Full title: Bacterial hemophilin homologs and their specific type eleven secretor proteins have

conserved roles in heme capture and are diversifying as a family

Short title: Specific secretion of hemophilin proteins with diverse substrates

Authors: Alex S. Grossman[1], David A. Gell[2‡], Derek G. Wu[1,3], Heidi Goodrich-Blair[1†]

Corresponding authors: †: hgblair@utk.edu ‡: david.gell@utas.edu.au

Affiliations: 1. Department of Microbiology, University of Tennessee Knoxville, Knoxville, TN,

USA. 2. School of Medicine, University of Tasmania, 17 Liverpool Street, Hobart, TAS 7000,

Australia. 3. Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA.

Author contributions: Alex S. Grossman performed, and generated figures for all network

analyses and co-expression experiments. Derek G. Wu assisted Alex S. Grossman with the

chimeric hemophilin secretion experiment. David A. Gell performed all physicochemical

characterization experiments on the identified hemophilin homologs, including ligand binding

and structural modelling, and generated the associated figures. Alex S. Grossman, David A. Gell,

and Heidi Goodrich-Blair wrote the text of this manuscript and Derek G. Wu assisted in

proofreading.

Abstract:

Cellular life relies on enzymes that require metal cofactors, which must be acquired

from extracellular sources. Bacteria utilize surface and secreted proteins to acquire such

valuable nutrients from their environment. These include the cargo proteins of the type eleven

secretion system (T11SS), which have been connected to host specificity, metal homeostasis,

and nutritional immunity evasion. This Sec-dependent, Gram-negative secretion system is

encoded by organisms throughout the phylum Proteobacteria, including human pathogens

Neisseria meningitidis, Proteus mirabilis, Acinetobacter baumannii, and *Haemophilus*

influenzae. Experimentally verified T11SS-dependent cargo include host metal acquisition

proteins transferrin binding protein B (TbpB) and lactoferrin binding protein B (LbpB), as well as

the hemophilin homologs heme receptor protein C (HrpC) and hemophilin A (HphA), the

complement immune evasion protein factor-H binding protein (fHbp), and the host symbiosis

factor nematode intestinal localization protein C (NilC). Secretion of each of these cargo

proteins relies on a specific T11SS. Here, we examined the specificity of T11SS systems for their

cognate cargo proteins using taxonomically distributed homolog pairs of T11SS and hemophilin

cargo and explore the ligand binding ability of those hemophilin homologs. Our comparative

ligand binding analysis of four hemophilin family proteins identified previously unknown ligand

binding diversity within this protein family, which informed our description of structural

features that are likely to contribute to heme/porphyrin binding specificity. *In vivo* expression

of hemophilin homologs revealed that each was secreted in a specific manner by its cognate

T11SS protein. Furthermore, secretion assays of chimeric hemophilin proteins revealed that

specificity is predominantly dictated by the C-terminal domain of the cognate cargo.

Meanwhile, the N-terminal effector domains of these T11SS-dependent cargo proteins feature

porphyrin binding pockets that drive ligand binding affinity and specificity. In light of these

results, we have termed this N-terminal domain the hemophilin ligand binding domain (Hlb)

after its first characterized representative.

Introduction:

Many enzymes have evolved expanded catalytic potential through the incorporation of metallic cofactors and prosthetic groups. Iron cofactors are essential to most living organisms due to their functional contributions to enzymes required for DNA synthesis, photosynthesis, respiration, and nitrogen metabolism [1]. Without the biochemical flexibility provided by metallic cofactors, life as we know it would be impossible. Because of this, and the limited bioavailability of essential metals, competition among organisms for these ions can be fierce. In some cases, including many marine environments, competition for bioavailable iron is actually the major limiting factor of microbial growth [2]. This phenomenon is exploited by animals through a process known as nutritional immunity, in which valuable ions, such as iron, are sequestered to slow or deter the pathogenic growth of microbes. Within animal hosts iron is sequestered by proteins such as hemopexin, transferrin, lactoferrin, and ferritin [3]. Medical conditions, such as hemochromatosis, that increase the serum iron concentration or prevent effective storage of iron increase a patient's risk of infection from many bacteria, including *Escherichia coli*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, and *Yersinia enterocolitica* [4]. In turn, to overcome iron limitation within an animal host, bacteria have evolved means of countering nutritional immunity, including adaptations to use alternative catalytic metals [5], production of high-affinity siderophores [6], and or membrane bound uptake receptors [3] that facilitate acquisition of iron from host metalloproteins.

Several recent studies have linked the type eleven secretion system (T11SS) outer membrane proteins (OMPs) and their cargo proteins to iron uptake strategies in Gram-negative bacteria. In *Neisseria*, the T11SS proteins Slam1 and Slam2 surface expose cargo proteins that

are responsible for binding host-metal carriers: Transferrin binding protein B (TbpB) and

Lactoferrin binding protein B (LbpB) are surface exposed by Slam1, and

Hemoglobin/Haptoglobin binding protein A (HpuA) is surface exposed by Slam2 [7–10]. These

surface exposed outer membrane lipoproteins facilitate bacterial colonization by capturing

their respective host factors (transferrin, lactoferrin, or hemoglobin/haptoglobin) and

complexing with a TonB-dependent uptake channel capable of importing the iron cofactor.

Since surface exposure is essential for the function of these lipoproteins, genetic inactivation of

the T11SS OMP, Slam1 prevents effective colonization and pathogenesis by *Neisseria* [11].

While *Neisseria* Slam1 and Slam2 have specificity for their respective cargo [7], no underlying

mechanism for specificity has been proposed yet and it is unknown if all T11SS have specificity

for their cognate cargo. Bioinformatic analyses revealed a large number of potential T11SS-

dependent cargo, lipid anchored and unanchored, which frequently exist in cognate

pairs/groupings according to genomic co-occurrence analyses [11,12]. To date, all verified or

predicted T11SS-dependent cargo have two distinct domains: an N-terminal domain that varies

in predicted structure and function across cargo, and a C-terminal, 8-stranded β-barrel domain

from the TbpBBD or lipoprotein C families, though the latter is not exclusive to lipoproteins but

also occurs in non-lipidated proteins [7,11,12].

T11SS are capable of secreting unlipidated cargo proteins, such as the soluble

hemophores heme receptor protein C from *X. nematophila* (HrpC) and hemophilin A from *A.*

baumanii (HphA) [12,13]. HphA likely captures heme from hemoglobin and other host

hemoproteins, and contributes to the virulence of *Acinetobacter baumannii* in a murine

infection model through its role as a co-receptor to the TonB-dependent heme receptor HphR

[13]. Thus, hemophilin proteins represent a high-affinity heme acquisition system comparable

to HasA from *Serratia marcescens* [14] or IsdB from *Staphylococcus aureus* [15]. Known

members of the hemophilin protein family function to import heme from a host environment

as depicted in Figure 1. Compiling the results of published data from multiple organisms into a

single model suggests that that hemophilin crosses the inner membrane through the Sec

translocon to reach the periplasm [12], may interact with chaperones such as Skp to traverse

the periplasm [16], and then crosses the outer membrane in a T11SS-dependent manner to

reach the extracellular milieu [7,12,13,17]. From here, hemophilin captures heme that is

released from hemoglobin or other host hemoproteins using a high affinity binding domain

[13,18]. Holo-hemophilin is predicted to interact with a TonB-dependent outer membrane co-

receptor which imports the heme molecule into the periplasm and releases apo-hemophilin.

Finally, the hemin utilization system delivers periplasmic heme into the cytoplasm for

incorporation into cellular processes or digestion by heme oxygenase to free the iron cation

[19].

Within this overall framework, hemophilin can have diverse functional roles within

different organisms and environments. For example, in *Haemophilus haemolyticus* hemophilin

can act as a probiotic factor by making bioavailable iron inaccessible to nontypeable

Haemophilus influenzae [20]. Hemophilin producing strains of *H. haemolyticus* inhibit the

growth of *H. influenzae* significantly more than non-hemophilin encoding strains in co-cultured

media [18] and cell cultures [20]. Additionally, oropharyngeal sampling of human subjects

indicates that individuals who carry hemophilin encoding *H. haemolyticus* are between 2.43 and

2.67 times less likely to carry nontypeable *H. influenzae* [21]. Conversely, within the

opportunistic pathogen *A. baumannii,* hemophilin can act as a virulence factor by facilitating

systemic infection in a murine model [13]. Furthermore, predicted hemophilin homologs found

in sequence databases display sequence variation within the heme-binding handle domain,

suggesting possible variability in ligand binding. To better understand the fundamental

biochemical and biological functions of hemophilin family proteins we sought to expand our

understanding of hemophilin secretion and activities across a broader taxonomic range*.*

Results:

Sequence similarity networks reveal hemophilin families that have genomic associations with

metal-related metabolic functions

121   To explore the relatedness of hemophilin family proteins and to identify subcluster

divisions that may reflect divergent function, a sequence similarity network generated through

Enzyme Function Initiative-Enzyme Similarity Tool (EFI-EST) was overlaid with a taxonomic

framework [22] (Fig. S1 and Supplemental File 1). The network was populated with the

previously published dataset of T11SS-associated cargo that were not predicted to be lipidated

or membrane anchored [12]. This analysis revealed a single major cluster containing all

previously described hemophilin proteins (88/107 nodes), one smaller cluster containing

uncharacterized proteins from predominantly *Pseudomonas* and *Neisseria* species (9/107

nodes), and a few unassociated doublets and singletons (10/107 nodes). To focus this study

specifically on hemophilin and its direct evolutionary relatives, all nodes not within the central

cluster were removed. The remaining nodes were labeled according to taxonomic family and

separated using a force-directed separation algorithm, resulting in five subclusters

predominantly populated by seven families from Alphaproteobacteria, Betaproteobacteria, and

Gammaproteobacteria (Fig. 2AC). The three subclusters that contained Hpl, HrpC, and HphA,

respectively were named Hpl-like, HrpC-like, and HphA-like after their respective characterized

member. One novel subcluster was termed 'Cobalt/molybdenum associated' due to its genomic

co-occurrence with genes predicted to encode cobalt- or molybdenum-dependent enzymes.

Another novel subcluster was termed 'Plant/Environmental' due to the dominant presence of

homologs encoded by microbes found in soil, water, and plant-associated environments. The

subclusters did not fall exclusively along taxonomic lines. For instance, the Hpl-like subcluster

includes *Neisseria* and *Pasteurella* hemophilin homologs that clustered closely together,

possibly indicating that these genes may have been horizontally exchanged. Cross-taxonomic-

class sequence similarity also was observed in the Plant/Environmental cluster of hemophilin

homologs.

To identify potential distinguishing features among the five subclusters, we examined

the identities of genes that commonly occur within genomic neighborhoods (± 6 genes) with

hrpB. All sequences from the network were submitted to the Rapid ORF Detection & Evaluation

Online (RODEO) web tool that uses profile hidden Markov models to identify co-occurring

protein domains (Table S1) [23]. Consistent with previous observations, 92.3% (240/260

sequences) of hemophilin homologs, regardless of subcluster, were encoded in association with

genes predicted to encode TonB and TonB-dependent receptors, suggesting a strong and

consistent link between T11SS cargo and TonB-dependent uptake across the outer membrane

[11,12]. However, some subclusters had further informative co-occurrences. For example,

hemophilin homologs in the HphA-like subcluster showed nearly universal co-occurrence with

genes predicted to encode heme oxygenase (51/53) and the iron-sensing regulator FecR

(48/53). Similarly, homologs in the Plant/Environmental subcluster typically were encoded near

genes predicted to encode metal responsive regulatory proteins (FecR or Fur) (64/72) and

occasionally near genes encoding heme oxygenase (19/72). Additionally, 69/72

Plant/Environmental-subcluster loci encoded additional regulatory genes such as RpoE, IscR-

family regulators, and LysR-family regulators. RpoE is a sigma factor that responds to extra-

cytoplasmic stress and is essential for metal resistance in *E. coli* [24]. IscR regulates iron-sulfur

cluster biosynthesis according to cellular demand [25], and LysR-family regulators drive diverse

pathways by binding DNA directly in response to co-inducing/co-repressing ligands [26].

Homologs in the Cobalt/molybdenum-associated subcluster occurred alongside other predicted

T11SS-dependent cargo (14/18) and were either located adjacent to a B12 biosynthetic locus

(3/18) or near a formate dehydrogenase locus (13/18). Formate dehydrogenase activity relies

on molybdenum metal cofactors, and their co-occurrence with T11SS OMPs may hint at a role

for the latter in molybdenum acquisition. The HrpC-like subcluster includes genes predicted to

encode redox enzymes, such as formate dehydrogenase (48/81) and NADPH:quinone

oxidoreductase (12/81), tRNA synthases and modification systems (30/81), and regulatory

proteins including TetR family regulators, FaeA family regulators, FecR, and FecI (32/81).

