Mutational analysis of the F plasmid partitioning protein ParA reveals

novel residues required for oligomerisation and plasmid maintenance.

Nivedita Mitra[1,2 †], Dipika Mishra[1,2 # †], Irene Aniyan Puthethu[1,2], Ramanujam

Srinivasan[1,2 ‡]

[1] School of Biological Sciences, National Institute of Science Education and Research,

Bhubaneswar – 752050, India

[2] Homi Bhabha National Institutes (HBNI), Training School Complex, Anushakti Nagar,

Mumbai, India 400094

† Authors contributed equally to the work

‡ Corresponding author

e-mail: rsrini@niser.ac.in

Present address:

School of Biological Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FF

Running Title: Oligomerisation of ParA in Plasmid segregation.

Keywords: ParA, F plasmid partitioning, oligomerisation

Abstract

Mobile genetic elements such as plasmids play a crucial role in the emergence of

antimicrobial resistance. Hence, plasmid maintenance proteins like ParA of the Walker

A type cytoskeletal ATPases/ ParA superfamily are potential targets for novel

antibiotics. Plasmid partitioning by ParA relies upon ATP-dependent dimerisation and

formation of chemophoretic gradients of ParA-ATP on bacterial nucleoids. Though

polymerisation of ParA has been reported in many instances, the need for

polymerisation in plasmid maintenance remains unclear. In this study, we provide novel

insights into the polymerisation of ParA and the effect of polymerisation on plasmid

maintenance. We first characterise two mutations, Q351H and W362E, in ParA from F

plasmid (ParA$_F$) that form cytoplasmic filaments independent of the ParBS$_F$ partitioning

complex. Both mutants fail to partition plasmids, do not bind non-specific DNA and act

as super-repressors to suppress transcription from the ParA promoter. Further, we

show that the polymerisation of ParA$_F$ requires the conformational switch to the ParA-

ATP* state. We identify two mutations, R320A in the C-terminal helix-14 and E375A

helix-16 of ParA$_F$, that abolish filament assembly and affect plasmid partitioning. Our

results thus suggest a role for higher-order structures or polymerisation of ParA in

plasmid maintenance.

INTRODUCTION

Antibiotic resistance is one of the major concerns for the current state of the world health system. The World Health Organization has declared antimicrobial resistance a global priority and identified Enterobacteriaceae as one of the major groups of pathogens as agents against which new antibiotics are urgently needed (Simonsen 2018; World Health Organization 2021). Enterobacteriaceae family includes *Klebsiella* and *Escherichia coli*, which are often acquired as hospital-borne infections and fail to respond to antibiotics due to the presence of multidrug resistance genes (Machado et al. 2022; Cerceo et al. 2016; Jalil and Al Atbee 2022). These genes are usually carried on single or low-copy number plasmids and are thought to be the most prevalent means to transfer antibiotic resistance genes across bacterial species (Yong et al. 2009; Phan et al. 2015; Stephens et al. 2020; Meynell et al. 1968; Moran et al. 2015). Thus, understanding plasmid maintenance and spread could be crucial to curtailing the rapid growth of multidrug resistance in bacteria.

Stable maintenance of these low copy number plasmids depends upon the functions of cytoskeletal proteins such as the actin homolog ParM (Møller-Jensen et al. 2003; van den Ent et al. 2002; Salje et al. 2010), tubulin homolog TubZ (Tinsley and Khan 2006; Anand et al. 2008; Larsen et al. 2007) and the Walker A type Cytoskeletal ATPases (WACA or the ParA superfamily)(Walker et al. 1982; Motallebi-Veshareh et al. 1990; Koonin 1993). The ParA family of proteins function to equipartition genetic material, both plasmids and chromosomes, during the bacterial cell cycle program (Ebersbach and Gerdes 2001; Castaing et al. 2008; Le Gall et al. 2016; McLeod et al. 2017; Lutkenhaus 2012; Lee and Grossman 2006). The F plasmid is one of the well-

studied model systems to understand the mechanisms by which the ParA family of

proteins function to ensure equipartitioning of the replicated plasmids into the daughter

cells during cell division. $ParA_F$, also known as SopA, is a member of the ParA

superfamily, which binds to the nucleotide ATP and localises to the nucleoid within the

bacterial cell (Hatano et al. 2007; Castaing et al. 2008; Roberts et al. 2012; Le Gall et al.

