Title: Pangenomics facilitated with structural analysis reveals host NAD$^+$

manipulation as a major virulence activity of bacterial effectors

Short title: Bacterial effectors manipulate NAD$^+$

Michelle T Hulin[1], Wenbo Ma[1*]

[1] The Sainsbury Laboratory, Norwich Research Park, NR4 7UH, United Kingdom

[*] Corresponding author: wenbo.ma@tsl.ac.uk

**Abstract (200 words)**

Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NAD$^+$) has emerged as a major component in both

eukaryotic and prokaryotic immune systems. Recent findings that Toll/interleukin-1

receptor (TIR) proteins function as NAD$^+$ hydrolases (NADase) link NAD$^+$ metabolism

with immune signaling. In this study, we investigated how manipulation of host NAD$^+$

metabolism can be employed as a virulence strategy by pathogens. Using the

pangenome of the model bacterial pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae*, we conducted a

structure-based similarity search for type III effectors (T3Es) with potential NADase

activity from 35,000 orthogroups. Thirteen T3Es, including five novel ones, were

identified to possess domain(s) related to seven NAD$^+$-hydrolyzing enzyme families.

Most *P. syringae* strains encode at least one NAD$^+$-manipulating T3Es, and many

have multiple. We experimentally confirmed the type III-dependent secretion and

virulence activity of a novel T3E, which shows similarity with both TIR and adenosine

diphosphate ribose (ADPR) cyclase. Using AI-based structural prediction and *in silico*

molecular docking, we found divergence at the NAD$^+$-interacting positions and

confirmed the functional importance of these residues in the TIR T3E HopAM1. This

study highlights NAD$^+$ manipulation as a key virulence mechanism and provides

insights into how pathogens may promote infection through manipulation of host NAD$^+$

metabolism.

**Introduction**

The metabolite and redox agent nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide ($NAD^+$) is a universal co-factor and essential redox carrier involved in diverse cellular processes. Recently research on the Toll/Interleukin-1 receptor (TIR) domain proteins has established a central role of $NAD^+$ in immune signaling across the kingdoms. TIR proteins were first identified as a stretch of ~150 conserved amino acids shared between Toll and Interleukin immune receptors in animals (Gay and Keith, 1991). TIR domains often associate with other domains that sense the presence of pathogens. Upon activation, TIR proteins cleave $NAD^+$ through a N-glycosidase activity (Essuman et al., 2017; Ofir et al., 2021; Wan et al., 2019), producing adenosine diphosphate ribose (ADPR) and nicotinamide (NAM). TIR proteins can also have cyclase activity to produce cyclic ADPR (cADPR) or variants of cADPR (v-cADPR), as well as base-exchange activity to produce nicotinic acid adenine dinucleotide (NAAD) (Angeletti et al., 2022). All these enzymatic activities are dependent on a catalytic Glutamic acid (Glu) within the catalytic site (Burdett et al., 2021; Duxbury et al., 2020). The resulting $NAD^+$-derived molecules activate immune signaling and in some cases metabolite depletion leads directly to cell death (Ofir et al., 2021).

In plants, the TIR domain is often associated with intracellular immune receptors that also contain the nucleotide binding/leucine-rich repeat (NLR) domains (Kourelis and van der Hoorn, 2018). The NLR proteins have been evolved to sense pathogen effectors, which are secreted to promote disease. TIR-NLR-triggered immunity is usually dependant on downstream Enhanced Disease Susceptibility 1 (EDS1)-helper NLR pathways (Adlung et al., 2016). Plant TIRs produce various products, including ADPR, NAM and a v-cADPR (Table 1), through $NAD^+$ hydrolysis (Huang et al., 2022; Jia et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2020; Wan et al., 2019). The structure of v-cADPR was recently identified as an isomer of cADPR and renamed 2'-cADPR (Manik et al., 2022). Other TIR generated products pRib-AMP/ADP, ADPR-ATP and diADPR were shown to bind to and activate specific EDS1 heterodimers (Huang et al., 2022; Jia et al., 2022), indicating these small molecules link TIR activation to EDS1-dependant immune signalling. In addition, TIR-only proteins also exhibit 2',3'-cNMP synthase activity *in vitro* and these cyclic nucleotides may also contribute to immunity (Yu et al., 2022).

With the establishment of NAD$^+$ metabolism as a major theme in innate immunity, it is intuitive to speculate that this process is manipulated by pathogens as a virulence strategy. For example, sequestering/degrading small molecule signals to block downstream signaling, or competing for the NAD$^+$ substrate to generate distinct molecules. Indeed, Tad1 produced by bacteriophages binds to a TIR-produced small molecule as a sponge to interfere with bacterial anti-viral defence (Leavitt et al., 2022). Intriguingly, pathogens can also suppress immunity using TIR effectors. BtpA and BtpB produced by the animal pathogen *Brucella abortus* reduce host NAD$^+$ levels to promote infection (Coronas-Serna et al., 2020). The type III effector (T3E) HopAM1 produced by the plant pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* cleaves NAD$^+$ and produces 3'-cADPR (originally designated v2-cADPR), which differs from the 2'-cADPR produced by characterised plant TIR proteins (Eastman et al., 2022; Manik et al., 2022).

Apart from the TIR proteins, there are additional enzymes that can cleave NAD$^+$ at either the pyrophosphate bond or the N-glycosidic bond by multiple enzymes (Figure 1; Table 1). The NUDIX (nucleoside diphosphate linked to a variable moiety X) pyrophosphatase enzymes (Srouji et al., 2017) and phosphodiesterases (PDEs) cleave pyrophosphate bonds. Pathogen effector proteins harboring the NUDIX domain include the oomycete pathogen *Phytophthora sojae* effector Avr3b, which hydrolyses NADH, ADPR as well as 2',3'-cNMPs (Dong et al., 2011; Yu et al., 2022) and the *Ralstonia solanacearum* T3E RipN, which alters the NAD+/NADH ratio to dampen immune responses (Sun et al., 2019). The PDE superfamily contains diverse groups with various functions, structures and different catalytic mechanisms (Azevedo et al., 2014). An example of PDE effector is SdeA produced by the animal bacterial pathogen *Legionella pneumophila* (Akturk et al., 2018).

**Figure 1. Enzyme families that may hydrolyse NAD⁺.**
The NUDIX (nucleoside diphosphate linked to a variable moiety X) enzymes and phosphodiesterases (PDEs) cleave the pyrophosphate bond. ADP-ribosyltransferases (ART), nucleoside hydrolases (NH), ADPR cyclases, and sirtuins cleave the N-glycosidic bond.

Enzymes that can potentially cleave the N-glycosidic bond in NAD⁺ include ADP-ribosyltransferases (ART), nucleoside hydrolases (NH), ADPR cyclases, and sirtuins (Figure 1). ARTs cleave NAD⁺ to release ADPR for post-translational modifications of proteins and nucleic acids (Corda and Di Girolamo, 2003; Takamura-Enya et al., 2001). However, some ARTs act primarily as NAD⁺ glycohydrolases and don't require a protein substrate (Ghosh and Caparon, 2006). ART effectors have been identified in various pathogens although most of them are presumed to modify host protein targets (Schreiber et al., 2021). A nucleoside hydrolase effector is the *P. syringae* T3E HopQ1, which was shown to alter purine metabolism (Li et al., 2013) and activate cytokinin signaling by hydrolyzing the cytokinin precursor iP-riboside 5′-monophosphate (iPRMP) (Hann et al., 2014; Li et al., 2013). Sirtuins utilise NAD⁺ as a co-factor during protein deactylation (Sanders et al., 2010); however, the sirtuin ThsA in *Bacillus cereus* primarily acts to deplete NAD⁺ during anti-viral immunity (Ofir et al., 2021). Finally, ADPR cyclases have similar activity to TIR proteins to cleave NAD⁺ into ADPR, cADPR and NAM, despite limited sequence similarity (Lee and Zhao, 2019). So far, pathogen effectors with sirtuin or ADPR cyclase domains have not been identified.

Here, we employ pangenomic and structure-based similarity searches to identify effectors with potential NADase activity from the model bacterial pathogen *P. syringae*. We found *P. syringae*, as a species complex, has a diverse T3E repertoire with various enzymatic activities that may hydrolyze $NAD^+$, supporting that manipulation of $NAD^+$ metabolism is a key virulence mechanism. Furthermore, we examined the structural features of the *P. syringae* TIR proteins using AlphaFold2 and *in silico* docking. This analysis revealed diversity at the $NAD^+$-interacting residues, which may fine tune the enzymatic activities, thus providing insight into how effectors may promote infection through $NAD^+$ manipulation in the host.

**Results**

**Pangenome analysis of putative NADases in *P. syringae***

Traditionally classified into pathovars based on host of isolation, *P. syringae* is a species complex infecting over 180 different plant species (Young, 2010). Utilizing the pangenomic diversity of *P. syringae*, we systematically analyzed NADase-encoding proteins using pipelines illustrated in Figure 2A. *P. syringae* is divided into phylogroups, which broadly correspond to phylogenetic "species" sharing 95% Average Nucleotide Identity (ANI) (Gomila et al., 2017). The major plant pathogens belong to the "primary" phylogroups I, II, III, IV, V, VI and X, which form a monophyletic clade and rely on a canonical *hrp* type III secretion system (T3S) to cause disease. The "secondary" phylogroups VII, IX, XI and XIII include environment-associated strains which may not possess the *hrp* T3S and encode very few T3Es, consistent with their mostly non-pathogenic lifestyle (Dillon et al., 2019; Xin et al., 2018). To examine NADases across the species complex, an initial 2,437 genomes were obtained. After removing lower quality and almost identical genomes, 531 genomes were used in the final analysis. A phylogeny based on the core genome (Figure 2B) shows that these strains represent previously defined phylogroups and additional undefined clades. The genomes were grouped into ≥ 95% identical ANI groups which loosely correspond to defined phylogroups (Supplemental Figure S1). The primary phylogroups grouped at ≥ 85% ANI (highlighted in red on Figure 2B). The secondary phylogroups and other

**Figure 2. Identification of NADases encoded in the *P. syringae* species complex.**

A) Two approaches based on HMMER and HHsearch respectively were used to predict all seven NAD hydrolyzing enzyme families from the pangenome of *P. syringae*.

B) NADase genes predicted across the *P. syringae* species complex are mapped onto the maximum-likelihood core genome phylogeny. Numbers of predicted genes from each enzyme family is presented by heatmaps. The phylogeny was generated based on 409 concatenated single copy core genes. The scale shows amino acid substitutions per site. Strains in the primary phylogroups are coloured in red. Due to similarity in enzymatic activity, NUDIX and pyrophosphatase were grouped together, as well as TIR and ADPR cyclase.

C) Venn diagrams to show the number of primary phylogroup specific NADase encoding orthogroups (left), orthogroups shared between primary and secondary phylogroups (middle), and orthogroups specific to secondary phylogroups (right).

149 genomes labelled as "*P. syringae*" were grouped outside the primary phylogroups at

150 80% ANI. Two divergent *P. viridiflava* strains, sharing 79% ANI with the rest of the

complex, were used as an out-group to root the tree. Orthology analysis defined the pangenome of 2,867,287 protein-encoding genes into 23,583 orthogroups (OGs), with an additional 11,608 singletons. In total, 35,191 OGs were further analyzed to identify candidate NADases.

Two complementary approaches (HMMER and HHsearch) were employed to identify proteins possessing any of the seven enzymatic domains including ART, NUDIX, pyrophosphatase, PDE, TIR, sirtuin, ADPR cyclase, and nucleoside hydrolase (Figure 2A; Supplemental Table S1). Using HMMER-based approach, 146 candidate OGs were identified, whilst the HHsearch-based approach picked up 564 candidates, including 136 being identified by both approaches (Table 2, full details in Supplemental Table S2). Among the 136 candidates are known housekeeping nucleosidases, such as the NUDIX enzyme NudC (OG1452), the Sirtuin CobB3 (OG752), the purine nucleosidase RihA (OG2649), and cyclic-AMP phosphodiesterase CpdA (OG3903) (Drabinska et al., 2020; Fuchs et al., 2010; Gallego-Jara et al., 2021; Petersen and Moller, 2001). In addition, both searches identified the TIR T3E HopAM1 (OG6638) (Eastman et al., 2022) and the ART T3E HopU1 (OG9885) (Fu et al., 2007). The large number of hits (428) uniquely identified from HHsearch indicates this method allowed the detection of divergent homologues. By using both approaches, we maximized the chance of capturing all potential candidates.

