Bacillus subtilis remains translationally active after CRISPRi-mediated

replication initiation arrest

Vanessa Muñoz-Gutierrez[1,2], Fabián A. Cornejo[1], Katja Schmidt[1], Christian K. Frese[1],

Manuel Halte[3], Marc Erhardt[1,3], Alexander K.W. Elsholz[1], Kürşad Turgay[1,2*],

Emmanuelle Charpentier[1,4]

[1]Max Planck Unit for the Science of Pathogens, D-10117 Berlin, Germany

[2]Institute of Microbiology, Leibniz Universität Hannover, D-30419 Hannover,

Germany

[3]Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institute for Biology – Bacterial Physiology,

Philippstr. 13, D-10115 Berlin, Germany

[4]Institute for Biology, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, D-10115 Berlin, Germany

[*]Corresponding author

Keywords:

Bacillus subtilis, replication, *oriC*, DnaA boxes, CRISPRi

Correspondence:

Kürşad Turgay, E-mail: turgay@mpusp.mpg.de

Abstract

Initiation of bacterial DNA replication takes place at the origin of replication, a region characterized by the presence of multiple DnaA boxes that serve as the binding sites for the master initiator protein DnaA. The absence or failure of DNA replication can result in bacterial cell growth arrest or death. Here, we aimed to uncover the physiological and molecular consequences of stopping replication in the model bacterium *Bacillus subtilis*. For this purpose, DNA replication was blocked using a CRISPRi approach specifically targeting DnaA boxes 6 and 7, which are essential for replication initiation. We characterized the phenotype of these cells and analyzed the overall changes in the proteome using quantitative mass spectrometry. Cells with arrested replication were elongating and not dividing but showed no evidence of DNA damage response. Moreover, these cells did not cease translation over time. This study sets the ground for future research on non-replicating but translationally active *B. subtilis*, which might be a valuable tool for biotechnological applications.

Importance

Even though bacteria are constantly replicating under laboratory conditions, natural environments expose them to various stresses like lack of nutrients, high salinity, and pH changes, which can keep them in non-replicating states. Non-replicating states can allow bacteria to become less sensitive or tolerant to antibiotics (persisters), remain inactive in specific niches for an extended period (dormancy), and adapt to some hostile ecosystems. Non-replicating states have been studied due to the possibility of repurposing energy to produce additional metabolites or proteins. Using CRISPRi targeting bacterial replication initiation sequences, we successfully arrested the

replication of *B. subtilis*. We observed that non-replicating cells continued growing but

not dividing, and the initial arrest did not induce global stress conditions such as SOS

or stringent response. Notably, these cells continued their metabolic activity and

translation. This study provides comprehensive insights into the physiological

response of replication initiation blockage in *B. subtilis*.

Introduction

DNA replication aims to duplicate the genomes of dividing cells to contribute a new

identical DNA copy to each daughter cell. Replication is therefore connected to cell

growth, chromosome segregation, and cell division. In bacteria, replication initiates at

a specific part of the chromosome, the origin of replication (*oriC*). This region contains

several DNA sequences called DnaA boxes that serve as binding sites for the master

initiator protein DnaA. DnaA binds to several boxes at the *oriC*, causing the unwinding

of an AT-rich region within the *oriC* and facilitating the recruitment of the replication

machinery at both strands (1–4). The absence or failure of DNA replication can lead

to bacterial growth arrest or cell death. Although bacteria can rapidly divide and

replicate under laboratory conditions, most bacteria in their natural habitat encounter

multiple stresses, such as nutrient scarcity, that hinder the capacity to duplicate. One

example of the non-replicative states in bacteria is persister cells, which constitute a

small percentage of the bacterial population that stops growing and is, therefore, less

sensitive to antibiotics (5). Another example is the "oligotrophic growth state", in which

bacteria can survive for multiple days in pure water while maintaining basic metabolic

activities (6).

The physiology of non-growing bacteria has been studied due to its relevance in

industrial and clinical contexts (7). The main advantage of using these cells in industry

biotechnology is that the carbon and energy spent for biomass formation can be

redirected to produce compounds of interest (8, 9). Notably, metabolically active states

in non-growing bacteria have previously been reported, with some displaying

enhanced protein production (10–13). The methods to induce these non-replicating

states include, for example: **i)** the use of toxins from toxin-antitoxin systems to induce

a persister-like phenotype (14, 15), **ii)** exploiting repressible promoters to

downregulate the RNA polymerase (10), **iii)** the elimination of chromosomal content

with endonucleases such as I-CeuI (11), **iv)** the removal of the *oriC* with serine

integrases (16), **v)** mimicking nutrient depletion, the addition of growth inhibitors, and

the use of CRISPRi to knockdown genes related to growth or replication (8, 9, 17, 18).

In this study, we constructed a strain with a chromosomally integrated CRISPRi

system specifically targeting DnaA boxes 6 and 7, which have been previously

reported to be the most important to promote DNA unwinding during replication

initiation in *B. subtilis* (19). We characterized the phenotype upon CRISPRi induction

by evaluating cell morphology, membrane integrity, replication status, and SOS

response. The time-resolved quantitative proteome profile of this strain reveals a

significant change in the abundance of ribosomal proteins; however, SOS response

proteins are not significantly elevated. This indicates that these cells stop replicating

but continue growing and translating. Overall, our results shed light on the fundamental

role of replication initiation in *B. subtilis* and provide a foundation for subsequent

biotechnological studies of this bacterium as a producer strain.

Results

An inducible CRISPRi system to block replication initiation

A recent study showed that the DnaA boxes 6 and 7 on the *oriC* of *B. subtilis* are

crucial for DNA unwinding and replication initiation (19). Thus, we hypothesized that

initiation could be blocked by sterically hindering the binding of DnaA to these boxes

using a xylose-inducible dCas9 (18) (Fig. 1A). As a control, we also selected sgRNAs

targeting boxes 1 – 2 and 3 – 4 (sgRNA^{box1-2} and sgRNA^{box3-4}) (Fig. 1B). This system

allows the conditional expression of dCas9 when xylose is present in the medium but

also tight repression of it when glucose is present.

To assess the block of replication initiation, we evaluated the growth of cells in the

early logarithmic phase under induction or repression of dCas9. Cells carrying only the

dCas9 integration grew similarly in inducing and repressing conditions, meaning that

dCas9 expression alone does not alter the capacity of bacteria to proliferate (Fig. 1C).

