The Structures of Secretory IgA in complex with *Streptococcus pyogenes* M4 and human

CD89 provide insights on mucosal host-pathogen interactions

Qianqiao Liu[1] and Beth M. Stadtmueller[1, 2*]

[1]Department of Biochemistry, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801

USA

[2]Department of Biomedical and Translational Sciences, Carle Illinois College of Medicine,

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801 USA

ABSTRACT

Immunoglobulin (Ig) A functions as monomeric IgA in the serum and Secretory (S) IgA in mucosal secretions. Host IgA Fc receptors (FcαRs), including human FcαR1/CD89, mediate IgA effector functions; however human pathogen *Streptococcus pyogenes* has evolved surface-protein virulence factors, including M4, that also engage the CD89 binding site on IgA. Despite human mucosa serving as a reservoir for pathogens, SIgA interactions with CD89 and M4 remain poorly understood. Here we report cryo-EM structures of M4-SIgA and CD89-SIgA complexes, which unexpectedly reveal different SIgA-binding stoichiometry for M4 and CD89. Structural data, supporting experiments, and modeling indicate that copies of SIgA bound to *S. pyogenes* M4 will adopt similar orientations on the bacterium surface and leave one host FcαR binding site accessible. Results suggest unappreciated functional consequences associated with SIgA binding to host and bacterial FcαRs relevant to understanding host-microbe co-evolution, IgA effector functions and to improving the outcomes of group A *Streptococcus* infection.

INTRODUCTION

Immunoglobulin (Ig) A is an antibody class expressed in mammals, where it functions in monomeric (m) and secretory (S) forms; the mIgA is the predominant form in serum whereas SIgA is the most abundant antibody present in mucosal secretions, where it protects the host epithelium against microbes and toxins[1]. Both forms of IgA contain fragment antigen-binding (Fab) and fragment crystallizable (Fc) regions. The Fab is responsible for binding to antigens, whereas the Fc region interacts with other components of the immune system, including IgA Fc Receptors (FcαRs) such as CD89 (a.k.a. FcαR1), that are expressed on the surface of some immune system cells and can promote downstream effector functions such as phagocytosis and respiratory burst[2]. Whereas the binding of host FcαRs is likely to elicit a favorable immune response, IgA can also be bound by bacterial proteins, for example, M4 (a.k.a. Arp4) and M22 (a.k.a Sir22) from *Streptococcus pyogenes* and SSL7 from *Staphylococcus aureus*, interactions that allow pathogenic bacteria to evade host IgA responses[3–6]. Despite significance, the functional consequences of IgA interactions with host FcαRs and bacterial proteins, sometimes referred to as decoys, remains poorly understood.

The monomeric and secretory forms of IgA that mediate host interactions with antigens, FcαRs and bacterial proteins adopt at least two distinct molecular structures. The mIgA contains two IgA heavy chains and two light chains, resulting in two Fabs and one Fcα. The Fcα contains two copies of immunoglobulin constant domains, Cα2 and Cα3, and adopts a rigid structure linked to two Fabs. Fcα contains two FcαR binding sites, one located at each Cα2 and Cα3 interface (Fig. 1a). In contrast, SIgA is polymeric and is typically composed of two mIgA that assemble with one joining-chain (JC) to form dimeric (d) IgA, which is bound by the polymeric Ig-receptor ectodomain, called secretory component (SC). The structures of dIgA and SIgA, reported in 2020, revealed two Fcα connected through four C-terminal motifs called tailpieces (Tps) and one JC, which contacts each heavy chain uniquely [7–9]. This results in two structurally unique Fcαs that

can be designated as Fc$_{AB}$ (Fcα containing heavy chains A and B) and Fc$_{CD}$ (Fcα containing heavy

chains C and D). Together, Fc$_{AB}$ and Fc$_{CD}$ adopt an asymmetric bent and tilted conformation with

distinct concave and convex sides. In SIgA, the SC is bound toward one side and protrudes from

the center of the molecule contributing further asymmetry. Overall, the SIgA conformation is

predicted to constrain the possible positions that Fabs can adopt and leave two FcαR binding

sites accessible (Fig. 1b). Notably, these two sites are located on the convex side, one on Fc$_{AB}$

and one on Fc$_{CD,}$ whereas sites on the concave side are occluded by the JC and the SC. Thus,

SIgA is presumed to have the same number of accessible FcαR binding sites as mIgA but instead

of two sites on one Fcα that are horizontally oriented relative to each other, it has one site on two

Fcαs that are vertically oriented relative to each other (Fig. 1)[7]. The functional significance of

these differences remains a topic of investigation; however, it is notable that two receptor binding

sites have been evolutionary preserved in both mIgA and SIgA.

Figure 1. Structures of mIgA, SIgA, and schematic of M4. (a) The structure of mIgA lacking Fabs (Fcα; PDB code 1OW0 with CD89 removed). (b) The structure of human SIgA lacking Fabs (PDB code 6UE7). Structures are colored according to the key; one Cα2 and one Cα3 domain are labeled along with Fc$_{AB}$ and Fc$_{CD}$. The SIgA tailpieces (Tps) are labeled and indicated with a black arrow and the FcαR binding sites are indicated by orange arrows. (c) Schematic of M4 depicted attached to the GAS cell wall through a C-terminal proline-glycine-threonine-serine (PGTS)-rich domain and a cell-wall-associated domain, which are followed by an ectodomain that includes three C-repeats, an IgA-binding region and an N-terminal hypervariable domain (HVR).

Both mIgA and SIgA can be bound by group A streptococcus (GAS; *Streptococcus*

pyogenes). GAS has long been considered a significant human pathogen that continues to be

one of the top ten causes of mortality worldwide from infectious diseases[10]. The clinical

manifestations of this Gram-positive bacterium are wide-ranging and diverse, encompassing both

mild and common local infections, such as tonsillitis, impetigo, as well as life-threating systemic

invasions like toxic shock and sepsis[11,12]. Although tonsillitis caused by GAS is much more

common than invasive GAS infections, with a 1000-fold higher incidence, it still contributes

significantly to the global burden of disease, resulting in over 160,000 deaths each year[13]. The

prevalence of severe GAS disease is at least 18.1 million cases, with 1.78 million new cases each

year[10]. Globally, GAS poses a significant threat to public health, causing both morbidity and

mortality and thus efforts to understand and limit its virulence are of high interest.

The most extensively studied GAS virulence factors are a family of serotype-specific

proteins called M proteins, which include IgA binding proteins M4 and M22. M proteins adopt a

coiled-coil structure that protrudes up to 60 nm from the bacterium cell and can bind a variety of

host extracellular matrix and serum proteins[14,15]. M proteins are attached to the bacterial cell wall

through a C-terminal proline-glycine-threonine-serine (PGTS)-rich domain and a cell-wall-

associated domain, which are followed by an ectodomain that includes several repetitive amino

acid sequence elements and a N-terminal hypervariable domain (HVR) (Fig. 1c). Variability in the

M protein ectodomain is correlated with the ability to bind specific host factors; for example, some

M proteins bind IgG, some IgA, some fibrinogen, and some other host factors[16,17]. These

interactions are thought to contribution to the bacterium's virulence primarily by modulating the

host immune response (e.g. limiting phagocytosis). Although M proteins have been shown to be

immunogenic, developing a vaccine that targets M proteins has proven difficult due to the

extensive diversity in the protein's most immunogenic region located at the N-terminus and

therefore developing other approaches to block the functions of M proteins is of interest[18].

