1   A nucleoid-associated protein is involved in the emergence of antibiotic resistance by promoting

2   the frequent exchange of the replicative DNA polymerase in *M. smegmatis*

3   Wei L. Ng [a], Jin Ho Park [a], and E. Hesper Rego[1] [a]

Affiliations

[a] Department of Microbial Pathogenesis, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT

06519

[1]To whom correspondence should be addressed: hesper.rego@yale.edu

SUMMARY

Antibiotic resistance in *M. tuberculosis* exclusively originates from chromosomal mutations,

either during normal DNA replication or under stress, when the expression of error-prone DNA

polymerases increases to repair damaged DNA. The mechanisms by which polymerases switch

at the replication fork are unknown. Here, we discover that a mutation in the nucleoid-

associated protein, Lsr2, produces several hallmarks of an impaired DNA damage response,

including a severe growth defect when exposed to genotoxic drugs and reduced mutation

frequency. Lsr2's function as a transcription factor cannot explain these phenotypes. Instead,

through a series of genetic and fluorescence imaging experiments, we find that Lsr2 is important

for modulating the dynamics of polymerases at the replication fork. The major replicative DNA

polymerase, DnaE1, exchanges more frequently in the presence of Lsr2, while, during DNA

damage, cells lacking *lsr2* cannot effectively load the complex needed to bypass DNA lesions,

and thus replicate with higher fidelity but exhibit growth defects. Together, our results show that

Lrs2 promotes dynamic flexibility of the mycobacterial replisome, which is critical for robust cell

growth and lesion repair in conditions that damage DNA.

INTRODUCTION

DNA replication and repair are fundamental to bacterial evolution. The function of DNA

replication and repair pathways are key determinants of the balance between genetic stability

and mutability. To establish this balance, bacteria encode and regulate numerous DNA

polymerases with specialized functions in different conditions (1). Importantly, the emergence

of antibiotic resistance in the major human pathogen *M. tuberculosis* is mainly driven by

chromosomal mutagenesis, as *M. tuberculosis* has little to no ability for horizontal gene transfer

(2, 3). Furthermore, numerous studies suggest a critical role for *de novo* mutagenesis and

differences in mutation rates underlie the emergence of *M. tuberculosis* drug resistance (4, 5, 6,

7, 8). Thus, the mechanisms regulating polymerase expression and activity are of particular

importance in mycobacterial evolution.

In mycobacteria, the fidelity of chromosome replication is established by the major

replicative polymerase DnaE1, which possesses endogenous proofreading activity (9). In

addition to DnaE1, mycobacteria encode a suite of other polymerases with specialized repair

functions that are only expressed under certain conditions, such as oxidative or DNA-damaging

stress (10, 11, 12). For example, the mycobacterial specialist polymerases DinB1, DinB2,

DinB3, and DnaE2 are induced under different conditions and have varying repair activities and

mutational signatures (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). Of particular importance is the error-prone

polymerase DnaE2. It and its accessory proteins ImuA' and ImuB, collectively referred to as the

'mutasome', are highly expressed in conditions that damage DNA and are the primary drivers of

stress-induced mutagenesis *in vitro* and potentially *in vivo* (10, 11, 16). In general, however, the

mechanisms that facilitate switching between polymerases at the site of repair are not well

understood, especially in mycobacteria (17).

As in *E.coli*, the abundance and function of the proteins involved in DNA repair are

tightly regulated transcriptionally and proteolytically in mycobacteria (18, 19, 20, 21). At the

transcriptional level, mycobacteria encode two stress-inducible DNA repair pathways: the

canonical SOS response, which is jointly controlled by transcriptional repressor LexA and co-

protease RecA, and an independent, Actinobacteria-specific response controlled by the

transcriptional activator PafBC (22, 23, 24, 25). Both pathways regulate the expression of

mycobacterial mutasome in *M. smegmatis* and in *M. tuberculosis* (25). DNA replication and

repair machinery are also regulated post-translationally in mycobacteria. For example, RecA

activity is controlled by post-translational modification, and RecA protein is targeted for

degradation to the Pup-proteasome system (23, 26). Studies from *E. coli* also suggest

additional, more complex mechanisms of regulating mutagenesis, including spatial

sequestration of key proteins, replisome dynamics, collisions with transcription complexes, and

complex expression dynamics at the single-cell level (18, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31).

Discovery of similar mechanisms is starting to emerge from studies in mycobacteria. For

example, RecA fluctuates dynamically and heterogeneously in single genetically identical *M.*

tuberculosis cells, and the DNA translocase Mfd promotes mutagenesis in *M. tuberculosis* and

many other bacteria, possibly through transcription-associated mutagenesis (27, 32, 33).

Furthermore, the distinct localization patterns of the mycobacterial DnaE2/ImuA'/ImuB

translesion DNA polymerase complex members indicate potential spatial regulation (34).

Here, we decided to investigate the expression of ImuA' and ImuB, encoded by a single

operon, *imuA'B*, at the single cell level by creating fluorescence reporters that could be used to

measure their expression by flow cytometry and microscopy. We serendipitously discovered a

mutant in the Actinobacteria-specific nucleoid-associated protein Lsr2 that resulted in higher

fluorescence, and several phenotypes associated with dysregulation of the DNA-damage

response (35). However, by analyzing both endogenous *imuA'B* expression and expression

from synthetic constructs, we demonstrate that Lsr2 regulation of the *imuA'B* promoter is

counteracted by the addition of neighboring sequences. Thus, our data indicate that Lsr2 has a

limited effect on the transcriptional regulation of *imuA'B.* Instead, using fluorescence imaging

techniques, including fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP), we discover that Lsr2

has a novel role in modulating the dynamics of the replisome and exchange of polymerases

within. Specifically, in cells missing *lsr2,* DnaE1 exchanges with the cytoplasmic pool more

slowly, and ImuB exchanges more quickly, suggesting ineffective loading of the mutasome.

Consistently, loss of *lsr2* results in growth defects in conditions that damage DNA, and reduced

mutagenesis. Overall, our data provide another unexpected layer to the mechanisms

mycobacteria use to mutate and acquire drug resistance.

RESULTS

Lsr2 affects the levels of an *imuA'B* promoter reporter, growth in mitomycin, and

acquisition of mutations

To investigate the expression of the mutasome in single cells, we constructed

fluorescent reporters for *dnaE2* and *imuA'B* promoter activity by fusing 500 bp upstream of the

start codon to a promoterless GFP (*pimuAB-msfGFP*) or mScarlet (*pdnaE2-mScarlet*) (**Fig 1A**).

We integrated these reporters in single copy at phage sites on the *M.smegmatis* chromosome.

imuA'B and *dnaE2* are induced upon exposure to DNA-damaging agents and are controlled by

several transcription factors (23, 25). To verify that our fusions were responsive to these

elements, we first exposed cells to the DNA-damaging agent mitomycin C (MMC, 80 ng/ml), and

observed the expected increase in reporter fluorescence by flow cytometry (**Fig 1B**). Given the

complex regulation associated with *imuA'B* expression, we focused on its single-cell distribution

in strains altered for the transcriptional regulators LexA and PafBC. As *lexA* is essential in

mycobacteria, we used CRISPRi to deplete *lexA* levels and monitored reporter fluorescence

(36, 37, 38). Consistent with LexA's function as a repressor, *lexA* knockdown increased the

average fluorescence of the population under basal conditions. Additionally, we observed little

to no change in fluorescence upon *lexA* depletion during MMC treatment, which is consistent

with the cleavage of LexA protein under these conditions (**Fig 1C**). Some DNA damage

response genes, including *imuA'B*, are transcriptionally activated by PafBC when exposed to

FIG 1. Construction & evaluation of *imuA'B* promoter fusion. (A) Schematic illustrating
the design of *imuA'B* and *dnaE2* fluorescent promoter fusions on phage integrative vectors.
Transcriptional regulators LexA and PafBC are also shown. **(B)** Representative flow
cytometry plot of a strain harboring the *imuA'B* and *dnaE2* promoter fusions. DNA damage
was induced by adding mitomycin C (MMC) (80 ng/ml, 6 hours). **(C,D)** Mean (±SD) of the
median fluorescence intensities obtained from flow cytometry (N=3 biological replicates) in a
pimuAB-msfGFP expressing strain with or without aTc-inducible CRISPRi knockdown of *lexA*
(C) *or pafBC* **(D)**. DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml, 11 hours).
lexA knockdown was induced by adding aTc (11-12 hours, 100 ng/ml) prior to mitomycin C
treatment. For all panels: p-values were obtained by unpaired t-test. 0.1234 (ns), 0.0332 (*),
0.0021 (**), 0.0002 (***), <0.0001 (****).

DNA damaging agents (23). PafBC is present but inactive in basal conditions, and becomes

activated during DNA damage (39). Consistently, deletion of *pafBC* resulted in little to no

change in fluorescence under basal conditions. In contrast, under DNA-damaging conditions,

cells missing *pafBC* had 6-fold lower fluorescence than wild-type cells (**Fig 1D**). Together, these

results show that our fluorescence reporter is responsive to known regulatory elements within

the promoter of *imuA'B*.

In subsequent studies, we observed the spontaneous emergence of a subpopulation

with dramatically higher levels of *imuA'B* promoter reporter fluorescence. We performed whole

genome sequencing to identify mutations exclusively found in clones that exhibited higher

fluorescence. Notably, all three isolates with elevated fluorescence had a smooth colony

morphology and contained inactivating mutations in the nucleoid-associated protein *lsr2*

(MSMEG_6092), which were absent from the three isolates with a rough colony morphology

and comparatively low fluorescence. To confirm that *lsr2* inactivation is responsible for elevated

imuA'B promoter reporter fluorescence, we generated a clean *lsr2* deletion mutant by

recombineering (40). As expected, Δ*lsr2* exhibited higher reporter fluorescence under both

basal and DNA damaging conditions, which could be complemented by expressing *lsr2* from the

native promoter on a phage integrated plasmid (**Fig 2A**).