Repressed cultures of the sgRNA^{box1-2} and sgRNA^{box3-4} had slight growth differences

compared to the control (Fig. 1C). Inducing dCas9 in the strain containing the

sgRNA^{box6-7} leads to a significant decrease in CFU/ml after 3 h. On the contrary, we

did not observe growth inhibition when the CRISPRi system targeted the other

adjacent boxes (Fig. 1C). This indicates that the observed effect results from a

competition between DnaA and dCas9 for binding to the DnaA boxes 6 and 7. This

specific block by the dCas9-sgRNA^{box6-7} complex could prevent DnaA-filament

formation and the subsequent associated replication-bubble opening that starts

replication. These observations also confirm the high specificity of DnaA binding to

certain boxes, specifically DnaA boxes 6 and 7, as an initial start of replication

initiation, as previously reported (19).

Figure 1: CRISPRi targeting the DnaA boxes 6-7 inhibit cell proliferation

(A) *B. subtilis* carrying a xylose-inducible dCas9 (orange) is directed to specific DNA targets by

constitutively expressed sgRNAs (green) under the P$_{veg}$ promoter control. The dCas9-sgRNA complex

blocks the binding of DnaA (yellow) to the DnaA boxes (triangles). *dcas9* was stably integrated into the

lacA locus, and the sgRNAs were integrated into the *amyE* locus. (B) DnaA boxes from *B. subtilis* and

the selected sgRNA targets (left side). Other elements of the *oriC* are represented: DnaA trios (green),

DnaD binding sites (fucsia) and the AT-rich region (yellow). (C) CRISPRi[box6-7] does not resume growth

when induced at the early exponential growth phase. Cell counts of cells under repression (glucose) or

induction (xylose) conditions. Data shown is the mean of 3 experiments and the error bars represent

the SD.

CRISPRi system inhibits the initiation of replication, leading to replisome

disassembly

To verify the effect of CRISPRi blocking replication initiation at single cell level, we

followed the replisome localization by generating a translational fluorescent reporter

gene fusion to the gene encoding the beta clamp of the polymerase protein, DnaN, at

its endogenous genomic locus. DnaN colocalizes with the replisome making it an

excellent reporter to evaluate the progression of DNA replication in the cell (20). The

GFP-DnaN fusion protein forms bright foci that assemble and disassemble inside the

cells, signaling the start and completion of DNA replication, respectively. Previous

studies have shown that no DnaN foci form in the absence of replication, while actively

replicating cells contain between zero to four DnaN foci (20, 21).

Dynamic localization of GFP-DnaN was evaluated under xylose conditions (Fig. 2A).

The wild-type (WT) strain displayed bright foci, indicating that the replication forks are

assembled, and the cells are actively replicating. Remarkably, in strain CRISPRi[box6-7],

foci diffusion is already observed after 2 hours of xylose induction, suggesting that

replication is no longer initiated in these cells.

A

B

Figure 2 Replication is inhibited in the CRISPRi strain.

(A) Epifluorescence microscopy of *B. subtilis* cells expressing GFP-DnaN undergoing CRISPRi

replication arrest. Strains were grown in LB + 1% glucose until OD600nm 0.1, washed and resuspended

in LB + xylose 1%. Cells were immediately subjected to microscopic analysis at 1, 2 , 3 and 5 h after

xylose addition. (B) Left panel: Explanation of replication states in bacteria. In nutrient-rich conditions,

chromosomes undergo multifork replication and have more than one *oriC* (red) per cell; therefore, their

ori to *ter* (blue) ratio is higher than in non-replicating conditions. Right panel: ori:ter ratios as determined

by RT-qPCR for WT and CRISPRi cells. Data points in (B) represent the means of three independent

replicates; error bars indicate standard deviations of the mean.

Another method to demonstrate that replication initiation has stopped is analyzing the

frequency of the origin and terminus region (ori-ter ratio). Cells that are actively

replicating have a ratio above 1, while cells containing only one copy of the

chromosome, like stationary phase cells or in a non-replicating state, are expected to

have a ratio closer to 1 (Fig. 2B). We determined the ori-ter ratios using qPCR (Fig.

2B). We observed that blocking the DnaA boxes 6 and 7 resulted in a decreased DNA

replication initiation rate after 3 hours of induction with an ori:ter ratio of 0.88 vs 2.89

for WT cells. This demonstrates that replication is blocked by the designed system.

These observations are consistent with the inhibition of DNA replication initiation and

were confirmed by the observed replisome disassembly with the GFP-DnaN reporter.

No evidence of DNA damage response under CRISPRi-mediated replication

arrest

Bacteria can sense and respond to DNA stress through the widely conserved SOS

response (reviewed in (22, 23)). The SOS response initiates when single-stranded

DNA accumulates following DNA damage or replication blocks. One of the possible

consequences of inducing replication arrest in a rich medium is the occurrence of

replication-transcription conflicts at stalled replication forks resulting in DNA damage

(24). In *B. subtilis*, the protein involved in inhibiting cell division during the SOS

response is YneA (25), whose expression is repressed by LexA, the transcriptional

repressor of the SOS regulon (26).

To test whether the replication-arrested cells were undergoing DNA damage response

(DDR), we added an ectopic integration of *gfp* under the control of the *yneA* promoter

in the CRISPRi and WT background strains. Since DNA damage leads to de-

repression of genes controlled by LexA such as *yneA* (27), we used GFP expression

as an indicator of SOS response. For this, the GFP fluorescence of the cells was

observed at various timepoints after xylose addition. As a positive control, we

performed the same experiment but exposed the cells to mitomycin C, a DNA-
damaging agent which creates interstrand cross-links, induces the SOS response and
results in cell elongation (25).

Both WT and CRISPRi strains showed no signs of DDR using the P_{yneA}-GFP reporter
compared to the mitomycin DDR response in WT cells (Fig. 3A). This observation
indicates that the SOS response was not induced during CRISPRi-mediated
replication arrest.

Figure 3. No evidence of DNA damage under replication arrest

(A) WT and CRISPRi strains containing the P_{yneA}-*gfp* ectopic integrations and grown LB with 1% xylose.

Images are from aliquots taken from cultures constantly growing at 37°C. Cells were subjected to

microscopic analysis at 1, 2 and 3 h after xylose addition. (B) An overview of the experimental setup to

collect the samples for MS analysis. WT and CRISPRi cells were harvested at different timepoints after

To explore the response of *B. subtilis* to CRISPRi-mediated replication arrest over

time, we analyzed the overall proteome for differences between CRISPRi and WT

samples using quantitative mass spectrometry (Fig. 2B).

We observed almost no difference in the protein abundance profiles between

replicating cells (WT) and non-replicating cells (CRISPRi) at timepoint 0 h and clear

changes in differentially expressed proteins over the course of the experiments (Fig.