M4 and M22 are the two M proteins found in GAS strains M4 and M22, respectively, both

of which can bind IgA[5,19–21]. Mutational analysis of both M4 and M22 revealed a 29-residue,

minimal IgA-binding region located within the ectodomain and including five C-terminal residues

of the HVR with similar, but not identical, sequences[6] (Fig. 1c). M22 also binds IgG at a site

overlapping with the IgA binding site[5]. Despite significance, how M proteins interact with host

ligands remains unclear. Existing structural data includes crystal structures of an M1 fragment

containing the HVR and a repetitive sequence element within the ectodomain and the HVR of M2,

M22, M28, and M49, none of which detail the structure of the IgA-binding region or IgA-M protein

interactions [22,23]. Published mutational analysis indicated that M4 and M22 binding to IgA is

dependent on residues located at the $C\alpha2/C\alpha3$ interface, including residues bound by host CD89

and *S. aureus* SSL7[2–4]. The overlapping interface of M4 and CD89 suggested that M4 may

interfere with IgA effector functions and studies suggested that M4 protein can block respiratory

burst in neutrophils *in vitro*[24]. However, the role of M4 (and CD89) in disease pathogenesis in the

host remains poorly understood and published studies have focused on mIgA despite mucosal

routes of entry. Indeed, pathogen interactions with mIgA are most likely to occur in the context of

invasive disease whereas interactions with SIgA are most likely to occur during mucosal

colonization.

To investigate how M proteins interact with SIgA and how those interactions compare to

host $Fc\alpha Rs$, we determined two Cryo-EM structures, one of SIgA in complex with M4 and one of

SIgA in complex with CD89. Together structures indicate that in contrast to previously proposed

models, M4 and CD89 share only a subset of IgA interface residues and bind through different

angles of approach. This leads to differences in binding stoichiometry, with M4 occupying only

one $Fc\alpha R$ binding site on SIgA, while leaving the other site sterically accessible to CD89 and

likely other $Fc\alpha Rs$.

RESULTS

Structure determination of the SIgA-M4 complex

In order to better understand how bacterial virulence factors such as M4 engage SIgA, we designed an M4 expression construct encoding the ectodomain (residues 1-314) and combined resulting protein with purified, recombinant human SIgA1 to create an SIgA-M4 complex. Using this complex, we determined the SIgA-M4 cryo-EM structure to an average resolution of 3.1 Å (FSC=0.143) (Fig. 2a). Map quality and resolution were sufficient to refine the positions of main chain and side chain atoms for the majority of residues in the complex with the exception of Fab residues, which were disordered (Fig. S1). The final structure included a single M4 dimer bound to one SIgA; M4 residues 46-74, which include the entire known IgA-binding domain, were built whereas the positions of residues more distal from the binding site were poorly resolved or disordered, likely due to the inherent flexibility of the M4 dimer's extended, coiled-coil structure. SIgA is superimposable with a previously published human SIgA1 structure with a RMSD of 0.708[8].

The M4 adopts an α-helical, parallel coiled-coil homodimer as observed for other M proteins [16]. The M4 fragment termini are stabilized by hydrophobic interactions including two ideal heptads, characterized by having Tyr, Ile, or Leu, at both *a* and *d* positions[25]. Hydrophobic residues at the *a* and *d* positions (Y49, L52, I70, L73) are packed against each other and stabilize the coiled-coil (Fig. 2b and 2c). We also observed polar interactions stabilizing the center of the M4 fragment, including E55 which forms a hydrogen bond with N56, and Y66 which forms a hydrogen bond with Q67 (Fig. 2c). A subset of residues between P47-K69 in both helices contact SIgA, with one (helix-a) forming the majority of contacts with the IgA heavy chain and the other (helix-b) using equivalent residues to contact solvent and a smaller interface with IgA. Prior studies, including mutational analysis, identified M4 residues 46-74 as the minimal IgA binding region[6]; our observations indicate that residues 46, 71, 72, and 74 contribute indirectly by stabilizing the M4 coiled-coil dimer.

Figure 2. SIgA-Apr4 Structure. (a) The Cryo-EM structure of the M4 fragment (residues 46-74) in complex with human SIgA is shown as a cartoon with partially transparent map in two orientations. The model is colored according to the key, M4 is labeled, and Fabs are disordered. (b) Sequence alignment of the IgA binding regions of M4 and M22 with their heptad registrations shown above; numbering corresponds to both sequences and M4 residues interacting with IgA are depicted in bold. (c) Interchain interactions between helix a and b of M4. Polar interactions are shown as dotted lines.

The structure of the SIgA-M4 interface

Despite the reported accessibility of two FcαR binding sites on SIgA, our structure reveals M4

bound only to Fc$_{AB}$[7]. The M4 interface includes 11 residues on the Cα3 domain of both heavy

chain-A (HC-A) and heavy chain-B (HC-B) (Fig. 3), with a total buried surface area of 1000 Å^2.

Participating IgA residues are predominantly located along one b-strand in HC-A (F443, T444,

Q445, T447), forming hydrogen bonds with M4 helix-a residues R50 and E55. HC-A E389 and

R346 also reach out to interact with M4 helix-a residues Q48 and D58 respectively, and HC-A

D449 forms a salt bridge with R60 on helix-b of M4. The Apr4 interface with IgA HC-B includes

only residues S356, E357 and A360, which form hydrogen bonds with Q67 of helix-b and R62,

K69 of helix-a respectively. All IgA interface residues are conserved in human IgA subtypes (IgA1,

IgA2m1, IgA2m2) and most are conserved in mouse IgA, with the exception of R346 and L441(Fig.

S2). Mouse IgA is not known to bind M4 thus R346 and L441 appear to be especially important

for M4 binding and structurally equivalent residues in mouse IgA, P341 and M436 respectively,

do not appear to support the interaction [26].

Mutagenesis confirms the key binding residues on M4

Although side chain density was apparent in the structure, the N and C termini of the M4 coiled-

coil were not resolved and therefore to validate residue assignments and investigate the

contributions of individual M4 residues on SIgA binding, we conducted structure-based mutational

analysis and surface plasmon resonance (SPR) binding assays. Based on the pairwise

interactions between M4 and SIgA (Fig. 3b) and pairwise interactions between M4 helix-a and

helix-b, we made three individual M4 point mutations Q48A, R50A, K69A. The subset of residues,

in which one copy was interacting with IgA and the other copy was stabilizing the coiled-coil were

not mutated due to the possibility of disrupting the M4 dimer. All mutated M4 variants behaved

equivalent to the wildtype M4 as assayed by SDS-PAGE and size exclusion elution

chromatography (not shown). M4 and mutant variant binding to SIgA were determined by SPR.