The 574 candidate OGs with potential NADase activity are distributed across the *P. syringae* species complex (Figure 2B). On average, each *P. syringae* genome contains 187 NADase-encoding genes, including 131 in core orthogroups (present in $\geq$ 95% of genomes) and 56 in accessory orthogroups. The distribution of orthogroups into core and accessory genomes varied for each enzyme group (Table 2). For example, 34% of NUDIX/pyrophosphastase orthogroups are in the core genome, whilst only 8% of TIR orthogroups are in the core genome. We next determined the candidate NADase orthogroups specific to the primary phylogroups, which are pathogens that rely on the *hrp* T3S for pathogenesis (Figure 2C; full data in Supplemental Table S2). The majority of candidates are encoded in the genomes of both groups, indicating that they are not directly related to pathogenesis. However, in each enzyme family, there are orthogroups only encoded by the primary phylogroups,

184    suggesting that they may function as virulence factors or facilitate pathogen adaptation
185    to host environment.
186
## NADases as Type III effectors
188
To identify T3Es from the NADase candidates, we established a pipeline, which
included an initial screen using the program EffectiveT3 (Eichinger et al., 2016)
followed by a promoter search for putative *hrp* boxes using FIMO (Grant et al., 2011).
Potential novel T3E candidates were further examined for the N-terminal amino acid
sequences for secretion signal characteristics (Guttman et al., 2002). The outcome of
this analysis revealed 13 OGs as high confidence effector candidates (Table 3;
Supplemental Figure S2; A full list before filtering is in Supplemental Table S3). The
robustness of this analysis is verified by the successful identification of all the known
T3Es with putative NADase-encoding domains: the ART effectors HopF/HopBB,
HopO1, AvrRpm, HopS, and HopU1, the NUDIX effector HopAG1, the NH effector
HopQ1, and the TIR effector HopAM1. The detection of multiple non-overlapping hits
to different enzymes in the same protein also revealed HopAG1 as a multi-domain
effector that contains an ART domain in addition to the previously known NUDIX
domain. Importantly, we identified five novel NADase T3E candidates, including two
ARTs (OG5256, OG18195), one PDE (OG4578), and two TIR/ADPR cyclases
(OG8567, OG18056).
205
The distribution of known NADase T3Es and novel candidates was mapped on the
core genome phylogeny (Figure 3A). 93% of the primary phylogroup strains have at
least one NADase T3Es and 72% possess T3Es belonging to more than one enzyme
family. On average, each primary phylogroup strain encodes three T3Es that
potentially hydrolyze $NAD^+$. Interestingly, three enzymatic activities that are each
represented by only one T3E are prevalent in primary phylogroup strains: the NUDIX
effector gene *hopAG1* is present in 55% of primary phylogroup strains across nine
phylogroups; the NH effector *hopQ1* is found in 31% of primary phylogroup strains
across five phylogroups; and the new PDE effector candidate OG4578 is found in 26%
of primary phylogroup strains, although restricted to phylogroup II and X. These results
indicate $NAD^+$ hydrolysis is a key virulence strategy widely used by *P. syringae*.
217

A

1. T3S+
2. No. Type 3 effectors

0 10 20 30 40 50 58

3. TIR/ADPR cyclase
- HopAM1
- OG18056
- OG8567

4. ART
- Known ARTs
- OG18195
- OG5256

5. NH
- HopQ1

6. NUDIX
- HopAG1

7. PDE
- OG4578

Orthogroup present but no predicted *hrp* box

B

Mean No. NADase effectors per genome

- ART
- NH
- NUDIX
- PDE
- TIR/ADPR cyclase

**Figure 3. Predicted NADases as type III effectors in *P. syringae*.**
A) NADase T3Es predicted across the *P. syringae* species complex are mapped onto the maximum-likelihood core genome phylogeny. Strains in the primary phylogroups are coloured in red. The presence of a canonical *hrp* T3SS is presented as Ring 1 (in green) and the number of known T3E genes encoded in each strain is presented in Ring 2 as a heatmap coloured in a scale of white to blue. Ring 3-7 each represents one of the five NADase enzyme families. Known T3Es with putative ART domains are in order: HopF/BB, HopO1, AvrRpm, HopS, HopU1, HopAG1. Presence of each orthogroup is coloured as in the scale, with grey squares indicating the orthogroup is present but with no *hrp* box in the promoter.
B) Mean number of NADase T3Es per phylogroup. The primary phylogroups are labelled with roman numerals, whilst secondary phylogroups correspond to their species number predicted by Average Nucleotide Identity in Supplemental Figure S1. A collapsed version of the core genome phylogeny, with the primary phylogroup clade in red is included for reference.

To better understand the diversity and distribution of NADase effectors in *P. syringae*,

we summarize the average number of each enzyme group per genome in each

phylogroup (Figure 3B; full details in Table 4). A clear difference between the primary

and secondary phylogroups can be visualized, with a significantly larger number of

NADase T3Es in the primary phylogroups. The number of ART effectors per genome

were particularly high in phylogroups I, VI, IVa, V and Xa. This could at least in part be

due to expansion of the HopO and HopF/HopBB families that has been observed previously (Lo et al., 2017). A closer look at the copy number variation of each ART effector across the phylogroups (Supplemental Figure S3) shows that strains within phylogroups III, I and V possess up to four HopF/HopBB family members, whilst HopO is specifically expanded in phylogroup I strains. An increase in copy number was also noted for the TIR effector HopAM1 which is present as two copies in 22% of the genomes that encode it. This observation indicates the effectors may impact host processes in a dose-dependent manner.

In summary, this analysis demonstrate that the *P. syringae* species complex has evolved effectors that contain diverse NADase domains, which potentially manipulate levels of NAD$^+$ in the plant hosts. Many strains possess a variety of enzyme groups with multiple gene copies, consistent with an important contribution to virulence.

**Novel NADases T3E candidates**

ART is the largest NADase T3E family with eight members (six known and two novel). Of the novel candidates, OG18195 is present in only three genomes in phylogroups I and II, whilst OG5256 is present in 139 genomes. Structurally, OG5256 is most similar to the T3E HopU1 (3U0J). Interestingly, *OG5256* gene was found to be downstream of a T3E gene cluster harbouring *hopAG1*, *hopAH1* and *hopAI1* (Supplemental Figure S2). The presence of these upstream effectors in a putative operon may explain why only 37 of the 139 strains had a predicted *hrp* box in the immediate upstream of this gene.

The candidate PDE effector OG4578 was identified as a protein with homology to FimX EAL phosphodiesterase. FimX was reported to regulate twitching motility in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (Kazmierczak et al., 2006), which is unlikely to be a T3E. This OG was present in 238 primary phylogroup strains but only 100 had a predicted *hrp* box promoter. These 100 strains are from a particular clade (Supplemental Figure S4), indicating that OG4578 might be re-purposed to directly contribute to pathogenesis.

Considering the recent breakthroughs in the functionality of TIR-NLR signalling, we
conducted in-depth analysis on the TIR/ADPR cyclase T3E candidates. HopAM1 was
the only known TIR T3E from previous studies. Our analysis identified two candidate
T3Es: OG8567 as a TIR candidate and OG18056 as an ADPR cyclase candidate.
OG8567 is encoded in 22 strains including 15 in the primary phylogroups; only genes
in these 15 strains carry *hrp*-box-like promoter sequences. The second candidate
OG18056 was predicted as an ADPR cyclase. OG18056 is only present in three *P.*
*coronafaciens* pv. *atropurpurea* strains clustered in the primary phylogroup IV which
are pathogens of grass species. In the genome assembly GCA_001400695, *OG18056*
is within 15 Kb of T3E homologues *hopV1 and hopAA1* and a coronatine biosynthesis
operon (Supplemental Figures S2 and S5). In addition, this gene is flanked by
transposase genes and conjugation-machinery (*virB* homologues), indicating that it is
located in a mobile region of the genome and therefore may have been acquired via
horizontal gene transfer.

Using AlphaFold2 (Mirdita et al., 2022), we generated structure models for HopAM1,
OG8567, and OG18056 (Supplemental Figure S6A). The structures were aligned to
the TIR domain of the well-characterised human NADase SARM1, with Root-Mean-
Square Deviation (RMSD) values of 2.58, 2.78, and 3.01 Å, respectively
(Supplemental Figure S6B). A glutamate (Glu) in the position 642 aa in hSARM1 is
crucial for its NADase activity (Essuman et al., 2017). Structural alignments confirmed
that HopAM1 has a catalytic Glu (E191), as shown previously (Eastman et al., 2022).
Similarly, OG18056 also has a Glu (E305) at the corresponding position to hSARM1-
642, indicating that it could be an active NAD$^+$-cleaving enzyme. In contrast, the other
candidate OG8567 has an isoleucine (I142) at this position; therefore it is less likely to
possess NADase activity, or could have a suboptimally positioned catalytic Glu in a
nearby position (E139).

**OG18056 is a novel T3E with structural features similar to both TIR and ADPR**
**cyclase**

The full structural alignment of OG18056 with the hSARM1 TIR domain (Figure 4A)
was intriguing because it was identified only from the HHsearch-based analysis, which
revealed structural similarity only with ADPR cyclases. Superimposition of OG18056

**Figure 4. OG18056 is a novel T3E with similarity to ADPR cyclases.**

A) Alignment of a structural model of OG18056 predicted by AlphaFold2 (in cyan) with human CD38 (6VUA, in grey) and the TIR domain of human SARM1 (6O0R, 561-700 aa, in light brown). Root-Mean-Square Deviation (RMSD) values and TM-scores are presented using OG18056 as the reference. For visualisation purposes, sequences outside the alignment region were removed and those that did not align within the region are more transparent. The predicted catalytic Glu residues are aligned in three structures and highlighted with a box.

B) Immunoblot showing the induction and secretion of OG18056 by *P. syringae*. OG18056-HA was expressed in PstDC3000 or the T3S mutant Δ*hrcC* under its native promoter. The bacteria were cultured in the rich medium Kings B (KB) or a Hrp-inducing minimal medium (HM). Proteins were extracted from cell pellet (cp) or supernatant (sn) and the protein levels of OG18056 were determined by western blotting using an anti-HA antibody. Ponceau S (PS) staining was used as the loading control.

C) OG18056 enhanced the virulence of the effectorless mutant PstDC3000 D36E on *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Upper: disease symptom development by D36E carrying the empty vector, OG18056 or OG18056(E305A). Numbers show the number of leaves with symptoms recorded over three independent experiments. Leaves were inoculated with 5 x $10^6$ CFU/ml inoculum and imaged 3 days later. Lower: population count of the D36E transformants in *A. thaliana*. Boxplots show the day 0 and day 3 populations in Log CFU/cm$^2$. Individual data points with different colors represent results from three separate experiments. Tukey-HSD significance groups extracted from ANOVA are presented.

D) OG18056 and its mutant were expressed under its native promoter in PstDC3000 D36E. Immunoblot showing OG18056 and OG18056(E305A) expression when bacteria were grown in Hrp-inducing minimal medium.

with the human ADPR cyclase hCD38 showed a RMSD value of 4.13 Å. Although this RMSD value is higher (indicating lower similarity) than that of the hSARM1 alignment (3.01 Å), the alignment length was greater (164 aa) than that aligned to hSARM1 (98 aa). In addition, OG18056-E305, which was aligned to the catalytic residue (E642) in hSARM1, could also be aligned to the catalytic residue (E226) of hCD38 (Munshi et

al., 2000). Topology analysis indicated that the active sites of all three enzymes have similar arrangement of alternating α helices and β sheets (Supplemental Figure S7). These results suggest OG18056 is structurally similar to both ADPR cyclase and TIR, hence may have a novel NADase activity.

To experimentally confirm that OG18056 is a T3E, we tested its expression pattern and potential T3S-dependent secretion. The gene encoding OG18056 was expressed in *P. syringae* strain PstDC3000 under its native promoter with a C-terminal HA tag. The bacterial cells were induced in a *hrp*-minimal medium (HM); total and secreted proteins were detected by immunoblotting (Figure 4B). Our results showed that *OG18056* was drastically induced in the minimal medium, an expression pattern commonly observed in T3S-related genes. Furthermore, OG18056 proteins were detected in the supernatant of PstDC3000, but not a T3S mutant Δ*hrcC*, confirming it is a true T3E that can be secreted in a T3S-dependent manner.

To examine the potential virulence activity of OG18056 when delivered by bacteria during infection, we expressed the gene in the effectorless mutant D36E of PstDC3000. Inoculation of D36E expressing OG18056 ($5 \times 10^6$ cfu/mL) into *A. thaliana* leaves resulted in chlorotic symptoms (Figure 4C). *In planta* bacterial growth (after inoculation at a lower dose, $5 \times 10^5$ cfu/mL) was also significantly increased. Both virulence functions required the predicted catalytic residue E305, indicating that the putative ADPR cyclase/TIR NADase activity is responsible for promoting bacterial infection by this novel T3E. Both OG18056 and the E305A mutant were confirmed to be expressed in D36E in *hrp*-inducing medium (Figure 4D).

**Characterization of NAD⁺-binding residues in bacterial TIR proteins**

Different NADases produce specific products. The previously characterized TIR T3E HopAM1 produces a variant of cADPR (3'-cADPR) that is different from the variant 2'-cADPR produced by plant TIRs (Manik et al., 2022). Over-expression of HopAM1 in *Nicotiana benthamiana* triggers cell death. This activity requires the catalytic residue E191, indicating that the cell death is induced either through the NADase products or NAD⁺ depletion (Eastman et al., 2022). Interestingly, HopAM1 triggered cell death is

independant of EDS1, indicating that it is through a pathway/mechanism distinctive
from most plant TIR-NLRs (Choi et al., 2017). Residues in the catalytic pocket of
NADases influence the preference of products after NAD$^+$ hydrolysis and can switch
enzymatic activity between NAD$^+$ hydrolysis and cyclization (Graeff et al., 2009;
Toshchakov and Neuwald, 2020). To gain insight into how this fine tuning of the
NADase activity may affect the function of HopAM1, we investigated the structural
diversity of the TIR and ADPR cyclase proteins in *P. syringae*.