Despite extensive research into transcriptional regulation by Lsr2, no previous reports

have shown Lsr2 regulation of *imuA'B* or other DNA damage response genes (41, 42, 43, 44).

Therefore, we further validated this observation of Lsr2 regulation of *imuA'B* by replacing the

chromosomal copy of *imuA'B* with *msfGFP* using recombineering, effectively recreating the

p*imuAB* reporter at the native locus. We performed flow cytometry of this reporter in a wild-type

and Δ*lsr2* background. As with the reporter integrated at the phage integration site, cells

expressing the fluorescent protein at the native locus also exhibited higher fluorescence in the

absence of *lsr2* (**Fig 2B**). Importantly, ImuA' or ImuB themselves were not responsible, as

reporter fluorescence increased regardless of their expression (**Fig S1**). Together, these results

show that Lsr2 regulates p*imuAB* reporter fluorescence.

132   *M. smegmatis* and *M. tuberculosis* cells missing ImuA' and ImuB are more sensitive to

FIGURE 2. Loss of *lsr2* leads to increased reporter fluorescence, growth defects on mitomycin C, and decreased mutagenesis. (A) Mean (±SD) of the median fluorescence intensities obtained from flow cytometry data (N=3) in a strain expressing *pimuAB-msfGFP* from the Giles *attB* site in either a wild-type or Δ*lsr2* background. DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml, 9 hours). **(B)** Mean (±SD) of the median fluorescence intensities obtained from flow cytometry data (N=5) in a strain expressing *pimuAB-msfGFP* from the *imuAB* locus in either a wild-type or Δ*lsr2* background. DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml, 7 hours). **(A-B)** p-values were obtained by unpaired t-test. **(C)** Serial dilutions of WT, Δ*lsr2*, and complemented strains on agar plates with or without mitomycin C (1.56 ng/ml). Results shown are representative spots of biological triplicates. **(D)** Frequency of rifampin-resistant mutants per 10^8 cfu without or with UV-induced DNA damage (20 mJ/cm^2). LOD refers to the limit of detection. *lsr2* complements were expressed from the native *lsr2* promoter on a phage integrative plasmid. p-values were obtained by one-way ANOVA. For all panels: 0.1234 (ns), 0.0332 (*), 0.0021 (**), 0.0002 (***), <0.0001 (****).

MMC treatment and are less likely to mutate when exposed to DNA-damaging agents, like

ultraviolet light (**Fig S2**) (16, 34). As our data indicated that Lsr2 is involved in the transcription

of *imuA'B*, we hypothesized that cells missing *lsr2* would be altered in these key phenotypes. To

test this, we first grew cells on agar plates with different concentrations of MMC. Deletion of *lsr2*

results in a severe growth defect in the presence of MMC (**Fig 2C**). Next, we assayed the ability

of Δ*lsr2* to acquire resistance to rifampicin, both spontaneously and when exposed to UV. We

chose a dose of UV that resulted in no survival difference between the two genotypes (**Fig S3**).

Consistent with a role in DNA damage response, we found that cells deleted for *lsr2* are

approximately 4-5 times less likely to acquire resistance to rifampicin when exposed to UV (**Fig

2C, right**). In addition, Δ*lsr2* is less likely to spontaneously acquire resistance, suggesting that

Lsr2's role is not strictly limited to conditions that induce DNA damage (**Fig 2C, left**). Taken

together, our data indicate a role for Lsr2 in promoting cellular growth during DNA damage and

the acquisition of mutations that confer drug resistance.

**RNAseq reveals a discrepancy between promoter reporter fluorescence and endogenous

RNA levels for many DNA-damage associated genes**

Lsr2 is a nucleoid-associated protein that is conserved in mycobacteria and related

actinomycetes (35, 42, 45, 46, 47). Like H-NS in *E.coli*, Lsr2 primarily binds AT-rich regions of

DNA and functions as a global transcriptional repressor (35). Notably, *in vitro* studies show that

Lsr2 binding interferes with transcription, inhibits topoisomerase I-dependent supercoil

relaxation, and protects DNA from DNase I digestion and H2O2-mediated degradation (42).

Loss of *lsr2* is associated with a wide range of different phenotypes in mycobacteria, including

altered cell cycle timing, and growth defects upon entering/exiting hypoxic conditions and when

exposed to oxidative stress and various antibiotics (41, 42, 43, 44, 48). Lsr2 is also involved in

resistance against phage infection, protection against reactive oxygen intermediates during

FIGURE 3. RNA-seq reveals a discrepancy between reporter fluorescence and endogenous RNA levels for many DNA damage-associated genes. (A) Flow cytometry histograms of strains expressing various DNA-damage inducible promoter reporters from the Giles *attB* site in either a wild-type (red) or Δ*lsr2 (*blue) background. *M. smegmatis lsr2* complement (grey) was expressed from the native promoter at the Tweety *attB* site. DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml, 9 hours). **(B)** Normalized counts per million (mean ±SD) for different DNA-damage inducible genes over time in either wild-type (solid line) and Δ*lsr2* (dashed line). In the *imuAB* plot, *imuA* and *imuB* RNA levels are shown in pink and purple, respectively. None of the genes shown were differentially expressed in Δ*lsr2* compared to WT (|log2FC|>1, p<0.05). DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml).

macrophage infection, and cells deleted for *lsr2* show reduced virulence in various hosts,

including mice (41, 44, 46, 49).

We set out to understand the molecular basis of Lsr2's role in promoting growth in

conditions that damage DNA and in acquiring mutations. As our data indicated a change in

imuA'B promoter activity in Δ*lsr2*, we hypothesized that Lsr2 acts as a transcription factor to

control the expression of proteins important for repairing DNA. Prior studies on role of Lsr2 in

gene expression under aerobic growth conditions as well as exposure various stressors,

including ethambutol, hypoxia, and hydrogen peroxide, did not report differential expression of

imuA'B or related genes, including *recA, dnaE2,* and *lexA,* in Δ*lsr2* (41, 42, 43, 44). We

hypothesized that lack of differential expression of DNA damage genes could be due to the lack

of or insufficient DNA damage induction in the conditions used. We therefore performed RNA-

seq at different time points throughout treatment with mitomycin C, a strong DNA damage

inducer. Consistent with previous studies, we observed up-regulation of many cell envelope

biosynthesis genes in basal conditions, including MSMEG_4727, in Δ*lsr2* (43) (**Tables S3 and**

S4). Curiously, although our *imuA'B* promoter reporter showed higher levels of fluorescence and

msfGFP RNA in the *lsr2* mutant background (**Fig 2A, 2B, 4C**), RNA-seq and RT-qPCR showed

that *imuA'* and *imuB* mRNA levels were either similar or slightly lower in Δ*lsr2* than in wild type

(**Tables S3 and S4**, **Fig 4A**). To examine whether the discrepancy between the promoter

reporter and endogenous RNA levels was generalizable to other DNA damage-inducible genes,

we constructed phage site-integrated fluorescent promoter reporters for several other DNA-

damage inducible genes. Of the seven additional reporters we constructed, five showed

increased fluorescence in the *lsr2* mutant background compared to wild type in the presence

and/or the absence of MMC (**Fig 3A**)**.** As seen with *imuA'B,* RNA-seq data showed little to no

difference in endogenous mRNA levels in Δ*lsr2* compared to wild type in in the absence of MMC

or at any timepoint ranging from 1 to 24 hours of treatment (**Fig 3B**). Taken together, these data

show that *lsr2* exhibits repression of promoter reporter constructs, even those integrated at the

native locus, but has little to no effect on endogenous RNA levels, suggesting that DNA outside

the promoter region contributes to gene expression.

Sequence context is important for regulation of *imuA'B*

lsr2 represses the expression of promoter reporters for multiple DNA damage-inducible

genes, but has little to no effect on endogenous RNA levels (**Fig 3A**). We thus hypothesized

that DNA outside the promoter region contribute to gene expression. In fact, when we carefully

looked at the RNA-seq reads mapped to the *imuA'B* locus, we noticed a high number of

antisense reads mapped to the 3' region of *imuA'B* (**Fig 4B**). The coding sequence of this region

includes *iunH,* which is predicted to encode a nucleoside hydrolase (50). The architecture of

imuA'B-iunH is conserved across mycobacterial species (24). Indeed, prior studies in *M.*

tuberculosis using microarrays, which cannot distinguish strandedness, noticed a high number

of *iunH* reads when *M. tuberculosis* was exposed to MMC (24). The expression of transcripts

depended on the presence of *recA* despite the absence of an SOS box in the promoter region of

iunH. Thus, the authors speculated the presence of anti-sense RNA in this region. We

wondered if the presence of this RNA was the result of transcriptional readthrough from *imuA'B*,

or if there existed an internal promoter within *imuA'B* driving expression. To distinguish these

two possibilities, we designed primers for the *imuB-iunH* junction, and performed quantitative

real-time PCR (**Fig S4A, S4B**). Consistent with transcriptional readthrough, we observed high

levels of this product in the reaction. Second, we fused the *imuA'B* coding region to a

promoterless GFP, and did not observe fluorescence in the absence or presence of MMC,

suggesting that *imuA'B* does not harbor an internal promoter (**Fig S4C**). Together, these data

suggest that the antisense *iunH* reads most likely originate from transcriptional readthrough of

imuA'B, and the *imuA'B* transcript includes a large 3' UTR, which is conserved in *M.*

tuberculosis (24).

