Dependence of diffusion in *Escherichia coli* cytoplasm on protein size, environmental conditions and cell growth

N. Bellotto[1], J. Agudo-Canalejo[2,†], R. Colin[1,†], R. Golestanian[2,3,+], G. Malengo[1,+], V. Sourjik[1,+]

[1]Max Planck Institute for Terrestrial Microbiology and LOEWE Center for Synthetic Microbiology (SYNMIKRO), Karl-von-Frisch-Strasse 16, D-35043 Marburg, Germany

[2]Max Planck Institute for Dynamics and Self-Organization, Am Faßberg 17, D-37077 Göttingen, Germany

[3]Rudolf Peierls Centre for Theoretical Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom

[†]These authors equally contributed to this work

[+]Corresponding authors: ramin.golestanian@ds.mpg.de, gabriele.malengo@synmikro.mpi-marburg.mpg.de, victor.sourjik@synmikro.mpi-marburg.mpg.de

Abstract

Inside prokaryotic cells, passive translational diffusion typically limits the rates with which cytoplasmic proteins can reach their locations. Diffusion is thus fundamental to most cellular processes, but the understanding of protein mobility in the highly crowded and non-homogeneous environment of a bacterial cell is still limited. Here we investigated the mobility of a large set of proteins in the cytoplasm of *Escherichia coli*, by employing fluorescence correlation spectroscopy (FCS) combined with simulations and theoretical modeling. We conclude that cytoplasmic protein mobility could be well described by Brownian diffusion in the confined geometry of the bacterial cell and at the high viscosity imposed by macromolecular crowding. We observed similar size dependence of protein diffusion for the majority of tested proteins, whether native or foreign to *E. coli*, and, for the faster-diffusing proteins, it is well consistent with the Stokes-Einstein relation once taking into account the specific dumbbell shape of protein fusions. Pronounced subdiffusion and hindered mobility are only observed for proteins with extensive interactions within the cytoplasm. Finally, while protein diffusion becomes markedly faster in actively growing cells, at high temperature, or upon treatment with rifampicin, and slower at high osmolarity, all of these perturbations affect proteins of different sizes in the same proportions, which could thus be described as changes of a well-defined cytoplasmic viscosity.

Introduction

Diffusion of molecules is important for the function of any cellular system, setting the upper limit for the mobility of proteins and other (macro)molecules and for the rates of many biochemical reactions that rely on random encounters between molecules (Schavemaker, Boersma, and Poolman 2018). Although the fundamental physics of diffusion in dilute aqueous solutions is well understood and mathematically described (Einstein 1906; Langevin 1908; Perrin 1909), diffusion in a cellular environment may be quite different (Schavemaker, Boersma, and Poolman 2018; Mika and Poolman 2011). The concentration of macromolecules in the bacterial cytoplasm, primarily proteins but also ribonucleic acids (RNAs), a phenomenon known as macromolecular crowding, is extremely high. For *Escherichia coli*, it is around 300 mg/mL, which corresponds to a volume fraction of 25-30% (Cayley et al. 1991; Zimmerman and Trach 1991). Such macromolecular crowding could hinder free diffusion and influence kinetics of protein association and of gene expression (Klumpp et al. 2013; Tabaka et al. 2014; van den Berg, Boersma, and Poolman 2017). The effects of crowding on protein diffusion have been demonstrated both *in vitro* and *in vivo* (Dix and Verkman 2008; Rivas and Minton 2016). Compared to water, the diffusion of a free green fluorescent protein (GFP) was reported to be three to four times slower in the eukaryotic cytoplasm (Swaminathan, Hoang, and Verkman 1997) and up to ten times slower in the bacterial cytoplasm (Elowitz Michael et al. 1999; Nenninger, Mastroianni, and Mullineaux 2010; Mika et al. 2010; Kumar, Mommer, and Sourjik 2010).

In addition to the high density of macromolecules, the diversity in the size and chemical properties of the solutes makes the cytoplasmic environment highly inhomogeneous (Luby-Phelps 1999; Spitzer and Poolman 2013). How much the diffusion of a particular molecule is affected by macromolecular crowding might thus depend on the size (Muramatsu and Minton 1988) and shape

of the molecule (Balbo et al. 2013) as well as on the nature of the crowders (Banks and Fradin

2005; Goins, Sanabria, and Waxham 2008). The effects of crowding observed in living cells appear

to be even more complex, varying not only with the properties of the diffusing particle but also

with the physiological state of the cell (Parry et al. 2014; Joyner et al. 2016) and the local cellular

environment (Konopka et al. 2006; Persson, Ambati, and Brandman 2020). Moreover, non-trivial

effects on diffusion arise due to reversible assembly and disassembly of the diffusing protein

complexes (Agudo-Canalejo, Illien, and Golestanian 2020), and possibly also due to the active

enhancement of enzyme diffusion by catalytic reactions (Golestanian 2015; Agudo-Canalejo et al.

2018; Zhang and Hess 2019).

The dependence of the diffusion coefficient (D) of a protein in the cytoplasm on its size might thus

not necessarily follow the Stokes-Einstein (also called Stokes-Einstein-Sutherland-Smoluchowski)

relation that is valid in dilute solutions, $D \propto T/(\eta R)$ (Einstein 1906), where T is the absolute

temperature in Kelvin, η the viscosity of the medium and R the hydrodynamic radius of the particle.

For globular proteins, R is given by the radius of gyration (Tyn and Gusek 1990) and depends on

the molecular mass (MM) as $R \propto \mathrm{MM}^{\beta}$, where the exponent β would be 1/3 for perfectly compact

and globular proteins but is in practice within the range of 0.35-0.43 for typical proteins, reflecting

the fractal nature of the spatial distribution of protein mass (Smilgies and Folta-Stogniew 2015;

Enright and Leitner 2005). Several studies of protein diffusion in the cytoplasm of *E. coli* have

yielded different dependencies on the molecular mass, from ~0.33 (Nenninger, Mastroianni, and

Mullineaux 2010) to ~2 (Kumar, Mommer, and Sourjik 2010), with an average β ~0.7 estimated

based on the data pooled from multiple studies (Mika and Poolman 2011; Kalwarczyk, Tabaka,

and Holyst 2012), and thus substantially steeper than predicted by the Stokes-Einstein relation.

Similar exponent of ~0.7 was observed for limited sets of differently-sized proteins (Mika et al.

2010; Stracy et al. 2021). However, neither of these studies took explicitly into account the non-

globularity of the used fluorescent constructs, where two or more proteins are typically connected

by flexible linkers. For such multidomain proteins, shape fluctuations and hydrodynamic

interactions between the different domains can have a sizeable effect on the effective diffusion

coefficient of the whole protein (Agudo-Canalejo and Golestanian 2020), and they might thus be

important to consider when interpreting deviations from the Stokes-Einstein relation.

Besides macromolecular crowding, the translational diffusion of cytoplasmic proteins is also

influenced by intracellular structures, such as cytoskeletal filaments (Sabri et al. 2020), and by

(transient) binding to other macromolecules (Saxton 2007; Guigas and Weiss 2008; von Bülow et

al. 2019). Both these factors can not only reduce protein mobility but also lead to the anomalous

subdiffusive behavior, where the mean square displacement (MSD) of diffusing particles does not

scale linearly with time, as for Brownian diffusion in dilute solutions, but rather follows MSD $\propto t^{\alpha}$

with the anomalous diffusion exponent α being <1 (Saxton 1996; Etoc et al. 2018). Subdiffusion is

commonly observed in eukaryotes, particularly at longer spatial scales, primarily due to the

obstruction by the cytoskeletal filaments to the diffusion of proteins and larger particles (Di Rienzo

et al. 2014; Sabri et al. 2020). The mobility of larger nucleoprotein (Golding and Cox 2004; Lampo

et al. 2017) and multiprotein particles (Yu et al. 2018) in the bacterial cytoplasm is also

subdiffusive, while the diffusion of several tested small proteins was apparently Brownian (Bakshi,

Bratton, and Weisshaar 2011; English et al. 2011).

Even for the same protein, e.g. GFP or its spectral variants, estimates of the diffusion coefficient

in the cytoplasm obtained in different studies vary widely (Schavemaker, Boersma, and Poolman

2018), which could be in part due to differences in methodologies. Most early studies in bacteria

relied on fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP), where diffusion is quantified from

the recovery of fluorescence in a region of the cell bleached by a high intensity laser (Loren et al.

2015). These measurements provided values of diffusion coefficient for GFP ranging from 3 $\mu m^2 s^{-1}$

to 14 $\mu m^2 s^{-1}$ (Elowitz Michael et al. 1999; Mullineaux et al. 2006; Konopka et al. 2009; Kumar,

Mommer, and Sourjik 2010; Mika et al. 2010; Nenninger, Mastroianni, and Mullineaux 2010;

Schavemaker, Smigiel, and Poolman 2017). More recently, single-particle tracking (SPT), where

diffusion is measured by following the trajectories of single fluorescent molecules over time

(Kapanidis, Uphoff, and Stracy 2018), became increasingly used. Lastly, diffusion can also be

studied *in vivo* using fluorescence correlation spectroscopy (FCS) (Cluzel, Surette, and Leibler

2000), which measures the time required by a fluorescent molecule to cross the observation volume

of a confocal microscope (Elson 2011). SPT and FCS measure protein mobility locally within the

cell, with FCS having also a significantly better temporal resolution than FRAP and SPT. Both

methods provided higher but still varying values of D_{GFP}, from 8 $\mu m^2 s^{-1}$ up to 18 $\mu m^2 s^{-1}$ (Meacci

et al. 2006; English et al. 2011; Sanamrad et al. 2014; Diepold et al. 2017; Rocha et al. 2019).

Protein mobility also depends on the environmental and cellular conditions that affect the structure

of the bacterial cytoplasm (Schavemaker, Boersma, and Poolman 2018). Diffusion of large

cytoplasmic particles, measured by SPT, was shown to be sensitive to the antibiotics-induced

changes in the cytoplasmic crowding (Wlodarski et al. 2020) and to the energy-dependent

fluidization of the cytoplasm (Parry et al. 2014). Protein diffusion is also affected by high

osmolarity that increases macromolecular crowding and might create barriers to diffusion

(Konopka et al. 2006; Konopka et al. 2009; Liu et al. 2019). Furthermore, the surface charge of

cytoplasmic proteins has been shown to have a dramatic effect on their mobility (Schavemaker,

Smigiel, and Poolman 2017).

Variations between values of diffusion coefficients observed even for the same model organism in

different studies, each investigating only a limited number of protein probes, using different strains,

growth conditions and measurement techniques, hampered drawing general conclusions about the

effective viscosity of bacterial cytoplasm and its dependence on the protein size. Furthermore,

while the impact of several physiological perturbations on protein diffusion has been established,

most of these previous studies used either large particles or free GFP, and how these perturbations

affect properties of the cytoplasm over the entire physiological range of protein sizes remained

unknown.

Here, we address these limitations by systematically analyzing the mobility of a large number of

differently-sized cytoplasmic fluorescent protein constructs under standardized conditions by FCS.

We further combined experiments with Brownian dynamics simulations and theoretical modeling

of diffusion to correct for effects of confined cell geometry. Our work establishes general

methodology to analyze FCS measurements of protein mobility in a confined space, which could

be broadly applicable to cellular systems.

For the majority of studied constructs, we observe consistent dependence of the diffusion

coefficient on the protein size, with a pronounced upper limit on diffusion at a given molecular

mass. When corrected for the confinement due to the bacterial cell geometry, the diffusion of these

constructs was nearly Brownian. Moreover, part of the deviation of the mass-dependence of their

diffusion coefficients from the Stokes-Einstein relation might be explained by the specific shape

of the fusion proteins. The slower and more anomalous diffusion of several protein constructs was

apparently due to their strong interactions with other cellular proteins and protein complexes, and

disruption of these interactions restored a Brownian diffusion close to the upper limit expected for

their mass. Proteins that are not native to *E. coli* were observed to diffuse very similarly to their *E.*

coli counterparts, except for their motion being slightly subdiffusive. Under the same experimental

conditions FCS and FRAP measurements yield similar values of diffusion coefficients, suggesting

that no pronounced dependence of protein mobility on spatial scale could be observed in the bacterial cytoplasm. Finally, we investigated the effects of environmental osmolarity and temperature, of exposure to antibiotics and of cell growth on the mobility of proteins of different size, demonstrating that the effects of all these perturbations, including cell growth, on protein diffusion could be simply explained by changes in a unique cytoplasmic viscosity.

