Control of Biofilm Formation by an *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* Pterin-Binding Periplasmic Protein Conserved Among Pathogenic Bacteria

Jennifer L. Greenwich[a], Justin L. Eagan[a], Nathan Feirer[a], Kaleb Boswinkle[b], George Minasov[c,d], Ludmilla Shuvalova[e], Nicole L. Inniss[c,d], Jakka Raghavaiah[f], Arun K. Ghosh[f], Karla J.F. Satchell[c,d], Kylie D. Allen[b] and Clay Fuqua[a]*

[a]Department of Biology
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405 USA

[b]Department of Biochemistry
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061 USA

[c]Department of Microbiology-Immunology
Feinberg School of Medicine
Northwestern University
Chicago, IL 60611 USA

[d]Center for Structural Biology of Infectious Diseases
Feinberg School of Medicine
Northwestern University
Chicago, IL 60611 USA

[e]Department of Pharmacology
Feinberg School of Medicine
Northwestern University
Chicago, IL 60611 USA

[f]Departments of Chemistry and Medicinal Chemistry

Purdue University

West Lafayette, IN 47907 USA

[*]Clay Fuqua

E-mail: cfuqua@indiana.edu

Current addresses: J.L.E., Medical Microbiology and Immunology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706; N.F., Promega Corp., Madison, WI, 53711

Author contributions: J.L.G, J.L.E., K.D.A. and C.F. designed the study; J.L.G., J.L.E., N.F., and K.B. performed the genetic and microbiological experiments, and J.L.G., K.B. and K.D.A. performed biochemical analysis of pterins and pterin-binding. L.S. and G.M. performed crystallization and structural determination. J.R. and A.K.G. developed and implemented a new pterin synthesis method. J.L.G., K.D.A., N.L.I., G.M. K.J.S.F. and C.F wrote the manuscript with input from all authors. C.F. supervised the entire study.

Competing Interest Statement: K.J.F.S. has a significant interest in Situ Biosciences, a contract research organization that conducts research unrelated to this study. All other authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in study design, data collection, and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Classification: Biological Sciences/Microbiology

Keywords: Biofilm, regulation, pterin, cyclic diguanylate monophosphate, protein structure

This PDF file contains: Main text (6766 words), Figures 1-7, Supplementary Information

1 ABSTRACT

Biofilm formation and surface attachment in multiple Alphaproteobacteria is driven by

unipolar polysaccharide (UPP) adhesins. The pathogen *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*

produces a UPP adhesin, which is regulated by the intracellular second messenger

cyclic diguanylate monophosphate (cdGMP). Prior studies revealed that DcpA, a

diguanylate cyclase-phosphodiesterase (DGC-PDE), is crucial in control of UPP

production and surface attachment. DcpA is regulated by PruR, a protein with distant

similarity to enzymatic domains known to coordinate the molybdopterin cofactor

(MoCo). Pterins are bicyclic nitrogen-rich compounds, several of which are formed via a

non-essential branch of the folate biosynthesis pathway, distinct from MoCo. The pterin-

binding protein PruR controls DcpA activity, fostering cdGMP breakdown and

dampening its synthesis. Pterins are excreted and we report here that PruR associates

with these metabolites in the periplasm, promoting interaction with the DcpA periplasmic

domain. The pteridine reductase PruA, which reduces specific dihydro-pterin molecules

to their tetrahydro forms, imparts control over DcpA activity through PruR.

Tetrahydromonapterin preferentially associates with PruR relative to other related

pterins, and the PruR-DcpA interaction is decreased in a *pruA* mutant. PruR and DcpA

are encoded in an operon that is conserved amongst multiple Proteobacteria including

mammalian pathogens. Crystal structures reveal that PruR and several orthologs adopt

a conserved fold, with a pterin-specific binding cleft that coordinates the bicyclic pterin

ring. These findings define a new pterin-responsive regulatory mechanism that controls

biofilm formation and related cdGMP-dependent phenotypes in *A. tumefaciens* and is

found in multiple additional bacterial pathogens.

SIGNIFICANCE

Biofilms are bacterial communities attached to surfaces, physiologically distinct

from free-living cells, and a common cause of persistent infections. Here we define the

mechanism of a novel biofilm regulatory system based on excreted metabolites called

pterins, that is conserved within a wide range of Gram-negative bacteria, including

multiple pathogens of animals and plants. The molecular mechanism of pterin-

dependent regulation is reported including structural determination of several members

of a new family of pterin-binding proteins. Pterins are produced across all domains of

life and mechanistic insights into this regulatory circuit could lead to new advances in

antibiofilm treatments.

INTRODUCTION

The regulation of bacterial attachment to surfaces plays a critical role in the formation of biofilms and can dictate their maturation. Biofilms are surface-associated microbial assemblages that are common among bacteria, and result in dramatic physiological changes including substantial tolerance towards antibiotic treatment (1, 2). Biofilms represent a major challenge for the treatment of bacterial infections as these multicellular structures are recalcitrant to standard therapies and act as protective reservoirs for pathogenic bacteria. Production of bacterial surface structures known as adhesins drive stable attachment of bacteria to surfaces, the first step in biofilm formation (3). Regulation of adhesin elaboration and activity thus can influence where and how biofilm formation occurs. In many bacteria the transition from a free-living to a sessile mode of growth is under the regulatory control of the cytoplasmic second messenger cyclic diguanylate monophosphate (cdGMP). Increasing levels of cdGMP often promote attachment and biofilm formation through production of adhesive proteins and polysaccharides that drive the attachment process (4). Synthesis of cdGMP is catalyzed by diguanylate cyclases (DGCs) and its turnover is driven by phosphodiesterases (PDEs). Single bacterial taxa can have multiple DGCs and PDEs that influence the cdGMP pool, and multi-domain proteins with dual DGC and PDE activities are not uncommon. Environmentally responsive modulation of cdGMP pools is mediated through control of gene expression and through allosteric regulation of these enzymes, many of which have sensory input modules. The flux of this second messenger in cells reflects the combined output of these synthesis and degradation activities (5).

The facultative plant pathogen, *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*, utilizes secreted

polysaccharides to stably attach to biotic and abiotic surfaces, most prominently

cellulose and a polar adhesin known as the u̲ni̲p̲olar p̲olysaccharide (UPP) (6). *A.*

tumefaciens is the causative agent of crown gall, a plant neoplastic disease that results

from bacteria-to-plant horizontal gene transfer (7). Attaching to plant tissue is a requisite

step in the virulence pathway of *A. tumefaciens*, but pathogenesis also involves

additional plant-produced-signals to activate virulence (8). Production of the UPP, as

well as cellulose, is under complex environmental control through cdGMP (9, 10). *A.*

tumefaciens encodes close to 30 proteins with predicted DGC domains and only two

solo PDE enzymes, but multiple proteins with predicted DGC domains also have PDE

domains (6).

In our prior studies, we identified the DcpA protein, with both canonical DGC and

PDE domains (9). DcpA has DGC and PDE activity *in vivo*, and genetic evidence

suggests that both domains are functional. However, under standard laboratory

conditions, DcpA is predominantly a PDE, maintaining low cdGMP levels and thereby

limiting surface attachment. The N-terminal portion of DcpA has two transmembrane

domains that flank an ~140 aa periplasmic domain of unknown function. Our prior

findings identified several other regulatory components critical for maintaining DcpA as

a PDE. These additional regulators include the PruA pteridine reductase, which reduces

specific 7,8-dihydropterins to their 5,6,7,8-tetrahydro forms, and PruR, a putative pterin-

binding protein (9, 11). Both of these proteins are required to regulate the enzymatic

activity of DcpA, and null mutants for *pruA* and *pruR* similarly lead to elevated cdGMP

and aberrant activation of surface adhesion. The *pruR* gene is transcriptionally coupled

with *dcpA* in a two gene operon, consistent with their related functions.