We hypothesized that additional regulation originating from this 3' region is responsible

for the discrepancy between our promoter fusion and transcript abundance. To test this, we

added 1.55kb sequence downstream of *imuB* to the 3' end of the *msfGFP* coding sequence of

our reporter and measured *msfGFP* transcript abundance by RT-qPCR*.* This 1.55kb

downstream sequence includes the *iunH* coding sequence and 500 additional bases to account

for *iunH* upstream regulatory elements. Consistent with our hypothesis, we observed that

transcript levels were more similar between wild type and Δ*lsr2* cells when we added the

downstream region (**Fig 4C**). Specifically, we noticed that when we added the downstream

region, *msfGFP* transcript levels in wild type increased to a level similar to those in Δ*lsr2*. To

FIGURE 4. Lsr2 regulation of the *imuA'B* promoter is counteracted by the addition of neighboring sequences. (A) RT-qPCR of endogenous *imuA* RNA. **(B)** RNA-seq reads at the *imuA'B* locus visualized in IGV. Top strand (blue), bottom strand (red). DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml, 6 hours). **(C, D)** Schematic and RT-qPCR of *msfGFP* or *imuA'* from phage integrative constructs. +/- DS indicates the presence or absence of a 1.55kb region (including the *iunH* coding sequence) downstream the *imuB* coding sequence. **(A, C, D)** Results shown are the median -dCt values of biological triplicates, with individual values shown as dots. Larger -dCt values correspond to higher expression. Phage integrative constructs in **(C)** and **(D)** are expressed in a WT and Δ*imuAB* background, respectively. DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml, 9 hours). p-values were obtained by unpaired t-test. 0.1234 (ns), 0.0332 (*), 0.0021 (**), 0.0002 (***), <0.0001 (****).

confirm that this also true for a transcript that includes the coding sequence of *imuA'B*, instead

of *msfGFP*, we integrated constructs containing the *imuA'B* coding sequence in cells deleted for

imuA'B, and performed RT-qPCR (**Fig 4D**). In this case, the effect of the downstream region

was much smaller, pointing to important elements within the coding sequence itself.

Nevertheless, the only scenario that recapitulated the levels of endogenous mRNA as

measured by the RNA-seq in both basal and MMC conditions included the region 3' to *imuA'B*.

Together these data show that regulatory or structural elements within the coding sequence and

the 3' region adjacent to *imuA'B* are responsible for the discrepancy between our promoter

fusion and RNA-seq data. Specifically, these data suggest that Lsr2 is capable of strongly

regulating the promoter of *imuA'B*, directly or indirectly, but does not when these other genomic

elements are present. One possible interpretation is that the coding sequence and adjacent 3'

region of the DNA forms a local DNA structure that is propagated to the promoter region and

prevents Lsr2 regulation. Although it is not clear whether Lsr2 directly regulates p*imuAB-GFP*

transcription certain NAPs are thought preferentially bind locally deformed DNA (51, 52, 53).

Notably, transcriptional regulation of the *proU* operon by *Salmonella typhimurium* H-NS also

depends on the sequence context (54).

Tn-seq reveals a connection between Lsr2 and stalled transcription complexes

Our data show that while the promoter of *imuA'B* may be responsive to Lsr2 in some

contexts, other factors are more important in controlling the endogenous levels of this transcript.

More broadly, we could not detect any change in the expression of genes known to be important

for DNA repair or replication in Δ*lsr2* in our RNA-seq data (**Tables S3 and S4**). Thus, we

conclude that Lsr2's function as a transcription factor is unlikely to account for its role in

surviving DNA damage survival and acquiring mutations.

Why, then, does Δ*lsr2* display phenotypes associated with dysregulation of the DNA-

damage response? Specifically, cells missing *lsr2* display some phenotypes typically associated

with cells missing DnaE2, the major error-prone polymerase, or its accessory proteins, ImuA'

and ImuB, despite having similar amounts of these transcripts (16). We reasoned that changes

#Orf	Name	Description	log2FC	Adj. p-value
MSMEG_3437c	-	putative esterase family protein	-6.17	0
MSMEG_6642	-	caib/baif family protein	-6.1	0
MSMEG_6136c	-	membrane protein, TerC family protein	-5.65	0
MSMEG_2107	-	hypothetical protein MSMEG_2107	-5.52	0
MSMEG_5089	-	hypothetical protein MSMEG_5089	-5.46	0
MSMEG_6230c	-	acyltransferase	-5.3	0
MSMEG_3186c	glgX	glycogen debranching enzyme GlgX	-5.21	0
MSMEG_5534c	**pcrA**	**ATP-dependent DNA helicase PcrA**	**-5.06**	**0**
MSMEG_0641c	-	binding-protein-dependent transport systems inner membrane component	-5.05	0
MSMEG_0167c	-	transmembrane transport protein	-4.8	0
MSMEG_6768c	-	halogenase	-4.73	0
MSMEG_3225	-	ferredoxin-dependent glutamate synthase 1	-4.49	0
MSMEG_2174	**-**	**superfamily protein I DNA or RNA helicase**	**-4.38**	**0**
MSMEG_1222c	-	ISMsm6, transposase	-4.28	0
MSMEG_4038	-	vanillin dehydrogenase	-4.21	0
MSMEG_2263	hybC	hydrogenase-2, large subunit	-4.07	0
MSMEG_0147c	-	C-5 sterol desaturase	-4.06	0
MSMEG_1219c	-	ABC-type transport system permease protein II	-4.04	0
MSMEG_5942c	-	AMP-dependent synthetase and ligase	-3.76	0
MSMEG_0816c	-	flavin-binding monooxygenase	-2.81	0
MSMEG_0408c	-	type I modular polyketide synthase	-2.04	0
MSMEG_5571c	-	ABC transporter ATP-binding protein	-6.73	0.0192

Table 1. Differential abundance of transposon mutants in a Δ*lsr2* library compared to wild-type. Light green shading corresponds to two genes harboring UvrD-like helicase domains that are substantially less abundant in Δ*lsr2* than wild-type.

247   in

gene essentiality might reveal additional cellular pathways associated with Lsr2 function. To that

end, we used Tn-seq to map essential pathways in cells with and without Lsr2. Of the 20 genes

that had the most significantly reduced transposon insertions in the mutant, many coded for

proteins involved in cell wall synthesis, consistent with Lsr2's function as a mediator of cell wall

composition of *M.smegmatis*. However, two genes with significantly fewer insertions contained

UvrD-like helicase domains, including HelD, which promote RNAP recycling at sites of stalled

transcription complexes (**Table 1**) (55). In bacteria, head-on collisions between transcription and

replication complexes can be lethal if not resolved (31). Thus, our Tn-seq data indicate that

replication/transcription collisions may occur more frequently or are less resolved in cells

missing *lsr2*. Along these same lines, Lsr2 inhibits *in vitro* transcription and topoisomerase I

activity, Lsr2 localizes near the replisome, and alters *M. smegmatis* progression through the cell

cycle (42, 48, 49). Thus, we hypothesized that Lsr2 affects the dynamics or localization of

DnaE1, a key mediator of replisome function and DNA replication fidelity.

Lsr2 alters replisome dynamics throughout the cell cycle

To investigate the dynamics of DnaE1, we visualized DnaE1-mScarletI in wild type and

Δ*lsr2* cells by expressing this fusion from the native promoter. A similar fusion encodes

functional DnaE1 (56). We next performed time-lapse microscopy and analyzed fluorescence

distributions as a function of both cell length and cell cycle. Consistent with the reported

placement of the replisome in mycobacteria, DnaE1 localizes at approximately mid cell, before

disappearing presumably after DNA replication has been completed (56). Towards the end of

the cell cycle, DnaE1 reappears at one- and three-quarter positions to initiate replication in

newly synthesized sister chromosomes. Consistent with prior findings using a DnaN reporter,

DNA replication is faster in cells missing *lsr2*, lasting for roughly one-half of the cell cycle (~70

minutes) versus approximately two-thirds of the cell cycle (~100 minutes) in wild type (**Fig 5A**)

(48). In our conditions, cells divide on average every 150 minutes, as defined by the time

between successive septal invagination events visualized by phase contrast microscopy.

We reasoned that Lsr2 could be affecting replisome dynamics directly or indirectly. To

address this, we constructed a strain harboring fluorescent translational fusions to Lsr2 and

DnaE1. ChIP-seq data show an abundance of Lsr2 binding sites across the chromosome;

consistent with this, we find that Lsr2 decorates the entire nucleoid in discrete and highly

dynamic puncta (43). Images at a single time point were ambiguous in relation to the amount of

co-localization between DnaE1 and Lsr2 (**Fig 5B**). Thus, we performed time-lapse microscopy

and, as before, constructed kymographs to visualize the probability distribution of Lsr2's

localization in both space and time. We find that Lsr2 is enriched near the pole of the cell and

that localization tracks with cell elongation (**Fig 5C**). Consistent with prior findings, Lsr2 localizes

nearby DnaE1 at certain times in the cell cycle, but does not co-localize with it, despite Lsr2's

abundance throughout nucleoid. Taken together, our data suggest that Lsr2 may be excluded

from the replisome, and in its absence, DNA replicates more quickly in standard laboratory

growth media (48). Thus, Lsr2 may be acting as an obstacle for DNA replication.

Lsr2 promotes frequent exchange of the polymerases in the replisome

In *E.coli*, replisome components exchange rapidly, likely when encountering DNA-

protein obstacles. That is, FRAP and single molecule studies have revealed that, despite being

highly processive *in vitro*, replisome components are highly dynamic within the cell (57). For

example, at room temperature, the alpha subunit of Pol III in *E. coli* exchanges with the

cytoplasmic pool at a time scale of approximately 4 seconds, suggesting that subunits are

constantly being replaced during the 150 minutes it takes to replicate the chromosome at this

temperature (57). These data underlie the notion that the replisome is dynamic and flexible,

allowing new subunits and components the opportunity to exchange frequently.

