1 Full title: Promoter selectivity of the RhlR quorum-sensing transcription factor receptor in
2 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is coordinated by distinct and overlapping dependencies on C$_4$-
3 homoserine lactone and PqsE
4 Short title: C$_4$HSL and PqsE coordinate RhlR promoter binding
5

6 Nicholas R. Keegan[1*], Nathalie J. Colón Torres[2*], Anne M. Stringer[2*], Lia I. Prager[2,3], Matthew
7 W. Brockley[2,3], Charity L. McManaman[1], Joseph T. Wade[1,2,†], and Jon E. Paczkowski[1,2,†]
8
[1]Department of Biomedical Sciences, University at Albany, School of Public Health, Albany,
New York, 12201, United States
[2]Division of Genetics, Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of Health, Albany, New
York, 12208, United States
[3]Department of Biological Sciences, University at Albany, Albany, New York, 12201, United
States
*these authors contributed equally to the work
†co-corresponding authors

ABSTRACT

Quorum sensing is a mechanism of bacterial cell-cell communication that relies on the production

and detection of small molecule autoinducers, which facilitate the synchronous expression of

genes involved in group behaviors, such as virulence factor production and biofilm formation. The

Pseudomonas aeruginosa quorum sensing network consists of multiple interconnected

transcriptional regulators with the transcription factor, RhlR, acting as one of the main drivers of

quorum sensing behaviors. RhlR is a LuxR-type transcription factor that regulates its target genes

when bound to its cognate autoinducer, C$_4$-homoserine lactone, which is synthesized by RhlI.

RhlR function is also regulated by the metallo-β-hydrolase enzyme, PqsE. We recently showed

that PqsE binds RhlR to alter its affinity for promoter DNA, a new mechanism of quorum-sensing

receptor activation. Here, we perform ChIP-seq analyses of RhlR to map C$_4$-homoserine lactone-

dependent and PqsE-dependent RhlR binding sites across the *P. aeruginosa* genome. We

identify 40 RhlR binding sites, all but three of which are associated with genes known to be

regulated by RhlR. While PqsE is generally required for full activation of RhlR transcriptional

activity, it is also responsible for preferentially driving RhlR to a distinct subset of binding sites.

RhlR binds to PqsE-dependent sites and regulates transcription from these sites independent of

the presence of autoinducer. Relatedly, autoinducer directly affects RhlR binding to all promoters,

but its effect on binding does not correlate with its role in regulating RhlR-dependent gene

expression. Thus, our work reveals three distinct modes of activation by RhlR: i) when RhlR is

unbound by autoinducer but bound by PqsE, ii) when RhlR is bound by autoinducer but not bound

by PqsE, and iii) when RhlR is bound by both autoinducer and PqsE, establishing a stepwise

mechanism for the progression of the RhlR-RhlI-PqsE quorum sensing pathway in *P. aeruginosa*.

AUTHOR SUMMARY

Pseudomonas aeruginosa represents a serious threat to public health in the United

States because of its intrinsic mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance. One of the primary drivers

of its antimicrobial resistance profile is biofilm formation. Biofilms are multicellular communities

that are formed in an ordered mechanism by the collective. In the case of *P. aeruginosa*, biofilm

formation is controlled by a cell-cell communication process called quorum sensing. Quorum

sensing underpins transcriptional changes in a bacterium that allows for the transition from

individual, planktonic behaviors to group, sessile behaviors. Group behaviors are behaviors that

are only beneficial to engage in once a critical threshold of kin population is reached. The

transition to group behaviors is mediated by quorum sensing through an interconnected regulatory

system, with the transcription factor receptor RhlR regulating the expression of hundreds of

genes. RhlR-dependent transcription relies on the detection of a ligand produced by its partner

synthase, RhlI, and an accessory binding protein that alters its affinity for promoter DNA, PqsE,

resulting in a dual regulatory mechanism that was not previously observed in quorum sensing.

The main goal of this study was to determine the molecular basis for promoter selection by RhlR

using bacterial genetics and DNA-based sequencing methods for measuring site-specific protein

binding. Our approach established the entirety of the RhlR direct regulon and the contributions of

each of the known regulators to RhlR-dependent promoter binding and gene regulation.

INTRODUCTION

Pseudomonas aeruginosa is a Gram-negative bacterium that can grow in nutrient-limited environments such as the reservoirs of water around sinks and in ventilators found in hospital settings. As a result, it is one of the most common nosocomial pathogens and is the primary cause of ventilator-associated pneumonia in the United States [1,2]. Quorum sensing (QS) is a process of bacterial cell-cell communication that controls pathogenesis in many bacterial species, including *P. aeruginosa.* QS relies on the production, accumulation, detection, and population-wide response to extracellular signal molecules called autoinducers (AI) [3]. QS allows bacteria to synchronously alter gene expression patterns that underpin collective behaviors, such as virulence factor production and biofilm formation [4,5]. QS signaling is relayed through a series of AI synthase/receptor pairs [6–12]. At high cell density, the synthase produces a secreted AI that diffuses across the membrane and binds its cognate cytosolic receptor, ultimately resulting in changes in gene expression [13–17].

P. aeruginosa has two LuxI/R-type synthase/receptor pairs that act in concert to regulate virulence factor expression: LasI/R and RhlI/R [8,18–20]. QS in *P. aeruginosa* is best described as a hierarchical system of interconnected regulatory networks, starting with the LasI/R circuit. LasI synthesizes the AI *N*-(3-oxododecanoyl)-L-homoserine lactone (3OC$_{12}$HSL), which binds the transcription factor receptor LasR. LasR upregulates the expression of *rhlI/R*, thereby initiating a second wave of QS gene regulation [20–22]. Homologous to LasI/R, RhlI synthesizes the AI *N*-butyryl-L-homoserine lactone (C$_4$HSL), which binds the transcription factor receptor RhlR. Both systems function in a positive feedback manner with the receptor upregulating the transcription of its partner synthase, thus maximizing the transcriptional response of the system [8,11,21–27]. LasR and RhlR regulate the transcription of hundreds of genes, both directly and indirectly [13,19,21,28–32]. Each transcription factor has its own regulon, with a subset of genes co-regulated by both systems. LasR and RhlR co-regulate a third QS pathway, the Pseudomonas quinolone signaling (PQS) system [33–35]. LasR upregulates the transcription of *pqsR*. PqsR is

a LysR transcription factor receptor that binds to the AI 2-heptyl-3-hydroxy-4(1*H*)-quinolone

(PQS), which is produced by the biosynthetic pathway enzymes encoded by the *pqsABCDE*

operon and *pqsH* [36–40]. Similar to the Las and Rhl system, PqsR upregulates the transcription

of genes involved in the synthesis of its AI, thereby establishing another positive feedback loop,

resulting in a fully activated QS network [35,36]. RhlR transcriptionally represses the *pqsABCDE*

operon, highlighting the interconnected regulatory mechanisms that govern the progression of QS

in *P. aeruginosa* [35]. PqsE is a metallo-β-hydrolase enzyme encoded in the *pqsABCDE* operon

and is involved in PQS synthesis. Recent work from our group and others has shown that PqsE

plays a more nuanced role in QS signaling, outside of its role as an enzyme in the PQS

biosynthetic pathway [29,41–47]. Moreover, PqsE is dispensable for the production of PQS, as

the deletion of *pqsE* results in wild-type (WT) levels of PQS [45,46].

Distinct from its role as an enzyme, PqsE plays an important role in the production of

virulence factors; deletion of *pqsE* results in a failure of the strain to produce pyocyanin, an

important virulence factor that is produced in a QS-dependent manner via the regulation of the

paralogous *phzABCDEFG1* and *phzABCDEFG2* operons as well as *phzH*, *phzM*, and *phzS*

[29,41,45,48,49]. Furthermore, pyocyanin production could not be restored by the addition of

PQS, indicating a non-enzymatic role for PqsE in the regulation of pyocyanin production [50]. We

recently discovered that PqsE physically interacts with RhlR to regulate the ability of RhlR to bind

DNA and, thus, contributes to the regulation of pyocyanin production [29,44,47]. More globally,

RNA-seq experiments revealed that the PqsE interaction with RhlR and C_4HSL-bound RhlR

contribute to RhlR-dependent gene regulation in an overlapping manner, with a few notable

exceptions [28,29]. For example, the rhamnolipid synthase, *rhlA*, is regulated by RhlR in a C_4HSL-

dependent manner, with PqsE exerting only a minor influence on its transcription. Conversely,

the hydrogen cyanide synthase, *hcnA*, is regulated by RhlR in a PqsE-dependent manner, with

C_4HSL exerting only a minor influence on its transcription. RNA-seq analyses revealed that these

two examples occur on the far ends of a wide spectrum of RhlR-dependent regulation. To date,

the RhlR regulon has been inferred from gene expression analyses [42,50]. Thus, it is unknown

which genes are directly regulated by RhlR promoter binding. Moreover, the dependence of RhlR

on PqsE and C_4HSL for binding different DNA sites has not been determined. Here, we perform

ChIP-seq analyses of RhlR in different genetic backgrounds to comprehensively map the direct

RhlR regulon in *P. aeruginosa*. We also assess the different and overlapping contributions of

C_4HSL and PqsE to RhlR-dependent regulation.

