Global characterization of the cyclic-di-GMP regulome by bi-directionally evolving a social trait in

Pseudomonas fluorescens

Collin Kessler[1], Wook Kim[1*]

[1] Department of Biological Sciences, Duquesne University, 600 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15282, USA

* Correspondence:

kimw1@duq.edu

Abstract

Microbial communities comprise densely packed cells where competition for space and

resources are fierce. These communities, generally referred to as biofilms, provide advantages to

individual cells against immunological and antimicrobial intervention, dehydration, and predation. High

intracellular pools of cyclic diguanylate monophosphate (c-di-GMP) cause individual cells to aggregate

during biofilm formation through the production of diverse extracellular polymers. Genes that encode c-

di-GMP enzymes or their regulators are commonly mutated during chronic infections due to enhanced

resistance to phagocytosis and antibiotics. Genome annotations predict the presence of numerous c-di-

GMP catalytic enzymes in most bacterial species, but the functionality and regulatory control of the vast

majority remain unconfirmed. Here, we begin to fill this gap by utilizing an experimental evolution

system in *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Pf0-1, which repeatedly produces a unique social trait through

bidirectional transitions between two distinct phenotypes converging on c-di-GMP modulation. Parallel

evolution of 33 lineages captured 147 unique mutations among 191 evolved isolates in genes that are

empirically demonstrated, bioinformatically predicted, or previously unknown to impact the intracellular

pool of c-di-GMP. Quantitative chemistry confirmed that each mutation causing the phenotypic shift

either amplifies or reduces c-di-GMP production. We integrate our data with current models of known

regulatory and catalytic systems, describe a previously unknown relationship between branched-chain

amino acids and c-di-GMP production, and predict functions of several new proteins that either regulate

or catalyze c-di-GMP production. Sequential mutations that continuously disrupt or recover c-di-GMP

production across discrete functional elements suggest a complex and underappreciated

interconnectivity within the c-di-GMP regulome.

Introduction

Microbes that persist in chronic infections utilize diverse signaling mechanisms to adapt and

respond to a dynamic environment. Opportunistic pathogens that evade host immune responses can

persist for long periods of time (Monack et al., 2004) and chronic infections typically require continuous

antibiotic therapy to suppress symptoms (Grant & Hung, 2013). Investigating bacterial phenotypes and

adaptations associated with persistent infections is essential for developing alternative therapeutic

strategies to counter the rise in antibiotic resistance. Individuals with cystic fibrosis (CF) typically

develop persistent and detrimental bacterial infections (Edwards et al., 2017; J. Malone, 2015; Starkey

et al., 2009). Clinical isolates of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* from CF patients characteristically display

enhanced resistance to phagocytosis and antibiotics frequently due to mutations in cyclic di-guanosine

monophosphate (c-di-GMP) associated genes (Gloag et al., 2019; Römling et al., 2013). Recent machine

learning models have demonstrated that physicians could utilize c-di-GMP related mutation data to

adjust treatments based on the predicted disease outcomes (Dahlstrom et al., 2018; Schumacher et al.,

2021; Yan et al., 2017).

C-di-GMP is a ubiquitous secondary messenger in bacteria and multiple regulatory pathways

converge on modulating intracellular c-di-GMP levels (Armbruster et al., 2019; Hall & Lee, 2018; Yan et

al., 2017). High intracellular levels of c-di-GMP repress flagellar genes while stimulating the expression

of biofilm-formation genes (Irie et al., 2010; Kuchma et al., 2015; Merritt et al., 2007). Activating c-di-

GMP production during a lung infection enables microbes to adhere to the mucosal surface through

lipopolysaccharide (LPS) modifications and the production of type IV pili and adhesins (Borlee et al.,

2010; Hall & Lee, 2018; McCarthy et al., 2017; Skotnicka et al., 2016). Numerous c-di-GMP binding

proteins and riboswitches respond to intracellular levels of c-di-GMP to also regulate cellular

morphology, virulence factors, antibiotic production, and the cell cycle (Dahlstrom et al., 2016; Tamayo,

2019). Many taxa possess dozens of enzymes that are predicted to control its synthesis and metabolism.

C-di-GMP is catalyzed from two molecules of GTP by a diguanylate cyclase (DGC) and hydrolyzed by a

phosphodiesterase (PDE). DGCs and PDEs are identified by the GGDEF or EAL/HD-GYP domains,

respectively, and many microbes have genes that encode hybrid proteins with both DGC and PDE

functions.

Bioinformatics analyses reveal that *Pseudomonas* spp. typically possess greater than 50

predicted DGCs or PDEs, but mechanistic understanding of their regulation is limited to only few

examples (Sarenko et al., 2017). PDEs and DGCs like RmcA and GcbC, respectively, are under allosteric

control where c-di-GMP concentrations initiate or prevent further enzymatic activity (Chan et al., 2005;

Christen et al., 2006; Giacalone et al., 2018; Mantoni et al., 2018). Other DGCs and PDEs like DgcH, CfcR,

MorA, PleD, SadC, WspR, and YfiN are governed by specific signaling pathways and regulators (De et al.,

2008; Giardina et al., 2013; Huertas-Rosales et al., 2017; Kessler et al., 2021; Merritt et al., 2010;

Moscoso et al., 2014; Ravichandran et al., 2015; Wassmann et al., 2007). However, the vast majority of

bioinformatically predicted DGCs and PDEs have not been empirically validated and their regulatory

mechanisms remain unknown (Dahlstrom et al., 2018).

Here, we report the utilization of a bidirectional experimental evolution system in *Pseudomonas*

fluorescens Pf0-1 (Kim et al., 2016) to identify 147 unique mutations in genes that are empirically

demonstrated, bioinformatically predicted, or previously unknown to impact c-di-GMP levels. We

expand the current model of c-di-GMP production by the Wsp signaling system and demonstrate that

branched-chain amino acid (BCAA) production is a recurrent target of mutations that positively correlate

to measured c-di-GMP levels. We also describe several proteins with no previous associations to c-di-

GMP that likely act as internal regulators. Lastly, we predict the interconnectivity of the c-di-GMP

regulome through sequential mutations that disrupt or recover c-di-GMP regulation across functionally

discrete systems. This work demonstrates how a simple experimental evolution system can

systematically map out c-di-GMP regulatory and enzymatic elements and uncover remarkable molecular

innovations.

Results and Discussion

Bidirectional evolution of mucoid and dry phenotypes occurs through intracellular c-di-GMP pool

oscillation

A previous experimental evolution study described the bidirectional evolution of mucoid (M)

and dry (D) colony phenotypes in *P. fluorescens* Pf0-1, which likely occurs through c-di-GMP oscillation

(Kim et al., 2016) (Fig. 1A). An aging colony of M cells repeatedly produces spreading fans at the

perimeter, which comprise the original M cells along with new D mutant cells that produce a dry and

wrinkly colony morphology on their own. Additionally, an aging colony of D cells also repeatedly

generates spreading fans, which comprise the original D cells along with a new mutant that appears

phenotypically identical to the ancestral M. This bidirectional selection of M and D phenotypes occurs

continuously because M and D cells self-organize in space and physically work together to spread out

from the nutrient-poor and crowded conditions of dense colony growth, and neither type is capable of

spreading out on their own (Kim et al., 2016). In contrast, a colony of initially mixed M and D cells readily

spreads out in a radial pattern without requiring additional mutations (Fig. 1A). Genetic analyses of

several D isolates and a second-generation M isolate revealed characteristic mutations in *wsp* genes to

suggest that c-di-GMP production is likely elevated in D and reduced in M (Kim et al., 2016). With the

expectation that a large-scale utilization of this experimental evolution system could identify diverse

mechanisms of c-di-GMP modulation, we set up 25 parallelly evolving lineages of M.

As anticipated, we observed bidirectional transitions between M and D phenotypes across all

lineages. In total, we isolated over 600 strains, genome sequenced a subset of 191 strains, and

quantified c-di-GMP in a subset of 56 strains. Remarkably, we detected a single mutation associated

with each phenotypic transition, with the exception of only few silent mutations across all 191 genome

sequences (Fig. S1, Table S1, Table S1 – Source Data 1). Genome sequencing successive strains within

each lineage provided an internal control, which confirmed the exclusive presence of the respective

preceding mutations. 147 unique mutations were detected across diverse genes that have been

empirically demonstrated, bioinformatically predicted, or are previously unknown to impact c-di-GMP

levels, including unannotated hypothetical genes. Motility assays showed that all D strains were non-

motile and all M strains were motile, and LC-MS/MS quantification confirmed that c-di-GMP was

elevated in all D strains relative to their respective parent M strain (Table S1). For the sake of an

accessible narrative, we will primarily focus our description on five select lineages that have been

simplified (Fig. 1B). Corresponding c-di-GMP measurements are shown in Fig. 1C and colony

morphologies are shown in Fig. S2. Among the 35 strains represented here, we observed a significant

increase in c-di-GMP in the 21 D strains compared to the 14 M strains (Fig. 1C). There is a slight overlap

in c-di-GMP concentrations when comparing all M and D strains together, but c-di-GMP was elevated in

all D strains respective to their immediate parent M strain. This observation may reflect the importance

of subcellular localization of c-di-GMP (Massie et al., 2012) compared to the overall intracellular pool

(Yan et al., 2017) for certain physiological properties, and variations in the wrinkly colony morphology as

observed among our collection of D strains (Fig. S2).

The combination of our mutation data and corresponding c-di-GMP quantification data could

serve as a powerful resource for deducing protein and pathway functions. Furthermore, successive

patterns of mutations across generations of independently evolving lineages could reveal previously

unknown connectivity between discrete regulatory and catalytic systems. Notably, many of our

mutations that sequentially disrupt or recover c-di-GMP production target the Wsp signaling system, the

most extensively studied c-di-GMP regulator in *Pseudomonas* spp. (Kessler et al., 2021). We first focus

on multiple series of sequential mutations in the Wsp system to reveal remarkable evolutionary

innovations to modulate c-di-GMP production.

Diverse mutations converge on the Wsp signal transduction system that dynamically rewire signal

flow to produce a spectrum of functional states

Among the 35 mutations identified across our subset of five lineages (Fig. 1B), 24 fall within the

Wsp signal transduction system (Fig. 2). The Wsp system was first reported two decades ago (Spiers et

al., 2002) and continues to serve as the primary model system of c-di-GMP regulation in *Pseudomonas*

spp. (Kessler et al., 2021). The Wsp system comprises seven proteins encoded in a monocistronic operon

under the control of an unidentified transcriptional regulator (Bantinaki et al., 2007). The

transmembrane protein WspA has an extracellular sensory domain that detects surface contact and may

respond to other unidentified signals (Armbruster et al., 2019). Homology with the enteric chemotaxis

system predicts that once WspA is stimulated by surface contact, it undergoes a conformational change

that exposes cytosolic methylation helices that are necessary for signal transduction (Rice & Dahlquist,

1991). The methyl-transferase WspC is then predicted to dock at the 5' tail of WspA and methylate the

WspA trimer-of-dimers complex (Feng et al., 1999). The signal is then relayed through the coupling

proteins WspB and WspD, and subsequently to WspE, which functions as a histidine kinase (Alexander

et al., 2010). WspE phosphorylates the DGC WspR to stimulate c-di-GMP production (Malone et al.,

2007). Simultaneously, WspE phosphorylates the methyl-esterase WspF, which de-methylates WspA and

terminates the signaling cascade (Bantinaki et al., 2007). Significant work has been carried out to

characterize the biochemical functions of WspE and WspR in particular, and WspE is a common

mutational target in a clinical setting (Kessler et al., 2021). More recently, studies have begun to explore

the functional role of WspA during signal activation and subcellular localization, revealing that both

properties are dependent on WspB and WspD proteins (O'Connor et al., 2012; Armbruster et al., 2019).

These studies also suggest that WspB and WspD likely possess unique functions, but they remain

unresolved.

Given that a mutation in any one of the seven Wsp protein coding genes could potentially

increase or decrease c-di-GMP production through WspR (Fig. 2), we expected *wsp* genes to be a

common target in our parallel experimental evolution study. However, we were surprised to find that

the vast majority of the first transitions from the ancestral M to D occurred through a *wsp* mutation

(Table S1). Such a striking pattern suggests that the Wsp system has the greatest capacity to contribute

to the overall intracellular pool of c-di-GMP under our experimental conditions, and this is also reflected

in our quantification data where the highest c-di-GMP production is typically associated with *wsp*

mutations (Table S1). We thus set up an independent lineage to commence with an engineered *ΔwspC*

M strain (Fig. 3, strain 1.0), with the expectation that the deletion of *wspC* would prevent further

mutations within the Wsp system, since the removal of the methyltransferase should prevent WspA

signaling (Fig. 2). However, this was not the case. The first D progeny strain 1.1 harbors a missense

mutation in WspA (A381V) within its signaling domain, which is consistent with the results from a

previous study (O'Connor et al., 2012). Mutations in this domain structurally stimulate WspE, so the

A381V mutation likely locks WspA in a constitutively active conformation even in the absence of

methylation by WspC. The subsequent M progeny strain 1.2 harbors a missense mutation in WspB

(L136P), which likely disrupts the interaction between WspA and WspE to terminate c-di-GMP

production. We next observed an in-frame deletion of amino acid residues 647-696 spanning the

phosphoreceiver domain of WspE in the D progeny strain 1.3. The restoration of c-di-GMP production in

this strain suggests that the observed deletion likely forces WspE to conform an activated state.

Accordingly, mutations within the phosphoreceiver domain of CheY, a WspE homolog in *Escherichia coli*,

can activate the protein without phosphorylation (Bellsolell et al., 1994; Re et al., 2002). In addition, the

DGC activity of WspR in *P. aeruginosa* does not necessarily depend on phosphorylation (De et al., 2008;

Huangyutitham et al., 2013). The subsequent M progeny strain 1.4 carries a frameshift mutation in

wspE, which should terminally shut down the Wsp system, and the c-di-GMP level was reduced as

predicted. C-di-GMP production was restored in this lineage once again in the following D strain 1.5

through a missense mutation in DgcH (V459G), a bioinformatically predicted DGC in *P. aeruginosa* PAO1

that impacts biofilm formation (Wei et al., 2019). While DgcH shares a namesake with the DGCs DgcA,

DgcB, and DgcC, no known interactions exist between these proteins and DgcH. The V459G mutation

significantly increases enzymatic output either by directly activating DgcH or relieving an unidentified

repressor. Sequence analysis shows that DgcH also possesses an inhibitory I-site, indicating that it may

be under allosteric control of c-di-GMP as discussed below.