Alphafold2 was used to generate 3D structure models for 63 of the 68 OGs predicted
from *P. syringae* pangenome using the consensus sequence of each orthogroup (five
were too short for structural prediction) (Figure 5A; Supplemental Table S4). 84% of
the predictions scored $\geq$ 70 pLDDT (Predicted Local Distance Difference Test)
indicating the prediction had worked well. We used the program P2RANK (Krivak and
Hoksza, 2018) to predict if there was a ligand binding pocket in each protein and in
parallel, alignments were performed with the TIR domain of hSARM1 to identify the
positions of putative catalytic residues. The RMSD scores of the *P. syringae* proteins
with hSARM1-TIR ranged from 1.75 to 5.47 Å, confirming structural homology
(Supplemental Table S4). 43 proteins were predicted to have pockets at the position
aligning to the hSARM1-TIR catalytic site. The structures of these 43 proteins were
aligned pairwise using fr-tmalign (Pandit and Skolnick, 2008) and a dendrogram was
constructed based on RMSD scores to represent their structural similarity (Figure 5B).
The three T3E candidates were scattered across the dendrogram. OG18056 is
clustered with other divergent TIR-like proteins outside the clade that showed higher
similarity with hSARM1, consistent with our earlier analysis suggesting that OG18056
is more similar to ADPR cyclases.

A) Predict protein structure → Identify catalytic site (align hSARM1, P2RANK) → Download ligands (ZINC20) → Generate grid coordinates → Run Autodock Vina → Identify interactions (PLIP)

...nerate 3D structure models of candidate NADases and predict NAD⁺-binding

...similarity of 42 TIR proteins and the one ADPR cyclase homologue (OG18056) ...ome. The dendrogram was built by the phylip program fitch using a distance ...om pairwise structural alignments. The RMSD values were normalized by ...dicted TIR/ADPR cyclase T3Es are highlighted in red. Mapped onto the ...g the structural alignment for each protein with hSARM1-TIR. The RMSD with ...tmap. A black box indicates that the protein had a glutamate aligning to the ...TIR. The NAD⁺ binding affinity of each protein is also presented.

...hat aligned to hSARM1-TIR for each *P. syringae* TIR protein. The residues are ...ositions and colour-coded by biochemical features. Nine positions that were ...during *in silico* docking are highlighted (also see D), whilst other positions are ...y Glu (E642 in hSARM1-TIR) is labelled with a star.

...edicted to bind NAD⁺ in more than ten *P. syringae* TIR proteins. These include residues ...RM1 catalytic residue E642 (position 9), the nearby residues 628, 637 and 638 (positions 6- ...68, 570, 574, 594 and 603 (positions 1-5), which are further upstream.

E) Sequence logo generated for the nine positions that interacted with NAD⁺ showing frequency of different amino acids in each position. Amino acids are colour-coded as in (C).

357
358

Fig. 6
Fig. 8

We next conducted a docking analysis using Autodock Vina to model the binding of $NAD^+$ within the pocket coordinates predicted by P2RANK (Figure 5A). From the eight different models predicted from each structure, the $NAD^+$ binding affinity was calculated using the top model from the prediction (Figure 5B). The results show that most structures, except for one, bind $NAD^+$ with affinities ranging from -5.71 to -9.72 kcal/mol (Supplemental Table S4). A monomeric hSARM1 TIR domain (561-700 aa scored -7.20 kcal/mol, indicating the *P. syringae* TIRs had similar predicted binding affinities to a known NADase). In summary, 42 of these proteins may have the potential to bind $NAD^+$ through a TIR-like catalytic pocket and 27 of them have a Glu aligned to the hSARM1-TIR catalytic residue E642, indicating that they may be active NADases.

We next investigated whether there were particular positions that were important for $NAD^+$ interaction. Using the structural alignment, we pulled out residues at each structurally equivalent position to hSARM1-TIR from each *P. syringae* protein to examine conservation (Figure 5C; Full region is presented in Supplemental Figure S8). In parallel, the program plip (Salentin et al., 2015) was used to predict which residues may interact with $NAD^+$ for each protein. Using hSARM1-TIR domain as a reference, we then calculated the number of proteins that had a residue predicted to interact with $NAD^+$ in each structurally equivalent position (Figure 5D). This analysis revealed nine positions that were predicted to bind $NAD^+$ in more than ten proteins. For clarity we refer to the positions based on the hSARM1 number. These include residues corresponding the hSARM1 catalytic residue 642, as well as nearby residues 628, 637 and 638. In addition, clusters of residues further upstream from the catalytic Glu, corresponding to positions 568, 570, 574, 594 and 603 in hSARM1 were also frequently predicted to bind $NAD^+$. The higher frequency of the predicted binding of these residues to $NAD^+$ may indicate their conserved importance in substrate binding. Indeed, some of the equivalent positions have been shown to be required for $NAD^+$-binding and/or NADase activity in ADPR cyclases (Liu et al., 2007) and TIR proteins in plants and bacteria (Essuman et al., 2017; Horsefield et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2022).

We also analyzed the conservation levels in each of the nine $NAD^+$-binding positions across the *P. syringae* proteins (Supplemental Table S5). Except for the highly conserved catalytic Glu residue (E642 in hSARM1-TIR), a high level of diversity was observed in all other positions (Figure 5E). Nonetheless, some trends appear: 1)

aromatic residues (F, W or Y) were common at positions corresponding to hSARM1

568, 603 and 638; 2) positively charged residues (K or R) were common at positions

574 and 628; 3) position 594 was frequently negatively charged (D). Residues

corresponding to positions 568, 574, 594 and 638 were shown to modulate the cyclase

activity, substrate preference, and ratio of ADPR/cADPR products generated by the

CD38 homologues (Graeff et al., 2009; Ramakrishnan et al., 2010; Tohgo et al., 1997).

Therefore, specific residues in these positions may fine tune the enzymatic activity.

**Functional analysis of the NAD⁺-binding residues in HopAM1**

To experimentally examine the functional relevance of the nine NAD$^+$-binding residues

and their diversity, we generated mutants of HopAM1 that may alter its activity.

Because cADPRs have been shown to predominantly produced by plant TIRs and

HopAM1, we were interested in reducing the cyclase activity by changing residues to

those in hSARM1 and hCD38, which are greater NAD$^+$ hydrolases, preferentially

producing ADPR rather than cADPR. For this purpose, we generated eight mutants

with specific substitutions of six positions based on the corresponding residues in

either hSARM1 or hCD38. Some mutations were also made based on studies of these

positions in previous studies (Table 5). A previous study of hCD38 showed a negative

amino acid at position corresponding to hSARM1 594 reduces cyclase activity (Graeff

et al., 2009). The residue in HopAM1 is D132 which is already negatively charged, so

we didn't generate any mutants of this residue. The catalytic E191A mutant (position

642) was included as a control. The positions of these residues in the HopAM1

structure docked with NAD$^+$ are presented in Figure 6A. These mutants were

expressed in *N. benthamiana* using *Agro*-infiltration (Supplemental Figure S9) and the

cell death phenotype was monitored. The mutant alleles were also expressed in the

effectorless mutant D36E (introduced on the plasmid pUCP20TK under the native

*hopAM1* promoter) and infiltrated into *N. benthamiana* leaves at a concentration of 2

x 10$^8$ cfu/mL in order to confirm the cell death-triggering activities (Supplemental

Figure S10). Similar observations were made from both experiments.

**Figure 6. Characterization of NAD⁺-binding residues for cell death inducing activity of HopAM1.**

A) Predicted structural model of HopAM1 docked with NAD⁺ with residues subjected to mutational analysis highlighted in green. The electrostatic image of the surface of HopAM1 active site is also presented with regions of positive, neutral and negative charge shown in blue, white and red respectively.

B) Cell death induced by HopAM1 and its mutants after transient expression in *N. benthamiana* by *Agro*-infiltration. Representative image of a *N. benthamiana* leaf five days post *Agro*-infiltration (DPI) is presented. The same leaf imaged under ultraviolet light is included to better visualize the cell death lesions. WT: wild-type; EV: empty vector.

C) Quantitative analysis of the cell death phenotype induced by various HopAM1 mutants. The appearance of cell death for each mutant was monitored at 3, 4, and 5 DPI, and scored as either no cell death (in green), weak cell death (limited, patchy appearance, in light brown) and strong cell death covering the whole inoculation site (dark brown). Statistical groupings of an ANOVA comparing cell death scores are shown above the graph. These results are from three independent experiments.

Three of the eight mutants, A97R, F102K, and S185K, showed no visible cell death,

similar to the catalytic mutant E191A (Figure 6B; Figure 6C; Supplemental Figure S9).

Both hCD38 and hSARM1, having a low cyclase activity, have an R at the

corresponding position to A97 (see Table 5). Likewise, both hCD38 and hSARM1 have

a K at the corresponding position to F102, and hSARM1 also has a K at the

corresponding to S185. Therefore, these mutants could have reduced the cyclase

activity of HopAM1, leading to no cell death.

Among the five mutants that were still able to cause cell death after 5 days, four

showed slower and weaker phenotype. For residues F95 and F187, we made

mutations to two different amino acids (F95 to W or H, and F187 to T or W).

Hydrophobic aromatic residues at these positions have been shown to alter the activity
and ADPR/cADPR product ratio of CD38 homologues (Graeff et al., 2009;
Ramakrishnan et al., 2010). Mutation of F95 to either W or H slowed down cell death
induction (Figure 6C). For F187, the F187T mutant exhibited weaker cell death, whilst
F187W was not significantly different from wild-type, indicating an aromatic residue is
important at this site. The cell death caused by the W160H mutant was also weaker
than the wild-type. Together, these results demonstrate that changes in NADase
activity altered the function of HopAM1 *in planta*.

**Discussion**

Recent research has brought the role of NAD$^+$-derived small molecules in host-
pathogen interactions into focus. It has become clear that the NADase activity
possessed by plant TIR proteins is essential for immune signaling (Bayless and
Nishimura, 2020). However, how pathogens may manipulate this key component of
immune system for the benefit of disease development is largely unknown. Harnessing
the pangenomic diversity and wealth of genetic resources of the model bacterial
pathogen *P. syringae*, we were able to conduct a near saturated search of NADases
and identified the NADase effector repertoire in this species complex. Further
structural analysis and experimental validation provide novel insight into the functional
diversity of NADase enzymes. Thus, this research advances our understanding of
NAD$^+$ manipulation as a important virulence strategy.

For NADase identification, we employed both a HMMER and HHsearch. Combining
both methods for domain identification was important because both approaches have
their own pros and cons. The HMMER approach searched all 2,867,287 *P. syringae*
protein sequences with high sensitivity and allowed specific searching of all alleles
within each of the > 35,000 orthogroups for similarity to a curated set of sequences of
defined domains. However, this analysis relied on what is already in the pfam-seed
alignment and may have missed remote homologues that do not share significant
sequence similarity (Pereira and Alva, 2021). For example, the HopAG1 ART domain,
OG5256, OG18195, OG4578, and OG18056 were not identified by the HMMER
search. The HHsearch approach used HMM-HMM comparisons and added secondary
structure information to identify hits in a database. However, this approach relies on

extracting hits annotated as the enzymes of interest and thus depended on accurate
annotation of database entries. In addition, we only ran the consensus sequence of
each orthogroup due to it being computationally intensive, so could miss variation
within orthogroups. Our results clearly demonstrate the power of using a combination
of methods for domain identification. This pipeline could readily be applied to identify
any protein or enzyme families of interest. With the advent of rapid and accurate
protein structural prediction, integration of Alphafold2 structural models in functional
annotation pipelines such as this one will aid predictions where sequence-based
approaches fail to pick up remote similarities in structure alone.
480
As a major metabolite and redox carrier, NAD$^+$ regulates various cellular processes.
Consistently, we found a large amount of NADases encoded in each *P. syringae*
genome, performing both house-keeping and accessory functions. Importantly, some
NADases are specifically found in the primary phylogroups that are major plant
pathogens, indicating that they may have specific roles in virulence or adaptation
towards host environments. Although we focused on identifying T3Es in this study, it
would be interesting to determine if any of these non-T3E NADases are *hrp*-regulated
and thus may also contribute to pathogenesis. For example, Drabinska et al. (2020)
identified multiple NUDIX enzymes in the animal opportunistic pathogen *P. aeruginosa*
that are involved in virulence, production of the toxin pyocyanin, and resistance to
oxidative stress.
492
Overall, *P. syringae* has a diverse set of T3Es with putative NADase activities. On
average, primary phylogroup strains possess three NADase T3E genes per genome,
with most possessing multiple T3Es with different enzymatic activities. Notably, we
found a putative novel ART which may be in an operon with three other known T3Es.
Within this operon the known effector HopAG1 also possesses both ART and NUDIX
domains. We also identified a novel PDE candidate. It has been noted that host
metabolism shifts drastically during PstDC3000 infection of *A. thaliana* (Drenichev et
al., 2019; Ward et al., 2010). PstDC3000 possesses effectors with NADase activities,
including two copies of the TIR effector HopAM1. These effectors may directly
contribute to metabolomic changes seen in these previous studies. Previous studies
on effector biology have been focused on protein targets in the host cells. Our results
point to manipulation of host metabolites as a major virulence target.

