Title: Dynamics and quantitative contribution of the aminoglycoside 6′-N-

acetyltransferase type Ib [AAC(6′)-Ib] to amikacin resistance

Authors: Ophélie d'Udekem d'Acoz[1], Fong Hue[2], Tianyi Ye[1], Louise Wang[1], Maxime

Leroux[1], Lucila Rajngewerc[2], Maria S. Ramirez[2], Walter Reisner[3], Marcelo E. Tolmasky[2]

and Rodrigo Reyes-Lamothe[1]

Affiliations: [1] Department of Biology, McGill University, 3649 Sir William Osler, Montréal,

Québec, H3G 0B1, Canada

[2] Center for Applied Biotechnology Studies, Department of Biological Science, California

State University Fullerton, Fullerton, California

[3] Department of Physics, McGill University, 3600 rue université, Montréal, Québec, H3A

2T8, Canada

Correspondence: rodrigo.reyes@mcgill.ca; mtolmasky@fullerton.edu

Running title: AAC(6′)-Ib impact per molecule on amikacin resistance

14
15

Abstract

Aminoglycosides are essential components in the available armamentarium to treat bacterial infections. The surge and rapid dissemination of resistance genes strongly reduce their efficiency, compromising public health. Among the multitude of modifying enzymes that confer resistance to aminoglycosides, the aminoglycoside acetyltransferase AAC(6′)-Ib is the most prevalent and relevant in the clinical setting as it can inactivate numerous aminoglycosides, such as amikacin. Although the mechanism of action, structure, and biochemical properties of the AAC(6′)-Ib protein have been extensively studied, the contribution of the intracellular milieu to its activity remains unclear. In this work, we combined a fluorescent-based system with CRISPR interference method to modulate and quantify the number of AAC(6′)-Ib per cell in *Escherichia coli*. These tools were then used to correlate enzyme concentrations with amikacin resistance levels. Our results show that resistance to amikacin increases linearly with a higher concentration of AAC(6′)-Ib until it reaches a plateau at a specific protein concentration. *In vivo* imaging of this protein shows that it diffuses freely within the cytoplasm of the cell, but it tends to form inclusion bodies at higher concentrations in rich culture media. Addition of a chelating agent completely dissolves these aggregates and partially prevents the plateau in the resistance level, suggesting that AAC(6′)-Ib aggregation lowers resistance to amikacin. These results provide the first step in understanding the cellular impact of each AAC(6′)-Ib molecule on aminoglycoside resistance. They also highlight the importance of studying its dynamic behavior within the cell.

Importance

Antibiotic resistance is a growing threat to human health. Understanding the mechanisms of antibiotic resistance can serve as foundation for developing innovative treatment strategies to counter this threat. While numerous studies clarified the genetics and dissemination of resistance genes and explored biochemical and structural features of resistance enzymes, their molecular dynamics and individual contribution to resistance within the cellular context remain unknown. Here, we examined this relationship modulating expression levels of AAC(6′)-Ib, an enzyme of clinical relevance. We show a linear correlation between copy number of the enzyme per cell and amikacin resistance levels up to a threshold where resistance plateaus. We propose that at concentrations below the threshold, the enzyme diffuses freely in the cytoplasm but aggregates at the cell poles at concentrations over the threshold. This research opens promising avenues for studying enzyme solubility's impact on resistance, creating opportunities for future approaches to counter resistance.

Introduction

The emergence and rapid dissemination of antibiotic resistance genes are among the biggest threats to global health (1, 2). Infections caused by antibiotic-resistant bacteria are rising in hospital and community settings. This growing trend is undermining treatment options and posing a significant risk to the success of medical and dental procedures that rely on preventing bacterial contamination (1). The current number of fatal infections due to resistance is estimated at hundreds of thousands per year, and the number could grow in the future (2). New drugs are urgently needed, but despite calls for action by diverse world organizations, the number of potential new drug candidates remains critically low (1-3). Two major therapeutic strategies have been proposed to deal with this crisis: (1) designing new antibiotics or (2) inhibitors of resistance that can be combined with existing antimicrobials (4). The success of these novel therapies depends on a detailed understanding of the different cellular and molecular mechanisms by which bacteria resist antibiotics (4).

Aminoglycosides are broad-spectrum antibiotics that interfere with normal protein synthesis by binding to the 16S rRNA. While not all classes of aminoglycosides bind to identical sites of the 16S rRNA, in all cases the A site (the ribosome's decoding center) undergoes a conformational change to one resembling the closed state, formed after interacting with the cognate tRNA and mRNA (5). Consequently, the proofreading capabilities of the ribosome are reduced or eliminated, resulting in high levels of mistranslation (6, 7). However, despite the remarkable advances in understanding the mechanism of action of aminoglycosides, there is still much to learn about the nature of

the translation errors generated by these drugs (8). Aminoglycosides have become less

popular after being broadly utilized for decades due to increased resistance and relatively

high toxicity. However, the requirement for effective medications and the need to develop

less harmful semisynthetic variations to overcome the most prevalent resistance

mechanisms have revitalized interest in their use (9, 10).

Amikacin, the most successful semisynthetic aminoglycoside (11), is refractory to

most aminoglycoside modifying enzymes, which through acetylation, phosphorylation, or

nucleotidylation, are the most common causes of resistance in clinical settings.

Unfortunately, amikacin is a substrate for aminoglycoside 6′-N-acetyltransferase type I

enzymes [AAC(6′)-I], which promote inactivation through acetylation at the 6' amine group

of the antibiotic (7, 11). Among *aac(6')-I* genes, *aac(6')-Ib* is the most clinically relevant,

being found in the vast majority of multiple aminoglycoside-resistant Gram-negative

isolates (12). The *aac(6')-Ib* gene is located within plasmids and chromosomes as part of

integrons, transposons, genomic islands, and other genetic structures that facilitate its

dissemination at the molecular and cellular level, reaching virtually all Gram-negative

bacteria (13). While considerable advances have been made in the understanding of the

dissemination mechanisms of *aac(6')-Ib* (7, 14, 15), structural characteristics of the

enzyme (16, 17), and its specificity properties (13, 18-20), multiple other aspects remain

to be elucidated.