2016; McLeod et al. 2017; Hirano et al. 1998). $ParA_F$ has an intrinsic ATP hydrolysis

activity, which is stimulated several folds upon interaction with the partitioning complex

comprising the adapter protein $ParB_F$ (SopB) and the $parS_F$ (sopC) DNA sequence

(Ravin et al. 2003; Watanabe et al. 1992; Libante et al. 2001; Ah-Seng et al. 2013; Ogura

and Hiraga 1983; Lane et al. 1987; Bouet et al. 2007; Barillà et al. 2005, 2007). Further,

upon interaction with the SopBC complex (referred to as $ParBS_F$ hereafter), $ParA_F$

exhibits foci formation that occupies the mid-cell, one-quarter or two-thirds positions

along the cell length (Niki and Hiraga 1997; Hatano et al. 2007; Hirano et al. 1998).

Recent super-resolution imaging also provides direct evidence of nucleoid localisation

of ParA (Le Gall et al. 2016; McLeod et al. 2017). Additional *in vitro* reconstitution on

DNA carpets and *in vivo* experiments have led to the idea that chemophoretic gradients

generated by dimerisation of ParA upon ATP binding and stimulation of ATPase activity

by the partitioning complex drive the directional movement of the replicated plasmids to

achieve spatial segregation (Vecchiarelli et al. 2013b, 2014; Hu et al. 2015; Hwang et al.

2013; Vecchiarelli et al. 2010). Furthermore, the elasticity of the bacterial nucleoid itself

has been shown to play a role, leading to the proposal of a DNA-relay model (Lim et al.

2014; Surovtsev et al. 2016).

However, *in vitro*, ParA$_F$ has also been observed to undergo polymerisation,

forming filaments upon interaction with ATP and radial asters in complex with ParBS$_F$

(Lim et al. 2005). Such filaments in the presence of ParBS$_F$ were also observed *in vivo*

in 15 % of the cells. Further, these filaments have been reported to grow at a rate of

0.18 ± 0.05 μm per minute, similar to the rates at which plasmids and chromosomes

segregate in bacteria (Lim et al. 2005). Polymeric structures of ParA$_F$ in the presence of

ATP have also been observed using electron microscopy (Bouet et al. 2007). Moreover,

such filaments and ATP-dependent polymers have also been observed in the case of

other ParA (Ringgaard et al. 2009; Hui et al. 2010; Volante and Alonso 2015) and related

ParA family members like ParF (Barillà et al. 2007, 2005; Schumacher et al. 2012) and

Soj (Leonard et al. 2005, 2004). Interestingly, the polymerisation of such filaments in

ParA$_F$ is mediated only by ATP, wherein non-specific DNA is thought to play a role in

inhibiting the formation of such polymers (Bouet et al. 2007). On the contrary, the ParA

homolog Soj from *Bacillus subtilis*, *Thermus thermophilus* and ParA2 (a member of the

Type-Ia superfamily like ParA$_F$) from *Vibrio cholerae* assembles into a higher-order

nucleoprotein complex in the presence of DNA (Leonard et al. 2005; Hui et al. 2010;

Parker et al. 2021; Leonard et al. 2004; Chodha et al. 2023). Although these early

observations supported a cytoskeletal polymerisation-based model for plasmid

segregation by ParA$_F$, more recent studies from several ParA members, as mentioned

above, have suggested mechanisms of DNA partitioning independent of ParA

polymerisation. Models like the diffusion ratchet mechanism (Vecchiarelli et al. 2012;

Brooks and Hwang 2017; Hatano and Niki 2010; Hu et al. 2015, 2017), DNA relay

mechanism (Lim et al. 2014; Surovtsev et al. 2016), and the Hitch-Hiking models (Le

Gall et al. 2016) have indeed questioned the physiological relevance of ParA

polymerisation.

