DciA helicase operators exhibit diversity across bacterial phyla

Helen C. Blaine[1]*, Joseph T. Burke[2,3]*, Janani Ravi[2#], and Christina L. Stallings[1#]

[1]Department of Molecular Microbiology, Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, Missouri 63110, USA.

[2]Departments of Pathobiology and Diagnostic Investigation, Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA.

[3]Genomics and Molecular Genetics Undergraduate Program, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA.

*Co-primary authors, contributed equally, listed alphabetically.

[#]Correspondence to stallings@wustl.edu and janani@msu.edu.

ABSTRACT

A fundamental requirement for life is the replication of an organism's DNA. Studies in *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis* have set the paradigm for DNA replication in bacteria. During replication initiation in *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*, the replicative helicase is loaded onto the DNA at the origin of replication by an ATPase helicase loader. However, most bacteria do not encode homologs to the helicase loaders in *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*. Recent work has identified the DciA protein as a predicted helicase operator that may perform a function analogous to the helicase loaders in *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*. DciA proteins, which are defined by the presence of a DUF721 domain (termed the DciA domain herein), are conserved in most bacteria but have only been studied in mycobacteria and γ-proteobacteria (*Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Vibrio cholerae*). Sequences outside of the DciA domain in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* DciA are

essential for protein function but are not conserved in the *P. aeruginosa* and *V. cholerae*

homologs, raising questions regarding the conservation and evolution of DciA proteins across

bacterial phyla. To comprehensively define the DciA protein family, we took a computational

evolutionary approach and analyzed domain architectures and sequence properties of DciA-

domain containing proteins across the tree of life. These analyses identified lineage-specific

domain architectures amongst DciA homologs as well as broadly conserved sequence-

structural motifs. The diversity of DciA proteins represents the evolution of helicase operation

in bacterial DNA replication and highlights the need for phylum-specific analyses of this

fundamental biological process.

IMPORTANCE

Despite the fundamental importance of DNA replication for life, this process remains

understudied in bacteria outside of *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis*. In particular, most

bacteria do not encode the helicase loading proteins that are essential in *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*

for DNA replication. Instead, most bacteria encode a DciA homolog that likely constitutes the

predominant mechanism of helicase operation in bacteria. However, it is still unknown how

DciA structure and function compare across diverse phyla that encode DciA proteins. In this

study, we perform computational evolutionary analyses to uncover tremendous diversity

amongst DciA homologs. These studies provide a significant advance in our understanding of

an essential component of the bacterial DNA replication machinery.

INTRODUCTION

DNA replication is a process critical to life for all organisms. The current paradigm for the process of DNA replication in bacteria has primarily been based on studies in *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis*. Bacterial DNA replication begins with the binding of the replication initiation protein DnaA to specific sequences referred to as DnaA boxes at the origin of replication (oriC) (1–7). DnaA binding to double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) triggers DNA unwinding at an AT-rich region of DNA called the DNA unwinding element (DUE), leaving a bubble of single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) (1, 4, 6, 8, 9). The ssDNA bubble is coated by single-stranded binding protein (SSB) (10), followed by the concerted loading of two hexameric replicative helicases onto the SSB-coated replication fork. The two helicases translocate along the two sides of the replication fork, unwinding the dsDNA as they move (1, 4, 5, 11–14).

Bacterial replicative helicases (DnaB in *E. coli* and DnaC in *B. subtilis*) are Superfamily IV type helicases, which are defined as hexameric RecA ATPases (4, 15, 16) that translocate in the 5'-3' direction (11, 12, 17) The bacterial replicative helicase translocates on ssDNA using a "hand-over-hand" mechanism, which is driven by nucleotide hydrolysis (18, 19) (reviewed in (17)). The C-terminus of the bacterial replicative helicase contains the RecA-like fold that is responsible for the ATPase activity and is connected to an N-terminal scaffolding domain via a linker region (1, 20, 21). The replicative helicase must oligomerize into a double-layered hexameric ring to be active during replication, with one layer made up of the N-termini and the other layer composed of the C-termini (1, 22, 23). In *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*, the loading of the replicative helicase is performed with the help of a helicase loader, termed DnaC in *E. coli* and DnaI in *B. subtilis* (4, 24–27). *dnaC* and *dnaI* were acquired by *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*, respectively,

via domestication of related but distinct phage ATPase-containing genes (28–31). DnaC and

DnaI are both in the ATPases Associated with diverse cellular Activities (AAA+) ATPase family,

and the ATPase activity of DnaC is required for its helicase loading function at the origin of

replication (32, 33).

E. coli and *B. subtilis* have long represented the paradigm of helicase loading during

bacterial replication. However, most bacteria do not encode ATPase helicase loader homologs

to DnaC or DnaI. Instead, most bacteria encode the ancestral protein, DciA (DnaC/I

Antecedent) (28, 34), which is defined by the presence of a Domain of Unknown Function

DUF721 (termed DciA domain herein). Despite the prevalence of DciA domain containing

proteins in bacteria (28), DciA homologs have only been studied in actinobacterial

(*Mycobacterium tuberculosis and Mycobacterium smegmatis)* and γ-proteobacterial

(*Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Vibrio cholerae*) species (28, 34–36). DciA homologs interact with

the replicative helicase DnaB and are essential for *M. tuberculosis, M. smegmatis,* and *P.*

aeruginosa DNA replication and viability (28, 34–36). Based on DciA's interaction with the

replicative helicase and requirement for DNA replication, DciA has been proposed to perform a

function analogous to that of the DnaC/I helicase loaders. However, DciA does not have a

predicted ATPase domain and, therefore, cannot be considered a helicase loader like DnaC/I.

Instead, DciA is referred to as a predicted helicase operator, although the mechanism of DciA

helicase operation is still unknown (28, 34).

Based on studies in *M. tuberculosis*, the DciA domain was predicted to contain a region

of structural homology to the N-terminus of DnaA (34), which was subsequently confirmed in

V. cholerae DciA (35, 36). The DciA domain in the *M. tuberculosis* DciA homolog is essential for

protein function (34). In addition, mycobacterial DciA homologs encode a 58 amino acid (aa)

sequence extension N-terminal to the DciA domain that is essential for *M. smegmatis* viability

(34). However, this sequence is not conserved in *P. aeruginosa* or *V. cholerae* DciA. Instead,

sequences C-terminal to the DciA domain in *V. cholerae* DciA that are not shared with

mycobacterial DciA are essential for the interaction between DciA and the replicative helicase

DnaB (35). Therefore, the DciA homologs in mycobacteria and the γ-proteobacteria *P.*

aeruginosa and *V. cholerae* have diverged in the relative position of the DciA domain and the

presence of N- or C-terminal sequence extensions. These sequence variations raise questions

of whether there are functional consequences of these differences and if a broader view of the

DciA protein family would reveal further diversification. To begin to address these open

questions, we took a computational evolutionary approach and analyzed the phylogenetic

distribution, domain architecture, and conservation of sequence properties amongst 26,789

DciA homologs. Our analysis revealed that most bacterial DciA proteins encode a single

annotated domain, the eponymous DciA domain. However, we also identified multiple DciA

homologs with novel domain architectures, which could provide clues to specialized functions

or biology in those bacteria. Amongst the bacterial DciA single-domain proteins, there was

lineage-specific variation in total protein length and positioning of the DciA domain. Despite

this variation in sequence properties, AlphaFold structural predictions (37) identified a broadly

conserved pattern of structural motifs where the DciA domain is connected to alpha-helical

structures via an unstructured linker. Therefore, our analyses reveal conserved sequence-

structural features of DciA homologs across bacterial phyla as well as lineage- and, sometimes,

species-specific features, highlighting the need for expanded studies of this protein family.

RESULTS

DciA domain-containing proteins are predominantly found in bacteria with rare transfers to eukaryota

A protein homology search with *M tuberculosis* DciA (AAK44227.1) only identifies closely related homologs, predominantly in actinobacteria; similarly, homologs of *P. aeruginosa* DciA (AAG07793.1) are mostly proteobacterial. These data suggest that the DciA homologs across different phyla exhibit low conservation in their primary amino acid sequence. This divergence warranted a more comprehensive approach that used multiple DciA-domain containing proteins as starting points to retrieve the rich repertoire of DciA-like proteins from across the tree of life. Therefore, we analyzed the ~27K InterPro entries for DciA domain-containing proteins (DUF721; Dna[CI] antecedent DciA; Pfam ID entry PF05258) (38), excluding metagenome data entries. We also added valuable metadata to this dataset, including protein accession numbers, taxID, species, and complete and collapsed lineages for each protein **(Table S1,** https://github.com/JRaviLab/dcia_evolution). Our initial characterization revealed that these ~27K DciA-like proteins spanned the three kingdoms of life with 37 bacterial (with assigned lineages), 76 bacterial candidatus lineages (yet unassigned), 5 archaeal, 1 viral, and 6 eukaryotic lineages.

