***Legionella pneumophila* inhibits type I interferon signaling to avoid cell-intrinsic host cell**

defense.

C.N.S. Allen[1,] D. A. Banks[1], M. Shuster[1], S. N. Vogel[2], T.J. O'Connor[3] and V. Briken[1]

[1] University of Maryland, Department of Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics

[2]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Maryland School of Medicine,

Baltimore, Maryland, USA

[3] Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Biological Chemistry

Corresponding author: vbriken@umd.edu

Abstract:

The host type I interferon (IFN) response protects against *Legionella pneumophila* infections.

Other bacterial pathogens inhibit type I IFN-mediated cell signaling; however, the interaction

between this signaling pathway and *L. pneumophila* has not been well described. Here, we

demonstrate that *L. pneumophila* inhibits the IFN-β signaling pathway but does not inhibit IFN-γ-

mediated cell signaling. The addition of IFN-β to *L. pneumophila*-infected macrophages limited

bacterial growth independently of NOS2 and reactive nitrogen species. The type IV secretion

system of *L. pneumophila* is required to inhibit IFN-β-mediated cell signaling. Finally, we show

that the inhibition of the IFN-β signaling pathway occurs downstream of STAT1 and STAT2

phosphorylation. In conclusion, our findings describe a novel host cell signaling pathway

inhibited by *L. pneumophila* via its type IV secretion system.

Introduction:

Legionella species are ubiquitous in the environment and have adapted to survive within freshwater amoebas (Rowbotham, 1980; Boamah et al., 2017). The bacteria rely on a type IV secretion system (T4SS) named defective in organelle trafficking and intracellular multiplication (Dot/Icm) to inject proteins into the host cell to manipulate host response pathways and increase their chances of survival (Berger and Isberg, 1993; Brand et al., 1994; Segal and Shuman, 1998; Vogel et al., 1998). Legionella can infect a wide variety of amoeba species and, therefore express multiple homologs of bacterial effectors to successfully modify the same host cell target in various hosts (Park et al., 2020). Humans are accidental hosts that can be exposed to Legionella via the aerosolization of contaminated water supplies, which may result in respiratory infections (McDade et al., 1977).

Type I interferons (IFNs), such as IFN-β, bind to the heterodimeric interferon-α/β receptor (IFNAR) and induce cell signaling, leading to the upregulation of hundreds of IFN-stimulated genes (ISGs) (Stetson and Medzhitov, 2006; Lazear et al., 2019). Type I IFNs are critical for host defense against viral pathogens (Stetson and Medzhitov, 2006; Lazear et al., 2019). However, during bacterial infections the activity of type I IFNs is more complex, in some cases mediating host resistance but in other cases increasing host susceptibility (Boxx and Cheng, 2016; Peignier and Parker, 2021). Legionella pneumophila induces IFN-β production by host cells via various cytosolic surveillance pathways, including the nucleic acid surveillance pathway (Liu and Shin, 2019). Type I IFNs then signal through IFNARs expressed on the cell surface of infected and bystander cells, contributing to L. pneumophila resistance, which has been observed in mice (Lippmann et al., 2011). Multiple studies have demonstrated that cell-intrinsic host defense mechanisms, including the production of nitric oxide (NO) (Plumlee et al., 2009) and itaconic acid (Naujoks et al., 2016), are triggered by exogenous IFN-β and subsequent IFNAR signaling during ex vivo L. pneumophila infections (Schiavoni et al., 2004;

Opitz et al., 2006; Plumlee et al., 2009; Majoros et al., 2016). Thus, the IFN-β response plays a

role in determining the outcome of *L. pneumophila* infections.

Here, we demonstrate that *L. pneumophila* can inhibit IFN-β-mediated cell signaling, and

this inhibition occurs downstream of the phosphorylation of STAT1 and STAT2. Additionally, we

show that the ability to reduce IFN-β signaling depends on the T4SS of *L. pneumophila* and is

thus likely mediated by a secreted effector(s).

Materials and Methods:

Cell culture and Mice

RAW 264.7 and RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells (InvivoGen, rawl-koirf3) were grown in

DMEM supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS). RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-

IRF3 cells were plated in FBS-free DMEM 16 hours before the infection since the absence of

FBS reduces the background activation of the integrated ISRE-Luciferase gene cassette.

THP-1 cells were purchased from ATCC and were maintained at 37°C and 5% CO_2 in

RPMI (ATCC) supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated FBS. For differentiation, THP-1 cells

were treated with 50 ng/ml of phorbol 12-myristate 13-acetate (PMA) for two days. The media

was then replaced and cells were cultured for two more days before infections.

Bone marrow-derived macrophages (BMDMs) were prepared from bone marrow cells

flushed from the tibias and femurs of wild-type, $Ifnb^{-/-}$, and $Nos2^{-/-}$ mice. The BMDMs were

cultured in Gibco Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) supplemented with 10% heat-

inactivated FBS, 1% penicillin/streptomycin, and 20% L929 conditioned medium for six days

prior to infection. L929 conditioned medium was used for all the BMDM infection experiments.

$Ifnb^{-/-}$ mice were originally obtained from Dr. E. Fish (University of Toronto) and have been

previously described (Deonarain et al., 2000). 57BL/6J (JAX SO: 5530121) and $Nos2^{-/-}$ (JAX

SO: 5530126) mice were obtained from the Jackson Laboratory. All mice used for BMDMs were

female.

Ethics statement

All animals were handled in accordance with the NIH guidelines for the housing and care

of laboratory animals. Studies were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use

Committee at the University of Maryland.

Bacteria

L. pneumophila Philadelphia-1 strain Lp02 was cultured at 37°C in liquid N-(2-

87Acetamido)-2-aminoethanesulfonic acid (ACES)-buffered yeast extract (AYE) medium or on

solid charcoal ACES-buffered yeast extract (CYET) containing 0.135 mg/ml L-cysteine (Sigma),

0.4 mg/ml iron(III) nitrate (Sigma), and 0.1 mg/ml thymidine (Sigma). The *L. pneumophila* Lp02

dotA deficient mutant ($\Delta dotA$) was previously described (Berger and Isberg, 1993).

Heat inactivation of *L. pneumophila and $\Delta dotA$ L. pneumophila* was achieved based on

a previous protocol (Allegra et al., 2011). Briefly, the bacteria were incubated in a water bath at

70°C for 30 minutes prior to the infections.

Cellular infections

95   *L. pneumophila* were grown in AYE medium to the post-exponential phase (OD_{600} = 3.7–

96   4.1). RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells, differentiated THP-1 cells, and BMDMs were infected with

97   *L. pneumophila* for one hour at the indicated multiplicity of infections (MOI). The cells were

98   washed three times with phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and incubated in DMEM media

99   supplemented with or without IFN-β for the given time.

IFN-β enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA)

The levels of secreted IFN-β were measured by an IFN-β enzyme-linked immunosorbent

assay (ELISA) (R&D Systems) following the manufacturer's protocol. RAW 264.7 cells were

infected with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 0.05 for one hour. After one hour, the media was

removed, the cells were rinsed three times with growth media, and fresh growth media was

added. The supernatants of the infected and uninfected cells were collected at 24-, 48-, 72-, and

96-hours post-infection (h.p.i). IFN-β levels were measured by a plate reader (BioTek ELx800).