We reasoned that if Lsr2 prevented fast replication of the chromosome, then it might

also affect the timescale of polymerase exchange. To test this, we took the same approach as

Beattie, TR *et al* and used FRAP to measure the dynamics of recovery of DnaE1 in cells with or

without Lsr2 (57). Fast recovery of fluorophores into a bleached spot indicates fast dissociation

of bleached molecules. Conversely, slow, or incomplete recovery of non-bleached fluorophores

indicates slow dissociation of bleached molecules, and a stably associated complex. To account

for differences in the degree of bleaching per cell, we normalized the fluorescence intensity after

bleaching to zero, and the final intensity to the maximum recovery we expected based on the

percentage of fluorophores bleached. We fit the data to a diffusion exchange reaction and

calculated both the timescale of recovery, reflecting the dissociation time of bound subunits, and

the maximum recovery, reflecting the mobile fraction of proteins. Imaging was done in the same

conditions as above, in which we measure the duration of chromosomal replication to be

approximately 100 minutes. DnaE1 had dramatically different timescales of exchange in wild

type and mutant cells. In wild type cells, consistent with similar measurements done in *E.coli*,

DnaE1 exchanged quickly and nearly completely with a timescale of approximately 8.09 +/- 3.11

seconds (mean±SD). In contrast, DnaE1 recovery occurred at a much longer timescale in *Δlsr2*

cells, exchanging with a timescale of 38.10 +/- 9.96 seconds (**Fig 5D, 5E, 5F**). As DnaE1 is a

highly faithful and processive enzyme, these data are consistent with faster replication time and

lower mutation rate of the *lsr2* mutant in these conditions (9).

We next wondered if Lsr2 also affected polymerase exchange in conditions that elevate

expression of the error-prone polymerase DnaE2 and its associated complex. To test this, we

created constructs that translationally fused ImuA', ImuB, and DnaE2 to fluorescent proteins.

ImuA' and ImuB fusions restored elevated mutation frequency in *ΔimuA'B* cells, as did a

chromosomal DnaE2-GFPmut (**Fig S5A, S5B**)(34). Notably, others have reported that ImuA'

and ImuB fluorescent fusions do not complement a small growth defect of *ΔimuA'B* on MMC-

containing agar (34). Based on their ability to restore mutation, we concluded that ImuA', ImuB,

and DnaE2 fusions were at least partly, if not entirely, functional.

Despite being co-transcribed, ImuA' and ImuB had dramatically different fluorescent

intensities: ImuB was brightly fluorescent, while ImuA' was barely detectable above the

background (**Fig S6A, S6B**). Thus, cellular levels of ImuA' are much lower than ImuB, implying

that additional post-transcriptional mechanisms exist (e.g. translation regulation or proteolysis)

FIGURE 5. Loss of *lsr2* changes replicative polymerase and translesion complex dynamics. **(A)** Kymograph of DnaE1-mScarlet expressed from the native promoter on a phage integrative plasmid in WT (left) or Δ*lsr2* (right). **(B, C)** Microscopy images and kymograph of cells expressing DnaE1-mGFPmut3 and Lsr2-mScarlet in a Δ*lsr2* background. **(D)** FRAP of DnaE1-mScarlet in WT (top) and Δ*lsr2* (bottom) imaged at 2 and 4 second intervals, respectively. Blue arrow indicates the location of the focus targeted for bleaching. **(E)** and **(G)** show the fluorescence recovery curves for DnaE1-mScarlet (N=21 for WT, 12 for Δ*lsr2*) and mScarlet-ImuB (N=13 for WT, 10 for Δ*lsr2*). Solid lines show a one-phase exponential association fit to the data. Individual points show the mean±SEM of fluorescence intensity after bleach correction. Dashed line represents the estimated maximum possible fluorescence recovery. **(F)** and **(H)** show bound times (mean±SD) obtained from one-phase exponential association fits for DnaE1 and ImuB, respectively.**(G, H)** DNA damage was induced by treatment with mitomycin C (1.56 ng/ml) for 4 hours. p-values were obtained by unpaired t-test. For all panels: 0.1234 (ns), 0.0332 (*), 0.0021 (**), 0.0002 (***), <0.0001 (****).

to limit ImuA' abundance. Like ImuA', DnaE2 was also very dim (**Fig S6C**). These data suggest

that one limiting factor in forming an active mutasome complex may be the low cellular

concentrations of ImuA' and/or DnaE2. Due to the low abundance of ImuA' and DnaE2 it was

difficult to draw conclusions about their localization or dynamics in cells with or without *lsr2*.

Thus, we decided to determine the exchange rate of ImuB, which recruits ImuA' and DnaE2 into

an active complex by binding to the β-clamp subunit of the replisome, and thus is a key factor in

the stability of the mutasome. To test the recovery of ImuB, we treated cells with a low

concentration of mitomycin to induce its expression and again performed FRAP. ImuB displayed

a much longer timescale of exchange than DnaE1 (73.97 +/- 13.65 seconds), suggesting the

protein remains associated with the β-clamp for a long time (**Fig 5G, 5H**). Such a long-bound

time may be necessary to recruit the lowly abundant proteins ImuA' and DnaE2. In cells missing

lsr2, ImuB exchanged more quickly (45.66 +/- 6.36 seconds), suggesting that the mutasome

complex is less stably associated in these cells.

These data lead to a model whereby in non-DNA damaging conditions, Lsr2 serves as

an obstacle that promotes the frequent exchange of DnaE1, thus preventing collisions with

transcription factors, and allowing other polymerases to exchange into the replisome (**Fig 6**).

This model is consistent with *Δlsr2* having a slightly reduced basal mutation rate, as Lsr2 could

be allowing exchange of polymerases besides DnaE1 at a low frequency. Likewise, in DNA

damaging conditions, Lsr2-mediated exchange of DnaE1 promotes loading of ImuB and thus

DnaE2 and ImuA'. DnaE1 is a more faithful enzyme but is unable to bypass lesions; thus, cells

missing *lsr2* grow more slowly under conditions that damage DNA but replicate with higher

fidelity.

DISCUSSION

Lsr2 acts as a transcriptional repressor for many genes on the *M. smegmatis* and *M.*

tuberculosis chromosomes (41, 42, 43, 44). Additionally, multiple lines of evidence suggest that

lsr2 has other roles aside from its function as a transcription factor (41, 48, 49). Our results

FIGURE 6. Model of Lsr2 regulation of DNA replication and mutagenesis. Lsr2 transcription factor activity is only partly determined by sequence, as the same sequence in different genomic contexts can be regulated by Lsr2 or not. Instead, our data suggest that loss of *lsr2* results in a decrease in mutagenesis due to a novel role for Lsr2 in modulating replisome dynamics. Specifically, our data are consistent with a model in which Lsr2 acts as a roadblock on the DNA to promote the exchange of the major replicative polymerase DnaE1 with others in the cytoplasmic pool. In conditions that do not induce DNA damage, these polymerases likely include DinB1, which is responsible, in part, for spontaneous mutation. In conditions that damage DNA, the mutasome, which is comprised of DnaE2 and its accessory proteins, ImuA' and ImuB, are induced and need to exchange with the replicative polymerase to repair lesions. Deletion of *lsr2* reduces the flexibility of the replisome needed for sufficient exchange, thereby resulting in cells that are more reliant on DnaE1, a high fidelity polymerase that unable to bypass lesions. Thus, cells missing *lsr2* are impaired in their ability to grow in conditions that damage DNA in their ability to acquire mutations.

advance our understanding of both functions of Lsr2, and implicate Lsr2 as a potential factor in

the emergence of mycobacterial antibiotic resistance.

Lsr2 can control transcription directly by binding promoter regions or indirectly, such as

by altering DNA structure (43). Consistent with studies of *Streptomyces* Lsr2 and of the *E.coli* H-

NS, prior studies identified no consensus motifs for Lsr2 binding in mycobacteria and

demonstrated increased Lsr2 binding in AT-rich sequences (42, 45, 58, 59). Our study identifies

the sequence context as an additional factor in Lsr2 regulation. We find that the sequence

context may permit or prohibit Lsr2 regulation, resulting in a discrepancy between promoter-

reporter constructs and endogenous RNA levels for some genes. While we do not yet know if

Lsr2 regulation is direct or indirect, it is possible that changes in the DNA structure may affect

Lsr2 access to the DNA. Lsr2 access to the DNA may also be mediated by other proteins,

including other NAPs and transcription factors. Further experiments are necessary to define the

mechanism by which the sequence context mediates Lsr2 regulation.

While Lsr2 binds to and/or alters the transcription of many genes in both *M. smegmatis*

and *M. tuberculosis,* very few phenotypes associated with the deletion mutant have been

connected to altered expression of target genes (41, 42, 43). One of the few exceptions is the

change in colony morphology, which can be attributed to the increased expression of a putative

polyketide synthase (MSMEG_4727) in *M. smegmatis* (43, 60). Why then is Lsr2 associated

with so many bacterial behaviors including bacterial growth, the cell cycle, robust infection,

survival to hydrogen peroxide and antibiotics, survival in low oxygen, and resistance to phage?

Our results indicate that one of Lsr2's main functions in the cell is to promote the

flexibility of the mycobacterial replisome, enabling specialist polymerases like the DnaE2

translesion complex (ImuB/DnaE2/ImuA') to access the replication fork, leading to efficient, but

error-prone, DNA replication and cell growth in conditions that damage DNA. Numerous studies

in eukaryotes and other bacteria show that the rate of replication fork progression is actively

regulated, in some cases by machinery that slow down DNA replication, to ensure coordination

amongst DNA replication, DNA repair, and transcription (61, 62, 63, 64). We hypothesize that

Lsr2 may function to regulate replication fork progression in mycobacteria, and that this function

may provide a unifying explanation for many of the phenotypes associated with loss of *lsr2,*

including slower DNA replication in the host and other environmental conditions likely to assault

DNA. Likewise, in conditions that do not significantly damage DNA, like those found in

laboratory growth media, loss of *lsr2* leads to faster and higher fidelity chromosomal replication,

possibly explaining the emergence of spontaneous *lsr2* mutants in several laboratories including

our own (60, 65, 66). Additionally, loss of *lsr2* is associated increased resistance against

infection by certain phages, and fewer and smaller zones of phage DNA replication (49). We

speculate that efficient turnover of the bacterial host DNA replication machinery mediated by

Lsr2 could be required for robust replication of phage DNA and productive infection.