Interestingly, Pogliano and colleagues had reported a spontaneous mutant of

ParA$_F$ (M315I Q351H) that stabilised the polymers in *E. coli* cells (Lim et al. 2005).

Further, we had earlier carried out an extensive mutational analysis of the C-terminal

region in ParA$_F$ and found a significant role for the C-terminal helix in plasmid

maintenance (Mishra et al. 2022). More recently, a cryo-EM study of filaments formed

by ParA from *Vibrio cholerae*, the ParA2$_{Vc}$ protein, has been suggested to involve the C-

terminal helix of the protein (Parker et al. 2021). Thus, these recent cryo-EM studies

prompted us to revisit the role of polymerisation in ParA function. Here, we report that

the C-terminal helix 14 and helix 16 play a significant role in stabilising the SopA

polymers. We first show that a single mutation (Q351H) is sufficient to recapitulate the

cytoplasmic filaments seen in ParA$_F$ M3154I Q351H (SopA1). We also report another

mutant of ParA$_F$, W362E, which assembles into similar polymers in the cytoplasm of *E.*

coli cells, suggesting that the mutants act to stabilise the ParA$_F$ polymers *in vivo*. We

show that while ParA$_F$ Q351H and W362E retain their ability to interact with the ParA$_F$

promoter region to act as super-repressors, the assembled filaments are not nucleoid-

associated. Further, ParA$_F$ Q351H strongly induces polymerisation of the wild-type

ParA$_F$ when co-expressed. Moreover, using various mutants ParA$_F$ in the conserved

K120 residue in the Walker A motif, we find that polymerisation of ParA$_F$ Q351H and

W362E requires ATP binding and depends upon the conformational change to the

ParA-ATP* state. Finally, we show that polymerisation is completely abolished when we

change a charged residue, E375, in the C-terminal helix 16 or R320 in helix 14 to

alanine. While ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A retain weak transcriptional activity in

response to the ParBS$_F$ complex, the mutants fail to maintain plasmids in cells stably.

Thus, our studies here highlight a role for helix 14 and the C-terminal helix 16 in

polymerisation of ParA$_F$ and are suggestive of a requirement of higher order structures

(oligomerisation) for co-operative binding of ParA$_F$ to DNA and F-plasmid segregation

functions.

RESULTS

Mutations in ParA$_F$ Q351 or W362 stabilise ParA$_F$ polymers and impair DNA

partitioning

We and others have earlier shown that a C-terminal GFP fusion to ParA$_F$ is fully

functional for plasmid partitioning, localises to the bacterial nucleoid and forms

oscillating foci in the presence of ParBS$_F$ complex (Lim et al. 2005; Bouet et al. 2007;

Hatano et al. 2007; Ah-Seng et al. 2013; Le Gall et al. 2016; Mishra et al. 2022). ParA$_F$-

GFP and its variants were expressed from the weakened P$_{trc}$ promoter, while $parBS_F$

was carried on a mini-F plasmid, pDAG198, that lacked ParA$_F$ ($\Delta parA_F$, $parBS^+$) under

the constitutive P$_{LtetO-1}$ promoter (Castaing et al. 2008). In the presence of the $parBS_F$,

the wild type ParA$_F$-GFP (SopA) formed foci or appeared as a haze, consistent with

earlier reports suggesting nucleoid association **(Fig. 1A)**. On the contrary, ParA$_F$ M315I

Q351H-GFP (called SopA1) formed filament structures in the cell **(Fig. 1A)** as reported

previously (Lim et al. 2005). To test if the Q351H mutation, instead of the double

mutations, was sufficient to trigger the polymerisation of ParA$_F$, we generated ParA$_F$

Q351H-GFP and expressed it in *E. coli* from the same weakened P$_{trc}$ promoter. ParA$_F$

Q351H-GFP also assembled into cytoplasmic filaments similar to that formed by ParA$_F$

