Evolution of a *cis*-acting SNP that controls Type VI Secretion in *Vibrio cholerae*

Siu Lung Ng[1,3,4], Sophia Kammann[1,3,4], Gabi Steinbach[2,4], Tobias Hoffmann[5], Peter J Yunker[2,4],

Brian K. Hammer[1,3,4#]

[1] School of Biological Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

[2]School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

[3]Parker H. Petit Institute for Bioengineering & Bioscience, Georgia Institute of Technology,

Atlanta, Georgia, USA

[4]Center for Microbial Diseases and Infection, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta,

Georgia, USA

[5]Biology Department, Spelman College, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

#Corresponding author: brian.hammer@biology.gatech.edu

Abstract:

Mutations in regulatory mechanisms that control gene expression contribute to phenotypic

diversity and thus facilitate the adaptation of microbes to new niches. Regulatory architecture

is often inferred from transcription factor identification and genome analysis using purely

computational approaches. However, there are few examples of phenotypic divergence that

arise from the rewiring of bacterial regulatory circuitry by mutations in intergenic regions,

because locating regulatory elements within regions of DNA that do not code for protein

requires genomic and experimental data. We identify a single *cis*-acting single nucleotide

polymorphism (SNP) dramatically alters control of the type VI secretion system (T6), a

common weapon for inter-bacterial competition. Tight T6 regulatory control is necessary for

adaptation of the waterborne pathogen *Vibrio cholerae* to *in vivo* conditions within the human

gut, which we show can be altered by this single non-coding SNP that results in constitutive

expression *in vitro*. Our results support a model of pathogen evolution through *cis*-regulatory

mutation and preexisting, active transcription factors, thus conferring different fitness

advantages to tightly regulated strains inside a human host and unfettered strains adapted to

environmental niches.

Introduction

A central role in the dynamic, temporal control of gene expression is played by transcription

factors (TFs), diffusible "*trans*" products that bind to molecular switches within DNA

sequences termed "*cis*"-regulatory elements (CREs). In eukaryotes, which lack horizontal gene

transfer (HGT), mutations in CREs that alter TF binding motifs are major contributors to

phenotypic diversity ([1-3](#)). In bacteria, where pervasive HGT of TFs can alter entire regulatory

circuits, CRE mutations receive little attention as drivers of phenotypic divergence ([4](#)). Thus,

elucidation of how microbes adapt to new niches, a process of fundamental importance in

bacterial pathogenesis, requires coupling of genome-wide computational methods with

experimental approaches to map the *cis* and *trans* regulatory interactions across and within

species.

To understand how mutations play a role in microbial adaptation, pathogenic viruses and

bacteria with lifestyles that exploit niches within and outside a human host are of great

interest. Following ingestion, pandemic strains of the bacterium *Vibrio cholerae* can colonize

the human gastrointestinal tract and secrete the cholera toxin that leads to the often fatal

diarrhea responsible for seven pandemics to date (5-7). Conversely, *V. cholerae* isolated from

non-human niches lack the horizontally-acquired prophage that carries the cholera toxin, and

cause mild illness (8). By contrast, all sequenced *V. cholerae* encode a Type VI Secretion System

(T6), a broadly distributed "nano-harpoon" weapon that injects into neighboring bacterial

cells toxic effector proteins that damage the cell envelope and cause lysis (9, 10). Due to its

broad distribution among bacteria including those of the human gut, there is intense interest

in understanding the T6 interactions between our microbiota and foreign pathogens, and

whether they can be manipulated to influence health (11).

V. cholerae obtained from humans carry a limited T6 arsenal of effectors believed to be

tailored for *in vivo* success (9, 12-16), strains from non-human niches encode a more diverse

effector repertoire (9, 12, 17, 18). To date, however, adaptative evolution mechanisms of T6

regulation in *V. cholerae* derived from non-human sources have largely been overlooked.

Studies of human-derived strains identify two primary TFs for T6 activation ([19-23](#)). T6 control

in pandemic strains (e.g. C6706) requires QstR (Quorum-Sensing and TfoX-Dependent

Regulator), which integrates multiple external cues ([24-27](#)), and contains a DNA binding

domain postulated to interact with a presumptive CRE of the major T6 gene cluster ([20](#), [24](#)).

T6 regulation in non-pandemic strain V52, which causes mild disease, requires TfoY,

modulatable by intracellular signals ([22](#), [23](#)). How QstR and TfoY control T6 transcription

remains elusive, with no T6 CRE yet described. Elucidation of the differences in intraspecies

T6 regulatory mechanisms between diverse *V. cholerae* isolates will provide insights into how

pathogens emerge from nonpathogenic progenitor.

To understand the regulatory differences in *V. cholerae* strains, we examine here several

environmental isolates that exhibit T6-mediated killing ([28](#)). Despite encoding functional

signaling circuity and TFs, we find that QstR is dispensable for killing with TfoY playing only a

minor role in the strains tested. Thus, existing regulatory models fail to explain the T6 control

in *V. cholerae* from human and non-human sources. Genomic analysis identifies one

conserved non-coding single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) that we show interconverts *V.*

cholerae T6 activity between chitin-inducible and constitutive states, which are QstR-

dependent and TfoY-independent, respectively. We demonstrate that non-coding SNPs can

rewire cis-regulatory elements to aid in adaptation of bacteria to different niches, including

the human host.