Intriguingly, Lsr2 is phosphorylated by PknB, a plasma membrane-bound eukaryotic

serine/threonine kinase involved in cell growth and division (67). Future research is needed but

we speculate that such regulation could be used to coordinate cell wall synthesis and DNA

synthesis during environmental changes or even during the course of a typical cell cycle.

Lsr2 may be a promising drug target for preventing the emergence of antibiotic

resistance in mycobacteria. Our work adds to the growing body of evidence Lsr2 is at the nexus

of several evolutionary tradeoffs, including fast chromosome replication, mutagenesis,

replisome flexibility, and phage resistance. Indeed, loss of Lsr2 results in severe growth defects

in *M. tuberculosis* and *M. abscessus in vivo* (44, 46). Thus, we speculate that targeting Lsr2

therapeutically may help treat drug-susceptible infections, while preventing the emergence of

drug resistance.

RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Lead contact

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Dr. Hesper Rego (hesper.rego@yale.edu).

Materials availability

All unique/stable reagents generated in this study are available from the lead contact.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strains and growth conditions

All mycobacterial strains are derivatives of *Mycobacterium smegmatis* MC2 155. Cells were grown in Middlebrook 7H9 broth supplemented with 0.05% (v/v) Tween80, ADC, and 0.2% (v/v) glycerol for liquid culture. LB agar was used as solid media. Liquid cultures were grown at 37 °C on a rotator. Agar plates were incubated at 37 °C. If applicable, antibiotics were added at the following final concentrations: hygromycin B (50 ug/mL), kanamycin (25ug/mL), nourseothricin (20 ug/ml), zeocin (20 ug/mL), and gentamicin (5 ug/ml).

Plasmid DNA for transformation into *M. smegmatis* was prepared from E.coli (DH5a, XL1). If applicable, antibiotics were added at the following final concentrations: hygromycin B (100 ug/mL), kanamycin (50 ug/mL), and nourseothricin (40 ug/ml). Plasmid constructs were generated using Gibson cloning and phage-based integrative vectors. Fluorescent promoter reporters were made by fusing a 500 bp region upstream the start codon of the target gene (e.g., *imuA'B*, *dnaE2*) to the native start codon and fluorescent protein (e.g., *msfGFP*, *mScarletI*)

coding sequence. *imuA'B* expression constructs were made using a similar approach as the

fluorescent reporter constructs, but using the *imuA'B* coding sequence. For *msfGFP* and *imuA'B*

constructs denoted (+)DS, the 1.55kb sequence downstream the endogenous *imuB* was cloned

downstream the *msfGFP* or *imuB* coding sequence in the phage integrative construct,

respectively.

Genetic modifications to the native locus were generated as previously described using

the mycobacterial Che9c phage RecET recombination system (40). To construct a knockout, we

designed a dsDNA substrate encoding a zeocin resistance cassette flanked by loxP sites and

~500bp of homology on either end of the locus of interest. The dsDNA substrate was then

electroporated into *M. smegmatis* strains carrying a plasmid encoding isovaleronitrile-inducible

expression of RecET. Colonies were selected by zeocin resistance and screened by PCR using

primers annealing to regions flanking dsDNA insertion. In some cases, the zeocin resistance

cassette was removed by Cre-Lox recombination. Primers and strains are listed in Table S1 and

S2. mc^{2}155 Δ*pafBC* is a gift of the Weber-Ban lab, and was generated using the *rpsL*

counterselection strategy (39).

Flow cytometry

Flow cytometry was performed on fixed cells with doublet discrimination. To induce DNA

damage, cells were treated with mitomycin C (80 ng/ml) for 9 hours unless otherwise noted.

Cells were fixed 1% paraformaldehyde in PBS+0.05% Tween-80 (PBST) for 10 minutes, and

washed twice and resuspended in PBST prior to flow cytometry. Flow cytometry data were

analyzed using FlowJo software.

Fluorescence microscopy

All microscopy experiments were performed on a Nikon TI-E inverted wide-field microscope

equipped with the Nikon Perfect Focus System, an ORCA-Flash4.0 Digital CMOS Camera

(Hamamatsu) and an environmental control chamber maintained at 37 °C.

Time-lapse and kymograph analysis: Time-lapse imaging was done using a 60X Oil 1.45NA

Plan Apochromat phase-contrast objective. Bacterial samples were loaded and grown in a B04A

microfluidic plate (CellAsic ONIX, B04A-03-5PK). Phase and fluorescence images were

acquired every 30 minutes using NIS Elements software. Fluorescence images were taken

sequentially using a 470 nm excitation laser and 515/30 emission filter for msfGFP and

mGFPmut3, and a 555 nm excitation laser and a 595/40 emission filter for mScarletI.

Kymograph analysis was performed using a custom pipeline for segmenting and tracking

cells, and extracting fluorescence profiles. Cell segmentation was performed on the phase

image using a U-Net network trained for segmenting mycobacterial cells (68). Semi-automated

cell tracking and extraction of fluorescence profiles from background-subtracted images was

done using a custom MATLAB program and open-source image analysis software Fiji (69).

Average kymographs were generated by 2D interpolation of at least twenty individual

kymographs.

FRAP: FRAP experiments were done using a 60X oil DIC objective. Bacterial cells were imaged

under 7H9 agar pads (1% agar, 0.2% (v/v) glycerol) in 50 mm glass-bottomed dishes.

Fluorescent spots were manually selected for localized bleaching with a focused 405-nm laser.

Two pre-bleach fluorescence images were acquired: one to identify and center a target focus,

and a second for quantification of total pre-bleach fluorescence. Fluorescence recovery was

monitored by acquisition at pre-defined intervals (2 to 10 sec) following photobleaching using an

exposure time of 200 ms.

Cell outlines for determination of total pre-bleach fluorescence were manually drawn

using the brightfield image. Fluorescence images were background subtracted and corrected for

photobleaching. To quantify the fluorescence of bleached foci over time, a circular ROI was

manually drawn around the bleached foci and intensity profiles over time were obtained using

Fiji (69). Fluorescence recovery curves were generated by first normalizing fluorescence

intensity profiles to pre-bleach focus fluorescence. The post-bleach value was then subtracted

from all time points. Maximum recovery was estimated by calculating the total amount of

fluorescence in the cell after photobleaching outside the focus. Finally, all time points were

divided by the estimated maximum recovery value, such that a value of 0 and 1 correspond to

no recovery and maximum recovery, respectively.

RNA-seq of WT *M. smegmatis* and Δ*lsr2*

WT *M. smegmatis* and Δ*lsr2* were grown in triplicate at 37°C to OD600 ~0.7-1.0. For mitomycin

treatment, 1 ml of cells were added to 4 ml of 7H9 containing 100 ng/ml mitomycin C for a final

concentration of 80 ng/ml mitomycin C. Approximately 2-4 ml of cells were harvested at each

timepoint and incubated with 2 volumes of RNAprotect (Qiagen) at room temperature for 5

minutes prior to centrifugation for 5 minutes at 4000xg 4°C. The supernatant was discarded,

and the cells were then immediately used for RNA extraction or stored at -80°C.

RNA extraction was performed using the Qiagen RNeasy Kit (74104). Cells were

resuspended in 500 ul of RLT buffer (Qiagen) with 2-mercaptoethanol and homogenized by

bead beating for 3 minute pulses at maximum speed, three times, with 5 minutes of rest on ice

in-between. The lysate was then centrifuged at maximum speed for 1 minute, and the

supernatant was transferred to a new tube. The remainder of the RNA extraction was performed

using the Qiagen RNeasy Kit according to manufacturer instructions. RNA quality was verified

using a bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies TapeStation 2200). DNase treatment and ribosomal

RNA depletion were performed at the Microbial Genome Sequencing Center before library

preparation and sequencing.

RT-qPCR

RNA was extracted as described for RNA-seq studies. RNA was DNAse-treated for 30 minutes

at 37 °C twice, and then cleaned using the Zymo RNA Clean and Concentrator kit. cDNA

synthesis and qPCR was performed using SuperScript IV First-strand Synthesis System & iTaq

Universal SYBR Green Supermix, respectively. RNA levels were normalized to *sigA.* All

experiments were done in triplicate. RT-qPCR primers are listed in **Table S1**.

Mutation frequency analysis

10 ml of bacterial cells were grown to OD600 ~0.7-1.0. 5 ml of cells were UV irradiated (20

mJ/cm2 UV; Stratalinker UV crosslinker), while the remaining 5 ml of cells were used for the

untreated control. Treated and untreated samples were then added to an equal volume of fresh

7H9 media and outgrown for 3 hours at 37°C. 100 ul liquid culture was used for CFU

determination, and the remainder of the culture was plated onto Rif-containing LB agar plates

(200 ug/ml) for mutant detection. All mutation frequency measurements were performed using 8

biological replicates. Rif-resistant colonies were enumerated after 5-7 days of incubation at

37°C. CFU plates were read after about 2-3 days of growth on non-selective media. Mutation

frequencies were calculated by the number of Rif-resistant colonies per ml of culture by the

CFU/ml.

Spot assay

Bacterial cells were grown to OD600 ~0.7-1.0, normalized to the same OD, and then 10-fold

serially diluted. 5 ul of culture were spotted on LB agar containing varying concentrations of

antibiotic. Plates were imaged after incubation at 37°C for 2-3 days. All assays were done in

biological triplicate.