Luciferase Reporter Assay

RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were infected with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10 for

one hour. After one hour, the cells were rinsed three times with media and then incubated in

fresh growth media. At the indicated concentrations, IFN-β (R&D Systems) or IFN-γ (R&D

Systems) was added to the post-infection media at 0 h.p.i. The supernatant from the infected

and uninfected cells was collected, and the amount of type I IFN signaling was indirectly

measured using QUANTI-Luc Gold, following the manufacturer's protocol.

qRT-PCR Assay

Total RNA was extracted using a GeneJet RNA Purification Kit (Thermo Scientific). A

NanoDrop 8000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific) was used to determine the purity and

concentration of the RNA. cDNA was synthesized from collected RNA using SuperScript IV

VILO cDNA Master Mix with ezDNase (Invitrogen). The following primers were used: BST2

(tetherin): (F) 5′-caaactcctgcaacctgaccgt -3′; (R) 5′-ctcctggttcagcttcgtgact-3′ and beta actin: (F)

5′-cattgctgacaggatgcagaagg-3′; (R) 5′-tgctggaaggtggacagtgagg-3′. All analyses were performed

using FastStart Universal SYBR Green (Roche) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

The relative mRNA quantitation was done using the comparative ΔΔCt method, and all results

are compared to the control group and loading control beta actin.

Cell Death AK Release Assay

A ToxiLight BioAssay Kit (Lonza) was used to determine cell death. This assay

measures the amount of adenylate kinase (AK) in the cellular supernatant released upon cell

membrane damage. The assay was performed following the manufacturer's protocol. Briefly, 20

μl of cellular supernatants from the infected and uninfected cell cultures were added to a 96-well

plate. Then, 100 μl of the AKDR solution from the kit was added to each well and incubated for

five minutes. The plate was then read using a microplate reader (BioTek).

Bacterial Survival

For bacterial survival assays, *L. pneumophila* used for infections was grown to the post-

exponential phase (OD_{600} = 3.8–4.0). Wild-type, *Nos2*$^{-/-}$, and *Ifna*$^{-/-}$ BMDMs were infected with *L.*

pneumophila at an MOI of 1 for one hour. After one hour, the cells were rinsed three times, and

the media was replaced with BMDM growth media. At the provided time points, saponin was

added to the cells to achieve a final concentration of 0.02% (w/v), and the cells were incubated

for ten minutes at 37°C. The medium was then harvested, and 100 µL of sterile water was

added to the wells. The water was then harvested and mixed with the original harvested media.

The bacteria were counted based on colony-forming units (CFUs) from plating diluted cellular

lysates on CYE medium agar plates.

Antibody neutralization

147   Antibody neutralization studies were performed using *InVivo*Plus anti-mouse IFNAR1

and *InVivo*MAB mouse IgG1 isotype control antibodies (Bio X Cell). Antibodies were added to

the infected cells at 0 h.p.i. at a final concentration of 20 µg/ml. The bacterial survival study was

performed using wild-type 57BL/6J BMDMs. Briefly, BMDMs were infected with *L. pneumophila*

at an MOI of 1 for one hour, then the cells were rinsed three times, and the media was replaced.

At the provided time points, saponin was added to the cells to achieve a final concentration of

0.02% (w/v), and the cells were incubated for ten minutes at 37°C. The medium was then

harvested, and 100 µL of sterile water was added, harvested, and mixed with the original

harvested media. The bacteria were counted based on colony-forming units (CFUs) from plating

diluted cellular lysates on CYE medium agar plates.

NO assay

159   The production of NO in response to IFN-β was quantified using a Griess assay kit

(Promega) following the manufacturer's protocol. Briefly, 50 µL of supernatant from the infected

cells with or without IFN-β at the indicated time points was added to wells in triplicate, mixed

with 50 µL of the Sulfanilamide solution, and incubated at room temperature for ten minutes.

Then, 50 µL of the NED solution was added and incubated at room temperature for ten minutes.

The production of nitrite, a derivative of NO, was measured at 548 nm using a microplate reader

(BioTek). The nitrite concentration was determined using a sodium nitrite standard curve.

Flow Cytometry

Differentiated THP-1 cells were infected with GFP-positive *L. pneumophila or L.*

pneumophila ΔdotA at an MOI of 10 for one hour. After infection, the media was removed, cells

were rinsed three times with fresh media, and fresh growth media was added and incubated for

30 minutes (STAT1 and STAT2) or 20 hours (tetherin). At collection, the medium was removed,

and Cellstripper (Corning) was added to detach the cells from the plate surface. The cells were

centrifuged at 425 x g for three minutes at 4°C. The supernatant was removed, and the cell

pellet was rinsed twice with 1 ml of PBS.

For live/dead staining, a LIVE/DEAD Yellow Fixable Dead Stain kit (Thermo Fisher

Scientific) was used for the anti-tetherin flow cytometry, and a LIVE/DEAD Near-IR Fixable

Dead Stain kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was used for the STAT1 and STAT2 flow cytometry

following the manufacturer's protocol. Briefly, the collected and rinsed cell pellets were

resuspended in 1 ml of PBS, and 1 µL of the fluorescent reactive dye from the kit was added to

each sample. The cells were then incubated in the dark for 30 minutes. The cells were then

centrifuged at 425 x g for three minutes at 4°C, rinsed with 1 ml of PBS, and centrifuged two

additional times. After the last centrifugation, the cell pellets were resuspended in the flow buffer

(PBS with 0.5 % BSA).

For the cell surface staining for the tetherin flow cytometry, the cell pellets were

resuspended in 50 µL of flow buffer. Human TruStain FcX (BioLegend) was added at a 1:10

dilution, and the cells were briefly vortexed. The cells were incubated for ten minutes. Next, 50

µL of the stain cocktail (1x Brillant Stain Buffer [BD Bioscience] and 5 µL per sample of APC

anti-human CD317 (BST2, Tetherin) antibody [BioLegend]) was added to each sample. The

samples were then incubated for one hour on ice in the dark. After the incubation, 1 ml of flow

buffer was added to the samples, centrifuged at 425 x g for three minutes at 4°C, rinsed with 1

ml of flow buffer, and centrifuged two more times. The cells were resuspended in 4% PFA

before running the samples.

For the intercellular staining for STAT1 and STAT2, the cell pellets were resuspended in

100 µL of 4% PFA for 15 minutes on ice. The cells were centrifuged at 425 x g for three minutes

at 4°C and rinsed with ice-cold PBS. For permeabilization, 1 ml of ice-cold 100% methanol was

added to the cells on ice. The cells were incubated for ten minutes on ice. The cells were then

centrifuged at 425 x g for three minutes at 4°C and rinsed with ice-cold PBS. The cell pellets

were resuspended in 50 µL of flow buffer. Human TruStain FcX (BioLegend) was added at a

1:10 dilution, and the cells were briefly vortexed. The cells were incubated for ten minutes. Next,

50 µL of the stain cocktail (1x Brillant Stain Buffer [BD Bioscience] and either 5 µL per sample of

Alexa Flour 647 Anti-Total Stat1 [N-Terminus] [BD Biosciences] and 5 µL per sample of PE anti-

STAT1 Phospho [Tyr701] [BioLegend]; or 2 µL per sample of Stat2 [D9J7L] Rabbit mAb [PE]

[Cell Signaling Technology] and 2 µL per sample of P-Stat2 [P-690] Rabbit mAb [Alexa 647]

[Cell Signaling Technology]) was added to each sample. The samples were then incubated for

one hour on ice in the dark. After the incubation, 1 ml of flow buffer was added to the samples,

centrifuged at 425 x g for three minutes at 4°C, rinsed with 1 ml of flow buffer, and centrifuged

two more times. The cells were then resuspended in 4% PFA prior to running the samples.

Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad 9.0. For all the experiments, the

data are shown as the mean ± standard deviation (*SD*) of three biological replicates unless

otherwise noted. Significance is indicated by a *p*-value less than or equal to 0.05.