Lineages 2, 3, 4, and 5 were commenced with an unaltered ancestral M strain (Fig. 3). Mutations

in lineages 2 to 4 were primarily detected in Wsp proteins with strongly predictable functional

outcomes. The first D strain 2.1 of lineage 2 carries a mutation in *wspA* that appears to activate WspA

through an in-frame deletion of the methylation helices. This mutation likely affects the helical coiled-

coil domain of WspA to mimic a permanently methylated state (Kessler et al., 2021), resulting in

increased signal transduction and the overproduction of c-di-GMP. The following shift to the M

phenotype is associated with a missense mutation in WspD (W90L), which likely disrupts the relay of

signal from WspA to WspE. The D strain 2.3 restores c-di-GMP production through the missense

mutation in Pfl01_3147 (A383S), which is annotated as a hypothetical protein, but we found homology

to an N-ethylammeline chlorohydrolase. We will refer to this protein as NarA (N-ethylammeline

chlorohydrolase associated c-di-GMP regulator). The potential role of this novel c-di-GMP regulator is

explored in the last section.

Similar to strain 2.1, the first D strain 3.1 of lineage 3 carries a unique in-frame deletion of *wspA*

that partially spans the methylation sites of WspA, which results in increased c-di-GMP (Fig. 3). Strain 3.2

transitions to the M phenotype through a missense mutation in the signaling domain of WspA (L387R).

This mutation likely weakens or abolishes signal transduction to WspE. In the following D strain 3.3, the

missense mutation in WspE (G601V) occurs in the putative WspF/WspR docking site (Kessler et al.,

2021). This mutation likely allows WspF and WspR to interact with WspE more easily, thereby increasing

the phosphorylation of both proteins. Since the methylation sites of WspA were initially removed in the

ancestral D strain 2.1, activation of WspF would not shut down signal transduction while the activation

of WspR would result in the observed overproduction of c-di-GMP (Fig. 2).

The first D strain 4.1 of lineage 4 carries an in-frame deletion mutation in *dgcH* that removes

amino acid residues 524-537 of DgcH (Fig. 3). Interestingly, the GGDEF diguanylate cyclase domain of

DgcH spans residues 537-693. The observed in-frame deletion adjacent to this domain appears to

activate c-di-GMP production, though we cannot currently speculate on the mechanisms due to limited

understanding of DgcH. We observed a reduction in c-di-GMP in the following M strain 4.2, which has a

missense mutation in DgcH (L634P). A search against NCBI's conserved domain database identifies that

the residues 619-643 contain the inhibitory I-site, with residue N637 as the predicted interaction site.

Our mutation data supports this annotation and the likelihood that DgcH is under allosteric control by c-

di-GMP. The L634P mutation may mimic a c-di-GMP bound state, causing the observed reduction in c-di-

GMP. We cannot discount the possibility of additional regulatory mechanisms since we observe

numerous other missense and in-frame deletion mutations across the length of DgcH (Table S1). The

following D strain 4.3 restores c-di-GMP production through a missense mutation in WspA (V380A),

which affects the signaling domain to activate WspA like the A381V mutation observed in the D strain

1.1. C-di-GMP is reduced again in the M strain 4.4, which carries a missense mutation in the HATPase

domain of WspE (D390N), likely disrupting the capability to cleave the phosphate from ATP. Despite

potentially disabling WspE's kinase activity, the D strain 4.5 recovers c-di-GMP production through an in-

frame deletion of the methylation helix of WspA. The observed increase in c-di-GMP is minimal, which is

consistent in a *wspE* knock down strain. WspE is then further disabled by another missense mutation

V441A in the M strain 4.6, which again affects the HATPase domain to decrease c-di-GMP production.

Incredibly, the following D strain 4.7 recovers c-di-GMP production through the missense mutation

S472C in the HATPase domain of WspE by replacing the polar amino acid serine with the non-polar

amino acid cysteine. Non-polar amino acids are important in protein-ATP binding and this mutation may

allow for WspE to interact with ATP more efficiently in the presence of the other acquired mutations

(Chauhan et al., 2009).

Mutations in non-*wsp* genes with known or unknown associations with c-di-GMP production integrate

with *wsp* mutations to modulate c-di-GMP levels

Sequential patterns of mutations and c-di-GMP quantification across our 33 lineages indicate

that the DGCs WspR, DgcH, and MorA represent the most dominant contributors to the intracellular c-

di-GMP pool (Table S1). Other known or predicted DGCs are typically targeted to modulate c-di-GMP

levels after the Wsp system and DgcH become genetically dysfunctional. We also observed mutations in

bioinformatically annotated genes with no known associations to c-di-GMP modulation. These patterns

are best represented in lineage 5, the longest sequenced lineage in this study with 13 linear phenotypic

transitions (Fig. 3, Table S1). Like other lineages, mutations initially accumulate within *wsp* genes to

deregulate the Wsp system, then other known or predicted DGCs SadC, DgcH, YfiN, GcbC, and MorA are

genetically modified to both reduce or stimulate c-di-GMP production. The first transition to the D strain

5.1 occurs through a missense mutation in WspF (P105S), which disrupts its methyl-esterase activity to

keep WspA in an activated state (Fig. 2). This activation is undone in the follow M strain 5.2 by an in-

frame deletion of 3 nucleotides in *wspA* that removes the amino acid residue S329 of WspA, which falls

in the linker region between the methylation sites and the signaling domain (Kessler et al., 2021). This

mutation likely interrupts the methylated signal received from WspC and prevents or weakens the

transmission of signal to WspE. C-di-GMP production is restored in the subsequent D strain 5.3 through

the partial deletion of the WspA methylation sites. This mutation likely produces a conformational

change in WspA that permits the relay of the signal past the previously acquired S329 deletion in the

helical coiled-coil domain. The next M strain 5.4 carries an in-frame deletion which removes seven

amino acids in WspD. While the functional importance of this region in WspD remains unresolved, its

impact on Wsp signaling is clear as reflected by the reduction in c-di-GMP. This region is likely important

for the signal transmission between WspA and WspE, either by destabilizing the tertiary structure of

WspD or by removing a docking domain required for interactions with WspA and/or WspE. Subsequent

strains D 5.5 and M 5.6 carry mutations that activate then deactivate the DGC SadC, respectively. The

activating mutation occurs in the 5'UTR of *sadC* and likely increases the expression of the DGC as

evidenced by increased intracellular c-di-GMP (Fig. 3). This activation is then undone through an in-

frame deletion of the L25 residue in SadC. Surprisingly, strain 5.7 returns this lineage to the D phenotype

through a missense mutation in IlvH (G150S), which is predicted to function in the biosynthesis of

branched chain amino acids (BCAA). We observed three independent missense mutations in IlvH across

our study that exclusively cause a phenotypic shift from M to D and reduced motility (Table S1).

Accordingly, quantification of c-di-GMP shows that each of these three mutations significantly increases

c-di-GMP respective to their immediate M parent (Fig. 4). These results indicate that a previously

unknown relationship between BCAA biosynthesis and c-di-GMP production may exist. We explore this

relationship in greater detail below.

Lineage 5 returns to the M phenotype in strain 5.8 through a missense mutation in the

hypothetical protein Pfl01_0730 (D115N) (Fig. 3). This protein, hereon ParA (P̲AP2 a̲ssociated c-di-GMP

regulator), shares homology with the PAP2 superfamily of proteins, suggesting that it may be involved in

phospholipid turnover and may impact the bioavailability of phosphate within the cell (Carman & Han,

2006). Although we found the relative decrease in c-di-GMP in strain 5.8 to be not statistically significant

from its parent likely due to technical noise (Fig. 4), the observed mutation clearly drives the phenotypic

transition from D to M. Furthermore, if this mutation does not impact c-di-GMP levels, then we would

not expect a further transition through elevated c-di-GMP production. In fact, we captured two

independent transitions back to the D phenotype, both with significantly increased c-di-GMP levels (Fig.

3). Strains 5.9a and 5.9b are sister strains that have developed unique chimeric Wsp proteins that likely

restore Wsp signaling. Both chimeric proteins (WspA::D and WspB::D) contain identical partial segments

of WspD commencing at residue 158, situated immediately adjacent to the in-frame deletion detected

in their common ancestral strain 5.4 that previously deactivated the Wsp system (Fig. 3). To determine

whether or not these chimeric proteins alone are sufficient to drive the phenotypic shift from M to D,

we replaced the corresponding native Wsp proteins in the ancestral M strain with each chimeric protein.

In parallel, we also replaced the corresponding naturally modified Wsp proteins in the immediate

parental M strain 5.8 with each chimeric protein. Both engineered strains in the ancestral M background

retained the M phenotype, but both engineered strains in the M strain 5.8 background recapitulated the

D transition that was observed in strains 5.9a and 5.9b (Table 1). These results indicate that the two

chimeric Wsp proteins require additional mutation(s) observed within this lineage to produce c-di-GMP.

Both the WspA::D and WspB::D chimeras have lost WspC, which is not surprising since the methylation

sites of WspA were removed previously in D strain 5.3. Similarly, WspB is completely removed in the

WspA::D chimera and nearly 75% of WspB has been removed in the WspB::D chimera. At this stage, it

remains unclear whether or not the observed mutations in *ilvH* and/or *parA* are required for the

function of the two Wsp chimeras. However, we present additional evidence below that strengthens the

potential relationship between IlvH and the Wsp system.

The WspB::D chimera strain 5.9b was next used to evolve the M progeny strains. Sister strains

5.10a and 5.10b were isolated and each were found to carry frameshift deletions in *ilvI* that decreased c-

di-GMP levels (Fig. 4). The two *ilvI* mutants carry a deletion of 17 or 23 nucleotides that start at the same

position, which should abolish IlvI's function. IlvI and IlvH form a complex that catalyzes the first step of

BCAA biosynthesis, where IlvH serves as the regulatory subunit and IlvI serves as the catalytic subunit

(Ricca et al., 1988). IlvH in *E. coli* has been bioinformatically predicted to respond to c-di-GMP levels due

to the presence of the inhibitory I-site that could manifest allosteric regulation (Fang et al., 2014). We

identified that IlvH of *P. fluorescens* Pf01 also contains the I-site RXXD motif at residues 103-106. None

of the independently identified IlvH mutations (A36E, S149R, and G150S) in our study fall within this

motif, but all three mutations significantly increase c-di-GMP levels (Fig. 4). Beyond the potential

allosteric regulation of IlvH by c-di-GMP, there is no known relationship between BCAA biosynthesis and

c-di-GMP production to the best of our knowledge. However, we suspected that the IlvH mutations,

including the G150S mutation observed earlier in this lineage, increase BCAA production to stimulate c-

di-GMP production through an unknown mechanism, since we subsequently observe frameshift

mutations in the catalytic subunit (IlvI) that returns this lineage back to the M phenotype with reduced

c-di-GMP levels.

The frameshift mutations in *ilvI* should lead to BCAA auxotrophy, which is likely masked by the

nutrient-rich medium utilized in our experimental evolution system. To test this prediction, we grew

strains 5.10a and 5.10b in a chemically defined minimal medium without BCAA. We did not observe any

growth unless BCAA was exogenously supplemented (Fig. S3), confirming that our *ilvI* mutants are

unable to synthesize BCAA. We next tested if exogenous supplementation of BCAA alone could restore

c-di-GMP production in the *ilvI* mutant (M strain 5.10a). Since the *ilvI* mutant cannot grow in the

minimal medium without BCAA supplementation, we also included our prototype M and D ancestors

(Fig. 1A), as relative controls in addition to the *ilvH* mutant (D strain 5.7) and *parA* mutant (M strain 5.8)

from the same lineage. Exogenous supplementation of BCAA in the *ilvI* mutant indeed restored c-di-

GMP production at comparable levels to both D and the *ilvH* mutant (D strain 5.7) (Fig. 5). In contrast, c-

di-GMP levels remained the same in both M and the *parA* mutant (M strain 5.8) regardless of BCAA

supplementation (Fig. 5). These results show that overabundance of BCAA does not correlate with c-di-

GMP production and defeats our initial prediction that the missense mutations in *ilvH* increase BCAA

production to stimulate c-di-GMP production. Although BCAA supplementation restores c-di-GMP

production in the *ilvI* mutant strain in a minimal medium, the reduction of c-di-GMP levels observed in

the same *ilvI* mutant under our nutrient-rich experimental evolution conditions (Fig. 4) is not likely

associated with losing the ability to synthesize BCAA. Accordingly, reconstructing the two frameshift *ilvI*

mutations independently in the ancestral D strain does not cause a shift to the M phenotype, but the

initially observed shift to the M phenotype is recapitulated when these mutations are introduced into

their direct parental D strains (Table 1). Since IlvI forms a complex with IlvH, the observed frameshift

mutations in *ilvI* likely decouples the complex, and consequently impacts IlvH's potential function to

modulate c-di-GMP production. Lineage five returns to the D phenotype following the *ilvI* mutations

through mutations in *wspE* or *dcgH* (Fig. 3). As observed in other lineages, we commonly isolate *wspE*

mutants when the upstream signaling of Wsp is disrupted. Here, we capture the mutations M123I,

D289N, and Δ524-537AA in WspE. These mutations fall in the HPT domain, the dimerization domain, and

the REC domain, respectively, and likely activate WspE in the absence or reduction of upstream Wsp

signal (Kessler et al., 2021). The fourth observed mutation that returns lineage five to the D phenotype is

an in-frame deletion of *dgcH* that is identical to the deletion reported in the D strain 4.1. These four

independent transition steps into the D phenotype clearly indicate that the catalytic activity of IlvI is not

required for c-di-GMP production.

