and phasing agent. *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **52**, 722–731 (2019).
18. Xu, C., Wang, B. C., Yu, Z. & Sun, M. Structural insights into Bacillus thuringiensis Cry, Cyt and parasporin toxins. *Toxins* **6**, 2732–70 (2014).
19. Promponas, V. J. *et al.* CAST: an iterative algorithm for the complexity analysis of sequence tracts. *Bioinformatics* **16**, 915–922 (2000).
20. Wootton, J. C. & Federhen, S. Statistics of local complexity in amino acid sequences and sequence databases. *Comput. Chem.* **17**, 149–163 (1993).
21. Liang, M. *et al.* The Coherent X-ray Imaging instrument at the Linac Coherent Light Source. *J. Synchrotron Radiat.* **22**, 514–519 (2015).
22. Sierra, R. G. *et al.* Concentric-flow electrokinetic injector enables serial crystallography of ribosome and photosystem II. *Nat. Methods* **13**, 59–62 (2016).
23. DePonte, D. P. *et al.* Gas dynamic virtual nozzle for generation of microscopic droplet streams. *J. Phys. -Appl. Phys.* **41**, 7 (2008).
24. Leaver-Fay, A. *et al.* Rosetta3: An Object-Oriented Software Suite for the Simulation

and Design of Macromolecules. *Methods Enzymol.* **487**, 545–574 (2011).

25.   Bairoch, A. & Apweiler, R. The SWISS-PROT protein sequence data bank and its
supplement TrEMBL in 1999. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **27**, 49–54 (1999).

26.   Pardo-Lopez, L., Soberon, M. & Bravo, A. Bacillus thuringiensis insecticidal three-
domain Cry toxins: mode of action, insect resistance and consequences for crop protection.
FEMS Microbiol. Rev. **37**, 3–22 (2013).

27.   Krissinel, E., Uski, V., Lebedev, A., Winn, M. & Ballard, C. Distributed computing for
macromolecular crystallography. *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. Struct. Biol.* **74**, 143–151 (2018).

28.   Colletier, J.-P. *et al.* De novo phasing with X-ray laser reveals mosquito larvicide
BinAB structure. *Nature* **539**, 43–47 (2016).

29.   Oestergaard, J., Ehlers, R. U., Martinez-Ramirez, A. C. & Real, M. D. Binding of
Cyt1Aa and Cry11Aa toxins of Bacillus thuringiensis serovar israelensis to brush border
membrane vesicles of Tipula paludosa (Diptera : Nematocera) and subsequent pore
formation. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **73**, 3623–3629 (2007).

30.   Yamagiwa, M., Sakagawa, K. & Sakai, H. Functional Analysis of Two Processed
Fragments of Bacillus thuringiensis Cry11A Toxin. *Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem.* **68**, 523–528
(2014).

31.   Munoz-Garay, C. *et al.* Oligomerization of Cry11Aa from Bacillus thuringiensis Has an
Important Role in Toxicity against Aedes aegypti. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **75**, 7548–7550
(2009).

32.   Fernandez, L. E. *et al.* Cry11Aa toxin from Bacillus thuringiensis binds its receptor in
Aedes aegypti mosquito larvae through loop alpha-8 of domain II. *Febs Lett.* **579**, 3508–3514
(2005).

33.   Carmona, D. *et al.* Dominant Negative Phenotype of Bacillus thuringiensis Cry1Ab,
Cry11Aa and Cry4Ba Mutants Suggest Hetero-Oligomer Formation among Different Cry
Toxins. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e19952 (2011).

34.   Du, J. P., Knowles, B. H., Li, J. & Ellar, D. J. Biochemical characterization of Bacillus
thuringiensis cytolytic toxins in association with a phospholipid bilayer. *Biochem. J.* **338**, 185–
193 (1999).

35.   Ntountoumi, C. *et al.* Low complexity regions in the proteins of prokaryotes perform
important functional roles and are highly conserved. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, 9998–10009
(2019).