Results and Discussion

<u>Constitutive, *in vitro* T6 activity requires neither QstR nor TfoY.</u>

In the absence of chitin, pandemic C6706 with *qstR* expressed from a heterologous promoter

(*qstR**) reduces survival of *Escherichia coli* "target" cells in co-culture by over 4-orders of

magnitude (~10,000), compared to wildtype (WT) C6706, T6⁻ (*ΔvasK)*, and *ΔqstR* mutants (Fig.

1A) ([26](#)). Deletion of *tfoY* does not reduce the killing activity of the T6⁺ *qstR** strain, but

eliminates the robust killing in non-pandemic strain V52 (serogroup O37), which does not

require QstR (Fig. 1B) ([23](#)).

To determine whether either QstR or TfoY participates in control of the T6 in non-human

strains, we examined 3223-74, a genetically-amenable, T6-proficient environmental strain

([28](#)). Like V52, 3223-74 does not require QstR to efficiently kill *E. coli* in conditions without

chitin, but surprisingly, also does not require TfoY. The *ΔtfoY* and *ΔqstR ΔtfoY* mutants retain

>99.99% killing activity, with only modest *E. coli* survival (Fig. 1C). Gene fusions of the 5'

intergenic region (IGR) of the major T6 cluster of each strain fused to green fluorescent protein

(*gfp*) confirm that transcriptional differences account for the killing observed, with maximal

gfp expression mirroring activity (i.e. low *E. coli* survival with high *gfp* expression, and *vice*

versa) (Fig. 1D-F). Confocal microscopy reinforces the negligible role of TfoY on killing by 3223-

74 (Fig. 1G). Transcription of plasmid-borne reporters is significantly higher in *V. cholerae* than

in *E. coli* (Fig. S1), supporting a hypothesis that an additional *V. cholerae*-specific regulator of

the T6 likely remains to be identified (Fig. S1).

Figure 1. *Vibrio cholerae* 3223-74 T6 activity is QstR- and TfoY-independent. (A-C) Indicated

V. cholerae strains were co-cultured with chloramphenicol resistant (Cm^R) *E. coli* followed by

determination of *E. coli* survival by counting of colony forming units (CFUs) on LB agar with

Cm. (D-F) Fluorescence levels are from reporters with *gfp* fused to the intergenic region 5' of

vipA derived from the three strains shown. The mean value ± S.E. of three independent co-

cultures (A-C) and monocultures (D-F) are shown from one experiment, with similar results

obtained in at least two other independent experiments. A one-way ANOVA with Dunnett

post-hoc test was conducted to determine the significance: ns denotes not significant, ****p

≤ 0.0001, ***p ≤ 0.001, **p ≤ 0.01, *p ≤ 0.05. (G) *E. coli* cells expressing constitutive *gfp* were

competed against 3223-74, with the same frame imaged at 0 h and 3 h by confocal microscopy.

In the images, *gfp* signal from the *E. coli* is overlaid on top of bright-light images of the co-

culture. Scale bar = 50 μm.

To probe each strain's T6-related regulatory circuitry, we measured canonical behaviors under

control of HapR, QstR and TfoY; quorum sensing (QS) controlled bioluminescence, natural

transformation, and motility, respectively (29-31). As expected, each TF is intact in C6706, and

V52 is QS$^-$ due to a *hapR* mutation (32) but still encodes a functional *tfoY* that controls motility

(Fig. S2A-B) (33). Interestingly, the regulatory circuit of *V. cholerae* 3223-74 is intact, like

C6706, confirming that it encodes functional TFs (Fig. S2C) that are expendable for T6-

mediated killing.

<u>A SNP in the T6 intergenic region confers QstR-dependency.</u>

Human and environmental isolates of *V. cholerae* we have characterized prior (28) share ≥97%

average nucleotide identity with many chromosomal differences ([9]), but inspection of the T6

IGRs of C6706, V52 and 3223-74 revealed only 17 SNPs and 3 multinucleotide polymorphisms

(Fig. 2A), which we hypothesized could contribute to the differences in transcription and killing

activity observed. To address this, we replaced the T6 IGR of C6706 on the chromosome with

that from V52 and 3223-74 and measured killing activity. While C6706 carrying the *qstR** allele,

but not WT, can adeptly kill *E. coli*, both IGR replacements increase the killing efficiency of WT

C6706 by 5- to 6-orders of magnitude (Fig. 2B), mimicking the robust killing observed by WT

V52 and 3223-74 (Fig. 1B-C). Deletion of *tfoY* in C6706 with V52's IGR increases *E. coli* survival

(~ 2-logs), as observed with V52, but does not alter *E. coli* survival with 3223-74's IGR (Fig. 2B).