A significant gap in our understanding of how AAC(6′)-Ib mediates resistance is its

intracellular dynamics. Previous studies have demonstrated that gene amplification is

correlated with higher expression of aminoglycoside modifying enzymes and increased

resistance levels (21-27). However, these studies rely on the number of gene copies

rather than the correlation between the measured number of protein molecules and

resistance levels. In this work, we describe the design of a fluorescence-based method

to accurately determine the number of molecules of AAC(6′)-Ib and a CRIPSPR

interference (CRISPRi) system to regulate the number of AAC(6′)-Ib molecules

synthesized. We observed a correlation between the quantity of AAC(6′)-Ib molecules and

amikacin resistance up to a threshold where adding additional AAC(6′)-Ib molecules

ceases to be associated with increased resistance. Live cell imaging showed that

AAC(6′)-Ib aggregates at the poles at higher concentrations, a process that may denature

and inactivate the excess molecules. Single molecule microscopy of the dynamics of

AAC(6′)-Ib in the cellular context showed that the enzyme freely diffuses in the cytoplasm,

not binding to any particular cellular structure. Our results provide a quantitative

understanding of the relationship between the number of enzyme molecules and

resistance levels. Furthermore, our findings suggest that the upper limit to amikacin

resistance arises due to protein aggregation at increased intracellular concentration.

Results

Mutant gRNAs mediate progressive regulation of AAC(6′)-Ib gene expression

To fine-tune AAC(6′)-Ib expression levels, we used CRISPRi. This method relies on a

catalytically dead variant of Cas9 (dCas9) that binds a specific DNA sequence but fails to

cleave it, producing a roadblock for transcriptional initiation or elongation (28). The level

of repression of *aac(6')-Ib* expression is maximum if the guide RNA (gRNA) and the

targeted DNA sequence are perfectly complementary. Therefore, introducing mismatches

in the gRNA reduces the repression strength (29, 30). We generated a library of gRNAs

that permitted the expression of different quantities of AAC(6′)-Ib molecules, which were

quantified using a derivative of the pJHCMW1 plasmid that carries the native *aac(6')-Ib*

gene fused to the gene coding for the mNeonGreen fluorescent protein (Fig. 1A) (31). We

introduced this plasmid into *E. coli* strains harboring an IPTG-inducible dCas9-coding

gene and a constitutive gRNA-coding gene (Fig. 1B). The gRNA molecules in each strain

were designed to target different *aac(6')-Ib* regions (the promoter, the coding sequence,

or the linker, the coding or non-coding strand), and to have various degrees of

complementarity to the target sequence (Fig. 1A and Fig. S1). The effect of each gRNA

on the AAC(6′)-Ib expression level was assessed by spectrofluorometry on overnight LB

cultures supplemented with IPTG. The number of AAC(6′)-Ib molecules per cell obtained

using this methodology was corroborated by confocal microscopy (Fig. S2-3). The results

confirmed that dCas9 blocks the initiation and elongation of transcription and that the

length of complementarity to the target sequence is correlated with the strength of

repression. Targeting either strand of the *aac(6')-Ib* promoter provides strong

transcriptional repression (Fig. 1C). Guiding dCas9 binding to the coding strand of the

structural gene or the linker results in robust inhibition of gene expression. Conversely,

repression is not as pronounced when targeting the non-coding strand (Fig. 1D and E).

Reduction of the length of complementarity to the coding strand was associated with a

decrease in the degree of inhibition of gene expression (Fig. 1D and E). The results

described in this section indicate that the fluorescence-fusion system is adequate to

assess the number of AAC(6′)-Ib molecules per cell, and the CRISPRi fluorescence-

based system is an efficient tool to modulate the AAC(6′)-Ib copy number, spanning three

orders of magnitude.

Figure 1 – Regulation of AAC(6′)-Ib copy number by CRISPRi. **A.** Schematic representation of the pJHCMW1 plasmid

and a zoomed view on the gene of interest, the aminoglycoside acetyltransferase AAC(6′)-Ib tagged with mNeonGreen

(mNG) under its native promoter. Boxes above the gene mark the regions targeted by the dCas9, which include the

promoter (Pro.), coding sequence (CDS), and linker. **B.** Schematic representation of the dCas9-coding gene under the

P_Llac promoter and the guide RNA (gRNA) with its constitutive promoter. **C.** Average AAC(6′)-Ib copy number per cell

obtained for strains harboring gRNAs with different complementarity to either the coding (cod.) or the non-coding strand

(non-cod.), varying lengths and targeting the promoter sequence, the CDS (**D.**) or the linker (**E.**) of the gene. Error bars

represent the standard deviation.

At low copy numbers, the abundance of AAC(6′)-Ib and the minimum inhibitory concentration of amikacin follow a linear relationship

We carried out microtiter plate-based assays to evaluate how variations in the cellular copy number of AAC(6′)-Ib impact amikacin-resistance levels. We determined the amikacin concentration needed to reduce the culture OD_{600} value by 50%, defined as the inhibitory concentration or IC_{50}. The native copy number of AAC(6′)-Ib in the strains used is ⁓92,000 molecules per cell, and the corresponding measured IC_{50} of amikacin was 135 µg/mL (Fig. 2A). Although such a high copy number is surprising, it is congruent with expression of the gene from 20-30 copies of the plasmid from a strong promoter (15, 31). Within a range spanning from none to about 10,000 AAC(6′)-Ib copies per cell, the IC_{50} value increased as a function of the copy number, with an apparent relation of 1 µg/mL resistance increase for every 170 AAC(6′)-Ib copies per cell (Fig. 2B). However, it was of interest that this correlation ceased at ⁓10,000 – 20,000 copies per cell when the resistance level hit a plateau at IC_{50} of amikacin of 105 µg/mL. This value was constant, up to ⁓70,000 copies per cell, where the IC_{50} increased again up to 135 µg/mL (Fig. 2A).

As a point of reference, the "epidemiological cut-off value," which is defined as the highest minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of the wild-type population, is reported to be 8 µg/mL for enterobacteria (http://www.eucast.org) (32). In our conditions, a concentration of 8 µg/mL is reached when the copy number of AAC(6′)-Ib per cell is ⁓475. While the conditions used to estimate this epidemiological cut-off value differ from those used in this work, we expect that the minimum copy number of the enzyme needed to be

173   classified as resistant to amikacin should at least be in the same order of magnitude as

174   our estimate.

Figure 2 – Impact per AAC(6′)-Ib enzyme molecule on amikacin resistance level. **A.** Correlation between the inhibitory concentration at which 50% of the maximal culture density is observed (IC_{50}) and AAC(6′)-Ib copy number per cell. The native resistance level of the wild-type plasmid and the epidemiological cut-off value are also indicated (https://www.eucast.org). Error bars represent standard deviations. **B.** Lower copy numbers follow a linear relation with IC_{50} to amikacin. The linear trendline equation and its corresponding R-squared value are shown. The green dot represents an outlier that is excluded from the trendline.