Homologs in the Hpl-like subcluster had few unifying co-occurrences, however many co-

occurred with tRNA synthases/modification systems (14/36), specifically selenocysteine tRNA

synthases (6/36) (Fig. 2B). Overall, network analysis of hemophilin homologs indicate that the

family is diversifying into distinct subfamilies independent of their taxonomic lineage, and that

those subfamilies are genomically associated with metal-related cellular activities such as ion

uptake, metal responsive regulatory proteins, and metal dependent enzymes.

Hemophilin cargo proteins have specificity for their cognate T11SS

Hemophilin homologs in each of the network subfamilies are predicted to be secreted

by a T11SS, and many were encoded adjacent to a T11SS OMP. We considered the possibility

that co-diversification of hemophilins and their T11SS OMPs has resulted in specificity between

cognate pairs. To test the extent of specificity between hemophilin cargo proteins and their

paired TXISS OMP secretor, and to further establish the role of TXISS OMPs in secretion of

hemophilin cargo, we conducted secretion assays on different cognate or non-cognate pairs,

chosen from each of the different subclusters of the hemophilin family network (except for the

Plant/Environmental subcluster): $HrpB_{X.nem}$/HrpC from *Xenorhabdus nematophila*,

$HrpB_{H.haem}$/Hpl from *Haemophilus haemolyticus*, HsmA/HphA from *A. baumannii*, and

CrpB/CrpC from *Xenorhabdus cabanillasii* were cloned into pETDuet-1 based expression vectors

to perform co-expression and secretion experiments in *E. coli* BL21 C43. Additionally, plasmids

were constructed to co-express $HrpB_{X.nem}$ alongside the non-cognate hemophilin homologs Hpl,

HphA, and CrpC. Western blotting of supernatant and cellular lysates was performed to

monitor cargo localization to the extracellular milieu. Extracellular HrpC and HphA both ran as

single protein bands somewhat larger than would be predicted from mature protein sequence

alone, with HrpC appearing at ~30 kD (~24 kD expected) and HrpA appearing at 29 kD (~25 kD

expected) (Supplemental file 2: sheets 2 and 4) [27]. In both cases this increase in apparent size

is too large to be explained by the presence of the signal peptide, though this larger apparent

size is consistent with our previous studies of HrpC [12]. Extracellular Hpl and CrpC were both

observed running as two different bands. Hpl had a predominant band at ~32 kD and a minor

one at the expected size of ~26 kD, while CrpC had a predominant band at ~19 kD and a minor

band at the predicted size of ~27 kD (Supplemental file 2: sheets 3 and 5). Interestingly, the

extracellular ~19-kD CrpC band was absent or reduced when the protein was expressed alone

or with the non-cognate $HrpB_{X.nem}$, suggesting potential protein modification (e.g., cleavage)

prior to, or during, secretion by its cognate T11SS. For enumeration of Hpl and CrpC localization

we opted to sum both protein bands to fairly represent all of the secreted protein.

Co-expression of hemophilin homologs with a cognate T11SS protein always significantly

increased the concentration of cargo protein found in the supernatant, though the level of

secretion varied greatly among T11SS proteins. At one hour after induction, the presence

relative to the absence of the cognate T11SS OMP increased the average level of extracellular

hemophilin homolog protein ($HrpB_{X.nem}$/HrpC: 34.2-fold; $HrpB_{H.haem}$/Hpl: 59.3-fold, HsmA/HphA:

4.6-fold; CrpB/CrpC: 56.9-fold) (Fig. 3; Supplemental File 2). $HrpB_{X.nem}$ significantly increased

(4.8-fold) the average extracellular levels of the non-cognate cargo Hpl, though it was

significantly less effective at doing so than the cognate T11SS $HrpB_{H.haem}$. $HrpB_{X.nem}$ did not

significantly impact average extracellular levels of HphA, (1.1 fold), or CrpC (1.7 fold).

The hemophilin C-terminal β-barrel domain contributes to specificity for T11SS

The data described above indicates that individual hemophilin family cargo proteins and

their cognate T11SS OMPs have specificity for each other. Published literature has implicated

the C-terminal β-barrel domain of cargo proteins in directing secretion by T11SS OMPs [11]. To

assess the role of the hemophilin C-terminal domain on T11SS specificity, two chimeric

hemophilin cargo were engineered. The first chimeric cargo had the N-terminal handle domain

from HrpC and the C-terminal β-barrel domain from Hpl (henceforth HrpC-Hpl), while the

second had the N-terminal handle from Hpl and the C-terminal β-barrel domain from HrpC

(henceforth Hpl-HrpC). pETDuet-1 constructs were assembled to independently co-express

HrpB$_{H.haem}$ and HrpB$_{X.nem}$ alongside both chimeric cargo proteins (Fig. 4A) and Western blotting

of supernatant and cellular lysates was again performed to monitor cargo secretion

(Supplemental file 2: sheet 6). The HrpC-Hpl chimera ran as a single band at ~27 kD, which is

larger than the predicted size of ~25 kD. The Hpl-HrpC chimera ran as two bands with apparent

sizes of ~33 kD and ~24 kD, which straddle the expected size of ~27 kD. Since Hpl-HrpC ran as

two bands, similarly to Hpl, we opted to sum both bands for the purpose of enumeration. Co-

expression with HrpB$_{H.haem}$ increased on average, the extracellular levels of its cognate cargo

Hpl by 65.0-fold, the HrpC-Hpl chimera by 51.0-fold, and the Hpl-HrpC chimera by 7.8-fold,

indicating that the presence of the cognate C-terminal domain of Hpl was optimal for secretion

by HrpB$_{H.haem}$. Co-expression with HrpB$_{X.nem}$ increased on average, the extracellular levels of the

cognate HrpC by 15.6-fold, the HrpC-Hpl chimera by 5.1-fold, and the Hpl-HrpC chimera by 8.1-

fold on average (Fig. 4B; Supplemental File 2). Overall, both the presence of the C-terminal

domain of the cognate cargo, relative to the non-cognate cargo, resulted in higher levels of

secreted chimeric hemophilin homolog protein. This finding reinforces the concept that T11SS

cargo are two-domain proteins: An N-terminal effector domain and a C-terminal β-barrel

domain that directs cargo for T11SS-mediated secretion [28]. Our findings additionally implicate

the C-terminal β-barrel domain in mediating specificity of cargo for particular T11SS OMPs.

Hemophilin homologs Hpl, HphA, and HrpC, but not CrpC bind heme

To begin to investigate if the heme ligand binding properties of Hpl and HphA are

conserved in other hemophilin homologs, Hpl from *H. haemolyticus*, HrpC from *X. nematophila*,

HphA from *A. baumannii*, and CrpC from *X. cabanillasii* were expressed without signal peptides

in the cytoplasm of *E. coli* and purified. As expected, Hpl from *H. haemolyticus* was recovered

from *E. coli* cytoplasm as an approximately 50:50 mix of heme-bound and heme-free protein,

with the level of heme saturation likely reflecting competition for heme binding and limitations

of heme biosynthesis *in vivo* [18]. Preparations of HrpC (*X. nematophila*) and HphA (*A.*

baumannii) had a brownish appearance and an absorbance peak at ~413 nm, possibly

indicating the presence of sub-saturating levels of a porphyrin ligand, whereas CrpC (*X.*

cabanillasii) was colorless with no peaks in the visible absorption spectrum, indicating the lack

of a porphyrin. Heme-free (apo-protein) preparations of Hpl, HphA, and HrpC were produced by

acid- acetone extract and reversed-phase HPLC, and heme-binding activities were investigated

by titration (Fig. 5; Table 1). Large changes in the UV-visible spectrum of hemin occurred upon

titration with *H. haemolyticus* Hpl, *A. baumannii* HphA or *X. nematophila* HrpC (Fig. 5A–C).

Similarities in the Soret (412–414 nm) and Q-band regions (500–600 nm) between HrpC and

HphA suggest that the heme coordination structure of HrpC is similar to that in HphA [13]. The

binding curves for Hpl, HphA, and HrpC (Fig. 6A) yielded K_d values of 9, 7 and 20 nM

respectively; however, the curves were close to linear, indicating that binding might be too

strong to reliably extract binding constants. Using simulated data with added Gaussian noise we

determined that data generated with K_d values < 15 nM produced fits that did not differ

significantly (at P ≤ 0.05 by F test) from fits where the K_d parameter was fixed at an extreme low

value. Thus, we suggest that Hpl and HphA bind heme with K_d values ≤ 15 nM and HrpC binds

with K_d = 20 (10–50) μM. In contrast, spectral changes upon addition of CrpC to heme were

more gradual (Fig. 5D) and were fit with a one-to-one binding model with apparent K_d ~5 μM

(Fig. 6A). These values are similar to the binding affinity we determined for BSA with apparent

K_d ~2 μM (Fig. S2).

To further distinguish between the porphyrin binding affinities of Hpl, HphA, and HrpC,

we assayed binding to Zn(II)PPIX, a fluorescent heme analog, in the presence of competition

from excess BSA (Fig. 7). We reasoned that fluorescence detection and competition binding

would shift the useful detection range to a high-affinity regime, compared to the previous

absorption design. These experiments (Fig. 7) yielded IC_{50} values for hemophilin binding Zn(II)-

PPIX in competition with BSA as shown in Table 1, together with calculated affinities based the

affinity of BSA for Zn(II)PPIX. The IC_{50} values for Hpl and HphA did not differ within error of the

measurements, suggesting that Hpl and HphA bind Zn(II)-PPIX with similar affinity. In

comparison, the IC_{50} value for *X. nematophila* HrpC was approximately 5–10 fold higher,

indicating weaker binding to Zn(II)-PPIX. Using the same fluorescence competition assay, the

interaction of CrpC with Zn(II)-PPIX was undetectable, consistent with the finding that CrpC and

BSA have similar propensities to bind heme. In summary, the above results suggest that heme

binding affinities of the hemophilin homologs proceed from higher to lower affinity in the order

Hpl ≈ HphA > HrpC >> CrpC.

To investigate the importance of the porphyrin metal to hemophilin binding, we

performed spectroscopic titrations with unmetalated PPIX. Because the CrpC gene is frequently

located close to cobalt/molybdenum associated genes, we also screened for binding to

Co(III)PPIX. Titration, monitored by UV-visible spectroscopy, indicated that Hpl, HphA and HrpC

bound PPIX with nM affinities, whereas CrpC binding was much weaker (K_d ~7 µM), in a pattern

(affinity HphA > Hpl ≈ HrpC >> CrpC) similar to that seen for a hemin ligand (Fig. 6B and S3). A

different pattern was seen with Co(III)-PPIX. Titration experiments with Co(III)-PPIX indicated

affinities ranked in the order Hpl > HphA ≈ HrpC ≈ CrpC, corresponding to a dramatic increase in

the relative affinity of CrpC for Co(III)PPIX compared to other porphyrins we tested (Fig. 6C and

S4). To understand the potential significance of this we looked at the interaction of BSA with

Co(III)-PPIX. We found that Co(III)-PPIX, and to a lesser degree Zn(II)-PPIX, bound more strongly

to BSA than did PPIX or hemin, suggesting that the Co(III) and Zn(II) metals might contribute to

binding interactions that are not available to Fe(III). We tested several other porphyrin-related

molecules, including coproporphyrin III, biliverdin and cobalamin and found no evidence for

CrpC binding (Fig. S5). These results suggest that Hpl, HphA, and HrpC might effectively

scavenge metalated or unmetalated porphyrins from the environment. *X. nematophila* HrpC

appeared to bind metalated and unmetalated porphyrin with similar affinities (10–20 nM). In

contrast, CrpC binds very weakly to PPIX and hemin. It is interesting to consider whether this

weak binding could allow CrpC to preferentially bind cobalt porphyrins in a biologically setting.

Hemophilin family proteins adopt a multi-domain structure characteristic of T11SS cargo

Our observations that hemophilin homologs vary in their binding capacities for

porphyrins prompted us next to investigate the structure function relationships among them.