We also set up another lineage to commence with an engineered *ΔwspCD* M strain (Table S1,

strain 27.0), with the same initial expectation as lineage 1 that the deletion of both *wspC* and *wspD*

would prevent further mutations within the Wsp system (Fig. 2). In contrast to the *ΔwspC* M strain

lineage 1, the first shift to the D phenotype is associated with a non-*wsp* mutation. We observed a

missense mutation in DgcH (Q454P), and the following shift to the M phenotype occurred through

another missense mutation in DgcH (Q148P), which showed the expected reduction in c-di-GMP

production. In addition to the four unique missense mutations in DgcH described thus far, we observed

several other missense mutations that cause phenotypic shifts in both directions, and unique in-frame

deletions that cause a shift to the D phenotype across many other lineages (Table S1). These

observations collectively indicate that DgcH is another main contributor to the total c-di-GMP pool. We

observed a very interesting pattern in the next two sequential steps, with the first shift to the D

phenotype occurring through a missense mutation in IlvH (A36E), which restores c-di-GMP production

(Fig. 4), and the following shift back to the M phenotype being associated with a mutation which

converts the stop codon of *wspB* with a cysteine residue to extend its open reading frame, but out of

frame with *wspE* (both *wspC* and *wspD* are already deleted). A common trend exists between lineages 5

(Fig. 3) and 27 (Table S1) in that multiple mutations first occur in Wsp proteins, which is proceeded by

mutations in a non-Wsp DGC (SadC or DgcH, respectively), then unique missense mutations occur in IlvH

to stimulate c-di-GMP production. Reconstructing the three IlvH missense mutations in the ancestral M

strain does not lead to a shift to the D phenotype, but reconstructing these mutations in their direct

parental M strain recapitulates the initially observed shift to the D phenotype (Table 1). The common

targets of mutations between the two lineages that converge on IlvH mutations are Wsp proteins, which

implies that the c-di-GMP stimulating mutations in IlvH associate with a de-regulated Wsp system.

Furthermore, the undoing of the IlvH (A36E)-induced c-di-GMP production by the stop codon mutation

in *wspB* implies potential IlvH-Wsp interactions that are unlikely to be metabolic in nature.

A macro assessment of sequential mutation patterns across all 33 parallel lineages captures potential

associations within the c-di-GMP regulome

A long standing question in the field is why microbes possess so many independent DGC and/or

PDE machineries. A systematic mutational analysis of genes that were bioinformatically predicted to be

DGCs in *P. fluorescens* demonstrated that most have little impact on the intracellular c-di-GMP pool

(Newell et al., 2011), and a significant number of DGCs/PDEs in *E. coli* are present in an inactive form

(Hengge et al., 2016). In addition, independent DGCs could regulate a sub-cellularly localized role

(Massie et al., 2012) that could also contribute to the total intracellular pool to regulate diverse

physiological pathways across a gradient (Yan et al., 2017). Our study indicates that many known or

predicted DGCs could be independently stimulated to regulate a common phenotypic shift, which

appears to operate across a broad range of c-di-GMP levels (Fig. 1C). We also capture mutations in

genes with no previously known c-di-GMP associations that significantly impact the c-di-GMP pool, and

these genes are affected repeatedly across multiple lineages (Table S1), which strongly suggests that

they are indeed components of the c-di-GMP regulome. To visualize patterns of sequential mutations

and potential associations within the c-di-GMP regulome, we compiled all sequential orders of the

mutation events across the 33 parallel lineages into a single node-edge plot (Fig. 6A). This type of plot

can be used to consolidate decision trees used to train a random forest machine learning model (Casarin

et al., 2021). Although much more extensive data are required to generate a such model, the depicted

relationships are predictive of sequential mutations that could, for example, be observed in clinical

isolates that typically accumulate numerous mutations throughout a chronic infection (Malone, 2015).

The nodes in Fig. 6A represent the mutated genes in our experiment. The edges (i.e. lines) of the

plot report if the mutation causes an M (blue) or D (orange) phenotype, and the thickness of the edge

reflects the frequency of the observed pattern (Table S2). Proteins that are integrated into this plot –

meaning that many edges connect to a specific node – collectively form the main ring. Nodes associated

with a single edge fall out of this ring, and mutations in these proteins typically occur at the end of a

lineage or a branched sub-lineage that was not sequenced. Since we did not isolate any progeny strains

from these ten mutants that fall outside the main ring, we do not further evaluate their potential role in

c-di-GMP modulation. Notably, the largest nodes in this plot constitute Wsp proteins, DgcH, and other

known diguanylate cyclase's like YfiN, GcbC, MorA, and SadC. We observe that mutations in WspA that

increase c-di-GMP are primarily followed by mutations in WspB, WspD, or WspE that result in the M

phenotype (blue edge) with decreased c-di-GMP. Mutations in WspF that fail to return the Wsp system

back to the ground state are followed by mutations in WspC to abolish WspA's activity, mutations in

WspA to force an off conformation, or mutations in WspR to physically shut down c-di-GMP production.

The frequency of these patterns correlates well with the direction of signal flow in the Wsp system (Fig.

2), where the primary mutations constitutively activate the Wsp system and subsequent mutations

disrupt the signal relay among the downstream components. Then, activating mutations occur in WspE

that decouple WspE from the upstream components to restore c-di-GMP production, which is followed

by mutations in WspE that deactivate it or mutations in WspR to shut down c-di-GMP production. The

majority of DGCs like SadC and YfiN have blue recursive edges that cause an M phenotype, which

indicates that mutations occur in the same protein to shut down its activity, immediately following a

mutation that initially stimulated its activity. The high frequency of blue recursive edges associated each

DGC and yellow edges between distinct DGCs collectively indicate that each DGC simply replaces

another to restore c-di-GMP production. Blue edges between DGCs are extremely rare, which suggests

that individual DGCs do not directly interact with another. Notably, there are several proteins with both

yellow and blue edges that are integrated in this plot and have not been shown to have a role in c-di-

GMP regulation or production. We next infer potential function of these proteins with respect to c-di-

GMP modulation.

NarA (<u>N</u>-ethylammeline chlorohydrolase <u>a</u>ssociated c-di-GMP <u>r</u>egulator)

In strain 2.3, we observe that the A383S mutation in NarA increases c-di-GMP levels (Fig. 6B),

which confirms that this hypothetical protein is indeed biologically active. This NarA mutation follows

the M-shifted W90L mutation in WspD, which suggests that NarA is either able to restore Wsp signaling

or activate other DGCs to increase c-di-GMP levels. We have no reason to suspect that NarA directly

catalyzes c-di-GMP since it lacks any c-di-GMP associated domains or motifs. The progeny of this NarA

mutant carries a nonsense mutation in *wspD*, reverting this strain back to an M phenotype (Table S1).

Thus, the A383S mutation in NarA associates specifically with *wspD* mutations to both restore and shut

down c-di-GMP production. NarA is predicted to catalyze N-ethylammeline, a derivative of ammeline,

and a recent study theorized that ammeline is likely an essential building block required for the

synthesis of cyclic complexes (Petelski & Fonseca Guerra, 2019). Although the metabolic connections are

unknown, there is a strong indication that NarA interacts with WspD at some capacity to modulate c-di-

GMP levels.

CdrB (Two-partner secretion system transporter)

Pfl01_0652 in *P. fluorescens* encodes a protein that is homologous to the transporter protein

CdrB in *P. aeruginosa* (PA4624). In *P. aeruginosa*, CdrA and CdrB are encoded in a single operon and

form a two-partner secretion (TPS) system associated with biofilm formation (Reichhardt et al., 2018).

CdrA (c-di-GMP regulated TPS A) is an extracellular adhesin known to respond to modifications made by

the periplasmic protease LapG which is activated by the transmembrane c-di-GMP receptor LapD

(Cooley et al., 2016). It has been reported that high intracellular levels of c-di-GMP enable CdrA to bind

and crosslink secreted Psl, thereby increasing cell-cell adhesion (Reichhardt et al., 2018). *cdrA/B*

expression also increases proportionally with intracellular levels of c-di-GMP during biofilm formation

(Borlee et al., 2010). CdrB is a transporter with domains that indicate it is a type V secretion system

transporter. CdrB is likely involved in the transport of the adhesin CdrA but has no identified role in c-di-

GMP modulation. In our lineage 6, the missense mutation YfiN G157C increases c-di-GMP production,

which is immediately followed by the CdrB A290T missense mutation to decrease c-di-GMP levels (Fig.

6B). This suggests that an unaltered CdrB or its native transport activity is necessary for YfiN's DGC

activity. As reported in Table S1, mutations that follow the CdrB mutation occur in *morA* or *dgcH*, each

increasing c-di-GMP as indicated by the D-phenotype (Table S1). Therefore, the negative impact of our

CdrB mutation on YfiN could be recovered through the genetic activation of other DGCs, which may also

reflect interactions with CdrB.

DgcX* and *DgcY (Bioinformatically predicted DGCs)

Pfl01_3550 and Pfl01_3508 are both bioinformatically predicted to encode DGCs, but their

enzymatic function has not yet been demonstrated. Here, we establish that they are both functionally

active in c-di-GMP catalysis and annotate them as *dgcX* and *dgcY*, respectively, since proteins DgcA

through DgcW already exist. Pfl01_3550, hereon *dgcX*, is a commonly mutated gene in our dataset

which increases c-di-GMP (Table S1). We observe a blue recursive loop in the node-edge plot for DgcX,

which is consistent with other known DGCs (Fig. 6A). We isolated two independently evolved D mutants

with the same M350I mutation, and an M mutant with an in-frame deletion of L289. Phenotypic and

motility data support that the observed mutations in *dgcX* influence the intracellular c-di-GMP pool. The

genomic location of *dgcY* is in a region of hypothetical genes that appear to form an operon.

Interestingly, our *dgcY* mutant strains carry large deletions that span the 9 hypothetical genes within

this genomic region. The deletion of Pfl01_3505, Pfl01_3506, and the 5' UTR region of *dgcY* results in a

significant increase in c-di-GMP (Strain 6.5a, Fig. 6B). This likely removes the repression of *dgcY*

transcription by replacing the promoter region of *dgcY* with that of Pfl01_3505. C-di-GMP is significantly

decreased in the progeny strain 6.6a (Fig. 6B) after the deletion of Pfl01_3500, Pfl01_3501, Pfl01_3502,

Pfl01_3503, Pfl01_3504, Pfl01_3505, Pfl01_3506, Pfl01_3508, Pfl01_3509, and Pfl01_3510, which

includes *dgcY*. It is unclear whether or not the encoded proteins of hypothetical genes that flank *dgcY*

are functionally related to DgcY. We had initially suspected that these hypothetical genes could encode

a complex signal transduction system like Wsp, but we did not detect any homologous Wsp domains or

other c-di-GMP associated motifs.

CalM (<u>c</u>-di-GMP <u>a</u>ssociated <u>L</u>ys<u>M</u>)

The hypothetical gene Pfl01_1895, hereon *calM* (<u>c</u>-di-GMP <u>a</u>ssociated <u>L</u>ys<u>M</u>) is a commonly

mutated gene in our study (Table S1). The encoded protein contains domains with homology to the

LysM peptidoglycan-binding superfamily and contains a FimV C-terminal transmembrane domain that is

implicated in modulating motility (Buendia et al., 2018; Wehbi et al., 2011). The LysM proteins are

identified by the lysin motif which is associated with cell lysis. The presence of the LysM and FimV

domains suggests that this protein may respond to changes in peptidoglycan stress, which is essential

for maintaining cell shape and integrity. C-di-GMP is a well-known regulator of cellular morphology in

Vibrio cholera and *Caulobacter crescentus* (Conner et al., 2017; Wassmann et al., 2007). We observe a

duplication of five nucleotides within *calM* that results in a significant decrease in c-di-GMP (Fig. 6B).

Two repetitive clusters of CAGCG shifts to three clusters to cause a frameshift. This mutation follows a

dcgH in-frame deletion that dramatically increases c-di-GMP production, indicating that CalM is

necessary for DgcH's activity. Remarkably, three independently evolved progeny strains in this lineage

carry mutations that remove the initial five nucleotide insertion, returning each strain back to the D

phenotype likely by restoring DgcH's activity (Table S1).

RndA (RND transporter)

Pfl01_2749 is bioinformatically predicted to encode an RND transporter. RND transporters

function as efflux pumps to remove toxins, antibiotics, quorum sensing (QS) molecules, and other

metabolites (Soto, 2013). We observe that the nonsense mutation Q51* in Pfl01_2749, hereon *rndA*,

significantly decreases c-di-GMP levels (strain 11.2, Fig. 6B). A recent study speculates that QS molecules

contribute to a feedback loop to inhibit c-di-GMP production (Liang et al., 2020). Thus, an active RndA

could potentially modulate this feedback loop by expelling certain effector compounds to stimulate c-di-

GMP production. The *rndA* mutant shifts to the D phenotype through an in-frame deletion that removes

amino acid residues 524-537 in DgcH. This specific mutation was observed in multiple lineages to

exclusively stimulate c-di-GMP production.

To confirm whether the observed mutations in these atypical c-di-GMP associated genes alone

could modulate c-di-GMP levels, we reconstructed representative mutations in their respective

ancestral backgrounds. None of the engineered strains produced a phenotypic shift (Table 1), indicating

that additional mutation(s) within their respective lineage are required to impact c-di-GMP levels.

Accordingly, reconstructing the same mutations in their direct parental strains recapitulates the initially

observed phenotypic shifts (Table 1). Although additional research is required to prescribe specific

mechanisms, diverse cellular processes appear to be integrated with numerous catalytic machineries to

modulate the c-di-GMP pool.

Conclusion

C-di-GMP associated mutations are commonly observed in chronic infections (Gloag et al., 2019;

Römling et al., 2013), indicating that deregulating c-di-GMP production is a clinically significant genetic

adaptation. Although we have extensive knowledge on how specific enzymes make or break c-di-GMP

and how this molecule interacts with a large number of regulatory elements to modulate diverse

physiological processes, relatively little is known about how C-di-GMP production itself is regulated. This

study utilizes a repeatedly evolving social trait in *P. fluorescens* to identify 147 unique mutations that

modulate the intracellular c-di-GMP pool. We demonstrate how numerous proteins could

independently and collectively produce remarkable sequences of genetic innovation to oscillate c-di-

GMP levels.

Our extensive library of *wsp* mutations allows us to reinforce the current functional model of

the Wsp system, which particularly lacks resolution in WspA, WspB, and WspD (Kessler et al., 2021).