Results:

To test how much IFN-β is produced during *L. pneumophila* infections, RAW 264.7 cells were infected with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 0.05 for one hour. After one hour of infection, the cells were rinsed, and fresh media was added. The amount of secreted IFN-β was measured at 24-hour intervals via ELISA. Each data point is obtained from the average of three technical replicates and represents an independent experiment. After 24 hours, 163.5 ± 55.2 pg/ml of IFN-β was detected, a ten-fold increase compared with the uninfected cells, and the IFN-β production stayed constant until 48 h.p.i. At 72 h.p.i., the level of IFN-β increased to 342.4 ± 103.9 pg/ml and continued to rise to 460.9 ± 109.5 pg/ml by 96 h.p.i. (Figure 1A). These results indicate that *L. pneumophila* induces IFN-β production in RAW 264.7 macrophages and that IFN-β accumulates over time after the infection.

Since it has been previously reported that *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* and *Shigella sonnei* inhibit IFNAR signaling in infected cells (Banks et al., 2019a; Alphonse et al., 2022), we wanted to determine if *L. pneumophila* also inhibits type I interferon signaling. RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were used for these studies since they are deficient in *Irf3* and consequently infections with *L. pneumophilia* will not induce the production of endogenous IFN-β. Hence, the only IFN-β-mediated cell signaling detected by the IFN-β-inducible reporter gene is that of the IFN-β added exogenously to the cells. Cells infected or not with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10 were cultured with increasing amounts of IFN-β (200–2000 pg/ml) for 20 hours to measure the effect *L. pneumophila* has on IFN-β-mediated cell signaling. The secretion of luciferase into the supernatant correlates with the activity of the IFN-β responsive promotor. The secreted luciferase was measured via a chemiluminescence assay and results are expressed in relative light units (RLU). Cells infected with *L. pneumophila* had lower levels of IFN-β-associated gene expression at all the doses of IFN-β tested when compared to the uninfected, untreated cells (Figure 1B). At the lower doses of IFN-β (200 and 400 pg/ml) a fold change of 0.25 relative to the uninfected cells was measured which changed to 0.8 at the highest IFN-β dose of 2000

pg/ml (Figure 1C). The IFN-β signaling pathway inhibition was reduced in a dose-dependent

manner, suggesting that as the IFN-β concentration increases, the ability of *L. pneumophila* to

impede the signaling pathway is overwhelmed.

The IFN-β and IFN-γ signal transduction pathways share some of their intracellular

signaling components, and thus, we asked if *L. pneumophila* can also inhibit IFN-γ signaling.

The RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 reporter construct is also induced by IFN-γ signaling and could

thus serve as a model to study the potential of *L. pneumophila* to inhibit IFN-γ signaling.

Increasing amounts of IFN-γ (200–2000 pg/ml) were added to *L. pneumophila*-infected or

uninfected cells (MOI of 10), and the luciferase production was analyzed (Figures 1D and E).

Overall, there was no reduction in the IFN-γ response in the infected cells; however, at IFN-γ

doses of 1000 and 2000 pg/ml, there was a significant increase in transcription response in the

L. pneumophila-infected cells compared with the uninfected cells (Figures 1D and E). These

results indicate that *L. pneumophila* partially inhibits IFN-β signaling while not affecting IFN-γ

signaling.

L. pneumophilia can reduce host protein synthesis via the secretion of multiple effectors

(Belyi et al., 2006; Shen et al., 2009; Fontana et al., 2011; Moss et al., 2019). To determine if

the decrease in the IFN-β signaling in *L. pneumophila*-infected RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells

was due to decreased global protein production, a q-RT-PCR for the mRNA of the IFN-β-

inducible gene tetherin (BST-2) was performed. In RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells infected or

not with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10, treated or not with IFN-β and cells were harvested for

mRNA extraction at 4 hours post infection. The level of tetherin mRNA in the infected cells, not

treated with IFN-β was three-fold higher than in the uninfected RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 not

treated with IFN-β. The induction of tetherin mRNA in the infected RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3

cells treated with IFN-β (1000 pg/ml) was significantly less than the induction of tetherin mRNA

in the uninfected RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 treated with IFN-β (Figure 2A). This result suggests

that the decrease in IFN-β signaling pathway is due to an inhibition of an event upstream of

transcription initiation. It also shows that the observed inhibition in the generation of luciferase in

the reporter cells is not due to an inhibition of overall protein synthesis due to *L. pneumophila*

infections.

An AK release assay was performed to test if the decrease in the IFN-β-mediated

luciferase production was due to a decrease in the total number of reporter cells due to

increased cell death. After 20 h.p.i, compared with the uninfected, non-IFN-β treated RAW-Lucia

ISG-KO-IRF3 cells, there was no significant increase in cell death in the *L. pneumophila*-

infected (MOI of 10) IFN-β treated cells (Figure 2B). This result suggests that the decrease in

luciferase in the *L. pneumophila*-infected RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells was not from

decreased cell counts via increased cell death.

IFN-β has been shown to contribute to the clearance of *L. pneumophila* in mice

(Lippmann et al., 2011) and in *ex vivo* infected BMDMs (Schiavoni et al., 2004; Plumlee et al.,

2009; Lippmann et al., 2011). *Ifnb*^{-/-}-derived BMDMs were infected with *L. pneumophila* and

treated with IFN-β to determine the effects of IFN-β on bacterial survival within macrophages.

We used *Ifnb*^{-/-}-derived BMDMs to observe the effects of exogenous IFN-β without the

production of endogenous IFN-β in response to the *L. pneumophila* infection (Plumlee et al.,

2009; Lippmann et al., 2011). Infected cells were treated with or without an IFNAR1-neutralizing

antibody or an isotype antibody to demonstrate the specificity of the IFN-β treatment due to

IFNAR signaling. The *Ifnb*^{-/-}-derived BMDMs were infected with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 1,

and then 20 µg/ml of the IFNAR1-neutralizing or isotype control antibodies were added. The

IFN-β treated groups were then treated with 1000 pg/ml IFN-β. The addition of IFN-β to the *Ifnb*[-

/-]-derived BMDMs did not affect the growth of the bacteria for the first two time points (24 and 48

h.p.i.) but at 72 and 96 h.p.i. there was a significant reduction in the CFUs in the isotype IFN-β-

treated cells compared with the untreated isotype cells (Figure 3A). However, blocking the

IFNAR receptor by the IFNAR1-neutralizing antibodies inhibited the IFN-β-mediated reduction in

the CFUs (Figure 3A). These results indicate that IFN-β plays a role in the growth inhibition of *L.*

pneumophila in macrophages and that this inhibition is dependent on signaling through the

IFNAR1 receptor.

Next, we investigated the role of NO production on host protection during IFN-β

treatment. The NO production was analyzed using a Griess assay, which detects nitrite as a

proxy for the induced production of NO. *L. pneumophila*-infected (MOI of 10) RAW-Lucia ISG-

KO-IRF3 cells had a slight increase in nitrite levels in the IFN-β-treated cells (1000 pg/ml)

compared with untreated cells at 24 h.p.i. (Figure 3B). After 48 hours, the IFN-β treatment

increased the nitrite level to about 18 μM; however, the nitrite level in the untreated cells was

about 5 μM. The IFN-β treatment led to nitrite production of about 25 μM at 96 hours, whereas

the level in the untreated cells remained low and was around 8 μM (Figure 3B). These results

show that IFN-β signaling induced NO production in the RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells and that

the production of NO is reduced in cells infected with *L. pneumophila*.