S1). Additionally, we observed that the DNA repair and SOS response proteins of

CRISPRi vs. WT did not show clear differences except for the nuclease inhibitor DinB,

which is differentially more abundant under replication arrest (Fig. 3C). These two

observations add further evidence that there is no significant DNA damage response

in the replication-arrested cells.

CRISPRi-mediated replication arrest enhances protein expression

To obtain a global view of the change in cellular processes upon replication arrest, we

analyzed the enrichment of the Gene Ontology (GO) terms within these cells (Fig. 4A

and Fig. S2). Here, we observed that after 5 and 6 h of replication arrest, the ribosomal

proteins and other translation-related proteins were more abundant. Our analysis

indicated no enrichment of SigB-regulated general stress response proteins (Fig. S3).

Figure 4. Proteomic characterization shows translation-related proteins are more abundant in replication-arrested cells after 5 and 6 h of xylose induction

(A) GO enrichment analysis of differentially expressed genes in CRISPRi and WT strains. Proteins whose abundance was significantly changed were analyzed. The enriched terms after 5 and 6 h of

Enhanced translation upon replication arrest is a possible mechanism to

increase protein and metabolite production and has been studied in *E. coli* (8, 9, 28).

To observe whether the levels of translation-related proteins were increased upon

replication arrest in *B. subtilis*, we made individual profile plots of translation-related

proteins as a function of the z-score (Fig. 4B). We observed that the level of most

ribosomal proteins in the CRISPRi strain remains constant over time. In contrast,

protein levels in the WT cells decreased (Fig. 4B). Our interpretation of this result is

that as WT cells enter the stationary phase, CRISPRi cells appear to be in an extended

exponential phase from the moment the replication block with dCas9 happens.

Next, we wanted to assess if the ribosomal protein abundance was related to

an increased translation. Therefore, we generated an ectopic integration of *gfp* under

an IPTG inducible promoter (P*hyperspank*) in the WT and CRISPRi background strains

as a reporter for protein translation. We then measured GFP fluorescence in a time-

lapse experiment after xylose and IPTG addition (Fig 5A). We note that the

cytoplasmic GFP signal allowed us as well to observe the general morphology of the

cells. WT cells showed clear cell division and septum formation. In contrast, CRISPRi

cells showed an elongated phenotype without an apparent septum (Fig. 5A). We next

quantified the fluorescence intensity of individual cells from the timelapse microscopy

experiment. We found that after 3 hours of xylose addition, CRISPRi cells displayed a

significantly enhanced GFP intensity per cell compared to the WT. These results at

the proteomic and single-cell levels indicate that replication arrest affects the overall

translation process. However, the observed increase in GFP expression might also be

caused by its stabilization.

Figure 5. Chromosomal GFP expression is higher after replication arrest.

(A) Snapshots taken from a time-lapse microscopy experiment. An ectopic integration of *gfp* under an

IPTG inducible promoter was analyzed in the WT and CRISPRi background strains. Strains were grown

in the presence of both xylose and IPTG. CRISPRi cells showed an increase in fluorescence.

Representative pictures are shown. (B) Mean GFP intensity per cell upon xylose induction in WT and

CRISPRi cells. Two-tailed Welch tests were performed for CRISPRi against WT as a control group and

asterisk represent p-values. *: P ≤ 0.05, **: P ≤ 0.01, ***: P ≤ 0.001, ****:

CRISPRi-mediated replication arrest causes cell elongation

From the time-lapse experiment, we next quantified the cellular morphology after

inducing replication arrest. Overall, cells are larger during replication arrest in the

CRISPRi cells. These differences became significant already after 1 hour of xylose

induction and became even more significant after 2 hours of induction and throughout

the whole experiment (Fig. 6A).

To pinpoint specific proteins that can be enriched in the CRISPRi cells and explain the

elongated phenotype, we analyzed the protein abundance in our proteomic

experiment for other related processes like cell division, cell shape, and DNA

segregation (Fig. 6B). We observed that most proteins have similar cellular levels

compared to the WT. However, we found three related proteins: LytE, MreB, and

MreBH, to be differentially more abundant in CRISPRi (Fig. 6B). LytE is a cell wall

hydrolase involved in cell elongation and separation (29), whose activity requires

functional MreB and MreBH (30, 31). This observation suggested that uncontrolled

cell elongation might lead to cell lysis, which we observed after 7 hours of xylose

induction (Video S4).

Figure 6. Uncontrolled cell elongation under replication arrest.

(A) Quantitative analysis of cell length on time-lapse data (Fig. 5). Cell length increases upon addition

of xylose in CRISPRi cells. Data are represented as box plots with the mean cell length of all biological

repeats. n =3. Two-tailed Welch tests were performed for CRISPRi against WT as a control group and

asterisk represent p-values. *: P ≤ 0.05, **: P ≤ 0.01, ***: P ≤ 0.001, ****: P ≤ 0.0001. (B) Heatmap

Taken together, these results show that CRISPRi mediated replication initiation arrest

is specific for the DnaA boxes 6 and 7. Moreover, this system stop the process of cell

division, while continuing the processes of cell translation and elongation. Additionally,

replication arrested cells do not undergo global stress response regulation.

Discussion

In this work, we employed a rational design using CRISPRi to block replication

initiation in *B. subtilis*. This block hinders the capacity of DnaA to bind specific DnaA

boxes, thereby impeding replication initiation but not interfering with DnaA expression

and its function as a transcriptional regulator (32). We found that targeting DnaA boxes

6 and 7 was more efficient than targeting other DnaA boxes within the *oriC* (Fig. 1C).

This finding aligns with previous reports targeting DnaA boxes in *B. subtilis* (19). In

contrast, targeting any DnaA box within the *oriC* in *E. coli* produces a non-replicating

phenotype (17). Based on these observations, we confirm that specific DnaA boxes

within the *oriC* in *B. subtilis* have a specialized function to trigger replication initiation.

However, it remains elusive whether such functional hierarchy in the DnaA boxes in

B. subtilis is observed in other bacteria. We expect this to be the case given the

conserved *oriC* architecture in *B. subtilis* and its similarities with other bacteria (33). It

is also interesting to know to what extent the location of *oriC* in *E. coli*, which is 40 kb

away from the DnaA and DnaN genes, might affect the functional hierarchy of the

DnaA boxes (33).

CRISPRi-mediated replication arrested cells were characterized by employing

cell biological assays in combination with proteomics approaches. We found that

CRISPRi-mediated block at the DnaA boxes 6 and 7 leads to a shutdown of the critical

cell cycle processes of DNA replication (Fig. 2) and cell division (Fig. 5A) while growth

(Fig. 5A and Fig. 6A) and translation continue (Fig. 4A and Fig. 5B). The phenotype

observed under replication arrest, where cells stop dividing and form filaments is

characteristic of cells under the SOS response and is mediated by YneA (26).