Of the novel T3Es identified, OG18056 is predicted to have similarity to ADPR cyclases, which represents a novel virulence activity. Only eukaroytic ADPR cyclases such as CD38 have been characterized for their roles in physiology and immunity (Hogan et al., 2019). Previous studies have suggested there is limited sequence and structural similarity between TIRs and ADPR cyclases, however the pocket of OG18056 was able to align to both structures suggesting at least some similarity in the folds that make up the catalytic pocket. It will be interesting to identify the substrates and products of this effector and understand how they are related to the virulence activity *in planta.* This effector is specifically found in pathogens of grass species. The presence of nearby mobile elements indicates this effector is likely within a plasmid/genomic island in these strains. A search of the protein against NCBI using BLASTP showed homologues in *Pectobacteriaceae* including plant-associated strains of *Pectobacterium* and *Brenneria* (Supplemental Table S6), reinforcing the horizontal gene transfer hypothesis.

It has been shown that TIR domains like ADPR cyclases have multiple activities including hydrolase, cyclase and base-exchange (Angeletti et al., 2022; Hogan et al., 2019). Once $NAD^+$ is cleaved, the ADPR may transiently remain in the catalytic pocket to be further modified for example via cyclisation or converted to other products. The residues on the catalytic surface likely dictate the strength of binding, orientation of ADPR and eventual products produced. Very recent structural analyses have shown that various bacterial TIR proteins cyclise ADPR at differing positions on the ribose sugar (Leavitt et al., 2022; Manik et al., 2022). Further investigation of diverse TIRs across kingdoms may lead to the discovery of additional small molecule variants with distinct roles. To add to this, the animal TIR hSARM1 is known to have a range of activities which are regulated by the metabolic state of the cell (Angeletti et al., 2022). How bacterial and plant TIR enzyme activities are regulated remain to be explored.

We examined the diversity of *P. syringae* TIRs using AlphaFold2-based structural modeling combined with $NAD^+$ docking. Our analysis identified 27 *P. syringae* TIRs that could be activite NADase enzymes and detected a high degree of diversity at the $NAD^+$-interacting residues, supporting that these enzymes could produce different products involved in anti-viral defence, metabolic pathways and pathogenesis. There

are some caveats to this analysis: for example TIR domain proteins often naturally form oligomers (Wan et al., 2019), so our monomeric structural models may be missing information about pockets/active site interactions that appear upon oligomerisation. In addition, purely *in silico* structural analysis may miss biologically relevant conformational changes (Hofer et al., 2016). However, this analysis can allow us to generate testable hypotheses. For example, conducting the docking analysis across diverse structures allowed us to generate a list of potentially important residues for functional analysis. Encouragingly, recent structural analysis of plant and bacterial TIRs (Burdett et al., 2021; Manik et al., 2022) detected similar positions that are involved in binding NAD$^+$ *in vitro*. Furthermore, specific substitutions of these residues led to functional changes in HopAM1, confirming the robustness of our analysis.

Several interesting observations were made through our HopAM1 mutagenesis analysis: the F187T mutant was slower at inducing cell-death. This is consistent with the recent finding that aromatic amino acids at positions corresponding to F187 in other bacterial TIRs is specifically important for the cyclase activity (Manik et al., 2022). Intriguingly, the mutant HopAM1(F187A) was not found to change cell death induction in yeast (Eastman et al., 2021). Similarly, the F95 mutants (F95H and F95W) and W160H triggered weaker cell death. Perhaps the enzymatic activity was reduced due to the importance of these residues for substrate binding. An alternative hypothesis is that the activity is altered and thus less of the 'cell-death' inducing molecule is produced. Mutations F102K, S185K and A97R completely abolished cell death. We were surprised that these mutations led to such drastic phenotypes as the amino acids were changed to those in the corresponding positions in hSARM1 (for S185 and A97) or hCD38 (for F102), and thereby should not abolish the enzymatic activity. It would be interesting to see if the loss of cell-death observed for these residues is due to a change in activity, such as the specific products produced. In summary, our results support the idea that different TIR/ADPR cyclase active sites vary and subtle differences in the amino acids across the sites modulate the enzymatic reaction and the phenotypic consequences.

A key question is why would bacterial pathogens produce TIR effectors that may trigger cell death? HopAM1 is known to trigger plant cell death in an EDS1-independent manner (Choi et al., 2017), thus differing from most plant immune

receptor TNLs, which signal through EDS1 (Lapin et al., 2020). Phylogenomic analysis
has revealed some plant TIR proteins are also EDS1-independent (Johanndrees et
al., 2021). It is intriguing to speculate that variation in key active site residues result in
the differences in products of these TIR proteins, leading to distinct phenotypes. How
these effector produced molecules trigger cell death whilst promoting virulence and if
they can disrupt plant TIR signalling pathways through molecular mimicry are
important future questions. Our research paved the way of conducting such
investigation in the future.
581
582 **Methods**
583
**Bacterial strains and plant material**
Strains and plasmids used in this study are listed in Supplemental Table S7.
*Pseudomonas* strains used in this study include *P. syringae* pv. tomato strain DC3000
(PstDC3000), the T3S mutant Δ*hrcC* (Yuan and He, 1996), and the effector-less
mutant D36E (Wei et al., 2015). *P. coronafaciens* NCPPB 2397 (equivalent to ICMP
4457, genome assembly GCA_001400695) was used to clone the novel T3E
OG18056. Antibiotics were used at the following concentrations kanamycin: 50 μg/mL,
rifampicin: 50 μg/mL, carbenicillin: 100 μg/mL, gentamycin 50 μg/mL. These strains
were used to inoculate *Nicotiana benthamiana* and *Arabidopsis thaliana* ecotype col-
0 to examine cell death-triggering activities of HopAM1 and its mutants. *Agrobacterium*
*tumerfaciens* strain GV3101 was used for *Agrobacterium*-mediated transient
expression in *N. benthamiana*.
596
597 *N. benthamiana* plants were grown in a controlled growth room with 16:8 light:dark
598 conditions at 22 °C, 80% humidity. *A. thaliana* plants were grown in a growth chamber
599 with 10:14 light:dark conditions at 20 °C, 80% humidity. Five week old *N. benthamiana*
600 and four week old *A. thaliana* were used for agro-infiltration and *P. syringae*
601 inoculations.
602
**Plasmid construction**
Golden gate cloning (Engler et al., 2008) was used to generate constructs for transient
expression of effectors in plants. Level 0 parts included: 35S long promoter, CDSNS

(no stop) acceptor, 3xFLAG C-terminal tag, 35S terminator. The CDS were ordered
from Twist Bioscience and PCR amplified using Phusion HR polymerase
(ThermoFisher) to add golden gate compatible overhangs. Primers used in this study
are presented in Supplemental Table S8. CDS were inserted into the level 0 CDSNS
acceptor using one-pot digestion-ligation reaction with the restriction enzyme BpiI-HF
(New England Biolabs). Level 0 fragments were then assembled into the *in planta*
expression vector pICH47732.

Effector genes were also cloned into pUCP20TK for expression in *P. syringae*. For
*OG18056*, the genomic DNA containing CDS and its native promoter (250 bp
upstream of the start codon) was amplified from *P. coronafaciens* NCPPB 2397 with
the addition of a C-terminal HA tag in the reverse primer. For *hopAM1*, the wild-type
allele (encoded by PstDC3000) and nine mutants were synthesized with C-terminal
HA tags (Twist Bioscience) and PCR amplified to add overhangs for infusion cloning
(Takara). The *hopAM1* promoter sequence (207 bp upstream of the start codon) was
PCR amplified from PstDC3000 gDNA. Infusion cloning was used to insert promoter
and CDS fragments in reverse orientation to the *lacZ* promoter in the pUCP20TK
vector after linearisation of the vector with BamH1 and EcoR1 (New England Biolabs).
For generation of the E305A mutant of OG18056, a site-directed mutagenesis
approach using infusion was performed, splitting the gene and promoter fragment into
two PCR products for cloning with the mutation introduced in primers R1 and F2. All
constructs were confirmed by sanger sequencing. The recombinant plasmids were
electroporated into *P. syringae* as described in Choi et al. (2006) apart from recovery
growth was for 2 hours at 28 °C, 220 rpm.

**Agro-infiltration in *N. benthamiana***
*A. tumefaciens* GV3101 with various constructs was streaked from glycerol stocks
onto LBA plates containing appropriate antibiotics. Two-day old bacterial lawns were
resuspended in sterile distilled water and washed twice by spinning at 3000 rpm for
10 minutes. The cells were resuspended in $MgCl_2$-2-(N-morpholino)ethanesulfonic
acid (MES) buffer (10 mM $MgCl_2$, 10 mM MES, pH 5.6) to a final concentration of
$OD_{600}$=1.0 before adding acetosyringone to a final concentration of 150 μM. Bacteria
were incubated at room temperature (22 °C) for 3 hours before combining in a 1:1 ratio

with the strain carrying the viral RNA silencing suppressor P19, meaning the final OD$_{600}$ of each *Agrobacterium* strain was 0.5. After *Agro*-infiltration, plants were monitored for cell death symptoms for 3-5 days. Images were taken under natural and UV light. Protein expression was confirmed by immunoblotting using total proteins extracted from 1 cm leaf discs at 2 days post inoculation. Leaf discs were immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 °C. To extract proteins, 100 μL of protein extraction buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5), 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.1% Triton X-100) was added and the discs were ground with a micropestle whilst on ice. Crude plant material was removed by centrifugation at 11,000 x g for 15 minutes and 60 μL of the supernatant was combined with 30 μL 3X Laemmli buffer (Laemmli, 1970) with 1x cOmplete EDTA-free protease inhibitor cocktail (ThermoFisher) and boiled at 95°C for 5 minutes. Immunoblotting was performed as described previously (Zhou et al., 2009). An anti-FLAG antibody conjugated to horseradish peroxidase (Sigma) was used at 1:2000.

**Effector expression and secretion analysis**

To confirm that novel effector protein OG18056 was induced in Hrp-inducing minimal medium and secreted in a T3S-dependent manner, PstDC3000 and the Δ*hrcC* mutant carrying pUCP20TK::OG18056-HA were used for protein extraction. A protocol based on (Vinatzer et al., 2005) was utilised to extract secreted proteins from supernatents. The protocol was modified to extract from 8 mL of bacterial supernatant (rather than 2 mL). Immunoblotting was performed as in Zhou et al. (2009) using anti-HA from rat (Roche) at 1:1000, followed by a secondary anti-rat antibody conjugated to horseradish peroxidase (sc-2750, Santa Cruz) at 1:2000. The same protocol without supernatant extractions was used to confirm the expression of OG18056 and HopAM1 in PstDC3000 D36E used in bacterial infection assays.

***In planta Pseudomonas* assays**

PstDC3000 D36E carrying specific effector alleles or the pUCP20TK empty vector were grown from glycerol stock for 2 days on agar plates at 28 °C, and the lawn was resuspended in 10 mM MgCl$_2$ to the required optical density for inoculation. Cell suspensions were syringe-infiltrated into *N. benthamiana* leaves at a concentration of OD$_{600}$ 0.4 (~2 x 10$^8$ cfu/mL). A lower concentration at 5 x 10$^6$ cfu/mL was used to

inoculate *A. thaliana*. Symptom development was recorded over several days and

pictures taken 3 days post inoculation. For bacterial population assays, inoculum was

prepared at 5 x $10^5$ cfu/mL for *A. thaliana*. Bacteria were enumerated after 0 and 3

days by plating a dilution series on Kings B agar supplemented with rifampicin and

kanamycin.

**Genome retrieval and annotation**

2,437 *P. syringae* (taxid136849) genomes were download from NCBI on November

18th, 2020.  Genomes were grouped into 806 clusters showing ≥ 99.95% ANI using

FastANI v1.32 (Jain et al., 2018). One genome per cluster was chosen based on the

assembly with the lowest number of contigs. Genomes were filtered using an approach

similar to Levy et al. (2018), removing those with ≥ 1000 contigs and an N50 value

lower than 40,000 bp computed with Quast (Gurevich et al., 2013). Finally, CheckM

(Parks et al., 2015) was used to select genomes with  ≥ 95% complete and < 5%

contamination, leaving 531 genomes. Using a cut-off of ≥ 80% ANI, all but two

genomes are clustered into a single group. These two genomes (GCA_ 900582625

and GCA_900573885) were kept as out-groups.

Genome annotation was performed using PROKKA (Seemann, 2014) and Orthofinder

(Emms and Kelly, 2019) was used to define orthogroups. To generate a core genome

phylogeny, 409 single copy orthogroups present in all genomes were aligned using

ClustalW (Thompson et al., 1994) with ends trimmed by Gblocks (Castresana, 2000).