To determine if the reduced NO production influenced the clearance of *L. pneumophila,*

wild-type and *Nos2$^{-/-}$* BMDMs were infected with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 1 and treated with

or without IFN-β (1000 pg/ml). The *Nos2$^{-/-}$* BMDMs not treated with IFN-β had the greatest

amount of bacterial growth. The wild-type IFN-β untreated BMDMs had significantly reduced

bacterial growth over all the measured time points compared with the *Nos2$^{-/-}$* untreated BMDMs

(Figure 3C). This result suggests that Nos2 provides some protection against *L. pneumophila* in

an IFN-β independent pathway. The *Nos2$^{-/-}$* and wild-type BMDMs treated with IFN-β had

significantly decreased bacterial survival compared with the BMDMs not treated with IFN-β;

however, there was no significant difference between the *Nos2$^{-/-}$* BMDMs and the wild-type

BMDMs treated with IFN-β (Figure 3C). This lack of significance in bacterial survival between

the *Nos2$^{-/-}$* BMDMs and the wild-type BMDMs treated with IFN-β suggests that the growth

inhibition of *L. pneumophila* observed with IFN-β is Nos2 independent.

To further test the role of reactive nitrogen species (RNS) in the clearance of *L.*

pneumophila in response to IFN-β, the iNOS inhibitor L-NMMA was used. First, it was

determined that L-NMMA had a dose-dependent effect on the nitrite production of wild-type

BMDMs treated with IFN-β (1000 pg/ml) after 20 hours. At the highest dose of L-NMMA (12

μM), the nitrite production was approximately 15% of the nitrite produced by the untreated cells

(Supplementary Figure 1A). L-NMMA (12 µM) was also determined to have no effect on *L.*

pneumophila cell growth rate (Supplementary Figure 1B). Wild-type BMDMs were infected with

L. pneumophila at an MOI of 1 and treated with or without IFN-β (1000 pg/ml) and with a solvent

control (DMSO) or 12 μM of L-NMMA to observe the effect that NO production has on the

survival of *L. pneumophila* (Figure 3D). The L-NMMA treated and IFN-β untreated BMDMs and

the untreated BMDMS had similar bacterial growth at all the tested time points. However, the L-

NMMA and IFN-β treated, and the only IFN-β treated BMDMs, had significantly decreased

bacterial survival compared with the BMDMs not treated with IFN-β (Figure 3D). This decreased

bacterial survival was similar for the L-NMMA and IFN-β treated and the only IFN-β treated

BMDMs. This result further suggests that the clearance of *L. pneumophila* observed with IFN-β

is independent of RNS.

L. pneumophila T4SS Dot/Icm is a critical virulence factor that deploys effector proteins

to the host cell to manipulate host cellular processes (Berger and Isberg, 1993; Brand et al.,

1994; Segal and Shuman, 1998; Vogel et al., 1998). One mechanism by which *L. pneumophila*

might inhibit IFN-β signaling is through the activity of a secreted effector. To test this, an *L.*

pneumophila dotA deficient mutant (∆*dotA*) was used to explore the importance of the Dot/Icm

system and, thus, the possibility that an effector is involved in inhibiting the IFN-β signaling

pathway. RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were infected with wild-type *L. pneumophila* or the

∆*dotA* mutant *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10 and were treated with 0, 600, 1000, or 2000

pg/ml of IFN-β for 20 hours (Figure 4A). The IFN-β-mediated signaling was reduced in the cells

infected with the wild-type bacteria to approximately 60% of uninfected, IFN-β-treated cells, for

all the tested IFN-β concentrations (Figure 4A). In contrast, the ∆dotA mutant did not reduce the

IFN-β-mediated signaling as much as the wild-type *L. pneumophila* (Figure 4A). In addition to

the wild-type and ∆dotA mutant, RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were infected with heat-

inactivated wild-type or ∆dotA mutant bacteria at an MOI of 10 to explore if the inhibition of the

IFN-β signaling pathway requires live bacteria or if the inhibition is a result of pre-existing heat

resistant bacterial lipids. The two heat-inactivated bacterial strains did not inhibit IFN-β signaling

compared with the uninfected Raw-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells (Figure 4A). Overall, these results

suggest that the inhibition of the IFN-β pathway results from the activity of an effector secreted

through the Dot/Icm T4SS.

Next, the role of the T4SS on the capacity of infected cells to produce NO upon IFN-β

stimulation was analyzed. Uninfected RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells treated with 100 ng/ml

LPS and 1000 pg/ml IFN-β were used as a positive control. RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were

infected with either wild-type *L. pneumophila* or ∆dotA mutant *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10

and treated with IFN-β (1000 pg/ml). The wild-type *L. pneumophila*-infected cells had

significantly less NO production than the ∆dotA mutant-infected cells or the positive control cells

(Figure 4B). The level of NO produced was not significantly different between the ∆dotA mutant

L. pneumophila-infected cells and the positive control. Overall, these results demonstrate that

the Dot/Icm T4SS is necessary for the bacteria to inhibit IFN-β-mediated cell signaling and

suggest that one or more *L. pneumophila* effectors secreted into the host cell are responsible for

inhibiting the IFN-β signaling pathway in murine cells.

To explore if the IFN-β signaling inhibition caused by *L. pneumophila* seen in the murine

cells also occurs in human cells, the human monocyte cell line THP-1 was used. THP-1 cells

were differentiated into macrophages using PMA for 48 hours and then cultured in media

without PMA for 48 hours, before infection with bacteria. The effects of *L. pneumophila* on the

IFN-β signaling pathway were observed by flow cytometry measuring the cell surface tetherin

levels. For these experiments, GFP wild-type and GFP Δ*dotA* mutant *L. pneumophila* were

used, which allowed us to specifically study *L. pneumophila*-infected THP-1 cells. The gating

strategy for the flow cytometry analysis was first to define the cell population (SSC/FSC), then

gate on single-cells, live cells, and finally the GFP-positive, infected cells (Supplementary Figure

2). The tetherin antibody showed an increase in mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) when

compared with the isotype control (Supplementary Figure 3A), and the GFP signal did not

influence the APC tetherin antibody signal (Supplementary Figure 3B). Differentiated THP-1

cells were infected with wild-type or Δ*dotA* mutant *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10. Then, the

infected and uninfected cells were left untreated or treated with IFN-β (10 ng/ml). After 20 hours,

the uninfected cells treated with IFN-β had roughly a three-fold increase in tetherin-staining MFI

compared with the uninfected, untreated cells (Figure 5A). The wild-type *L. pneumophila*-

infected, IFN-β treated cells had less of an induction of tetherin staining (1.5-fold over

uninfected, untreated) compared to the three-fold induction of the uninfected, IFN-β-treated

cells. However, the Δ*dotA* mutant *L. pneumophila*-infected, IFN-β treated cells had no significant

difference in the tetherin cell surface expression when compared with the uninfected, IFN-β-

treated cells (Figure 5A). These results show that *L. pneumophila* inhibits the IFN-β signaling

pathway in a T4SS-dependent manner in human macrophage-like cells.