Pterins are characterized by a nitrogen-rich, bicyclic ring structure with side

chains of varying length and modifications extending from the ring carbon at the sixth

position (12). Well known biomolecules with a pterin ring include the folates in which the

side chain is composed of a para-amino benzoic acid group conjugated to a glutamic

acid residue (or poly-glutamate). Folate derivatives are required as cofactors for multiple

aspects of one-carbon metabolism, and folate is essential in most organisms (13). More

broadly, diverse pterin derivatives are found in all domains of life, and in bacteria are

known to act as enzymatic cofactors. Molybdopterin cofactor (MoCo) is a complex

molybdenum-containing derivative used by various organisms as a prosthetic group to

catalyze redox reactions. MoCo is synthesized from GTP via a pathway independent

from folate biosynthesis (14). Biopterin and monapterin are pterins with hydroxylated 3

carbon side chains that function with cytoplasmic amino acid hydroxylases, but

curiously the dominant fraction of pterins is detected outside of cells (15). Pterins can

exist in a fully oxidized state as well as the reduced 7,8-dihydro and 5,6,7,8-tetrahydro

states, the latter of which serves as the biologically active form of the respective

cofactor. In *A. tumefaciens,* PruA catalyzes the NADPH-dependent reduction of H_2MPt

to H_4MPt (11). Extracts of *A. tumefaciens* contain a methylated derivative of H_4MPt (2′-

O-methylmonapterin) but this is undetectable in *pruA* deletion mutants and in mutants

expressing a catalytically inactive PruA protein (9). Mutations that interfere with PruA

activity result in high level DGC activity from DcpA, driving elevated UPP-dependent

adhesion.

The regulation of DcpA by PruA is indirect and requires PruR, but the

mechanistic basis for this was undefined (9)(Fig. S1A). PruR shares distant amino acid

sequence similarity with the SUOX family of proteins, defined by sulfite oxidases and

related enzymes, including YedY from *Escherichia coli* (16). SUOX proteins have

domains that associate with MoCo to facilitate their enzymatic activities and have a

conserved cysteine residue that coordinates the molybdenum atom in MoCo. There is

no cysteine at this position in PruR and the protein has no predicted enzymatic activity

(9, 17). Rather, we hypothesize that PruR is a pterin-binding protein functioning with

non-MoCo pterin derivatives. Here we report on the pterin-response mechanism, the

structure of PruR, its control of DcpA, and conservation of this system in multiple

bacterial pathogens.

RESULTS

PruR regulates DcpA and binds to pterin ligands *in vitro*

The impact of elevated cdGMP on UPP and cellulose production can be

qualitatively observed by cultivating *A. tumefaciens* derivatives on solid medium

supplemented with the azo-dye Congo Red – increased red pigmentation of colonies

(the elevated Congo Red or ECR phenotype) is indicative of increased polysaccharide

production (10). The ECR phenotype is also predictive for increased surface adhesion

via the UPP. The *pruR* gene (ATU_RS16195) is encoded in an operon 9 bp immediately

upstream of *dcpA* (ATU_RS16200). Our previous studies revealed that a precise in-

frame deletion of the entire *pruR* coding sequence leads to a *dcpA*-dependent ECR

phenotype and increased biofilm formation via elevated UPP production (9). We

constructed a new deletion mutant, preserving potential translational coupling with

dcpA, while deleting most of the *pruR* gene. This new Δ*pruR* mutant exhibited a

pronounced ECR phenotype and increased biofilm formation, and in contrast to our

prior Δ*pruR* mutant, which impacted downstream *dcpA* expression (9), was well

complemented with ectopic expression of *pruR* alone (Fig. S1B, S1C).

PruR was purified from *E. coli* to examine pterin binding *in vitro*. A restricted set

of pterins are available commercially, and the tetrahydro forms are quite susceptible to

oxidation. We synthesized an optically active H_2MPt from L-xylose by following a related

reported procedure (18) and obtained dihydroneopterin (H_2NPt), dihydrofolate (H_2F) and

tetrahydrofolate (H_4F) from commercial sources. Our prior studies established that the

A. tumefaciens pteridine reductase PruA reduces H_2MPt and H_2NPt (11). An enzyme-

coupled binding assay was developed to actively convert the dihydropterins to their

tetrahydro derivatives (Fig. 1A), in which purified pteridine reductase PruA (His_6-PruA)

was incubated with the dihydropterin substrates and NADPH and in the presence of

purified non-tagged PruR under anaerobic conditions. Extracted pterins bound to PruR

were oxidized and measured by HPLC separation by fluorescence measurement (folate

was detected by UV) (Fig. S2). PruR associated with H_2MPt at detectable levels but

bound considerably more of the pterin in the PruA-coupled reaction, indicating

increased affinity for the fully reduced H_4MPt (Fig. 1B *p*-value <0.05 compared to all

other pterins). PruR also weakly associated with the neopterin derivatives but did not

show a statistically significant preference for H_4NPt compared to H_2NPt. PruR bound

even less well to H_2F, with no preference for H_4F; both folate compounds were bound

significantly less well than H_4MPt and H_4NPt.

PruR actively modulates the DGC and PDE activity of DcpA

The *in vivo* phenotypes of several *dcpA* point mutants suggested that it has both

DGC and PDE activity, but that the PDE activity is dominant in planktonic laboratory

culture (9, 10). Enzymatic assays of the purified DcpA cytoplasmic domain (res. 190-

644, see Methods) revealed that the protein has both activities (Fig. S3), although the

DGC activity is weaker (0.26 A_{360} units $min^{-1}mol^{-1}$) compared to PDE activity (15.7 A_{360}

units min^{-1} mol^{-1}). However, it was unclear whether the PruR-dependent PDE-dominant

activity of DcpA *in vivo* reflects PruR stimulation of the PDE activity, the inhibition of

DGC activity, or both.

Ectopic expression of *dcpA* alone in *E. coli*, in the absence of *pruR*, resulted in

high level cdGMP synthesis and mutation of the DGC catalytic motif (GGDEF>GGDAF;

E308A) abolished this cdGMP increase, suggesting that PruR is required for dominant

PDE activity (9). Plasmid-borne expression of wild type *dcpA* complements the elevated

biofilm formation of *the* Δ*dcpA* mutant to normal levels. By contrast, the Δ*pruR*Δ*dcpA*

mutant harboring this plasmid exhibits a dramatic increase in biofilm formation relative

to wild type, and higher than the single *dcpA* mutant (Fig. 1C), consistent with the

increased cdGMP caused by *dcpA* ectopic expression in a *pruR* null mutant (9).

Expression of the DGC⁻(PDE⁺) DcpA$_{E308A}$ allele in the Δ*dcpA* mutant decreases biofilm

formation to wild type levels. However, this allele fails to cause this decrease in the

Δ*pruR*Δ*dcpA* mutant, suggesting that PDE activity is under PruR control. Ectopic

expression of *dcpA* in wild type does not significantly diminish biofilm formation (likely

due to cdGMP production by other DGCs) (9).

In the absence of PruR, the PDE activity of DcpA is not increased by ectopic

173 expression of DcpA. Mutation of *dcpA* to abolish DcpA PDE activity (EAL>EEL; E431A;

174 PDE⁻DGC⁺) resulted in striking stimulation of biofilm formation when this mutant is

175 ectopically expressed in the Δ*dcpA* mutant (Fig. 1C). However, expression of the

176 DcpA$_{E431A}$ allele in the Δ*pruR*Δ*dcpA* mutant imparts even more dramatic biofilm

177 stimulation, suggesting that PruR dampens DGC activity in addition to stimulating PDE

178 activity, and its effects on these two activities are genetically separable. Ectopically

179 expressing an allele mutated for both domains (DGC⁻PDE⁻, E308A E431A,) does not

180 strongly impact biofilm formation in either the Δ*dcpA* or the Δ*pruR*Δ*dcpA* mutant but

181 shows a slight increase in the *pruR-dcpA* double mutant relative to the Δ*dcpA* mutant.