Next, we analyzed the phyletic distribution and domain architectures of all ~27K DciA proteins using the MolEvolvR web application (39). This analysis highlighted that most (99.9%) proteins were found in the kingdom eubacteria **(Fig. 1A).** In addition, there were 26 DciA

domain-containing proteins from eukaryota, archaea, and viral sequences **(Fig. 1A and Table**

S2). We performed BlastP homology searches with the 26 non-bacterial DciA domain-

containing proteins (40) and found that over 95% of top hits with the highest confidence levels

retrieved for 24 of these proteins were from bacterial genomes, suggesting that these DciA-

domain containing proteins had been mistakenly attributed to archaeal, eukaryotic, or viral

genomes **(Table S2)**. The two remaining non-bacterial DciA-like proteins occur in *Kingdonia*

uniflora (KAF6150485.1), an endangered angiosperm with over-representation in DNA

replication and repair genes (41), and the fungus *Hyaloscypha bicolor E* (PMD57303.1) **(Table S2,**

Fig. S1A). All close homologs of the *K. uniflora* DciA protein were in magnoliopsida, a class of

flowering plants. The DciA protein from *H. bicolor E* predominantly retrieved (98/100) DciA-like

proteins in fungal species. We also verified that these two eukaryotic DciA proteins were part

of annotated ORFs in complete genomes, suggesting that they are truly eukaryotic proteins.

Further, using AlphaFold structure prediction, we found that the DciA domains within the *K.*

uniflora and *H. bicolor E* proteins resembled a truncated version of the *V. cholerae* DciA domain,

solved previously using NMR (36) **(Fig. S1B)**. Each eukaryotic DciA domain is approximately

half of the median length of *V. cholerae* DciA domain and is predicted to contain just the first

alpha-helix and beta-sheet present in the *V. cholerae* DciA domain **(Fig. S1B)** (36). Our analysis

using MolEvolvR revealed that the DciA domain-containing protein in *K. uniflora* also carries an

annotated HMA (heavy metal associated) domain (Pfam: PF00403), overlapping with the DciA

domain **(Fig. S1A,B)**. HMA domains are typically involved in heavy metal transport and

detoxification in both eukaryotic and prokaryotic species (42–44), where heavy metal exposure

can induce DNA damage (45–47). Although there were no additional Pfam domains annotated

in the *H. bicolor E* DciA domain-containing protein, we identified two AN11006-like domains

(PANTHER family: <u>PTHR42085</u>) of unknown function on either side of the DciA domain **(Table**

S2). Given that the DciA domain was previously considered to be an exclusively bacterial

protein domain, the identification of predicted DciA structural domains in two eukaryotic

species reveals the potential for much broader evolutionary distribution than previously

appreciated, providing avenues for future structure-function studies.

Bacterial DciA homolog domain architectures

DciA domains are mostly loners

The bacterial DciA proteins from InterPro fell into 37 bacterial lineages **(Fig. 1A)**, plus many

sequences annotated as Candidatus due to incomplete taxonomic classification **(Table S1,**

<u>https://github.com/JRaviLab/dcia_evolution</u>). In line with sequencing and publication bias,

proteobacterial, actinobacterial, and bacteroidetes genomes were over-represented in our

homolog space (48–50) **(Fig. 1A)**. Given the variation noted in the two eukaryotic DciA-domain

containing proteins, we then proceeded to characterize the domain architecture of the ~26K

bacterial DciA homologs using MolEvolvR (39). We found that a stark majority (99.7%) of

bacterial DciA proteins carried a lone DciA domain. In addition, we identified 38 variations

where DciA homologs either contained multiple DciA domains or additional annotated

domains **(Fig. 1B,C).** The domain architecture variations were often lineage-specific, as

described below, indicating that they evolved later during speciation to adapt to lineage-

specific biology.

Proteobacterial-specific variations in DciA domain architecture

Within proteobacteria, we identified four lineage-specific DciA domain architectures **(Fig. 1B)**,

including some domains present in other proteins associated with DNA replication.

Specifically, 15 proteobacterial DciA homologs contained a thioredoxin-like domain (Pfam:

Thioredoxin (TRX) PF13462; *e.g.,* ODT99650.1, *Rhodospirillales*) **(Fig. 1B,C)**. TRX domains are

present in a large class of redox-regulated proteins (51), and play roles in oxidative stress

responses (52, 53). In addition, *Cc*TRX1, an essential TRX domain protein, is upregulated during

DNA replication initiation in the α-proteobacteria *Caulobacter crescentus* (54). Two other

proteobacterial DciA homologs contain PDZ domains (Pfam: PF13180; e.g., KQZ00574.1,

Pseudolabrys) **(Fig. 1B,C)**, which are generally involved in protein-protein interactions (55, 56)

and could facilitate the interaction between these DciA proteins and other replication proteins.

The PDZ domain-containing DciA homologs also carry trypsin-like peptidase domains (Pfam:

PF13365) **(Fig. 1B,C)**, which have recently been linked to DNA replication in humans, where the

trypsin-like peptidase domain in the protein FAM111A is necessary for overcoming replication

fork stalling (57). The DciA homolog in the α-proteobacteria *Micavibrio aeruginosavorus*

(PZQ43964.1) encodes three translation elongation factor P domains (KOW-like, Pfam:

PF0820, OB, Pfam: PF01132, C-terminal, Pfam: PF09285) **(Fig. 1B,C)**.

Actinobacterial variations in DciA domain architectures

We identified four distinct lineage-specific domain architectures within actinobacteria, all of

which involve domains associated with nucleotide sensing and DNA replication. Three

Streptomyces DciA homologs contain a YspA domain (Pfam: YAcAr/PF10686; *e.g.,*

SNC77843.1) in addition to the DciA domain **(Fig. 1B,C)**. YspA domains typically have fusions

to domains that sense and process nucleotide-derived ligands such as ADP-ribose (58). We

found that the DciA protein in *Bifidobacterium callitrichos* (PST49340.1) contains the C-terminal

domain of the DEAD-box RNA helicase family (Pfam: <u>PF00271</u>) (59), and the res subunit of the

type III restriction enzyme, which encodes ATPase activity (Pfam: <u>PF04851</u>) (60) **(Fig. 1B,C)**. In

addition, five actinobacterial DciA homologs contain an N-terminal RecF/RecN/SMC domain

(Pfam: <u>02463</u>; *e.g.,* OUE04448.1, *Clavibacter*) **(Fig. 1B,C)** common in the N-termini of structural

maintenance of chromosome (SMC) proteins. The SMC domain typically includes an NTP-

binding motif and SMC proteins are involved in chromosome partitioning, DNA recombination,

and repair (61–65). In addition, six actinobacterial DciA homologs contain multiple DciA

domains (e.g. OEJ23183.1, *Streptomyces*) **(Fig. 1B,C)**.

In addition to actinobacteria-specific domain architectures, DciA proteins in

Micromonospora endolithica (<u>RKN42798.1</u>) and bacteroidetes species *Rhodothermus marinus*

(BBM73918.1, ACY49481.1) contain the γ/τ (Pfam: PF12169) and δ(Pfam: PF13177) subunit

domains of DNA polymerase III **(Fig. 1B,C)**, which make up part of the clamp loader complex in

E. coli (66, 67). The DNA pol III domains present in these DciA homologs also contain AAA+

ATPase domains, also found in DnaC/DnaI helicase loaders from *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* (29, 32,

33, 67).

Other DciA domain architectures involving domains associated with DNA replication

Thirty-six DciA homologs from nitrospinae and candidatus rokubacteria were annotated to

contain tetratricopeptide repeat (TPR) domains **(Fig. 1B,C)**. TPR domains are largely

eukaryotic protein-protein interaction domains (68). For example, the TPR domain of the

replication regulator Dia2 in eukaryotes is essential for the association of Dia2 with the

replisome progression complex, which interacts with the MCM2-7 helicase at the replication

fork (69). TPR proteins have also been identified in bacteria. For example, in the α-

proteobacteria *Orientia tsutsugamushi*, two TPR proteins bind to the eukaryotic RNA helicase

DDX3 to inhibit host cell translation (70). In candidatus rokubacteria, these TPR repeats are

sometimes associated with an anaphase-promoting complex domain (Pfam: PF12895; *e.g.*,

OLB41025.1), which along with TPR repeat domains, is present in eukaryotic cell cycle

regulators (71, 72).

The DciA homologs from two planctomycetes (KAF0244841.1, NUN49423.1) contain a

Histidine kinase-, DNA gyrase B-, and HSP90-like ATPase domain (Pfam: PF02518), a DNA

gyrase B domain (Pfam: PF00204), a toprim domain (DNA topoisomerase II Pfam: PF01751),

and a DNA gyrase B C-terminus domain (Pfam: PF00986). A closer look at one of the

planctomycetes DciA sequences (KAF0244841.1) shows that DciA and GyrB are annotated as a

single fused protein. GyrB, part of the bacterial gyrase, is responsible for the negative

supercoiling of dsDNA, which is essential during the opening of the DNA replication bubble

(73).

Homology search with multiple starting points identifies additional DciA domain

architectures

To ensure that we identified all sequenced DciA homologs and the entire repertoire of domain

architectures in this protein family, we selected 94 unique lineage-domain-architecture pairs

from 36 bacterial lineages and 27 total domain architectures to identify novel DciA homologs

across the tree of life using MolEvolvR **(Fig. S2A)**. The only phylum without a representative

from our initial analysis was atribacterota, which did not contain class-level assignments. In

addition to novel domain architectures discussed above, the homology search identified 8 new

domain architectures, including 11 actinobacterial homologs with a DciA dyad (*e.g.,*

WP_165395910.1 from *Streptomyces*), several fusions with TPR repeats, and a DciA domain

fused with an aminomethyltransferase domain (*Micrococcus sp. HSID17227*, WP_238693333.1)

(Fig. S2B). Together, our initial characterization along with these homologs captured the rich

repertoire of DciA variation.