However, profile plots of SOS-response-associated proteins indicate that this stress

response is not active (Fig. 3C). Moreover, the translational fusion of the *yneA*

promoter to GFP to detect the cellular SOS response did not show activity (Fig. 3A

and Fig. 3C).

Since the observed phenotype was not caused by the SOS-response, we think

this could indicate that the stop in cell division is SOS response independent. SOS-

independent inhibition of cell division has been reported in several microorganisms

(34–36). Likewise, DnaA binds specifically to the promoter regions of several genes,

including *ftsL* (32). FtsL is an unstable protein and is essential for cell division (34). A

decrease in *ftsL* mRNA levels quickly causes a decrease in FtsL protein and inhibits

cell division (25, 37). Future work can pinpoint at the specific response that halts

division by following the promoter activity or the expression of those genes in non-

replicating cells.

Proteomic analysis of the non-replicating cells revealed that proteins involved

in translation (rRNA-binding, ribosomal proteins, tRNA-binding and nucleoproteins)

are more abundant after 5 and 6 hour of xylose addition compared to WT (Fig. 4A).

Studies in several bacteria have suggested that protein synthesis continues during

growth arrest and that maintaining functional translation machinery may be required

for their viability (10–12, 38). Additionally, several studies in *E. coli* demonstrated enhanced protein and biochemical production of proteins and metabolites during replication arrest (8, 9, 28). We further confirmed that non-replicating cells maintained a higher rate of protein expression than WT cells (Fig. 5).

While the effect of protein expression is enhanced as described in other organisms, replication arrested *B. subtilis* cells started to lyse after 7 hours of induction (Video S1) probably because of the uncontrolled elongation of the cells. Cell elongation has been previously reported in some temperature-sensitive mutants for replications initiation in *B. subtilis* (39–41) and CRISPRi-mediated replication arrest in *E. coli* (17). However, these studies did not address if the uncontrolled elongation results in cell lysis. These elongation effects may be bypassed by making the process reversible before cell lysis (on/off switch of replication arrest) using temperature switches (42), degradation tags (17), light-activated and sensitive variants (42–44), or split variants (45).

For future biotech applications of these replication inhibiting CRISPRi cells as a microbial cell factory, it is important to effectively remove the need to add xylose in the media to induce dCas9 and eliminate the cell elongation constraints. To address the first, the expression of dCas9 can be driven by self-inducing promoters (46–48) that remove the dependence on chemical inducers, which are not economical at industrial scales. For the second, keeping control of the cell shape and membrane homeostasis may extend the lifespan of the bacteria and avoid anticipated cell lysis for industrial applications (24). One way to address this issue is to knockout elongation proteins that are being overexpressed such as LytE (Fig. 6B). However, deletion of cell wall hydrolases like LytE might not have an effect due to their redundancy, as single knockouts present no phenotype. In a multiple knockout approach of *B. subtilis*

cell wall hydrolases (42 in total), researchers were able to remove all but two of these

genes in a single strain, *lytE* and *cwlO,* which were shown to be synthetically lethal

(49). Their results indicate that the only essential function of cell wall hydrolases in *B.*

subtilis is to enable cell growth by expanding the wall and that LytE or CwlO alone is

sufficient for this function. Therefore, we suggest building a library to screen for targets

that inhibit cell replication and growth while allowing for continued protein production.

Similar approaches have been performed in *E. coli* (9).

The current system also has some limitations. For instance, comparing the non-

replicating CRISPRi with the replicating WT cells is challenging. Over time, replicating

cells increase cell density, so their nutrient availability is exhausted faster than non-

replicating cells. Hence, up- or downregulation of specific metabolic pathways in

replicating cells could also be caused by nutrient limitation and the entry into stationary

phase. These concerns about a better-suited comparison of the two different cellular

states can be addressed in future work by using either a chemostat or microfluidic

approaches that can maintain the cells in similar growth states.

Finally, this system could become a source for producing many toxins and

antibiotics that target the DNA replication machinery. In conclusion, our results show

a phenotypic and proteomic characterization of an unusual cellular state of a

replication-arrested strain generated by specifically targeting DnaA boxes 6 and 7 with

CRISPRi, which disintegrates the replisome and in the inhibition of critical cell cycle

processes like DNA replication and cell division, while protein translation and cell

elongation persists.

Materials and Methods

Strains and culture conditions

Bacterial strains and vectors used in this study are listed in **Tables S1 and S2**. *B. subtilis* and its derivative strains were routinely cultured in Luria-Bertani (LB Broth Miller, Becton Dickinson) medium containing: 10 g/L tryptone, 5 g/L yeast extract, 10 g/L NaCl (and 15 g/L agar for solid medium) with constant shaking of 180-200 rpm at 37°C. In addition, LB was supplemented with glucose (1%) or xylose (1%) when indicated. *E. coli* strains were grown at 37°C with constant shaking at 180 rpm in LB or LB agar supplemented with the appropriate antibiotics for selection on plates.

B. subtilis was grown at 37°C on a LB agar plate streaked from bacteria glycerol stocks stored at -80°C. Subsequently, cultures were grown from single colonies. When needed, antibiotics were added to the media at the following final concentrations: 10 µg/ml kanamycin (CorningTM) and 1 µg/ml erythromycin (Sigma-Aldrich); 15 µg/ml lyncomycin (CorningTM) and 150 µg/ml spectinomycin (Sigma-Aldrich) for *E. coli*. Xylose was added to a final concentration of 1% (w/w) to induce the conditional promoter (P_{xylA}). Glucose was used at a final concentration of 1% (w/v) and was used to repress the conditional inducible xylose inducible promoter (P_{xylA}).

Serial dilution plating viability assay

Overnight cultures were diluted to $OD_{600 nm}$ 0.01 in 20 ml LB with 1% glucose in 100 ml flasks and further incubated at 37°C, 180 rpm until $OD_{600 nm}$ 0.25 (+/- 0.025). To ensure cells are in early exponential phase, cultures were then back-diluted 1:10 in a total volume of 120 ml LB and 1% glucose in 1 L flasks, incubated at 37°C, 180 rpm until $OD_{600 nm}$ 0.1 (+/- 0.025). Cells were pelleted at 4000g, at room temperature

408   for 5 min and resuspended in LB supplemented with either 1% glucose or 1% xylose.

409   Cells were incubated at 37°C, 180 rpm and 100 µl samples were taken at 0, 1, 3 and

410   20 h and then 10-fold serially diluted in LB. 5 µl of each dilution was spotted onto LB

411   agar plates containing 1% (w/v) glucose to inhibit additional expression of dCas9 and

412   incubated overnight at 37°C. The number of CFU/ml was monitored.