183 **PruR is secreted and active in the periplasm**

184  Sequence analysis suggests that the PruR protein has an N-terminal secretion

185 signal (aa 1-22, Signal-P score 0.31, Fig. 2A). Given our hypothesis that PruR is a

186 pterin-binding protein, this prediction is surprising, as the only established function of

187 bacterial pterins is to serve as cofactors for amino acid hydroxylases, which are

188 cytoplasmic enzymes (15). To experimentally evaluate whether PruR is secreted to the

189 periplasm *in vivo*, we first tested this genetically by fusing it to *phoA*, encoding the

190 enzyme alkaline phosphatase (AP) that requires localization to the periplasm for activity

191 (19). Plasmid-borne, ectopic expression of the *pruR-phoA* fusion in *A. tumefaciens* led

192 to detectable AP activity in whole cells, above the very low levels of the same strain with

193 no *phoA* (Fig. S4A). Furthermore, fusion of only the *pruR* signal sequence (res. 1-22)

194 with *phoA* (*pruR*ss-*phoA*) similarly expressed from the same plasmid resulted in much

195 stronger AP activity. Neither construct was affected by expression in the Δ*pruR* null

mutant. It is likely that the full length PruR-PhoA fusion partially diminishes AP activity.

The periplasmic localization of PruR was tested directly by fractionating *A.*

tumefaciens cells from wild type and several derivatives into periplasmic and

cytoplasmic fractions using an osmotic shock protocol and probing western blots with a

polyclonal antibody preparation raised against PruR (α–PruR). Wild type cells clearly

revealed a protein the size of the processed from of PruR (146 aa, predicted 16.1 kDa)

in the periplasmic fraction, whereas a $\Delta pruR$ mutant lacked this protein (Fig. 2B).

Ectopic expression of a plasmid-borne copy of *pruR* expressed from P_{lac} in the $\Delta pruR$

mutant revealed an IPTG-inducible PruR protein in the periplasmic fraction. In contrast

the same expression construct deleted for the *pruR* signal sequence ($\Delta_{ss}pruR$) results

in PruR that remains in the cytoplasmic fraction.

Complementation of a $\Delta pruR$ mutant (the mutation which is partially polar on

dcpA) with a plasmid expressing *pruR* and *dcpA* rescues this mutant to normal levels of

surface attachment (Fig. 2C). However, expression of the same plasmid expressing the

$\Delta_{ss}pruR$ allele and *dcpA* failed to rescue these phenotypes (Fig. 2C). The even greater

surface adherence observed with the (P_{lac}-$\Delta_{ss}pruR$-*dcpA*) plasmid was most likely due

to its additional copy of *dcpA*.

Although PruR has a match for an N-terminal signal sequence there was an even

stronger match identified for a lipidation site in the signal sequence predicted at the

cysteine 19 (C19, Signal-P score 0.68, Fig. 2A) (20). In this analysis, PruR would be

lipidated at C19 with signal peptidase cleavage between it and the adjacent serine (S18,

Fig. 2A), rather than A22 as predicted for the non-lipidated secretion signal. Lipidated

PruR would be predicted to associate with the periplasmic leaflet of the inner membrane

rather than the outer membrane (21). Although this predicted lipidation site is an

imperfect match to the spacing for the canonical sequence "lipobox" motif

(L[A/S][A/G]C), we tested whether C19 is required for PruR activity. Ectopic expression

of a *pruR* allele with this cysteine residue mutated to an alanine (C19A) fully

complemented the elevated biofilm phenotype Δ*pruR* mutant, suggesting that PruR is

not lipidated, or minimally that it does not have to be anchored to the inner membrane to

function in the periplasm (Fig. S4B). Furthermore, *pruR* was effectively secreted and

retained full activity when fused with the *malE* and *dsbA* signal sequences (MalEss and

DsbAss) from *E. coli*, well characterized to direct two distinct Sec-dependent secretion

mechanisms, and to be non-lipidated (22, 23) (Fig. S4C and S4D).

***In vivo* crosslinking reveals a PruR-DcpA complex**

Direct interaction of PruR with the periplasmic region of DcpA would be one

mechanism by which pterins could regulate DcpA DGC and PDE activity. To test this

hypothesis, we used disuccinimidyl suberate (DSS) to perform protein crosslinking with

cell suspensions of *A. tumefaciens* and then probed for PruR and DcpA proteins using

polyclonal antibodies to PruR and separately to the periplasmic portion of DcpA (Fig. 3).

PruR is an approximately 16 kDa protein, and full-length DcpA is approximately 70 kDa.

Upon DSS addition in wild type cells, SDS-PAGE separation, and western blotting with

α-PruR antibody, a new protein species of ~85 kDa is observed (Fig. 3A). This species

is absent in the Δ*dcpA* mutant but is significantly more pronounced in wild type *A.*

tumefaciens expressing the *Plac-pruR-dcpA* construct. Elevated expression of the *pruA*

gene had no obvious impact on crosslinking of PruR and DcpA. Probing these western

blots with a lower titer α-DcpA antibody preparation against the periplasmic domain

captured the complex in cells harboring the P_{lac}-*pruR-dcpA* plasmid but was not

sufficiently sensitive to detect the complex at native levels of expression (Fig. S5).

Next, we tested the interaction of PruR independently with the periplasmic and

cytoplasmic DcpA domains. The DcpA periplasmic domain including its two

transmembrane elements (expressing codons 1-192) and the DcpA cytoplasmic

expression plasmid (codons 190-644) were independently expressed from P_{lac} either in

the wild type or the Δ*dcpA* mutant. DSS crosslinking of whole cell suspensions revealed

efficient PruR crosslinking with the DcpA periplasmic domain (predicted ~37.4 kDa

crosslinked complex) but not with the cytoplasmic domain (predicted 66.5 kDa complex)

(Fig. 3B). In the wild type background, the full length PruR-DcpA complex was also

visible, when probed for either PruR or the periplasmic domain of DcpA, but this was

abolished in the Δ*dcpA* mutant. These results are consistent with the genetic evidence

that the PruR-DcpA interaction occurs in the periplasm.

PruR interaction with the DcpA periplasmic domain is decreased in a *pruA* mutant

The Δ*pruA* mutant manifests a dramatic increase in UPP production and surface

attachment, similar to mutants of *pruR* or *dcpA*, and its impact is dependent on the

presence of a functional *dcpA* gene (9). To evaluate whether PruA-generated H_4MPt

impacts PruR-DcpA interactions, we compared DSS crosslinking for whole cell

suspensions of the Δ*pruA* mutant compared to the wild type, both ectopically expressing

PruR and the periplasmic domain of DcpA (these derivatives retain the chromosomal

pruR-dcpA genes). The amount of complex formation between PruR and $DcpA_{Peri}$ was

substantially diminished in the Δ*pruA* mutant relative to the wild type using both the

α–PruR (Fig. 4A) and α–DcpA$_{Peri}$ (Fig. 4B) antibodies. These results suggest that *pruA*

is required for maximal complex formation between PruR and DcpA and suggests that

pterins formed by PruA are essential for the PruR and DcpA interaction.