Chromosomal transcriptional *gfp* reporters with identical mutations were elevated relative to

WT C6706 in each IGR replacement strain (Fig. 2C), consistent with the enhanced killing

detected. These results support a hypothesis that a novel CRE lies within the IGR 5' of the T6

locus, despite a lack of any known direct TFs of this locus identified to date.

Figure 2. G-388T mutation abolishes QstR dependence in C6706 and T-388G confers QstR

dependence to 3223-74. (A) Alignment of the IGR upstream of *vipA* was conducted using

MUSCLE. SNPs and MNPs are highlighted in red, one gap indicated with a "–", the putative

promoter and the transcriptional start site (TSS; +1) in bold, and the start codon of *vipA* in

grey. (B) the C6706 5' IGR of *vipA* was replaced with the IGR from either V52 or 3223-74. (D)

A T-68G mutation in the 5' IGR of *vipA* was introduced into 3223-74 with different *qstR* alleles.

Competition assays were conducted by co-culturing *V. cholerae* killers and Cm^R *E. coli* target

followed by determination of *E. coli* survival by counting of colony forming units (CFUs) on LB

agar with Cm. (C, E) Shown are fluorescence levels of transcriptional reporters with *gfp* fused

to corresponding IGRs of *vipA* expressed in either C6706 (C) or 3223-74 (E). The mean value ±

S.E. of three independent co-cultures (B and D) and monocultures (C and E) are shown from

one experiment, with similar results were obtained in at least two other independent

experiments. A one-way ANOVA with Dunnett post-hoc test was conducted to determine the

significance - ns: not significant, ****$p \leq 0.0001$, **$p \leq 0.01$, *$p \leq 0.05$.

To begin mapping the T6 IGR region and SNP locations, we experimentally determined

(Methods) the transcriptional start site (+1) 320 nucleotides (nt) 5' of the ATG of the first T6

gene (*vipA*), and adjacent to a putative promoter with 8/12 identical nts compared to the

consensus for housekeeping genes (Fig. 2A). The +1 is consistent with paired-end RNAseq

results (26), and 320 nt 5' untranslated region (UTR) suggesting possible post-transcriptional

regulation, beyond the sRNA interactions already described near the ribosome binding site

(RBS) (34). Alignment of the IGRs of C6706 and V52 reveals a single SNP at -68, with a guanine

(G) in C6706 at that position and a thymine (T) in V52 (Fig. 2A). Because the replacement of

the C6706 IGR with V52 was effectively a G-68T mutation (Fig. 2B-C), we further tested

whether G was necessary for QstR activation by replacing the T with a G at position -68 (T-

68G) in the 3223-74 WT, *qstR**, and *ΔqstR* backgrounds. The T-68G mutation significantly

increases *E. coli* survival and T6 transcription in WT 3223-74 and the *ΔqstR* mutant, with killing

restored in the *qstR** background (Fig. 2D-E). Thus, a G at position -68 confers QstR-control,

while a T results in constitutive killing *in vitro*.

The SNP at -68 is evolutionarily conserved.

To determine the prevalence of the SNP at -68 in *V. cholerae* strains, we aligned the T6 IGR

sequences of diverse strains that exhibit T6 killing (Fig. 3A) ([28](#)). Consistent with prior studies

([9](#), [12](#), [14](#), [16](#)), our phylogenetic analysis of the T6 IGRs places human strains in a distinct clade,

with the exception of two O1 strains isolated nearly a century ago (NCTC8457 and MAK757),

and two non-O1 strains (MZO-2 O14 and V52 O37; Fig. S3). All 23 environmental isolates carry

the T-68 SNP and display constitutive T6, with one exception that is chitin-inducible (1496-86)

(Fig. 3A, S5). By contrast, the 18 human isolates tested carry either G or T at the -68 position

(Fig. 3A, S6). The 13 chitin-inducible human isolates carry a G; five show constitutive activity

and carry a T like environmental strains, with one exception that is constitutive yet carries the

G (2010EL-1749) (Fig. 3A, S6). Neither C nor A are observed at -68 in any stains tested,

although both pyrimidine nucleotides (T and C) confer constitutive killing at -68, and both

purines (G and A) behave similarly (Fig. S4). The focal SNP location is distal from the -35,

inconsistent with an AT-rich "UP element" ([35](#)) and more likely a component of a CRE for a TF

to be determined. Indeed, transversion mutations have greater effects of TF binding than

transitions, as noted here (Fig. S4) likely due to changes in shape of the DNA backbone or

DNA-amino acid contacts ([36](#), [37](#)).

We examined regulation of three additional manipulatable environmental strains (VC22,

2479-89, and 2512-86) that exhibit T6 killing ([28](#)). Like 3223-74, qstR is expendable in each

strain (Fig. 3B-E). TfoY contributes to some extent in activating T6, with varying *E. coli* recovery

observed in each *ΔtfoY* mutant (Fig. 3B-E). Taken together, our findings reveal that the

constitutive T6 killing activity of environmental *V. cholerae* is driven by a T at position -68,

which obviates the QstR requirement, and permits modest TfoY regulation.