RESULTS

Identification of 40 RhlR binding sites across the *P. aeruginosa* PA14 genome

123   Previous studies identified RhlR-regulated genes but could not determine the direct

RhlR-mediated regulation due to the lack of binding data [19,27–29,42,51]. To distinguish

between direct and indirect regulation, we mapped RhlR binding to the *P. aeruginosa* PA14

genome using ChIP-seq in WT PA14 with a polyclonal antibody raised against RhlR [41]. To

account for the possibility that the antibody binds proteins other than RhlR, we performed a

parallel ChIP-seq experiment in a Δ*rhlR* strain. Of the 168 genomic regions enriched in ChIP-seq

with the WT strain (Table S1), 40 had decreased enrichment in the Δ*rhlR* strain (Figure S1). We

consider these 40 regions to be true RhlR-bound regions (Table 1). We speculate that the other

128 regions are not RhlR-bound. Indeed, many of these 128 regions are known MvaT/U binding

sites, suggesting that their enrichment in the RhlR ChIP-seq was due to cross-reactivity of the

RhlR antibody with MvaT and/or MvaU [52,53].

134   The 40 RhlR-bound regions we identified include many with well-established RhlR

regulatory elements, such as *rhlA*, *hcnA*, and *phzA1* (Figure 1A-C) [19,20,29,54,55]. We identified

a strongly enriched DNA sequence motif associated with 26 of the 40 RhlR-bound regions (Figure

1D; Table 1). This sequence motif matches the known RhlR binding consensus, which was

previously determined using promoter sequences from the core regulon. Interestingly, we did not

find a match to the RhlR motif in the regions upstream of genes *phzH* and *rahU* (encodes

hemolysin) that are well-established RhlR-regulated genes. These findings suggest that the

presence of a *lux*-box sequence alone is insufficient to explain RhlR binding to all DNA targets,

or that some *lux*-boxes deviate considerably from the consensus motif.

We next determined the position of RhlR-bound regions relative to genes (Table 1). 32

RhlR binding sites are in intergenic regions, <500 bp upstream of the start of a gene. This is an

8-fold enrichment over the number of intergenic regions expected by chance (~10% of genome

is intergenic). Eight RhlR binding sites are within genes; these include sites within *phzB1* and

phzB2 that also have stronger upstream RhlR binding sites (Figure 1C). Five of the eight

intragenic RhlR-bound regions are <500 bp upstream of a neighboring gene, suggesting that RhlR

bound to these regions may regulate transcription of the neighboring gene. Overall, RhlR binds

predominantly to regions upstream of genes, consistent with its role as a transcription regulator.

Identification of directly RhlR-regulated genes

Intergenic RhlR binding sites are associated with 17 transcripts (defined as single-gene

or multi-gene operons) that showed significant (q<0.01) differential expression +/- *rhlR* in our

recent RNA-seq study (Figure 1A-C; Figure 2; Table 1). An additional 26 transcripts with

associated intergenic RhlR binding sites (e.g., *lasB*) did not have significant differential expression

in our data, but 14 of these transcripts were shown to be regulated by RhlR in other RNA-seq

studies, bringing the total number of transcripts with an upstream RhlR binding site and evidence

of RhlR-dependent regulation to 31. We consider these 31 transcripts to be direct regulatory

targets of RhlR (Table 1). RhlR-dependent regulation of some genes is likely to be condition-

specific, which would explain apparent disparities in RNA-seq studies. All but one of the directly

RhlR-regulated transcripts is positively regulated by RhlR, consistent with the known function of

RhlR as a transcription activator. Some genes (e.g., *chiC*, *opmD*, *pelG,* and *mucA*) have been

shown to be *rhlR*-dependent by RNA-seq in multiple studies, but were not associated with RhlR

binding [19,29,50]. These genes are likely indirectly regulated by RhlR. Consistent with this idea,

multiple genes encoding known or predicted transcription regulators, including *vqsR*, have

associated RhlR binding sites.

Characterization of the role of RhlI-synthesized C$_4$HSL in RhlR promoter selection

Previous work in our lab and others suggested that RhlI-synthesized C$_4$HSL has an

unequal impact on regulation of different genes by RhlR [19,29,56,57]. RNA-seq analyses of a

Δ*rhlR* strain and a Δ*rhlI* strain revealed that RhlR-controlled genes are regulated by C$_4$HSL to

varying degrees [19,29], suggesting that RhlR may bind and regulate transcription from some

DNA sites in the absence of its ligand and/or that there are additional factors that assist RhlR

binding DNA. To understand the impact of C$_4$HSL on RhlR binding to its DNA sites, we repeated

ChIP-seq of RhlR in a Δ*rhlI* strain and compared the occupancy of RhlR at each of the 40 RhlR-

bound regions. The Δ*rhlI* strain served to assess the role of C$_4$HSL in regulating RhlR binding;

analysis of a strain lacking *rhlI* is viewed as a strain lacking C$_4$HSL. The effect of C$_4$HSL on RhlR

binding to DNA varied considerably between RhlR-bound regions (Figure 3A; Table 1). For

example, binding of RhlR upstream of *rhlA* decreased 4-fold in the Δ*rhlI* strain compared to WT

PA14 (Figure 1A). Conversely, binding of RhlR upstream of *hcnA* increased 1.47-fold in the Δ*rhlI*

strain relative to WT PA14 (Figure 1B, Table 1). Thus, our data support a variable role of C$_4$HSL

in RhlR binding to DNA sites, with some sites requiring C$_4$HSL for maximal RhlR binding and other

sites being unaffected by the loss of C$_4$HSL.

The identification of binding sites upstream of *rhlA* and *hcnA* are examples of two broad

classes of RhlR-dependent binding sites that are more or less C$_4$HSL-dependent, respectively.

However, these dependencies are not binary, and occur on a spectrum with the least C$_4$HSL-

dependent binding site upstream of *hcnA*, and the most C$_4$HSL-dependent binding site upstream

of *arcD* (16-fold decrease in RhlR binding when *rhlI* was deleted) (Table 1). Known QS-regulated

genes associated with RhlR binding sites that are dependent on C$_4$HSL for RhlR binding include,

in order from less to more C$_4$HSL-dependent: *phzA1*, *phzH*, *lasA*, *lasB*, and *phzA2* (Table 1).

Known QS-regulated genes associated with RhlR binding sites that are not dependent on C$_4$HSL

for RhlR binding include *lecB*, *phzB1*, and *phzB2* (Table 1). We note that few RhlR-bound regions

are completely dependent upon C$_4$HSL for RhlR binding, indicating that RhlR can bind most of its

DNA sites in the absence of C$_4$HSL, albeit with reduced affinity in many cases.

To determine the role of C$_4$HSL in the regulation of RhlR target genes, we compared

expression of direct RhlR target genes +/- C$_4$HSL from our recent RNA-seq study (Figure 3B;

Table 1). We focused on genes associated with strong RhlR binding sites (see Methods for a

description of strong sites) and at least a 2-fold difference in expression +/- *rhlR*. C$_4$HSL-

dependent changes in expression of RhlR target genes correlated positively with C$_4$HSL-

dependent changes in RhlR binding (Figure 3C). The effect of deleting *rhlI* on expression of *rhlA*

was similar to the effect of deleting *rhlR*, consistent with strong C$_4$HSL-dependent binding of RhlR

upstream of *rhlA*. However, even for genes such as *hcnA*, where RhlR binding is unaffected by

C$_4$HSL, we still observed a substantial requirement for C$_4$HSL for regulation by RhlR (Figure 3C).

These data strongly suggest that even at sites where C$_4$HSL is not required for RhlR binding to

DNA, C$_4$HSL is required for RhlR to maximally activate transcription.

Characterization of the role of PqsE in RhlR promoter selection

Previous studies showed that PqsE forms a complex with RhlR and increases the affinity

of RhlR for some DNA sites [29,44]. PqsE also promotes transcription activation by RhlR

[28,29,43]. We speculated that PqsE can assist RhlR binding to some sites in the absence of

C$_4$HSL, which would explain the variable dependence of different RhlR binding sites for C$_4$HSL.

To investigate the effect of PqsE on RhlR binding to its DNA sites, we repeated ChIP-seq of RhlR

in a Δ*pqsE* strain and compared the binding of RhlR in the WT strain to each of the 40 RhlR-

bound regions +/- *pqsE* (Figure 4A). The effect of *pqsE* deletion on RhlR binding varied

dramatically for different RhlR-bound regions. For example, binding of RhlR upstream of *hcnA*

decreased 10-fold in the Δ*pqsE* strain compared to WT PA14 (Figure 1B). Conversely, binding of

RhlR upstream of *rhlA* decreased only 1.5-fold in the Δ*pqsE* strain (Figure 1A). Thus, our data

support a variable role of PqsE in RhlR binding to its DNA sites, with some sites requiring PqsE

for maximal RhlR binding and other sites being unaffected by loss of PqsE, similar to the role of

C_4HSL.