The Hpl and HphA crystal structures [13,18] were compared against the protein structure

database (DALI server [29]) and manually inspected within the protein fold classification

databases (CATH [30] and SCOP [31]). We observed the expected C-terminal β-barrel domain

structure (Fig. 8A and 8C) that appears to be characteristic of T11SS cargo proteins (CATH

superfamily 2.40.160.90, SCOP superfamily 3002098) [18]. More limited similarity was detected

between the N-terminal ligand-binding domains of Hpl or HphA (Fig. 8B and 8D) and the N-

terminal handle domain of TbpB proteins (CATH superfamilies 2.40.128.240/250; SCOP fold

2001281). This region also appears to be characteristic of T11SS cargo proteins, including Hpl

and HphA, and forms a β-sheet (strands 1, 8, 7, 6, and 5 in Hpl and HphA) that packs against the

β-barrel domain. The remainder of the N-terminal region of the Hpl and HphA are variable in

structure compared to each other and the other known T11SS cargo proteins. Whilst the N-

terminal domains of Hpl and HphA share features with the handle domain of TbpB, the

insertion of one or more α-helical elements between β-strands 3 and 4, and a change in

hydrogen-bond connectivity within β-strands 1–4 suggest that the hemophilin ligand binding

domain belongs to a separate domain family, as a subgroup of the TbpB handle domain

topology.

We also considered the predicted structures of HrpC and CrpC as representatives of the

two other subclusters of hemophilin family proteins. Overall, sequence similarity between

hemophilins is higher in the β-barrel domain (40% identity between Hpl and HrpC; 36% identity

between Hpl and CrpC) it is lower in the N-terminal domain (24% identity between Hpl and

HrpC; 20% identity between Hpl and CrpC). We made structural models using the program

MODELLER [32] with the crystal structures of Hpl and HphA [13,18] as templates (see methods)

and found that HrpC (Fig. 8E-F) and CrpC (Fig. 8G-H) are predicted to adopt a similar overall

structure as Hpl and HphA.

Hemophilin homologs share a signature N-terminal ligand binding domain

We next compared features of the known or predicted N-terminal ligand binding

domain folds of the hemophilin subcluster representatives, including from the

Plant/Environmental subcluster. Alignments were used to model the structures of

representative members of each subcluster, including *X. nematophila* HrpC (Fig. 8E-F) and *X.*

cabanillasii CrpC (Fig. 8G-H) for which we had measured ligand binding. The ligand-binding

domains of Hpl and HphA have a conserved hydrophobic core that was preserved in alignments

with HrpC and CrpC, as well as other members of each subcluster, including the

Plant/Environmental subcluster (e.g., *Lysobacter enzymogenes* ALN55974 and

Stenotrophomonas maltophila KUJ02124) (Fig. 9). We also looked for conserved pair-wise

contacts between side chains that are distant in the primary sequence and that might provide

additional confidence in modelling local structures. For example, we identified a DXNG[V/I]

motif corresponding to a β-hairpin in the ligand binding domain of *H. haemolyticus* Hpl that

makes a bifurcated hydrogen bond with a Tyr side chain in the β-barrel domain (Fig. 10A) and is

conserved in Hpl-like, HrpC-like and CrpC-like sequences, but is absent in the HphA-like cluster

(Fig. 9). With respect to this motif, the Plant/Environmental subcluster comprises two subsets,

one containing the DXNG motif (represented by ALN55974 from *L. enzymogenes*), and one

lacking the DXNG motif and with a divergent sequence/structure in β4-β5 hairpin (represented

by KUJ02124 from *S. maltophilia*) Fig. 9). Several groups of sequences in the Hpl-like subcluster

could not be aligned or modelled against the hemophilin domain due to greater sequence (and

therefore presumably structural) diversity) within this subcluster. With the exception of this

group, our alignment and structural motif analyses indicate that hemophilin homologs (e.g.,

HrpC, CrpC, HphA, Plant/Environmental subclusters, and a subset of the Hpl subcluster) have an

N-terminal domain with the same topology as the ligand-binding domains of *H. haemolyticus*

Hpl and *A. baumannii* HphA and that this hemophilin ligand binding domain is the signature

feature of an extensive family of hemophilin homologs.

Two distinct heme binding domains occur among hemophilin homologs

Having identified another hemophilin homolog capable of coordinating heme, we used

models to investigate possible structural reasons for common and distinct ligand binding

properties of hemophilin homologs. The available crystal structures of *H. haemolyticus* Hpl and

A. baumannii HphA, both of which bind heme, show that residues in loops β2-β3, β3-β4

(including the β3-β4 α-helix) and β5-β6 contribute majority of heme-binding contacts and that

the mode of heme binding in Hpl and HphA differs in the relative contributions of these loops

and in the heme-iron coordination structure (Fig. 8B and 8D). Of particular interest, heme in Hpl

is coordinated through a single His side chain in the β5-β6 loop, whereas heme in HphA is

coordinated by two His side chains, one from the β5-β6 loop and a second donated by the β2-

β3 loop.

The bis-histidyl heme coordination observed for HphA appears to be ubiquitous in the

HphA subcluster, based on the conservation of the amino acid sequence of this motif (data not

shown). A subset of sequences within the Hpl subcluster had >65% identity to *H. haemolyticus*

Hpl, and these are predicted to all share the same single histidinyl coordination heme binding

mode. However, the heme coordination pattern for the remaining members of the Hpl

subcluster is unclear due to the high level of sequence/structure diversity in this group.

Molecular models show that HrpC subcluster and Plant/Environmental subcluster proteins

contain His side chains in both the β2-β3 loop and β5-β6 loops, and modelling in the presence

of a heme ligand indicates that the position of these His residues is compatible with bis-histidyl

heme coordination similar to HphA (Fig. 8F and Fig. S6). Other structural similarities among

HphA, HrpC, and Plant/Environmental subclusters, but not for the Hpl subcluster, exist in the

β2-β3 loop, including a Gly, Ser, Pro rich sequence, and similar loop length (Fig. 9). The

mechanism of heme binding and release by *A. baumannii* HphA is proposed to involve

unfolding of the β2-β3 loop [13], and if so, this mechanism is likely to be conserved in

hemophilin homologs with this motif. The second heme-coordinating His of HphA occurs in the

β5-β6 loop, which contains a conserved PX[S/T]H sequence motif.

Like the β2-β3 loop, the PX[S/T]H motif of the β5-β6 loop is conserved across the HphA,

HrpC and Plant/Environmental clusters (Fig. 9, Fig. 10B). In *A. baumannii* HphA, the His side

chain of this motif is packed against the pyrrolidine ring of Pro and makes a H-bond with the Ser

side chain (substitution of Thr for Ser is expected to preserve this interaction). The carbonyl

oxygen of Pro also accepts a H-bond from the backbone amide of His. These interactions are

expected to stabilize the orientation of the heme-ligating His, and conservation of this motif in

HrpC and Plant/Environmental cluster hemophilin homologs further implies that the mode of

heme binding in HphA, HrpC and Plant/Environmental proteins is similar. The PX[S/T]H motif is

absent in Hpl, which has a substantially longer β5-β6 loop (20 residues in Hpl vs 14 residues in

HphA) and more completely covers the face of the porphyrin.

The N-terminal ligand binding domain regions of hemophilin homologs are diversifying

In addition to iron-ligating side chains, other amino acids contribute to ligand binding

through non-covalent interactions with apolar and polar sites on the porphyrin. Models of *X.*

nematophila HrpC show multiple hydrophobic contacts with the porphyrin ring contributed by

side chains in the β3-β4 α-helix, β5-β6 loop and underlying β sheet, and a hydrogen bond

network around the charged porphyrin 17-propionate comprising Tyr64, Ser96 and His97 side

chains – features similar to the HphA heme site (Fig. 8, compare D, F). Differences include a

shorter β3-β4 α-helix in HrpC than either HphA or Hpl, and a β4-β5 hairpin in HrpC that is more

similar to Hpl than to HphA. The pyrrole rings B and C appear to be more exposed to solvent in

HrpC than in either Hpl or HphA, which may partly explain a relatively lower affinity for the

metalated porphyrins, hemin and Zn(II)PPIX, because hydration is expected to increases the

rate of scission of the Fe-metal bond (although the lack of effect on Co(III)PPIX binding is not

explained).

Our porphyrin binding assays revealed that *X. cabanillasii* CrpC does not bind heme.

Consistent with this observation, while *X. cabanillasii* CrpC is predicted to adopt the hemophilin

ligand binding domain fold, it lacks His or other residues that typically coordinate heme-iron, in

either the β2-β3 or β5-β6 loops (Fig. 8G-H and Fig. S6). The β2-3 loop is reduced to a three-

residue hairpin and is too small to contribute to a porphyrin pocket of the kind seen in HphA

and HrpC. Neither does CrpC look like the Hpl heme-binding site, which employs a much longer

β2-β3 α-helix and longer β5-β6 loop. Nevertheless, the distribution of apolar and polar side

chains in Hpl/HphA that contact the porphyrin skeleton and ionizable propionates, respectively,

is largely conserved in CrpC, although we cannot model the precise conformation of the β5-6

loop in CrpC due to lack of a suitable template. Thus, CrpC could potentially accommodate a

porphyrin-like ligand in a more solvent exposed, and therefore presumably lower affinity,

binding site. This *X. cabanillasii* distinct non-histidine ligand binding domain is shared among

the other CrpC-like subcluster homologs, except for a small number of sequences that have a

large deletion in the hemophilin domain that removes the porphyrin binding site altogether.

Discussion:

A cornerstone of microbial existence is the extracellular deployment of metal-binding

molecules, such as hemophilins which facilitate the competitive uptake of metals essential for

cellular physiology. Here we investigated the structural features, secretion, and ligand binding

of representative hemophilins, a family of proteins in five distinct sequence similarity

subclusters encoded by Proteobacteria from human, animal, plant, built and free-living

environments. We found that the entire hemophilin family shares common motifs present in

the solved structures of the hemophilins *H. haemolyticus* Hpl and *A. baumannii* HphA [13,18]: a

central β-sheet domain and a C-terminal β-barrel domain, both of which are previously

described characteristics of T11SS cargo proteins [11,12]. In contrast, the N-terminal ligand

binding region was conserved in some, but not all hemophilin homologs. We established that,

like the hemophilins *X. nematophila* HrpC and *A. baumannii* HphA [12,33,34], two other

hemophilin homologs, *H. haemolyticus* Hpl and *X. cabanillasii* CrpC rely on a T11SS secretor to

reach the extracellular milieu. This establishes T11SS-dependence across all four hemophilin

sequence subclusters tested, and indicates T11SS-dependent secretion is a hallmark of the

entire family. Further, the results presented here support the concept that the β-sheet-β-barrel

domains are an ancestral scaffold for T11SS-dependent secretion, onto which new effector

variants are emerging through evolution of the N-terminal domain.

Despite the overall conservation of the core β-sheet-β-barrel motif among T11SS-

dependent cargo, there must be inherent differences among these domains, since different

cargo proteins show specificity for different T11SS secretors. To explore the underlying

contributors to such specificity, we capitalized on the fact that each hemophilin homolog is

associated with a cognate T11SS secretor, enabling different combinations of related cargo-

secretor pairs to be assessed for secretion activity. We found that, despite sequence, structural,

and functional similarity among hemophilin homologs and among their cognate T11SS

secretors, individual cargo-secretor pairs have specificity for each other, indicating co-

adaptation and co-diversification. These results establish that T11SS specificity is not shared

between cargo, even between closely-related homologs, and that the efficacy or rate of

secretion varies between T11SS/cargo pairings. By testing the secretion of hemophilin chimeras

with non-native C-terminal β-barrel domains we determined that this domain is largely

responsible for specificity of targeting to its cognate T11SS secretor. The effectiveness of the

tested secretors (*H. haemolyticus* HrpB and *X. nematophila* HrpB) was highest for the cognate

hemophilin cargo protein, followed by the chimeric hemophilin with the cognate C-terminal β-

barrel domain. The chimeric hemophilin with the non-cognate C-terminal β-barrel domain was

not secreted. Chimera secretion did not reach the same levels as native hemophilin cargo

protein-T11SS secretor pairings, which may indicate that the conserved β-sheet, which was not

substituted within the chimeric proteins, might also contribute to specificity. Alternatively, it

may indicate that the chimeric proteins generated have compromised stability relative to the

native cargo sequences that slows transposition or speeds up protein degradation.

The ability of the tested T11SS secretors to distinguish their cognate C-terminal domain

is striking given that their cargo proteins, Hpl and HrpC are closely related in sequence (39%

identity) and function, and reveals a previously underappreciated resolution of T11SS cargo

selection. Further, we show here that when expressed in a common *E. coli* background under

identical conditions, the T11SS secretors vary in their magnitude or efficacy. For example, HrpB

increased extracellular Hpl by 59.3-fold while HsmA increased extracellular HphA 4.6-fold.