Sensorgrams revealed lower responses for all M4 mutants when compared to concentration

matched wild-type M4, indicating markedly reduced binding affinity (Fig. 3c and Fig. S3). Mutant

variants R50A and K69A exhibited the most pronounce reduction in IgA-binding, consistent with

the observation that R50 interacts with one of the human-IgA specific binding site residues, L441.

K69 interacts with HC-B, indicating that contacts with both HC-A and HC-B chains are important.

Figure 3. The M4-SIgA interface. (a) Structure of the M4-SIgA interface. The boxed regions are enlarged (1-3) and depict the (1) M4 helix-a interaction with HC-A, (2) M4 helix-b interactions with HC-A, and (3) M4 interactions with HC-B. Black dotted lines indicate hydrogen bonds. (b) Polar and hydrophobic interactions between IgA and M4. Asterisks indicate residues contributing to hydrophobic interactions. (c) M4 binding analysis by surface plasmon resonance (SPR). The sensorgram shows the response of M4 (black) and individual M4 point mutants Q48A (green), R50A (yellow), and K69A (blue) binding to immobilized human SIgA1. All analyte concentrations shown are 0.5 uM. Sensorgrams including a complete concentration series for each analyte can be found in Figure S3.

The structure of SIgA-CD89 complex

The unexpected stoichiometry of the SIgA-M4 complex raised the question of how host $Fc\alpha Rs$ bind SIgA. Modeling based on the structure of mIgA in complex with CD89 and SIgA structures suggested that two CD89 can bind SIgA [8]; however, to verify this possibility, we determined the Cryo-EM structure of SIgA with CD89 to a resolution of 3.2 Å (Fig. 4a). The ectodomain of CD89 consists of two immunoglobulin-like domains (D1 and D2) arranged at an angle of approximately 90 degrees to each other. Map quality and resolution was sufficient to refine the positions of main

Figure 4. SIgA-CD89 structure. (a) The Cryo-EM structure of CD89 in complex with human SIgA is shown as a cartoon with partially transparent map in two orientations. The antigen binding fragments (Fabs) are disordered. The two Ig-like domains of CD89 are labeled D1, D2. CD89 D1 contacted a total of 19 IgA residues, including $C\alpha2$ residues L256, L257, L258 and $C\alpha3$ residues E348, R382, L384, S387, E389, M433, H436, E437, A438, L439, P440, L441, A442, F443, T444, Q445. (b) Alignment of the mIgA-CD89 crystal structure (PDB: 1OW0) to the Fc_{AB}-CD89 interface (left) and Fc_{CD}-CD89 interface (right) on SIgA-CD89. The BC, DE, FG loops are labeled on Fc_{AB}-CD89. All models are colored according to the key.

chain and side chain atoms for the residues at the interface, while density in the distal region of

CD89, including the second Ig-like domain D2, was of lower resolution (Fig. S5). The refined

structure revealed a 2:1 CD89:SIgA binding stoichiometry verifying that two copies of CD89 can

bind both mIgA and SIgA (Fig. 4a). Alignment to the mIgA-CD89 structure revealed

superimposable binding sites (RMSD=1.165 at Fc_{AB}; RMSD=1.121 at Fc_{CD}) on $C\alpha2$ and $C\alpha3$ [2].

Consistent with the mIgA-CD89 structure, the CD89 D1 BC loop, the D strand, the DE loop, and

the FG loop (Ig-like domain nomenclature) contacted a total of 19 IgA residues, including three

$C\alpha2$ residues and 16 $C\alpha3$ residues, burying a total of 1656 $Å^2$ (Fig. 4b).

CD89 and M4 share overlapping but distinct SIgA binding sites

Comparison of the CD89 and M4 binding footprints on SIgA revealed five shared interface

residues (E389, L441, F443, T444, Q445) located on the $C\alpha3$ domain. CD89 binds additional

residues located toward and on $C\alpha2$, whereas M4 contacts only $C\alpha3$ and binds residues closer

to the Tps and JC, including R346 from HC-A and S356, E357, A360 from HC-B (Fig. 5a). CD89

and M4's distinct binding footprints and structures direct CD89 D2 C-terminal residues away from

SIgA and direct the M4 fragment C-terminal residues (and likely the rest of the M4 coiled-coil),

alongside Fc_{AB} in a line near parallel to $C\alpha3$ (Fig. 5b). Noted differences contribute to the distinct

stoichiometry of CD89 versus M4 binding to SIgA. In the case of M4, the inclusion of S356, E357,

A360 and R346 in the M4 binding interface, together with its extended coiled-coiled topology,

enforce the surprising 1M4:1SIgA stoichiometry because the steric accessibility of these four

residues and neighboring residues differs between Fc_{AB} and Fc_{CD}. In Fc_{AB}, M4 can bind S356,

E357, A360 and R346 with residues on both helices and extend the coiled-coiled over neighboring

residues and toward the Tps. In Fc_{CD}, S356, E357, A360 and R346 remain solvent accessible,

but JC loop residues 24-32 bind the adjacent region, blocking the path occupied by M4 (helix-b

residues 70-73) and therefore occluding binding (Fig. 5b). The JC loop that occludes M4 binding

does not interfere with CD89 binding on Fc$_{CD}$, implying that sterically, CD89 and M4 ectodomains

could bind to the same copy of SIgA, with M4 binding Fc$_{AB}$ and CD89 binding Fc$_{CD}$ (Fig. 5c);

however, whether this would occur in the context of bacterial and host cell interactions remains

to be determined.

Figure 5. M4 and CD89 binding site comparison and modeling. (a) Comparison of M4 and CD89 binding site on Fcα shown in two orientations. Fcα is shown as ribbons and binding residues are shown as stick representation. The 11 residues bound by M4 are shown in pink and yellow and the 19 residues bound by CD89 are shown in orange and yellow. In all panels five shared binding site residues, E389, L441, F443, T444, Q445, are colored yellow. (b) M4 modeled at the second site (Fc$_{CD}$; blue) is partially overlapping with JC (magenta), indicating a steric clash. (c) Model of M4 (pink) and CD89 (orange) bound SIgA. CD89 bound to the Fc$_{CD}$ site does not clash with SIgA residues.

DISCUSSION

Data presented here provide new structural and mechanistic insights on how host FcαRs

and bacterial surface proteins engage SIgA, informing models for IgA effector functions, pathogen

virulence and host-microbe coevolution. Host and bacterial protein binding to IgA has long been

appreciated to occur through a conserved "hot spot," localized to the Cα2/Cα3 domain interface

found on mIgA, and more recently SIgA. The region supports binding of human FcαRs, including

CD89, as well as GAS M22, the β-protein from group B streptococci (GBS) and SSL7 from *S.*

aureus, presumably through overlapping binding sites [2–6,21,24,27]. Our work validates that CD89

can bind SIgA using the same site as reported for mIgA and confirms that both forms of IgA are

able to bind two copies of CD89 *in vitro*[2]. Our work also demonstrates that CD89 and M4 (and

likely M22) engage SIgA through the "hot spot" but share only five IgA contact residues and exhibit

distinct stoichiometry. Thus, while each receptor occludes a similar region on IgA, the modes of

binding are different and likely associated with unique functional consequences. In particular, the

five shared residues are all located on Cα3 in what is topologically described as the C-strand

(residue E389) and FG loop (residues L441, F443, T444 and Q445), indicating that the Cα3 FG

loop is critical for the interaction and likely represents the center of the hotspot. As noted, the M4

binding footprint extends even further toward the Tps to engage Cα3 residues R346, S356, E357,

and A360, which in the context of binding to SIgA appear to enforce the unexpected 1:1 M4:SIgA

binding stoichiometry. Notably, R346 from HC-A has not been reported to bind human FcαRs or

bacterial IgA binding proteins making it unique to the M4 binding footprint. The inclusion of this

site may in part explain why mouse IgA reportedly does not bind M4 or M22 because residues

R346 (and neighboring contact residue L441) are not conserved in mouse IgA (Fig. S2) [26,28].