The identification of binding sites upstream of *hcnA* and *rhlA* are examples of two broad

classes of RhlR-dependent binding sites that are more or less PqsE-dependent, respectively.

However, these dependencies are not binary, and occur on a spectrum with the least PqsE-

dependent binding site upstream of *PA14_48530* (no impact of PqsE on RhlR binding), and the

most PqsE-dependent binding site upstream of *PA_30840* (189-fold decrease in RhlR binding

when *pqsE* was deleted). Known QS-regulated genes associated with RhlR binding sites that are

dependent on PqsE for RhlR binding include, in order from less PqsE-dependent to more PqsE-

dependent include *lecB* and *hcnA*. Known QS-regulated genes associated with RhlR binding sites

that are not dependent on PqsE for RhlR binding include *azeB*, *azeA*, and *rhlI* [50]. We note that

17 of the 31 regulated sites had less than a 2-fold change in RhlR occupancy in the Δ*pqsE* strain

relative to that in WT PA14, indicating that RhlR binding to many sites is stimulated by PqsE.

We previously showed that a D73A substitution in PqsE abolishes catalytic activity but has

no impact on the interaction with RhlR [50]. We also showed that PqsE with the triple substitution

R243A/R246A/R247A (the "Non-Interacting" [NI] mutant) was impaired for interaction with RhlR

[29,44,58]. To test the effect of these mutations on the genome-wide binding profile of RhlR, we

performed ChIP-seq of RhlR in strains expressing *pqsE* D73A or *pqsE*-NI. Consistent with our

prior study, binding of RhlR in cells expressing *pqsE* D73A was very similar to that in WT cells

(Figure S2A), and binding of RhlR in cells expressing *pqsE*-NI was very similar to that of Δ*pqsE*

cells (Figure S2B), consistent with the overlapping expression profiles of both *pqsE* D73A with

WT (Figure S2C) and *pqsE*-NI with Δ*pqsE* (Figure S2D) [29,47].

To determine the role of PqsE in the regulation of RhlR target genes, we compared

expression of direct RhlR target genes +/- *pqsE* from our recent RNA-seq study (Figure 4B; Table

1). We focused on genes associated with strong RhlR binding sites and at least a two-fold

difference in expression +/- *rhlR*. PqsE-dependent changes in expression of RhlR target genes

correlated positively with PqsE-dependent changes in RhlR binding (Figure 4C). For example, the

effect of deleting *pqsE* on the expression of *hcnA* was similar to the effect of deleting *rhlR*,

consistent with strong PqsE-dependent binding of RhlR upstream of *hcnA*. By contrast, deleting

pqsE had no impact on expression of *rhlA*, consistent with a modest impact of PqsE on RhlR

binding upstream of *rhlA*. Strikingly, expression of some genes was largely independent of PqsE

despite a strong dependence of RhlR binding on PqsE. For example, binding of RhlR upstream

of *PA14_01490* was 3.7-fold lower in the Δ*pqsE* strain than in WT PA14, but the effect of deleting

pqsE on expression of *PA14_01490* was only 30% the effect of deleting *rhlR*. This suggests that

RhlR bound to DNA in the absence of PqsE is a stronger transcription activator than RhlR bound

in complex with PqsE.

Comparison of the roles of C$_4$HSL and PqsE in RhlR promoter selection

ChIP-seq and RNA-seq data showed that RhlR binding and RhlR-dependent

transcription activation of *rhlA* and *lasB* are more dependent on C$_4$HSL than PqsE, whereas the

opposite is true for *hcnA* and *lecB*. As an independent test of the impact of C$_4$HSL and PqsE on

RhlR-dependent transcription activation of *rhlA*, *lasB*, *hcnA*, and *lecB*, we used quantitative RT-

PCR to measure RNA levels for these genes in WT PA14, Δ*rhlR*, Δ*rhlI*, Δ*pqsE*, and Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE*

strains (Figure 5A). Expression of all five genes was reduced at least 2-fold in Δ*rhlR* relative to

WT PA14. These data are largely consistent with RNA-seq data. Expression of *rhlA* and *lasB* was

substantially more dependent upon *rhlI* than *pqsE*. By contrast, expression of *hcnA* was

substantially more dependent upon *pqsE* than *rhlI*. Expression of *lecB* was roughly equally

dependent upon *pqsE* and *rhlI*. For all five genes, simultaneous deletion of both *rhlI* and *pqsE*

mirrored the effect of deleting *rhlR*, suggesting that RhlR requires one or both of C$_4$HSL and PqsE

to bind DNA and activate transcription from any DNA site. The effect of deleting both *rhlI* and

pqsE on expression of RhlR target genes was consistent with our ChIP-seq analyses of RhlR

performed in a Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE* strain, as deletion of both regulators resulted in nearly the same

decrease in binding occupancy at almost all sites compared to the deletion of *rhlR* (Figure 5B).

To further assess the role of C$_4$HSL and PqsE on gene expression, we performed quantitative

RT-PCR on *rhlA*, *hcnA*, and *lecB* in Δ*rhlI* and Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE* strain backgrounds with increasing

concentrations of C$_4$HSL. Expression of *rhlA* was sensitive to the addition of C$_4$HSL in both the

Δ*rhlI* and Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE* backgrounds, indicating that C$_4$HSL is the main driver of its expression

(Figure 5C). Conversely, *hcnA* and *lecB* expression levels were largely independent of C$_4$HSL

across all concentration ranges tested in the Δ*rhlI* strain, and maximal expression was dependent

on the presence of PqsE, as the Δ*rhlI* strain had higher expression levels for both genes than the

Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE* strain (Figure 5C).

To directly assess the role of each of the regulators in gene expression, we compared the

effect of C$_4$HSL and PqsE on RhlR-dependent transcription activation of *rhlA*, *lasB*, *hcnA*, and

lecB using luciferase reporter fusions in *Escherichia coli* expressing either *rhlR* or *rhlR* and *pqsE*,

+/- C$_4$HSL (Figure 6A) [29,47,59]. These data are largely consistent with RNA-seq data and the

regulator dependencies described above. Expression of *rhlA* and *lasB* was strongly dependent

upon C$_4$HSL and only modestly stimulated by PqsE. By contrast, expression of *hcnA* and *lecB*

was largely independent of C$_4$HSL but was strongly stimulated by PqsE (Figure 6A). We view the

E. coli reporter system as being equivalent to an *in vitro* assessment of RhlR function. To

determine the effect of PqsE on RhlR binding to DNA sites *in vitro*, we performed electrophoretic

mobility shift assays (EMSA) using 200 bp fragments of the *rhlA*, *hcnA*, and *lecB* promoters

centered around the determined RhlR DNA-binding motif sequence (Figure 1D) with purified RhlR

+/- PqsE added at equimolar concentrations (Figure 6B; Table 1). We note that we, nor others in

the field, have purified WT RhlR bound to its native AI. Instead, we solubilized and purified RhlR

in the presence of the synthetic agonist meta-bromothiolactone (mBTL), as previously described

[41]. mBTL behaves identically to C_4HSL in cell-based reporter assays [60,61]. To the best of our

knowledge, native WT RhlR cannot be purified from *E. coli* without a ligand present. Thus, the

reciprocal experiment with RhlR +/- C_4HSL could not be performed. Consistent with our previous

work and with the work shown above, RhlR bound the *rhlA* promoter in the absence of PqsE, but

its binding was enhanced when in complex with PqsE [29]. Conversely, at the concentrations

tested, RhlR alone could not bind the *hcnA* or *lecB* promoter and required PqsE to bind DNA

(Figure 6B). These data are consistent with our ChIP-seq, *E. coli* reporter, and *P. aeruginosa*

transcription analyses, and indicate a potential hierarchy of promoter specificity that results from

the mixture of C_4HSL and PqsE dependencies at RhlR-regulated promoters.

DISCUSSION

This is the first comprehensive assessment of the direct RhlR regulon. Our findings are

largely consistent with prior studies that focused on RhlR-dependent changes in RNA levels

[27,29,42,50], but we clarify what regulation is direct versus indirect. Moreover, apparent

inconsistencies in RNA-seq data between studies, and the presence of RhlR binding sites

upstream of genes without apparent RhlR-dependent changes in RNA levels, suggest that direct

regulation of some genes by RhlR is condition-specific, requiring additional factors. Most direct

RhlR target genes have established roles in QS. Direct RhlR regulation of several uncharacterized

genes, such as *PA14_59180*, *PA14_22090,* and *PA14_10360*, strongly suggests a role for these

genes in QS. Regarding the role of PqsE, our data are also largely consistent with an RNA-seq

study that assessed the effect of RhlR and PqsE on transcript levels genome-wide [42]. However,

the majority of RhlR-regulated genes described in the earlier study are likely to be indirectly

regulated, highlighting the value of combining RNA-seq and ChIP-seq data.