DciA single-domain homologs vary in protein length and position of the DciA

domain

Despite having only one annotated domain, the DciA single-domain proteins varied

considerably in length, ranging from 32 to 482 amino acids **(Fig. 2A)**. In addition to total

protein length, the distance of the DciA domain from the N- or C-terminus varied widely,

where the DciA domain sometimes fell in the middle, at the N-terminus, or at the C-terminus

of the protein **(Fig. 2A)**. The median amino acid length of the annotated DciA domains in our

dataset is 85aa **(Table S1)**, indicating that DciA homologs close to this protein length would

only contain the DciA structural domain. An example of a DciA protein where the total protein

length is similar to the size of the single DciA structural domain is the *Bacteroides fragilis* DciA

homolog (AUI45441.1), which is 96aa long with the DciA domain annotated from amino acids

8-95. The AlphaFold structural prediction tool predicts that the entire *B. fragilis* DciA protein is

comprised of the predicted DciA domain structure, consisting of one alpha-helix followed by a

two beta-sheet motif, one kinked alpha-helix, and a third beta-sheet (34, 36) **(Fig. 2B)**.

However, with a median protein length of 148aa **(Fig. 2A),** most DciA single-domain proteins

are longer than the typical DciA domain length, suggesting that there may exist other

functional sequences in DciA single-domain proteins that are not annotated as domains. For

example, *V. cholerae* DciA is 157aa long, with the DciA domain positioned at the N-terminus

(amino acids 12–90) followed by a 67aa C-terminal sequence extension. An NMR structure of

the N-terminus of *V. cholerae* DciA confirms that the DciA domain in the N-terminus is

sufficient to form the DciA domain structure (36). In addition to confirming the DciA domain

structure in the N-terminus, AlphaFold prediction of the full-length *V. cholerae* DciA protein

(AAF95538.1) depicts the C-terminus as an alpha-helix immediately following the DciA domain,

connected to two terminal alpha-helices by an 11aa linker **(Fig. 2B)**. Given that the C-terminus

of *V. cholerae* DciA is required for its interaction with the replicative helicase *in vitro* (35), these

data demonstrate not only that most DciA single-domain homologs are longer than the DciA

domain alone, but also that the sequence extensions appended to the DciA domain can be

physiologically relevant. The identification of DciA homologs with different domain

architectures **(Fig. 1)**, varying protein lengths **(Fig. 2A)**, and different positioning of the DciA

domain **(Fig. 2A)** suggest that some DciA homologs have evolved sequence properties with

likely functional consequences for DciA activity.

Many DciA single-domain homologs are predicted to encode intrinsically disordered regions

Small-angle X-ray scattering, intrinsic disorder prediction tools, and molecular dynamic simulations have shown that the C-terminus of *V. cholerae* DciA that is required for DnaB binding *in vitro* contains an IDR (35). In addition, there is precedent for IDRs in other bacterial DNA replication proteins, including SSB (74–77), the replication restart helicase Rep (78, 79), the helicase loaders DnaC and DnaI, and the replication initiation protein DnaA (35). To estimate the co-occurrence of IDRs with DciA domains, we used MobiDBLite (from within MolEvolvR (80)) to predict IDRs in each of the bacterial DciA homologs **(Table S1; Fig. 3A)**. Out of ~23K total bacterial non-candidatus DciA single-domain homologs, ~8K proteins contained at least one IDR, and some (4,728) had multiple regions of disorder predicted. These IDRs were present in DciA homologs from 24 phyla **(Fig. 3A)**. Analysis of the lengths of the IDRs in the DciA homologs from each phyla found that these IDRs ranged in length from 14aa to 213aa **(Fig. 3B)**. *M. tuberculosis* DciA was among the single-domain proteins predicted to contain IDRs both N- and C-terminal to the DciA domain. Deletion of the N-terminal sequence of *M. tuberculosis* DciA that encodes the predicted IDR renders mycobacteria nonviable, demonstrating that this region predicted to form an IDR in DciA is essential for its cellular function (34).

DciA single-domain homologs can be separated into four groups based on protein length and the positioning of the DciA domain

The importance of the predicted IDR sequences for DciA activity in *M. tuberculosis* (34) and *V. cholerae* (35) along with the prevalence of predicted IDRs in DciA homologs suggest that IDRs in other DciA homologs may also be functionally relevant. In addition, we hypothesized that the N- and C-terminal sequence extensions in DciA single-domain proteins without predicted IDRs may also be functionally relevant. Since the minimum IDR sequence length in DciA homologs was 14aa **(Fig. 3B)**, we reasoned that any N- or C-terminal sequence extension ≥14aa in a DciA protein could comprise a functionally relevant sequence. To identify DciA proteins with potentially relevant sequence extensions associated with the DciA domain, we binned the bacterial non-candidatus DciA single-domain homologs (23,309 total proteins) into four groups: i) Group 1 proteins with ≥14aa N-terminal to the DciA domain and <14aa C-terminal, ii) Group 2 proteins with <14aa N-terminal to the DciA domain and ≥14aa C-terminal, iii) Group 3 proteins with ≥14aa both N- and C-terminally to the DciA domain, and iv) Group 4 proteins with <14aa on both N- and C-termini **(Fig. 4 top panel, Table S1)**.

Most (~90%) actinobacterial DciA homologs fell into Group 3, with sequences on both sides of the DciA domain, although there were examples of actinobacterial DciA proteins in each of the other three groups as well **(Fig. 4A)**. When we separated actinobacteria by class, we found that actinomycetia and coriobacteria DciA proteins were mostly in Group 3, whereas acidimicrobia, nitriliruptoria, and thermoleophilia DciA proteins were mostly in Group 1 **(Fig. 4B)**. Group 3 also contained several (~65%) proteobacterial DciA homologs, however, there were also 2,958 proteobacterial DciA proteins in Group 2, as well as representatives in Groups 1

313 and 4 **(Fig. 4A)**. When we separated proteobacteria into individual classes, homologs from α-

314 proteobacteria, β-proteobacteria, δ-proteobacteria, γ-proteobacteria, oligoflexia, and ζ-

315 proteobacteria fell mostly into Group 3 **(Fig. 4B)**. In contrast, DciA homologs in ε-

316 proteobacteria and hydrogenophila mostly fell into Group 2. In contrast to both actinobacteria

317 and proteobacteria, bacteroidetes DciA homologs fell almost exclusively into Groups 1 and 4,

318 with the majority (~84%) belonging to Group 4 **(Fig. 4A)**. When we separated bacteroidetes

319 into classes, we found that only the cytophagia bacteria contained mostly Group 1 homologs,

320 while the rest of bacteroidetes classes contained mostly Group 4 homologs, indicating lineage

321 and class-specific selection of DciA homolog sequence structures **(Fig. 4B)**.

322  To better visualize the distribution of DciA single-domain proteins from phyla with

323 smaller numbers of representative sequences, we removed the proteobacterial,

324 actinobacterial, or bacteroidetes sequences and plotted the distribution of the remaining DciA

325 single-domain homologs in Groups 1–4 **(Fig. 4C)**. Some lineages had almost all DciA homologs

326 classed within a single Group, indicating the evolution and conservation of a particular DciA

327 sequence organization for that lineage. For example, 94% of verrucomicrobia and 96% of

328 chlamydiae DciA homologs fell into Group 1. Other lineages had DciA homologs more broadly

329 distributed across Groups, although there were still lineage-specific biases towards single

330 Groups. Greater than 65% elusimicrobia, lentisphaerae, ignavibacteriae, and fibrobacteres

331 DciA proteins were classed into Group 1, >65% of cyanobacteria, nitrospirae, deinococcus-

332 thermus, and thermodesulfovibrio DciA homologs were classed in Group 2, and >65% of

333 synergistetes DciA homologs are in Group 3. Planctomycetes exhibited differentiation of DciA

334 homolog grouping at the Class level. Planctomycetes class planctomycetia homologs were

mostly in Group 1, while planctomycetes phycisphaerae homologs were split evenly between

Groups 1 and 3 (**Fig. 4C, Table S1**). Firmicute and fusobacteria DciA homologs were

represented equally in Groups 2 and 3, with a small number of representatives in groups 1 and

4. Alternatively, gemmatimonadetes DciA homologs were predominantly split between

Groups 1 and 4, and nitrospinae homologs were split between groups 1 and 2.

In addition to bacteroidetes, other lineages that were predominantly in Group 4

included chloroflexi (56% of DciA homologs), rhodothermaeota (81%), calditrichaeota (74%),

chlorobi (86%), and thermotogae (91%) **(Fig. 4C)**. Group 4 proteins only encode the DciA

structural domain, indicating that the DciA domain is sufficient for DciA activity in these

bacteria, although this has yet to be experimentally tested. DciA homologs from acidobacteria,

spirochaetes, and armatimonadetes did not follow any apparent trends in DciA homolog

classification, and kiritimatiellaeota, aquificae, chrysiogenetes, abditibacteriota, tenericutes,

balneolaeota, caldiserica, dictyoglomi, atribacterota, and deferribacteres had <20 sequences in

our dataset. The lineage and class-specific trends observed in the four different DciA groupings

suggest differentiation of DciA proteins in a largely lineage-specific manner. The sequences N-

and/or C-terminal to the DciA domain in Groups 1–4 could have functional consequences for

the mechanisms of DciA proteins in different bacterial lineages.

Structure predictions of DciA single-domain homologs reveal conserved

structural motifs within and outside of the DciA domain

To understand the impact of sequence extensions on protein structure in DciA single-domain

homologs, we used AlphaFold structure prediction to model representative DciA proteins from

Groups 1–4 **(Fig. 5)**. For Groups 1–3, we also compared the structures of homologs with and

without IDRs predicted in the sequence extensions. Regardless of Group designation, all DciA

domains were predicted to fold into a structure similar to that previously predicted for *M.*

tuberculosis DciA (34) and experimentally validated for *V. cholerae* DciA (36) **(Fig. 5)**.