Sequences were then concatenated into a 68,325 bp alignment, converted to the

phylip format and input into IQ-TREE2 (Minh et al., 2020) with parameters JTT+I+G

and 1000 bootstraps.

**Identification of Type III secretion system (T3S) and known Type III effectors**

**(T3Es)**

To identify genomes containing a canonical *hrp* T3S, a BLAST-based approach was

taken similar to that described in Dillon et al. (2019). T3S proteins from PstDC3000,

*P. syringae* pv. *syringae* B728A, and *P. viridiflava* LP23.1a (Supplemental Table S9

lists accession IDs) were used in a tBLASTn to query each genome. A genome was

determined to putatively encode a *hrp* T3S if it had a hit to every query with > 30%

length and > 30% identity for at least one of the three T3S inputs. A similar approach

was taken to determine which orthogroups corresponded to known T3E families in *P. syringae*. A set of T3E protein sequences from pseudomonas-syringae.org was used as input to query all orthogroups with BLASTp. Orthogroups containing proteins with hit identities of 100% and E-value < $1\times10^{-10}$ were determined to be those corresponding to known T3Es.

**NADase T3E prediction**

The procedure employed to identify nucleosidase candidates in *P. syringae* is presented in Figure 2A. HMMER (http://hmmer.org/) was used to search for proteins carrying domains that are associated with different NADases. Pfam seed alignments for enzyme families (listed in Supplemental Table S1) were obtained from Pfam (http://pfam.xfam.org/) (downloaded on December 1st, 2020). The script hmmbuild was used to create a HMM profile for each seed alignment. The command hmmsearch was then used to screen all *P. syringae* proteins. HMMER results were filtered based on a tolerant bit-score of $\geq$ 15 (Kloosterman et al., 2020) and grouped by orthogroup. Orthogroups with positive hits were further filtered to remove those in which less than 5% of the orthogroup members were a hit as these rare hits may not represent the orthogroup function.

The program HHsearch (Soding et al., 2005) was also used for each orthogroup to predict similarity to proteins in the PDB database (downloaded on October 28th, 2021). First, a multi-sequence alignment (MSA) was generated using ClustalW and a consensus sequence for each orthogroup was generated using hhcon. Next, the secondary structure of the consensus protein sequence was predicted by PSIPRED and added to the alignment (Jones, 1999) before running HHsearch. Bash scripting was used to extract candidates with hits towards NADase enzymes in the database using a cutoff of $\geq$ 80% probability score. Two additional hits per protein with non-overlapping regions were also identified, allowing proteins with multiple NADase domains to be identified.

Candidate orthogroups predicted with HMMER or HHsearch were next screened with EffectiveT3 (Eichinger et al., 2016) to determine if any could be T3Es. Orthogroups containing hits with a score $\geq$ 0.9 were further analyzed for putative *hrp* box sequences

in their promoter region (within 1000 bp upstream of the protein-coding sequence)
using the program FIMO (Grant et al., 2011). The background model was created
using all promoters of all orthogroups and the *hrp* box sequence GGAACC(15-
17N)CCACNNA was used as the input. The program was run three times to account
for different size spacers.

Candidate T3Es were manually filtered based on the percentage of sequences within
the orthogroup predicted to be an effector ($\geq$ 50%) and the percentage of these
sequences that contained a possible *hrp*-box promoter ($\geq$ 25%). Orthogroups that
were only present in genomes without a predicted *hrp* T3S were removed. Candidates
T3Es were then manually examined to determine if they had characteristic N-terminal
characteristics associated with *P. syringae* T3Es (Guttman et al., 2002; Petnicki-
Ocwieja et al., 2002). The consensus sequence of each orthogroup was examined for:
1) a high percentage of serines in the first 50 amino acids; 2) an aliphatic amino acid
in positions 3 or 4; and 3) a lack of negatively charged residues within the first 12
positions. The genomic locations of each T3E candidate gene were also manually
examined using Geneious Prime 2022.0.1 to examine gene neighbourhoods
(https://www.geneious.com).

**Protein structure prediction and alignment**
Structural prediction was conducted using ColabFold AlphaFold2 batch with MMseqs2
(Mirdita et al., 2022). The pipeline developed to identify the catalytic pocket of each
TIR protein and predict residues involved in NAD$^+$ binding is illustrated in Figure 5A.
For structural alignments, PDB files were aligned using fr-tm-align (Pandit and
Skolnick, 2008). Aligned residues, root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) scores, and
alignment lengths were extracted using bash scripting. To build a dendrogram based
on structural similarity, RMSD values from pairwise alignments were extracted and
standardised by dividing with alignment length. These values were then converted to
a distance matrix using R software. This distance matrix was used as the input to the
program fitch within phylip (v3.69) (Felsenstein, 2009). The order of species was
randomised in 100 independent runs.

Alignments were also conducted between each full-length *P. syringae* TIR protein and
the known NADase domain of the human TIR protein hSARM1 (structure 6O0R).
Residues in the 561-700 aa fragment of hSARM1 were extracted with PyMOL to
create a PDB file of just the TIR domain to be used in the alignments. To obtain the
corresponding positions in CD38, alignments were also performed with structures
6VUA and 1R12.
775
**Molecular docking of NAD$^+$**
Autodock Vina v1.2.3 (Eberhardt et al., 2021) was used for molecular docking. P2Rank
(Krivak and Hoksza, 2018) was first used to predict catalytic pocket sites. Output files
were processed with python to extract the pocket containing the catalytic residues that
aligned with hSARM1-TIR. Pocket coordinates were added to the Vina config file for
the docking run. The NAD$^+$ ligand was downloaded in 3D format from
https://zinc20.docking.org (Irwin et al., 2020) and converted to PDBQT format using
the Autodock Vina prepare_ligand script. The Radius of Gyration was calculated and
multiplied by 2.9 using python to generate the appropriate sized grid for ligand binding
(Feinstein and Brylinski, 2015). Autodock Vina was then ran with exhaustiveness of
32 to produce eight possible models.
787
For each docked model, the protein and docked ligand PDBQT files were converted
back to PDB using open babel (O'Boyle et al., 2011) and concatenated to generate a
single file. This was then input into plip (v2.2.2) (Salentin et al., 2015) with default
parameters to predict bonds between NAD$^+$ and the protein. The plip output files of all
eight possible docked conformations were then combined to obtain all possible protein
residues that may bind to NAD$^+$ regardless of its orientation within the active site.
794
**Figure creation**
PyMOL (https://pymol.org/2/) was used for visualisation of protein structures. The Pro-
origami online server was used for protein topology diagrams (Stivala et al., 2011).
WebLogo (http://weblogo.threeplusone.com/) was used to generate a sequence logo
of residues at particular positions in *P. syringae* TIR/ADPR cyclase proteins. Biorender
(BioRender.com) was used to create diagrams. All other figures were created using R
software (R.Core.Team, 2020). Specifically, the packages ape (Paradis and Schliep,

2019), phangorn (Schliep, 2011), ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016), ggtree (Guangchuang,
2020) and reshape (Wickham, 2007).

**Statistical analysis**
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to statistically compare cell death symptoms
over time after *Agro*-infiltration as well as population counts of *P. syringae* from
*Arabidopsis*. Tukey-HSD significance groups were extracted using R packages
emmeans (Lenth, 2022) and the cld function within agricolae (de Mendiburu and
Yaseen, 2020) .

**Acknowledgments:** We thank Dr. Alan Collmer for providing the *P. syringae* D36E
mutant and Ma lab members for discussions and technical support. We thank Dan
MacLean and George Deeks for bioinformatic analysis support. **Funding:** W.M. is
supported by Gatsby Charitable Foundation and UKRI BBSRC Grant
BBS/E/J/000PR9797. **Author Contributions:** W.M. and M.T.H. conceived the project.
M.T.H. did the experiments and analyzed the data. W.M. and M.T.H. wrote the
manuscript. **Competing Interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

**Data and material availability:** All code are available at https://github.com/michhulin/
Pseudomonas. Materials are available from W.M. upon request under a materials
transfer agreement with the Sainsbury Laboratory.

**Table 1. Characteristics of enzymes that can cleave NAD$^+$ including defining folds, catalytic residues, known substrates and products.**

| Group | Folds | Catalytic residues | Bond | Known role(s) | Activity | Substrates | Products | References |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUDIX | Nudix fold, beta-grasp domain, loop-helix-loop | RExxEE | Pyrophosphate/ phoshodiester | Hydrolase, removal of post-translational modifications | Hydrolysis | Pyro-phosphate bonds e.g. NADH | Various e.g. NMN, AMP | Srouji et al., (2017) |
| PDE | Phospho-esterase fold | H-H | Phosphodiester | Hydrolase | Hydrolysis | Various. cNMPs e.g. cAMP, DNA, RNA | various e.g. AMP | Turko et al. (1998), Akturk et al., (2018) |
| ART | ADP-ribosylating toxin turn-turn (ARTT) loop, phosphate-nicotinamide (PN) loop | ExE | N-glycosidic bond | Post-translation modification, DNA/RNA modification, NAD+ glycohydrolase | Hydrolysis, ribosyltransferase | NAD+ | ADPR, NAM | Menetrey et al. (2008), Aravind et al. (2015) |
| SIR | Rossmann-fold domain | N, H | N-glycosidic bond | Post-translation modification | Hydrolysis, deacetylase, ribosyltransferase | NAD+ | o-acetyl-ADPR, NAM | Sanders et al., (2010), Yuan and Marmorstein (2012) |
| TIR | Central parallel beta-sheet (βA-E) surrounded by alpha helices (αA–E) | E | N-glycosidic bond | Hydrolase | Hydrolysis, cyclase, base-exchange | NAD, NADP, NADH | ADPR, cADPR, v-cADPR, NAM, ADPRP, cADPRP, NAAD, NAADP, pRib-ADP, pRib-AMP, gcADPR, ADPR-ATP, diADPR | Ve et al. (2015),Essuman et al., (2017), Essuman et al., (2018), Angeletti et al., (2022), Huang et al. (2022), Leavitt et al. (2022), Jia et al. (2022) |
| ADPR cyclase | Central cleft between N and C-terminal domains forms active site | E | N-glycosidic bond | Hydrolase | Hydrolysis, cyclase, base-exchange | NAD, NADP, NADH, ADPR, Adenine | ADPR, cADPR, v-cADPR, NAADP, NAM, AP2A isomers, diADPR | Aarhus et al. (1995), Basile et al. (2005), Graeff et al., (2009), Grahnert et al. (2011) |
| NH | Central parallel beta-sheet surrounded by alpha helices | D-D | N-glycosidic bond | Hydrolase | Hydrolysis | Nucleosides, e.g. iP-riboside 5′-monophosphate | iP, PR | Garau et al. (2010), Li et al. (2013), Hann et al., (2014), Drenichev et al., (2018) |

848 **Table 2. Numbers of putative NADase enzymes predicted by HHsearch and HMMER in**

849 **the *P. syringae* pangenome.**

| | HHsearch | HHsearch unique | HMM | HMM unique | Shared | Complete | Core | Accessory |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TIR/ ADPR cyclase | 66 | 34 | 34 | 2 | 32 | 68 | 5 | 63 |
| NUDIX/ Pyrophosphatase | 109 | 81 | 30 | 2 | 28 | 111 | 38 | 73 |
| ART | 140 | 112 | 34 | 6 | 28 | 146 | 28 | 118 |
| PDE | 226 | 186 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 226 | 53 | 173 |
| NH | 8 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| SIR | 15 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 2 | 13 |
| Total | 564 | 428 | 146 | 10 | 136 | 574 | 128 | 446 |

852 **Table 3. Predicted number of T3Es for each enzyme family in the *P. syringae***
853 **pangenome.**

| Group | Total | EffectiveT3[a] | High frequency effectors[b] | T3SS+[c] and *hrp* promoter[d] | Manual filtering[e] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TIR/ADPR cyclase | 68 | 36 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| NUDIX/ Pyrophosphatase | 111 | 50 | 13 | 8 | 1 |
| ART | 146 | 74 | 26 | 14 | 7 |
| PDE | 226 | 114 | 43 | 20 | 1 |
| NH | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| SIR | 15 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 574 | 285 | 100 | 51 | 13 |

854
a; Candidates with members scoring over 0.90 with EffectiveT3

b; Candidates where $\geq$ 50% of the orthogroup sequences were annotated as an effector

c; Candidates with effectors present in at least 1 genome with a canonical T3SS predicted

d; Candidates with $\geq$ 25% of the sequences possessed a proceeding *hrp*-box promoter

within 1000 bp (purposely set low in the case of possible operons)

e; Remaining candidates were manually checked, those within operons of non-effector

genes, or with a *hrp*-box promoter within other CDS or > 400bp away from the start codon

were removed

**Table 4. Known NADase T3Es and predicted candidates in *P. syringae*.**

| Group | Ortho-group | No. genes | No. effectors | % Effectors | No. *hrp* promoter | % *hrp* promoter | No. genomes | No. T3SS+ genomes | % T3SS+ genomes | Notes | Secretion signal score (out of 3) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ART | OG4303 | 339 | 332 | 98 | 299 | 90 | 188 | 187 | 99 | HopF/BB | 2 |
| ART | OG5256 | 144 | 130 | 90 | 38 | 29 | 37 | 35 | 95 | **Novel** | **3** |
| ART | OG5397 | 133 | 91 | 68 | 54 | 59 | 46 | 46 | 100 | HopO1 | 3 |
| ART | OG5686 | 112 | 103 | 92 | 91 | 88 | 87 | 87 | 100 | AvrRpm | 3 |
| ART | OG6340 | 69 | 54 | 78 | 53 | 98 | 53 | 53 | 100 | HopS | 3 |
| ART | OG9885 | 14 | 14 | 100 | 10 | 71 | 10 | 10 | 100 | HopU1 | 3 |
| ART | OG18195 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | **Novel** | **3** |
| ART[a] | OG4463 | 297 | 223 | 75 | 213 | 96 | 213 | 213 | 100 | HopAG1 | 3 |
| NH | OG4871 | 195 | 124 | 64 | 121 | 98 | 118 | 117 | 99 | HopQ1 | 2 |
| NUDIX | OG4463 | 297 | 223 | 75 | 213 | 96 | 213 | 213 | 100 | HopAG1 | 3 |
| PDE | OG4578 | 258 | 214 | 83 | 102 | 48 | 101 | 100 | 99 | **Novel** | 2 |
| TIR | OG6638 | 55 | 49 | 89 | 45 | 92 | 38 | 37 | 97 | HopAM1 | 3 |
| TIR | OG8567 | 23 | 21 | 91 | 15 | 71 | 14 | 14 | 100 | **Novel** | 2 |
| TIR | OG18056 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | **Novel** | **3** |

No. genes: number of genes in orthogroup.