These aspects of secretion specificity and efficacy are important to consider for potential T11SS

bioengineering applications. For instance, our findings raise the possibility that novel T11SS-

dependent cargo could be engineered for specific secretion by fusing novel N-terminal

functional domains to the C-terminal domain from a characterized cargo protein. Similarly,

Slam proteins, the subset of T11SS responsible for surface exposure of lipoproteins, have been

proposed as a novel mechanism for surface presentation of immunogenic antigens as a

potential vaccination strategy [35], and our discovery that different T11SS may have different

levels of secretion efficacy could be exploited to fine-tune the levels of surface exposure or

secretion. An important next step towards achieving this goal will be to identify the individual

sequence and structural motifs responsible for the specificity between cargo and T11SS and any

T11SS-dependent cargo modifications that may occur, to enable automatic annotation of T11SS

cognate pairs and informed engineering of novel pairings.

The results presented here provide a comparative framework in which to consider the

evolution and relatedness of T11SS cargo protein structures, which can be described as

comprising three domains: an N-terminal variable effector domain, a mid-protein β-sheet

domain, and a C-terminal β-barrel domain. The C-terminal β-barrel domain, comprising 8 β-

strands arranged in a meander topology with a sheer value of 8, and a central core of

hydrophobic side chains [18], is a unique and defining feature of T11SS cargo proteins that, as

we have established here, contributes substantially to the recognition of cargo by the cognate

T11SS secretor. The β-sheet domain is also universally present among known T11SS cargo. It is

formed in large part by amino acids in the central portion of the protein sequence, and stacks

against the β-barrel forming a physical barrier and bridge between it and the variable N-

terminal effector domain. In some cargo, including hemophilins, there are integrated structural

interactions between the variable N-terminal region and the β-sheet, with residues in the

former contributing one or more β-strands to the β-sheet, and residues in the latter

contributing key active site residues.

In the case of hemophilins, there is a conserved β-strand topology across the entire

protein, comprising the effector strands (β2-β4), β-sheet strands (β1 and β5-8) and β-barrel

strands (β9-18). Within this topology, a conserved hydrophobic core is formed by residues in

the β1-β7 region, as are interfacial contacts between the β-sheet and β-barrel domains. Indeed,

the most highly conserved sequence motif in hemophilins is a YFGEW pentapeptide that maps

to β7 and contributes side chains to both the hemophilin hydrophobic core and to interdomain

contacts. The relatedness of the hemophilins with other metal-related T11SS cargo is supported

by the fact that this conserved hemophilin ligand binding domain (Hlb) shares a parent fold

(SCOP fold 2001281) with the TbpB handle domain (SCOP family 4006246; TbpB handle

domain-like) and with HpuA (SCOP family 4005058, hemoglobin receptor HphA). However, it is

distinguished from these by differences in connectivity in the $\beta1$-$\beta3$ strands and inclusion of

one or more α-helical elements in the $\beta3$-$\beta4$ loop. These results imply that β-strand topology

and the hydrophobic core of the Hlb comprise an ancestral scaffold which has been elaborated

on in evolution to bind a diverse range of ligands: heme in the case of Hpl, HphA, and HrpC, a

variety of protein targets in the cases of HpuA, TbpB, and fHbp, and unknown ligands in the

case of CrpC and NilC.

When considering active site residues and topology, the hemophilin homologs fell into

three general classes: the Hpl type with a single histidinyl coordination binding site, the

HphA/HrpC type, which included representatives from the Plant/Environmental subcluster,

with a bi-histidinyl coordination binding site, and the CrpC type which lacked any histidines in

the predicted active site. The *A. baumannii* HphA might be considered closer to a canonical

heme-binding structure, whereas the Hpl-like subcluster appears to be more diverse in

structure and arrangement of heme ligands.

In the HphA/HrpC type class, the heme is coordinated between two histidines, one in

the $\beta2$-$\beta3$ loop and a second in the $\beta5$-$\beta6$ loop. In all members of this binding class, the $\beta2$-$\beta3$

loop is rich in Gly, Pro, and polar residues. This low complexity sequence suggests that the

conformational heterogeneity that is seen in HphA may be a general feature; in heme-bound

HphA the loop and heme-coordinating His cover one face of the porphyrin, whereas the same

loop points out away from the binding site in the apo protein [13]. The structure of the $\beta5$-$\beta6$

loop does not differ between holo and apo structures of HphA and is predicted to be conserved

across the HphA, HrpC and Plant/Environmental subclusters; a characteristic PX[S/T]H motif

that features the second heme-ligating His side is stabilized by π-stacking and H-bonding

interactions. A search of the protein database using RASMOT-3D [36] identified only one other

heme binding protein (nine-heme cytochrome c, pdb 19hc) with a similar 3D arrangement of

Pro, Ser, and heme-coordinating His side chains, but different primary sequence arrangement,

thus the PX[S/T]H appears to be specific feature of the hemophilin domain. The modelled CrpC

structure is highly similar to HrpC except that the β2-β3 loop is reduced to a hairpin and

PX[S/T]H motif is gone, suggesting an evolutionary trajectory for loss of heme binding in CrpC.

Whereas *H. haemolyticus* Hpl clearly adopts the same topology as HphA, HrpC,

Plant/Environmental, and CrpC subcluster representatives (with addition of a second helical

segment in the β3-β4 loop of Hpl), the Hpl subcluster exhibits more extensive sequence (and

likely structural) variability. One common feature within the Hpl subcluster is a D[R/K/S]NGV

motif in the β4-β5 hairpin that is predicted to make conserved interactions at the interface

between the β-sheet and the β-barrel domains. A similar motif appears in HrpC, CrpC, and a

subset of the Plant/Environmental subcluster, but it is absent in HphA and the remaining

Plant/Environmental cluster sequences, indicating that some structural features do not

conform to a simple division between HphA-like and Hpl-like sequences. The heme-associated

α-helix in both HphA and Hpl is longer than predicted in HrpC and Plant/Environmental cluster

proteins, possibly contributing to higher heme affinity in HphA/Hpl by protecting a larger

surface area of the porphyrin from solvent. Although most sequences within the Hpl subcluster

carry His in the putative β5-6 loop, one group (sequence OFR67839 is one example) lacks this

residue and other subgroups potentially have two His ligands.

The distinguishing active site characteristics among the hemophilin homologs

contextualized our findings that purified hemophilin homologs displayed variable affinity for

hemin (Fig. 5; Table 1). Intriguingly, this variable affinity for hemin may reflect differences in the

ecological roles of the hemophilin homologs. Hpl and HphA, which have established roles in

competing for heme under stringent conditions, had the highest heme affinity. *H. haemolyticus*

Hpl is a heme chelating protein for nutritional heme uptake and can prevent the related

organism, *H. influenzae*, from accessing Plant/Environmental heme [18]. This role for *H.*

haemolyticus Hpl as a tool for competing against other organisms by sequestering a limiting

nutrient (a form of nutritional immunity) would naturally favor the evolution of high hemin

affinity. In a similar vein, *A. baumannii* HphA competes with mammalian host nutritional

immunity for heme. In contrast to these two hemophilins, HrpC, encoded by *X. nematophila*,

displayed lower heme binding affinity. This may be a reflection of the distinctive animal host

niches occupied by *X. nematophila* relative to *H. haemolyticus* and *A. baumannii*. As a

pathogen, *Xenorhabdus* can infect diverse insects, which are notoriously heme poor [37] and as

a mutualist, it colonizes the intestinal tissues of its nematode host, which is a heme auxotroph

[38,39]. The insect *Drosophila melanogaster* transferrin-1 binds heme with lower affinity than

mammalian transferrin and is susceptible to low pH conditions [40]. Therefore, to access heme

in an insect environment, *X. nematophila* HrpC may not need high affinity to overcome host

chelation. In turn, lower affinity may offer a selective advantage by enabling resource sharing

with its mutualistic nematode host, *S. carpocapsae,* with the resulting improved fitness

benefitting both mutualistic partners. Dissociation of heme from HrpC would be essential for

heme to be transferred to nematode iron chelating proteins. Entomopathogenic nematodes

can live for months at a time without feeding while in their free-living infective stage. During

this time they have a sealed intestine and no access to exogenous nutrients and they may rely

on their *Xenorhabdus* symbionts to provide heme chaperoned by hemophilin [41]. While this

study did not test the heme-binding affinity of hemophilin homologs from the

Plant/Environmental subcluster, these homologs encode His residues in the β2-β3 loop and the

β5-β6 loop like HphA and HrpC (Fig. S6), indicating the potential for heme-binding activity.

Future studies on the binding affinities of these homologs may shed light on additional

functions of hemophilins and their roles in facilitating bacterial lifestyles within plants, built

environments, and soil ecosystems.

Our work has revealed that not all hemophilins have heme-binding activity, which opens

the possibility that this family is diversifying and potentially gaining new ligand binding

activities. CrpC, a member of the Cobalt/molybdenum associated subcluster of hemophilin

homologs, did not bind heme, consistent with the fact that the predicted active site had neither

the heme-coordinating His residues noted for the other hemophilin classes, nor any other

typical heme ligands such as Cys, Met, or Tyr. There are residue types in the CrpC β5-β6 loop

(Asn, Gln, Glu) and β3-β4 α-helix (Lys), that conceivably could act as metal ligands; a small

number of protein crystal structures show Asn and Gln as a second heme ligand together with

His [42] or Gln [43], respectively, and a Glu side chain [44] is in within coordinate bonding

distance of heme iron in the terminal cytochrome bd oxidase, though it does not contribute

substantially to heme binding affinity [45]. Lys residues occur in several algal globins, but only

as a second Fe-ligand together with His [46]. However, none of these possibilities fit with the

predicted structure of CrpC, which does not have His or Cys residues close to the β5-β6 loop.

Thus the absence of a strong heme-iron ligand provides a structural explanation for the failure

of CrpC to bind to heme or Zn(II)PPIX.

In this context, the binding of Co(III)PPIX to CrpC with comparable affinity to other

hemophilins was unexpected. However, it is intriguing given the genomic context of the genes

encoding CrpC and its T11SS partner, CrpB, which are found adjacent to an anaerobic

B12/cobalamin biosynthesis locus in at least three strains of *Xenorhabdus* (Fig. 2B;

Supplemental file 2), which hints at a role for the CrpC/CrpB cargo/secretion pair in cobalt or

cobalamin binding. We found that the affinity of BSA for Co(III)PPIX was similarly about 2 orders

of magnitude stronger than binding to unmetalated PPIX suggesting that Co(III)PPIX makes

useful contacts with a wider range of side chains, perhaps those present in the CrpC active site,

than does either heme or Zn(II)PPIX. CrpC binds to Co(III)PPIX with similar affinity to other

hemophilin homologues, but has a dramatically lower affinity for heme and PPIX compared to

other hemophilin homologues. Based on these data, we suggest that CrpC has evolved to lose a

heme binding function while maintaining the ability to bind an alternative cobalt-metalated

porphyrin-related ligand, such as an intermediate in cobalamin biosynthesis or metabolism.

Overall, our findings suggest that bacteria can encode multiple members of the hemophilin

family, both bona-fide hemophilins, such as HrpC, and paralogs like CrpC, that might have

evolved new ligand binding activities by divesting themselves of their affinity for heme. An

exciting avenue for the discovery of new metal-, or other ligand-binding proteins will be to

examine the activities of additional members of the hemophilin family of proteins.

Materials and Methods:

Sequence similarity network analysis

Protein sequence similarity networks were generated using the Enzyme Function

Initiative-Enzyme Similarity Tool (EFI-EST) [22]. As an input we used the previously reported

database of soluble TbpBBD cargo encoding genes which co-occurred with T11SS encoding

genes [12]. EFI-EST performs an all-by-all BLAST of query sequences to assess relatedness, and

then generates a network where each node represents a protein sequence, and the color of the

edges indicates relatedness between nodes. A minimum alignment score of 35 was chosen to

reduce total network edges enough to visualize protein subclusters. To simplify visualization

proteins sharing ≥ 80% identity were compressed into representative nodes. Networks were

visualized and interpreted using Cytoscape v3.7.1 [47] and Gephi v0.9.5 [48]. For the complete

network of soluble TbpBBD domain proteins, nodes were organized with the Fruchterman-

Reingold force-directed algorithm [49]. For the network containing only hemophilin family

proteins, nodes were organized with the ForceAtlas2 algorithm for continuous force-directed

arrangement [50].

Bacterial culture conditions

All strains, plasmids, and primers utilized in this study are described in supplemental file

3. All cultures were grown in either glucose minimal media [33], LB stored in the dark to

prevent formation of oxidative radicals (henceforth dark LB), or glucose minimal media

supplemented with 1% dark LB. Plate based cultures were grown on either LB supplemented

with pyruvate to prevent the formation of reactive oxygen radicals (henceforth LBP or glucose

minimal plates [33]. For plasmid-based expression, chemically competent *Escherichia coli* strain

BL21-DE3 (C43) were chosen for ease of transformation and their ability to non-toxically

express membrane proteins [51,52]. Strains of *Escherichia coli* were grown at 37°C. Where

appropriate, media was supplemented with ampicillin at a concentration of 150 µg/ml,

chloramphenicol at 15 µg/ml or kanamycin at 50 µg/ml unless another concentration is stated.