AAC(6′)-Ib forms aggregates at higher concentrations

To gain insight into the correlation between protein copy number and resistance level

described in the previous section, we further assessed the number of molecules per cell

using confocal microscopy. The results of these assays showed that both techniques,

spectrophotometry and microscopy, produced numbers per cell within the same order of

magnitude (Fig. S3). However, it was surprising to us that microscopy permitted us to

observe that the enzyme distributes homogeneously in the cytoplasm up to a specific

concentration, after which any increase tends to result in the formation of aggregates at

the cell poles (Fig. 3A). Low solubility and tendency to aggregate as inclusion bodies have

been observed before in a related variant (16).

The observed plateau in amikacin resistance may arise from AAC(6′)-Ib's inability to

exist in soluble and native form at copy numbers higher than 10,000 – 20,000. To test this

hypothesis, cells were cultured in broth supplemented with the chelating agent

ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA), a compound known for disrupting ionic

interactions and favoring solubilization of protein aggregates. Fig. 3A shows that the

fluorescent protein was homogeneously distributed over the cytoplasm in cells cultured

in the presence of EDTA. In addition, Fig. 3B shows that the addition of EDTA did not

modify the number of molecules per cell, a clear indication that the sole effect of EDTA

was to dissolve the polar aggregates. Furthermore, the amikacin IC_{50} for cells cultured in

broth supplemented with EDTA increased as the AAC(6′)-Ib copy number increased (Fig.

3C). A comparison of the amikacin resistance levels in cells producing a number of

molecules consistent with the formation of aggregates but that were cultured in the

presence of the chelator showed a 1.5-fold increase in resistance. We conclude that

aggregation of AAC(6′)-Ib must inhibit enzymatic activity and is, at least in part,

responsible for the observed plateau effect.

A.

Low concentration (~3300 copies/cell) High concentration (~92000 copies/cell) High concentration + 0.5mM EDTA

1 µm

B.

C.

D.

Figure 3 – Formation of AAC(6′)-Ib aggregates at high protein concentrations partially inhibit enzyme activity against

amikacin. **A.** Representative images of strains carrying the pJHCMW1 plasmid derivative that encodes the *aac(6′)-Ib-*

mNeonGreen gene and the CRISPR-dCas9 system that targets the coding sequence (CDS) of this gene, with a strong

repression on the left and no repression in the middle image. The rightmost image displays the wild-type strain in

presence of 0.5 mM EDTA (ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid). **B.** Average copy number per cell of AAC(6′)-Ib in the

presence or absence of 0.5 mM EDTA, measured by spectrofluorometry. Each strain carries different lengths of gRNA

complementarity to the CDS of the *aac(6′)-Ib* gene. Error bars represent the standard deviation. A statistical analysis

compared the two conditions (ns, not significant for p=0.05). **C.** Scatterplot showing the relationship between AAC(6′)-

Ib copy number per cell and IC_{50} to amikacin. The shaded area represents the standard deviation in IC_{50}. **D.** Distribution

of AAC(6′)-Ib copy number, estimated with the confocal microscope, for strains encoding different guide RNAs in the

presence or absence of 0.5 mM EDTA. Complementarity of the gRNA to the coding strand of the *aac(6′)-Ib* gene is

indicated for each strain.

Diversity of AAC(6′)-Ib expression profile per cell within a population

While estimations of protein expression per cell are reproducible, measurements

made with the fluorometer do not provide any information regarding the variability of gene

expression within a population. The confocal microscope, however, allows an estimation

of AAC(6′)-Ib copy number at the single-cell level, revealing potential cell-to-cell variation.

This is particularly important in the case of strains where the expression of AAC(6′)-Ib is

regulated by CRISPRi. If there was cell-to-cell variability in the levels of dCas9, the

individual cell's AAC(6′)-Ib copy numbers could be significantly different, which would

cloud the interpretation of our results. However, the results showed that AAC(6′)-Ib

expression is normally distributed in the cell population of individual strains (Fig. 3D and

Table S4). Also, cell-to-cell fluctuations in the protein concentration were similar to

changes at native expression levels. These results indicated that our CRISPRi system

has no impact on the intrinsic variations of AAC(6′)-Ib expression. Importantly, this

experiment also confirmed that the presence of EDTA in the cell's environment does not

modify the protein's copy number or cell-to-cell variability.

AAC(6′)-Ib diffuses freely in the cell

To further understand the dynamics of AAC(6′)-Ib within the cytosol, we characterized

its diffusion properties using single-particle tracking via Photoactivated Localization

Microscopy (sptPALM) (33). We used a fusion of AAC(6′)-Ib with the photoconvertible

fluorescent protein mMaple (34) and captured images at 20-ms rates. To study the

dynamics of single molecules, we exposed cells to continuous 405 nm light at low

intensity, conditions that result in the activation of a single molecule of mMaple per cell,

on average. The resulting images permitted us to track a molecule's position and follow

its trajectory (Fig. 4A). Tracked molecules of AAC(6′)-Ib covered all the cytosol, with no

location preference or obvious binding to any cellular structure. The average apparent

diffusion coefficient of AAC(6′)-Ib diffusing in the cell is the same as that of mMaple alone

(Fig. 4B). In conclusion, the results described in this section indicate that in the absence

of aggregation, AAC(6′)-Ib molecules diffuse freely across the cytosol.

A.

AAC(6')-Ib-mMaple

B.

250   Figure 4 – AAC(6')-Ib is highly dynamic in the cells. **A.** Representative images of AAC(6')-Ib-mMaple foci every 20 ms.

251   Tracks are represented on the rightmost image. Scale bar: 1μm. **B.** Distribution of the logarithm of the apparent diffusion

252   coefficient (D_{app}) for mMaple (left) and AAC(6')-Ib-mMaple (right). The y axis represents the probability density function

253   (PDF). The apparent diffusion coefficient of the diffusing fraction, taken from the exponential of the mu and sigma

254   obtained from the Gaussian distribution, and the total amount of tracks analyzed are indicated.

Discussion

The rapid dissemination of aminoglycoside modifying enzymes has severely reduced

the effectiveness of aminoglycosides. The acetyltransferase AAC(6′)-Ib is among the

most clinically relevant due to its ability to catalyze the inactivation of numerous

aminoglycosides used to treat severe infections. The substrates of AAC(6′)-Ib include

natural as well as semisynthetic aminoglycosides such as amikacin (7, 11, 13). The

aac(6′)-Ib gene, as well as the AAC(6′)-Ib protein, have been the subject of intense

genetic, structural, and biochemical studies (7, 13, 16, 17, 35, 36). However, despite

these advances, numerous unanswered questions remain; clarifying these is critical for

the rational design of novel therapies.

To reduce the knowledge gap, we studied the dynamics of the AAC(6′)-Ib protein

inside the cytosol to assess how its copy number variation impacts amikacin resistance.