The activation of STAT1 and STAT2 via phosphorylation after IFN-β binding to IFNAR1

is an important step in the IFNAR signaling pathway and is important for the suppression of *L.*

pneumophila growth (Abdul-Sater et al., 2015). In order to assess if *L. pneumophila* infections

inhibit STAT1 or STAT2 phosphorylation, the levels of phospho-STAT1 and phospho-STAT2 in

L. pneumophila-infected THP-1 cells treated with IFN-β were measured by flow cytometry. The

total STAT1, phospho-STAT1, total STAT2, and phospho-STAT2 specific antibodies showed

good increases in MFI when compared with the isotype controls (Supplementary Figure 4), and

for each of these antibody stainings, the GFP signal of the *L. pneumophila* bacteria did not

cross over (Supplementary Figure 4). Differentiated THP-1 cells were infected with wild-type or

∆dotA mutant *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10. Next, the infected and uninfected cells were left

untreated or treated with IFN-β (10 ng/ml) for 30 minutes. The uninfected, IFN-β-treated cells

had about a nine-fold increase in phospho-STAT1 MFI and a six-fold increase in phospho-

STAT2 MFI when compared with the uninfected, untreated cells, indicating that IFN-β increased

the phosphorylation of these two proteins (Figures 5B and 5C). The wild-type *L. pneumophila*

and ∆dotA mutant *L. pneumophila* infected, untreated cells had increased phospho-STAT1 (Lp:

6-fold change, Lp∆: 3-fold change) and phospho-STAT2 (Lp: 2-fold change, Lp∆: 2-fold change)

levels compared with the uninfected, untreated cells, probably due to endogenous expression of

IFN-β after the infection (Figures 5B and 5C). Cells infected with wild-type *L. pneumophila* and

treated with IFN-β had a similar fold change increase in STAT1 phosphorylation compared to

uninfected, IFN-β-treated cells (about 9 to 10-fold for both). However, these cells showed a

significantly stronger increase (10-fold) in the level of phospho-STAT2 when compared with the

uninfected, IFN-β-treated cells (5-fold) (Figures 5B and 5C). Cells infected with the ∆dotA

mutant and treated with IFN-β had significantly increased phospho-STAT1 and phospho-STAT2

levels compared with the uninfected, IFN-β treated cells (Figures 5B and 5C). The levels of total

STAT1 and STAT2 were significantly changed in some conditions but overall, the magnitude of

these changes were minor (Supplementary Figure 5A and B). These results suggest that the

IFN-β signaling pathway inhibition caused by *L. pneumophila* is downstream of the

phosphorylation of STAT1 and STAT2.

Discussion

Type I IFNs have mainly been shown to play a protective role during viral infections

(Lazear et al., 2019); however, the role of type I IFNs is more complex in bacterial infections

since IFN-β has been shown to produce protective and detrimental effects depending on the

bacterial pathogen (Boxx and Cheng, 2016; Peignier and Parker, 2021). We demonstrate that

IFN-β plays a protective role against an *L. pneumophila* infection and contributes to the

clearance of *L. pneumophila* in BMDMs (Fig. 3). This observation aligns with previous studies,

which have shown that type I IFN protects against *L. pneumophila* infections in an IFN-γ-

independent way during *ex vivo* and *in vivo* infections (Schiavoni et al., 2004; Plumlee et al.,

2009; Lippmann et al., 2011; Abdul-Sater et al., 2015). NOS2/iNOS generates NO and

subsequently reactive nitrogen intermediates, which have cell-intrinsic, anti-bacterial activity

against the growth of many bacterial pathogens but seem to be mostly ineffective against *L.*

pneumophila (Gebran et al., 1994; Akamine et al., 2007; Plumlee et al., 2009; Naujoks et al.,

2016; Price et al., 2019), Accordingly, we did not observe any difference in bacterial growth

between the $Nos2^{-/-}$ BMDMs and the wild-type BMDMs treated with IFN-β. One possibility for

this lack of difference in bacterial survival could be redundancy in signaling pathways similar to

what has been shown for the protective activity of IFN-γ against *L. pneumophila,* where IRG1

and NOS2 compensate for the loss of one another (Price et al., 2019). The IFN-β/IRG-1

pathway mediates increased itaconic acid production, which targets *L. pneumophila*-containing

vacuoles and acts as a bactericide (Naujoks et al., 2016). Another possibility is that, unlike IFN-

γ, the anti-bacterial effect of IFN-β is RNS independent.

Previous studies have identified bacterial pathogens that inhibit IFN-β signaling. For

instance, *M. tuberculosis* inhibits IFN-β signaling by limiting the activation of IFNAR-associated

tyrosine kinase (Banks et al., 2019a). *S. sonnei* inhibits IFN signaling through the secreted

effector OspC, which binds to the host cell calmodulin, inhibiting calmodulin kinase II and

STAT1 phosphorylation (Alphonse et al., 2022). *L. pneumophila* inhibits host cell IFN-β

production via the T4SS-secreted effector Sdha (Monroe et al., 2009). However, we, to our best

knowledge, are the first to demonstrate that *L. pneumophila* employs mechanisms to inhibit IFN-

β signaling. Our results suggest that *L. pneumophila* secretes an effector(s) to inhibit the IFN-β

response since the T4SS-deficient mutant failed to inhibit IFN-β signaling (Figs. 4A, 5A).

Furthermore, *L. pneumophila* inhibits IFN-β signaling downstream of STAT1 and STAT2

phosphorylation since they are not downregulated upon *L. pneumophila* infection (Figs. 5B, 5C),

which is different from *M. tuberculosis*- and *S. sonnei*-mediated inhibition (Banks et al., 2019b;

Alphonse et al., 2022).

Humans are an accidental host for *L. pneumophila,* and so *L. pneumophila* has primarily

adapted to survive in amoebas and not in human macrophages. Amoebas do not have an

equivalent receptor to IFNAR or any class of receptors associated with tyrosine kinases

(Goldberg et al., 2006). The evolutionary advantage for *L. pneumophila* to inhibit IFNAR-

signaling when amoebas lack equivalent receptors is thus unclear. However, amoebas, such as

Dictyostelium sp. and *Acanthamoeba sp.,* express a homolog to mammalian STAT proteins

(Kawata et al., 1997; Kicinska et al., 2014). In particular, the amoebal STAT protein is closely

related to the human and mouse STAT2 protein (Kicinska et al., 2014), which is the STAT

isoform involved in type I but not type II IFN signaling (Villarino et al., 2020). This could

potentially explain why *L. pneumophila* can inhibit type I but not type II IFN signaling.

SH2 domains are the primary protein domain responsible for binding tyrosine-

phosphorylated targets involved in tyrosine kinase signaling cascades, such as the STAT1 and

STAT2 cascade (Schlessinger and Lemmon, 2003). Interestingly, *L. pneumophila* encodes for

84 proteins that contain an SH2 domain, and these SH2 domains, while lacking pocket

specificity, bind mammalian phosphorylated tyrosines with strong affinities (Kaneko et al., 2018).

Consequently, *L. pneumophila* could have evolved mechanisms to suppress amoebal STAT-

mediated transcriptional regulation, allowing for the growth of *L. pneumophila* in amoebas, and

serendipitously, this mechanism also inhibits mammalian STAT2-mediated transcriptional

regulation. Due to the homology of mammalian STAT2 with the amoeba STAT and the SH2

domains found in *L. pneumophila* proteins (Kicinska et al., 2014), we hypothesize that IFNAR

signaling could be inhibited at the STAT2 level after the phosphorylation of STAT2 via

interactions with an SH2 domain found in an *L. pneumophila* protein. This could potentially block

the association of STAT2 with STAT1 and IRF9, which is required to form the active ISGF3

complex. However, further studies are needed to test this hypothesis and identify the putative *L.*

pneumophila-secreted effector responsible for the inhibition of IFN-β signaling.

Acknowledgements

C.N.S.A., D.A.B., M.S. and V.B. were supported by grants R21AI142396 and R21 AI151973.

S.A.V. by grant R01 AI123371. M.S. was supported by "The Stefanie & Richard Vogel Graduate

Student Award" and T32 AI089621.