Although methylation of WspA remains to be empirically demonstrated, the WspA methylation helices

clearly have a functional role in Wsp signaling as they were commonly mutated to activate c-di-GMP

production. Based on our mutation data and homologies to Tsr-methylation in the chemotaxis system of

E. coli (Rice & Dahlquist, 1991), we predict that the following residues are methylated in WspA: CH_3-A:

Q285, E292, E299 and CH_3-B: Q502, E512. The linker region of WspA that connects the HAMP and

signaling domains contains the first set of E and Q residues, which undergo methyl esterification in Tsr

during chemotaxis. A second linker region between the signaling domain and predicted WspC-WspF

docking site contains the second set of E and Q residues. The addition of a bulky methyl group to the Tsr

methylation site of the coiled-coil alters the topology of the alpha helix which is relayed through the

linker domain and into the signaling domain (Levit & Stock, 2002). WspA is expected to undergo a similar

conformational change upon methylation and our data suggest that the deletion of the putative

methylation sites mimics a methylated state, which is relayed through its linker domain and into the

signaling domain that interacts with WspB, WspD, and WspE. The functional roles of WspB and WspD in

signal relay are largely modeled after homology to CheW of *E. coli*, which is the least characterized

protein in the chemotaxis system. A previous study explored the interaction sites between CheW, CheA

(WspE homolog), and Tsr through mutagenic screens (Liu & Parkinson, 1991). Mutations in CheW that

successfully disrupted signal transduction were largely limited to five unique amino acid clusters that

situate on the protein surface and are essential for the docking of CheW to Tsr (Li et al., 2007). WspB

and WspD also possess six and seven highly conserved amino acid clusters, respectively (Kessler et al.,

2021). We have identified WspB L135P and WspD W90L mutations that fall within these conserved

clusters that likely situate on the surface of WspB and WspD and natively act as docking sites for WspA

and WspE to permit signal relay. Consistent with our hypothesis, both mutations reduce c-di-GMP levels.

We also observed several other mutations in WspB and WspD that independently impact c-di-GMP

production. Our data confirm that both WspB and WspD are necessary for Wsp signal transduction.

Beyond the Wsp system, we have identified unique missense mutations and in-frame deletions

in multiple DGCs that fall outside their conserved catalytic domain. The sites of these mutations likely

represent regulatory domains that are critical for modulating enzymatic activity. Notably, DgcH is a

relatively understudied DGC, which greatly influenced the intracellular c-di-GMP pool in our system. The

L634P mutation occurring adjacent to the predicted I-site likely mimics a c-di-GMP bound state, thus

preventing catalytic activity as observed by reduction in c-di-GMP levels. The repeatedly observed in-

frame deletion of amino acids 524-537 exclusively increased c-di-GMP levels, which may act to override

the inhibition through the I-site or represents a unique domain for interaction with another repressive

element. We have also confirmed that several bioinformatically predicted DGCs to be indeed

enzymatically active. In particular, DgcY is encoded within a nine gene cluster of unknown function.

Although we could not identify any specific homologies, the large deletions we observed in this cluster

lead us to speculate that they encode a unique system that functions to regulate DgcY's activity.

Lastly, we have uncovered a set of unexpected or hypothetical proteins that clearly have the

capacity to influence c-di-GMP turnover. Three missense mutations in *ilvH* were identified to

independently stimulate c-di-GMP production, which appears to be independent of IlvH's primary role in

BCAA biosynthesis, but rather operates through an unknown interaction with the Wsp system. We have

identified the same I-site in IlvH as in DgcH, which suggests that IlvH physically interacts with c-di-GMP.

Similarly, CalM, CdrB, and RndA homologs in other organisms have been implicated to respond to c-di-

GMP levels, but they have never been associated with c-di-GMP modulation. We have confirmed that

the mutations observed in these proteins alone do not impact c-di-GMP levels, but do so in the presence

of other mutations. In particular, a DgcH-driven c-di-GMP production is negated by a frameshift

mutation in *calM*, which implies a potential interaction between these two proteins. Similarly, a YfiN-

driven c-di-GMP production is negated by a missense mutation in *cdrB*, and c-di-GMP production

appears to be restored again through a mutation in either *morA* or *dgcH*. Furthermore, a *narA* missense

mutation is flanked in sequence by independent mutations in *wspD* to modulate c-di-GMP production in

both directions.

An emerging concept here is that the intracellular pool of c-di-GMP, whether it be subcellularly

localized or in sum, appears to be modulated through the catalytic activities of many independent DGCs

that are in tune with diverse proteins. Such intricacies are masked by the activities of DGCs with high

output, but they could readily manifest otherwise. Although direct functional studies are necessary to

resolve the underlying mechanisms, this study reveals a complex and underappreciated

interconnectivity within the c-di-GMP regulome. Harvesting natural selection in the laboratory could

provide a unique path for discovering and disentangling complex molecular processes that are relevant

in a clinical setting.

Material and Methods

Strains and culture conditions

All *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Pf0-1 (Compeau et al., 1988) derivatives associated with parallel

experimental evolution are described in Table S1 and engineered strains are described in Table 1. Strains

were routinely grown in Lennox LB (Fisher BioReagents), *Pseudomonas* Minimal Medium (PMM) (Kirner

et al., 1996), or on *Pseudomonas* Agar F (PAF) (Difco). *Pseudomonas* F (PF) broth (a non-agar variant of

PAF) was prepared with the following: pancreatic digest of casein 10 g/L (Remel), proteose peptone No.

3 10 g/L (Remel), dipotassium phosphate 1.5 g/L (Sigma-Aldrich), and magnesium sulfate 1.5 g/L (Sigma-

Aldrich). Cultures were incubated at 30°C and shaken at 250 rpm when applicable.

Parallel experimental evolution

Pure cultures of the ancestral M strain or engineered M strains were grown overnight in 5mL LB

broth and 25uL volumes were spotted on PAF plates, then incubated at room temperature for 3 to 8

days to allow spreading fans to emerge. To ensure consistency across experiments, PAF plates were

always prepared and left to dry at room temperature for 2 days before being inoculated. One fan was

randomly sampled from each colony and streaked out on LB plates in duplicate. Sampling a fan always

produced two strains with either a mucoid (M) or dry (D) colony phenotype. A single isolated colony

exhibiting the D phenotype was randomly selected to start a new liquid culture and also frozen down.

This process was repeated to sample six independent fans (i.e. six lineages). Three of the six

independently isolated D strains were randomly selected and cultured as above to start the next round

of experimental evolution. We repeated the same sampling process as above except that new M

phenotypes were isolated instead. We bidirectionally selected M and D phenotypes for as many as 13

rounds for a single lineage, but the number of sampled fans at each step was reduced over time in a

varying manner across independent lineages. In total, approximately 600 independently evolved isolates

were frozen down across 33 parallel lineages. Every isolate was subjected to a motility assay in an LB

plate with 0.25% agar, and the prototype M and D ancestors were used as controls (Kim et al., 2016). In

addition, 25uL of pure cultures of each isolate, the ancestral strain with the opposite phenotype, and a

1:1 mixture of both were spotted onto PAF plates in triplicate and assessed for cooperative radial

spreading (Fig. 1A) to filter out hyper-motile and non-cooperative mutants (Kim et al., 2016). Colony

diameters were measured and recorded after four days of incubation at room temperature and

considered cooperative if the measured diameter of the 1:1 colony exceeded both the diameters of the

isolated mutant strain and the respective ancestral strain. Isolates that failed this test were removed

from this study.

Reconstruction of naturally derived mutations in ancestral and direct parental backgrounds

Experimentally evolved isolates were whole genome sequenced to identify the causal mutations as

described below. We reconstructed select naturally acquired mutations in the respective ancestral

background and also in the direct parental background using previously described methods (Kim et al.,

2016). PCR primers were developed from the sequence data to amplify mutations of interest and are

reported in Table S3. Isolates were grown overnight and underwent DNA extractions (Qiagen). Dream

Taq DNA Polymerase (ThermoFisher) was used in PCR reactions with purified DNA to generate insert

fragments carrying the mutations which ranged in size from 456bp to 934bp. PCR was carried out using

the recommended conditions of the Dream Taq amplification kit for amplicons below 2000bp. Inserts

were cloned into the pGEM-T Easy vector system (Promega) and then subcloned into the *Not*I site of the

suicide plasmid pSR47s (Matthews & Roy, 2000). Suicide plasmids were heat shocked into *E. coli*

S17.1λ*pir*, mated with the target strains reported in Table S3 on LB plates at 30°C for 16 hours, then

plated onto PMM plates supplemented with 50 ug/ml kanamycin. We observed that *ilvI* mutants could

not grow on PMM and therefore replaced the PMM selection plate with an LB plate supplemented with

50 ug/ml kanamycin and 100 ug/ml ampicillin for *ilvI* mutant constructs. Isolated colonies were grown

overnight, serially diluted and plated out on LB plates supplemented with 15% sucrose (w/v) for

counterselection. Isolated colonies were placed in cryo-storage as described above. Crude DNA extracts

were made for each strain where 100uL of overnight culture was boiled at 100°C, centrifuged at 15,000

RCF for 30 seconds, and 10uL of supernatant was used for PCR using the primers reported in Table S3.

PCR products underwent gel extraction and subsequent sanger sequencing (primers in Table S3) to

confirm that the mutation was successfully engineered into the target strain. Upon PCR confirmation,

pure cultures of cells from cryo-storage underwent DNA extraction (Qiagen) and were submitted for

WGS which confirmed that no additional mutations had accumulated in the target strains during mutant

construction.

DNA extraction, whole genome sequencing, and variant calling

Pure cultures were grown overnight in 5mL LB broth at 30°C. 1 mL was spun down to form a

pellet for DNA extraction. Pelleted cells were mechanically lysed with the Qiagen TissueLyser LT at 50

oscillations/second for 10 minutes. The Qiagen DNeasy UltraClean Microbial DNA extraction kit was

used following the standard operating procedures. Samples were then eluted into 30uL H_2O after a 5

minutes incubation at 4°C with the elution media and stored at -20°C prior to shipment. Genomic DNA

library preparations were carried out by the Microbial Genome Sequencing Center (Pittsburgh, PA)

following standard operating procedures. Pooled and indexed samples were sequenced on the NextSeq

2000 platform and demultiplexed prior to data delivery. The Trimmomatic algorithm was used to group

and quality filter paired reads at a Phred score of 20 using a 4bp sliding window. The BreSeq algorithm

was used to align the paired reads to the *P. fluorescens* Pf0-1 reference genome (CP000094.2) and

evaluate for single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), insertions, deletions, or rearrangements. Output

sequence data from BreSeq is compiled as 'Table S1 – Source Data 1' and was manually evaluated for

each strain to determine the order of mutations for a given lineage.

C-di-GMP extraction and LC-MS/MS

An isolated colony of each strain was transferred to PF broth and grown overnight. Overnight

cultures were diluted to an OD_{600} of 0.04 in triplicate and incubated for 2-4 hours until the samples

reached an OD_{600} of 0.5, then promptly processed for c-di-GMP extraction. C-di-GMP extraction and

quantification procedures followed the protocols established by the Michigan State University Research

Technology Support Facility (MSU-RTSF): MSU_MSMC_009 protocol for di-nucleotide extractions and

MSU_MSMC_009a for LC-MS/MS, with the following modifications. All the steps of c-di-GMP extraction

were carried out at 4°C unless noted otherwise. 1mL of 0.5 OD_{600} culture was centrifuged at 15,000 RCF

for 30 seconds, and cell pellets were resuspended in 100uL of ice cold acetonitrile/methanol/water

(40:40:20 (v/v/v)) extraction buffer supplemented with a final concentration of 0.01% formic acid and

25nM c-di-GMP-Fluorinated internal standard (InvivoGen CAT: 1334145-18-4). Pelleted cells were

mechanically disturbed with the Qiagen TissueLyser LT at 50 oscillations/second for 2 minutes.

Resuspended slurries were incubated at -20°C for 20 minutes and pelleted at 15,000 RCF for 15 minutes

at 4°C. The supernatant was transferred to a pre-chilled tube then supplemented with 4uL of 15% w/v

ammonium bicarbonate (Sigma-Aldrich) buffer for stable cryo-storage. Extracts were stored at -80°C for

less than two weeks prior to LC-MS/MS analysis at MSU-RTSF. Sample degradation was observed with

repeated freeze-thaw cycles, so extracts were never thawed until LC-MS/MS analysis. All samples were

evaporated under vacuum (SpeedVac, no heat) and redissolved in 100uL mobile phase (10 mM TBA/15

mM acetic acid in water/methanol, 97:3 v/v, pH 5). LC-MS/MS quantification was carried out with the

Waters Xevo TQ-S instrument with the following settings: c-di-GMP-F at m/z transition of 693 to 346

with cone voltage of 108 and collision voltage of 33; c-di-GMP at m/z transition of 689 to 344 with cone

voltage of 83 and collision voltage of 31. C-di-GMP data was normalized to 25nM c-di-GMP-F by MSU-

RTSF to account for sample matrix effects and sample loss during preparation. OD_{600} measurements of

the initial samples were used to report the quantified c-di-GMP as nM/OD and visualized with GraphPad

Prism9.

BCAA supplementation assay and c-di-GMP quantification

Pure cultures were grown overnight in 5mL LB broth. 5uL of each culture was transferred into

5mL PMM. Cultures were supplemented with the BCAA valine, leucine, and isoleucine as previously

described (Kim & Levy, 2008). Assessment of growth during BCAA supplementation contained either

0uM (loading control), 180uM, 200uM, 220uM, 250uM, or 300uM in triplicate. Samples were incubated

at 30°C for 24 hours at 250 rpm shaking. Cultures were manually pipetted to resuspend cells and 300uL

of culture was transferred to a 96-well black wall clear bottom plate for OD_{600} quantification. OD was

quantified using the SpectraMax plate reader and background (determined from blanks) was removed

from each quantified sample. Data analysis and visualization of growth during BCAA supplementation

was conducted in Excel. To evaluate the relationship between BCAA and c-di-GMP, pure cultures were

grown for 24 hours at 30°C and 250 rpm shaking in PMM liquid media containing either 0uM, 50uM,

100uM or 150uM of supplemented BCAAs. OD_{600} measurements were taken and samples were diluted

to an OD_{600} of 0.04 into PMM at the same BCAA concentrations. Samples were incubated for 24 hours

under the same conditions stated and then sonicated (Time 0.00:20, Pulse 01 01, Amplitude 20%) to

disrupt cell aggregates. OD_{600} measurements occurred every hour until OD_{600} was approximately equal

to 0.25. C-di-GMP analyte extraction was carried out as stated above with the modification that 2mL

cultures were used for cell lysis. Quantified values of c-di-GMP are reported as nM/OD_{600} and were

visualized with GraphPad Prism9.

Node-edge analysis and visualization

Data reported in Table S1 was used to generate the 'to-from' table which assesses mutation

patterns at the gene/protein level (Shannon et al., 2003). Counts were determined by the frequency of

the to-from patterns calculated from Table S1 where a mutation in a given gene/protein (to) occurred

after a mutation in another gene/protein (from). This table was uploaded to Cytoscape to visualize the

nodes (to genes/proteins) and edges (counts). Default renderings of the plot reported node centrality

(commonly mutated targets) through coordinate placement on the graph. This metric was converted to

node size with larger nodes representing more commonly mutated targets. Nodes were manually

aligned for visual clarity with nodes connected by two or more edges being placed in the main ring and

nodes with a single edge being placed outside the ring.