Figure 3. Environmental *V. cholerae* isolates encode a T at position -68 while clinical chitin-

induced isolates encode a G. (A) A SNP at position -68 in the IGR of the major T6 cluster

controls killing activity. Conserved nts are in dark grey and the SNP of interest is highlighted in

white/grey. T6 control was categorized as described ([28]). (B-E) Survival of *E. coli* following

competition assays with WT *V. cholerae* strains and mutants was determined by CFU counts.

Data shown are the mean ± S.E. of three independent experiments. A one-way ANOVA with

Tukey post-hoc test was conducted to determine the significance - ns: not significant, ****$p \leq$

0.0001, ***p ≤ 0.001, **p ≤ 0.01, *p ≤ 0.05.

While T6s were first described in *V. cholerae* in 2006, the identity of a TF that directly controls

the major T6 cluster has remained elusive ([19], [21]). We speculate that the focal SNP at position

-68 is a component of a CRE that contributes to pathoadaptation (Fig. 2A), with T6 activity

constrained by QstR in hosts devoid of chitin signals ([38]). Indeed, dramatic changes in host

mechanics induced by constitutive QstR expression may be detrimental to sustained host

association ([39]). By contrast, the T6 IGRs of environmental strains carry a T at -68 and

additional SNPs (Fig. S5, S6) that may allow TfoY contributions at the promoter DNA or in the

5' UTR (Fig. 2A and Fig. 3B-E). Microbial genome wide associations studies hold great promise

for identifying focal SNPs ([40]), with our study showcasing the power of combining genomic,

genetic and phenotypic analysis to identify polymorphisms contributing to pathogen

evolution.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial growth conditions and plasmid constructions

All *V. cholerae* and *E. coli* (Table S1) strains were grown aerobically at 37 °C overnight in

Lysogeny Broth (LB) with constant shaking or statically on LB agar. Ampicillin (100 μg/ml),

kanamycin (50 μg/ml), chloramphenicol (10 μg/ml), spectinomycin (100 μg/ml), streptomycin

(5 mg/ml), sucrose (20% w/v) and diaminopimelic acid (50 µg/ml) were supplemented where

appropriate.

Plasmids (Table S2) used were constructed with DNA restriction nucleases (Promega – WI,

USA), Gibson Assembly mix (New England Biolabs – MA, USA), and PCR amplification (Qiagen

- Hilden, Germany) by PCR with Q5 polymerase (New England Biolabs – MA, USA), and primers

(Table S3) generated by Eton Bioscience Inc (NC, USA). All reagents were used according to

the manufacturer's instructions. Plasmids were confirmed by PCR and Sanger sequencing by

Eton Bioscience Inc (NC, USA).

V. cholerae mutant construction

All genetically engineered strains of *V. cholerae* were constructed with established allelic

exchange methods using vector pKAS32 [41] and pRE118 (Addgene - Plasmid #43830). All

Insertions, deletions, and mutations were confirmed by PCR and Sanger sequencing

conducted by Eton Bioscience Inc (NC, USA). Primers used are in Table S3.

Fluorescence microscopy

V. cholerae 3223-74 strains and chromosomal-labeled GFP *E. coli* were separately back-diluted

1:100 and incubated at 37 °C for 3 h. *V. cholerae* and *E. coli* were normalized to OD_{600} = 1 and

mixed in a 1:5 ratio. A 2 µL aliquot of a mixed culture was inoculated on LB agar and allowed

to dry. Cells were imaged before and after a 3 h incubation at 37 °C and 96-100% humidity

using an Eclipse Ti-E Nikon (NY, USA) inverted microscope with a Perfect Focus System and

camera previously described ([9]). The images were processed with ImageJ ([31]).

Motility assay

Overnight cultures of *V. cholerae* were diluted to OD_{600} = 0.1, and 1 µL inoculated onto pre-

dried LB plates with 0.3 % agar. Cells were incubated at 37 °C statically overnight, with motility

determined by measuring the swarming diameter.

Transformation assay

Chitin-induced transformation frequency was measured as described with defined artificial

sea water (450 mM NaCl, 10 mM KCl, 9 mM $CaCl_2$, 30 mM $MgCl_2 \cdot 6H_2O$, and 16 mM

$MgSO_4 \cdot 7H_2O$; pH 7.8) ([42]). Bacteria were incubated with extracellular DNA in triplicate wells

containing crab shell tabs, and transformation frequency calculated as Spectinomycin

resistant ($Spec^R$) CFU ml^{-1} / total CFU ml^{-1}.

QS-dependent Luciferase assay

Overnight cultures of the bacterial strains were diluted to OD_{600} = 0.001 in liquid LB in

microtiter plates and incubated at 37 °C with shaking. The OD_{600} and luminescence were

measured each h with a BioTek (VT, USA) Synergy H1 microplate reader to calculate Relative

Luminescence Units (RLU) as Luminescence/OD_{600}. Data were collected when OD_{600} = 0.6-0.8.

LB medium was used as the blank for the OD_{600} and luminescence.

<u>GFP transcriptional reporter quantification</u>

Overnight cultures of *V. cholerae* or *E. coli* were diluted 1:100 and incubated at 37 °C for 3 h.