Protein expression was induced at the midlog point of bacterial growth via addition of isopropyl

β-d-1-thiogalactopyranoside (henceforth IPTG) at a concentration of 0.5mM.

Construction of T11SS and T11SS-dependent cargo expression plasmids

644   Expression plasmids for HrpC alone (HGB2531) and HrpBC co-expression (HGB2530)

were previously generated and reported on [12]. FLAG-*hrpB* was amplified from pETDuet-

1/*hrpBC*$_{X.nem}$ using primers 1-2. *hpl*-FLAG and its adjacently encoded T11SS neighbor, FLAG-

hrpB$_{H.haem,}$ were amplified from the purified genome of *Haemophilus haemolyticus* BW1 using

primers 3-6. *crpC*-FLAG and its adjacently encoded T11SS neighbor, FLAG-*crpB*, were amplified

from the purified genome of *Xenorhabdus cabanillasii* (HGB2490) using primers 7-10. *hphA*

(ACJ40780.1) and *hsmA* (ACJ40781.1) were generated via gene synthesis by Genscript. To make

cargo-only expression plasmids, pETDuet-1, *hpl*-FLAG, *crpC*-FLAG, and *hphA*-FLAG were digested

with NcoI and NotI. Each cargo protein was independently ligated into MCS1 of pETDuet-1 via

T4 DNA ligase, resulting in pETDuet-1/*hpl* (HGB2526), pETDuet-1/*crpC* (HGB2525), and

pETDuet-1/*hphA* (HGB2532). Integration of each T11SS-dependent cargo was confirmed via

digestion with NcoI and NotI as well as Sanger sequencing using primers 11-12 at the University

of Tennessee (UT) Genomics Core.

To make T11SS/cargo co-expression plasmids, each of the above cargo-only expression

plasmids were digested with KpnI and NdeI, alongside the PCR products for FLAG-*hrpB*$_{H.haem,}$

FLAG-*crpB*, and FLAG-*hsmA*. Each T11SS protein was then independently ligated into MCS2 of

the plasmid containing its cognate cargo via T4 DNA ligase, resulting in pETDuet-

1/*hpl*/*hrpB*$_{H.haem}$ (HGB2523), pETDuet-1/*crpC*/*crpB* (HGB2524), and pETDuet-1/*hphA*/*hsmA*

(HGB2533). Additionally, the PCR product for FLAG-*hrpB* from *X. nematophila* was digested with

KpnI and NdeI and ligated into MCS2 of all the cargo-only expression plasmids, resulting in

pETDuet-1/*hpl*/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2529), pETDuet-1/*crpC*/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2528), and pETDuet-

1/*hphA*/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2527). Integration of each T11SS protein was confirmed via digestion

with KpnI and NdeI as well as Sanger sequencing using primer 13 the at the University of

Tennessee (UT) Genomics Core.

To construct chimeric hemophilin homologs, *hrpC* and *hpl* were split into two domains

based on multiple sequence alignment and the NCBI conserved domain database. *hrpC* was

split between position 402 and 403, while *hpl* was split between position 474 and 475. Primers

14-15 were used to amplify the hemophilin handle domain from pETDuet-1/*hrpC*/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$

(HGB2530). Primers 16-17 were used to amplify *hrpB* and the hemophilin β-barrel domain from

pETDuet-1/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$/*hpl* (HGB2529). These two products were assembled into pETDuet-

1/Chimeric hemophilin(*hrpC-hpl*)/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2595). Primers 18-19 were used to amplify the

hemophilin handle domain from pETDuet-1/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$/*hpl* (HGB2529). To amplify *hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ and

the hemophilin β-barrel domain from pETDuet-1/*hrpC*/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2530). These two

products were assembled into pETDuet-1/Chimeric hemophilin(*hpl-hrpC*)/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2596).

Primers 14-15 were used to amplify the hemophilin handle domain from pETDuet-

1/*hrpC*/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2530). Primers 16-17 were used to amplify *hrpB*$_{H.haem}$ and the hemophilin

β-barrel domain from pETDuet-1/*hpl*/*hrpB*$_{H.haem}$ (HGB2523). These two products were

assembled into pETDuet-1/ Chimeric hemophilin (*hrpC-hpl*)/*hrpB*$_{H.haem}$ (HGB2597). Finally,

pETDuet-1/Chimeric hemophilin (*hpl-hrpC*)/*hrpB*$_{X.nem}$ (HGB2596) and pETDuet-1/*hpl*/*hrpB*$_{H.haem}$

(HGB2523) were digested with NotI and NcoI, liberating the hemophilin homolog from each

vector. The chimeric hemophilin from HGB2596 was isolated via gel electrophoresis and then

ligated into MCS1 of the vector isolated from HGB2523, resulting in pETDuet-1/Chimeric

hemophilin (*hpl-hrpC*)/*hrpB*$_{H.haem}$ (HGB2598). Integration of each T11SS protein and chimeric

cargo was confirmed via Sanger sequencing using primers 12-13 at the University of Tennessee

(UT) Genomics Core.

Protein expression and Immunoblotting

E. coli strains used for expression experiments were taken fresh from storage at -80°C

for each experiment. Strains were cultured on glucose minimal media plates + ampicillin

overnight. For each biological replicate, 10 colonies were pooled and inoculated into 5ml of

fresh minimal media glucose + ampicillin broth and incubated rotating overnight. Each replicate

of each strain was rinsed 2x in PBS and normalized to an OD$_{600}$ of 0.05 in 60ml of glucose

minimal media + 1% LB + ampicillin. These were grown shaking at 225rpm until they reached

mid log growth (OD$_{600}$ ≈ 1), typically between 5 and 8.5 hours. Upon reaching midlog growth,

25mls of each culture was removed and used as an uninduced T0 control. The remaining 35mls

were supplemented with IPTG to a concentration of 0.5mM. One milliliter supernatant samples

were taken at 1 and 2.5 hour(s) post induction. Supernatant samples were clarified via

centrifugation and filter sterilized. At 2.5 hours post induction the remaining cultures were

concentrated via centrifugation, rinsed 2x in PBS, and lysed via sonication (30 s at ~500-rms

volts). Supernatant samples and cellular lysate samples were supplemented with PMSF (1.7

µg/ml), Leupeptin (4.75 µg/ml), and Pepstatin A (0.69 µg/ml) to inhibit proteinase activity. The

no plasmid control was performed identically except without the presence of ampicillin in the

media.

The protein concentration of cellular lysates was normalized via the Pierce 660nm

Protein Assay (REF22660). For supernatant samples 600µl of each filtered sample was

precipitated via 10% Trichloroacetic acid precipitation as previously described [12,53]. Samples

were boiled for 10-25 min. prior to performing SDS-PAGE to ensure complete unfolding in the

protein sample buffer. SDS-PAGE was performed in duplicate using 10% polyacrylamide gels.

The first gel was used to perform Coomassie staining for total protein content while the second

gel was transferred to a PVDF membrane for Western immunoblotting. Immunoblots were

incubated in 50% Ly-cor blocking buffer:50% Tris buffered saline (TBS) for 1 hour to block.

Immunoblots were then incubated in 50% Ly-cor blocking buffer:50% TBS supplemented 0.1%

Tween20 and 1:5000 rat α-FLAG antibody for 1 hour. Subsequently the blots were incubated in

50% Ly-cor blocking buffer:50% TBS supplemented 0.1% Tween20 and 1:5000 goat α-rat

antibody bound to a 680CW fluorophore for 1 hour. Finally, immunoblots were visualized using

a Li-cor odyssey imaging the 700nm wavelength. The intensity of supernatant samples was

normalized to a clearly visible, non-target protein band in the Coomassie stain to control for

protein concentration. Efficacy of secretion was measured as the fold change of cargo protein

present in the supernatant when co-expressed with a T11SS protein relative to cargo protein

present in the supernatant when expressed alone. Fold changes were not normally distributed

initially, so they were $\log_{10}$ transformed prior to analysis. The resulting data were analyzed via a

one-way ANOVA and a Tukey's HSD Test [54].

Purification of hemophilin homologs

Hemophilin from *H. haemolyticus* was expressed and purified as previously described to

yield low and high heme-content fractions after anion exchange chromatography [18]. Heme

was removed by cold acid acetone treatment to yield an apo hemophilin fraction, as previously

described [55]. Residual Fe(III) heme was estimated at 1.8% of sites, based on extinction

coefficients of met-hemophilin being 96,100 M^{-1} cm^{-1} and 38,600 M^{-1} cm^{-1} at 414 nm and 280

nm, respectively, and extinction coefficient of the apo-protein being 25,900 M^{-1} cm^{-1} at 280

nm.

Expression constructs encoding the hemophilin homologs from *X. nematophila* (residues

23–247), *X. cabanillasii* (residues 23–238) and *A. baumannii* (residues 21–264) were

constructed in pET28a. In each case, the native N-terminal signal peptide was omitted and

replaced with a hexa-histidine tag and engineered tobacco etch virus (TEV) protease cleavage

site. Clones were transformed into *E. coli* strain Rossetta-2 (Novagen), grown in LB containing

34 µg/ml chloramphenicol and 25 µg/ml kanamycin; expression was induced with 1 mM IPTG

for 3 hours shaking at 37°C. Cells were suspended in lysis buffer (0.5 M NaCl, 0.05 M sodium

phosphate, 0.02 M imidazole, 100 µM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, pH 7.2) and lysed by

sonication (Branson), then hemophilin homologs were captured by Ni-affinity chromatography.

TEV protease was expressed and purified as described [56]. The His-tag was cleaved from

hemophilin homologs by TEV protease treatment overnight at room temperature, to liberate

hemophilin proteins with an additional N-terminal Gly-His-Met tripeptide residual from the TEV

cleavage site. TEV protease and His-tag peptides were removed over a second Ni-affinity

column. Hemophilin preparations from *X. nematophila* and *A. baumannii* had a brownish

appearance and an absorbance peak at ~413 nm characteristic of a porphyrin ligand, as well as

less intense absorption peaks at 533 and 659 nm. Ligand was estimated to occupy ~25% of sites

based on comparison with spectra of hemophilin from *H. haemolyticus*. In contrast, CrpC from

X. cabanillasii was colorless. Acid acetone or methyl ethyl ketone extraction was not effective

to remove colored contaminants from HrpC of *X. nematophila* or *A. baumannii*. Apo-protein

fractions of these proteins were prepared by reversed-phase HPLC over a C4 stationary phase

(Waters Symmetry) developed with a CH_3CN:water mobile phase gradient containing 0.1%

trifluoroacetic acid. Solvent was removed by lyophilisation. Apo-CrpC from *X. cabanillasii* was

applied to a strong anion exchange resin (Q sepharose, Pharmacia) in 25 mM Tris-HCl buffer (pH

8.25 at 21°C) and collected in the flow-through. All apo-proteins were dialyzed into 20 mM Tris-

HCl buffer (pH 7.9 at 21°C) prior to storage at –80°C. Apo-protein concentrations were

determined by absorption extinction coefficient at 280 nm calculated from amino acid

composition.

UV-visible absorption and fluorescence spectroscopy

UV-visible spectra were recorded on a Jasco V-630 spectrophotometer fitted with a

temperature-controlled sample holder (Jasco) and spectrosil quartz cuvettes with a path length

of 1.0 cm (Starna, Baulkham Hills, Australia). Porphyrin concentrations were determined

according to the following molar extinction coefficients and solvent conditions: hemin chloride,

ε_{385} = 58,400 $M^{-1}cm^{-1}$ in 0.1 M NaOH [57]; PPIX ε_{554} = 13,500 $M^{-1}cm^{-1}$ in 2.7 M HCl [57];

coproporphyrin III, ε_{548} = 16,800 $M^{-1}cm^{-1}$ in 0.1 M HCl [58]; Co(III)PPIX $\varepsilon424$ = 180,000 $M^{-1}cm^{-1}$

in NaOH(0.1 M):pyridine:H_2O 3:10:17 [59]. Zn(II)PPIX was determined as free PPIX after

decomposition in 2.7 M HCl. To prepare Zn-PPIX, 0.5 g PPIX (Frontier Scientific) was dissolved in

boiling chloroform (100 mL), to which a saturated solution of Zn acetate in MeOH (1 mL) was

added. The mixture was refluxed for 20 min and then a small amount of MeOH was added and,

after cooling, the dark red solid was filtered off (50:50 Zn-PPIX:PPIX by HPLC). Zn-PPIX was

purified by RP-HPLC over a C18 solid phase (Phenomenex) with isocratic

acetone:MeOH:water:formic acid (280:120:100:1) mobile phase, which achieved baseline

separation of the Zn-PPIX fraction.