No. effectors: number of genes within orthogroup that were predicted to encode an effector.

% effectors: % orthogroup that may code effector.

No. *hrp* promoter: Number of predicted effector genes per orthogroup that had a predicted *hrp* box

% *hrp* promoter: % effector genes in orthogroup that had *hrp* promoter.

No. T3S+ genomes: Number of genomes encoding the genes in each orthogroup predicted as effectors with a *hrp* box which have the genes required for T3S machinery.

% genomes with T3S+: % of effector genes with a *hrp* box per orthogroup that were in T3S+ genomes.

Secretion signal score: A score from 0-3 based on three previously defined criteria of T3E secretion signals:1) a high % serines; 2) a lack of negative amino acids in the first 12 residues; 3) an aliphatic amino acid at position 3 or 4.

[a]Although the main hit of OG0004463 (HopAG1) was a NUDIX domain, a further domain with homology to ART was predicted at a different region of the protein.

**Table 5. Information on the nine putative interacting sites across the catalytic sites of TIR/ADPR cyclases with rationale behind mutational strategy.**

| No. *P.s* TIRs interacting | HopAM1 (C?) | SARM1 (Ac) | OG 18056 (?) | hCD38 (Ac) | aCD38 (aC) | Mutants | Outcome | Reasoning | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | F95* | Y568 | W149 | W125 | W77 | H, W | Slower cell death | Change to similar residue to modify activity | Ramakrishnan et al., (2010) changed corresponding residue in SpARC4 cyclase (CD38 homologue) from Y to either W or H and reduced cyclase activity |
| 15 | A97 | R570 | G151 | R127 | G79 | R | No cell death | Change to SARM1/CD38 residue to alter activity | Liu et al., (2009) showed this residue R127 is involved in CD38 binding NAD+ |
| 12 | F102 | S574 | M164 | K129 | Y81 | K | No cell death | Changed to K based on CD38 lack of cyclase and aCD38 having similar hydrophobic residue | Tohgo et al., (1997) reported K129 in CD38 important for cADPR hydrolysis rather than hydrolysis of NAD+. K129 may also be target of ADP-ribosylation to modify the active site Jiang et al. (2013) |
| 11 | W160 | F603 | W263 | W189 | W140 | H | Slower cell death | Change to non-hydrophobic related amino acid to alter binding | W at this position in CD38 is generally important for binding NAD+ (Liu et al. (2009),Wolters et al. (2019) |
| 15 | S185 | K628 | N291 | N217 | R170 | K | No cell death | Change to SARM1 residue K to see if alters activity | Summers et al. (2016) showed K628 in SARM1 is important for activity. |
| 15 | F187* | W638 | T300 | T221 | F174 | T, W | Slower cell death in T mutant | Change to similar residues as in CD38 papers | Graeff et al., (2009) found mutation from F to T reduced cyclase activity of the cyclase aCD38 without drastically changing hydrolase |
| 14 | E191 | E642 | E305 | E226 | E179 | A | None | Act as a control to show mutation expected | Identified catalytic site of TIRs (Essuman et al. (2017); Horsefield et al. (2019; Eastman et al. (2021) |

885
886  A: produces ADPR, C: produces cyclic-ADPR. Lower case is where the activity of lower than the other

887  activity (in uppercase). ? means products are unknown. * For two well studied residues in CD38 these

888  residues in HopAM1 were changed to two different amino acids based on previous work of specifically

889  altering activity.

     **Figure legends**

**Figure 1. Enzyme families that may hydrolyse NAD⁺.**

The NUDIX (nucleoside diphosphate linked to a variable moiety X) enzymes and

phosphodiesterases (PDEs) cleave the pyrophosphate bond. ADP-ribosyltransferases

(ART), nucleoside hydrolases (NH), ADPR cyclases, and sirtuins cleave the N-

glycosidic bond.

**Figure 2. Identification of NADases encoded in the *P. syringae* species**

**complex.**

A) Two approaches based on HMMER and HHsearch respectively were used to

predict all seven NAD hydrolyzing enzyme families from the pangenome of *P.*

*syringae*.

B) NADase genes predicted across the *P. syringae* species complex are mapped onto

the maximum-likelihood core genome phylogeny. Numbers of predicted genes from

each enzyme family is presented by heatmaps. The phylogeny was generated

based on 409 concatenated single copy core genes. The scale shows amino acid

substitutions per site. Strains in the primary phylogroups are coloured in red. Due

to similarity in enzymatic activity, NUDIX and pyrophosphatase were grouped

together, as well as TIR and ADPR cyclase.

C) Venn diagrams to show the number of primary phylogroup specific NADase

encoding orthogroups (left), orthogroups shared between primary and secondary

phylogroups (middle), and orthogroups specific to secondary phylogroups (right).

**Figure 3. Predicted NADases as type III effectors in *P. syringae*.**

A) NADase T3Es predicted across the *P. syringae* species complex are mapped onto

the maximum-likelihood core genome phylogeny. Strains in the primary

phylogroups are coloured in red. The presence of a canonical *hrp* T3SS is

presented as Ring 1 (in green) and the number of known T3E genes encoded in

each strain is presented in Ring 2 as a heatmap coloured in a scale of white to blue.

Ring 3-7 each represents one of the five NADase enzyme families. Known T3Es

with putative ART domains are in order: HopF/BB, HopO1, AvrRpm, HopS, HopU1,

HopAG1. Presence of each orthogroup is coloured as in the scale, with grey

squares indicating the orthogroup is present but with no *hrp* box in the promoter.

B) Mean number of NADase T3Es per phylogroup. The primary phylogroups are
labelled with roman numerals, whilst secondary phylogroups correspond to their
species number predicted by Average Nucleotide Identity in Supplemental Figure
S1. A collapsed version of the core genome phylogeny, with the primary phylogroup
clade in red is included for reference.
930

**Figure 4. OG18056 is a novel T3E with similarity to ADPR cyclases.**
A) Alignment of a structural model of OG18056 predicted by AlphaFold2 (in cyan) with
human CD38 (6VUA, in grey) and the TIR domain of human SARM1 (6O0R, 561-
700 aa, in light brown). Root-Mean-Square Deviation (RMSD) values and TM-
scores are presented using OG18056 as the reference. For visualisation purposes,
sequences outside the alignment region were removed and those that did not align
within the region are more transparent. The predicted catalytic Glu residues are
aligned in three structures and highlighted with a box.
B) Immunoblot showing the induction and secretion of OG18056 by *P. syringae*.
OG18056-HA was expressed in PstDC3000 or the T3S mutant Δ*hrcC* under its
native promoter. The bacteria were cultured in the rich medium Kings B (KB) or a
Hrp-inducing minimal medium (HM). Proteins were extracted from cell pellet (cp) or
supernatant (sn) and the protein levels of OG18056 were determined by western
blotting using an anti-HA antibody. Ponceau S (PS) staining was used as the
loading control.
C) OG18056 enhanced the virulence of the effectorless mutant PstDC3000 D36E on
*Arabidopsis thaliana*. Upper: disease symptom development by D36E carrying the
empty vector, OG18056 or OG18056(E305A). Numbers show the number of leaves
with symptoms recorded over three independent experiments. Leaves were
inoculated with 5 x $10^6$ CFU/ml inoculum and imaged 3 days later. Lower:
population count of the D36E transformants in *A. thaliana*. Boxplots show the day
0 and day 3 populations in Log CFU/cm$^2$. Individual data points with different colors
represent results from three separate experiments. Tukey-HSD significance groups
extracted from ANOVA are presented.
D) OG18056 and its mutant were expressed under its native promoter in PstDC3000
D36E. Immunoblot showing OG18056 and OG18056(E305A) expression when
bacteria were grown in Hrp-inducing minimal medium.

**Figure 5. Structural analysis revealed diversity in the active site of *P. syringae* TIR proteins.**

A) A bioinformatic pipeline used to generate 3D structure models of candidate NADases and predict NAD$^+$-binding sites and residues.

B) A dendrogram based on structural similarity of 42 TIR proteins and the one ADPR cyclase homologue (OG18056) predicted from *P. syringae* pangenome. The dendrogram was built by the phylip program fitch using a distance matrix based on RMSD values from pairwise structural alignments. The RMSD values were normalized by alignment length. The three predicted TIR/ADPR cyclase T3Es are highlighted in red. Mapped onto the dendrogram is information regarding the structural alignment for each protein with hSARM1-TIR. The RMSD with hSARM1 is shown with a blue heatmap. A black box indicates that the protein had a glutamate aligning to the catalytic residue E642 in hSARM1-TIR. The NAD$^+$ binding affinity of each protein is also presented.

C) Structually equivalent amino acids that aligned to hSARM1-TIR for each *P. syringae* TIR protein. The residues are ordered based on hSARM1-TIR positions and colour-coded by biochemical features. Nine positions that were frequently predicted to bind NAD$^+$ during *in silico* docking are highlighted (also see D), whilst other positions are greyed out. The catalytic Glu (E642 in hSARM1-TIR) is labelled with a star.

D) Nine positions were predicted to bind NAD$^+$ in more than ten *P. syringae* TIR proteins. These include residues corresponding the hSARM1 catalytic residue E642 (position 9), the nearby residues 628, 637 and 638 (positions 6-8), as well as residues 568, 570, 574, 594 and 603 (positions 1-5), which are further upstream.

E) Sequence logo generated for the nine positions that interacted with NAD$^+$ showing frequency of different amino acids in each position. Amino acids are colour-coded as in (C).

**Figure 6. Characterization of NAD$^+$-binding residues for cell death inducing activity of HopAM1.**

A) Predicted structural model of HopAM1 docked with NAD$^+$ with residues subjected to mutational analysis highlighted in green. The electrostatic image of the surface of HopAM1 active site is also presented with regions of positive, neutral and negative charge shown in blue, white and red respectively.

B) Cell death induced by HopAM1 and its mutants after transient expression in *N. benthamiana* by Agro-infiltration. Representative image of a *N. benthamiana* leaf five days post Agro-infiltration (DPI) is presented. The same leaf imaged under ultraviolet light is included to better visualize the cell death lesions. WT: wild-type; EV: empty vector.

C) Quantitative analysis of the cell death phenotype induced by various HopAM1 mutants. The appearance of cell death for each mutant was monitored at 3, 4, and 5 DPI, and scored as either no cell death (in green), weak cell death (limited, patchy appearance, in light brown) and strong cell death covering the whole inoculation site (dark brown). Statistical groupings of an ANOVA comparing cell death scores are shown above the graph. These results are from three independent experiments.

**References**

Aarhus, R., Graeff, R.M., Dickey, D.M., Walseth, T.F., and Lee, H.C. (1995). ADP-ribosyl cyclase and CD38 catalyze the synthesis of a calcium-mobilizing metabolite from NADP. J Biol Chem *270*, 30327-30333.

Adlung, N., Prochaska, H., Thieme, S., Banik, A., Bluher, D., John, P., Nagel, O., Schulze, S., Gantner, J., Delker, C*., et al.* (2016). Non-host Resistance Induced by the *Xanthomonas* Effector XopQ Is Widespread within the Genus *Nicotiana* and Functionally Depends on EDS1. Front Plant Sci *7*, 1796.

Akturk, A., Wasilko, D.J., Wu, X., Liu, Y., Zhang, Y., Qiu, J., Luo, Z.Q., Reiter, K.H., Brzovic, P.S., Klevit, R.E*., et al.* (2018). Mechanism of phosphoribosyl-ubiquitination mediated by a single *Legionella* effector. Nature *557*, 729-733.