Data reported here are applicable to multiple GAS strains. Epidemiology surveillance

reports revealed that serotype M4 and M22 strains are abundant and geographically widespread,

especially M4, being one of the top five most common serotypes in a systemic review of global

distribution of GAS types[29]. As noted, the M22 strain expresses M22, another M protein specific

for IgA. We find that M4 residues making direct contact with IgA are highly conserved in M22.

Seven out of 11 direct contact residues are identical and the other four residues are similar (Fig.

2b), consistent with prior mutational analysis that identified similar IgA binding motifs in M4 and

M22. The IgA binding fragment of M22 has been produced as a peptide called Sap, which

corresponds to residues 35-83 of M22 with the addition of a C-terminal cysteine residue[28]. Sap is

likely superimposable with our structure but extending 10 residues in N and C- terminal directions.

M22 also binds human IgG, and the binding of IgA and IgG are mutually exclusive, indicating

shared or contiguous binding regions[5].

Our work also sheds new light on *S. aureus* SSL7 interactions with IgA, which we explored

by comparing the IgA binding footprints of M4 and SSL7, and modeling SSL7 binding to SIgA.

The published SSL7- human $Fc\alpha$ structure revealed SSL7 binding 20 residues on both $C\alpha 2$ and

$C\alpha 3$, nine of which are shared with M4 (Fig S5). Notably, SSL7 binds HC-B $C\alpha 3$ residues E357

and A360 (adjacent and overlapping with M4-bound S356, E357 and A360) positioning part of its

binding site closer to the Tps, similar to M4 and in contrast to CD89. The structure of the SSL7-

human $Fc\alpha$ complex revealed two copies of SSL7; however, the inclusion of E357 and A360 in

the binding site raises the question of whether two copies of SSL7 can bind SIgA, or if the nearby

JC loop residues would occlude binding to the Fc_{CD} as observed for M4. To explore this, we

modeled SSL7-SIgA by aligning the crystal structure of SSL7-$Fc\alpha$ (PDB:2QEJ) to each Fc on

SIgA (Fig. S5a)[4]. Resulting models suggest that SSL7 can bind both Fc_{AB} and Fc_{CD} resulting in

2:1 SSL7:SIgA stoichiometry, as observed for CD89:SIgA. This stoichiometry appears possible

because SSL7 adopts a flat "disk-like" topography, which at binds IgA using two loops from its

Oligonucleotide/Oligosaccharide-Binding (OB)-fold, that positions the C-terminus away from $Fc\alpha$,

similar to CD89 and in contrast to M4[4]. This structure and trajectory likely allows SSL7 to bind

SIgA Fc_{CD} E357 and A360 without being occluded by the JC loop as observed for M4 (Fig. S5).

Figure 6. Schematic model of human SIgA binding to M4 on a GAS surface. (a) AlphaFold2-multimer predicted M4 dimer; residues 287-316 are predicted to be disordered and not shown. The IgA-binding region on the predicted model is colored in pink and has an RMSD of 0.640 when aligned to the SIgA-M4 structure. (b) Surface-associated M4, shown in two orientations, binds to one side of SIgA (Fc$_{AB}$), holding all SIgA at a similar orientation and distance from the bacterium surface while leaving the Fc$_{CD}$ FcαR binding site (red sphere) open. Possible locations of disordered Fabs are shown as grey and green ovals. CD89 binding to M4 bound SIgA is sterically possible and modeled on one copy of the SIgA-M4 complex. SIgA SC domain D2 is indicated by a circle and is exposed near the outermost surface of bacterium.

Our data and analysis provide unexpected insights on potential functional outcomes of

M4-IgA interactions, most notably that among characterized FcαRs and Fcα-binding proteins the

sterically enforced 1:1 M4:SIgA stoichiometry appears to be unique to M4 (and presumably, M22).

This finding is intriguing because SIgA adopts an asymmetric structure, which published modeling

predicts will influence the positions of Fabs and accessibility of the SC and FcαR binding sites[7];

therefore, M4 binding to Fc$_{AB}$ positions SIgA differently than if it could bind to Fc$_{CD}$. To visualize

this possibility, we used Alphafold2-multimer to model the full-length M4, aligned it to our M4-SIgA

structure and created schematic representations of the complex on a bacterium surface (Fig. 6)[30].

Assuming that M4 is oriented approximately perpendicular to the outer membrane surface, M4

would extend ~400 Å, placing the bound SIgA ~ 250 Å from the surface where one set of Fabs

would be directed upward and away from the bacterium surface and the other set directed toward

the surface. In this model, the SC protrudes upward and away from the bacterium surface similar

to the M4 HVR, and the Fc_{CD} binding site is located closer to the bacterium surface and

approximately 62 Å from M4 (Fig. 6b). Other GAS surface proteins are expected to be shorter

than M4, implying that bound SIgA would occupy a position near the outermost surface of the

bacterium[31]. While information describing M4 flexibility, as well as the density of M4 and other

surface antigens, is needed to fully evaluate the geometric arrangement of SIgA-bound to the

bacterial surface, our data and analysis indicate that the 1:1 M4:SIgA stoichiometry will constrain

the location and orientation of bound SIgA, a possibility that should be considered when exploring

functional outcomes of bacterial-SIgA interactions (Fig. 6).

How might SIgA binding to GAS M4 (or M22) in a constrained orientation influence the

host or microbe? One possibility is that M4 binding to Fc_{AB} impacts the binding of SIgA Fabs to

other streptococcal surface antigens, such as streptococcal pyrogenic exotoxin (Spe), fibronectin-

binding proteins (FbI), Streptococcus pyogenes cell envelope proteinase (SpyCEP),

streptococcal C5a peptidase (ScpA) and streptolysin O (SLO)[32]. Bacteria that can bind SIgA

through M4 (or M22), may be able to limit antibody binding to other surface proteins, although as

suggested by others, the relative affinity of antibodies to other surface antigens and their steric

accessibility will likely impact the outcome[33]. Another possibility is that SIgA-bound M4 influences

the localization of the bacterium (e.g. in host mucosal secretions). SIgA is covered in host glycans,

which have been implicated in binding to host lectins, something we speculate could be promoted

by the position of SC, which our model predicts would be exposed near the M4 HVR toward the

outermost surface of the bacterium (Fig. 6).