Hemin binding measurements in absorbance mode were made by successive additions

of apo-protein (~0.4 mM stock) into porphyrin solution (1.5 μM) in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8 at

21°C. All binding experiments were performed at 21°C. Data were fitted to a 1:1 binding model

accounting for ligand depletion, where F_{obs} is fluorescence signal, F_0 is the starting

782           $$F_{obs} = F_0 - F_{sat}((L+K_d+M) - \sqrt{(L+K_d+M)^2 - 4ML})$$

783   fluorescence, F_{sat} is a scaling factor for fluorescence at saturation, L and M are the ligand and

784   macromolecule concentrations, respectively, and K_d is the equilibrium dissociation constant.

785   Data were fitted using GNUPLOT version 4.6. A 95% confidence interval for the K_d parameter was

786   obtained by determining a threshold sum-of-squares for which a fit with all fixed parameters

787           $$SS_{fixed} = SS_{best} ((F \times Dfn)/Dfd + 1)$$

would not be significantly different from the best-fit model at a significance level of P = 0.05

[60]. Here, SS_{best} is the sum-of-squares for the fit with all parameters floated; Dfn and Dfd are

the degrees of freedom in the numerator and denominator, respectively, for calculation of F.

The K_d value was then fixed at values above or below the best-fit K_d until fits exceeded the

threshold sum-of-squares. To determine a lower limit of Kd that we could expect to fit from

absorbance measurements we simulated data for different K_d values with Gaussian noise added

to give fits with SS_{best} that matched our experimental data. We determined by F test that K_d

values ≤ 15 nM were not significantly different (at P = 0.05) from arbitrarily high K_d

(approximating a straight-line fit), thus we decided on 15 nM as a lower cutoff for reporting K_d.

Fluorescence measurements for Zn(II)PPIX binding were made in 96-well format in 20

mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 at 21°C using individually mixed samples covering an appropriate range of

hemophilin protein concentrations based on preliminary experiments. IC_{50} for hemophilins

binding to Zn(II)PPIX (0.5 or 1.0 µM) in competition with BSA (15 µM) were determined by

fitted to the same 1:1 binding model as described above. The Cheng and Prusoff equation [61]

was used to convert to K_d, where [BSA] is the molar concentration of competing BSA (15 µM)

$$K_d = IC_{50} / (1 + [BSA]/K_{d,BSA})$$

and $K_{d,BSA}$ was the dissociation equilibrium constant for BSA binding to Zn(II)PPIX, determined to

be 0.3 (0.2–0.4) µM from absorbance titration data.

Generation of threading models for hemophilin active sites

Threading models were generated with the program MODELLER version 10.2 [32], using

the X-ray crystal structures of *H. Haemolyticus* Hpl (PDB 6om5) and *A. baumannii* HphA (PDB

7red) as templates [13,18]. Residues of the N-terminal signal peptide, as identified by SIGNALP

5.0 [62], were removed prior to analysis or modeling of all sequences. The threading approach

used by MODELLER relies on accurate alignment of template and query sequences. To identify

residues likely to be important for structural integrity of the hemophilin ligand binding domain

we collected the small number of sequences that shared similarity with Hpl, HphA and *X.*

nematophila HrpC in the N-terminal region, or with pair-wise combinations of these, based on

BLASTP searches. We aligned these sequences with the structure-based alignment of Hpl and

HphA produced by MODELLER to generate a profile against which subclusters from the sequence

similarity network analysis were then aligned using CLUSTALO. Alignments were inspected against

several criteria to see that they were structurally plausible. We specifically examined the

preservation of the conserved hydrophobic core ligand binding domains of Hpl and HphA,

corresponding to Hpl residues G26, I38, I40, A49, V51, I53, F76, M79, A83, A104, L125, F127,

Y136, G138, W140, Y136, A158 (Fig. 9). An initial structure-based alignment of *H. haemolyticus*

Hpl and *A. baumannii* HphA was produced using MODELLER, and this pairing was fixed in all

subsequent alignments. Amino acid residues with potential importance for the hemophilin fold

were identified by sequence homology (with the signal peptides and BBD removed) using BLASTP

[63]. Sequences were identified with similarity to the hemophilin domains of Hpl, HphA and the

N-terminal region of *X. nematophila* HrpC (WP_019473020, WP_057440571, WP_244182492),

or Hpl and HphA only (WP_005758278), or HphA and HrpC only (MBP6115507, WP_228864429,

WP_232888613), or Hpl and HrpC only (WP_038256617, WP_092512525, WP_244182492), or

HphA only (WP_121975315), or Hpl only (RKV63521). These sequences were aligned with the

structure-based alignment of Hpl and HphA using CLUSTAL OMEGA [64] to generate a. A profile

was generated from this sequence alignment and this profile was aligned with the profiles of

the hemophilin network clusters, Plant/Environmental, HphA-like, HrpC-like and CrpC-like,

using CLUSTAL OMEGA. Alignments were colored using MVIEW [65].

Acknowledgements:

We thank Dr. Brianna Atto for useful discussions and Sarah Kauffman for technical

assistance.

Financial Disclosure Statement:

This work was funded in part by funds awarded to HGB from the University of

Tennessee-Knoxville and the National Science Foundation (IOS-2128266). This work was funded

in part by a grant from the Clifford Craig Foundation awarded to Dr. Stephen Tristram (CCF192).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or

preparation of the manuscript. The authors have no competing interests that might be

perceived to influence the results and/or discussion reported in this paper.

References:

848   1.   Bertini I, Gray H, Stiefel E, Selverstone Valentine J. Biological inorganic chemistry:
849   structure and reactivity. Sausalito: University Science Books; 2007.
850   2.   Zhang H-R, Wang Y, Xiu P, Qi Y, Chai F. Roles of iron limitation in phytoplankton dynamics
851   in the western and eastern subarctic pacific. Frontiers in Marine Science. 2021. Available:
852   https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmars.2021.735826
853   3.   Hood MI, Skaar EP. Nutritional immunity: transition metals at the pathogen–host
854   interface. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2012;10: 525–537. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2836
855   4.   Khan FA, Fisher MA, Khakoo RA. Association of hemochromatosis with infectious
856   diseases: expanding spectrum. Int J Infect Dis. 2007;11: 482–487.
857   doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2007.04.007
858   5.   Posey JE, Gherardini FC. Lack of a role for iron in the Lyme disease pathogen. Science.
859   2000;288: 1651–1653. doi:10.1126/science.288.5471.1651
860   6.   Holden VI, Bachman MA. Diverging roles of bacterial siderophores during infection.
861   Metallomics. 2015;7: 986–995. doi:10.1039/c4mt00333k
862   7.   Hooda Y, Lai CC-L, Judd A, Buckwalter CM, Shin HE, Gray-Owen SD, et al. Slam is an outer
863   membrane protein that is required for the surface display of lipidated virulence factors in
864   Neisseria. Nat Microbiol. 2016;1. doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.9
865   8.   Chen CJ, Sparling PF, Lewis LA, Dyer DW, Elkins C. Identification and purification of a
866   hemoglobin-binding outer membrane protein from Neisseria gonorrhoeae. Infect
867   Immun. 1996;64: 5008–5014. doi:10.1128/iai.64.12.5008-5014.1996
868   9.   Calmettes C, Alcantara J, Yu R-H, Schryvers AB, Moraes TF. The structural basis of
869   transferrin sequestration by transferrin-binding protein B. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2012;19:
870   358–360. doi:10.1038/nsmb.2251
871   10.   Ostan NKH, Yu R-H, Ng D, Lai CC-L, Pogoutse AK, Sarpe V, et al. Lactoferrin binding
872   protein B - a bi-functional bacterial receptor protein. PLoS Pathog. 2017;13: e1006244.
873   doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1006244
874   11.   Hooda Y, Lai CC-L, Moraes TF. Identification of a large family of Slam-dependent surface
875   lipoproteins in Gram-negative bacteria. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2017;7.
876   doi:10.3389/fcimb.2017.00207
877   12.   Grossman AS, Mauer TJ, Forest KT, Goodrich-Blair H, Comstock L. A widespread bacterial
878   secretion system with diverse substrates. MBio. 2022;12: e01956-21.
879   doi:10.1128/mBio.01956-21
880   13.   Bateman TJ, Shah M, Ho TP, Shin HE, Pan C, Harris G, et al. A Slam-dependent
881   hemophore contributes to heme acquisition in the bacterial pathogen Acinetobacter
882   baumannii. Nat Commun. 2021;12: 6270. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-26545-9
883   14.   Arnoux P, Haser R, Izadi-Pruneyre N, Lecroisey A, Czjzek M. Functional aspects of the
884   heme bound hemophore HasA by structural analysis of various crystal forms. Proteins
885   Struct Funct Bioinforma. 2000;41: 202–210. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-
886   0134(20001101)41:2<202::AID-PROT50>3.0.CO;2-8
887   15.   Gianquinto E, Moscetti I, De Bei O, Campanini B, Marchetti M, Luque FJ, et al. Interaction
888   of human hemoglobin and semi-hemoglobins with the Staphylococcus aureus
889   hemophore IsdB: a kinetic and mechanistic insight. Sci Rep. 2019;9: 18629.

doi:10.1038/s41598-019-54970-w

16.   Huynh MS, Hooda Y, Li YR, Jagielnicki M, Lai CC-L, Moraes TF. Reconstitution of surface
lipoprotein translocation through the Slam translocon. Elife. 2022;11.
doi:10.7554/eLife.72822

17.   Fantappiè L, Irene C, De Santis M, Armini A, Gagliardi A, Tomasi M, et al. Some Gram-
negative lipoproteins keep their surface topology when transplanted from one species to
another and deliver foreign polypeptides to the bacterial surface. Mol & Cell
Proteomics. 2017;16: 1348 LP – 1364. doi:10.1074/mcp.M116.065094

18.   Latham RD, Torrado M, Atto B, Walshe JL, Wilson RK, Guss JM, et al. A heme-binding
protein produced by Haemophilus haemolyticus inhibits non-typeable Haemophilus
influenzae. Mol Microbiol. 2020;113: 381–398. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.14426

19.   Schwiesow L, Mettert E, Wei Y, Miller HK, Herrera NG, Balderas D, et al. Control of hmu
heme uptake genes in Yersinia pseudotuberculosis in response to iron sources. Frontiers
in Cellular and Infection Microbiology. 2018. Available:
https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fcimb.2018.00047

20.   Atto B, Latham RD, Kunde D, Gell DA, Tristram S. In vitro probiotic potential of
hemophilin-producing strains of Haemophilus haemolyticus. bioRxiv. 2020;
2020.01.02.893487. doi:10.1101/2020.01.02.893487

21.   Atto B, Kunde D, Gell DA, Tristram S. Oropharyngeal carriage of hpl-containing
Haemophilus haemolyticus predicts lower prevalence and density of NTHi colonisation in
healthy adults. Pathog (Basel, Switzerland). 2021;10. doi:10.3390/pathogens10050577

22.   Zallot R, Oberg NO, Gerlt JA. The EFI web resource for genomic enzymology tools:
leveraging protein, genome, and metagenome databases to discover novel enzymes and
metabolic pathways. Biochemistry. 2019;58: 4169–4182.
doi:10.1021/acs.biochem.9b00735

23.   Tietz JI, Schwalen CJ, Patel PS, Maxson T, Blair PM, Tai H-C, et al. A new genome-mining
tool redefines the lasso peptide biosynthetic landscape. Nat Chem Biol. 2017;13: 470–
478. doi:10.1038/nchembio.2319

24.   Egler M, Grosse C, Grass G, Nies DH. Role of the extracytoplasmic function protein family
sigma factor RpoE in metal resistance of Escherichia coli. J Bacteriol. 2005;187: 2297–
2307. doi:10.1128/JB.187.7.2297-2307.2005

25.   Schwartz CJ, Giel JL, Patschkowski T, Luther C, Ruzicka FJ, Beinert H, et al. IscR, an Fe-S
cluster-containing transcription factor, represses expression of Escherichia coli genes
encoding Fe-S cluster assembly proteins. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2001;98: 14895–14900.
doi:10.1073/pnas.251550898

26.   Maddocks SE, Oyston PCF. Structure and function of the LysR-type transcriptional
regulator (LTTR) family proteins. Microbiology. 2008;154: 3609–3623.
doi:10.1099/mic.0.2008/022772-0