Results

Dependence of cytoplasmic protein mobility on molecular mass measured by FCS

For our analysis of cytoplasmic protein mobility, we generated a plasmid-encoded library of 31 cytoplasmic proteins (Figure 1 – supplementary table 1 and supplementary table 2) of *E. coli* fused to superfolder GFP (sfGFP) (Pédelacq et al. 2006). We selected proteins that, according to the available information, are not known to bind DNA or to form homomultimers, although we did not exclude *a priori* proteins that interact with other proteins. The structure of all selected proteins is known and roughly globular, avoiding effects of the irregular protein shape on mobility. These proteins belong to different cellular pathways. The expected size and stability of each construct was verified by gel electrophoresis and immunoblotting (Figure 1 – figure supplement 1). Only one of the constructs, ThpR-sfGFP, showed >20% degradation to free sfGFP, and it was therefore excluded from further analyses. This was also the sole construct with an atypically high isoelectric point (pI), and all remaining constructs have pI ranging from 5.1 to 6.2, as common for cytoplasmic proteins (Schwartz, Ting, and King 2001). We further imaged the distribution of fusion proteins in the cytoplasm. Except for RihA-sfGFP and NagD-sfGFP that were subsequently excluded, all other

constructs showed uniform localization (Figure 1A). Expression of most fusion proteins used for

the measurements of diffusion had little effect on *E. coli* growth (Figure 1 – figure supplement 2),

and even for several proteins that delayed the onset of the exponential growth, the growth rate

around the mid-log phase when cultures were harvested for the analysis was similar.

The mobility of the remaining 28 fusion constructs and of free sfGFP was investigated in living *E.*

coli cells by FCS (see Materials and Methods and Appendix 1). In order to reduce the impact of

photobleaching on FCS measurements, cell length was moderately (approximately twofold)

increased by treatment with the cell-division inhibitor cephalexin for 45 min, yielding an average

cell length of ~5 μm (Figure 1A). The resulting larger cell volume indeed reduces the rate of

photobleaching. During each FCS measurement, the laser focus was positioned close to the polar

region in the cell cytoplasm, in order to keep the confocal volume possibly away from both the cell

membrane and the nucleoid, and the fluorescence intensity in the confocal volume was measured

over time (Figure 1 – figure supplement 3). For each individual cell, six subsequent acquisitions of

20 s each were performed at the same position. The autocorrelation function (ACF) of the

fluorescence intensity fluctuations was independently calculated for each time interval and fitted

to extract the mobility parameters of the fluorescent proteins. Although we initially considered both

the Brownian diffusion and the anomalous diffusion models, the latter model proved to be

considerably better in fitting the experimental data (Figure 1 – figure supplement 4). The

anomalous diffusion model was therefore used to determine the diffusion (or residence) time (τ_D)

of a fluorescent molecule in the confocal volume and the anomalous diffusion exponent α for all

ACFs (Figure 1B and Figure 1 – supplementary table 1 and Figure 1 - figure supplement 3). The

averaged values of τ_D and α for each individual cell were then calculated from these six individual

acquisitions (Figure 1C and Figure 1 – figure supplement 5). Although, as mentioned above, all

finally used protein constructs showed no or little degradation, we tested a possible impact of the

fraction of free sfGFP for the construct that displayed the strongest (~15%) degradation, DsdA-

sfGFP. To this end, we fitted the FCS data using a model of two-components anomalous diffusion,

where the weight of the fast component was fixed to 15% and its values of τ_D and α to the average

values obtained for sfGFP (Figure 1 – figure supplement 6). The average value of τ_D for the slow

component was only ~7% lower compared to our regular fit using the one-component model, and

the value of α remained unchanged, suggesting that the impact of an even smaller fraction of free

GFP for other constructs could also be neglected.

Despite their substantial intercellular variability, the obtained mean values of the diffusion time

were clearly different between protein constructs (Figure 1C and Figure 1 – supplementary table

1). We next plotted the mean values of $1/\tau_D$, which reflect protein mobility, against the molecular

mass of protein constructs (Figure 1D). This dependence revealed a clear trend, where mobility of

more than half of the constructs decreased uniformly with their molecular mass, while some

exhibited much lower mobility than the other constructs of similar mass. In contrast, the anomalous

diffusion exponent α showed no apparent dependence on the protein size, ranging from 0.8 to 0.86

for most of the constructs (Figure 1E). Notably, the few protein constructs with α of ~ 0.8 or lower

were also among the ones with low mobility (Figure 1D and 1E, colored symbols). There was no

significant correlation between the values of $1/\tau_D$ or α and the length or the width of individual

cells, although a weak trend of α to increase with cell width might exist (Figure 1 – figure

supplement 7). Furthermore, no significant effect of the treatment with cephalexin for cells of

similar length (Figure 1 – figure supplement 8) could be observed.

Figure 1. Dependence of protein mobility in bacterial cytoplasm on molecular mass and cellular interactions.

(A) Examples of fluorescence microscopy images of *E. coli* cells expressing either sfGFP or the indicated sfGFP-tagged cytoplasmic proteins. Scale bar is 2 μm. (B) Representative autocorrelation functions (ACFs) measured by FCS for the indicated protein constructs. Data were fitted using the anomalous diffusion model (solid lines). All ACF curves were normalized to their respective maximal values to facilitate comparison. (C) Diffusion times (τ_D) measured for the indicated protein constructs. Each dot in the box plot represents the value for one individual cell, averaged over six consecutive acquisitions (Figure 1 – figure supplement 3) *** $p < 0.0001$ in a two-tailed heteroscedastistic *t*-test. Exact p-values for all significance analyses performed in this study can be found in Appendix 4. (D, E). Dependence of protein mobility ($1/\tau_D$; D) and apparent anomaly of diffusion (α; E) on molecular mass. Each symbol represents the

average value for all individual cells that have been measured for that particular construct and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Individual values are shown in Figure 1 – figure supplement 5 and the numbers of measured cells for all the experiments performed in this study are shown in Appendix 5. Protein constructs with low mobility for which effects of specific interactions were further investigated are highlighted in color and labeled. The values of $1/\tau_D$ and α for both the original constructs (diamonds) and the constructs where mutations were introduced to disrupt interactions (circles) are shown. For Map, two alternative amino acid substitutions that disrupt its interaction with the ribosome are shown (see Figure 1 – figure supplement 10). (F-H) Cartoons illustrating the cellular interactions that could affect mobility of ClpS (F), Map (G), and DnaK (H). ClpS engages with the ClpAP protease and with substrates, cartoon adapted from (Roman-Hernandez et al. 2011). Map interacts with the actively translating ribosomes, cartoon adapted from (Sandikci et al. 2013). DnaK interacts with unfolded client protein. Amino acidic residues that were mutated to disrupt interactions are highlighted (see text for details).

Figure 1 – source data

Individual τ_D measurements from Figure 1C

Individual mean and standard errors of the mean of $1/\tau_D$ values from Figure 1D

Individual mean and standard errors of the mean of α values from Figure 1E

Macromolecular interactions reduce protein mobility

We reasoned that the main group of constructs that exhibit mobility close to the apparent mass-dependent upper limit represents proteins whose diffusion is only limited by macromolecular crowding, and that the lower $1/\tau_D$ and α of other constructs might be due to their specific interactions with other cellular proteins or protein complexes. Indeed, for three of these proteins (ClpS, Map, DnaK) such interactions are well characterized and can be specifically disrupted. ClpS is the adaptor protein that delivers degradation substrates to the protease ClpAP (Roman-Hernandez et al. 2011). The substrate-binding site of ClpS is constituted by three amino acid

residues (D35, D36, H66) that interact with the N-terminal degron of target proteins (Figure 1F).

If these residues are mutated into alanine, substrate binding *in vitro* is substantially reduced

(Roman-Hernandez et al. 2011; Humbard et al. 2013). Additionally, ClpS directly docks to the

hexameric ClpA. Consistently, we observed that while the stability of the mutant construct

ClpS$^{D35A\_D36A\_H66A}$-sfGFP was not affected (Figure 1 – figure supplement 9), its mobility in a *ΔclpA*

strain became significantly higher and less anomalous, with both $1/\tau_D$ and α reaching levels similar

to those of other proteins of similar mass (Figure 1D and 1E and Figure 1 – figure supplement 10).

Similar results were obtained for the other two constructs. Map is the methionine aminopeptidase

that cleaves the N-terminal methionine from nascent polypeptide chains (Solbiati et al. 1999). Map

interacts with the negatively charged backbone of ribosomes through four positively charged lysine

residues (K211, 218, 224, 226) located in a loop (Figure 1G). If these residues are mutated into

alanine, the *in vitro* affinity of Map for the ribosomes is reduced (Sandikci et al. 2013). The

mobility of Map-sfGFP was indeed much increased by alanine substitutions at all four lysine sites

(Figure 1D and 1E and Figure 1 – figure supplement 9 and figure supplement 10). Interestingly,

charge inversion of lysines to glutamic acid did not further increase Map-sfGFP mobility as was

expected based on *in vitro* experiments (Sandikci et al. 2013).

DnaK is the major bacterial chaperone that binds to short hydrophobic polypeptide sequences,

which become exposed during protein synthesis, membrane translocation or protein unfolding

(Genevaux, Georgopoulos, and Kelley 2007). DnaK accommodates its substrate peptides inside a

hydrophobic pocket (Figure 1H). The substitution of the valine residue 436 with bulkier

phenylalanine creates steric hindrance that markedly decreases substrate binding to DnaK *in vitro*

(Mayer, Rüdiger, and Bukau 2000), and both the $1/\tau_D$ and α of DnaK^{V436F}-sfGFP were significantly

higher than for the correspondent wild-type construct (Figure 1D and 1E and Figure 1 – figure

supplement 9 and figure supplement 10). Nevertheless, in this case the $1/\tau_D$ did not reach the levels

of other proteins of similar molecular mass, which is likely explained by multiple interactions of

DnaK with other components of the cellular protein quality control machinery besides its binding

to substrates (Kumar and Sourjik 2012).

Apparent anomaly of diffusion could be largely explained by confinement

When FCS measurements are performed in a confined space with dimensions comparable to those

of the observation volume, such confinement may affect the apparent mobility of fluorescent

molecules (Gennerich and Schild 2000; Jiang et al. 2020). To investigate the effect of confinement

on our FCS measurements, we performed Brownian dynamics simulations of FCS experiments

with particles undergoing three-dimensional, purely Brownian diffusion inside a bacterial cell-like

volume (Figure 2A *Inset*; see Materials and Methods). For the values of cell diameter commonly

observed under our growth conditions, 0.8-0.9 μm, and over a wide range of particle diffusion

coefficients, simulated autocorrelation functions could be indeed successfully fitted with the

anomalous diffusion model, yielding an anomalous diffusion exponent of around 0.8-0.9 (Figure

2A and 2B). This made us hypothesize that the relatively small apparent deviation from Brownian

diffusion in the fit, with α above 0.8 common to most constructs, may primarily reflect a

confinement-induced effect rather than proper subdiffusion.

In apparent agreement with these simulation results, when *E. coli* cell width was increased by

treatment with the inhibitor of bacterial cell wall biosynthesis A22 (Ouzounov et al. 2016) (Figure

2C), in addition to the standard cephalexin-induced elongation, the anomalous diffusion exponent

of sfGFP (Figure 2D) also significantly increased. A small, but significant increase in protein

mobility is also observed (Figure 2 – figure supplement 1). Since it was previously reported that

treatment with A22 can reduce dry-mass density of *E. coli* cells (Oldewurtel Enno, Kitahara, and

van Teeffelen 2021), we further performed a cell sedimentation assay (Figure 2 – figure supplement

2A-C). While the treatment with cephalexin slightly (by <0.1%) decreased the density of *E. coli*

cells in this assay, the additional treatment with A22, in our growth conditions, had only minor and

not significant impact once the effect of the volume increase on sedimentation was accounted for

(Figure 2 – figure supplement 2H). We thus conclude that the influence of A22 on the anomaly of

protein diffusion is most likely due to its effect on cell width and not on the cytoplasmic density.