To do so, we devised methodologies to quantify and control AAC(6′)-Ib copy number. A

fusion AAC(6′)-Ib-mNeonGreen enabled us to quantify the number of protein molecules

per cell using fluorometry and confocal microscopy. Then, we used a CRISPRi system to

produce strains that expressed a wide range of molecules per cell. These tools were used

to compare amikacin resistance levels in strains harboring different numbers of enzyme

molecules. We observed a close correlation between resistance levels and the number

of protein molecules at low concentrations. These results agree with previous reports that

the copy number of different resistance genes is amplified in mutants displaying increased

resistance (21-27). However, previous studies were limited to correlating the number of

gene copies, increased by amplification mechanisms or modification of plasmid copy

numbers and resistance levels. Absent in these reports are correlations of actual

expressed resistance enzyme molecules and resistance levels. This work now accurately

measured amikacin resistance as a function of AAC(6′)-Ib copy number.

Our results indicate that resistance levels reach a plateau at a certain level of AAC(6′)-

Ib concentration. The single-cell results obtained by microscopy showed that the AAC(6′)-

Ib molecules tend to aggregate and localize at the poles in structures resembling inclusion

bodies at higher concentrations. This observation, taken together with the well-known fact

that the protein has limited water solubility (16), explains, at least in part, the lack of

correlation between the AAC(6′)-Ib copy number and resistance levels at higher protein

concentrations. Physical exclusion of AAC(6′)-Ib, due to the formation of inclusion bodies,

can limit its accessibility to the antibiotic molecules. Adding EDTA to the growth medium

quantified the contribution of aggregate formation to the observed plateau in resistance

levels. The chelator's presence interfered with the formation of AAC(6′)-Ib aggregates and

was correlated with an increase in the amikacin IC_{50}. Not only do these results associate

aggregation with increased resistance, but they also suggest that the process is

structurally dynamic and reversible. This behavior will be essential to consider when

developing strategies to inhibit resistance. For example, antisense inhibition of AAC(6′)-

Ib expression, a methodology that attempts phenotypic conversion to susceptibility by

turning off gene expression, will need to be very efficient to reduce the number of proteins

produced well below the aggregation threshold.

Another potential contributor to the plateau observed is enzyme kinetics. The classic

expectation that the enzymatic reaction velocity increases linearly with enzyme

concentration is valid only when the substrate is present at much higher concentrations

than the enzyme. For amikacin resistance, substrates inside the cytosol may not saturate

the enzyme. The intracellular concentrations of acetyl-CoA, the acyl donor, have been

reported to be in the 20-600 µM range (37), which are comparable to those estimated for

AAC(6′)-Ib in strains producing high copy numbers (40-150 µM). Availability of acetyl-CoA

may limit the enzyme activity rate. Also, amikacin concentrations inside the cytosol are

likely lower than those in the growth medium (note that 125 µg/ml equals 160 µM). Hence,

the substrates/enzyme concentration ratios may also influence the resistance levels in

growing cells. While the enzyme solubility issue seems to affect our results, future

experiments must be planned to help understand the enzyme kinetics in the cytosol.

Adding to these complications, one must consider that different bacteria will have different

permeabilities to the antibiotic and could possess efflux pumps.

Our previous studies showed that unlike other resistance enzymes like β-lactamases

that are periplasmic (38), AAC(6′)-Ib is uniformly distributed within the cytoplasm (14, 39).

However, those experiments required overexpression of the enzyme, which could have

modified the subcellular location at physiological levels. The methodology used in this

work corroborated our early results and further illustrated the dynamics of AAC(6′)-Ib

inside the cytosol. The protein can traverse the length of the cell in ~100 ms.

In conclusion, this work makes inroads in understanding the individual contribution of

AAC(6′)-Ib molecules to resistance to aminoglycosides and clarifies its dynamics inside

the cell. Importantly, it opens the doors to understanding the role of solubility and

expression levels in the resistance phenotype. We expect that the system we devised will

help us better understand antibiotic resistance from cellular and molecular biology

perspectives.

Materials and methods

Strains and growth conditions

All strains used are derivatives of AB1157 (Table S1). Cells were routinely grown in LB or M9 minimal media. M9 was supplemented with glycerol (final concentration 0.2%); 100 µg/ml of amino acids threonine, leucine, proline, histidine, and arginine; and thiamine (0.5 µg/ml). When required, antibiotics were added at the following concentrations: ampicillin (100 µg/ml), kanamycin (50 µg/ml), and chloramphenicol (25 µg/ml). The TB25 strain was constructed by chromosomal integration of the P_{lacq}-$lacI$ P_{Llac-s}-$dCas9$ gene from the pTB35 plasmid at the lambda $attB$ site (40). Each gRNA was inserted into the pTB40-1 plasmid through site-directed mutagenesis that was carried out by uracil-specific excision reagent (USER) cloning (Table S2) (41). The different gRNAs were further integrated by lambda red in the $argE$ gene. OD030 was constructed using lambda red recombination with the pROD93 plasmid carrying the $mMaple$ gene, which was inserted into the $galK$ gene. The mNeonGreen gene was integrated into the pTT4 plasmid (15) to generate pTT4-mNG-wL, and the construction was subsequently sequenced by whole plasmid sequencing service of plasmidsaurus (www.plasmidsaurus.com). The pFH3 plasmid is a pTT4-mNG-wL derivative where the $mNeonGreen$ gene was replaced by $mMaple3$ by NcoI digestion and ligation. All primers used for these constructions are described in Table S3.

Protein expression and purification

Fluorescent proteins were produced using pROD93 expression vector in BL21(DE3)

strains. Cells were grown at 37°C until they reached an $OD_{600} \sim 0.6$. Protein expression

was then induced by adding 0.2% of L-arabinose and incubating the culture at 30°C. After

4 hours of induction, bacteria were centrifuged and the pellet was resuspended in

Resuspension Buffer (25 mM Tris HCl pH 7.5, 250 mM NaCl) supplemented with one

tablet of cOmplete protease inhibitor (Roche, Cat # 04693159001). Cells were then lyzed

using a high-pressure Emulsiflex C5 homogenizer (Avestin), and the lysate was cleared

by ultra-centrifugation (35 000 rpm, 1 hour, 4°C). The lysate was added to the Ni-IDA resin

(Takara, Cat # 635660) equilibrated with Binding Buffer (50 mM NaPi, 20 mM Imidazole,

300 mM NaCl, 10% glycerol, pH 8) and incubated for at least an hour at 4°C. The resin

was transferred to a disposable column and washed out at least 5 times with Binding

Buffer and twice with Binding Buffer that has a higher concentration of imidazole (40 mM).