Conservation of *pruR-dcpA* type operons among proteobacterial pathogens

We next sought to determine whether PruR is conserved in other bacteria. There

are well-conserved homologs of PruR in several taxa within the Alpha- and Gamma-

proteobacteria (Fig. 5). All of these proteins are of similar sizes with an N-terminal

secretion signal and share residues common among the SUOX family of proteins (see

residues marked by asterisks in Fig. S6A). Notably, all lack the critical cysteine involved

in MoCo binding in SUOX proteins, and instead have a tryptophan. None of these has a

Cys in their N-terminal signal sequence consistent with our finding that this residue is

dispensable for PruR function (Fig. S6A). Additionally, inspection of the genomic

location for the PruR homologs in these proteobacteria reveal presumptive bicistronic

operons with a downstream gene encoding a DcpA homolog which is comprised of two

transmembrane domains flanking a periplasmic loop and a large cytoplasmic portion of

the protein. Many of these have both DGC and PDE domains such as DcpA, although in

some cases they have only the DGC domain without the C-terminal PDE (Fig. 5). The

predicted periplasmic domains of these *dcpA* homologs are roughly the same length

(138-150 aa) and are chemically similar. However, these regions are only weakly

conserved at the primary amino acid sequence level, with two invariant residues in

common, a tryptophan and a glutamate (W40 and E48 in the full-length *A. tumefaciens*

DcpA) (Fig. S6B). Strikingly, most of the bacteria that encode this *pruR-dcpA* operon

are opportunistic pathogens of animals or plants. Interestingly, *Vibrio cholerae* has two

pruR-dcpA operons, VC1933-1934 and VCA0075-0074 (Fig. 5). The VC1934 DcpA

homolog has both DGC and PDE domains, but the GGDEF motif is degenerate

(GADEF) and likely inactive. Conversely, the VCA0074 DcpA homolog only has the

GGDEF domain without the PDE domain. In fact, VCA0074 is the well-studied CdgA

protein established to have DGC activity in *V. cholerae* and to play an important role in

biofilm formation (24).

PruR-type proteins share a common structural fold

Based on our experimental findings for PruR-pterin interactions and on sequence

conservation, we hypothesized that PruR represents a new class of proteins with an

overall fold similar to the MoCo binding domains of SUOX-type proteins, that instead

bind to the non-MoCo pterins. We purified representative members of the PruR family

and determined their three-dimensional structures by X-ray crystallography (Table S2).

The *A. tumefaciens* PruR structure reveals a general structural motif comprised of 10 β-

sheets and 7 α-helices (Fig. 7A, PDB 7kou). The β-strands form one mixed, five-

stranded β sheet (2-1-10-5-6) and one curved, four-stranded antiparallel β sheet (3-4-7-

9), and these sheets are interconnected by short α helices (1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7). We

solved an additional crystal structure of *A. tumefaciens* PruR (PDB 7kos) for which the

overall structure is identical except that in this crystal form a small surface pocket is

occupied by the side chain residues of neighboring or symmetry related polypeptide

chains (Fig. S7 and Table S1).

Structures of three other PruR homologs were also solved including proteins

from *V. vulnificus* (PDB 7kom, 30% identity; 1 Å), *V. cholerae* (PDB 7kp2, 32% identity,

1.03 Å), and *K. pneumoniae* (PDB 7rkb, 59% identity, 2.5 Å) (Fig. 6B and 6C). Multiple

sequence and structure alignments of these PruR homologs clearly show that the

structures are highly similar (root-mean-squared-deviation (RMSD) of 0.6 – 2.0 Å) and

all share the SUOX-like fold. Overall, the PruR fold is conserved in different Alpha- and

Gammaproteobacteria, consistent with a similar function for PruR in these bacteria.

PruR has a shortened MoCo binding site that associates with a pterin

Structural comparison of *A. tumefaciens* PruR to chicken liver sulfite oxidase

(PDB 1sox), a relatively close SUOX structural homolog, and *E. coli* YedY (PDB 1xdq),

a more distant sequence homolog, revealed significant structural overlap to the MoCo

binding domains (Fig. 7A and 7B). PruR from *A. tumefaciens* aligns over 126 aa

residues with the chicken liver SUOX protein with an RMSD value of 2.5 Å. The chicken

liver SUOX active site contains a single molybdopterin bound to a surface cleft

characterized by the conserved cysteine residue at the end of a lengthy β-hairpin (Fig.

7A). There is no surface cleft that could accommodate MoCo in the equivalent region of

PruR, and the β-hairpin with the conserved Cys residue in all SUOX proteins, including

in *E. coli* YedY (res. 138-146; (25), is truncated in PruR (res. 161-166). Furthermore,

structural-sequence alignments of PruR, YedY, and chicken liver sulfite oxidase show

that the canonical molybdenum-coordinating cysteine is substituted with a tryptophan

(W70) in PruR, which constitutes a proline-tryptophan (^{69}PW^{70}) motif conserved in PruR

homologs (Fig. 6C). Thus, the PruR fold is like that of SUOX family MoCo-binding

domains but several structural determinants for MoCo binding, including a deep binding

cleft, are lacking. The smaller pocket identified in our structures, however, can

accommodate a smaller non-MoCo pterin molecule.

To examine the pterin-PruR interaction, we co-crystallized PruR with H_2NPt, a

commercially available monapterin stereoisomer that is more stable to oxidation than

the tetrahydro pterins and thus compatible with crystallization methods. We obtained the

ligand-bound structures for both *K. pneumoniae* and *V. cholerae* PruR homologs (7rkb

and 7kp2, respectively) (Fig. 7C). Refinement revealed both were bound by the bicyclic

moiety of the neopterin, with the hydroxylated tail absent. In all structures, the neopterin

ring is positioned in the pterin binding cleft and is sandwiched between a tyrosine and

tryptophan (*A. tumefaciens* Y104 and W160, respectively) (Fig. 7C). The pterin also

forms hydrogen bonds with an asparagine residue (N102). These three residues are

conserved across all PruR homologs (Fig. 6C), and Y104 is conserved in other SUOX

proteins including YedY (Fig. 7B). Notably, in our apo structure of *A. tumefaciens* PruR,

the Y104 side chain is flipped away from the pterin binding pocket (Fig. 7C), suggesting

that binding of a ligand to this cleft induces key stacking interactions that stabilize the

pterin in the site. Further comparison of the pterin-bound PruR structures also revealed

three alternative binding conformations of neopterin. The orientation of the ring moiety

varies, yielding different positions of the hydroxylated tail (Fig. 7D and Fig. S8A-C). We

suspect that the observed variation in binding modes of neopterin is a result of

differences between this disfavored fully oxidized ligand and the cognate reduced

H_4MPt and/or 2′-*O*-Met-H_4MPt (9).

DISCUSSION

Here we describe the regulation of the dual-function DGC/PDE DcpA by a novel

pterin-binding protein PruR, building from our previous findings (9-11). All three

components of the pterin regulatory pathway discussed here (PruR, DcpA, and PruA)

were identified in a transposon mutagenesis screen designed to identify novel

regulators of surface attachment in *A. tumefaciens* (10). In this study we have further

interrogated this pterin regulatory pathway by (i) characterizing how the pterin-binding

protein PruR regulates DcpA activity, (ii) defining PruR as a periplasmic protein that

interacts with DcpA as well as H$_4$MPt, (iii) elucidating the role of PruA in promoting the

interaction between PruR and DcpA, and (iv) identifying similar regulatory systems in

other *Proteobacteria*. Furthermore, we determined the three-dimensional structure of

PruR and selected homologs in their apo forms, and two as a complex with a pterin.

The level of conservation of PruR and DcpA homologs among multiple *Proteobacteria*

suggests that they are likely to also utilize pterin-dependent regulation of cdGMP pools.