Both C_4HSL and PqsE contribute to RhlR-dependent transcription activation, but to

varying degrees depending on the RhlR site. In the absence of both C_4HSL and PqsE, RhlR

binding to DNA was abolished for almost all sites (Figure 5B), resulting in no RhlR-dependent

gene activation (Figure 5A). We conclude that in most cases, RhlR needs to bind at least one of

C_4HSL or PqsE to be functional. We speculated that there is an inverse relationship between

dependence on C_4HSL and dependence on PqsE, as appears to be the case for sites associated

with *rhlA*, *lasB*, *hcnA*, and *lecB* (Figures 5 and 6). However, this is not generally the case (Figure

7). Moreover, C_4HSL is required for binding at some places more than others but is essential for

maximal expression everywhere. We conclude that C_4HSL is required for binding only at certain

sites but is required for efficient transcription activation at all sites, suggesting that C_4HSL binding

to RhlR imparts substantial conformational changes in RhlR. These findings indicate that RhlR

could be stable and functional without a ligand in *P. aeruginosa*, which is not the case in

heterologous expression systems. The prevailing dogma was that this class of LuxR-type

receptors folded around their native ligand during complex assembly. However, previous Western

blot analyses on RhlR in a Δ*rhlI* strain revealed that RhlR remained in the soluble fraction and

was not targeted for degradation; it was unclear if the protein was functional [19]. Our results point

to a scenario where RhlR is stable without C_4HSL because of the presence of PqsE. PqsE is

required for RhlR binding to some sites more than others, but the ability of RhlR to activate

transcription is only weakly affected by loss of *pqsE* at sites that lose a significant amount of RhlR

binding when *pqsE* is absent. We speculate that C_4HSL:RhlR bound to PqsE, while having a

higher affinity for promoter DNA than C_4HSL:RhlR alone, is an overall weaker activator of

transcription.

The dependence on C_4HSL and/or PqsE for RhlR binding is likely due to differences in

the DNA sequences of the RhlR binding sites, or the surrounding sequence. Initially, we

hypothesized that PqsE could drive RhlR to promoters with a more degenerate binding motif, or

promoters without a detectable binding motif. While that appears to be the case with *hcnA*, it is

not true for *lecB* (Table 1). We were unable to infer a PqsE-dependent motif because so few

binding sites are strongly associated with PqsE for binding. Future experiments involving chimeric

binding sites may reveal the molecular basis for PqsE promoter dependency. Additionally, regions

surrounding the RhlR-dependent motif could have an effect on binding to the motif sequence in a

PqsE-dependent or -independent manner. For example, integration host factor (IHF) in *Vibrio*

harveyi regulates LuxR binding and transcription at the *luxC* promoter by binding to regions

upstream of the *lux*-box binding motif, bending the DNA, and physically interacting with LuxR [62].

Thus, additional regulatory sequences or regulatory elements could alter PqsE-dependency by

specifically interacting with PqsE only when it is in complex with RhlR.

The activation of a transcription factor, in this case, RhlR, via an accessory protein, such

as PqsE, is unique in QS. We speculate that the relative abundance of C_4HSL and PqsE might

differ according to different growth conditions, particularly with respect to cell density, and these

relative differences affect the timing of RhlR-dependent gene expression. For example, conditions

might exist where PqsE concentrations are low, which would result in a higher dependence on

C_4HSL binding and activation, leading to a subset of RhlR-dependent genes being expressed.

Given that RhlR represses *pqsE* expression, we speculate that expression of the PqsE-dependent

RhlR regulon decreases as C_4HSL accumulates. Thus, there is likely a window at which the

C_4HSL and PqsE concentrations are "optimal" that maximal gene expression of both regulons

can occur. Further studies are needed to determine whether the timing of RhlR activation for

different genes is impacted by the dependence on PqsE.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. *RhlR-, C_4HSL-, and PqsE-dependent binding occupancy and gene expression of known*

QS regulated genes. Genome browser depictions of ChIP-seq and RNA-seq profiles for WT PA14

(JPS0222) (black), Δ*rhlR* (JPS0151) (red), Δ*rhlI* (JPS0154) (blue), and Δ*pqsE* (JPS0561) (purple)

strains at the (A) *rhlA* operon, (B) *hcnA* operon, and (C) *phzA1* operon. ChIP-seq read counts per

base were normalized to reads/100,000,000 reads. RNA-seq data were normalized as a part of

genome alignment using Rockhopper. D) MEME analysis was conducted on all 40 RhlR-bound

sequences using default parameters, optionally looking for any number of repetitions [63].

Figure 2. *RhlR directly regulates 40 genes in the PA14 genome.* Global RNA-seq analysis

comparing normalized RNA levels from the WT PA14 strain to the normalized RNA levels from

the Δ*rhlR* strain for all genes in the *P. aeruginosa* genome. Red dots correspond to genes

containing a RhlR binding site <500bp upstream of the start site as determined by ChIP-seq

analyses. Characterized QS genes of interest are highlighted: *lecB* (magenta), *lasB* (dark green),

hcnA (light green), *rhlA* (cyan), *phzA1* (olive), and *phzA2* (brown).

Figure 3. *RhlR dependence on C₄HSL for gene activation correlates with its dependence on*

C₄HSL for binding to target sites. (A) Comparison of ChIP enrichment from the WT PA14 and

Δ*rhlI* strains, highlighting the 40 RhlR DNA binding sites from Figure 2. (B) Global RNA-seq

analysis comparing normalized RNA levels from the WT PA14 strain to the normalized RNA levels

from the Δ*rhlI* strain for all genes in the *P. aeruginosa* genome. Blue dots correspond to genes

containing a RhlR binding site <500bp upstream of the start site as determined by ChIP-seq

analyses. For (A) and (B) characterized QS genes of interest are highlighted: *lecB* (magenta),

lasB (dark green), *hcnA* (light green), *rhlA* (cyan), *phzA1* (olive), and *phzA2* (brown). (C)

Correlation of RhlR DNA binding dependence and gene activation dependence of RhlI. RhlR

dependence on C₄HSL for both gene expression and binding at a given binding site were

calculated by subtracting the expression (RNA-seq) or binding (ChIP-seq) values of the Δ*rhlR*

strain from the WT control strain and dividing that value by the resulting value of the subtraction

of the expression or binding values of the Δ*rhlI* from the WT control strain (i.e., (WT$_{expression}$ -

Δ*rhlR*$_{expression}$)/(WT$_{expression}$ - Δ*rhlI*$_{expression}$)). A value approaching 1 indicates a strong dependency

on C₄HSL for expression or binding. A value approaching 0 or lower indicates a low or lack of

dependency on C₄HSL for expression or binding.

Figure 4. *RhlR dependence on PqsE for gene activation correlates with its dependence on PqsE for binding to target sites.* (A) Comparison of ChIP enrichment from the WT PA14 and ΔpqsE strains, highlighting the 40 RhlR DNA binding sites from Figure 2. (B) Global RNA-seq analysis comparing normalized RNA levels from the WT PA14 strain to the normalized RNA levels from the ΔpqsE strain for all genes in the *P. aeruginosa* genome. Purple dots correspond to genes containing a RhlR binding site <500bp upstream of the start site as determined by ChIP-seq analyses. For (A) and (B) characterized QS genes of interest are highlighted: *lecB* (magenta), *lasB* (dark green), *hcnA* (light green), *rhlA* (cyan), *phzA1* (olive), and *phzA2* (brown). (C) Correlation of RhlR DNA binding dependence and gene activation dependence of PqsE. RhlR dependence on PqsE for both gene expression and binding were calculated by subtracting the expression (RNA-seq) or binding (ChIP-seq) values for each in the ΔrhlR strain from the WT control strain and dividing that value by the resulting value of the subtraction of the expression or binding values of the ΔpqsE from the WT control strain, (i.e., ($WT_{expression}$ - $\Delta rhlR_{expression}$)/($WT_{expression}$ - $\Delta pqsE_{expression}$)). A value approaching 1 indicates a strong dependency on PqsE for expression or binding. A value approaching 0 or lower indicates a low or lack of dependency on PqsE for expression or binding.