Supplementary Information

Figures S1-S3 and Tables S1-S3.

Table S1 – Source Data 1. BreSeq summary reports of mutations identified in strains isolated in this

study.

Acknowledgments

We thank RTSF (Michigan State University) for services and assistance with LC-MS/MS analyses and

MiGS (Pittsburgh, PA) for services and assistance with whole genome sequencing. This study was funded

by the Charles Henry Leach II Fund (W.K.) and the Faculty Development Fund (W.K.) awarded by

Duquesne University.

Author Contributions

W.K. designed the study, C.K. performed the experiments, C.K and W.K analyzed data and wrote the

manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Alexander, R. P., Lowenthal, A. C., Harshey, R. M., & Ottemann, K. M. (2010). CheV: CheW-like coupling

proteins at the core of the chemotaxis signaling network. *Trends in Microbiology*, *18*(11), 494–503.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2010.07.004

Armbruster, C. R., Lee, C. K., Parker-Gilham, J., de Anda, J., Xia, A., Zhao, K., Murakami, K., Tseng, B. S.,

Hoffman, L. R., Jin, F., Harwood, C. S., Wong, G. C., & Parsek, M. R. (2019). Heterogeneity in surface

sensing suggests a division of labor in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* populations. *ELife*, *8*, 1–29.

https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.45084

Bantinaki, E., Kassen, R., Knight, C. G., Robinson, Z., Spiers, A. J., & Rainey, P. B. (2007). Adaptive

Divergence in Experimental Populations of *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. III. Mutational Origins of

Wrinkly Spreader Diversity. *Genetics*, *176*(1), 441–453.

https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.106.069906

Bellsolell, L., Prieto, J., Serrano, L., & Coll, M. (1994). Magnesium binding to the bacterial chemotaxis

protein cheY results in large conformational changes involving its functional surface. In *Journal of*

Molecular Biology. https://doi.org/10.1006/jmbi.1994.1308

Borlee, B. R., Goldman, A. D., Murakami, K., Samudrala, R., Wozniak, D. J., & Parsek, M. R. (2010).

Pseudomonas aeruginosa uses a cyclic-di-GMP-regulated adhesin to reinforce the biofilm

extracellular matrix. *Molecular Microbiology*, *75*(4), 827–842. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-

2958.2009.06991.x

Buendia, L., Girardin, A., Wang, T., Cottret, L., & Lefebvre, B. (2018). LysM receptor-like kinase and lysM

receptor-like protein families: An update on phylogeny and functional characterization. In *Frontiers*

in Plant Science (Vol. 871). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01531

Carman, G. M., & Han, G. S. (2006). Roles of phosphatidate phosphatase enzymes in lipid metabolism. In

Trends in Biochemical Sciences (Vol. 31, Issue 12). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibs.2006.10.003

Casarin, R., Facchinetti, A., Sorice, D., & Tonellato, S. (2021). Decision trees and random forests. In *The*

Essentials of Machine Learning in Finance and Accounting.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003037903-2

Chan, C., Paul, R., Samoray, D., Amiot, N., Giese, B., Jenal, U., & Schirmer, T. (2005). Structural basis for

the activity and allosteric control of diguanylate cyclase. *Acta Crystallographica Section A*

Foundations of Crystallography. https://doi.org/10.1107/s0108767305089993

Chauhan, J. S., Mishra, N. K., & Raghava, G. P. S. (2009). Identification of ATP binding residues of a

protein from its primary sequence. *BMC Bioinformatics*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-

10-434

Christen, B., Christen, M., Paul, R., Schmid, F., Folcher, M., Jenoe, P., Meuwly, M., & Jenal, U. (2006).

Allosteric control of cyclic di-GMP signaling. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*.

https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M603589200

Compeau, G., Al-Achi, B. J., Platsouka, E., & Levy, S. B. (1988). Survival of rifampin-resistant mutants of

Pseudomonas fluorescens and Pseudomonas putida in soil systems. *Applied and Environmental*

Microbiology, *54*(10). https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.54.10.2432-2438.1988

Conner, J. G., Zamorano-Sánchez, D., Park, J. H., Sondermann, H., & Yildiz, F. H. (2017). The ins and outs

of cyclic di-GMP signaling in Vibrio cholerae. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*, *36*, 20–29.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2017.01.002

Cooley, R. B., Smith, T. J., Leung, W., Tierney, V., Borlee, B. R., O'Toole, G. A., & Sondermann, H. (2016).

Cyclic di-GMP-regulated periplasmic proteolysis of a Pseudomonas aeruginosa type Vb secretion

system substrate. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *198*(1), 66–76. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00369-15

Dahlstrom, K. M., Collins, A. J., Doing, G., Taroni, J. N., Gauvin, T. J., Greene, C. S., Hogan, D. A., &

O'Toole, G. A. (2018). A multimodal strategy used by a large c-di-GMP network. *Journal of*

Bacteriology, *200*(8). https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00703-17

Dahlstrom, K. M., Giglio, K. M., Sondermann, H., & O'Toolea, G. A. (2016). The inhibitory site of a

diguanylate cyclase is a necessary element for interaction and signaling with an effector protein.

Journal of Bacteriology, *198*(11), 1595–1603. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00090-16

De, N., Pirruccello, M., Krasteva, P. V., Bae, N., Raghavan, R. V., & Sondermann, H. (2008).

Phosphorylation-Independent Regulation of the Diguanylate Cyclase WspR. *PLoS Biology*, *6*(3), e67.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060067

Edwards, B. D., Greysson-Wong, J., Somayaji, R., Waddell, B., Whelan, F. J., Storey, D. G., Rabin, H. R.,

Surette, M. G., & Parkins, M. D. (2017). Prevalence and Outcomes of Achromobacter Species

Infections in Adults with Cystic Fibrosis: a North American Cohort Study. *Journal of Clinical*

Microbiology, *55*(7), 2074–2085. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02556-16

Fang, X., Ahmad, I., Blanka, A., Schottkowski, M., Cimdins, A., Galperin, M. Y., Römling, U., & Gomelsky,

M. (2014). GIL, a new c-di-GMP-binding protein domain involved in regulation of cellulose

synthesis in enterobacteria. *Molecular Microbiology*, *93*(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.12672

Feng, X., Lilly, A. A., & Hazelbauer, G. L. (1999). Enhanced Function Conferred on Low-Abundance

Chemoreceptor Trg by a Methyltransferase-Docking Site. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *181*(10), 3164–

3171. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.181.10.3164-3171.1999

Giacalone, D., Smith, T. J., Collins, A. J., Sondermann, H., Koziol, L. J., & O'Toole, G. A. (2018). Ligand-

mediated biofilm formation via enhanced physical interaction between a diguanylate cyclase and

its receptor. *MBio*, *9*(4). https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01254-18

Giardina, G., Paiardini, A., Fernicola, S., Franceschini, S., Rinaldo, S., Stelitano, V., & Cutruzzolà, F. (2013).

Investigating the allosteric regulation of YfiN from Pseudomonas aeruginosa: Clues from the

structure of the catalytic domain. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(11). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0081324

Gloag, E. S., Marshall, C. W., Snyder, D., Lewin, G. R., Harris, J. S., Santos-Lopez, A., Chaney, S. B.,

Whiteley, M., Cooper, V. S., & Wozniak, D. J. (2019). *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* interstrain dynamics

and selection of hyperbiofilm mutants during a chronic infection. *MBio*, *10*(4), e01698-19.

https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01698-19

Grant, S. S., & Hung, D. T. (2013). Persistent bacterial infections, antibiotic tolerance, and the oxidative

stress response. In *Virulence* (Vol. 4, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.4161/viru.23987

Hall, C. L., & Lee, V. T. (2018). Cyclic-di-GMP regulation of virulence in bacterial pathogens. In *Wiley

Interdisciplinary Reviews: RNA* (Vol. 9, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1002/wrna.1454

Hengge, R., Galperin, M. Y., Ghigo, J. M., Gomelsky, M., Green, J., Hughes, K. T., Jenal, U., & Landini, P.

(2016). Systematic nomenclature for GGDEF and EAL domaincontaining cyclic di-GMP turnover

proteins of Escherichia coli. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *198*(1), 7–11.

https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00424-15

Huangyutitham, V., Güvener, Z. T., & Harwood, C. S. (2013). Subcellular Clustering of the Phosphorylated

WspR Response Regulator Protein Stimulates Its Diguanylate Cyclase Activity. *MBio*, *4*(3), 1–8.

https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00242-13

Huertas-Rosales, Ó., Romero, M., Heeb, S., Espinosa-Urgel, M., Cámara, M., & Ramos-González, M. I.

(2017). The Pseudomonas putida CsrA/RsmA homologues negatively affect c-di-GMP pools and

biofilm formation through the GGDEF/EAL response regulator CfcR. *Environmental Microbiology*,

19(9), 3551–3566. https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.13848

Irie, Y., Starkey, M., Edwards, A. N., Wozniak, D. J., Romeo, T., & Parsek, M. R. (2010). *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa biofilm matrix polysaccharide Psl is regulated transcriptionally by RpoS and post-

transcriptionally by RsmA. *Molecular Microbiology*, *78*(1), 158–172.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2958.2010.07320.x

Kessler, C., Mhatre, E., Cooper, V., & Kim, W. (2021). Evolutionary divergence of the Wsp signal

transduction system in β- And γ-proteobacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, *87*(22).

https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.02.450980

Kim, W., & Levy, S. B. (2008). Increased fitness of Pseudomonas fluorescens Pf0-1 leucine auxotrophs in

soil. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, *74*(12), 3644–3651.

https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00429-08

Kim, W., Levy, S. B., & Foster, K. R. (2016). Rapid radiation in bacteria leads to a division of labour.

Nature Communications, *7*(1), 10508. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10508

Kirner, S., Krauss, S., Sury, G., Lam, S. T., Ligon, J. M., & van Pée, K. H. (1996). The non-haem

chloroperoxidase from Pseudomonas fluorescens and its relationship to pyrrolnitrin biosynthesis.

Microbiology, *142*(8). https://doi.org/10.1099/13500872-142-8-2129

Kuchma, S. L., Delalez, N. J., Filkins, L. M., Snavely, E. A., Armitage, J. P., & O'Toole, G. A. (2015). Cyclic di-

GMP-mediated repression of swarming motility by Pseudomonas aeruginosa PA14 Requires the

MotAB stator. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *197*(3), 420–430. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.02130-14

Levit, M. N., & Stock, J. B. (2002). Receptor methylation controls the magnitude of stimulus-response

coupling in bacterial chemotaxis. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, *277*(39).

https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M204325200

Li, Y., Hu, Y., Fu, W., Xia, B., & Jin, C. (2007). Solution structure of the bacterial chemotaxis adaptor

protein CheW from Escherichia coli. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*,

360(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2007.06.146

Liang, F., Zhang, B., Yang, Q., Zhang, Y., Zheng, D., Zhang, L., Yan, Q., & Wu, X. (2020). Cyclic-di-GMP

Regulates the Quorum-Sensing System and Biocontrol Activity of Pseudomonas fluorescens 2P24

through the RsmA and RsmE Proteins. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, *86*(24).

https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.02016-20

Liu, J., & Parkinson, J. S. (1991). Genetic evidence for interaction between the CheW and Tsr proteins

during chemoreceptor signaling by Escherichia coli. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *173*(16).

https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.173.16.4941-4951.1991

Malone, J. (2015). Role of small colony variants in persistence of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infections in

cystic fibrosis lungs. *Infection and Drug Resistance*, *8*, 237–247.

https://doi.org/10.2147/IDR.S68214

Malone, J. G., Williams, R., Christen, M., Jenal, U., Spiers, A. J., & Rainey, P. B. (2007). The structure–

function relationship of WspR, a *Pseudomonas fluorescens* response regulator with a GGDEF

output domain. *Microbiology*, *153*(4), 980–994. https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.2006/002824-0

Mantoni, F., Paiardini, A., Brunotti, P., D'Angelo, C., Cervoni, L., Paone, A., Cappellacci, L., Petrelli, R.,

Ricciutelli, M., Leoni, L., Rampioni, G., Arcovito, A., Rinaldo, S., Cutruzzolà, F., & Giardina, G. (2018).

Insights into the GTP-dependent allosteric control of c-di-GMP hydrolysis from the crystal structure

of PA0575 protein from Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *FEBS Journal*, *285*(20).

https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.14634

Massie, J. P., Reynolds, E. L., Koestler, B. J., Cong, J.-P., Agostoni, M., & Waters, C. M. (2012).

Quantification of high-specificity cyclic diguanylate signaling. *Proceedings of the National Academy*

of Sciences, *109*(31), 12746–12751. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1115663109

Matthews, M., & Roy, C. R. (2000). Identification and subcellular localization of the Legionella

pneumophila IcmX protein: A factor essential for establishment of a replicative organelle in

eukaryotic host cells. *Infection and Immunity*, *68*(7). https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.68.7.3971-

3982.2000

McCarthy, R. R., Mazon-Moya, M. J., Moscoso, J. A., Hao, Y., Lam, J. S., Bordi, C., Mostowy, S., & Filloux,

A. (2017). Cyclic-di-GMP regulates lipopolysaccharide modification and contributes to

Pseudomonas aeruginosa immune evasion. *Nature Microbiology*, *2*.

https://doi.org/10.1038/nmicrobiol.2017.27

Merritt, J. H., Brothers, K. M., Kuchma, S. L., & O'Toole, G. A. (2007). SadC reciprocally influences biofilm

formation and swarming motility via modulation of exopolysaccharide production and flagellar

function. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *189*(22), 8154–8164. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00585-07

Merritt, J. H., Ha, D. G., Cowles, K. N., Lu, W., Morales, D. K., Rabinowitz, J., Gitai, Z., & O'Toole, G. A.

(2010). Specific control of Pseudomonas aeruginosa surface-associated behaviors by two c-di-GMP

diguanylate cyclases. *MBio*. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00183-10

Monack, D. M., Mueller, A., & Falkow, S. (2004). Persistent bacterial infections: The interface of the

pathogen and the host immune system. In *Nature Reviews Microbiology* (Vol. 2, Issue 9).

https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro955

Moscoso, J. A., Jaeger, T., Valentini, M., Hui, K., Jenal, U., & Filloux, A. (2014). The diguanylate cyclase

SadC is a central player in Gac/Rsm-mediated biofilm formation in Pseudomonas aeruginosa.