Angeletti, C., Amici, A., Gilley, J., Loreto, A., Trapanotto, A.G., Antoniou, C., Merlini, E., Coleman, M.P., and Orsomando, G. (2022). SARM1 is a multi-functional NAD(P)ase with prominent base exchange activity, all regulated bymultiple physiologically relevant NAD metabolites. iScience *25*, 103812.

Aravind, L., Zhang, D., de Souza, R.F., Anand, S., and Iyer, L.M. (2015). The natural history of ADP-ribosyltransferases and the ADP-ribosylation system. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol *384*, 3-32.

Azevedo, M.F., Faucz, F.R., Bimpaki, E., Horvath, A., Levy, I., de Alexandre, R.B., Ahmad, F., Manganiello, V., and Stratakis, C.A. (2014). Clinical and molecular genetics of the phosphodiesterases (PDEs). Endocr Rev *35*, 195-233.

Basile, G., Taglialatela-Scafati, O., Damonte, G., Armirotti, A., Bruzzone, S., Guida, L., Franco, L., Usai, C., Fattorusso, E., De Flora, A*., et al.* (2005). ADP-ribosyl cyclases generate two unusual adenine homodinucleotides with cytotoxic activity on mammalian cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *102*, 14509-14514.

Bayless, A.M., and Nishimura, M.T. (2020). Enzymatic Functions for Toll/Interleukin-1 Receptor Domain Proteins in the Plant Immune System. Front Genet *11*, 539.

Burdett, H., Hu, X., Rank, M.X., Maruta, N., and Kobe, B. (2021). Self-association configures the NAD+-binding site of plant NLR TIR domains. BioRxiv.

Castresana, J. (2000). Selection of Conserved Blocks from Multiple Alignments for Their Use
in Phylogenetic Analysis. Mol Biol Evol *17*, 540–552.
Choi, K.H., Kumar, A., and Schweizer, H.P. (2006). A 10-min method for preparation of highly
electrocompetent *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* cells: application for DNA fragment transfer
between chromosomes and plasmid transformation. J Microbiol Methods *64*, 391-397.
Choi, S., Jayaraman, J., Segonzac, C., Park, H.J., Park, H., Han, S.W., and Sohn, K.H. (2017).
*Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *actinidiae* Type III Effectors Localized at Multiple Cellular
Compartments Activate or Suppress Innate Immune Responses in *Nicotiana benthamiana*.
Front Plant Sci *8*, 2157.
Corda, D., and Di Girolamo, M. (2003). Functional aspects of protein mono-ADP-ribosylation.
The EMBO Journal *22*, 1953–1958.
Coronas-Serna, J.M., Louche, A., Rodriguez-Escudero, M., Roussin, M., Imbert, P.R.C.,
Rodriguez-Escudero, I., Terradot, L., Molina, M., Gorvel, J.P., Cid, V.J.*, et al.* (2020). The TIR-
domain containing effectors BtpA and BtpB from *Brucella abortus* impact NAD metabolism.
PLoS Pathog *16*, e1007979.
de Mendiburu, F., and Yaseen, M. (2020). agricolae: Statistical Procedures for Agricultural
Research.R package version 1.4.0.
Dillon, M.M., Thakur, S., Almeida, R.N.D., Wang, P.W., Weir, B.S., and Guttman, D.S. (2019).
Recombination of ecologically and evolutionarily significant loci maintains genetic cohesion
in the *Pseudomonas syringae* species complex. Genome Biol *20*, 3.
Dong, S., Yin, W., Kong, G., Yang, X., Qutob, D., Chen, Q., Kale, S.D., Sui, Y., Zhang, Z., Dou,
D.*, et al.* (2011). *Phytophthora sojae* avirulence effector Avr3b is a secreted NADH and ADP-
ribose pyrophosphorylase that modulates plant immunity. PLoS Pathog *7*, e1002353.
Drabinska, J., Ziecina, M., Modzelan, M., Jagura-Burdzy, G., and Kraszewska, E. (2020).
Individual Nudix hydrolases affect diverse features of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.
MicrobiologyOpen *9*, e1052.
Drenichev, M.S., Bennett, M., Novikov, R.A., Mansfield, J., Smirnoff, N., Grant, M., and
Mikhailov, S.N. (2019). A role for 3'-O-beta-D-ribofuranosyladenosine in altering plant
immunity. Phytochemistry *157*, 128-134.
Duxbury, Z., Wang, S., MacKenzie, C.I., Tenthorey, J.L., Zhang, X., Huh, S.U., Hu, L., Hill, L.,
Ngou, P.M., Ding, P.*, et al.* (2020). Induced proximity of a TIR signaling domain on a plant-
mammalian NLR chimera activates defense in plants. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *117*, 18832-
18839.
Eastman, S., Smith, T., Zaydman, M.A., Kim, P., Martinez, S., Damaraju, N., DiAntonio, A.,
Milbrandt, J., Clemente, T.E., Alfano, J.R.*, et al.* (2022). A phytobacterial TIR domain effector
manipulates NAD(+) to promote virulence. New Phytol *233*, 890-904.
Eberhardt, J., Santos-Martins, D., Tillack, A.F., and Forli, S. (2021). AutoDock Vina 1.2.0: New
Docking Methods, Expanded Force Field, and Python Bindings. J Chem Inf Model *61*, 3891-
3898.
Eichinger, V., Nussbaumer, T., Platzer, A., Jehl, M.A., Arnold, R., and Rattei, T. (2016).
EffectiveDB--updates and novel features for a better annotation of bacterial secreted
proteins and Type III, IV, VI secretion systems. Nucleic Acids Res *44*, D669-674.
Emms, D.M., and Kelly, S. (2019). OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for
comparative genomics. Genome Biol *20*, 238.
Engler, C., Kandzia, R., and Marillonnet, S. (2008). A one pot, one step, precision cloning
method with high throughput capability. PLoS One *3*, e3647.

Essuman, K., Summers, D.W., Sasaki, Y., Mao, X., DiAntonio, A., and Milbrandt, J. (2017). The
SARM1 Toll/Interleukin-1 Receptor Domain Possesses Intrinsic NAD(+) Cleavage Activity that
Promotes Pathological Axonal Degeneration. Neuron *93*, 1334-1343 e1335.
Feinstein, W.P., and Brylinski, M. (2015). Calculating an optimal box size for ligand docking
and virtual screening against experimental and predicted binding pockets. J Cheminform *7*,
18.
Felsenstein, J. (2009). PHYLIP (phylogeny inference package) version 3.69. ( Seattle (WA):
Department of Genome Sciences, University of Washington).
Fu, Z.Q., Guo, M., Jeong, B.R., Tian, F., Elthon, T.E., Cerny, R.L., Staiger, D., and Alfano, J.R.
(2007). A type III effector ADP-ribosylates RNA-binding proteins and quells plant immunity.
Nature *447*, 284-288.
Fuchs, E.L., Brutinel, E.D., Klem, E.R., Fehr, A.R., Yahr, T.L., and Wolfgang, M.C. (2010). In
vitro and in vivo characterization of the *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* cyclic AMP (cAMP)
phosphodiesterase CpdA, required for cAMP homeostasis and virulence factor regulation. J
Bacteriol *192*, 2779-2790.
Gallego-Jara, J., Ortega, A., Lozano Terol, G., Sola Martinez, R.A., Canovas Diaz, M., and de
Diego Puente, T. (2021). Bacterial Sirtuins Overview: An Open Niche to Explore. Front
Microbiol *12*, 744416.
Garau, G., Muzzolini, L., Tornaghi, P., and Degano, M. (2010). Active site plasticity revealed
from the structure of the enterobacterial N-ribohydrolase RihA bound to a competitive
inhibitor. BMC Structural Biology *10*.
Gay, N., and Keith, F. (1991). *Drosophila* Toll and IL-1 receptor. Nature *351*, 355-256.
Ghosh, J., and Caparon, M.G. (2006). Specificity of *Streptococcus pyogenes* NAD(+)
glycohydrolase in cytolysin-mediated translocation. Mol Microbiol *62*, 1203-1214.
Gomila, M., Busquets, A., Mulet, M., Garcia-Valdes, E., and Lalucat, J. (2017). Clarification of
Taxonomic Status within the *Pseudomonas syringae* Species Group Based on a
Phylogenomic Analysis. Front Microbiol *8*, 2422.
Graeff, R., Liu, Q., Kriksunov, I.A., Kotaka, M., Oppenheimer, N., Hao, Q., and Lee, H.C.
(2009). Mechanism of cyclizing NAD to cyclic ADP-ribose by ADP-ribosyl cyclase and CD38. J
Biol Chem *284*, 27629-27636.
Grahnert, A., Grahnert, A., Klein, C., Schilling, E., Wehrhahn, J., and Hauschildt, S. (2011).
NAD+: A modulator of immune functions. Innate Immunity *17*, 212-233.
Grant, C.E., Bailey, T.L., and Noble, W.S. (2011). FIMO: scanning for occurrences of a given
motif. Bioinformatics *27*, 1017-1018.
Guangchuang, Y. (2020). Using ggtree to Visualize Data on Tree-Like Structures. Current
Protocols in Bioinformatics *69*, e96.
Gurevich, A., Saveliev, V., Vyahhi, N., and Tesler, G. (2013). QUAST: quality assessment tool
for genome assemblies. Bioinformatics *29*, 1072-1075.
Guttman, D.S., Vinatzer, B.A., Sarkar, S.F., Ranall, M.V., Kettler, G., and Greenberg, J.T.
(2002). A Functional Screen for the Type III (Hrp) Secretome of the Plant Pathogen
*Pseudomonas syringae*. Science *295*, 1722-1725.
Hann, D.R., Dominguez-Ferreras, A., Motyka, V., Dobrev, P.I., Schornack, S., Jehle, A., Felix,
G., Chinchilla, D., Rathjen, J.P., and Boller, T. (2014). The *Pseudomonas* type III effector
HopQ1 activates cytokinin signaling and interferes with plant innate immunity. New Phytol
*201*, 585-598.

Hofer, K., Li, S., Abele, F., Frindert, J., Schlotthauer, J., Grawenhoff, J., Du, J., Patel, D.J., and
Jaschke, A. (2016). Structure and function of the bacterial decapping enzyme NudC. Nat
Chem Biol *12*, 730-734.
Hogan, K.A., Chini, C.C.S., and Chini, E.N. (2019). The Multi-faceted Ecto-enzyme CD38: Roles
in Immunomodulation, Cancer, Aging, and Metabolic Diseases. Front Immunol *10*, 1187.
Horsefield, S., Burdett, H., Zhang, X., Manik, K.M., Shi, Y., Chen, J., Qi, T., Gilley, J., Lai, J.S.,
Rank, M.X.*, et al.* (2020). NAD + cleavage activity by animal and plant TIR domains in cell
death pathways. Science *365*, 793-799.
Huang, S., Jia, A., Song, W., Hessler, G., Meng, Y., Sun, Y., Xu, L., Laessle, H., Jirschitzka, J.,
Ma, S.*, et al.* (2022). Identification and receptor mechanism of TIR-catalyzed small molecules
in plant immunity. BioRxiv.
Irwin, J.J., Tang, K.G., Young, J., Dandarchuluun, C., Wong, B.R., Khurelbaatar, M., Moroz,
Y.S., Mayfield, J., and Sayle, R.A. (2020). ZINC20-A Free Ultralarge-Scale Chemical Database
for Ligand Discovery. J Chem Inf Model *60*, 6065-6073.
Jain, C., Rodriguez-R, L., Phillippy, A.M., Konstantinidis, K.T., and Aluru, S. (2018). High
throughput ANI analysis of 90K prokaryotic genomes reveals clear species boundaries. Nat
Commun *9*, 5114.
Jia, A., Huang, S., Song, W., Wang, J., Meng, Y., Sun, Y., Xu, L., Laessle, H., Jirschitzka, J., Hou,
J.*, et al.* (2022). TIR-catalyzed ADP-ribosylation reactions produce signaling molecules for
plant immunity. BioRxiv.
Jiang, H., Sherwood, R., Zhang, S., Zhu, X., Liu, Q., Graeff, R., Kriksunov, I.A., Lee, H.C., Hao,
Q., and Lin, H. (2013). Identification of ADP-ribosylation sites of CD38 mutants by precursor
ion scanning mass spectrometry. Anal Biochem *433*, 218-226.
Johanndrees, O., Baggs, E.L., Uhlmann, C., Locci, F., Läßle, H.L., Melkonian, K., Käufer, K.,
Dongus, J.A., Nakagami, H., Krasileva, K.V.*, et al.* (2021). Differential EDS1 requirement for
cell death activities of plant TIR-domain proteins. BioRxiv.
Jones, D.T. (1999). Protein secondary structure prediction based on position-specific scoring
matrices. Journal of Molecular Biology *292*, 195-202.
Kazmierczak, B.I., Lebron, M.B., and Murray, T.S. (2006). Analysis of FimX, a
phosphodiesterase that governs twitching motility in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Mol
Microbiol *60*, 1026-1043.
Kloosterman, A.M., Shelton, K.E., van Wezel, G.P., Medema, M.H., and Mitchell, D.A. (2020).
RRE-Finder: a Genome-Mining Tool for Class-Independent RiPP Discovery. mSystems *5*,
e00267-00220.
Kourelis, J., and van der Hoorn, R.A.L. (2018). Defended to the Nines: 25 Years of Resistance
Gene Cloning Identifies Nine Mechanisms for R Protein Function. Plant Cell *30*, 285-299.
Krivak, R., and Hoksza, D. (2018). P2Rank: machine learning based tool for rapid and
accurate prediction of ligand binding sites from protein structure. J Cheminform *10*, 39.
Laemmli, U.K. (1970). Cleavage of structural proteins during the assembly of the head of
bacteriophage T4. Nature *227*, 680-685.
Lapin, D., Bhandari, D.D., and Parker, J.E. (2020). Origins and Immunity Networking
Functions of EDS1 Family Proteins. Annu Rev Phytopathol *58*, 253-276.
Leavitt, A., Yirmiya, E., Amitai, G., Lu, A., Garb, J., Morehouse, B.R., Hobbs, S.J., Kranzusch,
P.J., and Sorek, R. (2022). Viruses inhibit TIR gcADPR signaling to overcome bacterial
defense. BioRxiv.
Lee, H.C., and Zhao, Y.J. (2019). Resolving the topological enigma in Ca(2+) signaling by cyclic
ADP-ribose and NAADP. J Biol Chem *294*, 19831-19843.