Figure 5. *PqsE and C₄HSL coordinate full RhlR-dependent DNA binding and gene expression.* (A) Quantitative RT-PCR analysis of *rhlA*, *lasB*, *hcnA*, and *lecB* in ΔrhlR (red), ΔrhlI (blue), ΔpqsE (purple), and ΔrhlIΔpqsE (JPS0278) (orange) strains compared to WT expression levels (dotted line). *gyrA* was used as an internal housekeeping control. Bars represent the mean of three biological replicates. Two technical replicates were performed and averaged for each gene in each biological replicate. Error bars represent standard deviations of the means of biological replicates. (B) Comparison of ChIP enrichment from the WT PA14 and ΔrhlIΔpqsE strains, highlighting the 40 RhlR DNA binding sites from Figure 2. Characterized QS genes of interest are

highlighted: *lecB* (magenta), *lasB* (dark green), *hcnA* (light green), *rhlA* (cyan), *phzA1* (olive), and

phzA2 (brown). (C) Quantitative RT-PCR analysis of *rhlA* (cyan), *hcnA* (light green), and *lecB*

(magenta) in Δ*rhlI* and Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE* strains without (-) or with increasing concentrations of C_4HSL.

gyrA was used as an internal housekeeping control. Transcript levels were normalized to the

Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE* (-) C_4HSL control. Bars represent the mean of three biological replicates. Two

technical replicates were performed and averaged for each gene in each biological replicate. Error

bars represent standard deviations of the means of biological replicates.

Figure 6. *PqsE is required for RhlR binding to certain promoters and maximal gene expression.*

(A) *E. coli* reporter system expressing RhlR alone (blue) or RhlR and PqsE (purple) in the

presence of *rhlA* (JPS0477 and JPS0476, respectively), *lasB* (JPS0924 and JPS0925,

respectively), *hcnA* (JPS0924 and JPS0925, respectively), and *lecB* (JPS0948 and JPS0949,

respectively) promoters fused to the *luxCDABE* operon (luciferase). All samples received 0.1%

arabinose to induce RhlR expression from the pBAD promoter. PqsE was constitutively expressed

from the *lac* promoter. The strains expressing RhlR alone contained an empty vector plasmid

equivalent to that of the plasmid containing *pqsE*. All samples received 1 μM of C_4HSL or the

equivalent volume of DMSO as a carrier control. Light values were normalized to the specific gene

reporter control that received only arabinose. Bars represent the mean of three biological

replicates. Two technical replicates were performed and averaged for each gene in each

biological replicate. Error bars represent standard deviations of the means of biological replicates.

(B) Representative images of electrophoretic mobility shift assays using 200 bp fragments of the

rhlA, *hcnA*, and *lecB* promoters with increasing concentrations of RhlR (left) or RhlR complexed

with PqsE (right). A representative SDS-PAGE loading control depicting the concentrations of

RhlR and RhlR-PqsE (bottom). RhlR was purified using the synthetic agonist mBTL.

Figure 7. *PqsE and C₄HSL binding dependencies for RhlR occur on a spectrum.* Correlation of

relative RhlR binding dependencies on both C_4HSL and PqsE. Correlation values for binding

dependence from Figures 3C and 4C were plotted against each other. A value approaching 1

indicates a strong dependency on C_4HSL or PqsE for binding. A value approaching 0 or lower

indicates a low or lack of dependency on C_4HSL or PqsE for binding.

Table 1. *List of RhlR binding sites in WT PA14 and their associated expression and binding*

dependencies in different genetic backgrounds. Expression values were determined using

Rockhopper [66] with data from Simanek *et al.* 2022 [29]. Q-values represent the probability of a

false discovery of differentially expressed genes. Expression values used to calculate relative

expression all increased by 1 to prevent div/0.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Bacterial strains and growth conditions. Specific growth conditions for the different strains of

P. aeruginosa and *E. coli* are described below for their corresponding experiments. Standard

molecular biology techniques were used to amplify and clone promoter fragments for the creation

of *luxCDABE* fusions. The primers used in this study are listed in Table S3. The plasmids and

strains used in this study are listed in Table S4.

Chromatin Immunoprecipitation Sequencing (ChIP-seq). *P. aeruginosa* strains were grown

overnight, back diluted 1:100 in fresh LB media and grown to $OD_{600\ nm}$ = 2.0. Crosslinking, lysis,

and immunoprecipitation were performed as previously described [64] with the following changes:

a polyclonal antibody raised against WT RhlR from PA14 from our previous work was used [41],

and the DNA library preparation was performed using Q5 high-fidelity DNA polymerase (New

England Biolabs). Peak-calling was performed as previously described [65].

Data analysis.

Initial analysis of RNA-seq data [29] was conducted using Rockhopper [66] without strand

specificity to normalize, align, and conduct a pairwise comparison of all WT and mutant strains

combining two independent sequencing runs [66–68]. The total reads for each called peak in each

replicate of the ChIP-seq data were calculated by summing the read count within 100 bases of

the center of each peak and normalizing by the total reads of the replicate multiplied by 1,000,000.

The read counts for each peak were then averaged with their duplicate. The value for each peak

in the WT average was then divided by the scores for the *rhlR* deletion average, and peaks with

a ratio > 1 were identified and referred to as "real" RhlR binding sites. The original list of ChIP-

sites was used to determine the genes with internal ChIP sites or a ChIP site within 500 bases

upstream of the gene or its operon start (Table S1). Genes were then further filtered by association

with a "real" RhlR binding site as identified using R (Table 1). Plots of relative ChIP-enrichment

and expression were generated using R. Genome browser images were generated using signal

map. ChIP-seq data used in the genome browser were normalized to reads/100,000,000 reads.

RNA seq data were normalized as part of Rockhopper alignment. To identify MvaT binding

detected by RhlR-ChIP, the sequences of sites without a RhlR deletion-associated change in

binding were entered into multiblast for PAO1. Previously detected MvaT binding sites in PAO1

were then compared to the artifactual sites [52,53]. The probability of a site being intergenic was

calculated using a binomial test, predicting the likelihood of 32 sites being intergenic out of 40

total and testing with the proportion of the genome that is intergenic (non-coding bases/total

bases). The code for data processing and analysis was deposited in the Wade Lab Github at:

https://github.com/wade-lab

***E. coli* luciferase reporter assay.** *E. coli* TOP10 strains were constructed to express *rhlR* and

pqsE with the following promoters fused to *luxCDABE* (luciferase): p*rhlA,* p*hcnA,* p*lecB,* and

p*lasB*. The *E. coli* strains contained a pBAD vector harboring *rhlR* coupled with one of two pACYC

vectors, either containing WT *pqsE* or an empty plasmid, as well as the pCS26 vector harboring

promoters of interest fused to *luxCDABE* at the 3'-end of the promoter to assess transcriptional

activity. The strains were inoculated from glycerol stocks and grown overnight at 37 °C with

shaking in 5 mL LB supplemented with ampicillin (100 µg/mL), kanamycin (50 µg/mL), and

tetracycline (15 µg/mL). Overnight cultures were diluted 1:100 in 20 mL LB antibiotic media and

incubated at 37 °C with shaking for 3 h. Once the optimal cell density was reached ($OD_{600\ nm}$ =

0.6), each culture was supplied with 0.1% arabinose. A black-bottom 96-well plate was prepared

with 1 µM C_4HSL or DMSO. To each well containing 1 µL of AI or DMSO, 99 µL of culture was

added. The plates were incubated for 4 h at 37 °C with shaking. The Veritas Microplate

Luminometer (Promega) was used to measure and record luminescence.

RNA extraction, cDNA synthesis, and qPCR. WT PA14, Δ*rhlI*, and Δ*rhlI*Δ*pqsE* strains were

inoculated from glycerol stocks and grown in 5 mL LB overnight at 37 °C with shaking. Overnight

cultures were allocated to make 4 subcultures per strain, with each containing a 1:100 dilution in

20 mL LB. Two 5-fold serial dilutions of C_4HSL starting at 25 mM were dispensed into its

corresponding flask to make a 1 µM, 5 µM, and 25 µM dilution for each strain. 20 µL of DMSO

was added to the last flask for the equivalent volume of a carrier control. Cultures were grown for

5 h until the optimal cell density was achieved and pyocyanin production was visualized. The

cultures were pelleted via centrifugation and saved at -80 °C. Cells were thawed on ice and then

resuspended with 700 µL TRIzol reagent (ThermoFisher). Samples were transferred to screw-

cap tubes with homogenization beads and homogenized for two 50 sec cycles. 100 µL chloroform

was added, hand mixed for 15 sec, and left on ice for 2 min. Samples were pelleted via

centrifugation at 12,000 x *g* for 20 min at 4 °C. The aqueous, RNA-containing layer was extracted

without disturbing the phenol layer and dispensed into a new microcentrifuge tube, where an

additional 500 µL isopropanol was added. Samples were inverted to mix and left at RT for 10 min.