Journal of Bacteriology, *196*(23), 4081–4088. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.01850-14

Newell, P. D., Yoshioka, S., Hvorecny, K. L., Monds, R. D., & O'Toole, G. A. (2011). Systematic Analysis of

Diguanylate Cyclases That Promote Biofilm Formation by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Pf0-1. *Journal*

of Bacteriology, *193*(18), 4685–4698. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.05483-11

O'Connor, J. R., Kuwada, N. J., Huangyutitham, V., Wiggins, P. A., & Harwood, C. S. (2012). Surface

sensing and lateral subcellular localization of WspA, the receptor in a chemosensory-like system

leading to c-di-GMP production. *Molecular Microbiology*, *86*(3), 720–729.

https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.12013

Petelski, A. N., & Fonseca Guerra, C. (2019). Designing Self-Assembled Rosettes: Why Ammeline is a

Superior Building Block to Melamine. *ChemistryOpen*, *8*(2).

https://doi.org/10.1002/open.201800210

Ravichandran, A., Ramachandran, M., Suriyanarayanan, T., Wong, C. C., & Swarup, S. (2015). Global

regulator MorA affects virulence-associated protease secretion in Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1.

PLoS ONE. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0123805

Re, S. da, Tolstykh, T., Wolanin, P. M., & Stock, J. B. (2002). Genetic analysis of response regulator

activation in bacterial chemotaxis suggests an intermolecular mechanism. *Protein Science*, *11*(11),

2644–2654. https://doi.org/10.1110/ps.0220402

Reichhardt, C., Wong, C., da Silva, D. P., Wozniak, D. J., & Parsek, M. R. (2018). CDRA interactions within

the pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilm matrix safeguard it from proteolysis and promote cellular

packing. *MBio*, *9*(5). https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01376-18

876 Ricca, E., Limauro, D., Lago, C. T., & de Felice, M. (1988). Enhanced acetohydroxy acid synthase III activity

877  in an ilvH mutant of Escherichia coli K-12. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *170*(11).

878  https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.170.11.5197-5199.1988

879 Rice, M. S., & Dahlquist, F. W. (1991). Sites of deamidation and methylation in Tsr, a bacterial

880  chemotaxis sensory transducer. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, *266*(15), 9746–9753.

881  https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9258(18)92884-X

882 Römling, U., Galperin, M. Y., & Gomelsky, M. (2013). Cyclic di-GMP: the First 25 Years of a Universal

883  Bacterial Second Messenger. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, *77*(1), 1–52.

884  https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.00043-12

885 Sarenko, O., Klauck, G., Wilke, F. M., Pfiffer, V., Richter, A. M., Herbst, S., Kaever, V., & Hengge, R. (2017).

886  More than enzymes that make or break cyclic Di-GMP—local signaling in the interactome of

887  GGDEF/EAL domain proteins of Escherichia coli. *MBio*, *8*(5). https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01639-

888  17

889 Schumacher, M. A., Gallagher, K. A., Holmes, N. A., Chandra, G., Henderson, M., Kysela, D. T., Brennan,

890  R. G., & Buttner, M. J. (2021). Evolution of a σ–(c-di-GMP)–anti-σ switch. *Proceedings of the*

891  *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *118*(30).

892  https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2105447118

893 Shannon, P., Markiel, A., Ozier, O., Baliga, N. S., Wang, J. T., Ramage, D., Amin, N., Schwikowski, B., &

894  Ideker, T. (2003). Cytoscape: A software Environment for integrated models of biomolecular

895  interaction networks. *Genome Research*, *13*(11). https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.1239303

896 Skotnicka, D., Petters, T., Heering, J., Hoppert, M., Kaever, V., & Søgaard-Andersen, L. (2016). Cyclic dI-

897  GMP regulates type IV pilus-dependent motility in Myxococcus xanthus. *Journal of Bacteriology*,

898  *198*(1). https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00281-15

Soto, S. M. (2013). Role of efflux pumps in the antibiotic resistance of bacteria embedded in a biofilm.

Virulence, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.4161/viru.23724

Spiers, A. J., Kahn, S. G., Bohannon, J., Travisano, M., & Rainey, P. B. (2002). Adaptive divergence in

experimental populations of *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. I. Genetic and phenotypic bases of wrinkly

spreader fitness. *Genetics*, *161*, 33–46.

Starkey, M., Hickman, J. H., Ma, L., Zhang, N., de Long, S., Hinz, A., Palacios, S., Manoil, C., Kirisits, M. J.,

Starner, T. D., Wozniak, D. J., Harwood, C. S., & Parsek, M. R. (2009). *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

Rugose Small-Colony Variants Have Adaptations That Likely Promote Persistence in the Cystic

Fibrosis Lung. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *191*(11), 3492–3503. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00119-09

Tamayo, R. (2019). Cyclic diguanylate riboswitches control bacterial pathogenesis mechanisms. *PLoS*

Pathogens, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1007529

Wassmann, P., Chan, C., Paul, R., Beck, A., Heerklotz, H., Jenal, U., & Schirmer, T. (2007). Structure of

BeF3--Modified Response Regulator PleD: Implications for Diguanylate Cyclase Activation,

Catalysis, and Feedback Inhibition. *Structure*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.str.2007.06.016

Wehbi, H., Portillo, E., Harvey, H., Shimkoff, A. E., Scheurwater, E. M., Howell, P. L., & Burrows, L. L.

(2011). The peptidoglycan-binding protein fimv promotes assembly of the pseudomonas

aeruginosa type IV pilus secretin. *Journal of Bacteriology*, *193*(2).

https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.01048-10

Wei, Q., Leclercq, S., Bhasme, P., Xu, A., Zhu, B., Zhang, Y., Zhang, M., Wang, S., & Maa, L. Z. (2019).

Diguanylate cyclases and phosphodiesterases required for basal-level c-di-GMP in Pseudomonas

aeruginosa as revealed by systematic phylogenetic and transcriptomic analyses. *Applied and*

Environmental Microbiology, *85*(21). https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01194-19

Yan, J., Deforet, M., Boyle, K. E., Rahman, R., Liang, R., Okegbe, C., Dietrich, L. E. P., Qiu, W., & Xavier, J.

B. (2017). Bow-tie signaling in c-di-GMP: Machine learning in a simple biochemical network. *PLOS*

Computational Biology, *13*(8), e1005677. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005677

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Bidirectional evolution of M and D phenotypes are c-di-GMP dependent. A) Colony

morphologies of the ancestral mucoid (M, left) and dry (D, middle) strains after 4 days of growth. Arrows

indicate the emergence of spreading fans that contain the respective parent strain and a new mutant

strain with the opposite phenotype. The spreading phenotype is readily produced by artificially mixing M

and D strains (right, scale bar = 10mm). B) Phylogeny of strains in select lineages colored by phenotype

and corresponding colony morphologies are shown in Fig. S2. The numbers indicate the IDs of the

evolved strains as shown in Table S1. Each strain was isolated from naturally emerging fans from their

respective parent colony with the opposite phenotype. This phylogeny depicts the bidirectional

transitions between mucoid and dry states which we show are c-di-GMP dependent. C) C-di-GMP levels

of evolved strains. C-di-GMP was quantified through LC-MS/MS and is reported as nM per OD600.

Samples are categorized by phenotype and we report the triplicate mean ± SD for each phenotypic

classification: mucoid n=14 and dry n=21 (*** Student's t-test p < 0.001).

Figure 2. Functional model of the Wsp signal transduction system. The Wsp system in *P. aeruginosa*

responds to surface contact to ultimately produce c-di-GMP. (CH3 = methyl group, P= phosphoryl

group).

Figure 3. C-di-GMP oscillates between all M and D phenotypic transitions. C-di-GMP was quantified via

LC-MS/MS and is reported as the triplicate mean ± SD. The charts capture the independently evolved

strains within the five selected lineages shown in Figure 1B. D strains are shown in orange and M strains

are shown in blue. The numerical IDs correspond to Table S1, and mutations reflect the affected amino

acid residues, except frameshift (FS) and promoter region (PR) mutations refer to the specific

nucleotides.

Figure 4. C-di-GMP levels fluctuate with BCAA mutations. C-di-GMP measurements in triplicate mean ±

SD. Raw c-di-GMP values of each mutant and its respective parent are reported in Table S1. Causal

mutation of each phenotypic shift is indicated on the left. D strains are shown in orange and M strains

are shown in blue. (Student's t-test: ns = non-significant, * = $p < 0.05$).

Figure 5. BCAA supplementation stimulates c-di-GMP production in a BCAA auxotroph with the M

phenotype, but does not impact c-di-GMP production in non-BCAA auxotrophs with the same M

phenotype. Strains were grown in the chemically defined PMM medium with 0, 50, 100, or 150 uM

BCAA supplementation (valine, leucine, isoleucine). C-di-GMP was extracted and quantified via LC-

MS/MS in triplicates and plotted as the mean with STD (ANOVA; Tukey's HSD Post Test: ns = non-

significant, * = $p < 0.05$). M and D refer to the prototypical M and D strains in Fig. 1A. The *ilvH* mutant (D

strain 5.7) produces c-di-GMP levels similar to the D strain control and the *parA* mutant (M strain 5.8)

produces c-di-GMP levels similar to the M strain control. These relative patterns are consistent with the

c-di-GMP quantification data reported in Fig 4 under nutrient-rich conditions. Exogenous

supplementation of BCAA across all concentrations does not significantly impact c-di-GMP production.

There is no data for the *ilvI* mutant at 0 uM BCAA, since this strain fails to grow in PMM unless BCAA is

exogenously provided. However, the *ilvI* mutant (M strain 5.10a) produces c-di-GMP levels comparable

to both D and the *ilvH* mutant (D strain 5.7) with BCAA supplementation.

Figure 6. A node-edge representation of 147 unique mutations across 33 lineages and c-di-GMP

quantification data of strains with mutations in proteins with significant network connectivity that are

not known to be associated with c-di-GMP modulation. A) A node-edge plot reveals focal proteins

under selection. Each node represents a protein and each edge represents a relationship where one

mutation precedes or proceeds another. Orange edges represent M to D shifts and blue edges represent

D to M shifts. The relative size of a node and thickness of an edge is proportional to frequencies within

the dataset. Proteins that collectively form the ring represent commonly mutated targets in this study

and likely have a substantial role in c-di-GMP regulation. Proteins with limited connectivity fall outside

the main ring. B) LC-MS/MS validates that proteins with significant network connectivity, but not

previously associated with c-di-GMP, have a significant impact on intracellular c-di-GMP levels. C-di-

GMP measurements are reported as the triplicate mean ± SD. C-di-GMP values of each mutant and its

respective parent are summarized in Table S1 with the corresponding ID tag. D strains are shown in

orange and M strains are shown in blue. (Student's t-test: * = $p < 0.05$, ** = $p < 0.01$).

Table S1 – Source Data 1. BreSeq summary reports of mutations identified in strains isolated in this

study. Whole genome sequencing data of select strains from the parallel evolution experiments were

subjected to variant analysis using the BreSeq algorithm against the published *P. fluorescens* Pf0-1

genome sequence. Summary files are provided for each analysis where the 'Strain ID' reported in Table

S1 is represented as the file name.

Table 1. Reconstructing select naturally acquired mutations in both the ancestral and direct parent strains reveal dependence on the previous mutation(s) to drive specific M-D phenotypic shifts.

Strain ID	Strain Mutation	Mutation CDS ID	Mutant Phenotype	Parent Strain ID	Parent Strain Mutation	Ancestor ‡	Reconstructed Mutants*	
							Parent	Ancestor
5.9a	WspA::D	Pfl01_1052::1055	dry	5.8a	ParA (D115N)	M	dry	mucoid
5.9b	WspB::D	Pfl01_1053::1055	dry	5.8a	ParA (D115N)	M	dry	mucoid
30.1	WspC::D	Pfl01_1054::1055	dry	ΔrsmE	ΔrsmE	M	dry	dry
27.3b	IlvH (A36E)	Pfl01_4787	dry	27.2	DcgH (Q148P)	M	dry	mucoid
5.7a	IlvH (S149R)	Pfl01_4787	dry	5.6a	SadC (25L 4→3)	M	dry	mucoid
5.9e	IlvH (G150S)	Pfl01_4787	dry	5.8b	YfiN (I212T)	M	dry	mucoid
5.10b	IlvI (Δ17bp)	Pfl01_4788	mucoid	5.9b	WspB::D	D	mucoid	dry
5.10a	IlvI (Δ 23bp)	Pfl01_4788	mucoid	5.9b	WspB::D	D	mucoid	dry
6.5a	DgcY (Δ3505-3506)	Pfl01_3505-3506	dry	6.4	WspE (+1bp)	M	dry	mucoid
6.6a	DgcY (Δ3500-3510)	Pfl01_3500-3510	mucoid	6.5a	DgcY (Δ3505-3506)	D	mucoid	dry
2.3	NarA (A383S)	Pfl01_3147	dry	2.2	WspD (W90L)	M	dry	mucoid
10.2	CalM (+5bp)	Pfl01_1895	mucoid	10.1	DgcH (Δ467-470)	D	mucoid	dry
11.2	RndA (Q51S)	Pfl01_2749	mucoid	11.1	WspA (A381V)	D	mucoid	dry
6.8a	CdrB (A290T)	Pfl01_0652	mucoid	6.7c	YfiN (G157C)	D	mucoid	dry

‡ Ancestors are the prototype M or D strains (Fig. 1).
* Each mutation was reconstructed in the direct parent and the corresponding ancestor strain. WGS confirmed the reconstruction of each mutation.

c-di-GMP (nM / OD$_{600}$)

Global characterization of the cyclic-di-GMP regulome by bi-directionally evolving a social trait in *Pseudomonas*
fluorescens

Collin Kessler[1], Wook Kim[1*]

[1] Department of Biological Sciences, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA 15101, USA

* Correspondence:
kimw1@duq.edu

Supplemental Figures

Figure S1. Phylogeny of 191 strains that were genome sequenced across 33 lineages. Evolved strains are classified as either D (orange) or M (blue) based on their colony morphology. Corresponding motility data, mutation data, and LC-MS/MS c-di-GMP quantification data are summarized in Table S1.