To additionally test our conclusion that the reduced value of α is due to confinement by the cell

width, we performed FCS measurements for sfGFP and AcnA-sfGFP on a smaller confocal

volume, thus limiting the analysis to fluorophores diffusing at a distance from the cell boundary,

by reducing the pinhole size to a less optimal but smaller value of 0.66 Airy units. Indeed, the value

of α derived from these measurements was significantly higher for both proteins, >0.9 (Figure 2 -

figure supplement 3A), consistent with our prediction. As expected, the residence time (τ_D) of

proteins in such a smaller confocal volume is also smaller (Figure 2 - figure supplement 3B)

We next derived an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) model for fitting FCS data, where the confinement

of Brownian diffusing fluorescent particles within the width of the cell is approximated by trapping

in a harmonic potential of the same width (Appendix 2). The two models fit the ACF of the

Brownian dynamic simulations comparably well and better than the model of unconfined Brownian

diffusion (Figure 2A and Figure 2 - figure supplement 4), with the OU model having one less free

parameter than the anomalous diffusion model. The OU model directly estimates the ansatz

diffusion coefficient with $\pm$ 5% accuracy for the typical cell widths observed in our experiments

(Figure 2 – figure supplement 5).

Since the OU model proved accurate in fitting the experimental data, comparably to the anomalous

diffusion model (Figure 2 – figure supplement 6), we used it to re-fit the ACF data for all faster

diffusing constructs and to estimate their Brownian diffusion coefficients (Figure 2E and Figure 1

– supplementary table 1). The dependence of D on molecular mass for this set of constructs was

scaling as $(MM)^{-\beta}$ with $\beta = 0.56 \pm 0.05$ (Figure 2F, solid blue line), less steep compared to the

previous estimates (Kumar, Mommer, and Sourjik 2010; Mika et al. 2010; Stracy et al. 2021) but

still steeper than expected from the Stokes-Einstein relation, even when assuming $\beta = 0.4$ for not

perfectly globular proteins (Figure 2F, black dashed line) (Enright and Leitner 2005; Smilgies and

Folta-Stogniew 2015). In order to elucidate whether part of this residual deviation may be

accounted for by the specific shape of fusion constructs, where sfGFP is fused to the differently-

sized target proteins by a short flexible linker, we further applied a previously derived model

describing diffusion of such linked proteins (Appendix 3) (Agudo-Canalejo and Golestanian 2020).

The dependence of D on molecular mass predicted by this linked-protein model seems indeed to

better recapitulate our experimental data, particularly for smaller protein fusions (Figure 2F, solid

yellow line), although it moderately overestimates D for several of the largest protein fusions (>100

kDa). Thus, we conclude that the size dependence of diffusion for the majority of cytoplasmic

proteins follows the Stokes-Einstein relation, once the shape of the sfGFP-tagged protein constructs

is taken into account.

Figure 2. Protein diffusion in bacterial cytoplasm corrected for confinement. (A) Representative ACFs of simulated fluorescence intensity fluctuations. Simulations were performed in a confined geometry of a cell with indicated length L and diameter d, and dimensions of the measurement volume ω_0 and z_0, representing an experimental FCS measurement (*Inset*; see Materials and Methods) for two different values of the ansatz diffusion coefficient. Solid lines are fits by the models of unconfined Brownian diffusion, anomalous diffusion and by the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) model of Brownian diffusion under confinement, as indicated. (B) The exponent α extracted from the fit of the anomalous diffusion model to the ACFs data that were simulated at different values of the cell diameter. Corresponding values of the diffusion coefficient are shown in Figure 2 – figure supplement 5. (C, D) *E. coli* cells treated with cephalexin alone or with cephalexin and 1 µg/mL of A22 (see Materials and methods), show A22-dependent increase in the measured cell diameter (C) and higher values of the exponent α extracted from the fit to the ACF measurements (D). *** $p<0.0001$ in a two-tailed heteroscedastistic *t*-test. (E) Dependence of the diffusion coefficient calculated from

fitting the experimental ACFs with the OU model of confined diffusion. Only the subset of apparently freely diffusing

constructs from Figure 1D has been analyzed with the OU model (see also Figure 1 – supplementary table 1). Each

circle represents the average value for all individual cells that have been measured for that particular construct

(Appendix 5), and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Error bars that are not visible are smaller

than the symbol size. (F) Fit of the mass dependence with an inverse power law (solid blue line, exponent $\beta = 0.56 \pm$

0.05), and predictions of the Stokes-Einstein relation (black dashed line) and of the model describing diffusion of two

linked globular proteins (solid yellow line), both with exponent $\beta = 0.4$.

Figure 2 – source data

Average and error from each simulation in Figure 2B

Individual measurements of cell diameters from Figure 2C

Individual measurements of α from Figure 2D

Individual mean and standard error of the mean of diffusion coefficient values from Figure 2E and 2F

Protein diffusion coefficients measured using FRAP or FCS are consistent

Since many previous measurements of protein diffusion in bacteria were performed using FRAP,

we aimed to directly compare the results of FRAP and FCS measurements for a set of constructs

of different mass. Importantly, we used the same growth conditions and microscopy sample

preparation protocols as for the FCS experiments. The cells were photobleached in a region close

to the pole, similar to the position that was used for the FCS experiment. The recovery of

fluorescence was then followed for 11 seconds with the time resolution of 18 ms (Figure 3A). The

diffusion coefficients were computed from the time course of recovery with the plugin for ImageJ,

simFRAP (Blumenthal et al. 2015), which utilizes a simulation-based approach (Figure 3B). We

observed very good correlation between both values of diffusion coefficients, although for most

constructs the diffusion coefficients determined by FRAP were 5 to 30% lower than those obtained

from the FCS data (Figure 3C and Figure 1 – supplementary table 1).

Figure 3. Comparison between protein diffusion coefficients measured by FCS and FRAP. (A) Examples of

FRAP measurements for two different constructs, sfGFP and AcnA-sfGFP. A 3x3 pixels area close to one cell pole

(red circle) was photobleached with a high intensity laser illumination for 48 ms and the recovery of fluorescence in

the bleached area was monitored for 11 s with the time resolution of 18 ms. (B) Representative curves of fluorescence

recovery in FRAP experiments and their fitting using simFRAP. The experimental data (colored dots) are used by the

simFRAP algorithm to simulate the underlying diffusional process (colored lines). The simulation is then used to

compute the diffusion coefficient. The simulation proceeds until the recovery curve reaches a plateau, therefore it is

interrupted at a different time for each curve. (C) Correlation between the diffusion coefficients measured in FCS

experiments (D_{FCS}, fitting with the OU model; data from Figure 2E) and in FRAP experiment (D_{FRAP}, fitting with

simFRAP). Error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Error bars that are not visible are smaller than the

symbol size.

Figure 3 – source data

Individual mean and standard error of the mean of diffusion coefficient values from Figure 3C

Diffusive properties of cytoplasmic proteins are largely conserved between bacterial species

We then investigated whether sfGFP fusions to non-native proteins, originating from other bacteria,

may show different diffusive properties in *E. coli* cytoplasm than their native counterparts. The

existence of an organism-dependent "quinary" code of unspecific, short living interactions has been

recently proposed in order to explain the reduced mobility of heterologous human proteins in *E.*

coli cytoplasm (Mu et al. 2017). Thus, we investigated the mobility of proteins from other Gram-

negative proteobacteria *Yersinia enterocolitica*, *Vibrio cholerae*, *Caulobacter crescentus* and

Myxococcus xanthus and from the Gram-positive bacterium *Bacillus subtilis* that are homologous

to several analyzed freely-diffusing *E. coli* protein constructs. Within this set of constructs, we

observed no significant differences of their $1/\tau_D$ values from *E. coli* homologues. An exception was

AcnA from *M. xanthus* (Figure 4A and Figure 4 – figure supplement 1A), whose lower mobility

might be a sign of its multimerization, although cellular distribution of this construct was uniform.

In contrast, all constructs showed slightly but mostly significantly increased anomaly of diffusion

compared to *E. coli* proteins (Figure 4B and Figure 4 – figure supplement 4B), which might reflect

the weakly increased propensity of non-native proteins to engage in unspecific interactions in *E.*

coli cytoplasm.

Figure 4. Mobility of homologous proteins from other bacterial species in *E. coli*. Mass dependence of protein

mobility ($1/\tau_D$; A) and anomaly of diffusion (α; B) of sfGFP fusions to homologues of Adk, Pgk and AcnA from

indicated bacterial species (*E.c. = Escherichia coli; Y.e. = Yersinia enterocolitica; V.c. = Vibrio cholerae; C.c. =*

Caulobacter crescentus; M.x. = Myxococcus xanthus; B.s. = Bacillus subtilis) compared with that of their counterpart

from *E. coli*. Each symbol represents the average value for all individual cells that have been measured for that

construct (Appendix 5) and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Error bars that are not visible are

smaller than the symbol size.

413   **Figure 4 – source data**

414   Individual mean and standard error of the mean of $1/\tau_D$ values from Figure 4A

415   Individual mean and standard error of the mean of α values from Figure 4B

Effects of osmolarity, temperature, antibiotics and cell growth on mobility of differently-sized proteins

We further characterized the impact of several environmental and cellular perturbations of the

bacterial cytoplasm on protein mobility, using apparently freely diffusing protein fusions of

different sizes as probes. We started with the previously characterized decrease in mobility of GFP

and large protein complexes or aggregates upon osmotic upshift (Konopka et al. 2006; Konopka et

al. 2009; Mika et al. 2010; Liu et al. 2019; Wlodarski et al. 2020). *E. coli* cells exposed to increased

ionic strength by addition of 100 mM NaCl showed decrease in cell length and width (Figure 5 –

figure supplement 1A, B) and an increase in cell density in the sedimentation assay (Figure 2 –

figure supplement 2D), consistent with a previous report (Wlodarski et al. 2020). Higher ionic

strength also significantly decreased the mobility of sfGFP (Figure 5A and Figure 5 – figure

supplement 2A), comparably to previously measured values (Konopka et al. 2009; Mika et al.

2010). Importantly, the mobility of all other tested constructs decreased proportionally (Figure 5A),

meaning that – in this range of molecular sizes – the effect of a moderate osmotic upshift can be

interpreted as a simple increase in cytoplasmic viscosity due to higher molecular crowding, which

is in contrast to the different effects of high osmolarity on small molecules and on GFP (Mika et

al. 2010). No effect is observed on the anomaly of diffusion for any protein construct (Figure 5 –

figure supplement 3A).

Next, we studied the effect of environmental temperature on protein mobility in bacterial

cytoplasm. According to the Stokes-Einstein equation, the diffusion of a particle directly depends

on the system's temperature in Kelvin and on the viscosity of the fluid, which itself changes with

temperature. In the biologically relevant range, the temperature sensitivity of diffusion is primarily

determined by the temperature dependence of water viscosity. The measured increase in mobility

of sfGFP and two other constructs, by approximately 20-25% between 25°C and 35°C (Figure 5B

and Figure 5 – figure supplement 2B), agrees well with the temperature-dependent decrease in

water viscosity over 10°C (Huber et al. 2009). Expectedly, the effect of imaging temperature was

not linked to any changes of the cell size (Figure 5 – figure supplement 1C, D). Of note, a weak,

but consistent, increase in the anomaly of protein diffusion is also observed at higher environmental

temperature (Figure 5 – figure supplement 3B). Instead, the growth temperature of the *E. coli*

culture had no apparent effect on protein mobility (Figure 5 – figure supplement 4), suggesting that

– at least in the tested temperature range – *E. coli* lacks the growth-temperature dependent

regulation of cytoplasmic viscosity that has been recently reported in the budding yeast (Persson,

Ambati, and Brandman 2020).

Antibiotics that inhibit transcription (e.g., rifampicin) or translation (e.g., chloramphenicol) are

known to affect the spatial organization of bacterial chromosomes (Bakshi et al. 2014). The

mobility of chromosomal loci and of large cytoplasmic aggregates was also shown to be affected

by several antibiotics, in apparent correlation with changes in the cytoplasmic density (Wlodarski

et al. 2020). We observed that chloramphenicol treatment caused a minor increase in cell width

(Figure 5 – figure supplement 1F) and a decrease in cell density (Figure 2 – figure supplement 2G).