Tn-seq

Transposon libraries in wild type and Δ*lsr2* were prepared as and sequenced described

elsewhere (70). The TRANSIT and TPP python packages were used to map insertions to the

mc^{2}155 genome and quantitatively compare insertions across stains, using the 'resampling'

option (71).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

mc2155 SMR5 Δ*pafBC* was generously provided by Dr. Elika Weber-Ban. We thank members

of the Rego lab for helpful suggestions, and Dr. Eduardo Groisman for discussions. We also

thank the Yale Flow Cytometry Facility for technical assistance with flow cytometry experiments.

This work was supported by the Searle and Pew Foundations to EHR.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

WLN and EHR conceived experiments. JHP performed Tn-seq and Tn-seq analysis; WLN

performed other experiments and analyzed data. WLN and EHR wrote the manuscript. EHR

secured funding for the work.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

558 **FIGURE S1. *imuA'B* deletion does not affect *pimuAB* reporter levels.** Flow cytometry

559 histograms of strains harboring *pimuAB* reporter at the Giles *attB* site in either a wild-type (red)

560 or Δ*imuA'B (*orange) background for one biological replicate. DNA damage was induced by

561 mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml, 9 hours).

FIGURE S2. *imuA'B* is required for UV-induced mutagenesis. *ΔimuA'B* exhibits frequency

of UV-induced mutants Frequency of rifampin-resistant mutants per 10^8 cfu without (left) or

with (right) UV-induced DNA damage (20 mJ/cm^2 UV). Strains are WT, Δ*imuA'B*, and Δ*imuA'B*

complemented with *imuA'B* expressed from the native *imuA'B* promoter on a phage integrative

plasmid. LOD refers to the limit of detection. p-values were obtained by one-way ANOVA.

0.1234 (ns), 0.0332 (*), 0.0021 (**), 0.0002 (***), <0.0001 (****).

FIGURE S3. WT and Δ*lsr2* survival after UV treatment. Loss of *lsr2* is not associated with a

decrease in survival following UV treatment (20 mJ/cm^2). Strains are WT, Δ*lsr2*, and Δ*lsr2*

complemented with *lsr2* expressed from the native *lsr2* promoter on a phage integrative

plasmid. Percent survival is the ratio of cfu/ml for UV-treated cells divided by the cfu/ml for

untreated cells multiplied by 100. p-values were obtained by one-way ANOVA. 0.1234 (ns),

0.0332 (*), 0.0021 (**), 0.0002 (***), <0.0001 (****).

FIGURE S4. Antisense *iunH* reads most likely originate from transcriptional readthrough of *imuA'B*. (A) Schematic of *imuA'B-iunH* locus and IGV visualization of RNA-seq reads in the absence (top) and presence (bottom) of mitomycin C (80 ng/ml, 24 hours). **(B)** Log2 fold-change in mRNA levels in mitomycin C-treated samples (80 ng/ml, 9 hours) relative to levels in untreated samples for the following amplicons, in order from left to right: *imuA'* coding sequence, the *imuB* coding sequence, three different amplicons spanning the *imuB-iunH* junction, and two amplicons for the *iunH* coding sequence. Amplicons are represented by black and orange lines across the bottom of **(A)**. Orange lines and bars in **(A)** and **(B)** correspond to amplicons that span the junction of the *imuB* and *iunH* coding sequences. **(C)** Flow cytometry histograms of strains harboring the *imuAB* coding sequence transcriptionally fused to the *mScarletI* fluorescent protein at the Giles *attB* site in either a wild-type (left) or Δ*imuA'B* (right)

background for one biological replicate. DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment

(80 ng/ml, 9 hours).

FIGURE S5. ImuA' and DnaE2 translational fusions maintain functionality in UV-induced

mutagenesis. Frequency of rifampin-resistant mutants per 10^8 cfu without or with UV-induced

DNA damage (20 mJ/cm^2 UV). **(A)** Results shown are for WT, *imuA'B* deletion, or *imuA'B*

deletion complemented with a fluorescent translational fusion of ImuA' and ImuB. **(B)** Results

shown are for WT, *dnaE2* deletion, and *dnaE2* deletion complemented with a fluorescent

translational fusion of DnaE2. Complements are expressed from the native promoter on a

phage integrative plasmid. LOD refers to the limit of detection. p-values were obtained by one-

way ANOVA. 0.1234 (ns), 0.0332 (*), 0.0021 (**), 0.0002 (***), <0.0001 (****).

604
605
606
607

608
FIGURE S6. Microscopy images of mutasome translational fusions. Images shown are of

(A) *imuA'B* deletion mutant complemented with a fluorescent translational fusion of ImuA' and

ImuB, **(B)** *imuA'B* deletion mutant complemented with ImuA and a fluorescent translational

fusion of ImuB, and **(C)** *dnaE2* deletion mutant complemented with a fluorescent translational

fusion of DnaE2. Complements are expressed from the native promoter on a phage integrative

plasmid. DNA damage was induced by mitomycin C treatment (80 ng/ml) for 4-6 hours. Images

were acquired using 1 second **(A, B)** or 500 ms **(C)** exposure times.

616
617

618   **TABLE S1.** Primer list

619   *see attached

 TABLE S2. Strain list

STRAIN	GENOTYPE	SOURCE	Additional information
HRCT117	DH5a / pJR962	Gift of the Rock Lab (36)	Backbone for CRISPRi constructs
WN701	mc2155 L5::pJR962ΔTetR-non-targeting sgRNA Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarlet-FLAG Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc	This work	WT *M. smegmatis* with non-targeting CRISPRi construct, and *pdnaE2* and *pimuAB* reporters
WN702	mc2155 L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarlet-FLAG Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc	This work	WT *M. smegmatis* with *lexA*-tareting CRISPRi construct, and *pdnaE2* and *pimuAB* reporters
WN414	mc2155 SMR5 ΔpafBC	Gift of the Weber-Ban lab (39)	
WN421	mc2155 SMR5 ΔpafBC Tweety::pdna-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pafBC* deletion strain with *pimuAB* and *pdnaE2* reporters
WN788	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR	This work	*lsr2* deletion strain
WN977	mc2155 Giles::pimuab-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pimuAB* reporter in WT background
WN1014	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::pimuab-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pimuAB* reporter in Δ*lsr2* background
WN1139	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::pimuab-msfGFP-myc Tw::pNative-MSMEG6092	This work	*pimuAB* reporter in Δ*lsr2* background, complemented with untagged *M. smegmatis* Lsr2
WN1342	mc2155Δimuab::msfGFP-myc-loxP	This work	*pimuAB* reporter at native locus in a WT background
WN1348	mc2155Δimuab::msfGFP-myc-loxP Δlsr2::zeoR	This work	*pimuAB* reporter at native locus in a Δ*lsr2* background
WN906	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR L5::plsr2-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc Tweety::pNative-MSMEG6092	This work	*lsr2* deletion strain, complemented with untagged *M. smegmatis* Lsr2
WN874	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc Tw::pdnaE2-mScarletI-FLAG L5::pNative-Rv3597c	This work	*lsr2* deletion strain, complemented with untagged *M. tuberculosis* Lsr2
WN296	mc2155 Tweety::pdnaE2-500-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::pdnae2-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pdnaE2* reporter in a WT background
WN288	mc2155 Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::p2723-msfGFP-myc	This work	*precA* reporter in a WT background
WN287	mc2155 Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::plexa-msfGFP-myc	This work	*plexA* reporter in a WT background
WN284	mc2155 Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::p2742-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pchiZ* reporter in a WT background
WN285	mc2155 Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::p5451-msfGFP-myc	This work	*p5451* reporter in a WT background
WN291	mc2155 Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::p6573-msfGFP-myc	This work	*p6573* reporter in a WT background
WN286	mc2155 Tweety::pdnaE2-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::p6837-msfGFP-myc	This work	*p6837* reporter in a WT background
WN845	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::pdnae2-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pdnaE2* reporter in a Δ*lsr2* background
WN834	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::p2723-msfGFP-myc	This work	*precA* reporter in a Δ*lsr2* background

WN843	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::plexa-msfGFP-myc	This work	*plexA* reporter in a Δ*lsr2* background
WN835	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::p2742-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pchiZ* reporter in a Δ*lsr2* background
WN841	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::p5451-msfGFP-myc	This work	*p5451* reporter in a Δ*lsr2* background
WN839	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::p6573-msfGFP-myc	This work	*p6573* reporter in a Δ*lsr2* background
WN842	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::p6837-msfGFP-myc	This work	*p6837* reporter in a Δ*lsr2* background
WN1140	mc2155 L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc	This work	*msfGFP* expression construct without downstream sequence in WT
WN1141	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc	This work	*msfGFP* expression without downstream sequence in Δ*lsr2*
WN1158	mc2155 L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pimuAB-500US-msfGFPmyc-1550DS	This work	*msfGFP* expression construct with downstream sequence in WT
WN1160	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pimuAB-msfGFPmyc-1550DS	This work	*msfGFP* expression with downstream sequence in Δ*lsr2*
WN1166	mc2155ΔimuAB::loxP L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pNative-imuAB	This work	*imuA'B* expression construct without downstream sequence in WT
WN1169	mc2155Δimuab::loxP Δlsr2::zeoR L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pNative-imuAB	This work	*imuA'B* expression without downstream sequence in Δ*lsr2*
WN1167	mc2155ΔimuAB::loxP L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pNative-imuAB-1550DS	This work	*imuA'B* expression construct with downstream sequence in WT
WN1170	mc2155Δimuab::loxP Δlsr2::zeoR L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pNative-imuAB-1550DS	This work	*imuA'B* expression with downstream sequence in Δ*lsr2*
WN1384	mc2155 Giles::pNative-dnae1-mScarletI-FLAG	This work	C-terminal DnaE1 fusion in a WT background; used for kymograph analysis and FRAP
WN1385	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::pNative-dnae1-mScarletI-FLAG	This work	C-terminal DnaE1 fusion in a Δ*lsr2* background; used for kymograph analysis and FRAP
WN1390	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR L5::pNative-MSMEG6092-mScarletI-FLAG Giles::pTetO-DnaE1-mGFPmut3-myc	This work	Dual-labeled C-terminal Lsr2 and C-terminal DnaE1 fusions in a Δ*lsr2* background; used for kymograph analysis
WN1278	mc2155ΔimuAB::loxP L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pNative-imuA_FLAG-mScarletI-imuB-1550DS	This work	N-terminal ImuB fusion in a WT background; used for FRAP
WN1280	mc2155Δimuab::loxP Δlsr2::zeoR L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pNative-imuA_FLAG-mScarletI-imuB-1550DS	This work	N-terminal ImuB fusion in a Δ*lsr2* background; used for FRAP
WN1236	mc2155ΔimuAB::loxP L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pimuAB-msfGFP-myc	This work	*pimuAB* reporter in Δ*imuA'B* background
WN1327	mc2155 Giles::imuAB-mScarletI-FLAG	This work	Fused *imuA'B* coding sequence to mScarletI; WT background
WN1328	mc2155Δlsr2::zeoR Giles::imuAB-mScarletI-FLAG	This work	Fused *imuA'B* coding sequence to mScarletI; Δ*lsr2* background