Fig. 1

A

B

C

D

E

Figure 1: *Legionella pneumophila* inhibits type I but not type II IFN signaling. (A) RAW-

Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were infected with *L. pneumophila* (Lp) at an MOI of 0.05, and the

amount of secreted IFN-β was detected by ELISA. (B) Infected (Lp) (MOI of 10) and uninfected

(UI) cells were challenged with increasing concentrations of IFN-β, and the IFN-β/γ-signaling

reporter gene expression was measured after 20 hours post-infection (h.p.i.) by detection of

secreted luciferase into the supernatant and values are plotted as relative light units (RLU). (C)

The data in B was expressed as the fold change of Lp-infected, IFN-β-treated cells compared to

uninfected, IFN-β-treated cells. (D) Infected (MOI of 10) and uninfected cells were challenged

with increasing concentrations of IFN-γ, and the IFN-β/γ-signaling reporter gene expression was

measured after 20 h.p.i. as for B. (E) The data in D was expressed as the fold change of Lp-

infected, IFN- γ-treated cells compared to uninfected, IFN- γ-treated cells. Individual points are

from independent experiments and indicate the averages of three technical replicates. Statistical

analyses were done using multiple unpaired *t*-tests with Welch correction for each time point (A)

or each dose concentration of IFN-β or IFN-γ (B, D). The fold change is relative to the uninfected

cells for the same IFN-β or IFN-γ treatment concentration. Statistical analyses were done using

multiple unpaired *t*-tests with Welch correction, and each fold change was compared to the fold

change of the uninfected cells for each treatment dose of IFN-β or IFN-γ (C, E). Significance is

indicated as follows: *$p \leq 0.05$ and **$p \leq 0.01$.

A

B

Figure 2: *L. pneumophila* (Lp) infection decreases transcriptional response to IFN-β-

treatment without affecting cell death. (A) Tetherin mRNA expression of RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-

IRF3 cells was quantified via qRT-PCR in *L. pneumophila* (Lp)-infected/untreated cells, Lp-

infected/IFN-β-treated cells and uninfected (UI)/IFN-β-treated cells at 4 hours post infection

(h.p.i.) and expressed as fold change compared to uninfected, untreated cells. The cells were

infected with Lp at an MOI of 10. (B) RAW-Lucia ISG-KO-IRF3 cell death was measured by an

adenylate kinase release assay in cells infected or not with *L. pneumophila* at an MOI of 10 after

20 h.p.i. and expressed as relative light units (RLU). The positive control is cells lysed with a

detergent. For A and B, individual points are the averages of three technical repeats and

obtained from independent experiments. An asterisk indicates multiple unpaired *t*-tests with

Welch correction relative to the untreated cells. Significance is indicated as follows: ****$p \leq$

0.0001.

Figure 3: IFN-β-treatment increases cell-intrinsic resistance to *L. pneumophila*

independent of NO production. (A) Bone marrow-derived macrophages (BMDMs) from *Ifnb*^{-/-}

mice were infected with *L. pneumophila* (Lp) at an MOI of 1 and treated with 1000 pg/ml IFN-

β throughout the infection. The number of colony-forming units (CFUs) was counted at the

indicated time points. The data are the mean ± standard deviation of six replicates obtained

from two independent infections. Asterisks indicate multiple unpaired *t*-tests with Welch

correction relative to the untreated cells. (B) RAW-ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were infected with Lp at

an MOI of 10. The amount of produced nitrite was measured using a Griess assay and shown

as the averages of three technical replicate from three independent experiments. (C) BMDMs

from *Nos2*^{-/-} mice were infected with Lp at an MOI of 1 and treated with 1000 pg/ml IFN-

β throughout the infection. The number of CFUs was counted at the indicated time points. The

points are the mean ± standard deviation of three independent experiments. Asterisks indicate

multiple unpaired *t*-tests with Welch correction relative to the untreated cells. (D) Wildtype

BMDM cells were infected with Lp at MOI of 1 and treated with 1000 pg/ml IFN-β and solvent

control (DMSO) or L-NMMA (12 µM). The mean ± standard deviation of three independent

experiments are shown. Asterisks indicate a multiple unpaired *t*-test with Welch correction

comparing DMSO ± IFN-β or L-NMMA ± IFN-β. Significance is indicated as follows: *$p \leq 0.05$

and **$p \leq 0.01$.

Fig. 4

Figure 4: The inhibition of IFN-β signaling by *L. pneumophila* is dependent on its type IV

secretion system. (A) RAW-ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were infected with wild-type *L. pneumophila*

(Lp), the Lp *dotA* deficient mutant (LpΔ*dotA*), the heat-inactivated wild-type Lp (HI Lp), or the

heat-inactivated *dotA* deficient mutant (HI LpΔ*dotA*) at an MOI of 10. All experimental groups

were treated with the indicated amounts of IFN-β. The y-axis shows the fold change in IFN-β

reporter gene expression compared to the uninfected/untreated experimental group after 20

h.p.i.. Data points are from independent experiments and represent the averages of three

technical replicates. (B) RAW-ISG-KO-IRF3 cells were infected with wild-type Lp or the Lp *dotA*

deficient mutant (LpΔ*dotA*) at an MOI of 10 or left uninfected but treated with LPS (100 ng/ml).

All cells were treated with 1000 pg/ml IFN-β. The production of NO was measured via the

Griess assay at the indicated times, and the data points from independent experiments and the

averages of three technical replicates. The data is expressed as fold change compared to

uninfected/treated cells. A two-way ANOVA with Geisser-Greenhouse correction and Tukey's

multiple comparisons test was performed on all data. Significance is indicated as follows: *$p \leq$

0.05, **$p \leq 0.01$, and ****$p \leq 0.0001$.

Fig. 5

Figure 5: *L. pneumophila* inhibits cell surface expression of tetherin but does not affect

the phosphorylation of STAT1 and STAT2. THP-1 cells were infected with GFP-expressing

wild-type *L. pneumophila* (Lp) and *dotA* deficient mutant (Lp∆) at an MOI of 10 and treated or

not with 10 ng/ml IFN-β. (A) The flow cytometry analysis performed on the GFP+/infected cells

using a fluorescent antibody targeting the cell surface ISG protein tetherin at 20 h.p.i.. (B) The

flow cytometry analysis performed on the GFP+/infected cells at an MOI of 10 using a

fluorescent antibody targeting phosphorylated STAT1 30 minutes post infection. (C) The flow

cytometry analysis performed on the GFP+/infected cells at an MOI of 10 using a fluorescent

antibody targeting phosphorylated STAT2 30 minutes post infection. The histograms are from

one experiment representative of three independent experiments. The bar graphs show the

mean fluorescent intensity (MFI) fold changes compared with the uninfected untreated cells for

each flow cytometry analysis. Individual points represent independent experiments. An asterisk

indicates multiple unpaired *t*-tests with Welch correction relative to the uninfected IFN-β treated

cells. Significance is indicated as follows: **$p \leq 0.01$, ***$p \leq 0.001$, and ****$p \leq 0.0001$.

A

B

Supplementary Figure 1: Effects of L-NMMA on nitrite production and *L. pneumophila*

growth. (A) The dose-response analysis of the iNOS2 inhibitor L-NMMA on RAW-ISG-KO-IRF3

cells treated with 1000 pg/ml of IFN-β 20 hours after dosing. The data points are from four

independent experiments. The statistical analysis was done using a repeat-measure (RM) one-

way ANOVA. (B) The growth curve of wild-type *L. pneumophila* (Lp) measured by OD_{600} in the

presence or absence of 12 µM L-NMMA. Points are the averages mean ± standard deviation of

three independent experiments. The statistical analysis was done by a multiple unpaired *t*-test

with Welch correction comparing the two groups at the time points indicated. Significance is

indicated as follows: **$p \leq 0.01$, ***$p \leq 0.001$, and ****$p \leq 0.0001$.