For a Group 1 DciA from planctomycetes (KLU02380.1, *Rhodopirellula islandica*) that is

predicted to have a 48aa IDR N-terminal to the DciA domain, AlphaFold predicts that the N-

terminal sequence extension does not form any structured helices or beta sheets, supporting

that this region could be intrinsically disordered **(Fig. 5)**. In contrast, the structural prediction of

a Group 1 DciA single-domain protein from bacteroidetes (GEO04242.1, *Adhaeribacter*

aerolatus) with no predicted IDR displays the C-terminal sequence extension ending with a

single alpha-helix, connected to the DciA protein with an unstructured linker **(Fig. 5)**.

A Group 2 DciA homolog from cyanobacteria (AFY85399.1, *Oscillatoria acuminata*) that

is predicted to contain a C-terminal IDR exhibited the classic DciA domain folds followed by

one alpha helix connected to two more C-terminal helices via a 24aa linker, which coincided

with the predicted IDR **(Fig. 5)**. The Group 2 DciA homolog from *P. aeruginosa* (AAG07793.1, γ-

proteobacteria) with no predicted IDR, contains the DciA domain folds connected to two C-

terminal helices via a 16aa linker **(Fig. 5)**, which is reminiscent of the structure for O. *acuminata*

DciA, .

The Group 3 DciA protein from the actinobacteria *M. tuberculosis* (BAL63824.1) consists

of a single 18aa alpha helix in its N-terminus that is connected to the DciA domain by a 34aa

linker region, which is predicted to contain an IDR **(Fig. 5)**. The C-terminus of *M. tuberculosis*

DciA is also predicted to contain a 19aa IDR. A group 3 protein with no predicted IDR from

Leptospira interrogans (spirochaete (AAN47203.1) contains sequence extensions in both its N-

and C-terminus **(Fig. 5)**, with the same double alpha helix fold in its C-terminus as observed in

the group 2 proteins *P. aeruginosa* and *O. acuminata.* The DciA domain is also connected to the

two-alpha helical domain by a 20aa unstructured linker region.

Similar to the structure predicted for *B. fragilis* DciA **(Fig. 2B),** other Group 4 DciA

homologs from thermotogae (*Thermotoga maritima*, AAD35914.1) and α-proteobacteria

(*Rickettsia conorii*, AAL03818.1) only contain the folds previously reported for the DciA domain

in *V. cholerae* (36) **(Fig. 5)**. These data further support that the DciA structural domain alone is

sufficient for DciA activity in Group 4 bacteria.

Visualization of these representative DciA structures reveals that when unannotated

sequences are appended to the DciA domain (Groups 1–3), they tend to form an unstructured

linker region connected to 1–2 alpha-helices at the termini, regardless of whether the

sequences are positioned N- or C-terminal to the DciA domain. In some Group 1–3 DciA

homologs, the linker is predicted to comprise an IDR. Notably, *V. cholerae* DciA has an

experimentally verified C-terminal IDR (35), although this was not predicted by MobiDBLite

(Table S1). Circular dichroism and secondary structure prediction tools of *V. cholerae* DciA

predict that the C-terminal IDR can transiently form two alpha-helices (35) **(Fig. 2B)**. These

helices occur at a similar position in *P. aeruginosa* DciA as well **(Fig. 5)**. Therefore, it is possible

that the unstructured linker motifs in *P. aeruginosa* and other Group 1–3 DciA homologs

comprise IDRs not predicted by MobiDBLite due to the alpha-helices that can form in the

termini. The conservation of the predicted structures of DciA homologs across bacterial

lineages, where the DciA domain is connected to alpha-helical structures via an unstructured

linker, suggests that these structural motifs are important for DciA activity in bacteria that

encode Group 1–3 homologs.

DciA evolution across the tree of life

Our sequence-structure analyses thus far revealed lineage-specific signatures in DciA domain

organization in addition to the widely prevalent DciA single-domain proteins. The natural next,

and final, question is how did these different DciA proteins evolve — are there species/lineage-

specific, domain architecture, or group-specific migration patterns? To address these

questions, we used all DciA proteins from **Fig. 1** to generate a phylogenetic tree **(Fig. 6)**. Most

strikingly, we observed that DciA homologs clustered by lineages **(Fig. 6A).** The three largest

lineages, actinobacteria, bacteroidetes, and proteobacteria, are labeled based on their

dominant membership **(Fig. 6A)**. We noted two main proteobacterial clades (left and bottom),

likely due to class-wise grouping. We, therefore, further resolved the tree by the predominant

bacterial classes from these three phyla **(Fig. 6B)**. The class-resolved tree explains the distinct

proteobacterial clusters observed in the phylum-based tree **(Fig. 6A)**, wherein α-

proteobacteria and β/γ-proteobacteria form distinct clusters **(Fig. 6B)**. This migration pattern

of the α-proteobacterial homologs suggests that the DciA proteins in this lineage have

diverged evolutionarily from the rest of the proteobacterial lineages. The phylogenetic analysis

indicates that variations in DciA protein domain architectures, protein lengths, and DciA

domain positioning likely occurred after lineage-specific divergence of bacterial classes.

Overall, the DciA phylogenetic tree delineates the evolution of this critical panbacterial protein

across all major lineages.

DISCUSSION

The recent discovery of DciA as a predicted helicase operator in bacteria (28, 34, 36) has begun

to shed light on a long-standing open question of how the majority of bacteria facilitate

helicase activity during DNA replication in the absence of the ATPase helicase loaders

expressed by *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*. The wide distribution of DciA in diverse bacterial phyla

indicates that these proteins likely represent the predominant paradigm for helicase operation,

despite not being conserved in *E. coli* and *B. subtilis,* the organisms typically used as a model

for bacterial replication. DciA proteins are defined by the presence of the DciA domain (28).

Prior phylogenetic analysis indicates that *dnaC* and *dnaI* homologs were acquired through

evolution at the expense of *dciA* (named for *dna[CI]* antecedent) (28, 30, 31) suggesting that

DciA and DnaC/DnaI perform a common function. In addition, it has been shown that DciA

interacts with the replicative helicase and is required for DNA replication and viability in the

few organisms it has been studied in (28, 34–36). However, the mechanism by which DciA

mediates replication initiation is still unknown.

Our comprehensive evolutionary study of DciA proteins has revealed both lineage-

specific and conserved features amongst homologs. We find that most homologs are DciA

single-domain proteins in bacteria, with rare instances of additional domains in DciA

homologs, many of which have known roles in DNA replication and repair **(Fig. 1, S2)**. These

additional domain architectures were predominantly phyla-, and sometimes species-, specific,

suggesting that they have been acquired and maintained to facilitate lineage-specific

requirements during DNA replication. Further study of these DciA domain architectures could

shed light on varying mechanisms of the regulation of bacterial replication, or other roles for

DciA in the cell. Similarly, we identified two eukaryotic proteins that encode partial DciA

domains **(Fig. S1)**, raising the question of how this domain would function in eukaryotes in the

absence of its bacterial replicative helicase binding partner. The eukaryotic DciA-domain

containing proteins also harbored additional domains without known connections to DNA

replication, possibly suggesting that the DciA domain has been co-opted for other purposes in

these organisms.

Even though most bacterial DciA homologs were single-domain proteins, they

exhibited a wide variety in sequence lengths and positioning of the DciA domain **(Fig 2, Table**

S1). When we grouped the DciA homologs based on the position of the DciA domain and the

presence of N- and C-terminal extensions, we identified lineage-specific trends in these

sequence features **(Fig. 4)**, suggesting that these variations mostly evolved following

speciation and highlight how the regulation of helicase activity during DNA replication

initiation could differ between phyla. For example, most actinobacterial and proteobacterial

DciA single-domain homologs fell into Groups 2 and 3, which harbored sequence extensions

either N-terminally or on both sides of the DciA domain, while most bacteroidetes DciA

homologs were classed in Group 4 encoding only the DciA structural domain. The sequence

extensions in actinobacteria *M. tuberculosis* and proteobacteria *V. cholerae* DciA have been

shown to be essential for DciA activity *in vivo* or *in vitro*, respectively (34, 35). The absence of

these sequences in most bacteroidetes homologs suggests differing requirements for DciA

activity in different bacteria.

464   Despite the lineage-specific grouping of DciA homologs based on sequence lengths and

465 positioning of the DciA domain, AlphaFold structural prediction of representative DciA

466 homologs from each Group revealed common structural patterns **(Fig. 5)**. The DciA domain

467 structure (36) was conserved across DciA homologs, and has previously been noted to

468 resemble the structure of the N-terminus of DnaA (34–36, 81). The N-terminus of DnaA is

469 critical for the interaction with the DnaB replicative helicase and other regulators (82, 83),

470 however, the role of the DciA domain in the interaction with DnaB has yet to be established. A

471 tryptophan residue conserved in the DciA domains of many DciA homologs is positioned

472 similarly to a phenylalanine residue in the DnaA N-terminus that has been predicted to have a

473 key role in making contacts between DnaA and its interacting partners, including DnaB (34,

474 84). Mutation of the tryptophan in the DciA domain of *M. tuberculosis* DciA results in slow

475 growth and decreased DNA replication (34). This supports that the tryptophan within the DciA

476 domain plays a key role for DciA function *in vivo* in mycobacteria. However, not all DciA

477 homologs encode this tryptophan residue within their DciA domain, a key example being *V.*

478 *cholerae* DciA, which has an isoleucine at this position (35). Therefore, even the defining DciA

479 domain feature of DciA proteins exhibits some variation in different bacteria that may reflect

480 differences in mechanism of action or mode of interaction with the replicative helicase.