Another way that M4/M22 binding to Fc_{AB} may impact virulence is by modulating

interactions between host FcαR and SIgA bound to GAS. For example, M4 has been shown to

reduce IgA-triggered respiratory burst in neutrophils[24]; although the precise mechanism of

inhibition remains unclear, CD89 activity is thought to occur when multiple copies of the receptor

bind to the antibody Fcα and thus, it has been proposed that M4 occludes CD89 binding thereby

blocking downstream effector functions. Our data indicate that mIgA has two accessible M4

binding sites and two accessible CD89 binding sites whereas SIgA has one accessible M4 binding

site and two accessible, CD89 binding sites. Although the accessibility of these sites on mIgA

and SIgA has not been verified on a bacterial surface and it seems plausible that CD89 activity

could be inhibited by occluding just one of the two CD89-binding sites, our data raise the intriguing

possibility that CD89 (and human FcαRs such as Fcα/μR) might bind Fc_{CD} on SIgA-M4 complexes

and promote effector functions in some way (Fig 6b). For example, kinetics that favor CD89

binding might allow one copy of CD89 to bind Fc_{CD} and subsequently, another copy to compete

with M4 for the Fc_{AB} site. Another possibility is that CD89 binding to Fc_{CD} could promote other

copies of CD89 binding to local SIgA that is not bound by M4, but rather is bound to another

antigen with its Fabs.

The question of how M4 (and M22) binding to SIgA impacts both the host and bacteria

must also consider the relative location of interactions with mIgA and SIgA and host immune

effector cells. As noted, GAS will be most likely to encounter mIgA in the serum during invasive

disease and SIgA in mucosal secretions during non-invasive disease. In the first example, the

binding of two copies of M4 to one mIgA could block both CD89 binding sites, limiting the functions

of CD89-expressing effector cells (e.g., neutrophils). CD89 effector functions have been studied

primarily in the context of mIgA and cells expressing CD89 are more prevalent in the serum than

mucosa, raising the possibility that CD89 binding to SIgA or an SIgA-M4 complex on a bacterium

surface may be a rare event. However, SIgA has been associated with CD89-expressing

polymorphonuclear leukocytes (PMN) activity with the presence of an accessory molecule Mac-

1 (CD11b/CD18)[34], and SIgA structures presented here reveal two CD89-accessible FcαR

binding sites, suggesting that throughout evolution, SIgA interactions with host FcαRs have

proved functionally advantageous. Similarly, GAS primarily colonize the human nasopharynx

mucosa, with comparatively few infections becoming invasive and M4 being one of the dominant

serotypes for non-invasive GAS. Given this and the prevalence of SIgA in the human nasopharynx

mucosa, it is tempting to speculate that host-GAS co-evolution has been driven by interactions

between virulence factors (e.g. M4 and M22) and SIgA. Interestingly, both M4 and M22 strains

lack a Hyaluronic Acid (HA) capsule, found on other GAS strains, which is antiphagocytic and has

long been proposed as an essential virulence factor[35,36]. We speculate that the Ig-binding proteins

provide an alternative and compensatory mechanisms for M4 and M22 strain virulence.

Regardless of whether the function of M4/M22 is to block host FcαR effector functions and/or

block antibody binding to surface antigens and/or provide another survival advantage for the

bacteria, our data highlight the potential selective pressure of SIgA and its effectors and the

importance of understanding their mechanisms of action in the mucosa. This extends beyond

GAS, given that at least two distinct pathogenic bacterial species expressing IgA-binding proteins,

S. pyogenes and *S. aureus,* utilize the human nasopharynx as their primary reservoir where

encounters with SIgA have potential to influence virulence and host response, and also serve as

a point for therapeutic intervention.

METHODS

Protein expression and purification

Genes encoding the human IgA1 heavy chain constant region and the lambda light chain constant

region were fused with STA121 VH and VL domain sequences [37]. The human tissue plasminogen

activator (tPA) signal sequence was inserted upstream of the IgA heavy chain sequence. These

sequences along with human JC and SC were cloned into mammalian expression vector

pD2610v1 (Atum). All constructs were transiently co-transfected into HEK Expi293F cells using

ExpiFectamine to produce SIgA complex (Thermo Fisher). Six days after transfection, SIgA was

purified from the cell supernatant using CaptureSelect™ Human IgA Affinity Resins. Superose 6

(Cytiva) size exclusion chromatography (SEC) was used to further purify SIgA. The gene

encoding the human CD89 ectodomain (uniprot ID: P24071) was fused to a C-terminal

hexahistine-tag and cloned into pD2610v1. The CD89 construct was transiently transfected into

HEK Expi293F cells using ExpiFectamine. CD89 was purified from the cell supernatant using Ni-

NTA affinity resin (Qiagen). Superose 6 SEC was used to further purify CD89. The gene encoding

the *Streptococcus pyogenes* M4 protein (uniprot ID P13050) was cloned into pET28_a (+) vector

(Novagen). The M4 endogenous signal peptide and propeptide were not included in the construct

and a C-terminal hexahistine-tag was added. M4 mutants Q48A, R50A, K69A were generated

using the Q5 site-directed mutagenesis kit (NEB, E0554). The M4 mutant variant constructs were

transformed and expressed in *E. coli* strain BL21 (DE3); expression was induced using 1mM

IPTG, added to the culture growing at 37°C when OD reaches 0.4-0.6. Cells were harvested 3-5

hours after IPTG induction by centrifugation, resuspended in 50 mM Tris-Cl, 150 mM NaCl, pH

7.5, 1mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride and lysed by sonication. The M4 was isolated from soluble

fraction of cell lysate using Ni-NTA affinity resin. Superose 6 SEC was used to further purify M4.

Purified SIgA and M4 or CD89 were mixed in a 1:2 molar ratio and incubated in storage buffer

(50 mM Tris-Cl, 150 mM NaCl, pH 7.5) at 4°C overnight and complexes were purified using

Superose 6 SEC.

Cryo-EM grid preparation and data collection

SIgA-M4: Quantifoil R2/2 300 mesh holey carbon grids were glow discharged for 60s; 3ul of SIgA-

M4 at 1.0 mg/ml was applied to each grid with Vitrobot Mark IV at SLAC with 1 blot of 1.5 s, 0

offset, 5 s wait, at 100% humidity and 4 C°. Movies were collected using EPU on a Titan Krios

(TEMALPHA at SLAC) operating at 300 kV and with a Gatan K4 direct electron detector. Both

untilted and 25-degree tilted movies were collected at 0.95 Å/Pixel, 40 frames per movie, total

exposure time of 4.95 s and total dose of 50 electrons/$Å^2$.

SIgA-CD89: Quantifoil R1.2/1.3 400 mesh holey carbon grids were glow discharged for

60s; 3ul of SIgA-CD89 at 1.0 mg/ml was applied to each grid with Vitrobot Mark IV with 1 blot of

2 s, 2 offset, 5 s wait, at 100% humidity and 4 C°. Movies were collected using SerialEM on a

Titan Krios at Purdue University operating at 300 kV and with a K3 direct electron detector. Both

untilted and 30-degree tilted movies were collected at 0.82 Å/Pixel, 60 frames per movie, total

exposure time of 2.41 s and total dose of 71.3 electrons/Å^2. Data collection statistics can be found

in Table SI.