27.   Science Gateway. Protein molecular weight calculator. www.sciencegateway.org;
Available: https://www.sciencegateway.org/tools/proteinmw.htm

28.   Grossman AS, Escobar CA, Mans EJ, Mucci NC, Mauer TJ, Jones KA, et al. A surface
exposed, two-domain lipoprotein cargo of a type XI secretion system promotes
colonization of host intestinal epithelia expressing glycans. Frontiers in Microbiology.
2022. Available: https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2022.800366

29.   Holm L, Rosenström P. Dali server: conservation mapping in 3D. Nucleic Acids Res.
935   2010;38: W545-9. doi:10.1093/nar/gkq366
936   30.   Sillitoe I, Bordin N, Dawson N, Waman VP, Ashford P, Scholes HM, et al. CATH: increased
937   structural coverage of functional space. Nucleic Acids Res. 2021;49: D266–D273.
938   doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa1079
939   31.   Andreeva A, Kulesha E, Gough J, Murzin AG. The SCOP database in 2020: expanded
940   classification of representative family and superfamily domains of known protein
941   structures. Nucleic Acids Res. 2020;48: D376–D382. doi:10.1093/nar/gkz1064
942   32.   Webb B, Sali A. Comparative protein structure modeling using MODELLER. Curr Protoc
943   Bioinforma. 2016;54: 5.6.1-5.6.37. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/cpbi.3
944   33.   Bhasin A, Chaston JM, Goodrich-Blair H. Mutational analyses reveal overall topology and
945   functional regions of NilB, a bacterial outer membrane protein required for host
946   association in a model of animal-microbe mutualism. J Bacteriol. 2012;194: 1763–1776.
947   doi:10.1128/JB.06711-11
948   34.   Cowles CE, Goodrich-Blair H. The Xenorhabdus nematophila nilABC genes confer the
949   ability of Xenorhabdus spp. to colonize Steinernema carpocapsae nematodes. J Bacteriol.
950   2008;190: 4121–4128. doi:10.1128/JB.00123-08
951   35.   Moraes TF, Lai CC-L, Hooda Y, Judd A, Schryvers AB, Gray-Owen SD. Slam polynucleotides
952   and polypeptides and uses thereof. US; US20210379176A1, 2021. pp. 1–36. Available:
953   https://patents.google.com/patent/US20210379176A1/en
954   36.   Debret G, Martel A, Cuniasse P. RASMOT-3D PRO: a 3D motif search webserver. Nucleic
955   Acids Res. 2009;37: W459–W464. doi:10.1093/nar/gkp304
956   37.   Burmester T, Hankeln T. The respiratory proteins of insects. J Insect Physiol. 2007;53:
957   285–294. doi:10.1016/j.jinsphys.2006.12.006
958   38.   Buecher EJ, Popiel I. Liquid culture of the entomogenous nematode steinernema feltiae
959   with its bacterial symbiont. J Nematol. 1989;21: 500–504.
960   39.   Hieb WF, Stokstad EL, Rothstein M. Heme requirement for reproduction of a free-living
961   nematode. Science. 1970;168: 143–144. doi:10.1126/science.168.3927.143
962   40.   Weber JJ, Kanost MR, Gorman MJ. Iron binding and release properties of transferrin-1
963   from Drosophila melanogaster and Manduca sexta: Implications for insect iron
964   homeostasis. Insect Biochem Mol Biol. 2020;125: 103438.
965   doi:10.1016/j.ibmb.2020.103438
966   41.   Goodrich-Blair H. They've got a ticket to ride: Xenorhabdus nematophila–Steinernema
967   carpocapsae symbiosis. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2007;10: 225–230.
968   doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2007.05.006
969   42.   Leys D, Backers K, Meyer TE, Hagen WR, Cusanovich MA, Van Beeumen JJ. Crystal
970   structures of an oxygen-binding cytochrome c from Rhodobacter sphaeroides. J Biol
971   Chem. 2000;275: 16050–16056. doi:10.1074/jbc.275.21.16050
972   43.   Girvan HM, Toogood HS, Littleford RE, Seward HE, Smith WE, Ekanem IS, et al. Novel
973   haem co-ordination variants of flavocytochrome P450BM3. Biochem J. 2009;417: 65–76.
974   doi:10.1042/BJ20081133
975   44.   Safarian S, Rajendran C, Müller H, Preu J, Langer JD, Ovchinnikov S, et al. Structure of a
976   bd oxidase indicates similar mechanisms for membrane-integrated oxygen reductases.
977   Science. 2016;352: 583–586. doi:10.1126/science.aaf2477

45.   Murali R, Gennis RB. Functional importance of Glutamate-445 and Glutamate-99 in
proton-coupled electron transfer during oxygen reduction by cytochrome bd from
Escherichia coli. Biochim Biophys Acta - Bioenerg. 2018;1859: 577–590.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbabio.2018.04.012
46.   Johnson EA, Russo MM, Nye DB, Schlessman JL, Lecomte JTJ. Lysine as a heme iron
ligand: A property common to three truncated hemoglobins from Chlamydomonas
reinhardtii. Biochim Biophys Acta - Gen Subj. 2018;1862: 2660–2673.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbagen.2018.08.009
47.   Shannon P. Cytoscape: A software environment for integrated models of biomolecular
interaction networks. Genome Res. 2003;13: 2498–2504. doi:10.1101/gr.1239303
48.   Bastian M, Heymann S, Jacomy M. Gephi: An open source software for exploring and
manipulating networks. Proc Int AAAI Conf Web Soc Media. 2009;3: 361–362. Available:
https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/ICWSM/article/view/13937
49.   Fruchterman TMJ, Reingold EM. Graph drawing by force-directed placement. Softw Pract
Exp. 1991;21: 1129–1164. doi:10.1002/spe.4380211102
50.   Jacomy M, Venturini T, Heymann S, Bastian M. ForceAtlas2, a continuous graph layout
algorithm for handy network visualization designed for the Gephi software. PLoS One.
2014;9: e98679. Available: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0098679
51.   Miroux B, Walker JE. Over-production of proteins in Escherichia coli: mutant hosts that
allow synthesis of some membrane proteins and globular proteins at high levels. J Mol
Biol. 1996;260: 289–298. doi:10.1006/jmbi.1996.0399
52.   Dumon-Seignovert L, Cariot G, Vuillard L. The toxicity of recombinant proteins in
Escherichia coli: a comparison of overexpression in BL21(DE3), C41(DE3), and C43(DE3).
Protein Expr Purif. 2004;37: 203–206. doi:10.1016/j.pep.2004.04.025
53.   Koontz L. Chapter one - TCA precipitation. In: Lorsch JBT-M in E, editor. Laboratory
methods in enzymology. Academic Press; 2014. pp. 3–10.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-420119-4.00001-X
54.   Tukey JW. Comparing individual means in the analysis of variance. Biometrics. 1949;5:
99–114. doi:10.2307/3001913
55.   Ascoli F, Rossi Fanelli MR, Antonini EBT-M in E. Preparation and properties of
apohemoglobin and reconstituted hemoglobins. Hemoglobins. Academic Press; 1981. pp.
72–87. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0076-6879(81)76115-9
56.   van den Berg S, Löfdahl P-Å, Härd T, Berglund H. Improved solubility of TEV protease by
directed evolution. J Biotechnol. 2006;121: 291–298.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiotec.2005.08.006
57.   Arnstein HR V. Data for biochemical research (Third Edition) : by R.M.C. Dawson, D.C.
Elliott, W.H. Elliott and K.M. Jones Oxford University Press; Oxford, 1986 xii + 580 pages.
£35.00. FEBS Lett. 1988;234: 506.
58.   Fuhrhop JH, Smith KM. Laboratory methods in porphyrin and metalloporphyrin research.
Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company; 1975. Available:
https://books.google.com/books?id=0tpFwgEACAAJ
59.   Yonetani T, Yamamoto H, Woodrow GV 3rd. Studies on cobalt myoglobins and
hemoglobins. I. Preparation and optical properties of myoglobins and hemoglobins
containing cobalt proto-, meso-, and deuteroporphyrins and thermodynamic

1022   characterization of their reversible oxygenation. J Biol Chem. 1974;249: 682–690.

1023   60.   Motulsky H, Christopoulos A. Fitting models to biological data using linear and nonlinear
1024   regression: a practical guide to curve fitting. Oxford University Press; 2004.

1025   61.   Cheng Y, Prusoff WH. Relationship between the inhibition constant (K1) and the
1026   concentration of inhibitor which causes 50 per cent inhibition (I50) of an enzymatic
1027   reaction. Biochem Pharmacol. 1973;22: 3099–3108. doi:10.1016/0006-2952(73)90196-2

1028   62.   Almagro Armenteros JJ, Tsirigos KD, Sønderby CK, Petersen TN, Winther O, Brunak S, et
1029   al. SignalP 5.0 improves signal peptide predictions using deep neural networks. Nat
1030   Biotechnol. 2019;37: 420–423. doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0036-z

1031   63.   Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. Basic local alignment search tool. J
1032   Mol Biol. 1990;215: 403–410. doi:10.1016/S0022-2836(05)80360-2

1033   64.   Sievers F, Wilm A, Dineen D, Gibson TJ, Karplus K, Li W, et al. Fast, scalable generation of
1034   high-quality protein multiple sequence alignments using Clustal Omega. Mol Syst Biol.
1035   2011;7: 539. doi:10.1038/msb.2011.75

1036   65.   Brown NP, Leroy C, Sander C. MView: a web-compatible database search or multiple
1037   alignment viewer. Bioinformatics. 1998;14: 380–381.
1038   doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/14.4.380

1039

1040

1041

Figure 1. **Conceptual model of hemophilin mediated heme acquisition.** Described hemophilin
homologs have a signal peptide directing them to the Sec translocon and signal peptidase I.
Based on analogy to the T11SS-dependent lipoprotein TbpB, hemophilin may depend on Skp for
periplasmic transport. Each hemophilin protein has a cognate T11SS which translocates it
through the outer membrane where it acts to bring heme to a TonB-dependent receptor for
uptake. Based on analogy to the *Yersinia pestis* Has hemophore system, heme is transported
through the periplasm and across the inner membrane by the hemin utilization system (Hmu).
Once brought into the cytoplasm, heme can be degraded by heme oxygenase (HmuS), an
enzyme which is frequently encoded adjacent to hemophilin loci.
1051

1052
Supplementary Figure S1. **Distribution and relatedness of soluble T11SS-dependent cargo**
proteins. A sequence similarity network of all soluble TbpBBD-domain-containing proteins
identified in Grossman and Mauer, et al. (2022). All of these sequences are encoded in the
same genomic region as a T11SS-encoding gene (± 6 genes). Sequences were submitted to EFI-
EST (see methods) to generate the network. Each node represents one or more protein
sequences with 80% or greater identity, the larger the node the more sequences it contains.
Edges indicate an alignment score of 35 or greater. Edge darkness indicates shared sequence
identity, with the darkest edges being the most identical. Dotted lines indicate proposed
subclusters as defined using the Fruchterman-Reingold algorithm and the distribution of
characterized proteins. Sequences that did not connect to any characterized hemophilin family
protein were excluded from further analysis (e.g., Figure 3). Despite having similar domain
architectures to hemophilin, none of these divergent sequences contained experimentally
characterized proteins.

1066
Figure 2. **Distribution and relatedness of hemophilin family proteins. A)** A sequence similarity
network of hemophilin homologs generated with EFI-EST. Each node represents one or more
protein sequences with 80% or greater identity, the larger the node the more sequences it
contains. Edges indicate an alignment score of 35 or greater. Edge darkness indicates shared
sequence identity, with the darkest edges being the most identical. Dotted lines indicate
proposed subclusters as defined using a force-directed algorithm and the distribution of
characterized proteins. **B)** Representative genomic neighborhoods from the subclusters
identified within the sequence similarity network demonstrating common co-occurring genes.
C) A cladogram of the seven genera which encode the most hemophilin family proteins, split
between Alpha-, Beta-, and Gammaproteobacteria. The circles and numbers to the right of the
cladogram indicate the relative abundance of known hemophilin homologs encoded by each
genus.