However, protein mobility rather decreased in chloramphenicol-treated cells, opposite to what

could be expected based alone on the chloramphenicol-induced reduction of cell density (Figure

5C and Figure 5 – figure supplement 2C). The reduced protein mobility could neither be simply

explained by compaction of the nucleoid in cells treated with chloramphenicol, since it was only

marginally lower inside than outside of the nucleoid (Figure 5 – figure supplement 5A, B). It should

be noted that no significant difference in the anomaly of diffusion (Figure 5 – figure supplement

5C) was observed inside or outside of the nucleoid.

In contrast, inhibition of RNA transcription by rifampicin treatment led to a marked increase in

protein mobility (Figure 5C and Figure 5 – figure supplement 2C). Such higher protein mobility is

consistent with the previously observed rifampicin-induced reduction of macromolecular crowding

in bacterial cytoplasm (Wlodarski et al. 2020), although only a minor decrease in cell density was

observed in our sedimentation assay (Figure 2 – figure supplement 2F) beyond the effect of DMSO

that was used as a solvent for rifampicin (Figure 2 – figure supplement 2E). Similar to the effects

of osmolarity and temperature, the increase in protein mobility caused by the rifampicin treatment,

and its decrease induced by chloramphenicol were similar for all tested proteins (Figure 5C), except

for the AcnA-sfGFP construct that was disproportionally affected by chloramphenicol in both

mobility and anomaly of diffusion (Figure 5 – figure supplement 3C).

Finally, we investigated whether protein mobility might be influenced by cell growth, comparing

FCS measurements in cells incubated at 35°C on agarose pads containing either only M9 salts or

M9 salts plus glucose and casamino acids. These conditions had only minor impact on the cell

shape (Figure 5 – figure supplement 1G, H). Although at this high temperature residual growth was

also observed for cells on M9 salt pads, cell growth in presence of nutrients was expectedly much

more pronounced. The observed protein mobility was also much higher in the presence of nutrients,

and this increase was again similar for the four tested differently-sized constructs (Figure 5D and

Figure 5 – figure supplement 2D), while no consistent trend was observed in the anomaly of protein

diffusion across these conditions (Figure 5 – figure supplement 3D). To further distinguish the

respective contributions of metabolic activity and of biosynthesis and resulting cell growth, we

incubated cells in presence of both nutrients and chloramphenicol on the agarose pad. Similar to

our previous experiments where chloramphenicol was added to the batch culture, its addition had

no or little effect on the mobility of sfGFP or the AcnA-sfGFP construct in absence of nutrients

(Figure 5 – figure supplement 6). In contrast, protein mobility in presence of nutrients was strongly

affected by chloramphenicol treatment. Thus, the enhanced protein mobility in presence of

nutrients appears to be primarily due to active protein production and cell growth. Nevertheless,

even chloramphenicol-treated cells exhibited a moderate increase in protein mobility in presence

of nutrients, indicating that the metabolic activity contributes to the overall effect of growth on

diffusion. It is possible that the contribution of the metabolic activity might be even larger than it

appears in this experiment, since the inhibition of protein translation might reduce metabolic

activity. In any case, the impact of growth on diffusion of individual proteins cannot be simply

explained by the energy state of the cell, since lowering it by the inhibition of respiration-dependent

ATP synthesis using treatment with dinitrophenol (DNP) did not reduce protein mobility, at either

25°C or 35°C. This is contrary to the effect of the DNP treatment on large cytoplasmic particles

(Parry et al. 2014) (Figure 5– figure supplement 7). An interesting exception was the mobility of

Adk-sfGFP, which was indeed reduced by the DNP treatment at high temperature. This, however,

might be a specific effect related to the enzymatic activity or conformation of Adk that binds ATP

as a substrate.

Figure 5. Effects of physicochemical perturbations and cell growth on mobility of differently-sized proteins.

Each dot represents the average value of protein mobility ($1/\tau_D$) of all the cells measured for the construct of the

indicated molecular mass (Appendix 5). Error bars represent the standard error. Error bars that are not visible are

smaller than the symbol size. The solid black lines are the fit with an inverse power law to extract the size dependence

of protein mobility (β) in that condition. (A) Protein mobility measured in cells that were resuspended in either

tethering buffer (ionic strength of 105 mM; $\beta = 0.60 \pm 0.01$) or in the same buffer but supplemented with additional

100 mM NaCl (total ionic strength of 305 mM; $\beta = 0.57 \pm 0.05$). The measurements were performed in agarose pads

prepared at the same ionic strength. (B) Protein mobility at different environmental temperatures. As for the other

experiments, *E. coli* cultures were grown at 37°C and bacterial cells during the measurements were incubated at 25°C

($\beta = 0.60 \pm 0.01$) or at 35°C ($\beta = 0.60 \pm 0.05$), as indicated. (C) Protein mobility in control cells ($\beta = 0.58 \pm 0.02$) and

after treatment with chloramphenicol (Cam; 200 µg/mL; $\beta = 0.88 \pm 0.11$), rifampicin (Rif; 200 µg/mL, in 0.1% v/v

DMSO; $\beta = 0.54 \pm 0.04$), or DMSO control (0.1% v/v; $\beta = 0.62 \pm 0.07$) as indicated. Antibiotics were added to growing

E. coli culture 60 minutes prior to harvesting. (D) Protein mobility in non-growing cells incubated at 35°C on agarose

pads containing only M9 salts ($\beta = 0.60 \pm 0.05$) in comparison with growing cell incubated on pads with M9 salts

supplemented with 20 mM glucose and 0.2% casamino acids (Glu + CA; $\beta = 0.68 \pm 0.10$).

Figure 5 – source data

Individual mean and standard error of the mean of $1/\tau_D$ values from Figure 5A

Individual mean and standard error of the mean of $1/\tau_D$ values from Figure 5B

Individual mean and standard error of the mean of $1/\tau_D$ values from Figure 5C

Individual mean and standard error of the mean of $1/\tau_D$ values from Figure 5D

Discussion

Bacteria rely on translational diffusion to deliver proteins and other macromolecules to their

cellular destinations, including their reaction partners, and the diffusional properties of bacterial

cytoplasm are therefore fundamental to the understanding of bacterial cell biology. Consequently,

a number of studies have investigated protein mobility in bacteria, all showing strong effects of

macromolecular crowding in the bacterial cytoplasm on diffusion (Konopka et al. 2006;

Mullineaux et al. 2006; Konopka et al. 2009; Kumar, Mommer, and Sourjik 2010; Mika et al. 2010;

Nenninger, Mastroianni, and Mullineaux 2010). Nevertheless, the relatively small number of

proteins investigated in each of these previous studies, and the differences between strains, growth

conditions and between methodologies, limited general conclusions about protein mobility, even

in the most-studied environment of *E. coli* cytoplasm. For example, combining data from different

studies to determine the relation between the size of a protein and its cytoplasmic diffusion

coefficient yielded only uncertain estimates (Mika and Poolman 2011; Schavemaker, Boersma,

and Poolman 2018). Such variability between different studies might be further compounded by

potentially profound effects on diffusion of size-independent protein properties such as surface

charge (Schavemaker, Smigiel, and Poolman 2017) or weak interactions with other proteins and

other cellular components (von Bülow et al. 2019). Similarly, it remains unclear whether a typical

protein in the cytoplasm exhibits Brownian diffusion, as has been shown in few examples (Bakshi,

Bratton, and Weisshaar 2011; English et al. 2011), or rather a subdiffusive behavior as common in

eukaryotic cells (Di Rienzo et al. 2014; Sabri et al. 2020) and for large proteins and nucleoprotein

particles in bacteria (Golding and Cox 2004; Lampo et al. 2017; Yu et al. 2018). Additionally,

while in eukaryotic cells anomalous diffusion is primarily associated with hindrance by

intracellular structures, the possible causes of anomalous diffusion in bacteria are still unclear.

Here, we addressed these questions by systematically investigating the diffusive behavior of a large

set of fluorescent protein fusions to differently-sized cytoplasmic proteins of *E. coli*. We

demonstrate that the majority of studied proteins exhibit a rather uniform relation between their

molecular mass and cytoplasmic mobility, with a clear upper bound on protein mobility at a given

molecular mass. This bound likely reflects the fundamental size-specific physical limit on protein

diffusion in *E. coli* cytoplasm, with lower mobility of individual proteins being due to their

interactions with other cellular components.

Furthermore, our simulations suggest that the apparent weak anomaly of diffusion observed in the

FCS data analysis, with $\alpha \sim 0.85\text{-}0.9$ for most proteins, could be accounted for by confinement of

the otherwise purely Brownian diffusing particles in the small volume of a bacterial cell. Similar

conclusions have been drawn by previous SPT studies for several individual proteins (Bakshi,

Bratton, and Weisshaar 2011; English et al. 2011). This interpretation is consistent with our

measurements of diffusion in A22-treated *E. coli* with an increased cell. Although the interpretation

of these experiments might be complicated by the reduced cytoplasmic density of A22-treated

bacteria (Oldewurtel Enno, Kitahara, and van Teeffelen 2021), under our conditions the effect of

A22 on cell density seems to be negligible. It is also supported by the FCS measurements using

smaller confocal volume, which yielded higher value of α, as could be expected from protein

diffusion away from the cell boundary.

We therefore used a model of purely Brownian diffusion under confinement (Ornstein-Uhlenbeck

model) to determine diffusion coefficients by directly fitting the autocorrelation functions of our

FCS measurements. The obtained overall dependence of diffusion coefficients on the molecular

mass of the fusion protein showed the exponent $\beta = 0.56$, steeper than predicted by the Stokes-

Einstein relation, with $\beta = 0.33$ for fully compact proteins or $\beta = 0.4$ for the more realistic case

where proteins are assumed to be not entirely compact (Enright and Leitner 2005; Smilgies and

Folta-Stogniew 2015). Nevertheless, at least for smaller constructs, the observed dependence of

the diffusion coefficient on the molecular mass could be well reproduced once the specific shape

of fusion constructs, where two roughly globular proteins are fused by a short linker, was taken

into account along with their imperfect globularity (Agudo-Canalejo and Golestanian 2020). Only

largest proteins in our set (above 100 kDa) showed mobility that was slower than predicted by this

model, possibly because diffusion of larger proteins is more strongly impacted by weak interactions

with other macromolecules (von Bülow et al. 2019).

Our analysis thus suggests that, despite the high crowdedness of the bacterial cytoplasm, the

diffusion of typical cytoplasmic proteins in bacteria is mostly Brownian and can be well described

by treating the cytoplasm as a viscous fluid, with only a moderate dependence of the effective

viscosity on the size of diffusing proteins. Given the diffusion coefficient determined in our study

for free sfGFP, ~14 $\mu m^2 s^{-1}$, for small proteins this effective viscosity of bacterial cytoplasm is only

approximately six times higher than in dilute solution (Potma et al. 2001). This diffusion coefficient

for GFP is substantially larger than the values reported in the early studies that used FRAP (Elowitz

Michael et al. 1999; Konopka et al. 2006; Mullineaux et al. 2006; Konopka et al. 2009; Kumar,

Mommer, and Sourjik 2010; Mika et al. 2010; Nenninger, Mastroianni, and Mullineaux 2010),

although it is consistent with other FCS and SPT studies (Meacci et al. 2006; English et al. 2011;

Sanamrad et al. 2014; Diepold et al. 2017; Rocha et al. 2019). These differences are apparently due

to the limitations of early FRAP analyses that generally underestimated protein mobility, rather

than due to different spatial and temporal scales assessed by the two techniques, since our direct

comparison between FCS and FRAP measurements yielded similar values of diffusion coefficients.

Indeed, a more recent FRAP study also reported higher diffusion coefficients for GFP

(Schavemaker, Smigiel, and Poolman 2017).

Several proteins in our set showed much lower mobility than expected from their size, and in some

cases also clearly subdiffusive behavior. For three selected examples, this deviation could be

explained by specific association with other proteins or multiprotein complexes, since disrupting

these interactions both increased protein mobility and reduced subdiffusion. This is consistent with

theoretical studies suggesting that binding of diffusing molecules to crowders can lead to

subdiffusion (Saxton 2007; Guigas and Weiss 2008). Thus, protein-protein interactions may be the

main cause of protein subdiffusion in bacterial cytoplasm, although other explanations might hold

for subdiffusion of large cytoplasmic particles (Golding and Cox 2004; Lampo et al. 2017; Yu et

al. 2018).