Figure S2. Colony morphologies of evolved strains depicted in Fig. 1B. Each evolved strain is classified either as M (blue) or D (orange) based on their mucoid or dry-wrinkly colony phenotypes, respectively. Motility data and LC-MS/MS c-di-GMP quantification data for each strain are reported in Table S1.

Figure S3. *ilvI* **mutants require exogenous supplementation of BCAA.** The ancestral M and independently isolated *ilvI* mutant strains were grown in LB (nutrient-rich medium) or PMM (minimal medium) with or without exogenous BCAA supplementation. Both *ilvI* mutants fail to grow in PMM unless supplied with BCAA (leucine (L), valine (V), and isoleucine (I)), and M does not show substantial change in growth with BCAA supplementation.

Table S1. 191 strains isolated from the parallel evolution experiment categorized by lineage.

Strain ID §	Generation §§	Motility Assay †	LC-MS/MS (nM/OD 600) ‡			Locus ***	CDS ID ***	Mutation Location (NT) ***	Consequence ***	Genotype (AA) ***	Genotype (NT) ***
			Replicate A	Replicate B	Replicate C						
WT #	WT	motile	59.23	73.16	62.21	na	na	na	na	na	na
M *	M0	motile	49.19	51.54	48.64	RsmE	Pfl01_1912 ←	2186046	Frame shift	Frame shift	Δ1 bp 126/195 nt
D **	D0	non-motile	187.52	146.52	156.37	WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1222594	In-frame readthrough	In-frame readthrough	Δ2 bp 1269-1270/1278 nt
1.0 **	M0	motile	49.64	58.15	53.51	WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1221330	In-frame Δ	ΔwspC	Δ5-1278/1278 nt
1.1	D0	non-motile	80.66	94.75	112.01	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220312	Missense	A381V	GCC→GTC
1.2	M1	motile	52.28	59.70	47.26	WspB	Pfl01_1053 →	1221196	Missense	L135P	CTG→CCG
1.3a	D1	non-motile	63.54	81.09	71.31	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225308	In-frame Δ	Δ674-696	Δ2029-2097/2295 nt
1.3b	D1	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225307	Duplication	673GMD 1→2	+9bp 2028/2295 nt
1.4	M2	motile	56.99	49.71	49.42	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224117	Frame shift	289*	+1bp 838/2295
1.5a	D2	non-motile	290.55	328.67	307.72	DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55870	Missense	V459G	GTC→GGC
1.5b	D2	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55317	Duplication	+472-643 @ 643	+513bp 1929/2091 nt
1.5c	D2	non-motile				Pfl01_3026	Pfl01_3026 →	3463653	Missense	T242I	ACC→ATC
2.1	D0	non-motile	167.26	267.13	209.38	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220020	In-frame Δ	Δ283-310	Δ850-933/1623 nt
2.2	M1	motile	47.27	41.65	36.89	WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1222868	Missense	W90L	TGG→TTG
2.3	D1	non-motile	77.37	81.28	110.54	NarA	Pfl01_3147 →	3613968	Missense	A383S	GCC→TCC
2.4	M2	motile				WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1223197	Nonsense	R200*	CGA→TGA
2.5	D2	non-motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4665 →/ → Pfl01_4666	5266677	5' UTR	+ Pfl01_2031-2032	+1316 +54/-56
2.6	M3	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1219276	Nonsense	E36*	GAA→TAA
2.7	D3	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55909	In-frame Δ	Δ441-446	Δ15bp 1323-1337/2091 nt
3.1	D0	non-motile	349.34	359.63	363.90	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220059	In-frame Δ	Δ297-310	Δ889-930/1623 nt
3.2	M1	motile	49.45	51.62	51.41	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220330	Missense	L387R	CTG→CGG
3.3a	D1	non-motile	127.36	112.64	160.92	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225081	Missense	G601V	GGC→GTC
3.3b	D1	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224300	Missense	E341K	GAA→AAA
3.4	M2	motile				WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1227186	Missense	L186Q	CTG→CAG
3.5	D2	non-motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	818804	Missense	G157A	GGT→GCT
3.6	M3	motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	819473	In-frame Δ	Δ381-385	Δ1139-1153/1269 nt
3.7a	D3	non-motile				DgcX	Pfl01_3550 →	4023270	Missense	M350I	ATG→ATA
3.7b	D3	non-motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4665 →/ → Pfl01_4666	5266677	5' UTR	+ Pfl01_2031-2032	+1316 +54/-56
3.7c	D3	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499015	Missense	M991T	ATG→ATA
3.7d	D3	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499101	Missense	A1020E	GCG→GAG
4.1	D0	non-motile	145.66	170.85	148.76	DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55647	In-frame Δ	Δ524-537	Δ1558-1599/2091 nt
4.2	M1	motile	42.78	46.36	47.13	DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55345	Missense	L634P	CTC→CCC
4.3a	D1	non-motile	392.53	328.69	404.68	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220309	Missense	V380A	GTC→GCC
4.3b	D1	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226046	Missense	S159L	TCG→TTG
4.3c	D1	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220170	In-frame Δ	Δ334-336	Δ1000-1008/1623 nt
4.4	M2	motile	50.14	53.49	61.31	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224447	Missense	D390N	GAC→AAC
4.5a	D2	non-motile	81.95	81.25	75.76	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220020	In-frame Δ	Δ283-310	Δ850-933/1623 nt
4.5b	D2	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1219961	Missense	Q264L	CAG→CTG
4.6a	M3	motile	57.50	54.72	51.88	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224601	Missense	V441A	GTG→GCG
4.6b	M3	motile	54.52	56.68	55.08	WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1223058	In-frame Δ	Δ152-157	Δ459-476/684 nt
4.7a	D3	non-motile	275.45	268.03	177.32	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224693	Missense	S472C	AGT→TGT
4.7b	D3	non-motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4665 →/ → Pfl01_4666	5266677	5' UTR	+ Pfl01_2031-2032	+1316 +54/-56
4.7c	D3	non-motile				FleN	Pfl01_1562 →	1752653	Missense	T13I	ACC→ATC
4.7d	D3	non-motile				CysH	Pfl01_1757 ←	1952544	Nonsense	W51*	TGG→TGA
4.8	M4	motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4666 →	5268046	Frame shift	Frame shift	+1bp 1314/1506 nt
4.9a	D4	non-motile				DgcY	Pfl01_3502	3982758	Frame shift	Frame shift	Δ502-555/672 nt
4.9b	D4	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5498817	Missense	M925I	ATG→ATC
5.1	D0	non-motile	106.41	95.85	119.21	WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1225883	Missense	P105S	CCG→TCG
5.2	M1	motile	39.11	39.97	57.53	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220156	In-frame Δ	Δ329	Δ986-988/1623 nt
5.3a	D1	non-motile	158.40	145.92	166.92	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220017	In-frame Δ	Δ283-296	Δ847-888/1623 nt
5.3b	D1	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220020	In-frame Δ	Δ283-310	Δ850-933/1623 nt
5.4	M2	motile	40.20	67.63	44.65	WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1223058	In-frame Δ	Δ152-157	Δ459-476/684 nt
5.5a	D2	non-motile	131.86	92.83	93.92	SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5013023	5' UTR	5' UTR	A→T (-11)
5.5b	D2	non-motile				SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5013023	5' UTR	5' UTR	A→C (-11)
5.5c	D2	non-motile				SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5013023	5' UTR	5' UTR	A→C (-11)
5.5d	D2	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224211	Duplication	308RMV 1→2	+9bp 932/2295
5.6a	M3	motile	49.79	50.94	43.86	SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5012937	In-frame Δ	25L 4→3	Δ74-76/1107 nt
5.6b	M3	motile				SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5012937	In-frame Δ	25L 4→3	Δ74-76/1107 nt
5.7a	D3	non-motile	68.79	59.84	78.79	IlvH	Pfl01_4787 ←	5402643	Missense	S149R	AGT→AGG
5.7b	D3	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55647	In-frame Δ	Δ524-537	Δ1558-1599/2091 nt
5.7c	D3	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225351	Missense	D691G	GAC→GGC
5.7d	D3	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224324	Missense	R349S	CGC→AGC
5.7e	D3	non-motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	818804	Missense	G157A	GGT→GCT
5.8a	M4	motile	54.44	51.70	73.94	ParA	Pfl01_0730 →	858438	Missense	D115N	GAT→AAT
5.8b	M4	motile	47.61	37.67	40.41	YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	818969	Missense	I212T	ATT→ACT
5.9a	D4	non-motile	329.69	230.96	263.57	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220649	In-frame Δ	wspA::D	Δ2421 bp
5.9b	D4	non-motile	92.77	95.21	136.41	WspB	Pfl01_1053 →	1220923	In-frame Δ	wspB::D	Δ1840 bp
5.9c	D4	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1223451	Missense	R58W	CGG→TGG

5.9d	D4	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1223648	Missense	M123I	ATG→ATA
5.9e	D4	non-motile	53.36	63.66	60.18	IlvH	Pfl01_4787 ←	5402642	Missense	G150S	GGC→AGC
5.10a	M5	motile	56.96	56.62	55.12	IlvI	Pfl01_4788 ←	5403629	Frame shift	Frame shift	Δ23bp 1166-1188/1725 nt
5.10b	M5	motile	49.96	49.89	107.61	IlvI	Pfl01_4788 ←	5403629	Frame shift	Frame shift	Δ17bp 1172-1188/1725 nt
5.10c	M5	motile				WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1227150	Missense	T174I	ACC→ATC
5.11a	D5	non-motile	110.47	109.78	180.81	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1223648	Missense	M123I	ATG→ATA
5.11b	D5	non-motile	104.23	129.78	152.89	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225239	In-frame Δ	Δ653-656	Δ12bp 1960-1971/2295 nt
5.11c	D5	non-motile	81.07	77.14	96.70	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224144	Missense	D289N	GAC→AAC
5.11d	D5	non-motile	128.07	115.76	132.55	DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55647	In-frame Δ	Δ524-537	Δ1558-1599/2091 nt
5.11e	D5	non-motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4665 →/ → Pfl01_4666	5266677	5' UTR	+ Pfl01_2031-2032	+1316 +54/-56
5.11f	D5	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499284	Missense	E1081A	GAA→GCA
5.12	M6	motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4666 →	5266862	Missense	A44P	GCC→CCC
5.13a	D6	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499088	In-frame Δ	Δ1015-1020	Δ15bp 3046-3060/3849 nt
5.13b	D6	non-motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4666 →	5267723	Missense	A331T	GCC→ACC
6.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226544	Frame shift	KI325R*	Δ974/1011 nt
6.2a	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1219239	Duplication	L23 2→3	+3bp 69/1623
6.2b	M1	motile				WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1227374	Missense	G249C	GGC→TGC
6.3	D1	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1219239	Duplication	L24 3→2	-3bp 69/1623
6.4	M2	motile	51.19	81.77	61.87	WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225435	Frame shift	748*	+1bp 2156/2295 nt
6.5a	D2	non-motile	189.04	141.94	135.43	DgcY	[Pfl01_3505]–Pfl01_3506	3985701	In-frame Δ	124* Δ5' UTR 3508	Δ3505,Δ3506,Δ3508 5'UTR
6.5b	D2	non-motile				SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5013023	5' UTR	5' UTR	A→C (-11)
6.6a	M3	motile	69.41	59.49	94.44	DgcY	[Pfl01_3500]–Pfl01_3510	3981080	In-frame Δ	Δ10 proteins	Δ3500-3510
6.6b	M3	motile				SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5012937	In-frame Δ	25L 4→3	Δ74-76/1107 nt
6.7a	D3	non-motile				CheB	Pfl01_1567	1758645	Frame shift	Frame shift	Δ1bp 1061/1137 nt
6.7b	D3	non-motile				FlgF	Pfl01_1501 →	1680303	Frame shift	Frame shift	Δ14bp 138-151/741 nt
6.7c	D3	non-motile	66.67	50.69	60.25	YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	818803	Missense	G157C	GGT→TGT
6.7d	D3	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 →	55952	Frame shift	Δ430	Δ1292-1294/2091 nt
6.7e	D3	non-motile				YfiR	Pfl01_0691 →	817876	In-frame Δ	Δ37-61	Δ114-188/576 nt
6.8a	M4	motile	41.34	42.22	39.91	CdrB	Pfl01_0652 ←	763630	Missense	A290T	GCC→ACC
6.8b	M4	motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	819458	Missense	A375V	GCG→GTG
6.8c	M4	motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	818709	Frame shift	Frame shift	+1bp 375/1269 nt
6.9a	D4	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55978	Missense	L423P	CTC→CCC
6.9b	D4	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499015	Missense	M991I	ATG→ATA
6.9c	D4	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499015	Missense	M991I	ATG→ATT
6.9d	D4	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55647	In-frame Δ	Δ524-537	Δ1558-1599/2091 nt
6.9e	D4	non-motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4665 →/ → Pfl01_4666	5266677	5' UTR	+ Pfl01_2031-2032	+1316 +54/-56
6.9f	D4	non-motile				RapA	Pfl01_1678 ←	1873535	Missense	S317A	TCG→GCG
7.1	D0	non-motile	187.52	146.52	156.37	WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1222594	In-frame Δ	wspC::D	Δ1269-1270/1278 nt
7.2a	M1	motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1223360	Frame shift	156*	+1bp 81/2295 nt
7.2b	M1	motile				WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1227186	Frame shift	205*	Δ1bp 557/1002 nt
7.2c	M1	motile				WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1223058	In-frame Δ	Δ152-157	Δ459-476/684 nt
7.2d	M1	motile				WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1223058	In-frame Δ	Δ152-157	Δ459-476/684 nt
7.3a	D1	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1223648	Missense	M123I	ATG→ATA
7.3b	D1	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224162	Missense	R295C	CGC→TGC
7.4a	M2	motile				WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1222912	Nonsense	Q105*	CAG→TAG
7.4b	M2	motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224637	Missense	H453R	CAC→CGC
7.5	D2	non-motile				SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5013023	5' UTR	5' UTR	A→C (-11)
7.6	M3	motile				SadC	Pfl01_4451 ←	5012937	In-frame Δ	25L 4→3	Δ74-76/1107 nt
7.7	D3	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5498240	Missense	S733L	TCG→TTG
8.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226036	Missense	I156R	ATC→CGA
8.2a	M1	motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1222439	Nonsense	Q372*	CAG→TAG
8.2b	M1	motile				WspD	Pfl01_1055 →	1223283	Missense	*228C (WspD::E)	TGA→TGC
8.3a	D1	non-motile				GcbC	Pfl01_4665 →/ → Pfl01_4666	5266677	5' UTR	+ Pfl01_2031-2032	+1316 +54/-56
8.3b	D1	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499015	Missense	M991I	ATG→ATA
8.3c	D1	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499286	Missense	E1082K	GAA→AAA
8.4	M2	motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5497033	Frame shift	487*	+4bp 991/3849nt
8.5a	D2	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55773	In-frame Δ	Δ413-491	Δ1237-1473/2091 nt
8.5b	D2	non-motile				DgcX	Pfl01_3550 →	4023270	Missense	M350I	ATG→ATA
8.6	M3	motile				DgcX	Pfl01_3550 →	4023180	In-frame Δ	Δ289	Δ3bp 865-867/1680 nt
8.7a	D3	non-motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	818891	Missense	P186R	CCG→CGG
8.7b	D3	non-motile				FliI	Pfl01_1539 →	1729003	Frame shift	Frame shift	+1bp 1015/1359 nt
9.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226393	Missense	G275W	GGG→TGG
9.2	M1	motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1223361	Frame shift	38*	Δ82-127/2295 nt
9.3	D1	non-motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	818803	Missense	G157S	GGT→AGT
9.4	M2	motile				YfiN	Pfl01_0692 →	819523	Nonsense	Q397*	CAA→TAA
9.5a	D2	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55896	In-frame Δ	Δ445-450	Δ1333-1350/2091 nt
9.5b	D2	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55647	In-frame Δ	Δ524-537	Δ1558-1599/2091 nt
9.6a	M3	motile				tRNA	Pfl01_R0084 ←	5451395	5' UTR	5' UTR	G→T 49/77nt
9.6b	M3	motile				RplV	Pfl01_5074 ←	5702436	Missense	A43T	GCC→ACC
10.1	D0	non-motile	301.71	271.29	205.50	DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55835	In-frame Δ	Δ467-470	Δ1400-1411/2091 nt
10.2	M1	motile	48.63	48.06	46.64	CalM	Pfl01_1895 →	2166348	Frame shift	Frame shift	+5bp 1685/2652 nt