WN1318	mc2155Δimuab::loxP L5::pJR962-LexA sgRNA Giles::pNative-imuA-mScarletI-FLAG_imuB-1550DS	This work	Translational fusion of ImuA'
WN171	mc2155 rpoB::mApple-hygR dnaE2:: gfpmut3-zeoR	This work	Translational fusion of DnaE2

624   **TABLES S3 and S4:** *see attached

625   **TABLE S3.** RNA-Seq of *M. smegmatis* wild-type under mitomycin C stress

626   **TABLE S4.** RNA-Seq of *M. smegmatis* Δ*lsr2* under mitomycin C stress

REFERENCES

1.   Fuchs RP, Fujii S. Translesion DNA synthesis and mutagenesis in prokaryotes. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2013;5(12):a012682.

2.   Galagan JE. Genomic insights into tuberculosis. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2014;15(5):307-20.

3.   Boritsch EC, Khanna V, Pawlik A, Honoré N, Navas VH, Ma L, et al. Key experimental evidence of chromosomal DNA transfer among selected tuberculosis-causing mycobacteria. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2016;113(35):9876-81.

4.   Sun G, Luo T, Yang C, Dong X, Li J, Zhu Y, et al. Dynamic population changes in Mycobacterium tuberculosis during acquisition and fixation of drug resistance in patients. J Infect Dis. 2012;206(11):1724-33.

5.   Mariam SH, Werngren J, Aronsson J, Hoffner S, Andersson DI. Dynamics of antibiotic resistant Mycobacterium tuberculosis during long-term infection and antibiotic treatment. PLoS One. 2011;6(6):e21147.

6.   Ford CB, Shah RR, Maeda MK, Gagneux S, Murray MB, Cohen T, et al. Mycobacterium tuberculosis mutation rate estimates from different lineages predict substantial differences in the emergence of drug-resistant tuberculosis. Nat Genet. 2013;45(7):784-90.

7.   McGrath M, Gey van Pittius NC, van Helden PD, Warren RM, Warner DF. Mutation rate and the emergence of drug resistance in Mycobacterium tuberculosis. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2014;69(2):292-302.

8.   Liu Q, Wei J, Li Y, Wang M, Su J, Lu Y, et al. Mycobacterium tuberculosis clinical isolates carry mutational signatures of host immune environments. Sci Adv. 2020;6(22):eaba4901.

9.   Rock JM, Lang UF, Chase MR, Ford CB, Gerrick ER, Gawande R, et al. DNA replication fidelity in Mycobacterium tuberculosis is mediated by an ancestral prokaryotic proofreader. Nat Genet. 2015;47(6):677-81.

10.   Dupuy P, Ghosh S, Adefisayo O, Buglino J, Shuman S, Glickman MS. Distinctive roles of translesion polymerases DinB1 and DnaE2 in diversification of the mycobacterial genome through substitution and frameshift mutagenesis. Nature Communications. 2022;13(1):4493.

11.   Boshoff HI, Reed MB, Barry CE, 3rd, Mizrahi V. DnaE2 polymerase contributes to in vivo survival and the emergence of drug resistance in Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Cell. 2003;113(2):183-93.

12.   Dupuy P, Ghosh S, Fay A, Adefisayo O, Gupta R, Shuman S, et al. Roles for
mycobacterial DinB2 in frameshift and substitution mutagenesis. Elife. 2023;12.

13.   Kana BD, Abrahams GL, Sung N, Warner DF, Gordhan BG, Machowski EE, et al. Role
of the DinB homologs Rv1537 and Rv3056 in Mycobacterium tuberculosis. J Bacteriol.
2010;192(8):2220-7.

14.   Ordonez H, Shuman S. Mycobacterium smegmatis DinB2 misincorporates
deoxyribonucleotides and ribonucleotides during templated synthesis and lesion bypass.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2014;42(20):12722-34.

15.   Ordonez H, Uson ML, Shuman S. Characterization of three mycobacterial DinB (DNA
polymerase IV) paralogs highlights DinB2 as naturally adept at ribonucleotide incorporation.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2014;42(17):11056-70.

16.   Warner DF, Ndwandwe DE, Abrahams GL, Kana BD, Machowski EE, Venclovas Č, et
al. Essential roles for *imuA*′- and *imuB*-encoded accessory factors in
DnaE2-dependent mutagenesis in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. Proceedings of the
National Academy of Sciences. 2010;107(29):13093-8.

17.   Joseph AM, Badrinarayanan A. Visualizing mutagenic repair: novel insights into bacterial
translesion synthesis. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2020;44(5):572-82.

18.   Ghodke H, Paudel BP, Lewis JS, Jergic S, Gopal K, Romero ZJ, et al. Spatial and
temporal organization of RecA in the Escherichia coli DNA-damage response. eLife.
2019;8:e42761.

19.   Goodman MF, McDonald JP, Jaszczur MM, Woodgate R. Insights into the complex
levels of regulation imposed on Escherichia coli DNA polymerase V. DNA Repair (Amst).
2016;44:42-50.

20.   Friedman N, Vardi S, Ronen M, Alon U, Stavans J. Precise temporal modulation in the
response of the SOS DNA repair network in individual bacteria. PLoS Biol. 2005;3(7):e238.

21.   Pribis JP, García-Villada L, Zhai Y, Lewin-Epstein O, Wang AZ, Liu J, et al. Gamblers:
An Antibiotic-Induced Evolvable Cell Subpopulation Differentiated by Reactive-Oxygen-Induced
General Stress Response. Mol Cell. 2019;74(4):785-800.e7.

22.   Brzostek A, Płociński P, Minias A, Ciszewska A, Gąsior F, Pawełczyk J, et al. Dissecting
the RecA-(In)dependent Response to Mitomycin C in Mycobacterium tuberculosis Using
Transcriptional Profiling and Proteomics Analyses. Cells. 2021;10(5):1168.

23.   Müller AU, Imkamp F, Weber-Ban E. The Mycobacterial LexA/RecA-Independent DNA
Damage Response Is Controlled by PafBC and the Pup-Proteasome System. Cell Rep.
2018;23(12):3551-64.

24.   Rand L, Hinds J, Springer B, Sander P, Buxton RS, Davis EO. The majority of inducible
DNA repair genes in Mycobacterium tuberculosis are induced independently of RecA. Molecular
Microbiology. 2003;50(3):1031-42.

25.   Adefisayo OO, Dupuy P, Nautiyal A, Bean JM, Glickman Michael S. Division of labor
between SOS and PafBC in mycobacterial DNA repair and mutagenesis. Nucleic Acids
Research. 2021;49(22):12805-19.

26.   Wipperman MF, Heaton BE, Nautiyal A, Adefisayo O, Evans H, Gupta R, et al.
Mycobacterial Mutagenesis and Drug Resistance Are Controlled by Phosphorylation- and
Cardiolipin-Mediated Inhibition of the RecA Coprotease. Mol Cell. 2018;72(1):152-61.e7.

27.   Ragheb MN, Thomason MK, Hsu C, Nugent P, Gage J, Samadpour AN, et al. Inhibiting
the Evolution of Antibiotic Resistance. Mol Cell. 2019;73(1):157-65.e5.

28.   Furukohri A, Goodman MF, Maki H. A dynamic polymerase exchange with Escherichia
coli DNA polymerase IV replacing DNA polymerase III on the sliding clamp. J Biol Chem.
2008;283(17):11260-9.

29.   Uphoff S. Real-time dynamics of mutagenesis reveal the chronology of DNA repair and
damage tolerance responses in single cells. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
2018;115(28):E6516-E25.

30.   Jones EC, Uphoff S. Single-molecule imaging of LexA degradation in Escherichia coli
elucidates regulatory mechanisms and heterogeneity of the SOS response. Nature
Microbiology. 2021;6(8):981-90.

31.   Pomerantz RT, O'Donnell M. What happens when replication and transcription
complexes collide? Cell Cycle. 2010;9(13):2537-43.

32.   Manina G, Griego A, Singh LK, McKinney JD, Dhar N. Preexisting variation in DNA
damage response predicts the fate of single mycobacteria under stress. Embo j.
2019;38(22):e101876.

33.   Lindsey-Boltz LA, Sancar A. The Transcription-Repair Coupling Factor Mfd Prevents and
Promotes Mutagenesis in a Context-Dependent Manner. Front Mol Biosci. 2021;8:668290.