Samples were pelleted by centrifugation at 12,000 x g for 10 min at 4 °C, and the supernatant

was discarded. Pellets were resuspended in 1 mL 70% ethanol and were pelleted by

centrifugation at 7,500 x g for 5 min at 4 °C. Supernatant was discarded and the pellets were

resuspended in 100 µL sterile, nuclease-free water and solubilized in a 37 °C water bath. RNA

concentration and purity were measured on a Nanodrop (ThermoFisher). In new microcentrifuge

tubes, DNase reactions were set up using 3 µg RNA, 3 µL 10X DNase Buffer, 1 µL TURBO

DNase, and 1 µL SUPERase-IN RNase Inhibitor (ThermoFisher) in a total reaction volume of 30

µL. Samples were incubated in a 37 °C water bath for 90 min, with an additional 1 µL DNase

added at the 1 h mark. A volume of 3 µL DNase Inactivation Slurry (ThermoFisher) was added to

each tube and samples were incubated with mixing at RT for 5 min. Samples were spun via

centrifugation at 10,000 x g for 2 min at 4 °C. Supernatant was transferred to new microcentrifuge

tubes and stored at -80ºC. Once thawed on ice, RNA concentration and purity was measured on

the NanoDrop. cDNA reactions were set up in PCR tubes using 500 ng DNA-free RNA, 1 µL 10

mM random hexamer, and 1 µL 10 mM dNTPs. Sterile, nuclease-free water was added to each

tube to bring the samples to a final volume of 13 µL. The reactions were incubated at 65 °C for 5

min in a thermocycler (Bio-Rad) and chilled on ice for 5 min. From the SuperScript III Kit, reactions

received 4 µL 5X First Strand Buffer, 1 µL 0.1 M DTT, 1 µL SUPERase-IN RNase Inhibitor, and

1 µL SuperScript III Reverse Transcriptase (ThermoFisher). Samples were incubated at 50 °C for

45 min, 70 °C for 15 min, and held at 4 °C in a thermocycler (Bio-Rad). The newly synthesized

20 µL cDNA reactions were diluted 1:5 with 80 µL sterile, nuclease-free water. A master mix for

each gene (*hcnA*, *lasB*, *rhlA*, *lecB*, *gyrA*, and *sigX*) was made using 10 µL SYBR Select Master

Mix (ThermoFisher), 0.6 µL forward and reverse primers, as well as 6.8 µL sterile, nuclease-free

water. Master mix volumes were multiplied by the number of samples for each gene. A 96-well

reaction plate (ThermoFisher) was prepared by supplying each well with 2 µL diluted cDNA and

18 µL master mix. A clear plate sealer was firmly adhered to the plate and was quickly spun down

via centrifugation at 4 °C. A 7500 Fast real-time PCR system (Applied Biosystems) and software

(v2.3) were utilized for relative gene expression analysis and cycle threshold quantification.

Protein expression and purification. 1 L cultures of BL21 strains containing pET28b-*pqsE* or

pETDuet-1-*rhlR* were grown in LB and protein production was induced as previously described

[47]. RhlR was solubilized using 50 µM mBTL during expression. After growth, cells were pelleted

via centrifugation at 12,000 x *g* at 4 °C for 30 min. Cell pellet was frozen at -80 °C until protein

purification. Lysis was achieved via sonication by resuspending pellet in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris

[pH 8.0], 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole), followed by centrifugation at 4 °C for 30 min at 15,000

x g. Supernatants for each protein were saved for affinity purification pulldown. Different protocols

were utilized for affinity purification pulldown for supernatants containing PqsE, and RhlR:mBTL.

Supernatant containing PqsE was incubated with 1.5 mL of previously washed Ni-NTA resin

(Qiagen) and mixed at 4 °C for 1 h. After incubation, sample was washed 3 times with 25 mL of

lysis buffer and then eluted 10x with 1 mL of elution buffer (50 mM Tris [pH 8.0], 150 mM NaCL,

500 mM imidazole). For supernatant containing RhlR:mBTL, Buffer A (20 mM Tris [pH 8.0], 1 mM

dithiothreitol) was mixed with the sample for a total of 50 mL and loaded onto a column for affinity

purification pulldown utilizing a HiTrap^{TM} Heparin HP (Cytiva) column. Protein samples were then

subjected to separation on a Superdex-200 column (Cytiva) equilibrated with 50 mM Tris HCl [pH

8.0] and 150 mM NaCl. Gels were then stained with Coomassie brilliant blue and imaged on a

Bio-Rad EZ-Doc gel imager. SDS-Page was used to assess the purity of proteins after separation.

Electrophoretic mobility shift assays. Concentrations of PqsE, RhlR:mBTL, and PqsE-

RhlR:mBTL were standardized to be equal per reaction. EMSA reactions consisted of 17 µL of

EMSA Buffer (200 mM KCl, 50 mM Tris-HCl [pH 7.5], 250 µg/mL bovine serum albumin, 50 mM

NaCl, 5 nM EDTA, 5 µM MgCl$_2$, 5 µM dithiothreitol), 2 µL of protein dilution, and 1 µL of 10 ng/µL

of the DNA fragment to be tested. The reactions were initiated, vortexed briefly and incubated at

RT for 15 min. 2 µL of Novex^{TM} Hi-Density TBE 5X Sample Buffer (Invitrogen) was mixed with 8

µL of the completed EMSA reaction and loaded on an 8% acrylamide gel. Electrophoresis was

performed in 1X TBE buffer at 100 V for 60 minutes followed by washing gel with 0.5X TB buffer

at RT for 15 min. Gels were stained with 50 mL of 1X SYBR-Gold in 0.5X TB buffer for 30 minutes

at RT and blocked from light. After staining, gel was washed with 50 mL of 0.5X TB buffer with

shaking for 15 min. The washing step was repeated an additional two times, followed by

visualization on a Bio-Rad EZ-Doc gel imager.

DATA AVAILABILITY

586 EBI ArrayExpress accession numbers for all RhlR ChIP-seq data were deposited under E-MTAB-

587 12966.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grant R01GM14436101, New York

Community Trust Foundation grant P19-000454, and Cystic Fibrosis Foundation grant

PACZKO21G0 to J.E.P, NIH Research Supplements to Promote Diversity in Health-Related

Research grant 1R01GM14436101-S1 to N.J.C.T and J.E.P., NIH training grant T32GM132066

to L.I.P and M.W.B, and NIH grant R35GM144328 to J.T.W. The authors thank the research

laboratories in the Division of Genetics at the Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of

Health for helpful discussions on the research and for resource sharing. We thank the dedicated

staff scientists at the Advanced Genomics Technologies Center and Media & Tissue Core

facilities at the Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of Health.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION CAPTIONS

Figure S1. *RhlR binds to 40 sites in the PA14 genome.* Comparison of ChIP enrichment from the

WT PA14 and Δ*rhlR* strains. The 40 sites bound specifically by RhlR are highlighted in red. All

non-specific sites are shown in black. See Table 1 for details on all RhlR specific binding sites.

See Table S1 for a list of all RhlR specific and non-specific sites.

Figure S2. *The PqsE-RhlR interaction interface is required for PqsE-dependent DNA*

binding. Comparison of ChIP enrichment between the (A) WT PA14 and *pqsE*-D73A strains and

(B) Δ*pqsE* and *pqsE*-NI strains. Comparison of gene expression between the (C) WT PA14 and

pqsE-D73A strains and (D) Δ*pqsE* and *pqsE*-NI strains

Table S1. *List of all RhlR ChIP-seq binding sites from WT PA14.* The average peak values are

the average of two biological replicates and two independent ChIP experiments. Peak values

were calculated as the sum of all enrichment within 100 bases upstream and downstream of the

center of the ChIP peak.

Table S2. *Gene expression levels for all genes in WT PA14 for the indicated genotype and their*

associated RhlR binding dependency. Expression values were determined using Rockhopper [66]

with data from Simanek *et al*. 2022 [29]. Q-values represent the probability of a false discovery of

differentially expressed genes.

Table S3. *List of all primers used in this study.*

Table S4. *List of all plasmids and strains used in this study.*

REFERENCES

1.   Simanek KA, Paczkowski JE. Resistance Is Not Futile: The Role of Quorum Sensing

Plasticity in Pseudomonas aeruginosa Infections and Its Link to Intrinsic Mechanisms of

Antibiotic   Resistance.   Microorganisms.   2022;10:   1247.

doi:10.3390/microorganisms10061247

2. Maurice NM, Bedi B, Sadikot RT. Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilms: Host response and

clinical implications in lung infections. Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol. 2018;58: 428–439.

doi:10.1165/rcmb.2017-0321TR

3. Papenfort K, Bassler BL. Quorum sensing signal-response systems in Gram-negative

bacteria. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2016;14: 576–588. doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2016.89

4. Davies DG, Parsek MR, Pearson JP, Iglewski BH, Costerton JW, Greenberg EP. The

involvement of cell-to-cell signals in the development of a bacterial biofilm. Science (80-).

1998/05/02.   1998;280:   295–298.   Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9535661

5. Herzog R, Peschek N, Frohlich KS, Schumacher K, Papenfort K. Three autoinducer

molecules act in concert to control virulence gene expression in Vibrio cholerae. Nucleic

Acids Res. 2019/01/17. 2019. doi:10.1093/nar/gky1320

6. Fuqua WC, Winans SC. A LuxR-LuxI type regulatory system activates Agrobacterium Ti

plasmid conjugal transfer in the presence of a plant tumor metabolite. J Bacteriol.