A new class of pterin binding proteins

Our findings suggest that PruR and its homologs are a new type of pterin-binding

periplasmic protein and we report the first structural information for this new group. The

overall fold of PruR-type proteins suggests that they are a branch of the SUOX protein

family, cytoplasmic enzymes including sulfite oxidases and nitrate reductases that utilize

MoCo as a co-factor (16). Most SUOX proteins are large and have additional domains

that drive catalysis. In contrast PruR-like proteins are small, almost entirely comprised

of the SUOX fold and their N-terminal secretion signal. Pterins such as H$_4$MPt and

related molecules are significantly smaller and less structurally complex than MoCo. It is

intriguing that the pterin binding site for PruR-type proteins and the SUOX MoCo

binding site are structurally and likely evolutionarily related, especially given the

markedly different functions of the two groups of proteins.

Other proteins known to bind the bicyclic pteridine ring are the aromatic amino

acid hydroxylases such as phenylalanine hydroxylase (PAH), which coordinates a

tetrahydrobiopterin (H_4BPt) molecule as a cofactor. The H_4BPt binding site stabilizes the

pteridine ring via a conserved acidic residue and a histidine-conjugated iron atom, which

interact with ring positions 2 and 4, respectively (26). This binding site thus bears no

significant similarity to the SUOX-type pterin binding site of the PruR-type proteins we

define here. There are also well studied, membrane-anchored mammalian proteins that

associate with the essential metabolite tetrahydrofolate (H_4F), which also contains the

bicyclic pteridine ring. These folate binding proteins (FBPs) are upregulated in fetal cells

and certain cancers (27, 28), and dramatically alter their conformation upon binding to

H_4F. Similar to PruR-like proteins, their association with the pteridine ring in H_4F is

fostered by conserved Tyr and Trp residues that sandwich the ring in a hydrophobic

pocket, although these proteins are otherwise structurally distinct the PruR-type proteins

reported here.

Preference of PruR for fully reduced monapterin

The pterin binding specificity of PruR was revealed by *in vitro* studies with

purified PruR and different pterin species. Fully reduced tetrahydropterins oxidize

readily to the dihydropterin forms (29). We used a coupled enzyme reaction with the

PruA pteridine reductase and NADPH in the presence of H_2MPt and H_2NPt under

anoxic conditions to generate the respective tetrahydropterin species in the presence of

PruR (11). We observed significantly greater association of the monapterin species in

the presence of PruA than in its absence, consistent with greater binding to the PruA-

generated H_4MPt. In contrast, neopterin binding to PruR was lower and unaffected by

the presence of PruA, even though our prior *in vitro* PruA work revealed similar catalytic

efficiency with H_2MPt and H_2NPt substrates (11). PruR detectably binds the neopterin

species and the reduced folate species, but not to the same extent as the PruA-

generated H_4MPt. Although this experiment is evidence for the pterin association with

PruR, it does not provide binding affinities.

Co-crystallization with the H_2NPt ligand and the PruR homologs from *V. cholerae*

(7KOU) and *K. pneumoniae* (7RKB) revealed the fully oxidized neopterin (presumably

due to oxidation of the exogenously added H_2NPt during crystallization) binding at the

analogous location as the MoCo binding site on SUOX. Pterin binding occurs within the

pterin-binding cleft we have defined on the PruR-type proteins through interaction of the

pteridine ring sandwiched between the conserved Tyr and Trp residues and several

other hydrogen bonding positions. The hydroxylated tail of the neopterin was not visible

in these structures suggesting greater mobility. The stereochemistry of the hydroxylated

tail distinguishes monapterin from its stereoisomer neopterin, and the more complex

benzoyl and glutamyl side chain substituents of folate, and we hypothesize that

interactions between this tail and PruR add binding specificity. Additionally, the binding

site may also interact directly with the fully reduced tetrahydropterin species through

interactions that are not observed in the crystal structures with oxidized neopterin. The

multiple positions of the neopterin detected within the binding cleft may also reflect

weaker interactions of the protein with the non-cognate, fully oxidized neopterin

molecule.

PruR interacts with pterins in the periplasm

PruR negatively regulates surface attachment in *A. tumefaciens* through

modulation of DcpA activity. Loss of function mutations in the pteridine reductase gene

pruA, preventing H_4MPt synthesis largely phenocopy *pruR* null mutants. The best

studied functions for bacterial pterins are to act as enzymatic cofactors for amino acid

hydroxylase enzymes such as phenylalanine hydroxylase (15). All evidence suggests

that PruA drives reduction of H_2MPt in the cytoplasm, but our findings have revealed

that PruR functions and responds to pterins in the periplasm. A longstanding,

unexplained observation among reports on bacterial pterins is that they accumulate

extracellularly, with as much as 100-fold greater pterin in the extracellular fraction as

compared to associated with cells (15, 30). The mechanism of excretion has not been

elucidated, but it is also thought that extracellular pterins can re-enter cells (31). The

PruR protein clearly interacts with a self-produced, reduced monapterin species in the

periplasm, but exogenous pterins that enter the periplasm might also act as agonists or

antagonists of the H_4MPt-PruR interaction. Our findings are most consistent with H_4MPt

preferentially binding to PruR. However, H_4MPt is susceptible to oxidation and thus will

have a relatively short half-life in the periplasm and elsewhere outside the cell (32).

Interaction of PruR and DcpA is stimulated by PruA

Crosslinking in whole cells reveals that PruR and DcpA interact through the DcpA

periplasmic domain to form a stable complex. The size of the crosslinked species (~85

kDa) suggests that the proteins are in a one-to-one stoichiometry. The crosslinked

product between ectopically expressed PruR and the DcpA periplasmic domain is

significantly diminished in the Δ*pruA* mutant, although it is still detectable. The Δ*pruA*

mutant has a dramatic phenotype in which DcpA exhibits predominantly DGC activity,

equivalent to the Δ*pruR* mutant (9), so whatever remaining interaction occurs between

the two proteins is insufficient to maintain a strong DcpA PDE bias. Our analysis of the

PruR control of DcpA catalytic site mutants suggests that in cells with active PruA, the

PruR-DcpA interaction stimulates PDE activity and also diminishes DGC activity. We

speculate this may be due the reciprocal control of dimerization for the separate DGC

and PDE domains of DcpA, known to be required for these activities in other proteins

that synthesize and degrade cdGMP (33, 34).

The DcpA periplasmic domain is less well conserved among the DcpA orthologs,

although there are two invariant residues, Trp40 and Glu48 (in *A. tumefaciens* DcpA).

The domains are all roughly 140 aa in length with dispersed chemical conservation.

Alpha Fold predictions suggests that the DcpA periplasmic domain forms a novel four

helix CACHE-type bundle, with overall structural similarity to the four helix bundles in

the periplasmic domains of methyl-accepting dependent chemotaxis proteins (MCPs),

that impart chemotactic motility responses to certain solutes (35). Rather than

interacting directly with their ligands in the periplasm, several MCPs mediate the

response through interactions with periplasmic solute binding proteins (SBPs) (36). The

interaction of PruR and the DcpA periplasmic domain may share similarities with MCP-

SBP interactions, with binding of the pterin fostering this interaction.

The PruR-DcpA system is strikingly analogous to the dual-function DGC-PDE

MbaA in *V. cholerae*, which is regulated through the interaction of its periplasmic

domain with NspS (37, 38). NspS is a SBP for polyamines and is encoded upstream of

mbaA in the same operon. The specific type of polyamine bound by NspS can regulate

its interaction with MbaA, thereby controlling the balance of DGC and PDE activities

from this enzyme. *V. cholerae* synthesizes and releases norspermidine, which

stimulates DGC activity through NspS-MbaA interactions, whereas other polyamines

such as spermidine inhibit association with MbaA. (39, 40). The polyamine response

impacts cdGMP levels, controlling *V. cholerae* biofilm formation. Interestingly, in the

absence of polyamines, NspS can bind to MbaA and weakly impacts its activity, similar

to our observation here that PruR weakly binds to DcpA in the absence of its proposed

H_4MPt ligand. There are multiple types of pterins produced and excreted by bacterial

and eukaryotic organisms (12), and it is conceivable that similar to the NspS-MbaA

system, the specific pterin-associated with PruR can impact its regulation of DcpA.