Sup Fig. 2

Supplementary Figure 2: Flow Cytometry Gating Strategy. THP-1 cells were first gated to

isolate cells from debris (SSC/FSC). Next single cells were selected (FSC-H/FSC-A) and using

LIVE/DEAD Fixable Dye the live cells were selected. Lastly, infected cells were selected by

measuring the GFP fluorescence intensity.

Supplementary Figure 3: Tetherin antibody testing and GFP Flow Cytometry. (A) MFI

peaks of uninfected IFN-β (10 ng/ml) treated THP-1 cells stained with the tetherin (α-tetherin) or

Isotype control antibodies (ISO). (B) Histograms of uninfected THP-1 cells stained with the APC

conjugated tetherin antibody (UI+IFN-β) and *L. pneumophila* GFP infected (GFP) (MOI of 10)

unstained cells measuring the APC intensity.

Sup Fig. 4

Supplementary Figure 4: Isotype antibodies and GFP Flow Cytometry control

experiments. The left column indicates the tests of the specific antibody stainings compared to

isotype controls as indicated and uninfected/IFN-β-treated (10 ng/ml) THP1 cells. The right

column analyses the potential spectral crossover of the GFP-signal into any of the other

channels used for the specific antibody stainings by infecting cells with Lp-GFP (MOI of 10) and

no specific antibody or having uninfected/IFN-β-treated cells stained with specific antibody. (A)

phospho-STAT1 antibody (B) total STAT1 antibody, (C) phospho-STAT2 antibody and (D) total

STAT2 antibody.

Supplementary Figure 5: The effects of *L. pneumophila* infection on the total STAT1 and

STAT2 levels. THP-1 cells were infected with GFP-expressing wild-type *L. pneumophila* (Lp)

and *dotA* deficient mutant (LpΔ) at an MOI of 10. The treated groups were treated with 10 ng/ml

IFN-β. (A) The flow cytometry analysis performed on the GFP+ infected cells using a fluorescent

antibody targeting total STAT1 30 minutes post infection. (B) The flow cytometry analysis

performed on the GFP+ infected cells using a fluorescent antibody targeting total STAT2 30

minutes post infection. The histograms are representative of three independent experiments

and illustrate the mean fluorescent intensity (MFI) of each group. The bar graphs show the MFI

fold changes compared with the uninfected/ untreated cells for each flow cytometry analysis.

Individual points indicate independent experiments. An asterisk indicates multiple unpaired *t*-

tests with Welch correction relative to the uninfected IFN-β treated cells. Significance is

indicated as follows: *$p ≤ 0.05$, **$p ≤ 0.01$, ***$p ≤ 0.001$, and ****$p ≤ 0.0001$.

References

Abdul-Sater, A. A., Majoros, A., Plumlee, C. R., Perry, S., Gu, A.-D., Lee, C., et al. (2015). Different STAT Transcription Complexes Drive Early and Delayed Responses to Type I IFNs. *J Immunol* 195, 210--216. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1401139.

Akamine, M., Higa, F., Haranaga, S., Tateyama, M., Mori, N., Heuner, K., et al. (2007). Interferon-Gamma Reverses the Evasion of Birc1e/Naip5 Gene Mediated Murine Macrophage Immunity by Legionella pneumophila Mutant Lacking Flagellin. *Microbiol. Immunol.* 51, 279–287. doi: 10.1111/j.1348-0421.2007.tb03909.x.

Allegra, S., Grattard, F., Girardot, F., Riffard, S., Pozzetto, B., and Berthelot, P. (2011). Longitudinal Evaluation of the Efficacy of Heat Treatment Procedures against Legionella spp. in Hospital Water Systems by Using a Flow Cytometric Assay. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 77, 1268–1275. doi: 10.1128/aem.02225-10.

Alphonse, N., Wanford, J. J., Voak, A. A., Gay, J., Venkhaya, S., Burroughs, O., et al. (2022). A family of conserved bacterial virulence factors dampens interferon responses by blocking calcium signaling. *Cell* 185, 2354-2369.e17. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2022.04.028.

Banks, D. A., Ahlbrand, S. E., Hughitt, V. K., Shah, S., Mayer-Barber, K. D., Vogel, S. N., et al. (2019a). Mycobacterium tuberculosis Inhibits Autocrine Type I IFN Signaling to Increase Intracellular Survival. *Journal of immunology (Baltimore, Md. : 1950)*, ji1801303. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1801303.

Banks, D. A., Ahlbrand, S. E., Hughitt, V. K., Shah, S., Mayer-Barber, K. D., Vogel, S. N., et al. (2019b). Mycobacterium tuberculosis Inhibits Autocrine Type I IFN Signaling to Increase Intracellular Survival. *Journal of immunology (Baltimore, Md. : 1950)*, ji1801303. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1801303.

Belyi, Y., Niggeweg, R., Opitz, B., Vogelsgesang, M., Hippenstiel, S., Wilm, M., et al. (2006). Legionella pneumophila glucosyltransferase inhibits host elongation factor 1A. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 103, 16953–16958. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0601562103.

Berger, K. H., and Isberg, R. R. (1993). Two distinct defects in intracellular growth complemented by a single genetic locus in Legionella pneumophila. *Mol Microbiol* 7, 7–19. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2958.1993.tb01092.x.

Boamah, D. K., Zhou, G., Ensminger, A. W., and O'Connor, T. J. (2017). From Many Hosts, One Accidental Pathogen: The Diverse Protozoan Hosts of Legionella. *Front Cell Infect Mi* 7, 477. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2017.00477.

Boxx, G. M., and Cheng, G. (2016). The Roles of Type I Interferon in Bacterial Infection. *Cell Host and Microbe* 19, 760–769. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2016.05.016.

Brand, B. C., Sadosky, A. B., and Shuman, H. A. (1994). The Legionella pneumophila icm locus: a set of
genes required for intracellular multiplication in human macrophages. *Mol Microbiol* 14, 797–808.
doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2958.1994.tb01316.x.

Deonarain, R., Alcami, A., Alexiou, M., Dallman, M. J., Gewert, D. R., and Porter, A. C. G. (2000).
Impaired Antiviral Response and Alpha/Beta Interferon Induction in Mice Lacking Beta Interferon.
Journal of Virology 74, 3404–3409. doi: 10.1128/jvi.74.7.3404-3409.2000.

Fontana, M. F., Banga, S., Barry, K. C., Shen, X., Tan, Y., Luo, Z.-Q., et al. (2011). Secreted Bacterial
Effectors That Inhibit Host Protein Synthesis Are Critical for Induction of the Innate Immune
Response to Virulent Legionella pneumophila. *Plos Pathog* 7, e1001289. doi:
10.1371/journal.ppat.1001289.

Gebran, S. J., Yamamoto, Y., Newton, C., Klein, T. W., and Friedman, H. (1994). Inhibition of
Legionella pneumophila growth by gamma interferon in permissive A/J mouse macrophages: role of
reactive oxygen species, nitric oxide, tryptophan, and iron(III). *Infect. Immun.* 62, 3197–3205. doi:
10.1128/iai.62.8.3197-3205.1994.

Gilchrist, A. K., Smolensky, D., Ngwaga, T., Chauhan, D., Cox, S., Perumal, R., et al. (2020). High-
polyphenol extracts from Sorghum bicolor attenuate replication of Legionella pneumophila within
RAW 264.7 macrophages. *Fems Microbiol Lett* 367, fnaa053. doi: 10.1093/femsle/fnaa053.