To enhance the translation of *gfp*, the sequence of the native RBS (12 nt sequence) was

replaced with the T7 RBS (12 nt sequence) in the primers used to make the fusions. Cm was

added to maintain the plasmid-borne versions of reporters that were cloned into plasmid

pSLS3. 300 µL aliquots were transferred to black microtiter plates to read the OD_{600} and GFP

fluorescence (Excitation: 485, Emission: 528) with a BioTek Synergy H1 microplate reader (VT,

USA) to calculate Relative Luminescence Units (RLU) as Luminescence/OD_{600}. LB medium was

used as the blank for the OD_{600}. Strain lacking reporters served as blanks for GFP fluorescence.

RFU was calculated by blanked GFP fluorescence / blanked OD_{600}.

<u>T6-mediated killing assay</u>

Overnight cultures of *V. cholerae* or *E. coli* were back-diluted 1:100 and incubated at 37 °C for

3 h. *V. cholerae* strains and the Cm^R *E. coli* target were normalized to OD_{600} = 1 and then mixed

at a ratio of either 10:1 or 1:5. A 50 µL mixed culture was spotted onto LB agar and dried. After

a 3 h incubation at 37°C, cells were resuspended in 5 ml of LB, and serial dilutions were

conducted. Finally, the resuspension was inoculated on a LB agar containing Cm to select for

the surviving *E. coli*, which was incubated overnight at 37 °C and the *E. coli* colonies were

counted and shown as CFU mL^{-1}.

RNA extraction and determination of the +1 of transcription by 5'-RACE

Overnight cultures of *V. cholerae* were back-diluted 1:100 and incubated at 37 °C for 3 h before

lysing. Three independent cultures of T6-active *V. cholerae* C6706 *qstR** and 3223-74 WT were

harvested by centrifugation at room temperature. RNA isolation, genomic DNA removal, and

RNA clean-up were performed as previously described ([43](#)). Genomic DNA contamination was

confirmed by conducting PCR with primer pair specific for 16S rRNA loci (*rrsA*) as previously

described (Table S3) ([44](#)). RNA purity was confirmed by NanoDrop (260 / 280 ≈ 2.0).

5'-RACE (Invitrogen™ - MA, USA) was conducted according to the manufacturer's protocol

with slight modifications. Specifically, SuperScript™ IV reverse transcriptase (Invitrogen™ -

MA, USA) was used to complete the first strand cDNA synthesis. Two *vipA*-specific primers

(GT3056 and GT3060) were used to identify the +1 of transcription for the major T6 gene

cluster (Table S3). PCR products were purified with QIAquick PCR purification kit (Qiagen -

Hilden, Germany) or Zymoclean gel DNA recovery kit (Zymo Research - CA, USA). Sanger

sequencing was conducted by Eton Bioscience Inc. (NC, USA) with the corresponding nesting

primer (Table S3).

<u>Genomic and phylogenetic analysis</u>

Genome sequences of *V. cholerae* strains were collected from NCBI Genome database (Table

S4) ([45](#)). The IGR upstream of major T6 cluster was extracted, aligned, and presented using

BLAST+ v2.2.18 ([46](#)), MUSCLE v3.8 (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/msa/muscle/) ([47](#), [48](#)), and

ESPript 3.0 (https://espript.ibcp.fr/) ([33](#)). The DNA sequence of the IGR was used for

phylogenetic analysis, and the phylogenetic tree was constructed by the Maximum likelihood

method using MEGA11 ([49](#), [50](#)).

For 2012V-1001, 2011EL-1939, 2011EL-1938, and 2011EL-1141 that do not have genome

sequence available, colony PCR was conducted to amplify the 5' IGR of the major T6 cluster

using OneTaq DNA Polymerase (New England Biolabs – MA, USA). PCR products were

confirmed with gel electrophoresis and Sanger sequencing by Eton Bioscience Inc. (NC, USA)

with the identical primer pair (Table S3).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. Jyl S. Matson for assistance with RNA isolation and Dr. Marvin

Whiteley and current and past members of the Hammer Lab for critiques and discussion,

specifically, Dr. Samit Watve and Rakin Choudhury for bioinformatic advice and assistance.

319   Competing interests

320   The authors have no competing interests.

References

References

1.   Wray GA. The evolutionary significance of cis-regulatory mutations. Nature reviews

Genetics. 2007;8(3):206-16. Epub 2007/02/17. doi: 10.1038/nrg2063. PubMed PMID:

17304246.

2.   Stern DL, Orgogozo V. THE LOCI OF EVOLUTION: HOW PREDICTABLE IS GENETIC

EVOLUTION?   Evolution.   2008;62(9):2155-77.   doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-

5646.2008.00450.x.

3.   Wittkopp PJ, Kalay G. Cis-regulatory elements: molecular mechanisms and evolutionary

processes underlying divergence. Nature reviews Genetics. 2011;13(1):59-69. Epub

2011/12/07. doi: 10.1038/nrg3095. PubMed PMID: 22143240.