Protein was eluted in Elution Buffer (50 mM NaPi, 200 mM Imidazole, 300 mM NaCl, 10%

glycerol, pH 8). The protein was then dialyzed in Slide-A-Lyzer MINI Dialysis Devices

immersed in the Storage Buffer (25 mM Tris HCl pH8, 300 mM NaCl, 10% glycerol) and

finally stored, protected from light, at -20°C.

Fluorometer calibration assay

For mNG fluorescence calibration, the purified protein stock was first diluted in M9

minimal media to a concentration of $2.5 \ 10^{-2}$ mg/mL and then diluted 1:2 for a total of 7

dilutions. 200µL of each concentration was distributed in a black microplate (Fisher, Cat

7200590), and the total intensity was measured with a Cary Eclipse Fluorescence

Spectrophotometer (Agilent Technologies) at 500 nm for excitation and 530 nm for

emission. The slits were set to 10 and 20 nm for excitation and emission, respectively.

After correcting for the background fluorescence of M9 minimal media, we could estimate

the average fluorescence intensity per mNG protein.

Fluorometer-based copy number quantification

The strains expressing the dCas9 with the different gRNAs and carrying the pTT4-

mNG-wL plasmid were first grown overnight in LB media in the presence of ampicillin and

1 mM IPTG at 37°C. The OD_{600} of the culture was measured, and 1 mL was washed in

M9 minimal media, from which 200 μL were distributed in a clear 96-well plate as

triplicates. Using the same parameters as in the fluoromoter calibration assay, the total

fluorescence was measured using the Cary Eclipse fluorometer. AAC(6′)-Ib copy number

could thus be estimated by dividing the measured intensity by the OD_{600}, correcting for

the fluorescence of the cells without the fluorescent plasmid and dividing by the average

fluorescence intensity per mNG molecule (4.92×10^{-12}, Fig. S2). This value was then

divided by the estimated bacterial count (5.22×10^8 CFU/OD_{600}/mL) to calculate the copy

number per cell.

Copy number estimation using the confocal microscope

Single-molecule mNG intensity was quantified using the YHZ23 strain that carries a

mNG-tagged Nup59, a well-characterized 16-mer component of the nucleopore complex

(NPC) in budding yeast. This strain was imaged using a custom-built spinning disk

confocal microscope (Leica DMi8 inverted microscope with Quorum Diskovery platform,

50 μm pinhole spinning disk and two iXon Ultra 512x512 EMCCD cameras). A single

colony was grown in synthetic complete (SC) media, with shaking, for 5 hours at 30°C.

This culture was diluted 100 times and cultured overnight in the same conditions before

being diluted again to an OD_{600} of 0.15 and incubated until it reached 0.3. 1mL of this

culture was spun down and concentrated twice in fresh SC media before being spread

on a 1% agarose pad. Imaging was performed by taking 10 z-stacks of 0.59μm step size

with 488 nm laser at 25% intensity and with a 200ms exposure time. Single spots were

identified manually throughout the z-stacks and were subsequently fitted to 2D Gaussian

with the GaussFit on Spot plugin in ImageJ. Using Matlab, the intensity values were fitted

to a Gaussian Mixture Model, resulting in two distinct components (Nup59 from single

and double NPCs). The mean of the first component, *i.e.,* in the single NPC, is the

intensity of 16 mNG molecules (mean intensity = 11374.4 and thus intensity of a single

mNG = 710.9).

As for the fluorometer-based quantification, bacterial cultures were incubated

overnight in LB media in the presence of ampicillin and 1 mM IPTG at 37°C. Imaging was

performed by taking 7 z-stacks of 0.59μm step size with 488 nm laser at 25% intensity

and with a 200ms exposure time. Stacked images were projected for analysis by

summing all pixel values at each position. Images were then segmented with Cellpose,

and the total intensity per cell was quantified using custom Fiji and Python scripts.

IC_{50} determination

Cells were first cultured overnight in LB medium in the presence of ampicillin and 1

mM IPTG. They were then diluted 1:10000 in fresh LB, and 5μL was added into each well

of a 96-well microtitre plate (Sarstedt, Cat # 82.1581.001) carrying 100μL LB of a series

of 2-fold dilutions of amikacin as well as 1mM IPTG. When desired, the LB media was

also supplemented with 0.5 mM EDTA. The plate was then incubated for 20 hours at

37°C. IC_{50} was defined as the lowest antibiotic concentration at which half of the bacterial

growth is inhibited.

Single molecule experiments and analysis

Overnight bacterial cultures were diluted in M9 minimal media supplemented with 1

mM IPTG and cultured until they reached early logarithmic phase (OD_{600} of 0.1-0.2). Cells

were then visualized with an inverted Olympus IX83 microscope at room temperature. A

Hamamatsu Orca-Flash 4.0 sCMOS camera was used for image capturing, and Z-stacks

were done using a NanoScanZ piezo by Prior Scientific. Excitation was performed with

an iChrome Multi-Laser Engine from Toptica Photonics, combined with a

405/488/561/640nm filter set (Chroma). We used a Single-line cellTIRF illuminator

(Olympus) for the experiments, and the Olympus CellSens 2.1 imaging software was

used to control the microscope and the lasers. All data analyses were performed using

custom MATLAB scripts (Mathworks), except for single molecule tracking that was done

using Trackmate (42, 43).

Acknowledgments

We thank Jia Yin Xiao for sharing microscope single-molecule calibration data. The Reyes

lab was funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada

(NSERC RGPIN-2019-05701), the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR PJT-

162247), the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI# 228994), and the Canada

Research Chairs program. The Tolmasky lab was funded by Public Health Service Grant

2R15AI047115-06 (National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, NIH) and the

Ramirez lab was funded by Public Health Service Grant SC3GM125556 (National

Institute of General Medical Sciences, NIH). Fong Hue was supported by grant MHRT

2T37MD001368 from the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities,

NIH. Some of the experiments used equipment from the Integrated Quantitative

Bioscience Initiative (IQBI), funded by CFI 9.

Author contributions: O.D.D.: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, and

Writing. F.H.: Formal analysis and Investigation, T.Y: Formal analysis and Investigation.

L.W.: Formal analysis and Investigation. M.L.: Formal analysis and Investigation. L.R.:

Formal analysis and Investigation. M.S.R.: Formal analysis and Investigation. W.R:

Conceptualization and Writing. M.E.T.: Conceptualization, Supervision, Funding

acquisition and Writing. R.R.-L.: Conceptualization, Supervision, Funding acquisition and

Writing.