Lenth, R.V. (2022). emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R
package version 1.7.3.
Levy, A., Salas Gonzalez, I., Mittelviefhaus, M., Clingenpeel, S., Herrera Paredes, S., Miao, J.,
Wang, K., Devescovi, G., Stillman, K., Monteiro, F.*, et al.* (2018). Genomic features of
bacterial adaptation to plants. Nat Genet *50*, 138-150.
Li, W., Chiang, Y.H., and Coaker, G. (2013). The HopQ1 effector's nucleoside hydrolase-like
domain is required for bacterial virulence in arabidopsis and tomato, but not host
recognition in tobacco. PLoS One *8*, e59684.
Liu, Q., Kriksunov, I.A., Graeff, R., Lee, H.C., and Hao, Q. (2007). Structural basis for
formation and hydrolysis of the calcium messenger cyclic ADP-ribose by human CD38. J Biol
Chem *282*, 5853-5861.
Lo, T., Koulena, N., Seto, D., Guttman, D.S., and Desveaux, D. (2017). The HopF family of
*Pseudomonas syringae* type III secreted effectors. Mol Plant Pathol *18*, 457-468.
Ma, S., Lapin, D., Liu, L., Sun, Y., Song, W., Zhang, X., Logemann, E., Yu, D., Wang, J.,
Jirschitzka, J.*, et al.* (2020). NAD+ cleavage activity by animal and plant TIR domains in cell
death pathways. Science *370*.
Manik, M.K., Shi, Y., Li, S., Zaydman, M.A., Damaraju, N., Eastman, S., Smith, T.G., Gu, W.,
Masic, V., Mosaiab, T.*, et al.* (2022). Chemical structures of cyclic ADP ribose (cADPR)
isomers and the molecular basis of their production and signaling. BioRxiv.
Menetrey, J., Flatau, G., Boquet, P., Menez, A., and Stura, E.A. (2008). Structural basis for
the NAD-hydrolysis mechanism and the ARTT-loop plasticity of C3 exoenzymes. Protein Sci
*17*, 878-886.
Minh, B.Q., Schmidt, H.A., Chernomor, O., Schrempf, D., Woodhams, M.D., von Haeseler, A.,
and Lanfear, R. (2020). IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic
Inference in the Genomic Era. Mol Biol Evol *37*, 1530-1534.
Mirdita, M., Schütze, K., Moriwaki, Y., Heo, L., Ovchinnikov, S., and Steinegger, M. (2022).
ColabFold - Making protein folding accessible to all. BioRxiv.
Munshi, C., Aarhus, R., Graeff, R., Walseth, T.F., Levitt, D., and Lee, H.C. (2000). Identification
of the enzymatic active site of CD38 by site-directed mutagenesis. J Biol Chem *275*, 21566-
21571.
O'Boyle, N., Banck, M., James, C., Morley, C., Vandermeersch, T., and Hutchison, G. (2011).
Open Babel: An open chemical toolbox. Journal of Cheminformatics *3*.
Ofir, G., Herbst, E., Baroz, M., Cohen, D., Millman, A., Doron, S., Tal, N., Malheiro, D.B.A.,
Malitsky, S., Amitai, G.*, et al.* (2021). Antiviral activity of bacterial TIR domains via immune
signalling molecules. Nature *600*, 116-120.
Pandit, S.B., and Skolnick, J. (2008). Fr-TM-align: a new protein structural alignment method
based on fragment alignments and the TM-score. BMC Bioinformatics *9*, 531.
Paradis, E., and Schliep, K. (2019). ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and
evolutionary analyses in R. Bioinformatics *35*, 526-528.
Parks, D.H., Imelfort, M., Skennerton, C.T., Hugenholtz, P., and Tyson, G.W. (2015). CheckM:
assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and
metagenomes. Genome Res *25*, 1043-1055.
Pereira, J., and Alva, V. (2021). How do I get the most out of my protein sequence using
bioinformatics tools? Acta Crystallogr D Struct Biol *77*, 1116-1126.
Petersen, C., and Moller, L.B. (2001). The RihA, RihB, and RihC ribonucleoside hydrolases of
*Escherichia coli.* Substrate specificity, gene expression, and regulation. J Biol Chem *276*, 884-
894.

Petnicki-Ocwieja, T., Schneider, D.J., Tam, V.C., Chancey, S.T., Shan, L., Jamir, Y., Schechter,
L.M., Janes, M.D., Buell, C.R., Tang, X.*, et al.* (2002). Genomewide identification of proteins
secreted by the Hrp type III protein secretion system of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato*
DC3000. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *99*, 7652-7657.
R.Core.Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (Vienna,
Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing,).
Ramakrishnan, L., Muller-Steffner, H., Bosc, C., Vacquier, V.D., Schuber, F., Moutin, M.J.,
Dale, L., and Patel, S. (2010). A single residue in a novel ADP-ribosyl cyclase controls
production of the calcium-mobilizing messengers cyclic ADP-ribose and nicotinic acid
adenine dinucleotide phosphate. J Biol Chem *285*, 19900-19909.
Salentin, S., Schreiber, S., Haupt, V.J., Adasme, M.F., and Schroeder, M. (2015). PLIP: fully
automated protein-ligand interaction profiler. Nucleic Acids Res *43*, W443-447.
Sanders, B.D., Jackson, B., and Marmorstein, R. (2010). Structural basis for sirtuin function:
what we know and what we don't. Biochim Biophys Acta *1804*, 1604-1616.
Schliep, K.P. (2011). phangorn: phylogenetic analysis in R. Bioinformatics *27*, 592-593.
Schreiber, K.J., Chau-Ly, I.J., and Lewis, J.D. (2021). What the Wild Things Do: Mechanisms of
Plant Host Manipulation by Bacterial Type III-Secreted Effector Proteins. Microorganisms *9*.
Seemann, T. (2014). Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics *30*, 2068-
2069.
Shi, Y., Kerry, P.S., Nanson, J.D., Bosanac, T., Sasaki, Y., Krauss, R., Saikot, F.K., Adams, S.E.,
Mosaiab, T., Masic, V.*, et al.* (2022). Structural basis of SARM1 activation, substrate
recognition, and inhibition by small molecules. Mol Cell.
Soding, J., Biegert, A., and Lupas, A.N. (2005). The HHpred interactive server for protein
homology detection and structure prediction. Nucleic Acids Res *33*, W244-248.
Srouji, J.R., Xu, A., Park, A., Kirsch, J.F., and Brenner, S.E. (2017). The evolution of function
within the Nudix homology clan. Proteins *85*, 775-811.
Stivala, A., Wybrow, M., Wirth, A., Whisstock, J.C., and Stuckey, P.J. (2011). Automatic
generation of protein structure cartoons with Pro-origami. Bioinformatics *27*, 3315-3316.
Sun, Y., Li, P., Shen, D., Wei, Q., He, J., and Lu, Y. (2019). The *Ralstonia solanacearum*
effector RipN suppresses plant PAMP-triggered immunity, localizes to the endoplasmic
reticulum and nucleus, and alters the NADH/NAD(+) ratio in *Arabidopsis*. Mol Plant Pathol
*20*, 533-546.
Takamura-Enya, T., Watanabe, M., Totsuka, Y., Kanazawa, T., Matsushima-Hibiya, Y.,
Koyama, K., Sugimura, T., and Wakabayashi, K. (2001). Mono(ADP-ribosyl)ation of 2'-
deoxyguanosine residue in DNA by an apoptosis-inducing protein, pierisin-1, from cabbage
butterfly. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *98*, 12414-12419.
Thompson, J., Higgins, D., and Gibson, T. (1994). CLUSTAL W: improving the sensitivity of
progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position-specific gap
penalties and weight matrix choice. Nucleic Acids Res *22*, 4673-4680.
Tohgo, A., Munakata, H., Takasawa, S., Nata, K., Akiyama, T., Hayashi, N., and Okamoto, H.
(1997). Lysine 129 of CD38 (ADP-ribosyl cyclase/cyclic ADP-ribose hydrolase) participates in
the binding of ATP to inhibit the cyclic ADP-ribose hydrolase. J Biol Chem *272*, 3879-3882.
Toshchakov, V.Y., and Neuwald, A.F. (2020). A survey of TIR domain sequence and structure
divergence. Immunogenetics *72*, 181-203.
Turko, I.V., Francis, S.H., and Corbin, J.D. (1998). Potential roles of conserved amino acids in
the catalytic domain of the cGMP-binding cGMP-specific phosphodiesterase. J Biol Chem
*273*, 6460-6466.

Ve, T., Williams, S.J., and Kobe, B. (2015). Structure and function of Toll/interleukin-1
receptor/resistance protein (TIR) domains. Apoptosis *20*, 250-261.
Vinatzer, B.A., Jelenska, J., and Greenberg, J.T. (2005). Bioinformatics Correctly Identifies
Many Type III Secretion Substrates in the Plant Pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* and the
Biocontrol Isolate *P. fluorescens* SBW25. MPMI *18*, 877-888.
Wan, L., Essuman, K., Anderson, R.G., Sasaki, Y., Monteiro, F., Chung, E.H., Osborne
Nishimura, E., DiAntonio, A., Milbrandt, J., Dangl, J.L.*, et al.* (2019). TIR domains of plant
immune receptors are NAD(+)-cleaving enzymes that promote cell death. Science *365*, 799-
803.
Ward, J.L., Forcat, S., Beckmann, M., Bennett, M., Miller, S.J., Baker, J.M., Hawkins, N.D.,
Vermeer, C.P., Lu, C., Lin, W.*, et al.* (2010). The metabolic transition during disease following
infection of *Arabidopsis thaliana* by *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato*. Plant J *63*, 443-457.
Wei, H.L., Chakravarthy, S., Mathieu, J., Helmann, T.C., Stodghill, P., Swingle, B., Martin,
G.B., and Collmer, A. (2015). *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* DC3000 Type III Secretion
Effector Polymutants Reveal an Interplay between HopAD1 and AvrPtoB. Cell Host Microbe
*17*, 752-762.
Wickham, H. (2007). Reshaping Data with the reshape Package. Journal of Statistical
Software *21*, 1-20.
Wickham, H. (2016). ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis (New York: Springer-Verlag
).
Wolters, V., Rosche, A., Bauche, A., Kulow, F., Harneit, A., Fliegert, R., and Guse, A.H. (2019).
NAD binding by human CD38 analyzed by Trp189 fluorescence. Biochim Biophys Acta Mol
Cell Res *1866*, 1189-1196.
Xin, X.F., Kvitko, B., and He, S.Y. (2018). *Pseudomonas syringae:* what it takes to be a
pathogen. Nat Rev Microbiol *16*, 316-328.
Young, J.M. (2010). Taxonomy of *Pseudomonas syringae*. Journal of Plant Pathology *92*,
S1.5-S1.14.
Yu, D., Song, W., Tan, E.Y.J., Liu, L., Cao, Y., Jirschitzka, J., Li, E., Logemann, E., Xu, C., Huang,
S.*, et al.* (2022). TIR domains of plant immune receptors are 2',3'-cAMP/cGMP synthetases
mediating cell death. Cell.
Yuan, H., and Marmorstein, R. (2012). Structural basis for sirtuin activity and inhibition. J Biol
Chem *287*, 42428-42435.
Yuan, J., and He, S.Y. (1996). The *Pseudomonas syringae* Hrp Regulation and Secretion
System Controls the Production and Secretion of Multiple Extracellular Proteins. J Bacteriol
*178*, 6399-6402.
Zhou, H., Morgan, R.M., Guttman, S., and Ma, W. (2009). Allelic Variants of the
*Pseudomonas syringae* Type III Effector HopZ1 Are Differentially Recognized by Plant
Resistance Systems. MPMI *22*, 176-189.
1302