Unspecific transient interactions might also explain the slightly subdiffusive behavior of sfGFP

fusions to proteins from other bacteria in *E. coli* cytoplasm. However, this anomaly was weak and

there was overall only little difference between the mobility of these non-native proteins and their

similarly-sized *E. coli* homologues, which is in contrast to pronounced differences observed

between bacterial and mammalian proteins (Mu et al. 2017). Thus, there is apparently little

organism-specific adaptation of freely diffusing proteins to their "bacterial host", with a possible

exception of bacteria with extreme pH or ionic strength of the cytoplasm (Schavemaker, Smigiel,

and Poolman 2017). This might facilitate horizontal gene transfer among bacteria, by ensuring that

their surface properties do not hinder accommodation of proteins in a new host.

We further probed how the effective viscous properties of bacterial cytoplasm changed under

different physicochemical perturbations, using a subset of proteins that showed fastest diffusion

for their molecular mass as reporters of unhindered diffusion. Consistent with the importance of

macromolecular crowding and in agreement with previous results (Konopka et al. 2009), protein

mobility decreased upon osmotic upshift as cytoplasmic crowding increases. In contrast, the

effective cytoplasmic viscosity decreases significantly (~20%) upon treatment with rifampicin that

inhibits transcription and thereby reduces the overall macromolecular crowding. This observation

is consistent with recent SPT measurements on large cytoplasmic particles (Wlodarski et al. 2020;

Rotter et al. 2021), and it agrees well with the relative contribution of RNA to the macromolecular

composition of an *E. coli* cell (Cayley et al. 1991) and with the reduction of molecular crowding

in rifampicin-treated cells (Wlodarski et al. 2020).

Despite multiple effects of environmental temperature on cellular processes, such as the active

(nonthermal) stirring of the cytoplasm at higher temperature (Weber, Spakowitz, and Theriot

2012), the temperature dependence of the cytoplasmic viscosity in the tested range was similar to

that of water and consistent with the Stokes-Einstein relation, decreasing by 20-30% for a

temperature increase of 10°C (Huber et al. 2009). Furthermore, the same temperature dependence

of protein mobility was observed upon treatment with the protonophore DNP that deenergizes cells

by dissipating proton gradient, arguing against general active stirring of cytoplasm in *E. coli* under

our experimental conditions. We further observed no dependence of the effective cytoplasmic

viscosity on growth temperature, in contrast to the homeostatic adaptation of bacterial membrane

fluidity (Sinensky 1974) and of bacterial signaling (Oleksiuk et al. 2011; Almblad et al. 2021) to

the growth temperature. Since growth-temperature dependent adaptation of the cytosolic viscosity

was recently reported for budding yeast (Persson, Ambati, and Brandman 2020), it is surprising

that such compensation apparently does not exist in *E. coli*. One possible explanation for this

difference might be a broader range of growth temperatures for budding yeast *Saccharomyces*

cerevisiae compared to *E. coli,* and a stronger temperature effect on protein diffusion in the yeast

cytosol. Of note, here we did not explore protein diffusion in thermally stressed *E. coli* cells, which

might have more profound effects on the properties of bacterial cytoplasm as recently shown for

Listeria monocytogenes (Tran et al. 2021).

Finally, we observed that protein mobility was significantly higher in rapidly growing cells. This

"fluidizing" effect of growth seems to be primarily due to the biosynthetic processes, likely protein

translation, as evidenced by the reduced mobility upon chloramphenicol treatment, or to cell

growth itself. The contribution of metabolic activity in presence of nutrients was also significant

but weaker, although it might be underestimated since inhibition of protein biosynthesis by

chloramphenicol could possibly indirectly reduce metabolic activity. Thus, the observed

phenomenon may be different from previously characterized ATP-dependent fluidization of the

bacterial cytoplasm that enables mobility of large multiprotein complexes but apparently does not

affect free GFP (Montero Llopis et al. 2012; Parry et al. 2014), as also observed for sfGFP and

other constructs in our experiments. The interplay between these energy-, metabolism- and growth-

dependent effects on diffusional properties of bacterial cytoplasm remains to be investigated.

Importantly, we observed that these perturbations to the cytoplasmic protein mobility, including

cell growth and changes to the macromolecular crowding and temperature, have proportional

effects on differently-sized proteins. These results suggest that - within the tested size range -

protein diffusion in *E. coli* cytoplasm remains Brownian under all tested conditions, including

growing cells, and effects of these perturbations on protein mobility can be simply accounted for

by changes in the cytoplasmic viscosity. We hypothesize that such proportional changes in

diffusion of differently-sized proteins might be important to maintain balanced rates of diffusion-

limited cellular processes under various environmental conditions.

Materials and methods

Bacterial strains, plasmids and media

All strains and plasmids used in this study are listed in Figure 1 – supplementary table 2. All

experiments were performed in the *Escherichia coli* strain W3110 (Serra et al. 2013). Genes of

interest were amplified by PCR using Q5 polymerase (New England Biosciences) and cloned in

frame with sfGFP using Gibson assembly (Gibson et al. 2009) into pTrc99A vector (Amann, Ochs,

and Abel 1988), under control of the *trc* promoter inducible by isopropyl ß-D-1-

thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG). In all cases sfGFP was fused at the C-terminus of the protein of

interest with a GGGGS linker. The stability of the fusion constructs was verified by gel

electrophoresis and immunoblotting using an anti-GFP primary antibody (JL-8 monoclonal,

Takara). Point mutations were introduced by site-directed mutagenesis (New England

Biosciences). The *ΔclpA* strain was generated by transferring the kanamycin resistance cassette

from the corresponding mutant in the Keio collection (Baba et al. 2006) by P1 transduction. The

cassette was further removed by FLP recombinase carried on the temperature-sensitive plasmid

pCP20 (Cherepanov and Wackernagel 1995).

E. coli cultures were grown in M9 minimal medium (48 mM Na_2HPO_4, 22 mM KH_2PO_4, 8.4 mM

NaCl, 18.6 mM NH_4Cl, 2 mM $MgSO_4$, 0.1 mM $CaCl_2$) supplemented with 0.2% casamino acids,

20 mM glucose and 100 µg/mL ampicillin for selection. The overnight cultures were diluted to

OD_{600} = 0.035 and grown for 3.5 hours at 37°C and 200 rpm shaking. Cultures were treated for

additional 45 minutes, under the same temperature and shaking conditions, with 100 µg/mL

cephalexin and with 0 - 15 µM IPTG (Figure 1 – supplementary table 1), to induce expression of

the fluorescent protein constructs. Where indicated, cultures were further incubated with 200

µg/mL rifampicin, DMSO as a mock treatment, 200 µg/mL chloramphenicol or 2 mM DNP for 1

hour or with 1 µg/mL A22 for 4 hours under the same temperature and shaking conditions.

Growth curves

Measurements of bacterial growth were performed using 96-well plates (Cellstar transparent flat-bottom, Greiner). Overnight cultures were inoculated at an initial OD_{600} of 0.01 in the same medium as used for growth in other experiments. Each well contained 150 µl of culture and the plate was covered with the plastic cover provided by the producer and further sealed with parafilm that prevents evaporation but allows air exchange. Plates were incubated at 37°C with continuous shaking, alternating between 150 s orbital and 150 s linear, in a Tecan Infinite® 200 PRO plate reader.

FCS data acquisition

Cells were harvested by centrifugation at 7000g for 3 minutes and washed 3 times in tethering buffer (10 mM K_2HPO_4, 10 mM KH_2PO_4, 1 µM methionine, 10 mM sodium lactate, buffered with NaOH to pH 7). When indicated, 1 mL of chloramphenicol-treated cells were stained for 15 minutes with 300 nM SYTOX Orange Nucleic Acid Stain (Invitrogen). The excess of SYTOX Orange was washed in tethering buffer before proceeding with FCS experiments. 2.5 µL of bacterial cells were then spread on a small 1% agarose pad prepared in tethering buffer salts (10 mM K_2HPO_4, 10 mM KH_2PO_4 buffered with NaOH to pH 7), unless differently stated. Imaging was performed on Ibidi 2-well µ-Slides (#1.5H, 170 µm ± 5 µm). After the 45 minutes treatment with cephalexin, length of most bacterial cells was in a range of 4-8 µm.

FCS measurements were performed on a LSM 880 confocal laser scanning microscope (Carl Zeiss Microscopy) using a C-Apochromat 40×/1.2 water immersion objective selected for FCS. sfGFP

was excited with a 488 nm Argon laser (25 mW) and fluorescence emission was collected from

490 to 580 nm. SYTOX Orange was excited with a 543 nm laser and fluorescence emission was

collected from 553 to 615 nm. In order to avoid partial spectral overlap between the emission

spectra of sfGFP and SYTOX Orange, fluorescence emission of sfGFP in the co-staining

experiments was collected from 490 to 535 nm. Each sample was equilibrated for at least 20

minutes at 25°C (or 35°C when specified), on the stage of the microscope and measurements were

taken at the same temperature. FCS measurements were acquired within 60 minutes from the

sample preparation. The pinhole was aligned on a daily basis, by maximizing the fluorescence

intensity count rate of an Alexa488 (Invitrogen) solution (35 nM) in phosphate-buffered saline

(PBS; 137 mM NaCl, 2.7 mM KCl, 8 mM Na_2HPO_4, 1.8 mM KH_2PO_4, pH 7.4). Unless differently

stated, all measurements were performed with a pinhole size correspondent to 1 Airy unit, to ensure

the optimal gathering of fluorescence signal. The coverslip collar adjustment ring of the water

immersion objective was also adjusted daily, maximizing the fluorescence intensity signal and the

brightness of Alexa 488. The laser power was adjusted in order to obtain molecular brightness (i.e.

photon counts per second per molecule, cpsm) of 10 kcpsm for Alexa 488, using the ZEN software

(Carl Zeiss Microscopy). The brightness of Alexa 488 was used as a daily reference to ensure

constant laser power and adjusting it using the software-provided laser power percentage whenever

necessary (range over the entire set of measurements was $0.11 - 0.18\%$). Before each measurement

session, we acquired three sequential FCS measurements of Alexa488 in PBS, to verify the

reproducibility of the confocal volume shape and size. The ratio between axial and lateral beam

waist $S = \frac{z_0}{\omega_0} = 8.0 \pm 0.2$ (Avg. ± SEM) was obtained from a Brownian fit of the Alexa 488

autocorrelation curves using the ZEN software. For the lateral beam waist, we obtained $\omega_0 = 0.186$

± 0.001 μm (Avg. ± SEM), calculated from the diffusion time $\tau_D = 20.9 \pm 0.11$ μs (Avg. ± SEM)

obtained from the Brownian fit, being

$$D = \frac{\omega_0^2}{4\tau_D}$$ (1)

and being $D_{Alexa488} = 414$ μm^2/s at 25°C (Petrov et al. 2006).

For the FCS measurements *in vivo*, the laser was positioned at the center of the short length axis

and typically 0.8-1 μm from one of the cell poles along the long axis. For each cell, six sequential

fluorescence intensity acquisitions of 20 seconds each were performed on the same spot (Figure 1

– figure supplement 3). The laser power used for measurements *in vivo* was fixed to a value about

7 times lower than for Alexa488 in PBS, in order to reduce photobleaching. Confocal images of

the selected cell were routinely acquired before and after the FCS measurement to verify focal (*z*)

and positioning (*xy*) stability (see Appendix 1 for additional information on the FCS

measurements).

FCS data analysis

Due to the small size of bacterial cells, fluorescence intensity traces are affected by photobleaching

(Appendix 1). The effect of photobleaching on autocorrelation curves was corrected by detrending

the long-time fluorescence decrease of each of the six fluorescence intensity traces using an ImageJ

plugin (Jay Unruh, https://research.stowers.org/imagejplugins/index.html, Stowers Institute for

Medical Research, USA). The plugin calculates the autocorrelation function (ACF) from each

fluorescence intensity trace, correcting it for the photobleaching effect by approximating the

decreasing fluorescence intensity trend with a multi-segment line (the number of segments was

fixed to two). We obtained almost identical ACFs correcting for photobleaching effects by local

averaging (Appendix 1 - figure 3) using the FCS-dedicated software package Fluctuation Analyzer

(Wachsmuth et al. 2015). In both cases, ACFs were calculated starting at 2 μs, since at times shorter

than 2 μsec, ACFs can be significantly affected by the GaAsp photomultipliers afterpulsing.