Supplementary data

Figure S1 – dCas9 targets (Promoter, CDS and Linker on both the coding (cod.) and non-coding (non-cod.) strands) in the *aac(6')-Ib* gene on the pJHCMW1-derivative plasmid. The complementary sequence to the gRNA (green bar) is highlighted in green and the blue arrow represents the positions at which the mismatches in the sequence of the gRNA were introduced. The *aac(6')-Ib* START codon is indicated in red and the number of base pairs not included in this representation are indicated in parenthesis.

Figure S2 – Calibration curve between mNeonGreen intensity measured by spectrofluorometry (in arbitrary units, a.u.) and the number of mNeonGreen molecules. The equation of the linear trendline, as well as the correlation coefficient (R^2), are indicated on the plot.

Figure S3 – Confirmation of AAC(6′)-Ib copy number by confocal microscopy. **A.** mNeonGreen intensity per molecule,

estimated by imaging Nup59-mNeonGreen. The brown lines represent the Gaussian Mixture Model fitted to each

population. The one on the left represents the 16-mer Nup59 (mean intensity = 11374.4), and the second peak carries

32 Nup59 (mean intensity = 20988.6). This gives an average intensity of 710.9 per mNeonGreen molecule. In total, 93

spots are represented in this plot. **B.** AAC(6′)-Ib copy number estimated with the spectrofluorometer (blue bars) and

with the confocal microscope (green bars) for four strains, each carrying a different guide RNA. The length of the gRNA

that is complementary to the coding (cod.) strand, as well as the targeted region of the *aac(6′)-Ib* gene, are indicated.

Error bars represent the standard deviation and comparative statistical analysis was performed to compare the two

methods (ns, not significant, and *, significant for p=0.05).

 Table S1 - Strains used for this study.

Strain	Relevant genotype	Source
AB1157	*thr-1*, *araC14*, l*euB6*(Am), DE(*gpt-proA*)62, *lacY1*, *tsx33*, qsr'-0, *glnV44*(AS), *galK2*(Oc), LAM⁻, Rac-0, *hisG4*(Oc), *rfbC1*, *mgl-51*, *rpoS396*(Am), *rpsL31*(str^R), *kdgK51*, *xylA5*, mtl-1, *argE3*(Oc), *thi-1*	(44)
BL21(DE3)	*fhuA2* [lon] *ompT gal* [*dcm*] *ΔhsdS*	(45)
TB25	AB1157 derivative, P$_{lacq}$-*lacI* P$_{Llac-s}$-*dCas9 cat::ΔattB*	This work
FHcas1nc	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Prom (20bp cod.)::argE*	This work
FHcas1	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Prom (20bp non-cod.)::argE*	This work
FHcas2nc	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (20bp cod.)::argE*	This work
LW3	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (15bp cod.)::argE*	This work
TY1	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (14bp cod.)::argE*	This work
LW2	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (13bp cod.)::argE*	This work
LW1	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (12bp cod.)::argE*	This work

TY2	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (11bp cod.)::argE*	This work
TY3	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (10bp cod.)::argE*	This work
FHcas2	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-CDS (20bp non-cod.)::argE*	This work
FHcas3nc	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Linker (18bp cod.)::argE*	This work
TY4	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Linker (14bp cod.)::argE*	This work
TY5	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Linker (11bp cod.)::argE*	This work
TY6	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Linker (10bp cod.)::argE*	This work
LW4	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Linker (9bp cod.)::argE*	This work
FHcas3	TB25 derivative, *gRNA-Linker (15bp non-cod.)::argE*	This work
OD030	*P$_{Lac}$-mMaple kan::ΔgalK*	This work
YHZ23	*MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 LYS2 ura3Δ0 nup59-mNeonGreen-Nat*	This work

477   Table S2 – Plasmids used in this study.

Plasmid	Description	Source
pTT4	pJHCMW1 derivative containing 96 copies of *tetO* inserted into the *tnpA* gene.	(15)
pTT4-mNG-wL	pTT4 derivative carrying an *aac(6')-Ib-mNeonGreen* fusion.	This work
pFH3	pTT4 derivative carrying an *aac(6')-Ib-mMaple* fusion.	This work
pROD93	Plasmid containing the *mMaple* gene under a P_{Llac} promoter, with an R6K gamma origin and kanamycin resistance.	(33)
pTB35	Plasmid carrying the *dCas9* gene under P_{Llac} promoter with constitutive lac. Used for *attP* integration with chloramphenicol resistance.	(46)
pTB40-1	Plasmid expressing dnaX-targetting gRNA. R6K gamma *ori*.	This work

479 **Table S3 –** Primers used in this work. The guide RNA sequences are highlighted in green, while the mutated base pairs

480 are shown in blue. cod., coding, non-cod., non-coding, compl., complementary, CDS, coding sequence.

Primer	Sequence 5'-3'	Description
TB04	ACTAGTAUTATACCTAGGACTGAG	Fixed primer for gRNA mutagenesis on the pTB40-1 plasmid
FHcas1	ATACTAGUTGCTTCAATAATATTGAAAAGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 20bp compl. to non-cod. strand of promoter.
FHcas1nc	ATACTAGUCAGGGTTATTGTCTCATGAGGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 20bp compl. to cod. strand of promoter.
FHcas2	ATACTAGUCAACATTTCCAAACAAAGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 20bp compl. to non-cod. strand of CDS.
FHcas2nc	ATACTAGUTTGTGATGCCTAACTTTGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 20bp compl. to cod. strand of CDS.
FHcas3	ATACTAGUGCCATGGCTGGCTCCGCTGCGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 15bp compl. to non-cod. strand of linker.
FHcas3nc	ATACTAGUGACTGCGCCAGAACCAGCAGGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 18bp compl. to cod. strand of linker.
14bpFHcas2nc	ATACTAGUAACACTTGCCTAACTTTGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 14bp compl. to cod. strand of CDS.

11bpFHcas2nc	ATACTAGUAACACTACGCTAACTTTGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 11bp compl. to cod. strand of CDS.
10bpFHcas2nc	ATACTAGUAACACTACGGTAACTTTGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 10bp compl. to cod. strand of CDS.
14bpFHcas3nc	ATACTAGUCTGACGGCCAGAACCAGCAGGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 14bp compl. to cod. strand of linker.
11bpFHcas3nc	ATACTAGUCTGACGCGGAGAACCAGCAGGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 11bp compl. to cod. strand of linker.
10bpFHcas3nc	ATACTAGUCTGACGCGGTGAACCAGCAGGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 10bp compl. to cod. strand of linker.
12bpFHcas2nc	ATACTAGUAACACTACCCTAACTTTGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 12bp compl. to cod. strand of CDS.
13bpFHcas2nc	ATACTAGUAACACTAGCCTAACTTTGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 13bp compl. to cod. strand of CDS.
15bpFHcas2nc	ATACTAGUAACACATGCCTAACTTTGTTGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 15bp compl. to cod. strand of CDS.
9bpFHcas3nc	ATACTAGUCTGACGCGGTCAACCAGCAGGTTTTAGAGCTAGAAATAGCAAG	Primer for gRNA mutagenesis of the pTB40-1 plasmid. 9bp compl. to cod. strand of linker.
TB200	ATAAATACTGCATGAATATTGATACTATCATGACCAGAGGTGTGTCAACATTTCGCTAAGGATGATTTCTGG	Primer to insert each gRNA into *argE* gene by lambda red.