1994/05/01.   1994;176:   2796–2806.   Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8188582

7. Latifi A, Winson MK, Foglino M, Bycroft BW, Stewart GS, Lazdunski A, et al. Multiple

homologues of LuxR and LuxI control expression of virulence determinants and secondary

metabolites through quorum sensing in Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1. Mol Microbiol.

1995;17: 333–343. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7494482

8. Brint JM, Ohman DE. Synthesis of multiple exoproducts in Pseudomonas aeruginosa is

under the control of RhlR-RhlI, another set of regulators in strain PAO1 with homology to

the autoinducer-responsive LuxR-LuxI family. J Bacteriol. 1995/12/01. 1995;177: 7155–

7163. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8522523

9. Lupp C, Ruby EG. Vibrio fischeri uses two quorum-sensing systems for the regulation of

early and late colonization factors. J Bacteriol. 2005;187: 3620–3629.

doi:10.1128/JB.187.11.3620-3629.2005

10.   von Bodman SB, Ball JK, Faini MA, Herrera CM, Minogue TD, Urbanowski ML, et al. The

quorum sensing negative regulators EsaR and ExpR(Ecc), homologues within the LuxR

family, retain the ability to function as activators of transcription. J Bacteriol. 2003/11/18.

2003;185: 7001–7007. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14617666

11.   Parsek MR, Val DL, Hanzelka BL, Cronan JE, Greenberg EP, Cronan Jr. JE, et al. Acyl

homoserine-lactone quorum-sensing signal generation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

1999/04/14. 1999;96: 4360–4365. doi:10.1073/pnas.96.8.4360

12.   Eberhard A, Burlingame AL, Eberhard C, Kenyon GL, Nealson KH, Oppenheimer NJ.

Structural identification of autoinducer of Photobacterium fischeri luciferase. Biochemistry.

1981/04/28. 1981;20: 2444–2449. Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7236614

13.   Schuster M, Lostroh CP, Ogi T, Greenberg EP. Identification, timing, and signal specificity

of Pseudomonas aeruginosa quorum-controlled genes: a transcriptome analysis. J

Bacteriol. 2003/03/20. 2003;185: 2066–2079. doi:10.1128/JB.185.7.2066-2079.2003

14.   Chen J, Xie J. Role and regulation of bacterial LuxR-like regulators. J Cell Biochem.

2011/06/17. 2011;112: 2694–2702. doi:10.1002/jcb.23219

15.   Tsai CS, Winans SC. LuxR-type quorum-sensing regulators that are detached from

common scents. Mol Microbiol. 2010/07/14. 2010;77: 1072–1082. doi:10.1111/j.1365-

2958.2010.07279.x

16.   Engebrecht J, Nealson K, Silverman M. Bacterial bioluminescence: isolation and genetic

analysis of functions from Vibrio fischeri. Cell. 1983/03/01. 1983;32: 773–781. Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6831560

17.   Pinto UM, Winans SC. Dimerization of the quorum-sensing transcription factor TraR

enhances resistance to cytoplasmic proteolysis. Mol Microbiol. 2009;73: 32–42.

doi:10.1111/j.1365-2958.2009.06730.x

18.   Seed PC, Passador L, Iglewski BH. Activation of the Pseudomonas aeruginosa lasI gene

by LasR and the Pseudomonas autoinducer PAI: an autoinduction regulatory hierarchy. J

Bacteriol. 1995/02/01. 1995;177: 654–659. Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7836299

19.   Mukherjee S, Moustafa D, Smith CD, Goldberg JB, Bassler BL. The RhlR quorum-sensing

receptor controls Pseudomonas aeruginosa pathogenesis and biofilm development

independently of its canonical homoserine lactone autoinducer. PLoS Pathog. 2017/07/18.

2017;13: e1006504. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1006504

20.   Pearson JP, Pesci EC, Iglewski BH. Roles of Pseudomonas aeruginosa las and rhl

quorum-sensing systems in control of elastase and rhamnolipid biosynthesis genes. J

Bacteriol. 1997/09/19. 1997;179: 5756–5767. Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9294432

21.   Whiteley M, Lee KM, Greenberg EP. Identification of genes controlled by quorum sensing

in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1999/11/26. 1999;96: 13904–

13909. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10570171

22.   Storey DG, Ujack EE, Rabin HR, Mitchell I. Pseudomonas aeruginosa lasR transcription

correlates with the transcription of lasA, lasB, and toxA in chronic lung infections associated

with cystic fibrosis. Infect Immun. 1998;66: 2521–2528. Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9596711

23.   Diggle SP, Winzer K, Chhabra SR, Worrall KE, Cámara M, Williams P. The Pseudomonas

aeruginosa quinolone signal molecule overcomes the cell density-dependency of the

quorum sensing hierarchy, regulates rhl-dependent genes at the onset of stationary phase

and can be produced in the absence of LasR. Mol Microbiol. 2003. doi:10.1046/j.1365-

2958.2003.03672.x

24.   Kumari A, Pasini P, Daunert S. Detection of bacterial quorum sensing N-acyl homoserine

lactones in clinical samples. Anal Bioanal Chem. 2008;391: 1619–1627.

doi:10.1007/s00216-008-2002-3

25.   Fuqua C, Parsek MR, Greenberg EP. Regulation of gene expression by cell-to-cell

communication: acyl-homoserine lactone quorum sensing. Annu Rev Genet. 2001;35:

439–468. doi:10.1146/annurev.genet.35.102401.090913

26.   Schuster M, Greenberg EP. A network of networks: quorum-sensing gene regulation in

Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Int J Med Microbiol. 2006;296: 73–81.

doi:10.1016/j.ijmm.2006.01.036

27.   Cruz RL, Asfahl KL, Van den Bossche S, Coenye T, Crabbé A, Dandekar AA. RhlR-

regulated acyl-homoserine lactone quorum sensing in a cystic fibrosis isolate of

pseudomonas aeruginosa. MBio. 2020. doi:10.1128/mBio.00532-20

28.   Mukherjee S, Moustafa DA, Stergioula V, Smith CD, Goldberg JB, Bassler BL. The PqsE

and RhlR proteins are an autoinducer synthase-receptor pair that control virulence and

biofilm development in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018/09/19.

2018;115: E9411–E9418. doi:10.1073/pnas.1814023115

29.   Simanek KA, Taylor IR, Richael EK, Lasek-Nesselquist E, Bassler BL, Paczkowski JE. The

PqsE-RhlR Interaction Regulates RhlR DNA Binding to Control Virulence Factor

Production in Pseudomonas aeruginosa . Microbiol Spectr. 2022;10.

doi:10.1128/spectrum.02108-21

30.   Chugani SA, Whiteley M, Lee KM, D'Argenio D, Manoil C, Greenberg EP. QscR, a

modulator of quorum-sensing signal synthesis and virulence in Pseudomonas aeruginosa.

Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2001. doi:10.1073/pnas.051624298

31.   Gambello MJ, Kaye S, Iglewski BH. LasR of Pseudomonas aeruginosa is a transcriptional

activator of the alkaline protease gene (apr) and an enhancer of exotoxin A expression.

Infect Immun. 1993;61: 1180–1184. Available:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8454322

32.   Gonzalez MR, Ducret V, Leoni S, Fleuchot B, Jafari P, Raffoul W, et al. Transcriptome

734   analysis of Pseudomonas aeruginosa cultured in human burn wound exudates. Front Cell

735   Infect Microbiol. 2018;8: 1–14. doi:10.3389/fcimb.2018.00039

736   33.   Lee J, Zhang L. The hierarchy quorum sensing network in Pseudomonas aeruginosa.

737   Protein Cell. 2014. doi:10.1007/s13238-014-0100-x

738   34.   McGrath S, Wade DS, Pesci EC. Dueling quorum sensing systems in Pseudomonas

739   aeruginosa control the production of the Pseudomonas quinolone signal (PQS). FEMS

740   Microbiol Lett. 2004. doi:10.1016/S0378-1097(03)00849-8

741   35.   Brouwer S, Pustelny C, Ritter C, Klinkert B, Narberhaus F, Häussler S. The PqsR and RhlR

742   transcriptional regulators determine the level of Pseudomonas quinolone signal synthesis

743   in Pseudomonas aeruginosa by producing two different pqsABCDE mRNA Isoforms. J

744   Bacteriol. 2014. doi:10.1128/JB.02000-14

745   36.   Déziel E, Lépine F, Milot S, He J, Mindrinos MN, Tompkins RG, et al. Analysis of

746   Pseudomonas aeruginosa 4-hydroxy-2-alkylquinolines (HAQs) reveals a role for 4-

747   hydroxy-2-heptylquinoline in cell-to-cell communication. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

748   2004;101: 1339–1344. doi:10.1073/pnas.0307694100

749   37.   Rampioni G, Pustelny C, Fletcher MP, Wright VJ, Bruce M, Rumbaugh KP, et al.