4.   Perez JC, Groisman EA. Evolution of transcriptional regulatory circuits in bacteria. Cell.

2009;138(2):233-44. Epub 2009/07/28. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2009.07.002. PubMed PMID:

19632175; PMCID: PMC2726713.

5.   Dziejman M, Balon E, Boyd D, Fraser CM, Heidelberg JF, Mekalanos JJ. Comparative

genomic analysis of Vibrio cholerae: genes that correlate with cholera endemic and pandemic

disease. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.

2002;99(3):1556-61. Epub 2002/01/31. doi: 10.1073/pnas.042667999. PubMed PMID:

11818571; PMCID: PMC122229.

6.   Faruque SM, Albert MJ, Mekalanos JJ. Epidemiology, Genetics, and Ecology of

Toxigenic *Vibrio cholerae*. Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews.

1998;62(4):1301-14. doi: doi:10.1128/MMBR.62.4.1301-1314.1998.

7.   Karaolis DKR, Johnson JA, Bailey CC, Boedeker EC, Kaper JB, Reeves PR. A *Vibrio*

cholerae pathogenicity island associated with epidemic and pandemic strains.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 1998;95(6):3134-9. doi:

10.1073/pnas.95.6.3134.

8.   Pruzzo C, Vezzulli L, Colwell RR. Global impact of Vibrio cholerae interactions with chitin.

Environ Microbiol. 2008;10(6):1400-10. Epub 2008/03/04. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-

2920.2007.01559.x. PubMed PMID: 18312392.

9.   Crisan CV, Chande AT, Williams K, Raghuram V, Rishishwar L, Steinbach G, Watve SS,

Yunker P, Jordan IK, Hammer BK. Analysis of Vibrio cholerae genomes identifies new type VI

secretion system gene clusters. Genome Biol. 2019;20(1):163. Epub 2019/08/14. doi:

10.1186/s13059-019-1765-5. PubMed PMID: 31405375; PMCID: PMC6691524.

10.   MacIntyre DL, Miyata ST, Kitaoka M, Pukatzki S. The Vibrio cholerae type VI secretion

system displays antimicrobial properties. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of

the United States of America. 2010;107(45):19520-4. Epub 2010/10/27. doi:

10.1073/pnas.1012931107. PubMed PMID: 20974937; PMCID: PMC2984155.

11.   Gallegos-Monterrosa R, Coulthurst SJ. The ecological impact of a bacterial weapon:

microbial interactions and the Type VI secretion system. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2021;45(6). Epub

2021/06/23. doi: 10.1093/femsre/fuab033. PubMed PMID: 34156081; PMCID: PMC8632748.

12.   Hussain NAS, Kirchberger PC, Case RJ, Boucher YF. Modular Molecular Weaponry Plays a

Key Role in Competition Within an Environmental Vibrio cholerae Population. Frontiers in

Microbiology. 2021;12(979). doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2021.671092.

13.   Ishikawa T, Sabharwal D, Bröms J, Milton DL, Sjöstedt A, Uhlin BE, Wai SN, Camilli A.

Pathoadaptive Conditional Regulation of the Type VI Secretion System in Vibrio cholerae O1

Strains. Infection and Immunity. 2012;80(2):575-84. doi: doi:10.1128/IAI.05510-11.

14.   Kirchberger PC, Unterweger D, Provenzano D, Pukatzki S, Boucher Y. Sequential

displacement of Type VI Secretion System effector genes leads to evolution of diverse

immunity gene arrays in Vibrio cholerae. Scientific Reports. 2017;7(1):45133. doi:

10.1038/srep45133.

15.   Santoriello FJ, Pukatzki S. When the pandemic opts for the lockdown: Secretion system

evolution in the cholera bacterium. Microb Cell. 2021;8(3):69-72. Epub 2021/03/09. doi:

10.15698/mic2021.03.744. PubMed PMID: 33681340; PMCID: PMC7919388.

16.   Unterweger D, Miyata ST, Bachmann V, Brooks TM, Mullins T, Kostiuk B, Provenzano D,

Pukatzki S. The Vibrio cholerae type VI secretion system employs diverse effector modules for

intraspecific   competition.   Nature   Communications.   2014;5(1):3549.   doi:

10.1038/ncomms4549.

17.   Crisan CV, Chandrashekar H, Everly C, Steinbach G, Hill SE, Yunker PJ, Lieberman RR,

Hammer BK, Ellermeier CD. A New Contact Killing Toxin Permeabilizes Cells and Belongs to a

Broadly Distributed Protein Family. mSphere. 2021;6(4):e00318-21. doi:

doi:10.1128/mSphere.00318-21.

18.   Drebes Dörr NC, Blokesch M. Interbacterial competition and anti-predatory behaviour of

environmental Vibrio cholerae strains. Environmental Microbiology. 2020;22(10):4485-504.

doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.15224.

19.   Crisan CV, Hammer BK. The Vibrio cholerae type VI secretion system: toxins, regulators

and consequences. Environ Microbiol. 2020;22(10):4112-22. Epub 2020/03/07. doi:

10.1111/1462-2920.14976. PubMed PMID: 32133757.