TB201	CGGATGCGGCGCGAGCGCCTT ATCCGGCCTACGTTTTAATGCCA GCATATCCTCCTTAGTTCCTATT CC	Primer to insert each gRNA into *argE* gene by lambda red.
mMapleNcoI_ F	TTTCCATGGCTGGCTCCGCTGC TGGTTC	Primer to clone *mMaple* into pTT4 by *Nco*I digestion.
mMapleNcoI_ R	TTTCCATGGTTACTTGTACAGCT CGTCCATGC	Primer to clone *mMaple* into pTT4 by *Nco*I digestion.
galK_insF	GTTTGCGCGCAGTCAGCGATAT CCATTTTCGCGAATCCGGAGTG TAAGAACGCCCAATACGCAAAC CG	Primer to insert *pLac-mMaple* into *galK* gene by lambda red.
galK_insR	CGGCTGACCATCGGGTGCCAG TGCGGGAGTTTCGTTCAGCACT GTCCTGCCTTATGAATATCCTCC TTAG	Primer to insert *pLac-mMaple* into *galK* gene by lambda red.

483 **Table S4 –** Number of repeats and total cell count for Figure 3.D

Strain	Treatment	Number of repeats	Total number of cells	Average copy number ± Standard deviation
TY4	/	3	2402.99 ± 852.69	1212
	EDTA	3	1681.9 ± 689.61	1492
TY1	/	3	5193.5 ± 1673.95	1673
	EDTA	3	4299.94 ± 1375.28	1365
FHcas2	/	3	21798.56 ± 6187.83	1633
	EDTA	3	16461.43 ± 4888.06	639
TB25	/	3	68815.57 ± 15122.08	1900
	EDTA	3	67141.91 ± 21968.79	873

References

1.   Boucher HW. 2020. Bad bugs, no drugs 2002-2020: progress, challenges, and call to action.
Trans Am Clin Climatol Assoc 131:65-71.

2.   Murray C, Ikuta K, Sharara F, Swetschinski L, Aguilar G, Gray A, Han C, Bisignano C, Rao P,
Wool E, Johnson S, Browne A, Chipeta M, Fell F, Hcket S, al e. 2022. Global burden of
bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. Lancet 399:629-655.

3.   Butler MS, Gigante V, Sati H, Paulin S, Al-Sulaiman L, Rex JH, Fernandes P, Arias CA, Paul
M, Thwaites GE, Czaplewski L, Alm RA, Lienhardt C, Spigelman M, Silver LL, Ohmagari N,
Kozlov R, Harbarth S, Beyer P. 2022. Analysis of the clinical pipeline of treatments for drug-
resistant bacterial infections: despite progress, more action Is needed. Antimicrob Agents
Chemother 66:e0199121.

4.   Tolmasky ME. 2017. Strategies to prolong the useful life of existing antibiotics and help
overcoming the antibiotic resistance crisis, p 1-27. *In* Atta-ur-Rhaman (ed), Frontiers in
Clinical Drug Research-Anti Infectives, vol 1. Bentham Books, Sharjah, UAE.

5.   Kaul M, Barbieri CM, Pilch DS. 2004. Fluorescence-based approach for detecting and
characterizing antibiotic-induced conformational changes in ribosomal RNA: comparing
aminoglycoside binding to prokaryotic and eukaryotic ribosomal RNA sequences. J Am
Chem Soc 126:3447-53.

6.   Krause KM, Serio AW, Kane TR, Connolly LE. 2016. Aminoglycosides: an overview. Cold
Spring Harb Perspect Med 6:a027029.

7.   Ramirez MS, Tolmasky ME. 2010. Aminoglycoside modifying enzymes. Drug Resist Updat
13:151-71.

8.   Wohlgemuth I, Garofalo R, Samatova E, Gunenc AN, Lenz C, Urlaub H, Rodnina MV. 2021.
Translation error clusters induced by aminoglycoside antibiotics. Nat Commun 12:1830.

9.   Bottger EC, Crich D. 2020. Aminoglycosides: time for the resurrection of a neglected class
of antibacterials? ACS Infect Dis 6:168-172.

10. Houghton JL, Green KD, Chen W, Garneau-Tsodikova S. 2010. The future of
aminoglycosides: the end or renaissance? Chembiochem 11:880-902.

11. Ramirez MS, Tolmasky ME. 2017. Amikacin: uses, resistance, and prospects for inhibition.
Molecules 22.

12. Vakulenko SB, Mobashery S. 2003. Versatility of aminoglycosides and prospects for their
future. Clin Microbiol Rev 16:430-50.

13. Ramirez MS, Nikolaidis N, Tolmasky ME. 2013. Rise and dissemination of aminoglycoside
resistance: the *aac(6')-Ib* paradigm. Front Microbiol 4:121.

14. Tolmasky ME. 2007. Aminoglycoside-modifying enzymes: characteristics, localization, and
dissemination., p 35-52. *In* Tolmasky ME, Bonomo RA (ed), Enzyme-Mediated Resistance

to Antibiotics: Mechanisms, Dissemination, and Prospects for Inhibition. ASM Press,
Washington, DC.

15.   Reyes-Lamothe R, Tran T, Meas D, Lee L, Li AM, Sherratt DJ, Tolmasky ME. 2014. High-copy
524   bacterial plasmids diffuse in the nucleoid-free space, replicate stochastically and are
525   randomly partitioned at cell division. Nucleic Acids Res 42:1042-51.

526   16.   Maurice F, Broutin I, Podglajen I, Benas P, Collatz E, Dardel F. 2008. Enzyme structural
527   plasticity and the emergence of broad-spectrum antibiotic resistance. EMBO Rep 9:344-
528   9.

529   17.   Vetting MW, Park CH, Hegde SS, Jacoby GA, Hooper DC, Blanchard JS. 2008. Mechanistic
530   and structural analysis of aminoglycoside *N*-acetyltransferase AAC(6')-Ib and its
531   bifunctional, fluoroquinolone-active AAC(6')-Ib-cr variant. Biochemistry 47:9825-35.