414   Determination of origin-to-terminus ratio by qPCR

Cells in early logarithmic phase ($OD_{600\,nm}$ 0.1 ± 0.025) were pelleted at 4000 g,

at room temperature for 5 min, split in two and resuspended either in LB supplemented

with 1% glucose or 1% xylose and incubated at 37°C, 180 rpm. 15 ml samples were

taken at different time points (0, 3 and 20 hours), spun down at 11000 g, 4°C for 5 min

followed by a genomic DNA extraction with the Nucleospin DNA extraction Kit

(macherey-nagel) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

The primer pair targeting the origin region was OLEC11491 and OLEC11492,

and for the terminus was OLEC11493 and OLEC11494. qPCR reactions of 20 µl

contained 2.5 ng of DNA, 200 nM of each primer and 10 µl of 2X Power SYBR™ Green

PCR-Master-Mix (Applied Biosciences™), and amplifications were performed on a

QuantStudio™ 5 Real-Time PCR system (Applied Biosciences) according to the

following protocol: 95°C for 3 min, followed by 40 cycles of 95°C for 30 s, 60°C for 30

s and 72°C for 30 s. ori-ter ratios were analyzed using the 2ΔΔCt method(50). A fixed

sample of the WT strain grown into late stationary phase, where the population would

be expected to have an ori-ter ratio corresponding to 1, was used for normalization in

every cycling run.

Replisome localization by GFP-DnaN

Cell in early logarithmic phase were pelleted at 4000 g, at room temperature for 5 min and resuspended in LB supplemented with either 1% glucose or 1% xylose. Afterwards, they were incubated at 37°C, 180 rpm and 200 µl samples from timepoint 1, 2, 3 and 5 h were spun down at RT, 4000 g for 5 min. Cell pellets were washed twice with 1X PBS and resuspended in a final volume of 500 µl 1X PBS from which 1.5 µl were spotted onto 1.5% agarose pads and observed under the microscope using the GFP channel.

DNA damage response assay

The promoter of *yneA* was fused to *gfp* gene and integrated into the ectopic *amyE* locus (27). Strains in early logarithmic growth phase ($OD_{600\ nm}$ 0.1) were treated with 1% glucose to repress or 1% xylose to induce expression of dCas9 for 3 hours. Cells treated with 3 µg/ml mitomycin for 3 hours were used as positive controls. 1 ml of each culture was washed twice (4000 *g*, room temperature for 5 min) and suspended in 1X PBS (phosphate-buffered saline, NaCl 137 mM, KCl 27 mM, Na_2HPO4 10 mM, KH_2PO_4 1.8 mM, pH 7.4); 2 µl were placed on 1.5% agarose in TAE pads.

Fluorescence microscopy

452   Cell were grown to an $OD_{600\,nm}$ of ~0.4. One microliter of cells was spotted onto

453   1.5% agarose pads and imaged. Images were acquired with an Inverted Microscope

454   (Leica DMi8, DFC9000 GT VSC-D6212 camera), and a 100× phase contrast objective

455   (HC LP APO 100X/1.40 oil). Filter sets for GFP channel were used when indicated.

Time-lapse microscopy

After preparation of the culture, bacterial samples were added to an 1%

agarose pad in $S_{7\,50}$ media (51) supplemented with IPTG (1mM) and 1% xylose.

Fluorescence time-lapse microscopy was carried out using a Ti-2 Nikon inverted

microscope equipped with a CFI Plan Apochromat DM 60× Lambda oil Ph3/1.40

objective (Nikon) and camera Fusion FT (12bit sensitive scan mode standard,

Hamamatsu) in the absence of binning. A denoise module (Nikon) was used during

the acquisition of the images. Microscope settings were set to the following: GFP 488

nm 50ms 5%, Phase Contrast: 150ms DIA 12bit sensitive single plane, using a LED

Lamp Lumencor Spectra III light engine (Lumencor) and filter cube MXR00256 - LED-

DA/FI/TR/Cy5/Cy7-A (DAPI / FITC / TRITC / Cy5 / Cy7 - Full Multiband Penta)

(Semrock). Images were taken every 10 minutes in a pre-warmed chamber at 37°C

with Nikon Perfect Focus Systems (PFS4).

Image analysis was performed using Fiji (52) and ilastik (53) to segment the

cells, and MicrobeJ (54) to subsequently detect the cells and analyse the mean GFP

fluorescence intensities and cell length. For each strain, three positions on the agarose

pad were imaged and analysed.

Identification and quantification of proteins by mass spectrometry

Sample collection

Strains were grown in LB and 1% glucose. Once they reach early logarithmic phase cells pelleted at 4000 *g*, at room temperature for 5 min and resuspended in LB supplemented with 1% xylose. Cells were incubated at 37°C, 180 rpm and 20 ml samples were taken at different timepoints per treatment (0, 3, 4, 5 and 6 hours) followed by centrifugation at 11,000 *g*, 4°C for 5 min. Pellets were resuspended in 20 ml of ice-cold 1X PBS.

Cells were lysed with 500 µl 2x lysis buffer (final concentration: 2% SDS, 20 mM TCEP, 80 mM CAA (Chloroacetamide, Sigma-Aldrich), 100 mM HEPES pH 8 (VWR), 0.5x protease inhibitors (Roche) in tubes containing 25 mg 0.1mm silica beads (BeadBeater® Glass beads, 0.1 mm (Roth) and were disrupted using a FastPrep-24TM 5G Homogenizer (MP Biomedicals). Samples were spun down at 11000 g, 10 min to separate the soluble from the insoluble fraction. The supernatant was heated at 95°C for 5 min and then cooled down to room temperature. The protein concentration was determined using Pierce™ BCA Protein Assay Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific), followed by nucleic acid digestion with 0.5 Units of Benzonase per 1 µg of protein (Sigma-Aldrich) for 30 min at 37°C. Samples were kept at -20°C for further analyses.

Sample preparation

All samples were subjected to SP3 sample preparation(55) on an Agilent BRAVO liquid handling robot. Ten µg of a 1:1 mixture of hydrophilic and hydrophobic

carboxyl-coated paramagnetic beads (SeraMag, #24152105050250 and

#44152105050250, GE Healthcare) were added for each µg of protein. Protein binding

was induced by addition of acetonitrile to a final concentration of 50% (v/v). Samples

were incubated for 10 min at room temperature. The tubes were placed on a magnetic

rack, and beads were allowed to settle for 3 min. The supernatant was discarded, and

beads were rinsed three times with 200 µL of 80% ethanol without removing the tubes

from the rack. Beads were resuspended in digestion buffer containing 50 mM

triethylammonium bicarbonate and both Trypsin (Serva) and Lys-C (Wako) in a 1:50

enzyme to protein ratio. Protein digestion was carried out for 14 hours at 37°C in a

PCR cycler. Afterwards the supernatant was recovered dried down in a vacuum

concentrator.