481   In addition to conservation of the DciA domain structure, when sequence extensions

482 were associated with the DciA domain, they tended to form unstructured linkers terminating in

483 1–2 alpha-helices **(Fig. 5)**. These linker and alpha-helical structures were identified either C- or

484 N-terminal to the DciA domain, depending on the homolog, where the role of this positioning

485 in terms of function is still unknown. At least one third of the DciA single-domain homologs

were also predicted to contain IDRs **(Fig. 3, 5)**. The IDR C-terminal to the DciA domain in the *V.*

cholerae homolog is required for its interaction with the DnaB helicase (35). IDRs in other

replication proteins, including SSB and Rep, also play key roles in facilitating protein-protein

interactions within the replisome (74–79), indicating a common theme and function of these

domains during bacterial DNA replication. However, if the IDR in the unstructured linker

sequence is required for the interaction between DciA and the replicative helicase, this would

imply that Group 4 DciA homologs, which only encode the DciA structural domain and no

linker domains, employ other sequences or mechanisms to interact with DnaB. Thus far, no

DciA homologs in Group 4 have been studied either genetically or biochemically and so how

the DciA domain functions on its own remains a mystery.

Our computational evolutionary analyses have enabled an in-depth delineation of the

evolution of DciA across the tree of life and elucidated the variation in DciA domain

architectures, co-occurrences with IDRs, and the many flavors of bacterial DciA sequence-

structural features. Despite this deep exploration, many unknowns still remain regarding DciA

proteins and bacterial DNA replication. Our results highlight the complexities and diversity

that have evolved in the fundamental process of DNA replication, where no single species of

bacteria will be able to represent a central dogma that holds true throughout the kingdom.

These studies provide a framework for researchers to consider the evolutionary variation while

dissecting the mechanistic basis for helicase operation in bacteria.

METHODS

Query selection

We started with ~27K DciA carrying proteins from Pfam (UniProt sequences from the InterPro database (38)). We added relevant metadata to each of these homologs, including corresponding NCBI protein accession numbers, protein length, taxID, species, and lineages. We used MolEvolvR (39) and the underlying InterProScan (85) to explore the domain architectures, cellular localizations, and disorder predictions for all ~27K DciA proteins. The resulting domain architectures (from MolEvolvR) were also appended to each homolog's metadata. All these data are available in **Table S1**, and on GitHub (https://github.com/JRaviLab/dcia_evolution).

Representative DciA proteins: To select representatives for subsequent analyses, we picked DciA carrying proteins from each lineage–domain-architecture combination. We excluded proteins that were not bacterial, and those without an assigned lineage, (*e.g.,* candidatus and uncultured bacteria). The remaining sequences were then grouped by the short lineage column (superkingdom>phylum>class) and the Pfam domain architecture column. These groups were then reverse sorted by sequence completeness and one representative protein in each group was selected. From this selection process we found 94 representative proteins from 72 bacterial lineages with 23 unique domain architectures.

Protein homology search: We performed homology searches of the 26 non-bacterial DciA

proteins using the NCBI BLASTP (40). When examining the results, we excluded any non-

bacterial query protein (from the 27) if they retrieved <5% non-bacteria in their top 100 hits (or

23 hits in the case of RLI67678.1) (≥95% were bacterial).

Analysis using MolEvolvR

Domain architectures: We used MolEvolvR (39) to determine and characterize all DciA-

containing proteins from InterPro and their homologs. We first downloaded the sequences of

all DciA-containing proteins identified by InterPro from UniProt. The domain architectures

were identified using InterProscan (85) and analyzed by lineage, quantified with heatmaps, and

visualized by unique combinations of Pfam domains. During this analysis, we renamed

MobiDBLite predictions to "Intrinsically disordered regions" to be consistent with previous

literature. Also, DciA homologs with TPR fusions were condensed by the number of TPR

repeats for clarity, *e.g.,* TPR+TPR+TPR was condensed to TPR(3). We then aggregated relevant

species and protein annotation metadata from the NCBI into our combined dataset. We

selected 94 representatives to include each combination of bacterial lineage (excluding

atribacterota, which did not contain class-level assignments) and Pfam domain architecture as

queries for MolEvolvR homology search.

Homology search: These 94 proteins were submitted to MolEvolvR to identify homologs in the

NCBI RefSeq non-redundant proteins database (86). The domain architectures and sequence-

structure motif predictions, as well as lineage and protein-related metadata, were determined

using MolEvolvR for each of the homologs (as described above) for downstream analyses. The

resulting data were summarized and visualized from within MolEvolvR and using custom R

scripts.

Data availability: All our data, analyses, and visualizations summarizing the DciA homologs

across the bacterial kingdom, along with their domain architectures and phyletic spreads, are

available at https://github.com/JRaviLab/dcia_evolution. Detailed legends for our data tables,

structure predictions, and sequences used for tree generation are also available in our GitHub

repository.

Phylogenetic Tree

Fasta sequences of all DciA-containing proteins from InterPro (~27k) were obtained from the

UniProtKB. These sequences were aligned using kalign3 (87) and a phylogenetic tree was

constructed using FastTree (88). The resulting tree was visualized with FigTree

(http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/) and color-coded by lineage.

Alphafold Structure Prediction

We used the AlphaFold structural prediction Colab notebook (37, 89) via the ChimeraX 1.4 daily

build software (90) downloaded 2022-02-07 for all protein models. Visualization and analyses

of models performed with UCSF ChimeraX, developed by the Resource for Biocomputing,

Visualization, and Informatics at the University of California, San Francisco (90). All AlphaFold

structures have been deposited via ModelArchive (http://modelarchive.org/), and are available

with the following accession codes (follow the link and enter the temporary supplementary

access code when prompted): ma-q8sq3 (*K. uniflora* – temporary supplemental access code:

xbO9Q6QacF), ma-vyetl *(H. bicolor E* – temporary supplemental access code: u1N27DoUat),

ma-z6rsv *(B. fragilis* – temporary supplemental access code: 16QiFKRCzw), ma-1hvpi *(V.*

cholerae – temporary supplemental access code: UWLLwXhQa4), ma-tk4v8 *(R. islandica* –

temporary supplemental access code: ljFtsjbocW), ma-9cnra *(A. aerolatus* – temporary

supplemental access code: uyu5HEqHrF), ma-v2jc1 *(O. acuminata* – temporary supplemental

access code: yMKAkPTopL), ma-ibgex *(P. aeruginosa* – temporary supplemental access code:

HcHuzHbF4s), ma-2ovw9 *(M. tuberculosis* – temporary supplementary access code:

kUR6yS2EXW), ma-n7tbg *(L. interrogans* – temporary supplementary access code:

Ro2XoDN45Q), ma-o2qnb *(T. maritima* – temporary supplemental access code: LvLPofxN1e),

ma-3ee0e *(R. conorii* – temporary supplementary access code: GBBQZBO9LD). Public DOIs

(currently pending) will become available upon publication. The structures are also available in

our   GitHub   repository   (PDB   format;   under   'model_structures'):

https://github.com/JRaviLab/dcia_evolution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are very grateful to the Midwest Microbial Pathogenesis Conference (MMPC) 2021

organizers for providing HCB a travel award and opportunity to present the DciA story. This

interactive venue enabled the start of this collaboration between JR, JTB and CLS, HCB.

FUNDING

CLS is supported by a Burroughs Wellcome Fund Investigator in the Pathogenesis of Infectious Disease Award. HCB is supported by the Sondra Schlesinger Student Fellowship in Molecular Microbiology. JR is supported by Michigan State University (MSU) College of Veterinary Medicine Endowed Research Funds and MSU start-up funds. UCSF ChimeraX has support from National Institutes of Health R01-GM129325 and the Office of Cyber Infrastructure and Computational Biology, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.

DATA AVAILABILITY AND REUSE

All the data, analyses, and visualizations are available in our GitHub repository, https://github.com/JRaviLab/dcia_evolution. Text, figures, and data are licensed under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0.

REFERENCES

1.   Chodavarapu S, Kaguni JM. 2016. Replication Initiation in Bacteria. Enzymes 39:1–30.

2.   Fuller RS, Funnell BE, Kornberg A. 1984. The dnaA protein complex with the E. coli chromosomal replication origin (oriC) and other DNA sites. Cell 38:889–900.

3.   Fuller RS, Kornberg A. 1983. Purified dnaA protein in initiation of replication at the Escherichia coli chromosomal origin of replication. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 80:5817-5821.

4.   Jameson KH, Wilkinson AJ. 2017. Control of Initiation of DNA Replication in Bacillus
subtilis and Escherichia coli. Genes 8:22–22.

5.   Kaguni JM. 2011. Replication initiation at the Escherichia coli chromosomal origin.
Current opinion in chemical biology, 2011/08/18 ed. 15:606–613.

6.   Mott ML, Berger JM. 2007. DNA replication initiation: mechanisms and regulation in
bacteria. Nature Reviews Microbiology 5:343–354.

7.   Schaper S, Messer W. 1995. Interaction of the initiator protein DnaA of Escherichia coli
with its DNA target. The Journal of biological chemistry 270:17622–17626.

8.   O'Donnell M, Langston L, Stillman B. 2013. Principles and concepts of DNA replication in
bacteria, archaea, and eukarya. Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in biology 5:a010108–
a010108.

9.   Bramhill D, Kornberg A. 1988. Duplex opening by dnaA protein at novel sequences in
initiation of replication at the origin of the E. coli chromosome. Cell 52:743–755.