20.   Jaskolska M, Stutzmann S, Stoudmann C, Blokesch M. QstR-dependent regulation of

natural competence and type VI secretion in Vibrio cholerae. Nucleic Acids Res.

2018;46(20):10619-34. Epub 2018/08/14. doi: 10.1093/nar/gky717. PubMed PMID:

30102403; PMCID: PMC6237807.

21.   Joshi A, Kostiuk B, Rogers A, Teschler J, Pukatzki S, Yildiz FH. Rules of Engagement: The

Type VI Secretion System in Vibrio cholerae. Trends Microbiol. 2017;25(4):267-79. Epub

2016/12/29. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2016.12.003. PubMed PMID: 28027803; PMCID:

PMC5365375.

22.   Joshi A, Mahmoud SA, Kim SK, Ogdahl JL, Lee VT, Chien P, Yildiz FH. c-di-GMP inhibits

LonA-dependent proteolysis of TfoY in Vibrio cholerae. PLoS Genet. 2020;16(6):e1008897.

Epub 2020/06/27. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1008897. PubMed PMID: 32589664; PMCID:

PMC7371385.

23.   Metzger LC, Stutzmann S, Scrignari T, Van der Henst C, Matthey N, Blokesch M.

Independent Regulation of Type VI Secretion in Vibrio cholerae by TfoX and TfoY. Cell Rep.

2016;15(5):951-8. Epub 2016/04/28. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2016.03.092. PubMed PMID:

27117415; PMCID: PMC4858559.

24.   Lo Scrudato M, Blokesch M. A transcriptional regulator linking quorum sensing and chitin

induction to render Vibrio cholerae naturally transformable. Nucleic Acids Res.

2013;41(6):3644-58. Epub 2013/02/06. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkt041. PubMed PMID: 23382174;

PMCID: PMC3616704.

25.   Meibom KL, Blokesch M, Dolganov NA, Wu CY, Schoolnik GK. Chitin induces natural

competence in Vibrio cholerae. Science. 2005;310(5755):1824-7. Epub 2005/12/17. doi:

10.1126/science.1120096. PubMed PMID: 16357262.

26.   Watve SS, Thomas J, Hammer BK. CytR Is a Global Positive Regulator of Competence,

Type VI Secretion, and Chitinases in Vibrio cholerae. PLoS One. 2015;10(9):e0138834. Epub

2015/09/25. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0138834. PubMed PMID: 26401962; PMCID:

PMC4581735.

27.   Tsou AM, Cai T, Liu Z, Zhu J, Kulkarni RV. Regulatory targets of quorum sensing in Vibrio

cholerae: evidence for two distinct HapR-binding motifs. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009;37(8):2747-

56. Epub 2009/03/12. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkp121. PubMed PMID: 19276207; PMCID:

PMC2677876.

28. Bernardy EE, Turnsek MA, Wilson SK, Tarr CL, Hammer BK, Liu S-J. Diversity of Clinical and

Environmental Isolates of Vibrio cholerae in Natural Transformation and Contact-Dependent

Bacterial Killing Indicative of Type VI Secretion System Activity. Applied and Environmental

Microbiology. 2016;82(9):2833-42. doi: doi:10.1128/AEM.00351-16.

29. Jobling MG, Holmes RK. Characterization of hapR, a positive regulator of the Vibrio

cholerae HA/protease gene hap, and its identification as a functional homologue of the Vibrio

harveyi luxR gene. Molecular Microbiology. 1997;26(5):1023-34. doi:

https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2958.1997.6402011.x.

30. Pursley BR, Maiden MM, Hsieh ML, Fernandez NL, Severin GB, Waters CM. Cyclic di-GMP

Regulates TfoY in Vibrio cholerae To Control Motility by both Transcriptional and

Posttranscriptional Mechanisms. J Bacteriol. 2018;200(7). Epub 2018/01/10. doi:

10.1128/JB.00578-17. PubMed PMID: 29311281; PMCID: PMC5847662.

31. Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis.

Nat Methods. 2012;9(7):671-5. Epub 2012/08/30. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.2089. PubMed PMID:

22930834; PMCID: PMC5554542.

32. Zheng J, Shin OS, Cameron DE, Mekalanos JJ. Quorum sensing and a global regulator TsrA

control expression of type VI secretion and virulence in Vibrio cholerae.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2010;107(49):21128-33. doi:

10.1073/pnas.1014998107.

33. Robert X, Gouet P. Deciphering key features in protein structures with the new ENDscript

server. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014;42(Web Server issue):W320-4. Epub 2014/04/23. doi:

10.1093/nar/gku316. PubMed PMID: 24753421; PMCID: PMC4086106.

34. Shao Y, Bassler BL. Quorum regulatory small RNAs repress type VI secretion in Vibrio

cholerae. Mol Microbiol. 2014;92(5):921-30. Epub 2014/04/05. doi: 10.1111/mmi.12599.

PubMed PMID: 24698180; PMCID: PMC4038675.

35. Gourse RL, Ross W, Gaal T. UPs and downs in bacterial transcription initiation: the role of

the alpha subunit of RNA polymerase in promoter recognition. Mol Microbiol.