Peptide labeling and fractionation

TMT 11plex (Pierce, #A37725) was used for peptide multiplexing and

quantification. Briefly, equal amounts of peptides were resuspended in 50 mM HEPES

pH 8.5. Additionally, 10% from each sample was pooled to create a common sample

as internal standard. TMT reagents were allowed to equilibrate to room temperature

for 30 minutes and were dissolved in anhydrous acetonitrile to a final concentration of

59 mM. To each sample TMT was added to a final concentration of 11.8 mM and tubes

were incubated at 25°C for 60 minutes with mixing at 500 rpm on a ThermoMixer.

Labeling was quenched by addition of hydroxylamine to a final concentration of 0.4%.

Samples were mixed, desalted using solid phase extraction (Seppak 1cc/50mg,

Waters), dried down in a vacuum concentrator and resuspended in 20 µL 2%

acetonitrile. Basic reversed phase fractionation was performed on a quaternary Agilent

1290 Infinity II UPLC system equipped with a Kinetex Evo-C18 column (150 x 2.1 mm,

2.6µm, 100 Å, Phenomenex) that was operated at 40°C. Solvent A consisted of HPLC

grade water, solvent B consisted of 100% acetonitrile, and solvent C consisted of 25

mM ammoniumbicarbonate in water. Fractionation was carried out at a constant flow

rate of 100 µl/min using a linear gradient from 2-25% acetonitrile within 50 minutes,

followed by column washing and equilibration. Over the whole gradient solvent C was

kept constant at 10%. In total 32 fractions were collected in conical 96well plates. The

organic solvent was removed in a vacuum concentrator for 30 minutes and fractions

were concatenated into 8 final samples. Peptides were acidified with formic acid,

desalted using OASIS HLB 96well cartridges (Waters, #186001828BA), dried down

and resuspended in 2% acetonitrile, 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) prior MS analysis.

Mass spectrometry

All samples were analyzed on a Orbitrap Exploris (Thermo Scientific) that was

coupled to a 3000 RSLC nano UPLC (Thermo Scientific). Samples were loaded on a

pepmap trap cartridge (300 µm i.d. x 5 mm, C18, Thermo) with 2% acetonitrile, 0.1%

TFA at a flow rate of 20 µL/min. Peptides were separated over a 50 cm analytical

column (Picofrit, 360 µm O.D., 75 µm I.D., 10 µm tip opening, non-coated, New

Objective) that was packed in-house with Poroshell 120 EC-C18, 2.7 µm (Agilent).

Solvent A consists of 0.1% formic acid in water. Elution was carried out at a constant

flow rate of 250 nL/min using a 180 minute method: 8-33% solvent B (0.1% formic acid

in 80% acetonitrile) within 120 minutes, 33-48% solvent B within 25 minutes, 48-98%

buffer B within 1 minute, followed by column washing and equilibration. Data

acquisition on the Orbitrap Exploris was carried out using a data-dependent method

in positive ion mode. MS survey scans were acquired from 375-1500 m/z in profile

mode at a resolution of 120,000. AGC target was set to 100% at a maximum injection

time of 50 ms. The ten most abundant peptides were isolated within a 0.4 m/z window

and subjected to HCD fragmentation at a normalized collision energy of 36%. The

MS2 AGC target was set to 200%, allowing a maximum injection time of 54 ms.

Product ions were detected in the Orbitrap at a resolution of 30,000. TurboTMT

acquisition as enabled. Precursors were dynamically excluded for 45 s.

Data analysis

Data analysis performed as described in Schäfer and collaborators (56). A two-tailed

t-test and *p*-value correction were performed using Perseus to identify differentially

expressed proteins (|log$_2$ fold change| ≥ 1; *p*-value ≤ 0.05). Enriched pathways,

biological processes and Uniprot keywords were calculated using DAVID (57, 58).

Proteins forming part of the ribosome or involved in cell length, shape, or cell

division used for profile plots and heat maps were retrieved from SubtiWiki (59). The

log2 protein intensities were scaled to standard deviation units (*z*-scores) using R for

profile plots.

The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the

ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE (60) partner repository.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge Prof. Heath Murray from the Newcastle University for strains and

valuable discussions. We thank Tim Sullivan for support with sgRNA off-target scoring.

The authors are grateful to the members of the Charpentier group for constructive

discussions and critical reading of the paper. This work was supported by the Max

Planck Society [to M.E. and E.C.], the Max Planck Foundation [E.C.], Deutsche

Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) [Leibniz-Prize to E.C.] and the Volkswagen Stiftung

[to A.K.W.E.].

Contributions

V.M.G, A.K.W.E., K.T., F.A.C., C.K.F. and E.C. designed the study; V.M., K.S., C.K.F

and M.H. performed the experiments; F.A.C., M.H., C.K.F. and V.M.G performed the

data analysis; V.M.G., F.A.C., M.H. and A.K.W.E. interpreted the data; A.K.W.E., K.T.,

M.E., and E.C. oversaw the project; V.M. wrote the paper. All the authors read, edited,

and approved the paper.

References

1. Mott ML, Berger JM. 2007. DNA replication initiation: mechanisms and regulation

in bacteria. Nat Rev Microbiol 5:343–354.

2. Katayama T, Ozaki S, Keyamura K, Fujimitsu K. 2010. Regulation of the

replication cycle: conserved and diverse regulatory systems for DnaA and oriC.

Nat Rev Microbiol 8:163–170.

3. Leonard AC, Grimwade JE. 2011. Regulation of DnaA assembly and activity:

taking directions from the genome. Annu Rev Microbiol 65:19–35.

4.   Richardson TT, Harran O, Murray H. 2016. The bacterial DnaA-trio replication

origin element specifies single-stranded DNA initiator binding. Nature 534:412–

416.

5.   Balaban NQ, Helaine S, Lewis K, Ackermann M, Aldridge B, Andersson DI,

Brynildsen MP, Bumann D, Camilli A, Collins JJ, Dehio C, Fortune S, Ghigo J-M,

Hardt W-D, Harms A, Heinemann M, Hung DT, Jenal U, Levin BR, Michiels J,

Storz G, Tan M-W, Tenson T, Van Melderen L, Zinkernagel A. 2019. Definitions

and guidelines for research on antibiotic persistence. Nat Rev Microbiol 17:441–

448.