532   18.   Chavideh R, Sholly S, Panaite D, Tolmasky ME. 1999. Effects of F171 mutations in the 6'-N-
533   acetyltransferase type Ib [AAC(6')-Ib] enzyme on susceptibility to aminoglycosides.
534   Antimicrob Agents Chemother 43:2811-2.

535   19.   Panaite DM, Tolmasky ME. 1998. Characterization of mutants of the 6'-*N*-acetyltransferase
536   encoded by the multiresistance transposon Tn*1331*: effect of Phen171-to-Leu171 and
537   Tyr80-to-Cys80 substitutions. Plasmid 39:123-33.

538   20.   Shmara A, Weinsetel N, Dery KJ, Chavideh R, Tolmasky ME. 2001. Systematic analysis of a
539   conserved region of the aminoglycoside 6'-*N*-acetyltransferase type Ib. Antimicrob Agents
540   Chemother 45:3287-92.

541   21.   Cook LC, Dunny GM. 2013. Effects of biofilm growth on plasmid copy number and
542   expression of antibiotic resistance genes in *Enterococcus faecalis*. Antimicrob Agents
543   Chemother 57:1850-6.

544   22.   Sandegren L, Andersson DI. 2009. Bacterial gene amplification: implications for the
545   evolution of antibiotic resistance. Nat Rev Microbiol 7:578-88.

546   23.   Tolmasky ME, Chamorro RM, Crosa JH, Marini PM. 1988. Transposon-mediated amikacin
547   resistance in *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 32:1416-20.

548   24.   Edlund T, Normark S. 1981. Recombination between short DNA homologies causes
549   tandem duplication. Nature 292:269-71.

550   25.   Nordstrom K, Ingram LC, Lundback A. 1972. Mutations in R factors of *Escherichia coli*
551   causing an increased number of R-factor copies per chromosome. J Bacteriol 110:562-9.

552   26.   Peterson BC, Rownd RH. 1985. Drug resistance gene amplification of plasmid NR1
553   derivatives with various amounts of resistance determinant DNA. J Bacteriol 161:1042-8.

554   27.   Roth JR. 2011. The joys and terrors of fast adaptation: new findings elucidate antibiotic
555   resistance and natural selection. Mol Microbiol 79:279-82.

556   28.   Qi LS, Larson MH, Gilbert LA, Doudna JA, Weissman JS, Arkin AP, Lim WA. 2013.
557   Repurposing CRISPR as an RNA-guided platform for sequence-specific control of gene
558   expression. Cell 152:1173-83.

29. Bikard D, Jiang W, Samai P, Hochschild A, Zhang F, Marraffini LA. 2013. Programmable
repression and activation of bacterial gene expression using an engineered CRISPR-Cas
system. Nucleic Acids Res 41:7429-37.

30. Vigouroux A, Oldewurtel E, Cui L, Bikard D, van Teeffelen S. 2018. Tuning dCas9's ability to
block transcription enables robust, noiseless knockdown of bacterial genes. Mol Syst Biol
14:e7899.

31. Sarno R, McGillivary G, Sherratt DJ, Actis LA, Tolmasky ME. 2002. Complete nucleotide
sequence of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* multiresistance plasmid pJHCMW1. Antimicrob
Agents Chemother 46:3422-7.

32. EuropeanCommitteeonAntimicrobialSusceptibilityTesting. 2023.   Breakpoint tables for
interpretation of MICs and zone diameters, Version 13.1. https://www.eucast.org.
Accessed

33. Beattie TR, Kapadia N, Nicolas E, Uphoff S, Wollman AJ, Leake MC, Reyes-Lamothe R. 2017.
Frequent exchange of the DNA polymerase during bacterial chromosome replication. Elife
6:e21763.

34. McEvoy AL, Hoi H, Bates M, Platonova E, Cranfill PJ, Baird MA, Davidson MW, Ewers H,
Liphardt J, Campbell RE. 2012. mMaple: a photoconvertible fluorescent protein for use in
multiple imaging modalities. PLoS One 7:e51314.

35. Soler Bistue AJ, Martin FA, Petroni A, Faccone D, Galas M, Tolmasky ME, Zorreguieta A.
2006. *Vibrio cholerae* InV117, a class 1 integron harboring *aac(6')-Ib* and *bla*CTX-M-2, is
linked to transposition genes. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 50:1903-7.

36. Tolmasky ME. 1990. Sequencing and expression of *aadA*, *bla*, and *tnpR* from the
multiresistance transposon Tn*1331*. Plasmid 24:218-26.

37. Takamura Y, Nomura G. 1988. Changes in the intracellular concentration of acetyl-CoA and
malonyl-CoA in relation to the carbon and energy metabolism of E*scherichia coli* K12. J
Gen Microbiol 134:2249-53.

38. Minsky A, Summers RG, Knowles JR. 1986. Secretion of beta-lactamase into the periplasm
of *Escherichia coli*: evidence for a distinct release step associated with a conformational
change. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 83:4180-4.

39. Dery KJ, Soballe B, Witherspoon MS, Bui D, Koch R, Sherratt DJ, Tolmasky ME. 2003. The
aminoglycoside 6'-*N*-acetyltransferase type Ib encoded by Tn*1331* is evenly distributed
within the cell's cytoplasm. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 47:2897-902.

40. Diederich L, Rasmussen LJ, Messer W. 1992. New cloning vectors for integration in the
lambda attachment site *attB* of the *Escherichia coli* chromosome. Plasmid 28:14-24.

41. Geu-Flores F, Nour-Eldin HH, Nielsen MT, Halkier BA. 2007. USER fusion: a rapid and
efficient method for simultaneous fusion and cloning of multiple PCR products. Nucleic
Acids Res 35:e55.

42. Tinevez JY, Perry N, Schindelin J, Hoopes GM, Reynolds GD, Laplantine E, Bednarek SY,
Shorte SL, Eliceiri KW. 2017. TrackMate: An open and extensible platform for single-
particle tracking. Methods 115:80-90.

43. Uphoff S, Reyes-Lamothe R, Garza de Leon F, Sherratt DJ, Kapanidis AN. 2013. Single-
molecule DNA repair in live bacteria. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110:8063-8.

44. Dewitt SK, Adelberg EA. 1962. The occurrence of a genetic transposition in a strain of
Escherichia coli. Genetics 47:577-85.

45. Wood WB. 1966. Host specificity of DNA produced by *Escherichia coli*: bacterial mutations
affecting the restriction and modification of DNA. J Mol Biol 16:118-33.

46. Soubry N, Wang A, Reyes-Lamothe R. 2019. Replisome activity slowdown after exposure
to ultraviolet light in Escherichia coli. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 116:11747-11753.