10.   Meyer RR, Laine PS. 1990. The single-stranded DNA-binding protein of Escherichia coli.
Microbiological reviews 54:342–380.

11.   Baker TA, Funnell BE, Kornberg A. 1987. Helicase action of dnaB protein during
replication from the Escherichia coli chromosomal origin in vitro. Journal of Biological
Chemistry 262:6877–6885.

12.   LeBowitz JH, McMacken R. 1986. The Escherichia coli dnaB replication protein is a DNA

628   helicase. The Journal of biological chemistry 261:4738–4748.

629   13.   Lewis JS, Jergic S, Dixon NE. 2016. The E. coli DNA Replication Fork. The Enzymes 39:31–

630   88.

631   14.   Oakley AJ. 2019. A structural view of bacterial DNA replication. Protein science: a

632   publication of the Protein Society 28:990–1004.

633   15.   Gorbalenya AE, Koonin EV. 1993. Helicases: amino acid sequence comparisons and

634   structure-function relationships. Current Opinion in Structural Biology 3:419–429.

635   16.   Leipe DD, Aravind L, Grishin NV, Koonin EV. 2000. The bacterial replicative helicase DnaB

636   evolved from a RecA duplication. Genome research 10:5–16.

637   17.   Fernandez AJ, Berger JM. 2021. Mechanisms of hexameric helicases. Critical Reviews in

638   Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 56:621–639.

639   18.   Itsathitphaisarn O, Wing RA, Eliason WK, Wang J, Steitz TA. 2012. The hexameric helicase

640   DnaB adopts a nonplanar conformation during translocation. Cell 151:267–277.

641   19.   Spinks RR, Spenkelink LM, Stratmann SA, Xu Z-Q, Stamford NPJ, Brown SE, Dixon NE,

642   Jergic S, van Oijen AM. 2021. DnaB helicase dynamics in bacterial DNA replication

643   resolved by single-molecule studies. Nucleic acids research 49:6804–6816.

644   20.   Nakayama N, Arai N, Kaziro Y, Arai K. 1984. Structural and functional studies of the dnaB

645   protein using limited proteolysis. Characterization of domains for DNA-dependent ATP

hydrolysis and for protein association in the primosome. The Journal of biological

chemistry 259:88–96.

21. Sakamoto Y, Nakai S, Moriya S, Yoshikawa H, Ogasawara N. 1995. The Bacillus subtilis

dnaC gene encodes a protein homologous to the DnaB helicase of Escherichia coli.

Microbiology (Reading, England) 141(Pt 3):641–644.

22. Arias-Palomo E, Puri N, O'Shea Murray VL, Yan Q, Berger JM. 2019. Physical Basis for the

Loading of a Bacterial Replicative Helicase onto DNA. Molecular cell 74:173-184.e4.

23. Liu B, Eliason WK, Steitz TA. 2013. Structure of a helicase–helicase loader complex

reveals insights into the mechanism of bacterial primosome assembly. Nat Commun

4:2495.

24. Bruand C, Farache M, McGovern S, Ehrlich SD, Polard P. 2001. DnaB, DnaD and DnaI

proteins are components of the Bacillus subtilis replication restart primosome. Molecular

microbiology 42:245–255.

25. Kobori JA, Kornberg A. 1982. The Escherichia coli dnaC gene product. II. Purification,

physical properties, and role in replication. Journal of Biological Chemistry 257:13763–

13769.

26. Koonin EV. 1992. DnaC protein contains a modified ATP-binding motif and belongs to a

novel family of ATPases including also DnaA. Nucleic acids research 20:1997–1997.

27.   Wahle E, Lasken RS, Kornberg A. 1989. The dnaB-dnaC replication protein complex of

665   Escherichia coli. II. Role of the complex in mobilizing dnaB functions. J Biol Chem

666   264:2469–2475.

667   28.   Brézellec P, Vallet-Gely I, Possoz C, Quevillon-Cheruel S, Ferat J-L. 2016. DciA is an

668   ancestral replicative helicase operator essential for bacterial replication initiation. Nat

669   Commun 7:13271.

670   29.   Chase J, Berger J, Jeruzalmi D. 2022. Convergent evolution in two bacterial replicative

671   helicase loaders. Trends in Biochemical Sciences 26:S0968-0004(22)00042-1.

672   30.   Rokop ME, Auchtung JM, Grossman AD. 2004. Control of DNA replication initiation by

673   recruitment of an essential initiation protein to the membrane of Bacillus subtilis. Mol

674   Microbiol 52:1757–1767.

675   31.   Weigel C, Seitz H. 2006. Bacteriophage replication modules. FEMS Microbiol Rev 30:321–

676   381.

677   32.   Davey MJ, Fang L, McInerney P, Georgescu RE, O'Donnell M. 2002. The DnaC helicase

678   loader is a dual ATP/ADP switch protein. EMBO J 21:3148–3159.

679   33.   Ioannou C, Schaeffer PM, Dixon NE, Soultanas P. 2006. Helicase binding to DnaI exposes

680   a cryptic DNA-binding site during helicase loading in Bacillus subtilis. Nucleic Acids Res

681   34:5247–5258.

34.   Mann KM, Huang DL, Hooppaw AJ, Logsdon MM, Richardson K, Lee HJ, Kimmey JM,

Aldridge BB, Stallings CL. 2017. Rv0004 is a new essential member of the mycobacterial

DNA replication machinery. PLoS Genet 13:e1007115.

35.   Chan-Yao-Chong M, Marsin S, Quevillon-Cheruel S, Durand D, Ha-Duong T. 2020.

Structural ensemble and biological activity of DciA intrinsically disordered region. Journal

of Structural Biology 212:107573.

36.   Marsin S, Adam Y, Cargemel C, Andreani J, Baconnais S, Legrand P, Li de la Sierra-Gallay

I, Humbert A, Aumont-Nicaise M, Velours C, Ochsenbein F, Durand D, Le Cam E, Walbott

H, Possoz C, Quevillon-Cheruel S, Ferat J-L. 2021. Study of the DnaB:DciA interplay

reveals insights into the primary mode of loading of the bacterial replicative helicase.

Nucleic Acids Research 49:6569-6586.

37.   Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, Tunyasuvunakool K,

Bates R, Žídek A, Potapenko A, Bridgland A, Meyer C, Kohl SAA, Ballard AJ, Cowie A,

Romera-Paredes B, Nikolov S, Jain R, Adler J, Back T, Petersen S, Reiman D, Clancy E,

Zielinski M, Steinegger M, Pacholska M, Berghammer T, Bodenstein S, Silver D, Vinyals

O, Senior AW, Kavukcuoglu K, Kohli P, Hassabis D. 2021. Highly accurate protein

structure prediction with AlphaFold. 7873. Nature 596:583–589.

38.   Blum M, Chang H-Y, Chuguransky S, Grego T, Kandasaamy S, Mitchell A, Nuka G,

Paysan-Lafosse T, Qureshi M, Raj S, Richardson L, Salazar GA, Williams L, Bork P, Bridge

A, Gough J, Haft DH, Letunic I, Marchler-Bauer A, Mi H, Natale DA, Necci M, Orengo CA,

Pandurangan AP, Rivoire C, Sigrist CJA, Sillitoe I, Thanki N, Thomas PD, Tosatto SCE, Wu

CH, Bateman A, Finn RD. 2021. The InterPro protein families and domains database: 20

years on. Nucleic Acids Research 49:D344–D354.

39.   Burke JT, Chen SZ, Sosinski LM, Johnston JB, Ravi J. 2022. MolEvolvR: A web-app for

characterizing   proteins   using   molecular   evolution   and   phylogeny.   bioRxiv

https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.18.461833.

40.   Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment search

tool. J Mol Biol 215:403–410.

41.   Sun Y, Deng T, Zhang A, Moore MJ, Landis JB, Lin N, Zhang H, Zhang X, Huang J, Zhang

X, Sun H, Wang H. 2020. Genome Sequencing of the Endangered Kingdonia uniflora

(Circaeasteraceae,   Ranunculales)   Reveals   Potential   Mechanisms   of   Evolutionary

Specialization. iScience 23:101124.

42.   Arnesano F, Banci L, Bertini I, Ciofi-Baffoni S, Molteni E, Huffman DL, O'Halloran TV.

2002. Metallochaperones and Metal-Transporting ATPases: A Comparative Analysis of

Sequences and Structures. Genome Res 12:255–271.

43.   Dykema PE, Sipes PR, Marie A, Biermann BJ, Crowell DN, Randall SK. 1999. A new class

of proteins capable of binding transition metals. Plant Mol Biol 41:139–150.

44.   Sun X-H, Yu G, Li J-T, Jia P, Zhang J-C, Jia C-G, Zhang Y-H, Pan H-Y. 2014. A Heavy Metal-

Associated   Protein   (AcHMA1)   from   the   Halophyte,   Atriplex canescens   (Pursh)   Nutt.,

Confers Tolerance to Iron and Other Abiotic Stresses When Expressed in Saccharomyces

cerevisiae. Int J Mol Sci 15:14891–14906.

45. Morales ME, Derbes RS, Ade CM, Ortego JC, Stark J, Deininger PL, Roy-Engel AM. 2016.

Heavy Metal Exposure Influences Double Strand Break DNA Repair Outcomes. PLoS ONE

11:e0151367.

46. Stohs SJ, Bagchi D. 1995. Oxidative mechanisms in the toxicity of metal ions. Free Radic

Biol Med 18:321–336.