6.   Gray DA, Dugar G, Gamba P, Strahl H, Jonker MJ, Hamoen LW. 2019. Extreme

slow growth as alternative strategy to survive deep starvation in bacteria. Nat

Commun 10:890.

7.   Lempp M, Lubrano P, Bange G, Link H. 2020. Metabolism of non-growing

bacteria. Biol Chem 401:1479–1485.

8.   Li S, Jendresen CB, Grünberger A, Ronda C, Jensen SI, Noack S, Nielsen AT.

2016. Enhanced protein and biochemical production using CRISPRi-based

growth switches. Metab Eng 38:274–284.

9.   Li S, Jendresen CB, Landberg J, Pedersen LE, Sonnenschein N, Jensen SI,

Nielsen AT. 2020. Genome-Wide CRISPRi-Based Identification of Targets for

Decoupling Growth from Production. ACS Synth Biol 9:1030–1040.

10.   Gefen O, Gabay C, Mumcuoglu M, Engel G, Balaban NQ. 2008. Single-cell

protein induction dynamics reveals a period of vulnerability to antibiotics in

persister bacteria. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 105:6145–6149.

11. Gefen O, Fridman O, Ronin I, Balaban NQ. 2014. Direct observation of single
stationary-phase bacteria reveals a surprisingly long period of constant protein
production activity. PNAS 111:556–561.

12. Manina G, Dhar N, McKinney JD. 2015. Stress and host immunity amplify
Mycobacterium tuberculosis phenotypic heterogeneity and induce nongrowing
metabolically active forms. Cell Host Microbe 17:32–46.

13. Yin L, Ma H, Nakayasu ES, Payne SH, Morris DR, Harwood CS. 2019. Bacterial
Longevity Requires Protein Synthesis and a Stringent Response. mBio 10.

14. Bokinsky G, Baidoo EEK, Akella S, Burd H, Weaver D, Alonso-Gutierrez J,
García-Martín H, Lee TS, Keasling JD. 2013. HipA-triggered growth arrest and β-
lactam tolerance in Escherichia coli are mediated by RelA-dependent ppGpp
synthesis. J Bacteriol 195:3173–3182.

15. Shomar H, Gontier S, van den Broek NJF, Tejeda Mora H, Noga MJ, Hagedoorn
P-L, Bokinsky G. 2018. Metabolic engineering of a carbapenem antibiotic
synthesis pathway in Escherichia coli. Nat Chem Biol 14:794–800.

16. Kasari M, Kasari V, Kärmas M, Jõers A. 2021. Decoupling growth and production
by removing the origin of replication from a bacterial chromosome. bioRxiv
2021.12.07.471534.

17. Wiktor J, Lesterlin C, Sherratt DJ, Dekker C. 2016. CRISPR-mediated control of
the bacterial initiation of replication. Nucleic Acids Res 44:3801–3810.

18. Peters JM, Colavin A, Shi H, Czarny TL, Larson MH, Wong S, Hawkins JS, Lu
CHS, Koo B-M, Marta E, Shiver AL, Whitehead EH, Weissman JS, Brown ED, Qi

LS, Huang KC, Gross CA. 2016. A Comprehensive, CRISPR-based Functional

Analysis of Essential Genes in Bacteria. Cell 165:1493–1506.

19. Richardson TT, Stevens D, Pelliciari S, Harran O, Sperlea T, Murray H. 2019.

Identification of a basal system for unwinding a bacterial chromosome origin.

EMBO J 38:e101649.

20. Goranov AI, Breier AM, Merrikh H, Grossman AD. 2009. YabA of Bacillus subtilis

controls DnaA-mediated replication initiation but not the transcriptional response

to replication stress. Mol Microbiol 74:454–466.

21. Soufo CD, Soufo HJD, Noirot-Gros M-F, Steindorf A, Noirot P, Graumann PL.

2008. Cell-cycle-dependent spatial sequestration of the DnaA replication initiator

protein in Bacillus subtilis. Dev Cell 15:935–941.

22. Friedberg EC. 2003. DNA damage and repair. Nature 421:436–440.

23. Janion C. 2008. Inducible SOS response system of DNA repair and mutagenesis

in Escherichia coli. Int J Biol Sci 4:338–344.

24. Merrikh H, Zhang Y, Grossman AD, Wang JD. 2012. Replication-transcription

conflicts in bacteria. Nat Rev Microbiol 10:449–458.

25. Kawai Y, Moriya S, Ogasawara N. 2003. Identification of a protein, YneA,

responsible for cell division suppression during the SOS response in Bacillus

subtilis. Mol Microbiol 47:1113–1122.

26. Au N, Kuester-Schoeck E, Mandava V, Bothwell LE, Canny SP, Chachu K,

Colavito SA, Fuller SN, Groban ES, Hensley LA, O'Brien TC, Shah A, Tierney JT,

Tomm LL, O'Gara TM, Goranov AI, Grossman AD, Lovett CM. 2005. Genetic

composition of the Bacillus subtilis SOS system. J Bacteriol 187:7655–7666.

27. Gozzi K, Ching C, Paruthiyil S, Zhao Y, Godoy-Carter V, Chai Y. 2017. Bacillus

subtilis utilizes the DNA damage response to manage multicellular development.

NPJ Biofilms Microbiomes 3:8.

28. Kasari M, Kasari V, Kärmas M, Jõers A. 2022. Decoupling Growth and Production

by Removing the Origin of Replication from a Bacterial Chromosome. ACS Synth

Biol https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.1c00618.

29. Ishikawa S, Hara Y, Ohnishi R, Sekiguchi J. 1998. Regulation of a new cell wall

hydrolase gene, cwlF, which affects cell separation in Bacillus subtilis. J Bacteriol

180:2549–2555.

30. Domínguez-Cuevas P, Porcelli I, Daniel RA, Errington J. 2013. Differentiated

roles for MreB-actin isologues and autolytic enzymes in Bacillus subtilis

morphogenesis. Mol Microbiol 89:1084–1098.

31. Carballido-López R, Formstone A, Li Y, Ehrlich SD, Noirot P, Errington J. 2006.

Actin homolog MreBH governs cell morphogenesis by localization of the cell wall

hydrolase LytE. Dev Cell 11:399–409.

32. Washington TA, Smith JL, Grossman AD. 2017. Genetic networks controlled by

the bacterial replication initiator and transcription factor DnaA in Bacillus subtilis.

Mol Microbiol 106:109–128.

33. Briggs GS, Smits WK, Soultanas P. 2012. Chromosomal replication initiation

machinery of low-G+C-content Firmicutes. J Bacteriol 194:5162–5170.