Cryo-EM data processing

SIgA-M4: 2600 movies were collected with untilted stage and 3251 movies were collected with

stage tilted at 25 degrees. All data processing were done in CryoSPARC v.3.2.0[38]. Initial

processing of the two data sets were done separately. Movies were motion corrected, CTF

estimated and manually curated based on ice thickness, total motion and CTF fits, resulting in

2081 untilted and 2786 tilted movies. Particles were picked using blob picker in CryoSPARC with

minimum and maximum particle diameter of 100 Å and 200 Å. Particles were extracted with 2x

binning. 2D classification of these particles generated initial references for template-based particle

picking, which gave 970k particles from untilted movies and 1.3 million particles from tilted movies.

Those particles were combined and subjected to several rounds of 2D classification to remove

bad classes. A final set of 200K particles were used to generate the *ab-initio* model. Particles in

the final set were then re-extracted at full-pixel size and used for non-uniform refinements of the

model. The final refinement generated a map with an average resolution of 3.07 Å at FSC=0.143.

SIgA-CD89: 2955 movies were collected with untilted stage and 3696 movies were

collected with stage tilted at 30 degrees. All data processing were done in CryoSPARC v.4.1.2[38].

Initial processing of the two data sets were done separately. Movies were motion corrected, CTF

estimated and manually curated based on ice thickness, total motion and CTF fits, resulting in

2865 untilted and 3105 tilted movies. Particles were picked using blob picker in CryoSPARC with

minimum and maximum particle diameter of 150 Å and 250 Å. Particles were extracted with 2x

binning. 2D classification of these particles generated initial references for template-based particle

picking, which gave 507K particles from untilted movies and 732K particles from tilted movies.

Those particles were combined and went through several rounds of 2D classification to remove

bad classes. A final set of 249K particles were used to generate the *ab-initio* model. Particles in

the final set were then re-extracted at full-pixel size and used for non-uniform refinements of the

model. The final refinement generated a map with an average resolution of 3.18 Å at FSC=0.143.

Structure building and refinement

SIgA-M4: The structure of human SIgA (PDB: 6UE7) was docked into the map using UCSF

Chimera[39]. The M4 fragment was hand-built using the Coot Molecular Graphics Package[40]. All

chains of SIgA and M4 were refined as rigid bodies using Phenix real space refinement[41].

Subsequent iterations involved inspection of the map-model fit and manual adjustment of the

model followed by Phenix real space XYZ refinement. Iterations of Phenix refinements and

manual adjustments were repeated until model quality no longer improves.

SIgA-CD89: Human SIgA structure (PDB: 6UE7) and mIgA:CD89 structure (PDB:1OW0)

were docked into the map using UCSF Chimera[39]. All chains of SIgA and CD89 were refined as

rigid bodies using Phenix real space refienemnt[41]. Inspection of the map-model fit and manual

adjustment of the model were done after each Phenix real space XYZ refinement. Iterations of

Phenix refinements and manual adjustments were repeated until model quality no longer

improves. Model and refinement statistics can be found in Table SI.

Surface plasmon resonance

Surface plasmon resonance (SPR) binding experiments were done using a Bruker Sierra SPR-

32 Pro instrument. 0.2 uM human dIgA or SIgA in sodium acetate buffer (pH = 4.5) was coupled

to lanes B and D, respectively, on a high-capacity amine (HCA) chip using an amine coupling kit

(Bruker 1862634). Lane A and C were mock coupled (with only sodium acetate buffer PH 4.5)

and used as references. Responses were measured for a two-fold dilution series of each analyte

(M4 wild type and mutants Q48A, R50A, K69A) in HBS-EP+ buffer (0.01 M HEPES pH 7.4, 0.15

M NaCl, 3 mM EDTA, 0.005% v/v Surfactant P20) with a high concentration of 2 uM. All binding

experiments were done with 120 s contact time, 180 s dissociation time, and flow rate of 25 ul/min.

Surfaces were regenerated with 2.5M $MgCl_2$. All data were collected at room temperature.

Structure modelling, analysis, and sequence alignment

Human SIgA (PDB: 6UE7) was aligned to the M4-bound SIgA in The PyMOL Molecular Graphics

System (Version 2.5.1 Schrödinger, LLC) and the RMSD between the bound and unbound state

of SIgA was calculated automatically during the alignment performed by PyMOL (A>align>align

to molecule). A list of all possible interactions between SIgA and M4 was generated using the

protein interaction calculator (PIC) webserver[42]. The interactions were visualized and manually

checked in PyMOL and contacts within 4 Å were selected and reported in Fig. 3b. The buried

surface area was calculated using the 'get_area' function in PyMOL.

AlphaFold2-multimer was used to predict the full length M4 dimer structure and ColabFold

1.5.2 was used to generate the prediction[30]. M4 residues 287-314 are predicted as disordered

and not shown in figures. Full length modeled M4 residues 46-74 were aligned to the

corresponding residues in the SIgA-M4 structure using PyMOL, with an RMSD of 0.640. The

aligned structure of full length M4 with SIgA were used in Fig. 6. The distance of M4 to GAS

surface was estimated by measuring the distance between M4 residues 16 and 286. The distance

from the $Fc\alpha R$ site on Fc_{CD} to M4 was measure from HC-D residue L441 to M4 helix-b residue

H98.

The sequence alignment between human and mouse IgA heavy chain (human: Uniprot

P10876, P10877, A0A0G2JMB2; mouse: Uniprot P01878) was carried out using ClustalOmega

and the alignment figure was made using ESPript3[43,44]. The alignment of mIgA:CD89 (PDB:

1OW0) to SIgA:CD89 and RMSD calculation were done in the same way as described above.

Figures

Structural figures were made using UCSF Chimera and PyMOL; SPR data were plotted using

Bruker Sierra-32 Analyzer and Microsoft Excel[39]. All figures were assembled using Adobe

Photoshop.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The Cryo-EM density maps have been deposited in the EM databank (www.ebi.ac.uk/emdb) with

the accession codes 40568, and 40567 for M4-SIgA and CD89-SIgA structures, respectively, and

the refined coordinates have been deposited in the Protein Data Bank (www.rcsb.org) with

accession codes 8SKV (M4-SIgA) and 8SKU (CD89-SIgA).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The study was conceived by B.M.S and Q.L.; experiments were conducted by Q.L.; B.M.S and

Q.L. analyzed data and wrote the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by NIH R01 AI165570 (PI Beth Stadtmueller) and University of Illinois

start-up funding. Cryo-Electron microscopy data were collected at the Purdue Cryo-EM facility

(http://cryoem.bio.purdue.edu) with assistance from Thomas Klose and the Stanford-SLAC Cryo-

EM Center (S^2C^2) supported by the National Institutes of Health Common Fund Transformative

High Resolution Cryo-Electron Microscopy program (U24 GM129541) with assistance from Htet

A. Khant. We thank members of the Stadtmueller lab for insightful discussion and Sarah Leonard

for supporting SPR experiments.

MATERIALS AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Beth Stadtmueller,

bethms@illinois.edu.

COMPETING INTERESTS.

Authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Mantis, N. J., Rol, N. & Corthésy, B. Secretory IgA's complex roles in immunity and mucosal homeostasis in the gut. *Mucosal Immunol* **4**, 603–611 (2011).
2. Herr, A. B., Ballister, E. R. & Bjorkman, P. J. Insights into IgA-mediated immune responses from the crystal structures of human FcαRI and its complex with IgA1-Fc. *Nature 2003 423:6940* **423**, 614–620 (2003).
3. Wines, B. D., Willoughby, N., Fraser, J. D. & Mark Hogarth, P. A competitive mechanism for staphylococcal toxin SSL7 inhibiting the leukocyte IgA receptor, FcαRI, is revealed by SSL7 binding at the Cα2/Cα3 interface of IgA. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **281**, 1389–1393 (2006).
4. Ramsland, P. A. *et al.* Structural basis for evasion of IgA immunity by Staphylococcus aureus revealed in the complex of SSL7 with Fc of human IgA1. *PNAS* **104**, 15051–15056 (2007).
5. Stenberg, L., Otoole, P. W., Mesteckm, J. & Lindahl, G. Molecular Characterization of Protein Sir, a Streptococcal Cell Surface Protein That Binds Both Immunoglobulin A and Immunoglobulin G*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **269**, 13458–13464 (1994).
6. Johnsson, E., Andersson, G., Lindahl, G. & Hedén, L. O. Identification of the IgA-binding region in streptococcal protein Arp. *J. Immunol* **153**, 3557–3564 (1994).
7. Kumar Bharathkar, S. *et al.* The Structures of Secretory and Dimeric Immunoglobulin A. *Elife* 61801 (2020).
8. Kumar, N., Arthur, C. P., Ciferri, C. & Matsumoto, M. L. Structure of the secretory immunoglobulin A core. *Science* **367**, 1008–1014 (2020).
9. Wang, Y. *et al.* Structural insights into secretory immunoglobulin A and its interaction with a pneumococcal adhesin. *Cell Res* **30**, 602 (2020).
10. Ralph, A. P. & Carapetis, J. R. Group a streptococcal diseases and their global burden. *Curr Top Microbiol Immunol* **368**, 1–27 (2013).
11. Mitchell, T. J. The pathogenesis of streptococcal infections: from Tooth decay to meningitis. *Nature Reviews Microbiology 2003 1:3* **1**, 219–230 (2003).
12. Happonen, L. *et al.* A quantitative Streptococcus pyogenes–human protein–protein interaction map reveals localization of opsonizing antibodies. *Nature Communications 2019 10:1* **10**, 1–15 (2019).
13. Carapetis, J. R., Steer, A. C., Mulholland, E. K. & Weber, M. The global burden of group A streptococcal diseases. *Lancet Infect Dis* **5**, 685–694 (2005).
14. McNamara, C. *et al.* Coiled-coil irregularities and instabilities in group A Streptococcus M1 are required for virulence. *Science* **319**, 1405–1408 (2008).

515   15.   Phillips, G. N., Flicker, P. F., Cohen, C., Manjula, B. N. & Fischetti, V. A. Streptococcal M
516   protein: alpha-helical coiled-coil structure and arrangement on the cell surface. *Proc Natl*
517   *Acad Sci U S A* **78**, 4689–4693 (1981).
518   16.   Frost, H. R., Sanderson-Smith, M., Walker, M., Botteaux, A. & Smeesters, P. R. Group A
519   streptococcal M-like proteins: From pathogenesis to vaccine potential. *FEMS Microbiol*
520   *Rev* **42**, 193–204 (2018).
521   17.   Smeesters, P. R., McMillan, D. J. & Sriprakash, K. S. The streptococcal M protein: a
522   highly versatile molecule. *Trends Microbiol* **18**, 275–282 (2010).
523   18.   Steer, A. C. *et al.* Status of research and development of vaccines for Streptococcus
524   pyogenes. *Vaccine* **34**, 2953–2958 (2016).
525   19.   R. Maliszewski, C., J. March, C., A. Schoenborn, M., Gimpel, steve & Shen, L.
526   Expression Cloning of a Human Fc Receptor for IgA. *J. Exp. Med.* **172**, 1665–1672
527   (1990).
528   20.   Lindahl, G. & Akerstrom, B. Receptor for IgA in group A streptococci: cloning of the gene
529   and characterization of the protein expressed in Escherichia coii. *Mol Microbiol* **3**, 239–
530   247 (1989).
531   21.   Frithz, E., Heden, L.-O. & Lindahl, G. Extensive sequence homology between IgA
532   receptor and M proteins in Streptococcus pyogenes. *Mol Microbiol* **3**, 1111–1119 (1989).
533   22.   Buffalo, C. Z. *et al.* Conserved patterns hidden within group A Streptococcus M protein
534   hypervariability recognize human C4b-binding protein. *Nat Microbiol* **1**, (2016).
535   23.   MacHeboeuf, P. *et al.* Streptococcal M1 protein constructs a pathological host fibrinogen
536   network. *Nature 2011 472:7341* **472**, 64–68 (2011).
537   24.   Pleass, R. J., Areschoug, T., Lindahl, G. & Woof, J. M. Streptococcal IgA-binding
538   Proteins Bind in the Cα2-Cα3 Interdomain Region and Inhibit Binding of IgA to Human
539   CD89. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **276**, 8197–8204 (2001).
540   25.   Kolesinski, P., Wang, K. C., Hirose, Y., Nizet, V. & Ghosh, P. An M protein coiled coil
541   unfurls and exposes its hydrophobic core to capture LL-37. *Elife* **11**, (2022).
542   26.   Akerstrom, B., Lindqvist, A. & Lindahl, G. *BINDING PROPERTIES OF PROTEIN ARP, A*
543   *BACTERIAL IgA-RECEPTOR. Mokcular Immunology* vol. 28 (1991).
544   27.   Pleass, R. J., Dunlop, J. I., Anderson, C. M. & Woof, J. M. Identification of Residues in
545   the CH2/CH3 Domain Interface of IgA Essential for Interaction with the Human Fcα
546   Receptor (FcαR) CD89. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **274**, 23508–23514 (1999).
547   28.   Sandin, C. *et al.* Isolation and Detection of Human IgA Using a Streptococcal IgA-Binding
548   Peptide. *The Journal of Immunology* **169**, 1357–1364 (2002).
549   29.   Steer, A. C., Law, I., Matatolu, L., Beall, B. W. & Carapetis, J. R. Global emm type
550   distribution of group A streptococci: systematic review and implications for vaccine
551   development. *Lancet Infect Dis* **9**, 611–616 (2009).
552   30.   Bryant, P., Pozzati, G. & Elofsson, A. Improved prediction of protein-protein interactions
553   using AlphaFold2. *Nature Communications 2022 13:1* **13**, 1–11 (2022).
554   31.   Fischetti, V. A. M Protein and Other Surface Proteins on Streptococci. in *Streptococcus*
555   *pyogenes : Basic Biology to Clinical Manifestations* (2016).
556   32.   Castro, S. A. & Dorfmueller, H. C. A brief review on Group A Streptococcus pathogenesis
557   and vaccine development. *R Soc Open Sci* **8**, (2021).
558   33.   Mills, J. O. & Ghosh, P. Nonimmune antibody interactions of Group A Streptococcus M
559   and M-like proteins. *PLoS Pathog* **17**, e1009248 (2021).
560   34.   Spriel, A. B. van, Leusen, J. H. W., Vilé, H. & Winkel, J. G. J. van de. Mac-1
561   (CD11b/CD18) as Accessory Molecule for FcαR (CD89) Binding of IgA. *The Journal of*
562   *Immunology* **169**, 3831–3836 (2002).
563   35.   Husmann, L. K., Yung, D. L., Hollingshead, S. K. & Scott, J. R. Role of putative virulence
564   factors of Streptococcus pyogenes in mouse models of long-term throat colonization and
565   pneumonia. *Infect Immun* **65**, 1422 (1997).