750   Transcriptomic analysis reveals a global alkyl-quinolone-independent regulatory role for

751   PqsE in facilitating the environmental adaptation of Pseudomonas aeruginosa to plant and

752   animal hosts. Env Microbiol. 2010/04/22. 2010;12: 1659–1673. doi:10.1111/j.1462-

753   2920.2010.02214.x

754   38.   Wade DS, Calfee MW, Rocha ER, Ling EA, Engstrom E, Coleman JP, et al. Regulation of

755   Pseudomonas quinolone signal synthesis in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Bacteriol.

756   2005/06/22. 2005;187: 4372–4380. doi:10.1128/JB.187.13.4372-4380.2005

757   39.   Pesci EC, Milbank JBJ, Pearson JP, Mcknight S, Kende AS, Greenberg EP, et al.

758   Quinolone signaling in the cell-to-cell communication system of Pseudomonas aeruginosa.

Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1999;96: 11229–11234. doi:10.1073/pnas.96.20.11229

40.   Gallagher LA, McKnight SL, Kuznetsova MS, Pesci EC, Manoil C. Functions required for

extracellular quinolone signaling by Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Bacteriol. 2002;184:

6472–6480. doi:10.1128/JB.184.23.6472-6480.2002

41.   McCready AR, Paczkowski JE, Cong J-P, Bassler BL. An autoinducer-independent rhlr

quorum-sensing receptor enables analysis of rhlr regulation. PLoS Pathog. 2019;15.

doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1007820

42.   Letizia M, Mellini M, Fortuna A, Visca P, Imperi F, Leoni L, et al. PqsE Expands and

Differentially Modulates the RhlR Quorum Sensing Regulon in Pseudomonas aeruginosa.

Microbiol Spectr. 2022. doi:10.1128/spectrum.00961-22

43.   Groleau M-C, de Oliveira Pereira T, Dekimpe V, Déziel E. PqsE Is Essential for RhlR-

Dependent Quorum Sensing Regulation in Pseudomonas aeruginosa . mSystems. 2020.

doi:10.1128/msystems.00194-20

44.   Feathers JR, Richael EK, Simanek KA, Fromme JC, Paczkowski JE. Structure of the RhlR-

PqsE complex from Pseudomonas aeruginosa reveals mechanistic insights into quorum-

sensing   gene   regulation.   Structure.   2022;30:   1626-1636.e4.

doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.str.2022.10.008

45.   Zender M, Witzgall F, Drees SL, Weidel E, Maurer CK, Fetzner S, et al. Dissecting the

Multiple Roles of PqsE in Pseudomonas aeruginosa Virulence by Discovery of Small Tool

Compounds.   ACS   Chem   Biol.   2016/04/16.   2016;11:   1755–1763.

doi:10.1021/acschembio.6b00156

46.   Drees SL, Fetzner S. PqsE of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Acts as Pathway-Specific

Thioesterase in the Biosynthesis of Alkylquinolone Signaling Molecules. Chem Biol.

2015/05/12. 2015;22: 611–618. doi:10.1016/j.chembiol.2015.04.012

47.   Taylor IR, Paczkowski JE, Jeffrey PD, Henke BR, Smith CD, Bassler BL. Inhibitor Mimetic

Mutations in the Pseudomonas aeruginosa PqsE Enzyme Reveal a Protein–Protein

Interaction with the Quorum-Sensing Receptor RhlR That Is Vital for Virulence Factor Production. ACS Chem Biol. 2021;16: 740–752. doi:10.1021/acschembio.1c00049

48. Higgins S, Heeb S, Rampioni G, Fletcher MP, Williams P, Camara M. Differential Regulation of the Phenazine Biosynthetic Operons by Quorum Sensing in Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1-N. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2018/08/08. 2018;8: 252. doi:10.3389/fcimb.2018.00252

49. Recinos DA, Sekedat MD, Hernandez A, Cohen TS, Sakhtah H, Prince AS, et al. Redundant phenazine operons in Pseudomonas aeruginosa exhibit environment-dependent expression and differential roles in pathogenicity. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012/11/07. 2012;109: 19420–19425. doi:10.1073/pnas.1213901109

50. Asfahl KL, Smalley NE, Chang AP, Dandekar AA. Genetic and Transcriptomic Characteristics of RhlR-Dependent Quorum Sensing in Cystic Fibrosis Isolates of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. mSystems. 2022;7. doi:10.1128/msystems.00113-22

51. Asfahl KL, Smalley NE, Chang AP, Dandekar AA. Genetic and Transcriptomic Characteristics of RhlR-Dependent Quorum Sensing in Cystic Fibrosis Isolates of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. mSystems. 2022;7. doi:10.1128/msystems.00113-22

52. Castang S, McManus HR, Turner KH, Dove SL. H-NS family members function coordinately in an opportunistic pathogen. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2008;105: 18947–18952. doi:10.1073/pnas.0808215105

53. Lippa AM, Gebhardt MJ, Dove SL. H-NS-like proteins in Pseudomonas aeruginosa coordinately silence intragenic transcription. Mol Microbiol. 2021;115: 1138–1151. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.14656

54. Medina G, Juárez K, Valderrama B, Soberón-Chávez G, Juarez K, Valderrama B, et al. Mechanism of Pseudomonas aeruginosa RhlR transcriptional regulation of the rhlAB promoter. J Bacteriol. 2003/10/04. 2003;185: 5976–5983. doi:10.1128/JB.185.20.5976-5983.2003

55.   Pessi G, Haas D. Transcriptional control of the hydrogen cyanide biosynthetic genes
hcnABC by the anaerobic regulator ANR and the quorum-sensing regulators LasR and
RhlR in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Bacteriol. 2000. doi:10.1128/JB.182.24.6940-
6949.2000

56.   Soto-Aceves MP, Cocotl-Yañez M, Servín-González L, Soberón-Chávez G. The Rhl
quorum-sensing system is at the top of the regulatory hierarchy under phosphate-limiting
conditions   in   pseudomonas   aeruginosa   PAO1.   J   Bacteriol.   2020;203.
doi:10.1128/JB.00475-20

57.   Dekimpe V, Déziel E. Revisiting the quorum-sensing hierarchy in Pseudomonas
aeruginosa: The transcriptional regulator RhlR regulates LasR-specific factors.
Microbiology. 2009;155: 712–723. doi:10.1099/mic.0.022764-0

58.   Borgert SR, Henke S, Witzgall F, Schmelz S, zur Lage S, Hotop S-K, et al. Moonlighting
chaperone activity of the enzyme PqsE contributes to RhlR-controlled virulence of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Nat Commun. 2022;13: 7402. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-35030-
w

59.   Paczkowski JE, Mukherjee S, McCready AR, Cong J-P, Aquino CJ, Kim H, et al.
Flavonoids suppress Pseudomonas aeruginosa virulence through allosteric inhibition of
quorum-sensing Receptors. J Biol Chem. 2017;292. doi:10.1074/jbc.M116.770552

60.   O'Loughlin CT, Miller LC, Siryaporn A, Drescher K, Semmelhack MF, Bassler BL. A
quorum-sensing inhibitor blocks Pseudomonas aeruginosa virulence and biofilm formation.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110: 17981–17986. doi:10.1073/pnas.1316981110

61.   Paczkowski JE, McCready AR, Cong J-P, Li Z, Jeffrey PD, Smith CD, et al. An Autoinducer
Analogue Reveals an Alternative Mode of Ligand Binding for the LasR Quorum-Sensing
Receptor. ACS Chem Biol. 2019;14. doi:10.1021/acschembio.8b00971

62.   Chaparian RR, Olney SG, Hustmyer CM, Rowe-Magnus DA, van Kessel JC. Integration
host factor and LuxR synergistically bind DNA to coactivate quorum-sensing genes in

837   Vibrio harveyi. Mol Microbiol. 2016. doi:10.1111/mmi.13425

838 63. Bailey TL, Johnson J, Grant CE, Noble WS. The MEME Suite. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015;43:

839   W39–W49. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv416

840 64. Stringer AM, Currenti S, Bonocora RP, Baranowski C, Petrone BL, Palumbo MJ, et al.

841   Genome-Scale Analyses of Escherichia coli and Salmonella enterica AraC Reveal

842   Noncanonical Targets and an Expanded Core Regulon. J Bacteriol. 2014;196: 660–671.

843   doi:10.1128/jb.01007-13

844 65. Fitzgerald DM, Bonocora RP, Wade JT. Comprehensive Mapping of the Escherichia coli

845   Flagellar Regulatory Network. PLOS Genet. 2014;10: e1004649-. Available:

846   https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004649

847 66. McClure R, Balasubramanian D, Sun Y, Bobrovskyy M, Sumby P, Genco CA, et al.

848   Computational analysis of bacterial RNA-Seq data. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41: e140–

849   e140. doi:10.1093/nar/gkt444

850 67. Tjaden B. De novo assembly of bacterial transcriptomes from RNA-seq data. Genome Biol.

851   2015;16: 1. doi:10.1186/s13059-014-0572-2

852 68. Tjaden B. A computational system for identifying operons based on RNA-seq data.

853   Methods. 2020;176: 62–70. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymeth.2019.03.026

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7