36.   Henrich, B. *et al.* The adaptive gain integrating pixel detector AGIPD a detector for
the European XFEL. *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. Sect. Accel. Spectrometers Detect.*
Assoc. Equip. **633**, S11–S14 (2011).

37.   Likitvivatanavong, S. *et al.* Multiple Receptors as Targets of Cry Toxins in
Mosquitoes. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **59**, 2829–2838 (2011).

38.   Fernandez, L. E., Aimanova, K. G., Gill, S. S., Bravo, A. & Soberon, M. A GPI-
anchored alkaline phosphatase is a functional midgut receptor of Cry11Aa toxin in Aedes
aegypti larvae. *Biochem. J.* **394**, 77–84 (2006).

39.   Bourgouin, C., Delecluse, A. & Rapoport, G. Specificity and Synergism of Bacillus
thuringiensis israelensis Toxins on Mosquito Larvae. in *Bacterial Protein Toxins* (ed.
Fehrenbach) 225–226 (Gustav Fisher, 1988).

40.   Lopez-Diaz, J. A., Emiliano Canton, P., Gill, S. S., Soberon, M. & Bravo, A.
Oligomerization is a key step in Cyt1Aa membrane insertion and toxicity but not necessary to
synergize Cry11Aa toxicity in Aedes aegypti larvae. *Environ. Microbiol.* **15**, 3030–3039
(2013).

41.   Pérez, C. *et al.* Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. israelensis Cyt1Aa synergizes Cry11Aa
toxin by functioning as a membrane-bound receptor. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **102**,
18303–18308 (2005).

42.   Sawaya, M. R. *et al.* Protein crystal structure obtained at 2.9 Å resolution from
injecting bacterial cells into an X-ray free-electron laser beam. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **111**,
12769–12774 (2014).

43.   Galitsky, N. *et al.* Structure of the insecticidal bacterial delta-endotoxin Cry3Bb1 of
Bacillus thuringiensis. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **57**, 1101–1109 (2001).