For each FCS measurement, we fitted all the six ACFs, calculated using the multi-segment

detrending method, with a three-dimensional anomalous diffusion model that includes one

diffusive component and one blinking component due to the protonation-deprotonation of the

chromophore of sfGFP, according to the Equation (2):

$$G(\tau) = G_\infty + \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{1 - F_P + F_P e^{-\frac{\tau}{\tau_P}}}{1 - F_P} \right) \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_D}\right)^\alpha \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{S^2}\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_D}\right)^\alpha}} \quad (2)$$

where N is the average number of particles in the confocal volume, F_P is the fraction of particles

in the non-fluorescent state, τ_P is the protonation-deprotonation lifetime at pH 7.5, $S = \frac{z_0}{\omega_0}$, the

aspect ratio of the confocal volume with z_0 and ω_0 being the axial and lateral beam waists, τ_D is the

diffusion time in the confocal volume, α is the anomalous diffusion exponent, and G_∞ is the offset

of the autocorrelation function. The protonation-deprotonation lifetime (τ_P) for sfGFP was fixed to

25 μs according to FCS measurements for sfGFP in PBS at pH 7.5 (Cotlet et al. 2006). The aspect

ratio of the confocal volume was fixed to $S = 8$ in the fittings to be consistent with the experimental

calibration (see above). All other parameters were left free. For each FCS measurement, we

calculated the average diffusion time τ_D and the average anomalous diffusion exponent α based on

the autocorrelation curves of the six sequential fluorescence intensity traces. Importantly, no

significant trend in τ_D or α was apparent when comparing the six sequential autocorrelation

functions acquired for a given bacterial cell (Appendix 1 - figure 4). Fitting to the anomalous

diffusion model was performed using the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm in the FCS analysis-

dedicated software QuickFit 3.0 developed by Jan Wolfgang Krieger and Jörg Langowski

(Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum, Heidelberg, https://github.com/jkriege2/QuickFit3).

Identical results were obtained when fitting the data with OriginPro.

Alternatively, the autocorrelation functions were fitted by the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model

(Appendix 2) according to Equation (3):

$$G(\tau) = G_\infty + \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{1-F_P+F_P e^{-\frac{\tau}{\tau_P}}}{1-F_P}\right)\left(1+2\frac{\sigma^2}{\omega_0^2}\frac{1-e^{-\frac{1\omega_0^2\,\tau}{2\sigma^2\tau_D}}}{1+\frac{1\omega_0^2}{8\sigma^2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(1+\frac{\tau}{\tau_D}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(1+2\frac{\sigma^2}{S^2\omega_0^2}\frac{1-e^{-\frac{1\omega_0^2\,\tau}{2\sigma^2\tau_D}}}{1+\frac{1S^2\omega_0^2}{8\,\sigma^2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

(3)

where S and τ_P were fixed to the same values mentioned for equation (2), ω_0 was fixed to 0.19 and

σ was fixed to $d/2$=0.42 μm, being d the typical diameter of an *E. coli* cell (see Ornstein-Uhlenbeck

model validation paragraph). Fitting to the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model was performed with

OriginPro.

FRAP data acquisition and analysis

Cells for FRAP experiments were grown and prepared for imaging following the same protocol as

for the FCS measurements. Due to the higher sensitivity of FCS at low fluorophore concentrations,

several fusion constructs required higher induction by IPTG (Figure 1 – supplementary table 1) to

obtain fluorescence intensity suitable for FRAP. The same LSM 880 confocal microscope,

including objective and light path was used for FRAP as for the FCS measurements. The bacterial

cell was imaged at 40×40 pixels with 30× zoom (pixel size 0.177 μm) with a pixel dwell time of

3.15 μs. First, 15 pre-bleaching frames were acquired at 2% laser power, subsequently the

photobleaching was performed on a 3×3 pixels area on one cell pole with 100% laser power for a

total of 48 ms and 584 post-bleaching frames were acquired to monitor the fluorescence recovery.

We observed that the mobile fraction for all constructs was >0.9. FRAP measurements were

analyzed using simFRAP (Blumenthal et al. 2015), an ImageJ plugin based on a simulation

approach implemented in a fast algorithm, which bypasses the need of using analytical models to

interpolate the data. The simFRAP algorithm simulates two-dimensional random walks in each

pixel, using the first image acquired after bleaching to define initial and boundary conditions, and

it resolves numerically the diffusion equation by iterative simulation. The frame time and pixel size

were fixed respectively to 0.018 s and 0.177 μm, and the target cell and the bleached region were

defined as ImageJ ROIs (regions of interest). Of note, we used the target cell itself as a reference

to compensate for the gradual bleaching during the measurement, as done previously (Kumar,

Mommer, and Sourjik 2010). This enabled us to achieve the highest possible temporal resolution,

by reducing the acquisition area to a single *E. coli* cell. The FRAP derived diffusion coefficient

D_{FRAP} was directly obtained as output of the plugin.

806 Cellular density measurements

Cell cultures were grown following the same protocol as for the FCS and FRAP measurements.

Cultures were harvested at 4000g for 5 minutes, and the pellet was resuspended in motility buffer

(MB) (10 mM KPO$_4$, 0.1 mM EDTA, 67 mM NaCl, 0.01% Tween 80). Tween 80 is a surfactant

that prevents cell-surface adhesion (Nielsen et al. 2016; Schwarz-Linek et al. 2016). Bacterial

suspension was adjusted to a high cell density (OD$_{600}$=15) by subsequent centrifugation (4000g, 5

minutes) and resuspension in a medium containing 20% iodixanol to match the density of MB with

that of *E. coli* cell (1.11 g/ml) (Martínez-Salas, Martín, and Vicente 1981). Each sample was then

loaded in the chamber of a previously fabricated poly-di-methylsiloxane (PDMS) microfluidic

device. The chamber consists of an inlet connected to an outlet by a straight channel of 50 μm

height, 1 mm width and 1 cm length. The channel was then sealed with grease to prevent fluid

flows. After letting the mixtures reach the steady state in the microfluidic device for 40 minutes,

cell sedimentation was visualized by acquiring Z-stack images of the whole microfluidic channel

using the same microscopy setup as for the FCS and FRAP measurements (1px = 0.2 μm in X and

Y, 1px = 1 μm in Z; field of view = 303.64 x 303.64 x 70 μm³, 0.35 μs/px exposure). The number

of cells in each Z plane was quantified by the connected components labeling algorithm for ImageJ

(Legland, Arganda-Carreras, and Andrey 2016). Each experiment was conducted in three technical

replicates. Because the height and the tilt of the microfluidic channels slightly varies from sample

to sample, the Z position was binned and the mean of the cell fraction over the bins was calculated.

The vertical density profiles were fitted to the theoretical expectation for diffusing particles in a

buoyant fluid, $n(z) = n_o \exp\left(-\frac{z}{z_o}\right)$, in the range $z = [0.25, 0.8] \times 50$ μm to avoid effects of

sample boundaries. The fitted decay length is expected to obey $\frac{1}{z_o} = \frac{\Delta\rho V g}{k_B T}$, with $\Delta\rho$ the difference

in density between the cells and the suspending fluid, V the average volume of the cells, $g = 9.81$

m²/s the acceleration of gravity and $k_B T = 4.11$ pN·nm the thermal energy at 25°C. To compute

the buoyancy-corrected cell density $\Delta\rho = \frac{k_B T}{V g\, z_o}$, the cell volume was estimated assuming the cells

are cylinders closed by hemispherical caps, $V = \pi d^3/6 + (L - d)\pi d^2/4$. For all conditions, the

cell diameter d was evaluated on confocal images taken prior to FCS measurement (see Figure 1 –

figure supplement 7, Figure 2C and Figure 5 – figure supplement 1), and so was the length of

cephalexin treated cells (L = 5.5 ± 0.1 (SEM) μm), cephalexin + A22 treated cells (L = 5.8 ± 0.1

(SEM) μm), and untreated cells (L=2.8 ± 0.2 μm). Cell length for 100 mM NaCl, DMSO,

rifampicin and chloramphenicol treated cells was kept equal to the one of untreated cells, because

cephalexin was not used during culture growth for sedimentation assay for these conditions.

Brownian dynamics simulations

We performed Brownian dynamics simulations of uncorrelated point particles under confinement.

The $N = 50$ fluorescent particles performed a random walk with steps taken from a Gaussian

distribution of width $\sqrt{2D\Delta t}$, with D the free diffusion coefficient and $\Delta t = 10^{-6}$ s the simulation

step. Confinement was imposed by redrawing the random steps that moved out of the confinement

volume. Imposing elastic reflections on the walls yielded identical results. The confinement volume

was assumed to be a cylinder of diameter d and length (L-d) closed at both ends by hemispheric

caps of diameter d, idealizing the shape of $E.$ $coli$. The cell length was fixed to $L = 5$ μm. The

diameter was varied in the range $d = [0.7, 1]$ μm. The collected fluorescence intensity was

computed at each time step assuming a Gaussian intensity profile of the laser beam, $I(t) =$

$\sum_{i=1}^{N} I_G(\boldsymbol{r}_i(t) - \boldsymbol{r}_0)$ with $\boldsymbol{r}_i(t)$ the position of particle i, $\boldsymbol{r}_0$ the center of the confocal volume and

$I_G(\boldsymbol{r} = (x, y, z)) = \exp\left(-2\left(\frac{x^2+y^2}{\omega_0^2} + \frac{z^2}{z_0^2}\right)\right)$, with $\omega_0 = 200$ nm and $z_0 = 800$ nm the lateral and

axial widths of the confocal volume. The normalized intensity autocorrelation $C(dt) =$

$\frac{\langle I(t+dt)I(t)\rangle}{\langle I(t+dt)\rangle\langle I(t)\rangle} - 1$ is computed for logarithmically spaced lag times dt, to reflect experimental

practices. The center of the confocal volume was chosen in the center of the cell along the y and z

axes and 1 μm away from the edge of the cell along the longitudinal x axis of the cell, similarly to

experimental conditions. The intensity autocorrelation function was finally multiplied by an

exponential decay, $\left(1 + 0.1 * \exp{-\frac{dt}{\tau_H}}\right)/1.1$ with $\tau_H = 25$ μs, to mimic the blinking component

due to the protonation-deprotonation process of sfGFP, before fitting with the different models of

diffusion. The code used for this simulation is available in GitHub

(https://github.com/croelmiyn/Simulation_FCS_in_Bacteria)   and   via

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5940484.

Validation of fitting by the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model

We first estimated the relation between the width σ of the potential well and the diameter d of the

bacteria by fitting the ACF of the Brownian simulations with the OU model, fixing all parameters

except σ to their ansatz values. The best fit was obtained for $\sigma \simeq d/2$ over the whole range of

tested parameters. To mimic the fit procedure of experimental data and evaluate the accuracy of

the diffusion coefficient estimation by the OU model (Figure 2 – figure supplement 3), we then

fixed $\sigma = d/2$, and ω_0 and z_0 to their ansatz values, since they are measured independently in

experiments, whereas the diffusion coefficient, number of particles N in the confocal volume,

fraction of triplet excitation and background noise were taken as free parameters.

Acknowledgements

873 We thank Lotte Søgaard-Andersen, Martin Thanbichler, Knut Drescher and Andreas Diepold for

874 providing bacterial genomic DNA. We thank Silvia Espada Burriel for the assistance with the

875 cellular density measurements and data analysis. This work was supported by the Max Planck

876 Society.

Competing Interests

879 The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Agudo-Canalejo, Jaime, Tunrayo Adeleke-Larodo, Pierre Illien, and Ramin Golestanian. 2018. 'Enhanced Diffusion and Chemotaxis at the Nanoscale', *Accounts of Chemical Research*, 51: 2365-72.

Agudo-Canalejo, Jaime, and Ramin Golestanian. 2020. 'Diffusion and steady state distributions of flexible chemotactic enzymes', *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 229: 2791-806.

Agudo-Canalejo, Jaime, Pierre Illien, and Ramin Golestanian. 2020. 'Cooperatively enhanced reactivity and "stabilitaxis" of dissociating oligomeric proteins', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117: 11894.