Strain ID	Generation	Motility	‡	‡	‡	Gene	Locus	Mutation Location (NT)	Consequence	Genotype (AA)	Genotype (NT)
10.3a	D1	non-motile				CalM	Pfl01_1895 →	2166348	In-frame Δ	In-frame Δ	-5bp 1685/2652 nt
10.3b	D1	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226204	Nonsense	E212*	GAA→TAA
10.3c	D1	non-motile				CalM	Pfl01_1895 →	2166348	In-frame Δ	In-frame Δ	-5bp 1685/2652 nt
10.4	M2	motile				WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1226823	Missense	L65Q	CTG→CAG
10.5	D2	non-motile				CalM	Pfl01_1895 →	2166348	In-frame Δ	In-frame Δ	-5bp 1685/2652 nt
11.1	D0	non-motile	80.66	94.75	112.01	WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220312	Missense	A381V	GCC→GTC
11.2	M1	motile	49.17	51.38	65.08	RndA	Pfl01_2749 ←	3170622	Nonsense	Q51*	CAG→TAG
11.3	D1	non-motile	147.33	132.67	152.43	DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55647	In-frame Δ	Δ524-537	Δ1558-1599/2091 nt
11.4	M2	motile	43.58	37.94	43.96	WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1226967	Missense	A113D	GCC→GAC
12.1	D0	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225222	Missense	D648G	GAC→GGC
12.2	M1	motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1222526	Frame shift	421*	Δ1201-1202/1278 nt
12.3	D1	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220020	In-frame Δ	Δ283-310	Δ850-933/1623 nt
13.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1225581	Missense	A4E	GCA→GAA
13.2	M1	motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1222479	Missense	H385P	CAC→CCC
14.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226127	Missense	H186P	CAT→CCT
14.2	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220333	Missense	S388F	TCC→TTC
15.1	D0	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225307	Duplication	673GMD 1→2	+9bp 2028/2295 nt
15.2	M1	motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226474	Missense	S302R	AGT→CGT
16.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1225883	Missense	P105S	CCG→TCG
16.2	M1	motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1221551	Nonsense	E76*	GAA→TAA
17.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226391	Missense	T274I	ACA→ATA
17.2	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1219453	Nonsense	Q95*	CAG→TAG
18.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1225721	In-frame Δ	Δ48-52	Δ151-165/1011 nt
18.2	M1	motile				WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1226688	Nonsense	L20*	TTG→TAG
19.1	D0	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220020	In-frame Δ	Δ283-310	Δ850-933/1623 nt
19.2	M1	motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1223907	Frame shift	Frame shift	-1 bp 628/2295
20	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226559	Nonsense	L330*	TTG→TAG
21	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1225721	In-frame Δ	Δ48-52	Δ151-165/1011 nt
22	D0	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220020	In-frame Δ	Δ283-310	Δ850-933/1623 nt
23	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1225883	Missense	P105S	CCG→TCG
24	D0	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5499286	Missense	E1082K	GAA→AAA
25	D0	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1224324	Missense	R349S	CGC→AGC
26	D0	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5498817	Missense	M925I	ATG→ATA
27.0 **	M0	motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1221330	In-frame Δ	ΔwspCD	Δ1954/1954 nt
27.1	D0	non-motile				DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	55873	Missense	Q458P	CAG→CCG
27.2	M1	motile	42.70	39.96	36.29	DgcH	Pfl01_0050 ←	56803	Missense	Q148P	CAG→CCG
27.3a	D1	non-motile	47.26	71.96	72.99	IlvH	Pfl01_4787 ←	5402983	Missense	A36E	GCG→GAG
27.3b	D1	non-motile				FlgL	Pfl01_1507 ←	1687852	Frame shift	326*	Δ1bp 866/1572 nt
27.4	M2	motile				WspB	Pfl01_1053 →	1221329	Missense	*179C (WspB+)	TGA→TGC
27.5	D2	non-motile				MorA	Pfl01_4876 →	5498222	Missense	V727A	GTA→GCA
ΔrsmE *	M0	motile	61.11	61.63	60.13	RsmE	Pfl01_1912 ←	2185977	In-frame Δ	ΔrsmE	Δ1-195/195 nt
28.1	D0	non-motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220020	In-frame Δ	Δ283-310	Δ850-933/1623 nt
28.2	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220716	Nonsense	Q516*	CAG→TAG
29.1	D0	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225506	Missense	K743Q	AAG→CAG
29.2a	M1	motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1221416	Frame shift	51*	+ 19bp 91/1278 nt
29.2b	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1219453	Nonsense	Q95*	CAG→TAG
30.1	D0	non-motile				WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1226123	Nonsense	Q185*	CAG→TAG
30.2a	M1	motile				WspR	Pfl01_1058 →	1227012	Frame shift	138*	Δ1bp 383/1002 nt
30.2b	M1	motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1222448	Frame shift	389*	Δ1bp 1123/1278 nt
31.1	D0	non-motile				WspC	Pfl01_1054 →	1222342	In-frame Δ	WspC::D	Δ305bp WspC:WspD
31.2a	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220714	Missense	R515P	CGT→CCT
31.2b	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1220099	Missense	T310N	ACC→AAC
32.1	D0	non-motile				WspE	Pfl01_1056 →	1225223	Missense	D648G	GAC→GAA
32.2a	M1	motile				WspA	Pfl01_1052 →	1219957	Missense	S263P	TCC→CCC
32.2b	M1	motile				WspB	Pfl01_1053 →	1221235	Nonsense	W148*	TGG→TAG
33.1	D0	non-motile	86.13	60.82	85.85	WspF	Pfl01_1057 →	1225721	In-frame Δ	Δ48-52	Δ151-165/1011 nt

§ Relationships of the lineages presented here are visualized in Fig. S1. Strain IDs correspond to variant calling files found in 'Table S1 - Source Data 1' that provides evidence for each reported mutation. All strains were generated in this experiment unless otherwise noted or stated here: * (Kim et al., 2014); ** (Kim et al., 2016); # (Compeau et al., 1988). M and D served as the prototype ancestral strains throughout this study.

§§ Generation refers to an individual strain's evolutionary distance from WT where the following sequence represents the accumulation of mutations at each generation: WT, M0, D0, M1, D1, … M6, D6.

† Determined by stab-motility assays.

‡ Select strains were chosen for LC-MS/MS c-di-GMP quantification conducted in triplicate.

*** Locus, CDS, and Mutation Location (NT) were extracted from GenBank reference CP000094 unless otherwise stated. CDS: → (+ strand), ← (- strand), / (intergenic space). Genotype (AA/NT) was reported by BreSeq during variant analysis. Consequence describes the nature of mutation.

Table S2. Node-edge plot data matrix*.

Source	Target	Attribute	Count	Source	Target	Attribute	Count
CdrB	DgcH	D	1	WspA	WspD	M	3
CdrB	MorA	D	1	WspA	WspE	M	5
ParA	WspA	D	1	WspB	MorA	D	1
ParA	WspB	D	1	WspB	WspE	D	2
CalM	CalM	D	2	WspB	IlvI	M	2
CalM	WspF	D	1	WspC	DgcH	D	1
RndA	DgcH	D	1	WspC	WspA	D	2
NarA	WspD	M	1	WspC	WspE	D	1
DgcY	Pfl01_1567	D	1	WspC	WspD	M	2
DgcY	FlgF	D	1	WspC	WspE	M	1
DgcY	DgcY	M	1	WspC	WspR	M	1
DgcX	Pfl01_1539	D	1	WspD	Pfl01_1562	D	1
DgcX	YfiN	D	1	WspD	Pfl01_1757	D	1
DgcX	DgcX	M	1	WspD	SadC	D	3
SadC	DgcH	D	2	WspD	GcbC	D	2
SadC	IlvH	D	1	WspD	MorA	D	2
SadC	MorA	D	1	WspD	WspA	D	1
SadC	WspE	D	2	WspD	WspD	D	1
SadC	YfiN	D	2	WspD	WspE	D	3
SadC	YfiR	D	1	WspD	WspA	M	3
SadC	SadC	M	4	WspE	Pfl01_3026	D	1
DgcH	FlgL	D	1	WspE	DgcY	D	1
DgcH	IlvH	D	1	WspE	SadC	D	2
DgcH	WspA	D	2	WspE	DgcH	D	2
DgcH	WspF	D	1	WspE	GcbC	D	1
DgcH	CalM	M	1	WspE	MorA	D	2
DgcH	DgcH	M	2	WspE	WspA	D	2
DgcH	R0084	M	1	WspE	WspE	D	1
DgcH	RplV	M	1	WspE	YfiN	D	1
DgcH	WspR	M	1	WspE	WspA	M	2
GcbC	DgcY	D	1	WspE	WspB	M	1
GcbC	GcbC	D	1	WspE	WspC	M	2
GcbC	MorA	D	2	WspE	WspE	M	2
GcbC	GcbC	M	1	WspE	WspR	M	2
IlvH	ParA	M	1	WspF	WspA	M	4
IlvH	WspB	M	1	WspF	WspC	M	4
IlvI	DgcH	D	1	WspF	WspD	M	1
IlvI	WspE	D	3	WspF	WspE	M	2
MorA	DgcX	D	1	WspF	WspR	M	4
MorA	DgcH	D	1	WspR	CalM	D	2
MorA	MorA	M	1	WspR	GcbC	D	1
RsmE	DgcH	D	2	WspR	MorA	D	1
RsmE	WspA	D	4	WspR	YfiN	D	1
RsmE	WspD	D	1	YfiN	DgcX	D	1
RsmE	WspE	D	2	YfiN	DgcH	D	3
RsmE	WspF	D	15	YfiN	GcbC	D	2
RsmE	WspD	M	1	YfiN	IlvH	D	1
WspA	NarA	D	1	YfiN	MorA	D	3
WspA	DgcH	D	1	YfiN	RapA	D	1
WspA	WspA	D	3	YfiN	WspE	D	2
WspA	WspE	D	2	YfiN	CdrB	M	1
WspA	RndA	M	1	YfiN	YfiN	M	4
WspA	WspA	M	4	YfiR	YfiN	M	1
WspA	WspB	M	1				

* Values are reported in to-from format with source indicating the mutation a parent strain carries, target indicating the mutation a daughter cell carries, attribute indicating if said daughter cell's mutation resulted in the M or D phenotype, and count indicating the frequency of the pattern in the dataset.

Table S3. Description of PCR primers used to reconstruct mutations.

Target mutation	Forward Primer Sequence	Reverse Primer Sequence
WspA::D	ATCTGGTGAACGCCAAACT	TGACCAGGCAATCTTCCATC
WspB::D	CCACGTATGACATCGAACAGA	CTGTCGAGATCGAGCAGTTC
WspC::D	TGCCGAGAACGAAGGTTA	CTGTCGAGATCGAGCAGTTC
IlvH (A36E)	CAAGACGGAGCGTACCTAATC	AACGGTAGCCGAACCTTTAC
IlvH (S149R)	CAAGACGGAGCGTACCTAATC	AACGGTAGCCGAACCTTTAC
IlvH (G150S)	CAAGACGGAGCGTACCTAATC	AACGGTAGCCGAACCTTTAC
IlvI (Δ17bp)	AGGGAAGCTCAAAGCGATAC	AACCTGCCGGTTACCAATAC
IlvI (Δ 23bp)	AGGGAAGCTCAAAGCGATAC	AACCTGCCGGTTACCAATAC
DgcY (Δ3505-3506)	ATGGCTAAGCCCAGTTACACA	TGAAGCCGTTGAGATCGATA
DgcY (Δ3500-3510)	ATCGTTAGGGCGCTATCAATAC	TTGCATCGAGCAGGGTTTTC
NarA (A383S)	CATTTACACCTCGGGAGATGAC	CGACAGCGCATTGAAGAAAC
CalM (+5bp)	CTGCTGACCAATCCAATCCT	AAGTCATCGTCTGCCAACTC
RndA (Q51S)	TTGTTCACTCATCGCCTACTG	CGACCAGCGTTCCGATAAA
CdrB (A290T)	CGTTATCAACAGGACGGCTATC	GCTTGAGTTCCAGACCGTTATT
ilvH external check	CGCACTCCTACATGGAATCA	CAGCTACATCGGTCACTTTCA
ilvI external check	AAGCCAAACTGCGTTCCTA	TTCATCTGGATACTGCCTTCAC