44.   Adalat, R., Saleem, F., Crickmore, N., Naz, S. & Shakoori, A. R. In Vivo
Crystallization of Three-Domain Cry Toxins. *Toxins Basel* **9**, (2017).
45.   Hughes, M. P. *et al.* Atomic structures of low-complexity protein segments reveal
kinked β sheets that assemble networks. *Science* **359**, 698–701 (2018).
46.   Salinas, N., Colletier, J. P., Moshe, A. & Landau, M. Extreme amyloid polymorphism
in Staphylococcus aureus virulent PSMα peptides. *Nat Commun* **9**, 3512 (2018).
47.   Sun, Y. *et al.* Construction and characterization of the interdomain chimeras using
Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba from Bacillus thuringiensis and identification of a possible novel toxic
chimera. *Biotechnol. Lett.* **36**, 105–111 (2013).
48.   Fernandez, L. E. *et al.* Cry11Aa toxin from Bacillus thuringiensis binds its receptor in
Aedes aegypti mosquito larvae through loop alpha-8 of domain II. *Febs Lett.* **579**, 3508–3514
(2005).
49.   Schonherr, R., Rudolph, J. M. & Redecke, L. Protein crystallization in living cells. *Biol*
Chem **399**, 751–772 (2018).
50.   Baek, M. *et al.* Accurate prediction of protein structures and interactions using a
three-track neural network. *Science* **373**, 871–876 (2021).
51.   Jumper, J. *et al.* Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature*
596, 583–589 (2021).
52.   Cowtan, K. Completion of autobuilt protein models using a database of protein
fragments. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **68**, 328–335 (2012).
53.   Murshudov, G. N. *et al.* REFMAC5 for the refinement of macromolecular crystal
structures. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **67**, 355–367 (2011).
54.   Banneville, A.-S. *et al.* Structural and functional characterization of DdrC, a novel
DNA damage-induced nucleoid associated protein involved in DNA compaction | bioRxiv.
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.10.27.466113v1?rss=1.
55.   Park, H. W., Delecluse, A. & Federici, B. A. Construction and characterization of a
recombinant Bacillus thuringiensis subsp israelensis strain that produces Cry11B. *J.*
Invertebr. Pathol. **78**, 37–44 (2001).
56.   Wu, D. & Federici, B. A. Improved production of the insecticidal CryIVD protein in
Bacillus-thuringiensis using CryLA(c) promoters to express the gene for an associated 20-
KDa protein. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **42**, 697–702 (1995).
57.   Kirmitzoglou, I. & Promponas, V. J. LCR-eXXXplorer: a web platform to search,
visualize and share data for low complexity regions in protein sequences. *Bioinformatics* **31**,
2208–2210 (2015).
58.   Girish, V. & Vijayalakshmi, A. Affordable image analysis using NIH Image/ImageJ.
Indian J Cancer **41**, 47 (2004).
59.   Nečas, D. & Klapetek, P. Gwyddion: an open-source software for SPM data analysis.
Cent. Eur. J. Phys. **10**, 181–188 (2012).
60.   Chen, S. W. & Pellequer, J.-L. DeStripe: frequency-based algorithm for removing
stripe noises from AFM images. *BMC Struct. Biol.* **11**, 7 (2011).
61.   Sierra, R. G. *et al.* Concentric-flow electrokinetic injector enables serial
crystallography of ribosome and photosystem II. *Nat. Methods* **13**, 59–62 (2016).
62.   Liang, M. *et al.* The Coherent X-ray Imaging instrument at the Linac Coherent Light
Source. *J. Synchrotron Radiat.* **22**, 514–519 (2015).
63.   Waterman, D. G. *et al.* Diffraction-geometry refinement in the DIALS framework. *Acta*
Crystallogr. Sect. Struct. Biol. **72**, 558–575 (2016).
64.   Sauter, N. K., Hattne, J., Grosse-Kunstleve, R. W. & Echols, N. New Python-based
methods for data processing. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **69**, 1274–1282 (2013).
65.   Hattne, J. *et al.* Accurate macromolecular structures using minimal measurements
from X-ray free-electron lasers. *Nat. Methods* **11**, 545–548 (2014).
66.   Winter, G. *et al.* DIALS: implementation and evaluation of a new integration package.
Acta Crystallogr. Sect. Struct. Biol. **74**, 85–97 (2018).
67.   Vagin, A. & Teplyakov, A. MOLREP: an Automated Program for Molecular
Replacement. *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **30**, 1022–1025 (1997).
68.   Leaver-Fay, A. *et al.* ROSETTA3: an object-oriented software suite for the simulation

and design of macromolecules. *Methods Enzymol.* **487**, 545–574 (2011).

69. McCoy, A. J. *et al.* Phaser crystallographic software. *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **40**, 658–674
(2007).

70. Coquelle, N. *et al.* Raster-scanning serial protein crystallography using micro- and
nano-focused synchrotron beams. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **71**, 1184–1196
(2015).

71. Foucar, L. *et al.* CASS—CFEL-ASG software suite. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183**,
2207–2213 (2012).

72. White, T. A. *et al.* Crystallographic data processing for free-electron laser sources.
Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr. **69**, 1231–1240 (2013).

73. Skubák, P. & Pannu, N. S. Automatic protein structure solution from weak X-ray data.
Nat. Commun. **4**, 1–6 (2013).

74. Winn, M. D. *et al.* Overview of the CCP4 suite and current developments. *Acta*
Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr. **67**, 235–242 (2011).

75. Gevorkov, Y. *et al.* XGANDALF - extended gradient descent algorithm for lattice
finding. *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. Found. Adv.* **75**, 694–704 (2019).

76. Duisenberg, A. J. M. Indexing in single-crystal diffractometry with an obstinate list of
reflections. *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **25**, 92–96 (1992).

77. Ginn, H. M. *et al.* ıt TakeTwo: an indexing algorithm suited to still images with known
crystal parameters. *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. D* **72**, 956–965 (2016).