47. Zhou S, Wei C, Liao C, Wu H. 2008. Damage to DNA of effective microorganisms by heavy

metals: Impact on wastewater treatment. Journal of Environmental Sciences 20:1514–

1518.

48. Blackwell GA, Hunt M, Malone KM, Lima L, Horesh G, Alako BTF, Thomson NR, Iqbal Z.

2021. Exploring bacterial diversity via a curated and searchable snapshot of archived DNA

sequences. PLoS biology 19:e3001421–e3001421.

49. Land M, Hauser L, Jun S-R, Nookaew I, Leuze MR, Ahn T-H, Karpinets T, Lund O, Kora G,

Wassenaar T, Poudel S, Ussery DW. 2015. Insights from 20 years of bacterial genome

sequencing. Functional & integrative genomics 15:141–161.

50. Tatusova T, Ciufo S, Fedorov B, O'Neill K, Tolstoy I. 2014. RefSeq microbial genomes

database: new representation and annotation strategy. Nucleic Acids Research 42:D553–

D559.

51.   Atkinson HJ, Babbitt PC. 2009. An atlas of the thioredoxin fold class reveals the
complexity of function-enabling adaptations. PLoS Comput Biol 5:e1000541.

52.   Lee S, Kim SM, Lee RT. 2013. Thioredoxin and Thioredoxin Target Proteins: From
Molecular Mechanisms to Functional Significance. Antioxid Redox Signal 18:1165–1207.

53.   Lu J, Holmgren A. 2014. The Thioredoxin Superfamily in Oxidative Protein Folding.
Antioxidants & Redox Signaling 21:457–470.

54.   Goemans CV, Beaufay F, Wahni K, Van Molle I, Messens J, Collet J-F. 2018. An essential
thioredoxin is involved in the control of the cell cycle in the bacterium Caulobacter
crescentus. J Biol Chem 293:3839–3848.

55.   Muley VY, Akhter Y, Galande S. 2019. PDZ Domains Across the Microbial World:
Molecular Link to the Proteases, Stress Response, and Protein Synthesis. Genome
Biology and Evolution 11:644–659.

56.   Nourry C, Grant SGN, Borg J-P. 2003. PDZ domain proteins: plug and play! Sci STKE
(179):RE7.

57.   Kojima Y, Machida Y, Palani S, Caulfield TR, Radisky ES, Kaufmann SH, Machida YJ. 2020.
FAM111A protects replication forks from protein obstacles via its trypsin-like domain. Nat
Commun 11:1318.

58.   Burroughs AM, Zhang D, Schäffer DE, Iyer LM, Aravind L. 2015. Comparative genomic

analyses reveal a vast, novel network of nucleotide-centric systems in biological conflicts,

immunity and signaling. Nucleic acids research, 2015/11/20 ed. 43:10633–10654.

59.   Cordin O, Banroques J, Tanner NK, Linder P. 2006. The DEAD-box protein family of RNA

helicases. Gene 367:17–37.

60.   Wyszomirski KH, Curth U, Alves J, Mackeldanz P, Möncke-Buchner E, Schutkowski M,

Krüger DH, Reuter M. 2012. Type III restriction endonuclease EcoP15I is a heterotrimeric

complex containing one Res subunit with several DNA-binding regions and ATPase

activity. Nucleic Acids Res 40:3610–3622.

61.   Britton RA, Lin DC-H, Grossman AD. 1998. Characterization of a prokaryotic SMC protein

involved in chromosome partitioning. Genes Dev 12:1254–1259.

62.   Hirano T. 2005. SMC proteins and chromosome mechanics: from bacteria to humans.

Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 360:507–514.

63.   Pellegrino S, Radzimanowski J, de Sanctis D, Boeri Erba E, McSweeney S, Timmins J.

2012. Structural and functional characterization of an SMC-like protein RecN: new

insights into double-strand break repair. Structure 20:2076–2089.

64.   Strunnikov AV, Jessberger R. 1999. Structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC)

proteins. European Journal of Biochemistry 263:6–13.

65.   Strunnikov AV. 2006. SMC complexes in bacterial chromosome condensation and

segregation. Plasmid 55:135–144.

66.   Kelch BA, Makino DL, O'Donnell M, Kuriyan J. 2012. Clamp loader ATPases and the

evolution of DNA replication machinery. BMC Biology 10:34.

67.   O'Donnell M, Jeruzalmi D, Kuriyan J. 2001. Clamp loader structure predicts the

architecture of DNA polymerase III holoenzyme and RFC. Current Biology 11:R935–R946.

68.   Zeytuni N, Zarivach R. 2012. Structural and Functional Discussion of the Tetra-Trico-

Peptide Repeat, a Protein Interaction Module. Structure 20:397–405.

69.   Morohashi H, Maculins T, Labib K. 2009. The Amino-Terminal TPR Domain of Dia2

Tethers SCFDia2 to the Replisome Progression Complex. Current Biology 19:1943–1949.

70.   Bang S, Min C-K, Ha N-Y, Choi M-S, Kim I-S, Kim Y-S, Cho N-H. 2016. Inhibition of

eukaryotic translation by tetratricopeptide-repeat proteins of Orientia tsutsugamushi. J

Microbiol 54:136–144.

71.   Alfieri C, Zhang S, Barford D. 2017. Visualizing the complex functions and mechanisms of

the anaphase promoting complex/cyclosome (APC/C). Open Biol 7:170204.

72.   Sudakin V, Ganoth D, Dahan A, Heller H, Hershko J, Luca FC, Ruderman JV, Hershko A.

1995. The cyclosome, a large complex containing cyclin-selective ubiquitin ligase activity,

targets cyclins for destruction at the end of mitosis. Mol Biol Cell 6:185–197.

73.   Cozzarelli NR. 1980. DNA Gyrase and the Supercoiling of DNA. Science 207:953–960.

74.   Antony E, Lohman TM. 2019. Dynamics of E. coli single stranded DNA binding (SSB)

protein-DNA complexes. Seminars in cell & developmental biology 86:102–111.

75.   Bianco PR, Pottinger S, Tan HY, Nguyenduc T, Rex K, Varshney U. 2017. The IDL of E. coli

SSB links ssDNA and protein binding by mediating protein-protein interactions. Protein

science: a publication of the Protein Society 26:227–241.

76.   Kozlov AG, Weiland E, Mittal A, Waldman V, Antony E, Fazio N, Pappu RV, Lohman TM.

2015. Intrinsically Disordered C-Terminal Tails of E. coli Single-Stranded DNA Binding

Protein Regulate Cooperative Binding to Single-Stranded DNA. Journal of Molecular

Biology 427:763–774.

77.   Tan HY, Wilczek LA, Pottinger S, Manosas M, Yu C, Nguyenduc T, Bianco PR. 2017. The

intrinsically disordered linker of E. coli SSB is critical for the release from single-stranded

DNA. Protein science: a publication of the Protein Society 26:700–717.

78.   Guy CP, Atkinson J, Gupta MK, Mahdi AA, Gwynn EJ, Rudolph CJ, Moon PB, van

Knippenberg IC, Cadman CJ, Dillingham MS, Lloyd RG, McGlynn P. 2009. Rep Provides a

Second Motor at the Replisome to Promote Duplication of Protein-Bound DNA.

Molecular Cell 36:654–666.

79.   Nguyen B, Shinn MK, Weiland E, Lohman TM. 2021. Regulation of E. coli Rep helicase

activity by PriC. Journal of Molecular Biology 433:167072–167072.

80.   Necci M, Piovesan D, Dosztányi Z, Tosatto SCE. 2017. MobiDB-lite: fast and highly

specific consensus prediction of intrinsic disorder in proteins. Bioinformatics (Oxford,

England) 33:1402–1404.

81.   Jameson KH, Rostami N, Fogg MJ, Turkenburg JP, Grahl A, Murray H, Wilkinson AJ. 2014.

Structure and interactions of the Bacillus subtilis sporulation inhibitor of DNA replication,

SirA, with domain I of DnaA. Mol Microbiol 93:975–991.

82.   Abe Y, Jo T, Matsuda Y, Matsunaga C, Katayama T, Ueda T. 2007. Structure and function

of DnaA N-terminal domains: specific sites and mechanisms in inter-DnaA interaction and

in DnaB helicase loading on oriC. The Journal of biological chemistry 282:17816–17827.

83.   Sutton MD, Carr KM, Vicente M, Kaguni JM. 1998. Escherichia coli DnaA protein. The N-

terminal domain and loading of DnaB helicase at the E. coli chromosomal origin. J Biol

Chem 273:34255–34262.

84.   Keyamura K, Abe Y, Higashi M, Ueda T, Katayama T. 2009. DiaA dynamics are coupled

with changes in initial origin complexes leading to helicase loading. The Journal of

biological chemistry 284:25038–25050.

85.   InterProScan 5: genome-scale protein function classification. Bioinformatics 30(9):1236-

1240.

86.   O'Leary NA, Wright MW, Brister JR, Ciufo S, Haddad D, McVeigh R, Rajput B, Robbertse

B, Smith-White B, Ako-Adjei D, Astashyn A, Badretdin A, Bao Y, Blinkova O, Brover V,

Chetvernin V, Choi J, Cox E, Ermolaeva O, Farrell CM, Goldfarb T, Gupta T, Haft D,

Hatcher E, Hlavina W, Joardar VS, Kodali VK, Li W, Maglott D, Masterson P, McGarvey

KM, Murphy MR, O'Neill K, Pujar S, Rangwala SH, Rausch D, Riddick LD, Schoch C,

Shkeda A, Storz SS, Sun H, Thibaud-Nissen F, Tolstoy I, Tully RE, Vatsan AR, Wallin C,

Webb D, Wu W, Landrum MJ, Kimchi A, Tatusova T, DiCuccio M, Kitts P, Murphy TD,

Pruitt KD. 2016. Reference sequence (RefSeq) database at NCBI: current status,

taxonomic expansion, and functional annotation. Nucleic acids research 44:D733-45.