M315I Q351H-GFP, showing that the mutation in the residue Q351 was sufficient to

induce polymerisation of ParA$_F$ **(Fig. 1A).** During the course of our studies on the role of

the C-terminal helix on ParA$_F$ function (Mishra et al. 2022), we identified another

mutation, W362E, which likewise resulted in the assembly of ParA$_F$-GFP into

cytoplasmic filaments **(Fig. 1A)**. In the case of ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H, 56.5 % ± 11.27

(95% CI, n=3, at least 100 cells were counted for each experiment) formed cytoplasmic

filaments. Further, 41.3 % ± 14.8 (95% CI, n=3; at least 100 cells were counted for each

experiment) of the cells in the case of ParA$_F$ Q351H contained filaments, while in the

case of ParA$_F$ W362E, 38.0 % ± 17.9 (95% CI, n=3; at least 100 cells were counted for

each experiment) of the cells contained filaments in presence of *parBS$_F$* complex **(Fig.**

1B).

The cytoplasmic filaments assembled by ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP have been

reported to be less dynamic as compared to the WT-ParA$_F$ and fail to support F plasmid

maintenance (Lim et al. 2005). We, therefore, tested whether the assembly of ParA$_F$

Q351H and W362E into polymers also resulted in the loss of mini-F plasmids from cells

and carried out plasmid stability assays using the two-plasmid system (Ah-Seng et al.

2013; Mishra et al. 2022). ParA$_F$-GFP and its variants were expressed from the

weakened P$_{trc}$ promoter and a mini-F plasmid lacking ParA$_F$ but containing *parBS$_F$*

under the constitutive P$_{LtetO-1}$ promoter (mini-F Cam^R *P$_{LtetO-1}$::ΔparA$_F$, parBS$^+$*; Castaing

et al. 2008) constituted the second plasmid whose maintenance was tested. As would

be expected, in the presence of wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP, mini-F plasmids were maintained

stably, whereas a loss rate of 4.3 % ± 0.32 (SD, n=3; at least 400 colonies were tested

for each experiment) per generation was observed in the absence of $ParA_F$. The mini-F

plasmid loss rates in cultures carrying $ParA_F$ mutants Q351H and W362E were 3.1 % ±

0.80 (SD, n=3; at least 400 colonies were tested for each experiment) and 3.7 % ± 0.40

(SD, n=3; at least 400 colonies were tested for each experiment) respectively, which

was comparable to those lacking $ParA_F$ **(Fig. 1C)**. $ParA_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP (SopA1)

also exhibited plasmid loss from the cultures as reported earlier (Lim et al. 2005) at the

rate of 3.3 % ± 0.33 (SD, n=3; at least 400 colonies were tested for each experiment),

showing that these $ParA_F$ mutants that assemble into stable polymers are impaired in

partitioning plasmids.

$ParA_F$ Q351H and $ParA_F$ W362E or W362A assemble into polymers in the absence

of $parBS_F$

Earlier reports have suggested that ParB influences the polymerisation of $ParA_F$

(Bouet et al. 2007). We thus tested if $ParA_F$ M315I Q351H, $ParA_F$ Q351H and $ParA_F$

W362E assembled into cytoplasmic filaments in the absence of $parBS_F$. Cytoplasmic

filaments of $ParA_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP, $ParA_F$ Q351H-GFP and $ParA_F$ W362E-GFP

were observed in the absence of $ParBS_F$ as well **(Fig. 2A)**, showing that the

polymerisation of these $ParA_F$ mutants were independent of the partitioning complex.

We also substituted W362 with a non-polar amino acid, alanine (W362A) and found that

$ParA_F$ W362A-GFP also assembled into polymers similar to those formed by $ParA_F$

M315I Q351H, $ParA_F$ Q351H, and $ParA_F$ W362E **(Fig. 2A)**. Moreover, in the absence of

$parBS_F$, quantification of the number of cells with filaments showed no significant

differences between the various ParA$_F$ mutants **(Fig. 2B)**. While cells expressing ParA$_F$

M315I Q351H-GFP showed 39.2 % ± 3.37 (95% CI, n=3; at least 100 cells were

counted for each experiment) of cells containing filaments, ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and

ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP resulted in 48.7 % ± 9.46 (95% CI, n=3; at least 150 cells were

counted for each experiment) and 42.80 % ± 8.23 (95% CI, n=3; at least 150 cells were

counted for each experiment) of cells having filaments, respectively **(Fig. 2B)**. The

percentage of cells having filaments in the case of ParA$_F$ W362A was 53.8 % ± 15.12

(95% CI, n=3; at least 150 cells were counted for each experiment) **(Fig. 2B)**. Further,

ParA$_F$ Q351H and W362E filaments showed a mean length of 0.88 µm ± 0.19 (95% CI,

n=3; number of cells counted were > 73 and < 121) and 0.71 µm ± 0.14 (95% CI, n=3;

number of cells counted were > 59 and < 99) respectively **(Fig. 2C)**.

Fission yeast (*Schizosaccharomyces pombe*) has been used as a heterologous

host to study the assembly of cytoskeletal proteins of bacteria and chloroplast

(Srinivasan et al. 2007, 2008; Pande et al. 2022; TerBush et al. 2018; TerBush and

Osteryoung 2012). We thus tested if these ParA$_F$ mutants (M315I Q351H, Q351H and

W362E) assembled to filaments in fission yeast as well. We expressed ParA$_F$ M315I

Q351H, ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E as C-terminal GFP fusions in fission yeast using

the medium-strength thiamine repressible promoter *nmt41/42* (Basi et al. 1993). We

observed that, while ParA$_F$-GFP was localised to the nucleus, probably owing to the

nsDNA binding activity, ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP, ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$

W362E-GFP assembled into polymeric structures in the cytoplasm of *S. pombe* **(Fig.**

2D). Interestingly, the filament length spanned the length of *S. pombe* cells, suggesting

that the limited filament length observed in *E. coli* was possibly a result of either the

physical limit of cell length or the amount of protein available for polymerisation. These

observations further suggest that the polymerisation of these mutants was intrinsic to

ParA$_F$ and that these filaments were formed independent of any host factor specific to

assembly in bacteria. Taken together, these results suggest that the mutations in the

residues Q351 and W362 result in the formation of stable polymers of ParA$_F$, and the

assembly into cytoplasmic filaments is independent of the ParBS$_F$ partitioning complex.

Q351 and W362 influence non-specific DNA binding

ParA$_F$-mediated plasmid partitioning is majorly dependent on the nucleoid

association of ParA$_F$-ATP dimers and the formation of the chemophoretic gradient

through which the ParB-*parS* plasmid complex migrates. We had earlier shown that the

last C-terminal helix played a role in nsDNA binding and plasmid partitioning. Both

Q351H and W362E in ParA$_F$ map to the C-terminal region, and it was thus imperative

for us to test if these filament-forming mutants were also impaired in interaction with

non-specific DNA. The localisation of the filaments formed by these mutant proteins was

thus determined by live-cell imaging in conjunction with the nucleoid stain DAPI and the

membrane marker FM 4-64. ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP filaments often

seemed to localise between the nucleoid and the membrane and appeared not to be co-

localised with DNA (**Fig. 3A**). Further 3D structured illumination microscopy (3D-SIM) of

cells expressing ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP **(Fig. 3B i)** and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP **(Fig. 3B ii)**

showed that the spatial localisation of the polymers were clearly distinct from the

nucleoid, suggesting that these filaments were cytoplasmic and were not associated

with the nucleoid. **(Fig. 3B i and ii)**. In order to better visualise DNA-free regions and

determine if the polymers were indeed localised to DNA-free regions and not bound to

the nucleoid, we inhibited cell division using cephalexin for a short duration of 30

minutes and condensed nucleoids using chloramphenicol, stained them with DAPI and

carried out live-cell imaging. The ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP filaments

were invariably localised to the nucleoid-free regions of the cell **(Fig. 3C)**, and we did

not find any co-localisation of filaments with the nucleoid. On the contrary, ParA$_F$-GFP

was seen to be entirely co-localised with the nucleoid, as expected **(Fig. 3C)**.