78. Leslie, A. G. W. The integration of macromolecular diffraction data. *Acta Crystallogr.*
D Biol. Crystallogr. **62**, 48–57 (2006).

79. White, T. A. *et al.* ıt CrystFEL: a software suite for snapshot serial crystallography. *J.*
Appl. Crystallogr. **45**, 335–341 (2012).

80. Krissinel, E., Uski, V., Lebedev, A., Winn, M. & Ballard, C. Distributed computing for
macromolecular crystallography. *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. Struct. Biol.* **74**, 143–151 (2018).

81. Terwilliger, T. C. *et al.* Iterative model building, structure refinement and density
modification with the PHENIX AutoBuild wizard. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **64**, 61–
69 (2008).

82. Emsley, P. & Cowtan, K. Coot: model-building tools for molecular graphics. *Acta*
Crystallogr Biol Crystallogr **60**, 2126–32 (2004).

83. Afonine, P. V. *et al.* Towards automated crystallographic structure refinement with
phenix.refine. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **68**, 352–367 (2012).

84. Uervirojnangkoorn, M. *et al.* Enabling X-ray free electron laser crystallography for
challenging biological systems from a limited number of crystals. *eLife* **4**, (2015).

85. Blanc, E. *et al.* Refinement of severely incomplete structures with maximum likelihood
in BUSTER-TNT. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **60**, 2210–2221 (2004).

86. *The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System*. (Schrödinger, LLC.).

87. Bond, C. S. & Schüttelkopf, A. W. ALINE: a WYSIWYG protein-sequence alignment
editor for publication-quality alignments. *Acta Crystallogr Biol Crystallogr* **65**, 510–2 (2009).

88. Krissinel, E. & Henrick, K. Inference of macromolecular assemblies from crystalline
state. *J. Mol. Biol.* **372**, 774–797 (2007).

89. Madeira, F. *et al.* The EMBL-EBI search and sequence analysis tools APIs in 2019.
Nucleic Acids Res. **47**, W636–W641 (2019).

90. Krissinel, E. & Henrick, K. Secondary-structure matching (SSM), a new tool for fast
protein structure alignment in three dimensions. *Acta Crystallogr Biol Crystallogr* **60**, 2256–
68 (2004).

91. Gille, C. & Frömmel, C. STRAP: editor for STRuctural Alignments of Proteins.
Bioinformatics **17**, 377–8 (2001).

92. Gille, C., Fähling, M., Weyand, B., Wieland, T. & Gille, A. Alignment-Annotator web
server: rendering and annotating sequence alignments. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **42**, W3–W6
(2014).

93. Mirdita, M., Steinegger, M., Breitwieser, F., Söding, J. & Levy Karin, E. Fast and
sensitive taxonomic assignment to metagenomic contigs. *Bioinformatics* **37**, 3029–3031
(2021).

94.   Steinegger, M. & Söding, J. MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching
for the analysis of massive data sets. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **35**, 1026–1028 (2017).
95.   Prakash, A., Jeffryes, M., Bateman, A. & Finn, R. D. The HMMER Web Server for
Protein Sequence Similarity Search. *Curr. Protoc. Bioinforma.* **60**, 3.15.1-3.15.23 (2017).
96.   Potter, S. C. *et al.* HMMER web server: 2018 update. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **46**, W200–
W204 (2018).
97.   Savi, M. K., Mangamana, E. T., Deguenon, J. M., Hounmenou, C. G. & Kakaï, R. G.
Determination of Lethal Concentrations Using an R Software Function Integrating the Abbott
Correction. *J. Agric. Sci. Technol. A* **7**, (2017).
98.   Wheeler, M. W., Park, R. M. & Bailer, A. J. Comparing median lethal concentration
values using confidence interval overlap or ratio tests. *Env. Toxicol Chem* **25**, 1441–4 (2006).
99.   R. *R: a language and environment for statistical computing.* (R Foundation for
Statistical Computing, 2011).
100.   Rosenfeld, J., Capdevielle, J., Guillemot, J. C. & Ferrara, P. In-gel digestion of
proteins for internal sequence analysis after one- or two-dimensional gel electrophoresis.
Anal. Biochem. **203**, 173–179 (1992).
101.   Laganowsky, A., Reading, E., Hopper, J. T. S. & Robinson, C. V. Mass spectrometry
of intact membrane protein complexes. *Nat. Protoc.* **8**, 639–651 (2013).
102.   Marty, M. T. *et al.* Bayesian Deconvolution of Mass and Ion Mobility Spectra: From
Binary Interactions to Polydisperse Ensembles. *Anal. Chem.* **87**, 4370–4376 (2015).
1243