87. Lassmann T. 2020. Kalign 3: multiple sequence alignment of large datasets.

Bioinformatics 36:1928–1929.

88. Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. 2009. FastTree: Computing Large Minimum Evolution

Trees with Profiles instead of a Distance Matrix. Molecular Biology and Evolution

26:1641–1650.

89. Varadi M, Anyango S, Deshpande M, Nair S, Natassia C, Yordanova G, Yuan D, Stroe O,

Wood G, Laydon A, Žídek A, Green T, Tunyasuvunakool K, Petersen S, Jumper J, Clancy

E, Green R, Vora A, Lutfi M, Figurnov M, Cowie A, Hobbs N, Kohli P, Kleywegt G, Birney E,

Hassabis D, Velankar S. 2022. AlphaFold Protein Structure Database: massively

expanding the structural coverage of protein-sequence space with high-accuracy models.

Nucleic Acids Research 50:D439–D444.

90. Pettersen EF, Goddard TD, Huang CC, Meng EC, Couch GS, Croll TI, Morris JH, Ferrin TE.

2021. UCSF ChimeraX: Structure visualization for researchers, educators, and developers.

Protein Sci 30:70–82.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. DciA protein phyletic spread and domain architectures. A. Phyletic spread of DciA domain containing proteins. The heatmap shows the abundance of DciA containing proteins across Bacterial, Archaeal, Viral, and Eukaryotic lineages. The color gradient indicates the number of homologs in a particular lineage. **B.** Phyletic spread of diverse DciA domain architectures (excluding DciA single-domain proteins) across bacterial lineages. The color gradient indicates the number of homologs with that domain architecture in a particular lineage. Domain architectures involving TPR repeats were combined based on the number of repeats. **C.** Key domain architectures of bacterial DciA homologs (including Pfam domains and MobiDBLite predicted IDRs). Representative proteins for each Pfam domain architecture within annotated bacterial lineages (no candidatus or metagenomes) were selected. Each representative protein is marked with the kingdom (B, bacteria), phylum (first 6 letters), Genus, and species (represented as 'Gspecies'), and the NCBI protein accession number. The Pfam and MobiDB annotations for each domain prediction are shown in the legend. The arrow lengths represent the overall protein length. The characteristic DciA domain is indicated with a black arrow in the legend (grey domains).

Figure 2. Length and DciA domain positioning in DciA single-domain proteins. A. Distributions of DciA single-domain protein length and the distances of the DciA domain from the N and C termini across bacterial lineages. Summary statistics for the single-domain DciA

proteins were calculated for all bacterial lineages (no candidatus or metagenomes). The blue

lines represent the 25th and 75th (light blue), and median/50th (dark blue) percentiles across

lineages. **B.** AlphaFold structural prediction on the *B. fragilis* (AUI45441.1) and *V. cholerae*

(AAF95538.1) DciA proteins visualized with ChimeraX. Protein is oriented left-to-right N-C

termini. Color key indicates accuracy confidence (0–100).

Figure 3. Disordered regions in DciA single-domain proteins. A. Phyletic spreads of

Intrinsically disordered region (IDR)-containing DciA proteins. The heatmap shows the

abundance of IDR-containing DciA proteins across bacterial lineages (no candidatus or

metagenomes). 'x' in 'IDR(x)' indicates the number of IDRs predicted. The color gradient

indicates the number of homologs in a particular lineage. **B.** Distribution of IDR length across

bacterial lineages. Summary statistics for the single-domain DciA proteins with IDRs were

calculated and plotted for each bacterial lineage. The blue lines represent the 25th and 75th

(light blue), and median/50th (dark blue) percentiles across lineages.

Figure 4. Grouping of DciA single-domain proteins and their phyletic spread. The top panel

shows the four Groups of bacterial DciA single-domain proteins binned based on the lengths of

flanking N- and C-terminal extensions of DciA domains: : i) Group 1 proteins with ≥14aa N-

terminal to the DciA domain and <14aa C-terminal, ii) Group 2 proteins with <14aa N-terminal

to the DciA domain and ≥14aa C-terminal, iii) Group 3 proteins with ≥14aa both N- and C-

terminally to the DciA domain, and iv) Group 4 proteins with <14aa on both N- and C-termini.

Stacked barplots of 4 groups of DciA single-domain proteins are plotted across **A.** all bacterial

lineages, with a focus on **B.** predominant lineages further resolved into sub-phyla

(proteobacteria, actinobacteria, and bacteroidetes), and **C.** other lineages. The number of

homologs in each group is are further characterized based on their lineage-wise distribution.

No bacterial candidatus or metagenomes are displayed.

Figure 5. Structure prediction of representative DciA homologs by groups (with and

without IDR). AlphaFold representatives from **A.** Group 1 DciA proteins from *A. aerolatus* (left;

GEO04242.1) and *R. islandica* (right; KLU02380.1), **B.** Group 2 DciA proteins from *P. aeruginosa*

(left; AAG07793.1) and *O. acuminata* (right; AFY85399.1), **C.** Group 3 DciA proteins from *L.*

interrogans (left; AAN47203.1) and *M. tuberculosis* (right; BAL63824.1)**,** and Group 4 DciA

proteins *T. maritima* (left; AAD35914.1) and *R. conorii* (right; AAL03818.1). Models visualized

with ChimeraX. Proteins are oriented left-to-right N-C termini, termini marked on each

structure. DciA domains annotated in blue text, IDRs annotated with black bracket with all

corresponding amino acid annotations. Key indicates accuracy confidence (0–100). See

Methods for accession codes of each model deposited in ModelArchive.

Figure 6. DciA evolution across the tree of life. All DciA domain-containing proteins from

Figure 1 were used to reconstruct the DciA phylogenetic tree. Kalign3 (87) was used for

multiple sequence alignment, and FastTree (88) was used to generate the tree. The resulting

tree was visualized using FigTree (http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/).   The tree was

colored by major lineages (left: bacterial phyla; right: key bacterial classes) with the remaining

DciA proteins in black. The three predominant bacterial lineages, proteobacteria,

actinobacteria, and bacteroidetes, are marked on the phylum-based tree **(A)** next to their

corresponding largest clusters, and the major bacterial classes are marked next to their largest

clusters in the class-based tree **(B)**.

A Lineages

DciA

B

C Domain architectures

A

DciA protein length

Distance from N-terminus

Distance from C-terminus

Length (in amino acids)

Lineages

B

DciA 8-95

B. fragilis

accuracy
confidence

DciA 12-90

V. cholerae

Group 1 | with IDR

A. aerolatus | *R. islandica*

Group 2

P. aeruginosa | *O. acuminata*

Group 3

L. interrogans | *M. tuberculosis*

Group 4

R. conorii | *T. maritima*

accuracy confidence

A

Bacterial lineages
kingdom>phylum

Bacteria>Abditibacteriota
Bacteria>Acidobacteria
Bacteria>Actinobacteria
Bacteria>Aquificae
Bacteria>Armatimonadetes
Bacteria>Bacteroidetes
Bacteria>Caldiserica
Bacteria>Calditrichaeota
Bacteria>Chlamydiae
Bacteria>Chlorobi
Bacteria>Chloroflexi
Bacteria>Chrysiogenetes
Bacteria>Cyanobacteria
Bacteria>Deferribacteres
Bacteria>Deinococcus-Thermus
Bacteria>Dictyoglomi
Bacteria>Elusimicrobia
Bacteria>Fibrobacteres
Bacteria>Firmicutes
Bacteria>Fusobacteria
Bacteria>Gemmatimonadetes
Bacteria>Ignavibacteriae
Bacteria>Kiritimatiellaeota
Bacteria>Nitrospinae
Bacteria>Nitrospirae
Bacteria>Planctomycetes
Bacteria>Proteobacteria
Bacteria>Rhodothermaeota
Bacteria>Spirochaetes
Bacteria>Synergistetes
Bacteria>Tenericutes
Bacteria>Thermodesulfobacteria
Bacteria>Thermotogae
Bacteria>Verrucomicrobia

Actinobacteria

Bacteroidetes

Proteobacteria

2.0

B

Major lineages
kingdom>phylum>class

Bacteria>Actinobacteria>Acidimicrobiia
Bacteria>Actinobacteria>Actinomycetia
Bacteria>Actinobacteria>Coriobacteriia
Bacteria>Actinobacteria>Rubrobacteria
Bacteria>Actinobacteria>Thermoleophilia
Bacteria>Bacteroidetes>Bacteroidia
Bacteria>Bacteroidetes>Chitinophagia
Bacteria>Bacteroidetes>Cytophagia
Bacteria>Bacteroidetes>Flavobacteriia
Bacteria>Bacteroidetes>Saprospiria
Bacteria>Bacteroidetes>Sphingobacteriia
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Acidithiobacillia
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Alphaproteobacteria
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Betaproteobacteria
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Deltaproteobacteria
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Epsilonproteobacteria
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Gammaproteobacteria
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Hydrogenophilalia
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Oligoflexia
Bacteria>Proteobacteria>Zetaproteobacteria

actinomycetia

cytophagia

flavobacteria

bacteroidia

α-proteobacteria

β-proteobacteria

γ-proteobacteria