These structurally variant pterins may act as agonists or antagonists for the PruR-H_4MPt

interaction. It is also plausible that the PruR-associated pterin acts as a proxy to detect

a different cue in the periplasm, such as specific redox-active compounds.

Insights into conserved PruR-DcpA type systems in other bacteria

The PruR homologs we identify here are well conserved proteins and highly likely

to be orthologous in function. The structural determination of the four different PruR-

type apo-proteins all had high similarity with an RMSD value of <2.0 Å. This similarity

includes the residues we have identified that associate with the pteridine ring. Most of

these *pruR* homologs are immediately upstream of *dcpA* homologs with both the DGC

and PDE domains similar to DcpA, or only the DGC domain. The periplasmic domains

of these DcpA-type proteins are of similar size and amino acid chemistry but with only

the two fully conserved residues mentioned above. For some of the conserved *pruR-*

dcpA operons, only one of the cdGMP functions is retained. For example, there are two

of these conserved operons in *V. cholerae*, VC1933-VC1934 and VCA0075-VCA0074

(VCA0074 is the well-studied DGC known as CdgA, (24)). Interestingly VC1934 is

unlikely to be active for cdGMP synthesis (due to its nonfunctional GADEF motif) but

active for its degradation, and CdgA is well established to be active for cdGMP

synthesis (24, 41). In combination they may provide similar, but independently regulated

DGC/PDE activities, as does the dual functionality of DcpA in *A. tumefaciens.* In the two

major model strains of *P. aeruginosa*, PA01 and PA14, mutants for their *dcpA* homologs

(PA2780/PA1426970), both impact cdGMP-dependent phenotypes, although to different

extents (42, 43). In all of these cases, the positioning of a *pruR*-type gene immediately

upstream is consistent with a regulatory relationship with the downstream gene. Given

the remarkable similarity of the PruR gene products, it is highly likely that they bind the

same or related pterin ligands and provide pterin-dependent control.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Detailed descriptions of materials and methods can be found in the

Supplementary Information, including: bacterial strains and plasmids used (Tables S3

and S4), growth conditions, molecular cloning and site-directed mutagenesis, Congo

Red staining, biofilm formation quantification, PhoA secretion assays, antibody

production and purification, western blots, periplasmic fractionation, *in vivo* crosslinking,

HPLC analysis of pterins and folates, *in vitro* analysis of pterin binding to PruR, protein

crystallography (including molecular cloning, protein production and purification, data

collection, structure solution and refinement), purification of PruA, and *in vitro* enzymatic

assays for DcpA.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The structures determined here were deposited in the Protein Data Bank

(https://www.rcsb.org/) with the assigned PDB codes: 7kos (*A. tumefaciens*), 7kou (*A.*

tumefaciens 2), 7kom (*V. vulnificus*), 7rkb (*K. pneumoniae*), 7kp2 (*V. cholerae*). Protein

diffraction data have been deposited at proteindiffraction.org. All additional experimental

data is available upon request from the authors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Fitnat Yildiz, Seth Rubin, Vanessa Mariscal, Thomas Bernhardt, and Jon

Beckwith for helpful discussions and Ramya Natarajan for technical assistance with

preliminary protein purification. This project was supported by grants to C.F. (NIH R01

GM120337), K.D.A (NSF-CHE 2105598), A.K.G. (AI150466.). N.F. received support

from the IU Genetics, Cellular and Molecular Sciences NIH Training Grant (T32

GM007757). Work by the Center for Structural Biology of Infectious Diseases was

supported by HHS/NIH/NIAID contracts #HHSN272201700060C and

75N93022C00035. This research used resources of the Advanced Photon Source, a

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science User Facility operated for the DOE

Office of Science by Argonne National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC02-

06CH11357. Use of the LS-CAT Sector 21 was supported by the Michigan Economic

Development Corporation and the Michigan Technology Tri-Corridor (Grant

085P1000817). Access to LS-CAT and computational resources is facilitated by the NU

Structural Biology Facility, which is supported by NCI grant to P30 CA060553 the

Robert H. Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center.

REFERENCES

1.   O. Ciofu, C. Moser, P. O. Jensen, N. Hoiby, Tolerance and resistance of
microbial biofilms. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **20**, 621-635 (2022).
2.   K. Sauer *et al.*, The biofilm life cycle: expanding the conceptual model of biofilm
formation. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **20**, 608-620 (2022).
3.   C. Berne, C. K. Ellison, A. Ducret, Y. V. Brun, Bacterial adhesion at the single-
cell level. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **16**, 616-627 (2018).
4.   U. Jenal, A. Reinders, C. Lori, Cyclic di-GMP: second messenger extraordinaire.
Nat Rev Microbiol **15**, 271-284 (2017).
5.   T. E. Randall *et al.*, Sensory perception in bacterial cyclic diguanylate signal
transduction. *J Bacteriol* **204**, e0043321 (2022).
6.   M. A. Thompson, M. C. Onyeziri, C. Fuqua, Function and regulation of
Agrobacterium tumefaciens cell surface structures that promote attachment. *Curr
Top Microbiol Immunol* **418**, 143-184 (2018).
7.   S. B. Gelvin, *Agrobacterium*-mediated plant transformation: the biology behind
the "gene-jockeying" tool. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* **67**, 16-37 (2003).
8.   J. E. Heindl *et al.*, Mechanisms and regulation of surface interactions and biofilm
formation in *Agrobacterium*. *Frontiers in plant science* **5**, 176 (2014).
9.   N. Feirer *et al.*, A pterin-dependent signaling pathway regulates a dual-function
diguanylate cyclase-phosphodiesterase controlling surface attachment in
Agrobacterium tumefaciens. *mBio* **6**, e00156 (2015).
10.   J. Xu *et al.*, Genetic analysis of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* unipolar
polysaccharide production reveals complex integrated control of the motile-to-

sessile switch. *Mol Microbiol* **89**, 929-948 (2013).

11.   M. Labine *et al.*, Enzymatic and mutational analysis of the PruA pteridine
reductase required for pterin-dependent control of biofilm formation in
Agrobacterium tumefaciens. *J Bacteriol* 10.1128/JB.00098-20 (2020).

12.   N. Feirer, C. Fuqua, Pterin function in bacteria. *Pteridines* **28**, 23-36 (2017).

13.   J. M. Green, B. P. Nichols, R. G. Matthews, "Folate biosynthesis, reduction and
polyglutamylation" in *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella*: Cellular and Molecular
Biology*,* F. C. Neidhardt, Ed. (ASM Press, Washington, D.C., 1996), vol. 1, chap.
41, pp. 665-673.

14.   S. Leimkuhler, M. M. Wuebbens, K. V. Rajagopalan, The history of the discovery
of the molybdenum cofactor and novel aspects of its biosynthesis in bacteria.
Coord Chem Rev **255**, 1129-1144 (2011).

15.   A. Pribat *et al.*, FolX and FolM are essential for tetrahydromonapterin synthesis
in *Escherichia coli* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *J Bacteriol* **192**, 475-482
(2010).

16.   G. J. Workun, K. Moquin, R. A. Rothery, J. H. Weiner, Evolutionary persistence
of the molybdopyranopterin-containing sulfite oxidase protein fold. *Microbiol. Mol.*
Biol. Rev. **72**, 228-248 (2008).