34.   Gessner S, Martin Z, Reiche MA, Santos JA, Dhar N, Dinkele R, et al. The
mycobacterial mutasome: composition and recruitment in live cells. bioRxiv.
2021:2021.11.16.468908.

35.   Gordon BR, Imperial R, Wang L, Navarre WW, Liu J. Lsr2 of Mycobacterium represents
a novel class of H-NS-like proteins. J Bacteriol. 2008;190(21):7052-9.

36.   Rock JM, Hopkins FF, Chavez A, Diallo M, Chase MR, Gerrick ER, et al. Programmable
transcriptional repression in mycobacteria using an orthogonal CRISPR interference platform.
Nature Microbiology. 2017;2(4):16274.

37.   Minato Y, Gohl DM, Thiede JM, Chacón JM, Harcombe WR, Maruyama F, et al.
Genomewide Assessment of Mycobacterium tuberculosis Conditionally Essential Metabolic
Pathways. mSystems. 2019;4(4).

38.   DeJesus MA, Gerrick ER, Xu W, Park SW, Long JE, Boutte CC, et al. Comprehensive
Essentiality Analysis of the Mycobacterium tuberculosis Genome via Saturating Transposon
Mutagenesis. mBio. 2017;8(1).

39.   Fudrini Olivencia B, Müller AU, Roschitzki B, Burger S, Weber-Ban E, Imkamp F.
Mycobacterium smegmatis PafBC is involved in regulation of DNA damage response. Sci Rep.
2017;7(1):13987.

40.   Murphy KC, Papavinasasundaram K, Sassetti CM. Mycobacterial recombineering.
Methods Mol Biol. 2015;1285:177-99.

41.   Colangeli R, Haq A, Arcus VL, Summers E, Magliozzo RS, McBride A, et al. The
multifunctional histone-like protein Lsr2 protects mycobacteria against reactive oxygen
intermediates. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2009;106(11):4414-8.

42.   Colangeli R, Helb D, Vilchèze C, Hazbón MH, Lee CG, Safi H, et al. Transcriptional
regulation of multi-drug tolerance and antibiotic-induced responses by the histone-like protein
Lsr2 in M. tuberculosis. PLoS Pathog. 2007;3(6):e87.

43.   Kołodziej M, Łebkowski T, Płociński P, Hołówka J, Paściak M, Wojtaś B, et al. Lsr2 and
Its Novel Paralogue Mediate the Adjustment of Mycobacterium smegmatis to Unfavorable
Environmental Conditions. mSphere. 2021;6(3).

44.   Bartek IL, Woolhiser LK, Baughn AD, Basaraba RJ, Jacobs WR, Jr., Lenaerts AJ, et al.
Mycobacterium tuberculosis Lsr2 is a global transcriptional regulator required for adaptation to
changing oxygen levels and virulence. mBio. 2014;5(3):e01106-14.

45.   Gehrke EJ, Zhang X, Pimentel-Elardo SM, Johnson AR, Rees CA, Jones SE, et al.
Silencing cryptic specialized metabolism in Streptomyces by the nucleoid-associated protein
Lsr2. eLife. 2019;8:e47691.

46.   Le Moigne V, Bernut A, Cortès M, Viljoen A, Dupont C, Pawlik A, et al. Lsr2 Is an
Important Determinant of Intracellular Growth and Virulence in Mycobacterium abscessus. Front
Microbiol. 2019;10:905.

47.   Wiechert J, Filipchyk A, Hünnefeld M, Gätgens C, Brehm J, Heermann R, et al.
Deciphering the Rules Underlying Xenogeneic Silencing and Counter-Silencing of Lsr2-like
Proteins Using CgpS of Corynebacterium glutamicum as a Model. mBio. 2020;11(1).

48.   Kołodziej M, Trojanowski D, Bury K, Hołówka J, Matysik W, Kąkolewska H, et al. Lsr2, a
nucleoid-associated protein influencing mycobacterial cell cycle. Scientific Reports.
2021;11(1):2910.

49.   Dulberger CL, Guerrero-Bustamante CA, Owen SV, Wilson S, Wuo MG, Garlena RA, et
al. Mycobacterial nucleoid-associated protein Lsr2 is required for productive mycobacteriophage
infection. Nature Microbiology. 2023;8(4):695-710.

50.   Villela AD, Rodrigues VDJ, Pinto AF, Wink PL, Sánchez-Quitian ZA, Petersen GO, et al.
Characterisation of iunH gene knockout strain from Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Mem Inst
Oswaldo Cruz. 2017;112(3):203-8.

51.   Owen-Hughes TA, Pavitt GD, Santos DS, Sidebotham JM, Hulton CS, Hinton JC, et al.
The chromatin-associated protein H-NS interacts with curved DNA to influence DNA topology
and gene expression. Cell. 1992;71(2):255-65.

52.   Tupper AE, Owen-Hughes TA, Ussery DW, Santos DS, Ferguson DJ, Sidebotham JM,
et al. The chromatin-associated protein H-NS alters DNA topology in vitro. Embo j.
1994;13(1):258-68.

53.   Sonnenfield JM, Burns CM, Higgins CF, Hinton JC. The nucleoid-associated protein
StpA binds curved DNA, has a greater DNA-binding affinity than H-NS and is present in
significant levels in hns mutants. Biochimie. 2001;83(2):243-9.

54.   Jordi BJAM, Fielder AE, Burns CM, Hinton JCD, Dover N, Ussery DW, et al. DNA
Binding Is Not Sufficient for H-NS-mediated Repression ofproU Expression*. Journal of
Biological Chemistry. 1997;272(18):12083-90.

55.   Kouba T, Koval' T, Sudzinová P, Pospíšil J, Brezovská B, Hnilicová J, et al.
Mycobacterial HelD is a nucleic acids-clearing factor for RNA polymerase. Nature
Communications. 2020;11(1):6419.

56.   Trojanowski D, Kołodziej M, Hołówka J, Müller R, Zakrzewska-Czerwińska J. Watching
DNA Replication Inhibitors in Action: Exploiting Time-Lapse Microfluidic Microscopy as a Tool
for Target-Drug Interaction Studies in Mycobacterium. Antimicrob Agents Chemother.
2019;63(10).

57.   Beattie TR, Kapadia N, Nicolas E, Uphoff S, Wollman AJ, Leake MC, et al. Frequent
exchange of the DNA polymerase during bacterial chromosome replication. Elife. 2017;6.

58.   Gordon BRG, Li Y, Wang L, Sintsova A, van Bakel H, Tian S, et al. Lsr2 is a nucleoid-
associated protein that targets AT-rich sequences and virulence genes in <i>Mycobacterium
tuberculosis</i>. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2010;107(11):5154-9.

59.   Gordon BR, Li Y, Cote A, Weirauch MT, Ding P, Hughes TR, et al. Structural basis for
recognition of AT-rich DNA by unrelated xenogeneic silencing proteins. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S
A. 2011;108(26):10690-5.

60.   Báez-Ramírez E, Querales L, Aranaga CA, López G, Guerrero E, Kremer L, et al.
Elimination of PknL and MSMEG_4242 in Mycobacterium smegmatis alters the character of the
outer cell envelope and selects for mutations in Lsr2. The Cell Surface. 2021;7:100060.

61.   Tan KW, Pham TM, Furukohri A, Maki H, Akiyama MT. Recombinase and translesion
DNA polymerase decrease the speed of replication fork progression during the DNA damage
response in Escherichia coli cells. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015;43(3):1714-25.

62.   Munden A, Rong Z, Sun A, Gangula R, Mallal S, Nordman JT. Rif1 inhibits replication
fork progression and controls DNA copy number in Drosophila. eLife. 2018;7:e39140.

63.   Kobayashi T, Horiuchi T. A yeast gene product, Fob1 protein, required for both
replication fork blocking and recombinational hotspot activities. Genes Cells. 1996;1(5):465-74.

64.   Tsirkas I, Dovrat D, Thangaraj M, Brouwer I, Cohen A, Paleiov Z, et al. Transcription-
replication coordination revealed in single live cells. Nucleic Acids Research. 2022;50(4):2143-
56.

65.   Arora K, Whiteford DC, Lau-Bonilla D, Davitt CM, Dahl JL. Inactivation of lsr2 results in a
hypermotile phenotype in Mycobacterium smegmatis. J Bacteriol. 2008;190(12):4291-300.

66.   Kocíncová D, Singh AK, Beretti JL, Ren H, Euphrasie D, Liu J, et al. Spontaneous
transposition of IS1096 or ISMsm3 leads to glycopeptidolipid overproduction and affects surface
properties in Mycobacterium smegmatis. Tuberculosis (Edinb). 2008;88(5):390-8.

67.   Alqaseer K, Turapov O, Barthe P, Jagatia H, De Visch A, Roumestand C, et al. Protein
kinase B controls Mycobacterium tuberculosis growth via phosphorylation of the transcriptional
regulator Lsr2 at threonine 112. Mol Microbiol. 2019;112(6):1847-62.

68.   Falk T, Mai D, Bensch R, Çiçek Ö, Abdulkadir A, Marrakchi Y, et al. U-Net: deep
learning for cell counting, detection, and morphometry. Nature Methods. 2019;16(1):67-70.

69.   Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, Kaynig V, Longair M, Pietzsch T, et al. Fiji: an
open-source platform for biological-image analysis. Nature Methods. 2012;9(7):676-82.

70.   Dragset MS, Ioerger TR, Loevenich M, Haug M, Sivakumar N, Marstad A, et al. Global
Assessment of Mycobacterium avium subsp. hominissuis Genetic Requirement for Growth and
Virulence. mSystems. 2019;4(6).

71.   DeJesus MA, Ambadipudi C, Baker R, Sassetti C, Ioerger TR. TRANSIT--A Software
Tool for Himar1 TnSeq Analysis. PLoS Comput Biol. 2015;11(10):e1004401.