Acknowledgements. We thank Aline LeRoy for help during experiments with the Nanotemper
apparatus and Dr. Guy Schoehn for his support. IBS acknowledges integration into the
Interdisciplinary Research Institute of Grenoble (IRIG, CEA). We thank the LCLS for beamtime
allocation under proposals cxi0416, L091, P127, P125 and P141, and the EuXFEL for
beamtime allocation under proposals P2156 and P2545. This work was supported by the
Agence Nationale de la Recherche (grants ANR-17-CE11-0018-01 and ANR-2018-CE11-
0005-02 to J.-P.C.), the CNRS (PEPS SASLELX grant to MW) and used the atomic force
microscopy (AFM) platform at the IBS and the electron microscopy (EM) platform of the
Grenoble Instruct-ERIC center (ISBG; UMS 3518 CNRS-CEA-UGA-EMBL) within the
Grenoble Partnership for Structural Biology (PSB). Platform access was supported by FRISBI
(ANR-10-INBS-05-02) and GRAL, a project of the University Grenoble Alpes graduate school
(Ecoles Universitaires de Recherche) CBH-EUR-GS (ANR-17-EURE-0003). The EM facility is
supported by the Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes Region, the Fondation Recherche Medicale (FRM),
the fonds FEDER and the GIS-Infrastructures en Biologie Sante et Agronomie (IBiSA). Use of
the LCLS at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) National Laboratory, is supported
by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, and Office of Basic Energy Sciences under
contract no. DE-AC02-76SF00515. The CXI instrument was funded by the Linac Coherent
Light Source Ultrafast Science Instruments project, itself funded by the DOE Office of Basic
Energy Sciences. Parts of the sample injector used at LCLS for this research were funded by
the National Institute of Health, P41GM103393, formerly P41RR001209. This research was
also supported by NIH grant GM117126. Data processing was supported by National Institutes
of Health grant GM117126 to N.K.S. N.A.S.'s contributions reported in this publication were
supported by the Ruth L. Kirschstein National Research Service Award of the National
Institutes of Health under award number GM007185.

1268

1269

1270 Author contributions

G.T., A.-S.B, D.B., E.L., L.D., H.-W.P., B.F. designed and constructed and transformed WT
and mutants plasmids; G.T., E.A.A., A.-S.B, N.A.S., D.B., N.Z., H.-W.P. and B.F. produced
crystals *in vivo*; L.S., E.J.C. and M.A.B. performed MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry
experiments; P.Q. and A.L. performed native MS/MS mass spectrometry experiments; G.T.,
E.A.A. and N.A.S. performed solubilization assays; E.A.A. performed heat stability assays;
N.A.S., M. B., W.L.L. and I.G. conducted transmission electron microscopy imaging; G.T.,
E.A.A., A.-S.B, N.A.S., R.S. and I.S. performed crystal visualization by SEM; G.T., J.-M.T.,
D.F. and J.-L.P. performed crystal visualization and size measurements by AFM; G.T. and J.-
L.P. performed the statistical analysis of solubilization data and G.T. and J.-L.P. performed the
statistical analyses of AFM data; A.-S.B., M.B., M.W. and J.-P.C secured beamtime at the

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Tables

Table 1. Data collection and refinement statistics Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba.

Table 2. Data collection and refinement statistics of the Cry11Aa mutants.