Figure 3. **Secretion of hemophilin proteins by their cognate and non-cognate T11SS proteins.** Each cargo protein was expressed in *Escherichia coli* in isolation (cargo alone; pink diamonds) or co-expressed in with their cognate T11SS (blue squares) or with non-cognate HrpB$_{X.nem}$ (orange circles). Supernatant proteins were precipitated and quantified via immuno-blotting with anti-FLAG antibody to detect extracellular cargo proteins. Fold change of secretion was determined by dividing the amount of extracellular cargo detected in co-expression treatments by the amount seen in the respective cargo-alone treatment. Data were transformed with a log$_{10}$ function prior to performing a Tukey's HSD test for each hemophilin homolog. Letters indicate significance groups. All four T11SS proteins assayed significantly increased the amount of cognate cargo that was secreted into the extracellular milieu. The non-cognate T11SS HrpB$_{X.nem}$ significantly increased secretion of Hpl but less effectively than the cognate T11SS of Hpl. HrpB$_{X.nem}$ did not significantly affect the secretion of HsmA or CrpC.

Figure 4. **Secretion of domain-swapped chimeric hemophilin proteins by HrpB$_{X.nem}$ and HrpB$_{H.haem}$. A)** A pictorial depiction of the experimental treatments used to assess secretion of chimeric hemophilin cargo proteins by HrpB T11SS secretors from *H. haemolyticus* (HrpB$_{H.haem}$; orange) and *X. nematophila* (HrpB$_{X.nem}$; yellow). Each T11SS protein was co-expressed alongside its cognate cargo protein (Hpl [blue] and HrpC [green], respectively), and two chimeric cargo proteins (HrpC/Hpl and Hlp/HrpC) generated by swapping the two domains (N-terminal effector/C-terminal barrel) of Hpl and HrpC. Fold change of secretion was determined by immunoblotting with anti-FLAG antibodies and dividing the amount of extracellular cargo in detected co-expression treatments by the amount seen in the respective cargo-only treatment. **B)** Secretion data were made normal with a log$_{10}$ transformation. Both chimeric hemophilin proteins were preferentially secreted by the T11SS that was cognate to the C-terminal barrel domain they contained. However, neither chimeric protein (triangles) was as effectively secreted as the native (non-chimeric; circles) hemophilin proteins.

Figure 5. **Titration of hemophilin homologues with hemin.** Titrations of hemophilin proteins into hemin (Fe(III)-PPIX) solution (2.5 μM hemin in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 at 21°C) were monitored by UV-visible absorption spectroscopy. **A)** Spectra recorded after addition of *H. haemolyticus* Hpl to a final concentration in the range 0.3–4.5 μM. **B)** Spectra recorded after addition of *A. baumannii* HphA to a final concentration in the range 0.4–3.8 μM. **C)** Spectra with addition of *X. nematophila* HrpC in the concentration range 0.2–5.4 μM. **D)** Spectra with addition of *X. cabanillasii* CrpC in the concentration range 0.3–9.1 μM. Arrows indicate the direction of spectral changes.

Figure 6. **Binding isotherms for hemophilin homologs binding to porphyrins**. Binding isotherms were generated from absorption data (symbols) by fitting to peak wavelength changes using a 1:1 binding model accounting for ligand depletion (lines). **A)** Binding isotherms for Hpl, HphA, HrpC or CrpC with hemin, generated from data in Figure 5. **B)** Binding isotherms for Hpl, HphA, HrpC or CrpC with PPIX, generated from data in Supplementary Figure 2. **C)** Binding isotherms for Hpl, HphA, HrpC or CrpC with Co(III)PPIX, generated from data in Supplementary Figure 4.

Supplementary Figure 2. **Titration of BSA into porphyrins monitored by UV-vis spectroscopy.**
A) Spectra of hemin (2.5 μM) alone or with addition of BSA to a final concentration covering the range 1–21 μM. **B)** Spectra of Zn(II)PPIX (1.5 μM), alone or with addition of BSA to a final concentration in the range 0.05–12 μM. **C)** Spectra of PPIX (1.5 μM) alone or with addition of BSA to a final concentration in the range 0.2–92 μM. **D)** Spectra of Co(III)PPIX (1.5 μM) alone or with addition of BSA to a final concentration in the range 0.13–4.5 μM BSA. Arrows show the direction of spectral changes. All spectra were recorded in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 (at 21°C). **E)** Binding isotherms for BSA with hemin, PPIX, Zn(II)PPIX and Co(III)PPIX generated from the data in **A–D** by fitting to peak wavelength changes using a 1:1 binding model accounting for ligand depletion.

Supplementary Figure 3. **Titration of HrpC proteins in PPIX monitored by UV-vis spectroscopy.**
A) Spectra of PPIX (1.5 µM) alone, or with addition of *H. haemolyticus* Hpl to a final
concentration in the range 0.2–4.3 µM. **B)** Spectra of PPIX (1.5 µM) alone, or with addition of *A.
baumannii* HphA to a final concentration in the range 0.2–3.3 µM. **C)** Spectra of PPIX (1.5 µM)
alone, or with addition of *X. nematophila* HrpC to a final concentration in the range 0.3–3.2 µM.
D) Spectra of PPIX (1.5 µM) alone, or with addition of *X. cabanillasii* CrpC to a final
concentration in the range 0.3–24 µM. Arrows show the direction of spectral changes. All
spectra were recorded in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 (at 21°C).

Figure 7. **Titration of hemophilin homologues with Zn(II)PPIX.** Binding of hemophilin homologues was monitored by changes in fluorescence intensity of the Zn(II)PPIX ligand (prepared in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 at 21°C) in the presence of excess BSA (15 μM). Data points (+) were fit (solid lines) with a 1:1 binding model accounting for ligand depletion. **A–C)** Titrations of Zn(II)PPIX (0.5 μM) with Hpl, HphA or HrpC. **D)** Titration of CrpC into Zn(II)PPIX (1.0 μM).

Supplementary Figure 4. **Titration of HrpC proteins in Co(III)PPIX monitored by UV-vis spectroscopy. A)** Spectra of Co(III)PPIX (1.5 μM) alone, or with addition of *H. haemolyticus* Hpl to a final concentration in the range 0.2–2.2 μM. **B)** Spectra of Co(III)PPIX (1.5 μM) alone, or with addition of *A. baumannii* HphA to a final concentration in the range 0.13–2.6 μM. **C)** Spectra of Co(III)PPIX (1.5 μM) alone, or with addition of *X. nematophila* HrpC to a final concentration in the range 0.3–3.2 μM. **D)** Spectra of Co(III)PPIX (1.5 μM) alone, or with addition of *X. cabanillasii* CrpC to a final concentration in the range 0.15–4.8 μM. Arrows show the direction of spectral changes. All spectra were recorded in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 (at 21°C).

Supplementary Figure 5. **Propensity of Hpl and CrpC to bind to selected linear and cyclic tetrapyrroles.** UV-visible spectra of selected tetrapyrroles (4 µM) in the absence (solid lines) or presence of Hpl (left panels, broken lines) or CrpC (right panels, broken lines) at a concentration of 6 µM. Selected ligands are: PPIX, hemin (Fe(III)PPIX), Zn(II)PPIX, Coproporphyrin III (an intermediate in the coproporphyrin pathway of heme synthesis), uroporphyrin I ethyl ester (from porphyric bovine urine), BV (a linear tetrapyrrole and a natural breakdown product of

hemin), cobalamin, Co(II) chloride, and hexamine Co(III) chloride. The buffer condition was 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 (21°C). Addition of Hpl to PPIX, Zn(II)PPIX, Fe(III)PPIX caused large spectral peak shifts consistent with stoichiometric binding. By comparison, minor changes in absorption peak wavelengths accompanied addition of CrpC to PPIX, Zn(II)PPIX and Fe(III)PPIX reflecting the weak binding characterized in titration studies. Copro III contains four propionate groups and is therefore larger and more polar than PPIX. Weak binding of Hpl to copro III was indicated by small spectroscopic shifts, whereas no binding was evident with CrpC. Similarly, small spectral changes indicated some propensity for Hpl, but not CrpC, to bind to the linear tetrapyrrole, BV. Neither Hpl nor CrpC showed any indication of binding to uroporphyrin I ethyl ester (compared to PPIX, this is a larger amphipathic porphyrin with four alkylated propionates). No spectroscopic changes were induced upon mixing CrpC with cobalamin, Co(II) chloride, and hexamine Co(III) chloride.

Table 1. **Relative porphyrin binding affinity of hemophilin homologs**

Protein	Hemin K_d (nM)†	Zn(II)-PPIX IC_{50} (nM)*	Zn(II)-PPIX K_d (nM)†	Zn(II)-PPIX K_d (nM)‡	PPIX K_d (nM)†	Co(III)-PPIX K_d (nM)†
Hh Hpl	≤ 15	10 (1 − 20)	N/A	0.2	70 (30 − 140)	≤ 15
Ab HphA	≤ 15	20 (2 − 50)	N/A	0.4	≤ 15	30 (10 − 50)
Xn HrpC	20 (10 − 50)	110 (70 − 180)	N/A	2.2	20 (10 − 30)	24 (20 − 29)
Xc CrpC	$5\ (1–9) \times 10^3$	N/A	$3\ (2 − 4) \times 10^2$	N/A	$7\ (3–11) \times 10^3$	24 (21 − 26)
BSA	$2\ (1–5) \times 10^3$	N/A	$3\ (2 − 4) \times 10^2$	N/A	$11\ (6–14) \times 10^3$	70 (50 − 80)

Values in brackets are 95% confidence intervals

* Calculated from fluorescence measurements in competition with BSA

† Calculated from absorbance data

‡ Calculated from IC_{50} values according to Cheng and Prussoff 1973, using measured K_d = 0.3 µM for BSA binding Zn(II)PPIX and [BSA] = 15 µM

Figure 8. **Structural modelling of HrpC and CrpC**. **A)** Domain structure of Hpl (pdb 6om5) showing the N-terminal hemophilin ligand binding domain (grey, cyan, green) and C-terminal 8-stranded β-barrel domain (BBD; tan color). **B)** Heme binding site of Hpl showing structural elements that contribute to heme binding including the β2-β3 loop (cyan), β3-β4 α-helix that carries Arg82 and Trp86, and the β5-β6 loop (green) that carries the heme-coordinating His119. The heme porphyrin and central iron atom are shown in pink and orange, respectively. **C)** Domain structure HphA (pdb 7red) shown with the same coloring as A. **D)** Heme binding site of HphA colored as B. The heme iron is coordinated by two His side chains: His43 in the β2-β3 loop and His106 in the β4-β5 loop. **E-F)** Structural model of *X. nematophila* HrpC based on the alignment in Figure 10, modelled with bound heme. The heme binding site has features similar to HphA, including bis-histidyl heme coordination. **G-H)** Modelled structure of *X. cabanillasii* CrpC without a heme ligand. The precise conformation of the β5-β6 loop cannot be modelled by threading due to the lack of a suitable template.

Figure 9. **Aligned sequences of representative members from hemophilin subclusters defined by sequence similarity network analysis.** The alignment is a composite of information including structure-based alignment of *H. haemolyticus* Hpl and *A. baumannii* HphA sequences and sequence-based alignments using the full membership of each hemophilin subcluster output from network analysis. Only representative members of the HrpC-like, CrpC-like and Plant/Environmental clusters used in modelling (see Figure 8 and supplementary Figure S6) are shown in the figure. The approximate position of secondary structure elements is displayed in cartoon, with residues of the DXNG and PX[S/T]H motifs (see Figure 10) shown in colored circles. Boxes indicate regions where query sequences could be modelled on one or both structure templates. Residues of the conserved hydrophobic core of the N-terminal hemophilin domain, or interdomain contact, are marked with blue circles without or with a black outline, respectively.

Figure 10. **Conserved sequence-structure motifs. A)** DXNG[V/I] motif structure in the β4-β5 hairpin. **B)** PX[S/T]H motif incorporating the heme-ligating His in the β5-β6 loop.

Supplementary Figure S6. **Structural models of hemophilin homologues.** Structural model of the hemophilin ligand binding domain are shown for sequences in Figure 9. In the left-hand panels, residues of the β2-β3 (cyan) and β4-β5 (green) loop are shown as in Figure 8. In the right-hand panels, regions of the structure/sequence that do not have sequence-similar threading templates from either *H. haemolyticus* Hpl or *A. baumannii* HphA are colored yellow.

Supplemental file 1: **SubclusterRodeoResultsAndNetworkNodeTable.xlsx** Node information from a sequence similarity network of predicted unlipidated T11SS-dependent cargo proteins generated using EFI-EST, alongside the results of a co-occurrence analysis of hemophilin family subclusters generated using RODEO.

Supplemental file 2: **WesternImages.xlsx** Images of immunoblots performed to demonstrate secretion of hemophilin homologs and chimeric hemophilin acquired using a Li-cor odyssey at 700nm.

Supplemental file 3: **StrainAndPrimerTable.xlsx** Collated descriptions of the bacterial strains utilized within this study and the oligonucleotides used for cloning and sequencing.