17.   C. Kisker *et al.*, A structural comparison of molybdenum cofactor-containing
enzymes. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **22**, 503-521 (1998).

18.   V. R. Sokya, W. Pfleiderer, R. Prewo, Pteridines: Synthesis and characteristics of
5,6-dihydro-6-(1,2,3-trihydroxypropyl)pteridines: Covalent intramolecular
adducts. *Helv. Chim. Acta.* **73**, 808-826 (1990).

19.   C. Manoil, J. J. Mekalanos, J. Beckwith, Alkaline phosphatase fusions: sensors
of subcellular location. *J Bacteriol* **172**, 515-518 (1990).

20.   H. Nielsen, K. D. Tsirigos, S. Brunak, G. von Heijne, A brief history of protein
sorting prediction. *Protein J* **38**, 200-216 (2019).

21.   S. Okuda, H. Tokuda, Lipoprotein sorting in bacteria. *Annu Rev Microbiol* **65**,
239-259 (2011).

22.   D. Huber *et al.*, Use of thioredoxin as a reporter to identify a subset of
Escherichia coli signal sequences that promote signal recognition particle-
dependent translocation. *J Bacteriol* **187**, 2983-2991 (2005).

23.   C. F. Schierle *et al.*, The DsbA signal sequence directs efficient, cotranslational
export of passenger proteins to the *Escherichia coli* periplasm via the signal
recognition particle pathway. *J Bacteriol* **185**, 5706-5713 (2003).

24.   S. Beyhan, L. S. Odell, F. H. Yildiz, Identification and characterization of cyclic
diguanylate signaling systems controlling rugosity in *Vibrio cholerae*. *J Bacteriol*
190, 7392-7405 (2008).

25.   L. Loschi *et al.*, Structural and biochemical identification of a novel bacterial
oxidoreductase. *J Biol Chem* **279**, 50391-50400 (2004).

26.   J. A. Ronau *et al.*, A conserved acidic residue in phenylalanine hydroxylase
contributes to cofactor affinity and catalysis. *Biochemistry* **53**, 6834-6848 (2014).

27.   C. Chen *et al.*, Structural basis for molecular recognition of folic acid by folate
receptors. *Nature* **500**, 486-489 (2013).

28.   A. S. Wibowo *et al.*, Structures of human folate receptors reveal biological
trafficking states and diversity in folate and antifolate recognition. *Proc Natl Acad*

Sci U S A **110**, 15180-15188 (2013).
29.   R. L. Blakley, S. J. Benkovic, *Folates and Pterins: Chemistry and Biochemistry of*
Pterins (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1985), vol. 2.
30.   K. Iwai, M. Kobashi, H. Fujisawa, Occurrence of *Crithidia* factors and folic acid in
various bacteria. *J Bacteriol* **104**, 197-201 (1970).
31.   A. Noiriel, V. Naponelli, G. G. Bozzo, J. F. Gregory, 3rd, A. D. Hanson, Folate
salvage in plants: pterin aldehyde reduction is mediated by multiple non-specific
aldehyde reductases. *Plant J* **51**, 378-389 (2007).
32.   T. Arai *et al.*, Auto-oxidation of 5,6,7,8-tetrahydroneopterin *Pteridines* **9**, 26-28
(1988).
33.   C. Chan *et al.*, Structural basis of activity and allosteric control of diguanylate
cyclase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **101**, 17084-17089 (2004).
34.   F. Rao, Y. Yang, Y. Qi, Z. X. Liang, Catalytic mechanism of cyclic di-GMP-
specific phosphodiesterase: a study of the EAL domain-containing RocR from
Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *J Bacteriol* **190**, 3622-3631 (2008).
35.   A. Ortega, I. B. Zhulin, T. Krell, Sensory repertoire of bacterial chemoreceptors.
Microbiol Mol Biol Rev **81** (2017).
36.   J. P. Cerna-Vargas, B. Sanchez-Romera, M. A. Matilla, A. Ortega, T. Krell,
Sensing preferences for prokaryotic solute binding protein families. *Microb*
Biotechnol **16**, 1823-1833 (2023).
37.   A. A. Bridges, J. A. Prentice, C. Fei, N. S. Wingreen, B. L. Bassler, Quantitative
input-output dynamics of a c-di-GMP signal transduction cascade in *Vibrio*
cholerae. *PLoS Biol* **20**, e3001585 (2022).
38.   E. Karatan, T. R. Duncan, P. I. Watnick, NspS, a predicted polyamine sensor,
mediates activation of *Vibrio cholerae* biofilm formation by norspermidine. *J*
Bacteriol **187**, 7434-7443 (2005).
39.   A. A. Bridges, B. L. Bassler, Inverse regulation of *Vibrio cholerae* biofilm
dispersal by polyamine signals. *Elife* **10** (2021).
40.   S. R. Cockerell *et al.*, *Vibrio cholerae* NspS, a homologue of ABC-type
periplasmic solute binding proteins, facilitates transduction of polyamine signals
independent of their transport. *Microbiology* **160**, 832-843 (2014).
41.   B. Lim, S. Beyhan, F. H. Yildiz, Regulation of Vibrio polysaccharide synthesis
and virulence factor production by CdgC, a GGDEF-EAL domain protein, in
Vibrio cholerae. *J Bacteriol* **189**, 717-729 (2007).
42.   D. G. Ha, M. E. Richman, G. A. O'Toole, Deletion mutant library for investigation
of functional outputs of cyclic diguanylate metabolism in *Pseudomonas*
aeruginosa PA14. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **80**, 3384-3393 (2014).
43.   K. Eilers *et al.*, Phenotypic and integrated analysis of a comprehensive
Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1 library of mutants lacking cyclic-di-GMP-related
genes. *Front Microbiol* **13**, 949597 (2022).
659

     FIGURE LEGENDS

     Figure 1. PruR binds pterins and is required to control both the DGC and PDE

     activity of DcpA. (A) PruA reaction and relevant pterin molecule structures. (i): PruA

     uses NADPH as a cofactor and catalyzes the reduction of a 7,8-dihydropterin substrate

     to a 5,6,7.8-tetrahydropterin. Atoms are numbered in the dihydropterin. R indicates side

     groups as shown in (ii)-(iv); (ii): R1- monapterin; (iii): R2- neopterin; (iv): R3 - pABA-

     glutamate (folate). **(B)** *In vitro* pterin binding assays were performed as described in the

     supplemental methods with purified Δ_{SS}-PruR (50 µM), NADPH, and with or without

     His$_6$-PruA. HPLC fractioned reactions were examined by fluorescence for the oxidized

     pterins (excitation: 356 nm, emission: 450 nm). UV absorbance at 283 nm was used to

     measure folate relative to standards. PruR was incubated with the following pterin or

     folate species: H$_2$MPt, dihydromonapterin; H$_4$MPt, PruA-generated-

     tetrahydromonapterin; H$_2$NPt, dihydroneopterin; H$_4$NPt, PruA-generated

     tetrahydroneopterin; H$_2$F, dihydrofolate; and H$_4$F, tetrahydrofolate. Bars are averages of

     triplicate assays with error bars as standard deviations. Analyzed by standard one-way

     ANOVA and post-hoc Tukey analysis (P values relative to H$_4$MPt, *, <0.05, *** <0.001,

     ****, <0.0001). **(C)** Biofilm assays of. *A. tumefaciens* C58 WT (gray bar), a $\Delta dcpA$

     mutant (black bars) or a $\Delta dcpA\Delta pruR$ double mutant (white bars) containing the vector

     control or a plasmid-borne P_{lac}-$dcpA$ fusion expressing either the wild type $dcpA$ or

     catalytic site mutants (DGC⁻, E308A; PDE⁻, E431A; DGC⁻PDE⁻, both). Ratio of acetic

     acid-solubilized CV absorbance (A$_{600}$) from 48 h biofilm assays normalized to the OD$_{600}$

     planktonic turbidity from the same culture. Assays performed in triplicate and error bars

     are standard deviation; P values calculated comparing complementation of $dcpA$ in the

Δ*dcpA* strain compared to the Δ*dcpA*Δ*pruR* strain by standard two-tailed *t*-test. *(P*

values, * <0.05, **** <0.0001.)*

Figure 2. PruR is a periplasmic protein. (A) Signal P prediction of the PruR N-

terminal signal sequence. Black arrow, predicted signal peptidase cleavage site; Grey

arrow, putative cleavage and lipidation site; Grey text, predicted lipidated Cys19. **(B)**

Western blot of SDS-PAGE using α-PruR polyclonal antisera to probe extracts of wild

type *A. tumefaciens* C58 WT and the Δ*pruR* mutant on its own or expressing either the

P_{lac}-*pruR* plasmid or the P_{lac}-Δ$_{SS}$*pruR* plasmid (both plasmids also expressing *dcpA*).