36.   Wessels, M. R., Moses, A. E., Goldberg, J. B. & Dicesare, T. J. Hyaluronic acid capsule
is a virulence factor for mucoid group A streptococci. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **88**, 8317
(1991).
37.   Moor, K. *et al.* High-avidity IgA protects the intestine by enchaining growing bacteria.
Nature 2016 544:7651 **544**, 498–502 (2017).
38.   Punjani, A., Rubinstein, J. L., Fleet, D. J. & Brubaker, M. A. cryoSPARC: algorithms for
rapid unsupervised cryo-EM structure determination. *Nature Methods 2017 14:3* **14**, 290–
296 (2017).
39.   Pettersen, E. F. *et al.* UCSF Chimera--a visualization system for exploratory research and
analysis. *J Comput Chem* **25**, 1605–1612 (2004).
40.   Emsley, P., Lohkamp, B., Scott, W. G. & Cowtan, K. Biological Crystallography Features
and development of Coot. doi:10.1107/S0907444910007493.
41.   Liebschner, D. *et al.* Macromolecular structure determination using X-rays, neutrons and
electrons: recent developments in Phenix. *urn:issn:2059-7983* **75**, 861–877 (2019).
42.   Tina, K. G., Bhadra, R. & Srinivasan, N. PIC: Protein Interactions Calculator. *Nucleic*
Acids Res **35**, 473–476 (2007).
43.   Robert, X. & Gouet, P. Deciphering key features in protein structures with the new
ENDscript server. *Nucleic Acids Res* **42**, W320–W324 (2014).
44.   Sievers, F. *et al.* Fast, scalable generation of high-quality protein multiple sequence
alignments using Clustal Omega. *Mol Syst Biol* **7**, 539 (2011).
586

 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Figure S1. CryoEM data collection and CryoSPARC processing pipeline. (a) Schematic summary of data processing pipeline of SIgA-M4 complex in CryoSPARC; (b) representative micrograph; (c) representative 2D class averages; (d) FSC curve for the final reconstruction with reported resolution at FSC=0.143 shown by the blue horizontal line. (e) Local resolution map calculated by cryoSPARC and colored in Chimera. (f) Density from M4 helix-a residues 46-60 contoured to 3σ and carved at 2 Å cutoff.

Figure S2. Sequence alignment of human and mouse IgA heavy chains. Sequence alignment including human IgA subtypes (hIgA1, hIgA2m1 and hIgA2m2) and mouse IgA. Identical residues are colored in red. Each square denotes an interfacing residue described in the main text. Squares are colored according to the key at the bottom of the figure, blue asterisks indicate that the residue is on heavy chain-B.

601
602 **Figure S3. M4 binding analysis by surface plasmon resonance (SPR).** Sensorgrams showing
603 the response of M4 (a) and individual M4 point mutants, Q48A (b), R50A (c), and K69A (d) binding
604 to immobilized hSIgA1. All data were collected on a surface immobilized with 0.2uM hSIgA1 and
605 all analytes were tested with a two-fold dilution series starting from 2uM.

606
Figure S4. SIgA-CD89 CryoEM data collection and CryoSPARC processing pipeline. (a)
Schematic summary of data processing pipeline of SIgA-CD89 complex in CryoSPARC; (b)
representative micrograph; (c) representative 2D class averages; (d) FSC curve for the final
reconstruction with reported resolution at FSC=0.143 shown by the blue horizontal line. (e) Local
resolution map calculated by cryoSPARC and colored in Chimera; (f) density from CD89 residues
52-56 contoured to 3σ and carved at 2 Å cutoff.

613
Figure S5. Comparison of M4 and SSL7 binding to SIgA. (a) The structure of M4-SIgA and
model of SSL7 bound to SIgA. The SSL7-SIgA model was built by aligning the cocrystal structure
of an SSL7-Fcα complex (PDB: 2QEJ) to both copies of SIgA Fcα. M4 only binds at Fc$_{AB}$, as
shown in Fig. 5 and the second site (Fc$_{CD}$) is occluded by JC (magenta) whereas SSL7 (purple)
bound to the second site (Fc$_{CD}$) is not overlapping with any part of SIgA, indicating that binding is
feasible. The JC loop that occluded M4 binding is indicated by an arrow. (b) Comparison of M4
and SSL7 binding sites on Fcα. Monomeric Fcαs (PDB code: 1OW0 with CD89 removed) are
shown as ribbons and binding residues are shown as stick representations. The 11 residues
bound by M4 are shown in pink and the 20 residues bound by SSL7 are shown in purple. Nine
Cα3 residues are bound by both M4 and SSL7 including: E357 (HC-B), A360 (HC-B), E389, L441,
F443, T444, Q445, T447, D449. The other 11 residues bound by SSL7 interface are: L257, L258,
E313, N316, H317, M433, H436, E437, P440, A442, R450.

Table S1. Cryo-EM data collection, refinement, and validation statistics

	#1 SIgA:M4 (EMDB-40568) (PDB 8SKV)	#2 SIgA:CD89 (EMDB-40567) (PDB 8SKU)
Data collection and processing		
Magnification	130K	165K
Voltage (kV)	300	300
Electron exposure (e–/Å^2)	50	71
Defocus range (μm)	-0.8 to -2.0	-0.8 to -2.0
Pixel size (Å)	0.95	0.82
Symmetry imposed	C1	C1
Initial particle images (no.)	2270K	1240K
Final particle images (no.)	200K	249K
Map resolution (Å)	3.07	3.18
FSC threshold	0.143	0.143
Map resolution range (Å)	2-5	2-5
Refinement		
Initial model used (PDB code)	6ue7	6ue7, 1ow0
Model resolution (Å)	3.0	3.2
FSC threshold	0.143	0.143
Map sharpening B factor (Å^2)	185	170
Model composition		
Non-hydrogen atoms	12220	14476
Protein residues	1632	1951
Ligands	NAG:15	NAG:12
B factors (Å^2)		
Protein	0	0
Ligand	51.53	41.21
R.m.s. deviations		
Bond lengths (Å)	0	0.005
Bond angles (°)	0	0.642
Validation		
MolProbity score	1.67	1.93
Clashscore	5.26	9.20
Poor rotamers (%)	0.32	0.2
Ramachandran plot		
Favored (%)	94.32	93.15
Allowed (%)	5.77	6.85
Disallowed (%)	0	0