2000;37(4):687-95. Epub 2000/09/06. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2958.2000.01972.x. PubMed

PMID: 10972792.

36. Guo C, McDowell IC, Nodzenski M, Scholtens DM, Allen AS, Lowe WL, Reddy TE.

Transversions have larger regulatory effects than transitions. BMC Genomics. 2017;18(1):394.

doi: 10.1186/s12864-017-3785-4.

37. Slattery M, Zhou T, Yang L, Dantas Machado AC, Gordân R, Rohs R. Absence of a simple

code: how transcription factors read the genome. Trends in Biochemical Sciences.

2014;39(9):381-99. doi: 10.1016/j.tibs.2014.07.002.

38. Zhao W, Caro F, Robins W, Mekalanos JJ. Antagonism toward the intestinal microbiota

and its effect on Vibrio cholerae virulence. Science. 2018;359(6372):210-3. Epub 2018/01/13.

doi: 10.1126/science.aap8775. PubMed PMID: 29326272; PMCID: PMC8010019.

39. Logan SL, Thomas J, Yan J, Baker RP, Shields DS, Xavier JB, Hammer BK, Parthasarathy R.

The Vibrio cholerae type VI secretion system can modulate host intestinal

mechanics to displace gut bacterial symbionts. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences. 2018;115(16):E3779-E87. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1720133115.

40. San JE, Baichoo S, Kanzi A, Moosa Y, Lessells R, Fonseca V, Mogaka J, Power R, de Oliveira

T. Current Affairs of Microbial Genome-Wide Association Studies: Approaches, Bottlenecks

and   Analytical   Pitfalls.   Front   Microbiol.   2019;10:3119.   Epub   2020/02/23.   doi:

10.3389/fmicb.2019.03119. PubMed PMID: 32082269; PMCID: PMC7002396.

41. Skorupski K, Taylor RK. Positive selection vectors for allelic exchange. Gene.

1996;169(1):47-52. Epub 1996/02/22. doi: 10.1016/0378-1119(95)00793-8. PubMed PMID:

8635748.

42. Watve SS, Bernardy EE, Hammer BK. Vibrio cholerae: Measuring Natural Transformation

Frequency.   Curr   Protoc   Microbiol.   2014;35:6A 4 1-12.   Epub   2014/11/05.   doi:

10.1002/9780471729259.mc06a04s35. PubMed PMID: 25367272.

43. Matson JS. Preparation of Vibrio cholerae Samples for RNA-seq Analysis. Methods Mol

Biol. 2018;1839:29-38. Epub 2018/07/27. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4939-8685-9_3. PubMed PMID:

30047051.

44.   Manera K, Caro F, Li H, Pei TT, Hersch SJ, Mekalanos JJ, Dong TG. Sensing of intracellular

Hcp levels controls T6SS expression in Vibrio cholerae. Proceedings of the National Academy

of Sciences of the United States of America. 2021;118(25). Epub 2021/06/24. doi:

10.1073/pnas.2104813118. PubMed PMID: 34161288; PMCID: PMC8237632.

45.   Sayers EW, Agarwala R, Bolton EE, Brister JR, Canese K, Clark K, Connor R, Fiorini N, Funk

K, Hefferon T, Holmes JB, Kim S, Kimchi A, Kitts PA, Lathrop S, Lu Z, Madden TL, Marchler-Bauer

A, Phan L, Schneider VA, Schoch CL, Pruitt KD, Ostell J. Database resources of the National

Center for Biotechnology Information. Nucleic Acids Res. 2019;47(D1):D23-D8. Epub

2018/11/06. doi: 10.1093/nar/gky1069. PubMed PMID: 30395293; PMCID: PMC6323993.

46.   Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. BLAST+:

architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics. 2009;10:421. Epub 2009/12/17. doi:

10.1186/1471-2105-10-421. PubMed PMID: 20003500; PMCID: PMC2803857.

47.   Edgar RC. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput.

Nucleic Acids Res. 2004;32(5):1792-7. Epub 2004/03/23. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkh340. PubMed

PMID: 15034147; PMCID: PMC390337.

48.   Madeira F, Park YM, Lee J, Buso N, Gur T, Madhusoodanan N, Basutkar P, Tivey ARN,

Potter SC, Finn RD, Lopez R. The EMBL-EBI search and sequence analysis tools APIs in 2019.

Nucleic Acids Res. 2019;47(W1):W636-W41. Epub 2019/04/13. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkz268.

PubMed PMID: 30976793; PMCID: PMC6602479.

49.   Felsenstein J. Evolutionary trees from DNA sequences: a maximum likelihood approach.

J Mol Evol. 1981;17(6):368-76. Epub 1981/01/01. doi: 10.1007/BF01734359. PubMed PMID:

7288891.

50.   Tamura K, Stecher G, Kumar S. MEGA11: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis

Version   11.   Mol   Biol   Evol.   2021;38(7):3022-7.   Epub   2021/04/24.   doi:

10.1093/molbev/msab120. PubMed PMID: 33892491; PMCID: PMC8233496.