Cultures were grown to similar densities with or without induction with 400 μM IPTG and

fractionated to separate the cytoplasmic/membrane fraction (C lanes) from the

periplasmic fraction (P lanes). **(C)** Biofilm assays of WT or a Δ*pruR* mutant derivative

with the empty vector plasmid (-) or harboring a plasmid-borne P_{lac} fusion expressing

either *pruR* or the Δ$_{SS}$*pruR* (both plasmids also express *dcpA*). Ratio of acetic acid-

solubilized CV A_{600} from 48 h biofilm assays normalized to the OD_{600} planktonic turbidity

of the same culture. Assays performed in triplicate and error bars are standard

deviation; *P* values calculated by standard two-tailed *t*-test (*P* values, *** <0.01).

Figure 3. PruR forms a complex with the periplasmic region of DcpA. (A) Western

blot probing for PruR with α−PruR polyclonal antisera . Whole cell suspensions were

either untreated or incubated with DSS crosslinker (0.75 mM) for wild type *A.*

tumefaciens C58 and the Δ*dcpA* mutant. Wild type *A. tumefaciens* harboring a plasmid

ectopically expressing either *pruR-dcpA* or *pruA* from P_{lac} (400 μM IPTG) was also

subjected to same analysis. Black arrows; PruR-DcpA complex, 87 kDa; DcpA, 71 kDa;

PruR; 16 kDa. **(B)** Similar western blot to panel A probing for PruR following DSS

crosslinking of whole cell suspensions of either *A. tumefaciens* wild type strain or the

Δ*dcpA* mutant. Either the cytoplasmic (DcpA$_{cyt}$) or periplasmic (DcpA$_{peri}$) domains of

DcpA are ectopically expressed from P_{lac} (400 μM IPTG). Red triangles, PruR-DcpA, 87

kDa; Blue triangles, expected size of PruR-DcpA$_{cyt}$, ~68 kDa; Black triangles, PruR-

DcpA$_{peri}$,38 kDa. α-PruR used at 1:40,000 and antibody binding detected with GAR-

HRP secondary antibody and chemiluminescent substrate on a BioRad ChemiDoc.

Non-specific bands serve as protein loading controls.

Figure 4. Deletion of *pruA* diminishes the interaction between DcpA and PruR.

Western blot probing for the PruR-DcpA$_{peri}$ complex following *in vivo* DSS crosslinking in

A. tumefaciens wild type or a Δ*pruA* mutant expressing the P_{lac}-*pruR-dcpA$_{cyt}$* plasmid

(400 μM IPTG). Probed with polyclonal antibody preparations **(A)** α-PruR, 1:40,000; **(B)**

α-DcpA$_{peri}$, 1:20,000. Antibody binding was detected with GAR-HRP secondary antibody

and a chemiluminescent substrate on a BioRad ChemiDoc. Non-specific bands serve

as protein loading controls.

Figure 5. The *pruR-dcpA* operon is conserved across Proteobacteria in animal

and human pathogens. (A) Domain structure for PruR and DcpA; transmembrane

domains and signal sequence are black lines; DGC domain is green; PDE domain is

lime green; Pt indicates the pterin-binding activity of the protein. **(B)** Presumptive

operon structure for homologs of the *pruR-dcpA* operon from multiple pathogens. A

subset of DcpA homologs are truncated relative to DcpA, and contain only the DGC

domain. *Ochrobactrum anthropi* ATCC 49188, *Klebsiella pneumoniae pneumoniae*

ATCC 700721; *Vibrio cholerae,* O1 biovar El Tor str. N16961*; Vibrio vulnificus* CMCP6;

Pseudomonas aeruginosa PA01. Color coding as in panel A – gene and domain sizes

are proportional.

Figure 6. The structure of PruR is a degenerate SUOX fold conserved in multiple

Alpha- and Gammaproteobacteria (A) The overall structure of PruR from *A.*

tumefaciens is depicted. The secondary structure elements are labeled and shown in

red (α helices), yellow (β-strands) and green (loops). **(B)** Superposition of PruR from *A.*

tumefaciens (orange, 7kos; violet, 7kou), *K. pneumoniae* (pink, 7rkb) *V. cholerae*

*(*wheat, 7kp2), *V. vulnificus* (light green, 7kom)*.* The peptide main chains of all

structures are depicted as ribbons. **(C)** Multiple sequence alignment of PruR proteins

with secondary structure elements from *A. tumefaciens* (PDB code 7kos) mapped

above. Lime green circles mark pterin binding site residues conserved across all

proteins.

Figure 7. Comparison of PruR structure to conserved MoCo-binding domains. (A)

Superposition of *A. tumefaciens* PruR (orange, 7kou) with the MoCo binding domain of

chicken liver SUOX (violet, PDB 1sox) and *E. coli* YedY (salmon, PDB 1xdq). The

MoCo and conserved C185 of SUOX are shown as balls-and-sticks (carbon, violet;

oxygen, red; nitrogen, dark blue; sulfur, yellow), the molybdenum is shown as a green

sphere, water molecules as small cyan spheres and hydrogen bonds as black, dashed

lines. W70, conserved in PruR, is also shown as sticks. **(B)** Multiple sequence

alignment of *A. tumefaciens* PruR with the MoCo binding domain of chicken liver sulfite

oxidase and *E. coli* YedY. The magenta oval marks PruR W70 that aligns with the

conserved **C185** in canonical MoCo-binding domains. The green oval marks an active

site tyrosine conserved in pterin-binding proteins. **(C)** A zoomed in view of superposition

of *A. tumefaciens* (orange, 7kou) and *K. pneumoniae* (pink, 7rkb) PruR. The neopterin

and conserved residues of the pterin binding pocket are shown as sticks. Residue

sidechains are numbered according to *A. tumefaciens*. **(D)** Superposition of all observed

neopterin binding modes from crystal structures of *K. pneumoniae* (7RKB) and *V.*

cholerae (7KP2). The binding pocket is represented as an electrostatic surface potential

(blue-to-red, positive-to-negative charge) and neopterin as stick models. Carbons are in

yellow (alternative conformation A, *V. cholerae*), grey (alternative conformation B, *V.*

cholerae, 7kp2) and green (*K. pnuemoniae*, 7rkb), with oxygen in red and nitrogen in

blue.

Figure 1 – PruR-DcpA

A

0.69   0.31

MSVGRVLLSAFLSLMWLS**C**AQAGT

B

C

Figure 2 – PruR-DcpA

Figure 3 – PruR-DcpA

Figure 4 - PruR-DcpA

Figure 5 - PruR-DcpA

Figure 6 - PruR-DcpA

Figure 7 - PruR-DcpA