Goldberg, J. M., Manning, G., Liu, A., Fey, P., Pilcher, K. E., Xu, Y., et al. (2006). The Dictyostelium
Kinome—Analysis of the Protein Kinases from a Simple Model Organism. *Plos Genet* 2, e38. doi:
10.1371/journal.pgen.0020038.

Jacobs, A. T., and Ignarro, L. J. (2001). Lipopolysaccharide-induced Expression of Interferon-β Mediates
the Timing of Inducible Nitric-oxide Synthase Induction in RAW 264.7 Macrophages*. *J Biol Chem*
276, 47950–47957. doi: 10.1074/jbc.m106639200.

Kaneko, T., Stogios, P. J., Ruan, X., Voss, C., Evdokimova, E., Skarina, T., et al. (2018). Identification
and characterization of a large family of superbinding bacterial SH2 domains. *Nat. Commun.* 9, 4549.
doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-06943-2.

Kawata, T., Shevchenko, A., Fukuzawa, M., Jermyn, K. A., Totty, N. F., Zhukovskaya, N. V., et al.
(1997). SH2 Signaling in a Lower Eukaryote: A STAT Protein That Regulates Stalk Cell
Differentiation in Dictyostelium. *Cell* 89, 909–916. doi: 10.1016/s0092-8674(00)80276-7.

Kicinska, A., Leluk, J., and Jarmuszkiewicz, W. (2014). Acanthamoeba castellanii STAT Protein. *Plos
One* 9, e111345. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0111345.

Lazear, H. M., Schoggins, J. W., and Diamond, M. S. (2019). Shared and Distinct Functions of Type I
and Type III Interferons. *Immunity* 50, 907–923. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2019.03.025.

Lippmann, J., Müller, H. C., Naujoks, J., Tabeling, C., Shin, S., Witzenrath, M., et al. (2011). Dissection
of a type I interferon pathway in controlling bacterial intracellular infection in mice. *Cell Microbiol*
13, 1668–1682. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-5822.2011.01646.x.

Liu, M., Conover, G. M., and Isberg, R. R. (2008). Legionella pneumophila EnhC is required for efficient
replication in tumour necrosis factor α-stimulated macrophages. *Cell Microbiol* 10, 1906–1923. doi:
10.1111/j.1462-5822.2008.01180.x.

Liu, X., and Shin, S. (2019). Viewing Legionella pneumophila pathogenesis through an immunological
lens. *J Mol Biol* 431, 4321–4344. doi: 10.1016/j.jmb.2019.07.028.

Majoros, A., Platanitis, E., Szappanos, D., Cheon, H., Vogl, C., Shukla, P., et al. (2016). Response to
interferons and antibacterial innate immunity in the absence of tyrosine-phosphorylated STAT1. *Embo*
Rep 17, 367–382. doi: 10.15252/embr.201540726.

McDade, J. E., Shepard, C. C., Fraser, D. W., Tsai, T. R., Redus, M. A., and Dowdle, W. R. (1977).
Legionnaires' Disease — Isolation of a Bacterium and Demonstration of Its Role in Other Respiratory
Disease. *New Engl J Medicine* 297, 1197–1203. doi: 10.1056/nejm197712012972202.

Monroe, K. M., McWhirter, S. M., and Vance, R. E. (2009). Identification of Host Cytosolic Sensors and
Bacterial Factors Regulating the Type I Interferon Response to Legionella pneumophila. *Plos Pathog*
5, e1000665. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1000665.

Moss, S. M., Taylor, I. R., Ruggero, D., Gestwicki, J. E., Shokat, K. M., and Mukherjee, S. (2019). A
Legionella pneumophila Kinase Phosphorylates the Hsp70 Chaperone Family to Inhibit Eukaryotic
Protein Synthesis. *Cell Host Microbe* 25, 454-462.e6. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2019.01.006.

Naujoks, J., Tabeling, C., Dill, B. D., Hoffmann, C., Brown, A. S., Kunze, M., et al. (2016). IFNs Modify
the Proteome of Legionella-Containing Vacuoles and Restrict Infection Via IRG1-Derived Itaconic
Acid. *PLoS Pathog.* 12, e1005408. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1005408.

Opitz, B., Vinzing, M., Laak, V. van, Schmeck, B., Heine, G., Günther, S., et al. (2006). Legionella
pneumophila Induces IFNβ in Lung Epithelial Cells via IPS-1 and IRF3, Which Also Control
Bacterial Replication. *J Biol Chem* 281, 36173–36179. doi: 10.1074/jbc.m604638200.

Park, J. M., Ghosh, S., and O'Connor, T. J. (2020). Combinatorial selection in amoebal hosts drives the
evolution of the human pathogen Legionella pneumophila. *Nat Microbiol* 5, 599–609. doi:
10.1038/s41564-019-0663-7.

Peignier, A., and Parker, D. (2021). Impact of Type I Interferons on Susceptibility to Bacterial Pathogens.
Trends in microbiology, 1–13. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2021.01.007.

Plumlee, C. R., Lee, C., Beg, A. A., Decker, T., Shuman, H. A., and Schindler, C. (2009). Interferons
Direct an Effective Innate Response to Legionella pneumophila Infection*. *J Biol Chem* 284, 30058–
30066. doi: 10.1074/jbc.m109.018283.

Price, J. V., Russo, D., Ji, D. X., Chavez, R. A., DiPeso, L., Lee, A. Y.-F., et al. (2019). IRG1 and
Inducible Nitric Oxide Synthase Act Redundantly with Other Interferon-Gamma-Induced Factors To
Restrict Intracellular Replication of Legionella pneumophila. *Mbio* 10, e02629-19. doi:
10.1128/mbio.02629-19.

Rowbotham, T. J. (1980). Preliminary report on the pathogenicity of Legionella pneumophila for
freshwater and soil amoebae. *J Clin Pathol* 33, 1179. doi: 10.1136/jcp.33.12.1179.

Schiavoni, G., Mauri, C., Carlei, D., Belardelli, F., Pastoris, M. C., and Proietti, E. (2004). Type I IFN
Protects Permissive Macrophages from Legionella pneumophila Infection through an IFN-γ-
Independent Pathway. *J Immunol* 173, 1266–1275. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.173.2.1266.

Schlessinger, J., and Lemmon, M. A. (2003). SH2 and PTB Domains in Tyrosine Kinase Signaling. *Sci.'s*
STKE 2003, RE12. doi: 10.1126/stke.2003.191.re12.

Segal, G., and Shuman, H. A. (1998). Intracellular multiplication and human macrophage killing by
Legionella pneumophila are inhibited by conjugal components of IncQ plasmid RSF1010. *Mol*
Microbiol 30, 197–208. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2958.1998.01054.x.

Shen, X., Banga, S., Liu, Y., Xu, L., Gao, P., Shamovsky, I., et al. (2009). Targeting eEF1A by a
Legionella pneumophila effector leads to inhibition of protein synthesis and induction of host stress
response. *Cell. Microbiol.* 11, 911–926. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-5822.2009.01301.x.

Stetson, D. B., and Medzhitov, R. (2006). Type I interferons in host defense. *Immunity* 25, 373–381. doi:
10.1016/j.immuni.2006.08.007.

Villarino, A. V., Gadina, M., O'Shea, J. J., and Kanno, Y. (2020). SnapShot: Jak-STAT Signaling II. *Cell*
181, 1696-1696.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2020.04.052.

Vogel, Joseph. P., Andrews, H. L., Wong, S. K., and Isberg, R. R. (1998). Conjugative Transfer by the
Virulence System of Legionella pneumophila. *Science* 279, 873–876. doi:
10.1126/science.279.5352.873.