 Figures captions :

 Fig. 1. Crystals and overall fold of Cry11 toxins. a-b, scanning (left; SEM) and transmission
 (middle, right; TEM) electron micrographs of gold plated and negatively-stained Cry11Aa (**a**)
 and Cry11Ba (**b**) crystals, respectively. The right panels show a close-up view of the crystal
 surface. **c,** Cry11Aa crystal structure, depicted as a cartoon. Domain I is shown in blue; domain
 II is shown in orange except for the $\alpha_h\beta_h$-handle and βpin which are shown in purple and red,
 respectively; domain III is shown in pink. **d**, Topology diagram of a Cry11Aa dimer. Domain I
 is shown in green, except for central helix α5, which is shown in blue: domain II is shown in
 magenta, except for the $\alpha_h\beta_h$-handle, which is shown in purple; and domain III is shown in
 cyan, respectively. The two monomers in a dimer assemble via the β_{pin}, resulting in the
 formation of a large β-sheet.

 Fig. 2. Monomer interactions in Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba. a, Cry11Aa crystal packing,
 coloured according to sequence (from blue to red) indicating the domain-based assembly; and
 coloured according to tetramer assembly (see panel (**b**)). The highlighted areas indicate the
 regions shown in (**b**) (full line) and (**c**) (dashed line). **b,** Cry11Aa tetramer with zoom on each
 of the three interfaces identified by PISA (interface #1, #3 and #6), with the involved residues
 depicted as spheres. For interfaces with hydrogen and/or salt bridges (see g), an additional
 (right) image shows only those residues that make up these interactions. **c,** Cry11Aa crystal
 assembly by interactions between neighbouring tetramers, formed by interface #2, #4 and #5,
 visualized as in b. **d,** Cry11Ba crystal packing, coloured as in (**a**). **e,** Cry11Ba tetramer with
 zoom on the interfaces as in (**b**). **f,** Cry11Ba crystal assembly, visualized as in (**c**). As
 compared to Cry11Aa, Cry11Ba crystals contain an additional interface #7 between an A-B
 pair from two neighbouring tetramers. **g,** interface statistics as identified by PISA for Cry11Aa
 (blue) and Cry11Ba (red).

 Fig. 3. Point-mutations of Cry11Aa affect the shape, size and pH-sensitivity of *in vivo*-
 grown nanocrystals. a, Crystals from mutants exhibit similar sigmoidal patterns of crystal
 solubilization as a function of pH, except F17Y and E583Q that are more and less sensitive to
 pH, respectively. Error bars indicate the standard error of the measurements. **b,** Cry11Aa WT
 and mutants exhibit similar heat stability. As expected, toxins are more stable (+ 17.5 ± 0.3°C)
 in their crystalline than soluble form, irrespective of the mutation. **c,** Visualization of a
 representative crystal for Cry11Aa WT (black) and mutants F17Y (red), Y272Q (brown), Y349F
 (purple), Y449F (blue), D507N-D514N (orange) and E583Q (green) by SEM (scale bar = 500
 nm). **d,** Crystals of Y449F, F17Y and E583Q imaged by AFM were all smaller in length (L),
 width (W), thickness (T) and volume than WT highlighting a perturbation of the intrinsic crystal

1346 organization induced by these mutations. In each graph, the boxes represent the lower and
1347 upper quartiles around the median. The whiskers indicate the minimum and maximum values.
1348

Figures

Fig. 1. Crystals and overall fold of Cry11 toxins. a-b, scanning (left; SEM) and transmission (middle, right; TEM) electron micrographs of gold plated and negatively-stained Cry11Aa (**a**) and Cry11Ba (**b**) crystals, respectively. The right panels show a close-up view of the crystal surface. **c,** Cry11Aa crystal structure, depicted as a cartoon. Domain I is shown in blue; domain II is shown in orange except for the αhβh-handle and βpin which are shown in purple and red, respectively; domain III is shown in pink. **d**, Topology diagram of a Cry11Aa dimer. Domain I is shown in blue, except for central helix α5, which is shown in dark-blue: domain II is shown in orange, except for the βpin and αhβh-handle, which are shown in red and purple, respectively; and domain III is shown in pink. The two monomers in a dimer assemble via the βpin, resulting in the formation of a large β-sheet.