Almblad, Henrik, Trevor E. Randall, Fanny Liu, Katherine Leblanc, Ryan A. Groves, Weerayuth Kittichotirat, Geoffrey L. Winsor, Nicolas Fournier, Emily Au, Julie Groizeleau, Jacquelyn D. Rich, Yuefei Lou, Elise Granton, Laura K. Jennings, Larissa A. Singletary, Tara M. L. Winstone, Nathan M. Good, Roger E. Bumgarner, Michael F. Hynes, Manu Singh, Maria Silvina Stietz, Fiona S. L. Brinkman, Ayush Kumar, Ann Karen Cornelia Brassinga, Matthew R. Parsek, Boo Shan Tseng, Ian A. Lewis, Bryan G. Yipp, Justin L. MacCallum, and Joe Jonathan Harrison. 2021. 'Bacterial cyclic diguanylate signaling networks sense temperature', *Nature Communications*, 12: 1986.

Amann, E., B. Ochs, and K. J. Abel. 1988. 'Tightly regulated tac promoter vectors useful for the expression of unfused and fused proteins in *Escherichia coli*', *Gene*, 69: 301-15.

Baba, T., T. Ara, M. Hasegawa, Y. Takai, Y. Okumura, M. Baba, K. A. Datsenko, M. Tomita, B. L. Wanner, and H. Mori. 2006. 'Construction of *Escherichia coli* K-12 in-frame, single-gene knockout mutants: the Keio collection', *Molecular Systems Biology*, 2: 2006 0008.

Bakshi, Somenath, Benjamin P Bratton, and James C Weisshaar. 2011. 'Subdiffraction-Limit Study of Kaede Diffusion and Spatial Distribution in Live *Escherichia coli*', *Biophysical Journal*, 101: 2535-44.

Bakshi, Somenath, Heejun Choi, Jagannath Mondal, and James C. Weisshaar. 2014. 'Time-
dependent effects of transcription- and translation-halting drugs on the spatial
distributions of the *Escherichia coli* chromosome and ribosomes', *Molecular*
Microbiology, 94: 871-87.

Balbo, Jessica, Paolo Mereghetti, Dirk-Peter Herten, and Rebecca C. Wade. 2013. 'The shape of
protein crowders is a major determinant of protein diffusion', *Biophysical Journal*, 104:
1576-84.

Banks, Daniel S., and Cécile Fradin. 2005. 'Anomalous Diffusion of Proteins Due to Molecular
Crowding', *Biophysical Journal*, 89: 2960-71.

Blumenthal, D., L. Goldstien, M. Edidin, and L. A. Gheber. 2015. 'Universal Approach to FRAP
Analysis of Arbitrary Bleaching Patterns', *Scientific Reports*, 5: 11655.

Cayley, Scott, Barbara A. Lewis, Harry J. Guttman, and M. Thomas Record. 1991.
'Characterization of the cytoplasm of *Escherichia coli* K-12 as a function of external
osmolarity: Implications for protein-DNA interactions in vivo', *Journal of Molecular*
Biology, 222: 281-300.

Cherepanov, Peter P., and Wilfried Wackernagel. 1995. 'Gene disruption in *Escherichia coli*:
TcR and KmR cassettes with the option of Flp-catalyzed excision of the antibiotic-
resistance determinant', *Gene*, 158: 9-14.

Cluzel, Philippe, Michael Surette, and Stanislas Leibler. 2000. 'An Ultrasensitive Bacterial Motor
Revealed by Monitoring Signaling Proteins in Single Cells', *Science*, 287: 1652-55.

Cotlet, M., P. M. Goodwin, G. S. Waldo, and J. H. Werner. 2006. 'A comparison of the
fluorescence dynamics of single molecules of a green fluorescent protein: one- versus
two-photon excitation', *Chemphyschem*, 7: 250-60.

Di Rienzo, Carmine, Vincenzo Piazza, Enrico Gratton, Fabio Beltram, and Francesco Cardarelli.
2014. 'Probing short-range protein Brownian motion in the cytoplasm of living cells',
Nature Communications, 5: 5891.

Diepold, A., E. Sezgin, M. Huseyin, T. Mortimer, C. Eggeling, and J. P. Armitage. 2017. 'A
dynamic and adaptive network of cytosolic interactions governs protein export by the
T3SS injectisome', *Nature Communications*, 8: 15940.

Dix, James A., and A. S. Verkman. 2008. 'Crowding Effects on Diffusion in Solutions and Cells',
Annual Review of Biophysics, 37: 247-63.

Einstein, Albert 1906. 'On the theory of the Brownian movement', *Annalen der Physik*, 19: 371-
81.

Elowitz Michael, B., G. Surette Michael, Pierre-Etienne Wolf, B. Stock Jeffry, and Stanislas
Leibler. 1999. 'Protein Mobility in the Cytoplasm of *Escherichia coli*', *Journal of
Bacteriology*, 181: 197-203.

Elson, E. L. 2011. 'Fluorescence correlation spectroscopy: past, present, future', *Biophysical
Journal*, 101: 2855-70.

Enderlein, Jörg. 2012. 'Polymer Dynamics, Fluorescence Correlation Spectroscopy, and the
Limits of Optical Resolution', *Physical Review Letters*, 108: 108101.

Enderlein, Jörg, Ingo Gregor, Digambara Patra, Thomas Dertinger, and U. Benjamin Kaupp.
2005. 'Performance of Fluorescence Correlation Spectroscopy for Measuring Diffusion
and Concentration', *Chemphyschem*, 6: 2324-36.

English, Brian P., Vasili Hauryliuk, Arash Sanamrad, Stoyan Tankov, Nynke H. Dekker, and
Johan Elf. 2011. 'Single-molecule investigations of the stringent response machinery in
living bacterial cells', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United
States of America*, 108: E365-E73.

Enright, Matthew B., and David M. Leitner. 2005. 'Mass fractal dimension and the compactness
of proteins', *Physical Review E*, 71: 011912.

Etoc, Fred, Elie Balloul, Chiara Vicario, Davide Normanno, Domenik Liße, Assa Sittner, Jacob
Piehler, Maxime Dahan, and Mathieu Coppey. 2018. 'Non-specific interactions govern

cytosolic diffusion of nanosized objects in mammalian cells', *Nature Materials*, 17: 740-46.

Genevaux, P., C. Georgopoulos, and W. L. Kelley. 2007. 'The Hsp70 chaperone machines of *Escherichia coli*: a paradigm for the repartition of chaperone functions', *Molecular Microbiology*, 66: 840-57.

Gennerich, Arne, and Detlev Schild. 2000. 'Fluorescence Correlation Spectroscopy in Small Cytosolic Compartments Depends Critically on the Diffusion Model Used', *Biophysical Journal*, 79: 3294-306.

Gibson, D. G., L. Young, R. Y. Chuang, J. C. Venter, C. A. Hutchison, 3rd, and H. O. Smith. 2009. 'Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases', *Nature Methods*, 6: 343-5.

Goins, Aron B., Hugo Sanabria, and M. Neal Waxham. 2008. 'Macromolecular crowding and size effects on probe microviscosity', *Biophysical Journal*, 95: 5362-73.

Golding, Ido, and Edward C. Cox. 2004. 'RNA dynamics in live *Escherichia coli* cells', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101: 11310.

Golestanian, Ramin. 2015. 'Enhanced Diffusion of Enzymes that Catalyze Exothermic Reactions', *Physical Review Letters*, 115: 108102.

Guigas, Gernot, and Matthias Weiss. 2008. 'Sampling the Cell with Anomalous Diffusion—The Discovery of Slowness', *Biophysical Journal*, 94: 90-94.

Huber, M. L., R. A. Perkins, A. Laesecke, D. G. Friend, J. V. Sengers, M. J. Assael, I. N. Metaxa, E. Vogel, R. Mareš, and K. Miyagawa. 2009. 'New International Formulation for the Viscosity of H2O', *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data*, 38: 101-25.

Humbard, M. A., S. Surkov, G. M. De Donatis, L. M. Jenkins, and M. R. Maurizi. 2013. 'The N-degradome of *Escherichia coli*: limited proteolysis in vivo generates a large pool of proteins bearing N-degrons', *The Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 288: 28913-24.

984   Jiang, Yanfei, Bingxian Xu, Artem Melnykov, Guy M. Genin, and Elliot L. Elson. 2020.
985   'Fluorescence Correlation Spectroscopy and Photon Counting Histograms in Finite,
986   Bounded Domains', *Biophysical Journal*, 119: 265-73.

987   Joyner, Ryan P., Jeffrey H. Tang, Jonne Helenius, Elisa Dultz, Christiane Brune, Liam J. Holt,
988   Sebastien Huet, Daniel J. Müller, and Karsten Weis. 2016. 'A glucose-starvation response
989   regulates the diffusion of macromolecules', *Elife*, 5: e09376.

990   Kalwarczyk, Tomasz, Marcin Tabaka, and Robert Holyst. 2012. 'Biologistics--diffusion
991   coefficients for complete proteome of *Escherichia coli*', *Bioinformatics (Oxford,*
992   *England)*, 28: 2971-78.

993   Kapanidis, A. N., S. Uphoff, and M. Stracy. 2018. 'Understanding Protein Mobility in Bacteria by
994   Tracking Single Molecules', *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 430: 4443-55.

995   Klumpp, Stefan, Matthew Scott, Steen Pedersen, and Terence Hwa. 2013. 'Molecular crowding
996   limits translation and cell growth', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110:
997   16754.

998   Konopka, M. C., I. A. Shkel, S. Cayley, M. T. Record, and J. C. Weisshaar. 2006. 'Crowding and
999   confinement effects on protein diffusion in vivo', *Journal of Bacteriology*, 188: 6115-23.

1000   Konopka, M. C., K. A. Sochacki, B. P. Bratton, I. A. Shkel, M. T. Record, and J. C. Weisshaar.
1001   2009. 'Cytoplasmic protein mobility in osmotically stressed *Escherichia coli*', *Journal of*
1002   *Bacteriology*, 191: 231-7.

1003   Kumar, M., M. S. Mommer, and V. Sourjik. 2010. 'Mobility of cytoplasmic, membrane, and
1004   DNA-binding proteins in *Escherichia coli*', *Biophysical Journal*, 98: 552-9.

1005   Kumar, Mohit, and Victor Sourjik. 2012. 'Physical map and dynamics of the chaperone network
1006   in *Escherichia coli*', *Molecular Microbiology*, 84: 736-47.

1007   Lampo, Thomas J., Stella Stylianidou, Mikael P. Backlund, Paul A. Wiggins, and Andrew J.
1008   Spakowitz. 2017. 'Cytoplasmic RNA-Protein Particles Exhibit Non-Gaussian
1009   Subdiffusive Behavior', *Biophysical Journal*, 112: 532-42.

Langevin, Paul. 1908. 'Sur la théorie du mouvement brownien', *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des sciences*, 146: 530-33.

Legland, David, Ignacio Arganda-Carreras, and Philippe Andrey. 2016. 'MorphoLibJ: integrated library and plugins for mathematical morphology with ImageJ', *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, 32: 3532-34.

Liu, B., Z. Hasrat, B. Poolman, and A. J. Boersma. 2019. 'Decreased Effective Macromolecular Crowding in *Escherichia coli* Adapted to Hyperosmotic Stress', *Journal of Bacteriology*, 201.

Loren, N., J. Hagman, J. K. Jonasson, H. Deschout, D. Bernin, F. Cella-Zanacchi, A. Diaspro, J. G. McNally, M. Ameloot, N. Smisdom, M. Nyden, A. M. Hermansson, M. Rudemo, and K. Braeckmans. 2015. 'Fluorescence recovery after photobleaching in material and life sciences: putting theory into practice', *Quarterly Reviews of Biophysics*, 48: 323-87.

Luby-Phelps, Katherine. 1999. 'Cytoarchitecture and Physical Properties of Cytoplasm: Volume, Viscosity, Diffusion, Intracellular Surface Area.' in Harry Walter, Donald E. Brooks and Paul A. Srere (eds.), *International Review of Cytology* (Academic Press).

Macháň, Radek, Yong Hwee Foo, and Thorsten Wohland. 2016. 'On the Equivalence of FCS and FRAP: Simultaneous Lipid Membrane Measurements', *Biophysical Journal*, 111: 152-61.

Martínez-Salas, E., J. A. Martín, and M. Vicente. 1981. 'Relationship of Escherichia coli density to growth rate and cell age', *J Bacteriol*, 147: 97-100.