34.   Modell JW, Kambara TK, Perchuk BS, Laub MT. 2014. A DNA damage-induced,

SOS-independent checkpoint regulates cell division in Caulobacter crescentus.

PLoS Biol 12:e1001977.

35.   Bojer MS, Frees D, Ingmer H. 2020. SosA in Staphylococci: an addition to the

paradigm of membrane-localized, SOS-induced cell division inhibition in bacteria.

Curr Genet 66:495–499.

36.   Burby PE, Simmons LA. 2020. Regulation of Cell Division in Bacteria by

Monitoring Genome Integrity and DNA Replication Status. Journal of Bacteriology

202.

37.   Goranov AI, Katz L, Breier AM, Burge CB, Grossman AD. 2005. A transcriptional

response to replication status mediated by the conserved bacterial replication

protein DnaA. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 102:12932–12937.

38.   Stapels DAC, Hill PWS, Westermann AJ, Fisher RA, Thurston TL, Saliba A-E,

Blommestein I, Vogel J, Helaine S. 2018. Salmonella persisters undermine host

immune defenses during antibiotic treatment. Science 362:1156–1160.

39.   Karamata D, Gross JD. 1970. Isolation and genetic analysis of temperature-

sensitive mutants of B. subtilis defective in DNA synthesis. Mol Gen Genet

108:277–287.

40.   Rokop ME, Auchtung JM, Grossman AD. 2004. Control of DNA replication

initiation by recruitment of an essential initiation protein to the membrane of

Bacillus subtilis. Mol Microbiol 52:1757–1767.

41. Moriya S, Atlung T, Hansen FG, Yoshikawa H, Ogasawara N. 1992. Cloning of

an autonomously replicating sequence (ars) from the Bacillus subtilis

chromosome. Mol Microbiol 6:309–315.

42. Richter F, Fonfara I, Bouazza B, Schumacher CH, Bratovič M, Charpentier E,

Möglich A. 2016. Engineering of temperature- and light-switchable Cas9 variants.

Nucleic Acids Res 44:10003–10014.

43. Nihongaki Y, Kawano F, Nakajima T, Sato M. 2015. Photoactivatable CRISPR-

Cas9 for optogenetic genome editing. Nat Biotechnol 33:755–760.

44. Jain PK, Ramanan V, Schepers AG, Dalvie NS, Panda A, Fleming HE, Bhatia

SN. 2016. Development of Light-Activated CRISPR Using Guide RNAs with

Photocleavable Protectors. Angew Chem Int Ed Engl 55:12440–12444.

45. Richter F, Fonfara I, Gelfert R, Nack J, Charpentier E, Möglich A. 2017.

Switchable Cas9. Curr Opin Biotechnol 48:119–126.

46. Wenzel M, Müller A, Siemann-Herzberg M, Altenbuchner J. 2011. Self-inducible

Bacillus subtilis expression system for reliable and inexpensive protein production

by high-cell-density fermentation. Appl Environ Microbiol 77:6419–6425.

47. Guan C, Cui W, Cheng J, Zhou L, Guo J, Hu X, Xiao G, Zhou Z. 2015.

Construction and development of an auto-regulatory gene expression system in

Bacillus subtilis. Microb Cell Fact 14:150.

48. Tran DTM, Phan TTP, Doan TTN, Tran TL, Schumann W, Nguyen HD. 2020.

Integrative expression vectors with Pgrac promoters for inducer-free

overproduction of recombinant proteins in Bacillus subtilis. Biotechnol Rep (Amst)

28:e00540.

49. Wilson S, Garner E. 2021. An Exhaustive Multiple Knockout Approach to

Understanding Cell Wall Hydrolase Function in Bacillus subtilis. bioRxiv

2021.02.18.431929.

50. Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. 2001. Analysis of relative gene expression data using

real-time quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta Delta C(T)) Method. Methods

25:402–408.

51. Sauls JT, Cox SE, Do Q, Castillo V, Ghulam-Jelani Z, Jun S. 2019. Control of

Bacillus subtilis Replication Initiation during Physiological Transitions and

Perturbations. mBio 10.

52. Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, Kaynig V, Longair M, Pietzsch T,

Preibisch S, Rueden C, Saalfeld S, Schmid B, Tinevez J-Y, White DJ, Hartenstein

V, Eliceiri K, Tomancak P, Cardona A. 2012. Fiji: an open-source platform for

biological-image analysis. Nat Methods 9:676–682.

53. Berg S, Kutra D, Kroeger T, Straehle CN, Kausler BX, Haubold C, Schiegg M,

Ales J, Beier T, Rudy M, Eren K, Cervantes JI, Xu B, Beuttenmueller F, Wolny A,

Zhang C, Koethe U, Hamprecht FA, Kreshuk A. 2019. ilastik: interactive machine

learning for (bio)image analysis. Nat Methods 16:1226–1232.

54. Ducret A, Quardokus EM, Brun YV. 2016. MicrobeJ, a tool for high throughput

bacterial cell detection and quantitative analysis. Nat Microbiol 1:16077.

55. Engler C, Kandzia R, Marillonnet S. 2008. A one pot, one step, precision cloning
method with high throughput capability. PLoS One 3:e3647.

56. Schäfer H, Beckert B, Frese CK, Steinchen W, Nuss AM, Beckstette M, Hantke
I, Driller K, Sudzinová P, Krásný L, Kaever V, Dersch P, Bange G, Wilson DN,
Turgay K. 2020. The alarmones (p)ppGpp are part of the heat shock response of
Bacillus subtilis. PLoS Genet 16:e1008275.

57. Sherman BT, Hao M, Qiu J, Jiao X, Baseler MW, Lane HC, Imamichi T, Chang
W. 2022. DAVID: a web server for functional enrichment analysis and functional
annotation of gene lists (2021 update). Nucleic Acids Res gkac194.

58. Huang DW, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. 2009. Systematic and integrative analysis
of large gene lists using DAVID bioinformatics resources. Nat Protoc 4:44–57.

59. Pedreira T, Elfmann C, Stülke J. 2022. The current state of SubtiWiki, the
database for the model organism Bacillus subtilis. Nucleic Acids Res 50:D875–
D882.

60. Perez-Riverol Y, Csordas A, Bai J, Bernal-Llinares M, Hewapathirana S, Kundu
DJ, Inuganti A, Griss J, Mayer G, Eisenacher M, Pérez E, Uszkoreit J, Pfeuffer J,
Sachsenberg T, Yilmaz S, Tiwary S, Cox J, Audain E, Walzer M, Jarnuczak AF,
Ternent T, Brazma A, Vizcaíno JA. 2019. The PRIDE database and related tools
and resources in 2019: improving support for quantification data. Nucleic Acids
Res 47:D442–D450.