Fig. 2. Monomer interactions in Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba. a, Cry11Aa crystal packing, coloured according to sequence (from blue to red) indicating the domain-based assembly; and coloured according to tetramer assembly (see panel (**b**)). The highlighted areas indicate the regions shown in (**b**) (full line) and (**c**) (dashed line). **b,** Cry11Aa tetramer with zoom on each of the three interfaces identified by PISA (interface #1, #3 and #6), with the involved residues depicted as spheres. For interfaces with hydrogen and/or salt bridges (see g), an additional (right) image shows only those residues that make up these interactions. **c,** Cry11Aa crystal assembly by interactions between neighbouring tetramers, formed by interface #2, #4 and #5, visualized as in b. **d,** Cry11Ba crystal packing, coloured as in (**a**). **e,** Cry11Ba tetramer with zoom on the interfaces as in (**b**). **f,** Cry11Ba crystal assembly, visualized as in (**c**). As compared to Cry11Aa, Cry11Ba crystals contain an additional interface #7 between an A-B pair from two neighbouring tetramers. **g,** interface statistics as identified by PISA for Cry11Aa (blue) and Cry11Ba (red).

Fig. 3. Point-mutations of Cry11Aa affect the shape, size and pH-sensitivity of *in vivo*-grown nanocrystals. a, Crystals from mutants exhibit similar sigmoidal patterns of crystal solubilization as a function of pH, except F17Y and E583Q that are more and less sensitive to pH, respectively. Error bars indicate the standard error of the measurements. **b,** Cry11Aa WT and mutants exhibit similar heat stability. As expected, toxins are more stable (+ 17.5 ± 0.3°C) in their crystalline than soluble form, irrespective of the mutation. **c,** Visualization of a representative crystal for Cry11Aa WT (black) and mutants F17Y (red), Y272Q (brown), Y349F (purple), Y449F (blue), D507N-D514N (orange) and E583Q (green) by SEM (scale bar = 500 nm). **d,** Crystals of Y449F, F17Y and E583Q imaged by AFM were all smaller in length (L), width (W), thickness (T) and volume than WT highlighting a perturbation of the intrinsic crystal organization induced by these mutations. In each graph, the boxes represent the lower and upper quartiles around the median. The whiskers indicate the minimum and maximum values.

1358   **Tables**

Table 1. Data collection and refinement statistics Cry11Aa and Cry11Ba.

	Cry11Aa pH 7	Cry11Aa-TBXO4 pH7	Cry11Ba pH 6.5	Cry11Ba pH 10.4
PDB ID	7QX4		7QYD	7R1E
Data collection				
Space group	$I\,2\,2\,2$	$I\,2\,2\,2$	$P\,2_1\,2_1\,2$	$P\,2_1\,2_1\,2$
Cell dimensions (Å)	57.64 ± 0.19 155.69 ± 0.80 171.14 ± 0.54	57.64 ± 0.15 156.29 ± 0.73 170.75 ± 0.40	168.18 ± 0.19 158.45 ± 0.26 57.51 ± 0.08	167.50 ± 0.29 157.99 ±0.47 57.43 ±0.14
Wavelength (Å)	1.27	1.27	1.30	1.30
X-ray beam focus (µm)	5	5	1	1
No. collected frames	792623	558747	813133	990643
No. indexed frames	48652	77373	19708	15689
No. merged crystals	50613	88511	19708	15689
Resolution range (Å)	33.55 – 2.60 (2.66 – 2.60)	33.51 – 2.55 (2.61 – 2.55)	44.73 – 2.20 (2.24 – 2.20)	35.72 – 2.55 (2.59 – 2.55)
No. observations	8253629 (365007)	14069217 (640046)	3996555 (31710)	3747530 (52399)
No. unique reflections	24198 (1583)	48634 (3297)	78897 (3815)	50646 (2488)
$<I/\sigma\,(I)>$	9.50 (1.16)	11.23 (1.62)	3.87 (0.50)	3.65 (0.84)
R_{split} (%)	10.73 (95.40)	7.97 (70.58)	18.0 (111.8)	24.50 (97.10)
$CC_{1/2}$	1.00 (0.38)	1.00 (0.68)	0. 99 (0. 12)	0.984 (0.082)
Completeness (%)	99.9 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	97.9 (80.9)	99.4 (100.0)
Multiplicity	341.09 (230.58)	289.29 (194.13)	50.66 (8.3)	71.34 (21.01)
Anomalous data				
Completeness (%)		100.0 (100.0)		
CCano		0.26 (0.00)		
CRDano		1.35 (1.01)		
Refinement				
Resolution range (Å)	33.55 – 2.60		44.77 – 2.20	35.72 – 2.55
No. reflections	24196		70858	50657
R_{work}/R_{free}*	17.2 / 24.1		18.9 / 23.8	23.8 / 19.2
No. atoms				
Protein	5080		10083	9961
Water	261		623	98
B-factors (Å^2)				
Main chain	50.47		41.82 / 41.06§	41.02 / 42.58
Side chain	51.44		46.11 / 45.55	43.26 / 44.59
Water	46.17		41.36	40.04
R.m.s.d.				
Bonds lengths (Å)	0.004		0.008	0.009
Bonds angles (º)	0.633		1.324	1.590