Mayer, Matthias P., Stefan Rüdiger, and Bernd Bukau. 2000. 'Molecular Basis for Interactions of the DnaK Chaperone with Substrates', *Biological Chemistry*, 381: 877-85.

Meacci, G., J. Ries, E. Fischer-Friedrich, N. Kahya, P. Schwille, and K. Kruse. 2006. 'Mobility of Min-proteins in *Escherichia coli* measured by fluorescence correlation spectroscopy', *Physical Biology*, 3: 255-63.

Mika, J. T., G. van den Bogaart, L. Veenhoff, V. Krasnikov, and B. Poolman. 2010. 'Molecular
sieving properties of the cytoplasm of *Escherichia coli* and consequences of osmotic
stress', *Molecular Microbiology*, 77: 200-7.

Mika, Jacek T., and Bert Poolman. 2011. 'Macromolecule diffusion and confinement in
prokaryotic cells', *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 22: 117-26.

Montero Llopis, Paula, Oleksii Sliusarenko, Jennifer Heinritz, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner.
2012. '*In vivo* biochemistry in bacterial cells using FRAP: insight into the translation
cycle', *Biophysical Journal*, 103: 1848-59.

Mu, Xin, Seongil Choi, Lisa Lang, David Mowray, Nikolay V. Dokholyan, Jens Danielsson, and
Mikael Oliveberg. 2017. 'Physicochemical code for quinary protein interactions in
Escherichia coli', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114: E4556.

Mullineaux, C. W., A. Nenninger, N. Ray, and C. Robinson. 2006. 'Diffusion of green
fluorescent protein in three cell environments in *Escherichia coli*', *Journal of
Bacteriology*, 188: 3442-8.

Muramatsu, N., and A. P. Minton. 1988. 'Tracer diffusion of globular proteins in concentrated
protein solutions', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States
of America*, 85: 2984-88.

Nenninger, A., G. Mastroianni, and C. W. Mullineaux. 2010. 'Size dependence of protein
diffusion in the cytoplasm of *Escherichia coli*', *Journal of Bacteriology*, 192: 4535-40.

Nielsen, Christina K., Jørgen Kjems, Tina Mygind, Torben Snabe, and Rikke L. Meyer. 2016.
'Effects of Tween 80 on Growth and Biofilm Formation in Laboratory Media', *Frontiers
in Microbiology*, 7.

Oldewurtel Enno, R., Yuki Kitahara, and Sven van Teeffelen. 2021. 'Robust surface-to-mass
coupling and turgor-dependent cell width determine bacterial dry-mass density',
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118: e2021416118.

Oleksiuk, O., V. Jakovljevic, N. Vladimirov, R. Carvalho, E. Paster, W. S. Ryu, Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, M. Kollmann, and V. Sourjik. 2011. 'Thermal robustness of signaling in bacterial chemotaxis', *Cell*, 145: 312-21.

Ouzounov, N., J. P. Nguyen, B. P. Bratton, D. Jacobowitz, Z. Gitai, and J. W. Shaevitz. 2016. 'MreB Orientation Correlates with Cell Diameter in *Escherichia coli*', *Biophysical Journal*, 111: 1035-43.

Parry, B. R., I. V. Surovtsev, M. T. Cabeen, C. S. O'Hern, E. R. Dufresne, and C. Jacobs-Wagner. 2014. 'The bacterial cytoplasm has glass-like properties and is fluidized by metabolic activity', *Cell*, 156: 183-94.

Pédelacq, Jean-Denis, Stéphanie Cabantous, Timothy Tran, Thomas C. Terwilliger, and Geoffrey S. Waldo. 2006. 'Engineering and characterization of a superfolder green fluorescent protein', *Nature Biotechnology*, 24: 79-88.

Perrin, Jean. 1909. 'Mouvement brownien et réalité moléculaire', *Annales de chimie et de physique*.

Persson, Laura B., Vardhaan S. Ambati, and Onn Brandman. 2020. 'Cellular Control of Viscosity Counters Changes in Temperature and Energy Availability', *Cell*, 183: 1572-85.e16.

Petrov, E. P., T. Ohrt, R. G. Winkler, and P. Schwille. 2006. 'Diffusion and segmental dynamics of double-stranded DNA', *Physical Review Letters*, 97: 258101.

Potma, Eric O., Wim P. de Boeij, Leonard Bosgraaf, Jeroen Roelofs, Peter J. M. van Haastert, and Douwe A. Wiersma. 2001. 'Reduced Protein Diffusion Rate by Cytoskeleton in Vegetative and Polarized Dictyostelium Cells', *Biophysical Journal*, 81: 2010-19.

Rivas, Germán, and Allen P. Minton. 2016. 'Macromolecular Crowding *In Vitro*, *In Vivo*, and In Between', *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, 41: 970-81.

Rocha, J., J. Corbitt, T. Yan, C. Richardson, and A. Gahlmann. 2019. 'Resolving Cytosolic Diffusive States in Bacteria by Single-Molecule Tracking', *Biophysical Journal*, 116: 1970-83.

Roman-Hernandez, G., J. Y. Hou, R. A. Grant, R. T. Sauer, and T. A. Baker. 2011. 'The ClpS
adaptor mediates staged delivery of N-end rule substrates to the AAA+ ClpAP protease',
Molecular Cell, 43: 217-28.

Rotter, D. A. O., C. Heger, L. M. Oviedo-Bocanegra, and P. L. Graumann. 2021. 'Transcription-
dependent confined diffusion of enzymes within subcellular spaces of the bacterial
cytoplasm', *BMC Biology*, 19: 183.

Sabri, Adal, Xinran Xu, Diego Krapf, and Matthias Weiss. 2020. 'Elucidating the Origin of
Heterogeneous Anomalous Diffusion in the Cytoplasm of Mammalian Cells', *Physical*
Review Letters, 125: 058101.

Sanamrad, A., F. Persson, E. G. Lundius, D. Fange, A. H. Gynna, and J. Elf. 2014. 'Single-
particle tracking reveals that free ribosomal subunits are not excluded from the
Escherichia coli nucleoid', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
United States of America, 111: 11413-8.

Sandikci, A., F. Gloge, M. Martinez, M. P. Mayer, R. Wade, B. Bukau, and G. Kramer. 2013.
'Dynamic enzyme docking to the ribosome coordinates N-terminal processing with
polypeptide folding', *Nature Structural & Molecular Biology*, 20: 843-50.

Saxton, M. J. 1996. 'Anomalous diffusion due to binding: a Monte Carlo study', *Biophysical*
Journal, 70: 1250-62.

Saxton, Michael J. 2007. 'A Biological Interpretation of Transient Anomalous Subdiffusion. I.
Qualitative Model', *Biophysical Journal*, 92: 1178-91.

Schavemaker, P. E., W. M. Smigiel, and B. Poolman. 2017. 'Ribosome surface properties may
impose limits on the nature of the cytoplasmic proteome', *Elife*, 6.

Schavemaker, Paul E., Arnold J. Boersma, and Bert Poolman. 2018. 'How Important Is Protein
Diffusion in Prokaryotes?', *Frontiers in Molecular Biosciences*, 5: 93.

Schwartz, Russell, Claire S. Ting, and Jonathan King. 2001. 'Whole Proteome pI Values

Correlate with Subcellular Localizations of Proteins for Organisms within the Three

Domains of Life', *Genome Research*, 11: 703-09.

Schwarz-Linek, Jana, Jochen Arlt, Alys Jepson, Angela Dawson, Teun Vissers, Dario Miroli,

Teuta Pilizota, Vincent A. Martinez, and Wilson C. K. Poon. 2016. 'Escherichia coli as a

model active colloid: A practical introduction', *Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces*,

137: 2-16.

Serra, D. O., A. M. Richter, G. Klauck, F. Mika, and R. Hengge. 2013. 'Microanatomy at cellular

resolution and spatial order of physiological differentiation in a bacterial biofilm', *mBio*,

4: e00103-13.

Sinensky, M. 1974. 'Homeoviscous adaptation--a homeostatic process that regulates the viscosity

of membrane lipids in *Escherichia coli*', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

of the United States of America, 71: 522-25.

Smilgies, Detlef- M., and Ewa Folta-Stogniew. 2015. 'Molecular weight-gyration radius relation

of globular proteins: a comparison of light scattering, small-angle X-ray scattering and

structure-based data', *Journal of applied crystallography*, 48: 1604-06.

Solbiati, José, Anne Chapman-Smith, Judith L. Miller, Charles G. Miller, and John E. Cronan.

1999. 'Processing of the N termini of nascent polypeptide chains requires deformylation

prior to methionine removal', *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 290: 607-14.

Spitzer, Jan, and Bert Poolman. 2013. 'How crowded is the prokaryotic cytoplasm?', *FEBS*

Letters, 587: 2094-98.

Stasevich, Timothy J., Florian Mueller, Ariel Michelman-Ribeiro, Tilman Rosales, Jay R.

Knutson, and James G. McNally. 2010. 'Cross-validating FRAP and FCS to quantify the

impact of photobleaching on in vivo binding estimates', *Biophysical Journal*, 99: 3093-

101.

Stracy, M., J. Schweizer, D. J. Sherratt, A. N. Kapanidis, S. Uphoff, and C. Lesterlin. 2021. 'Transient non-specific DNA binding dominates the target search of bacterial DNA-binding proteins', *Molecular Cell*, 81: 1499-514 e6.

Swaminathan, R., C. P. Hoang, and A. S. Verkman. 1997. 'Photobleaching recovery and anisotropy decay of green fluorescent protein GFP-S65T in solution and cells: cytoplasmic viscosity probed by green fluorescent protein translational and rotational diffusion', *Biophysical Journal*, 72: 1900-07.

Tabaka, Marcin, Tomasz Kalwarczyk, Jedrzej Szymanski, Sen Hou, and Robert Holyst. 2014. 'The effect of macromolecular crowding on mobility of biomolecules, association kinetics, and gene expression in living cells', *Frontiers in Physics*, 2.

Tran, Buu Minh, Haritha Prabha, Aditya Iyer, Conor O'Byrne, Tjakko Abee, and Bert Poolman. 2021. 'Measurement of Protein Mobility in *Listeria monocytogenes* Reveals a Unique Tolerance to Osmotic Stress and Temperature Dependence of Diffusion', *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 12.

Tyn, Myo T., and Todd W. Gusek. 1990. 'Prediction of diffusion coefficients of proteins', *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 35: 327-38.

van den Berg, Jonas, Arnold J. Boersma, and Bert Poolman. 2017. 'Microorganisms maintain crowding homeostasis', *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 15: 309-18.

von Bülow, Sören, Marc Siggel, Max Linke, and Gerhard Hummer. 2019. 'Dynamic cluster formation determines viscosity and diffusion in dense protein solutions', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116: 9843-52.

Wachsmuth, M., C. Conrad, J. Bulkescher, B. Koch, R. Mahen, M. Isokane, R. Pepperkok, and J. Ellenberg. 2015. 'High-throughput fluorescence correlation spectroscopy enables analysis of proteome dynamics in living cells', *Nature Biotechnology*, 33: 384-9.

Weber, Stephanie, C., Andrew Spakowitz, J., and Julie Theriot, A. 2012. 'Nonthermal ATP-dependent fluctuations contribute to the in vivo motion of chromosomal loci', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109: 7338-43.

Wlodarski, Michal, Leonardo Mancini, Bianca Raciti, Bianca Sclavi, Marco Cosentino
Lagomarsino, and Pietro Cicuta. 2020. 'Cytosolic Crowding Drives the Dynamics of Both
Genome and Cytosol in Escherichia coli Challenged with Sub-lethal Antibiotic
Treatments', *iScience*, 23: 101560.

Yu, Shi, Julian Sheats, Pietro Cicuta, Bianca Sclavi, Marco Cosentino Lagomarsino, and Kevin
D. Dorfman. 2018. 'Subdiffusion of loci and cytoplasmic particles are different in
compressed Escherichia coli cells', *Communications Biology*, 1: 176.

Zhang, Yifei, and Henry Hess. 2019. 'Enhanced Diffusion of Catalytically Active Enzymes', *ACS*
Central Science, 5: 939-48.

Zimmerman, Steven B., and Stefan O. Trach. 1991. 'Estimation of macromolecule concentrations
and excluded volume effects for the cytoplasm of *Escherichia coli*', *Journal of Molecular*
Biology, 222: 599-620.

1173

1174