* R_{free} is calculated using 5 and 10% % of random reflections excluded from refinement.

§ Average B-factor for chain A / chain B

1359

Table 2. Data collection and refinement statistics of the Cry11Aa mutants.

	Cry11Aa-F17Y pH 7	Cry11Aa-Y449F pH 7	Cry11Aa-E583Q pH 7
PDB ID	7QX7	7QX5	7QX6
Data collection			
Space group	*I 2 2 2*	*I 2 2 2*	*I 2 2 2*
Cell dimensions (Å)	57.72 ± 0.35 155.39 ± 1.49 171.66 ± 0.64	57.73 ± 0.24 155.55 ± 1.21 171.52 ± 0.57	57.76 ± 0.24 155.51 ± 0.98 171.51 ± 0.58
Wavelength (Å)	1.33	1.33	1.33
X-ray beam focus (µm)	1.3	1.3	1.3
No. collected frames	3150500	5993679	3523741
No. indexed frames	28227	104359	21833
No. merged crystals	28811	111014	22760
Resolution range (Å)	23.17 – 3.40 (3.40 – 3.48)	23.78 – 3.10 (3.10 – 3.17)	23.50 – 3.30 (3.30 – 3.38)
No. observations	2908715 (141787)	20279640 (1092683)	3210163 (154933)
No. unique reflections	10990 (707)	14447 (950)	12014 (787)
$<I/\sigma (I)>$	6.31 (1.67)	9.95 (1.35)	5.64 (1.52)
R_{split} (%)	19.74 (76.86)	11.79 (89.56)	21.11 (80.18)
$CC_{1/2}$	0.96 (0.21)	1.00 (0.60)	0.99 (0.31)
Completeness (%)	99.6 (100.0)	99.7 (100.0)	99.6 (100.0)
Multiplicity	265.7 (200.5)	1403.7 (1150.2)	267.2 (196.8)
Refinement			
Resolution range (Å)	23.17 – 3.40	23.18 – 3.10	23.08 – 3.30
No. reflections	10986	14442	12008
R_{work}/R_{free}*	21.2 / 25.1	22.4 / 25.2	21.5 / 25.4
No. atoms			
Protein	4970	4965	4970
Water	5	13	6
B-factors (Å^2)			
Main chain	54.6	43.1	45.4
Side chain	54.2	42.7	45.3
Water	52.9	59.3	36.0
R.m.s.d.			
Bonds lengths (Å)	0.002	0.002	0.003
Bonds angles (°)	0.448	0.441	0.489

* R_{free} is calculated using 5% of random reflections excluded from refinement.