Co-expression of filament-forming mutants can induce polymerisation of wild-

type ParA$_F$-GFP

Earlier studies have shown that ParA$_F$ M315 Q351H (SopA1) can co-assemble with

ParA$_F$-GFP and induce the formation of ParA$_F$-GFP filaments. To further test if ParA$_F$

Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E can similarly induce polymerisation of wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP,

which are otherwise localised to the nucleoid, we resorted to in vivo imaging of a two-

plasmid system. We expressed the wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP fusion from the P_{trc} promoter

(pDSW210 vector, Amp^R) as described above and simultaneously expressed versions

of ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E lacking the fluorescent protein tag from the highly

regulated arabinose promoter (pBAD33 vector, Cm^R). Upon co-expression of untagged

wild-type ParA$_F$ from the pBAD33 vector, ParA$_F$-GFP was found localised to the

nucleoid as expected **(Fig. 4A)**. However, ParA$_F$-GFP assembled into polymers in cells

co-expressing untagged ParA$_F$ Q351H **(Fig. 4A)**, suggesting that ParA$_F$ Q351H co-

assembled with wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP and stabilised ParA$_F$ in its polymeric form *in vivo*.

On the contrary, ParA$_F$ W362E only weakly induced polymerisation of ParA$_F$-GFP and

most of the ParA$_F$ remained nucleoid-associated **(Fig. 4A)**. Further, the polymers

assembled by wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP were more clearly visualised upon preventing cell

division by treatment of cells with cephalexin (**Fig. 4B)**. Thus, using co-expression of

WT-ParA$_F$-GFP and untagged versions of ParA$_F$ mutants and imaging, we show that the

mutants ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E can co-polymerise with wild-type ParA$_F$ and

sequestered into the polymeric form. Our results here further support the premise that

wild-type ParA$_F$ has the property to assemble into higher-order oligomers, and these

mutations (Q351H and W362E) resulted in the polymerisation of ParA$_F$ *in vivo*.

Continuous protein synthesis is required to maintain ParA$_F$ filaments

We next attempted to visualise the polymerisation dynamics of ParA$_F$ Q351H and

ParA$_F$ W362E. However, we could rarely capture the phenomenon of foci/ spot to

filament formation in our time-lapse images. The increment in the length could not be

discerned, probably owing to limiting protein levels due to the weak promoter used

(pDSW210; Weiss et al., 1999) and cell division-induced dilution effects. Therefore, we

resorted to cephalexin treatment of cells, which inhibited cell division, to monitor

filament growth in the presence of IPTG. We were able to monitor filament elongation in

these non-dividing cells and were able to capture the growth of the polymers assembled

by ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP **(Fig. 5A)** and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP **(Fig. 5B)** in our time-lapse

experiments.

Moreover, we had serendipitously observed that cells containing ParA$_F$ W362E-

GFP filaments exhibited diffuse cytoplasmic fluorescence when placed on LB agarose

pads lacking IPTG for extended periods **(Supplementary Fig. S1**). Further, we also

observed that ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP exhibited shortening or loss of ParA$_F$ filaments within

20-minutes on LB agarose pads lacking IPTG **(Fig. 5C)**. The depolymerisation of ParA$_F$

filaments in the absence of IPTG suggested that the maintenance of polymers required

continuous protein synthesis. To determine if the persistence of ParA$_F$ filaments

depended upon continual protein synthesis, we prevented further induction of protein

and blocked protein synthesis in cells expressing ParA$_F$ filaments and carried out time-

lapse microscopy. We first grew cultures carrying pDSW210-ParA$_F$ Q351H or

pDSW210-ParA$_F$ W362E with IPTG to induce polymerisation. We then carried out time-

lapse imaging of these cells placed on IPTG containing agarose pads and compared

them with cells imaged on agarose pads containing chloramphenicol and glucose, but

lacking IPTG. We added chloramphenicol (Cm), a protein synthesis inhibitor, to prevent

further protein synthesis and glucose (Glu) to completely repress ParA$_F$ expression from

the weakened P$_{trc}$ promoter. Time-lapse imaging of ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP **(Fig. 5D)** and

ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP **(Fig. 5E)** in the presence of Glu + Cm **(Fig. 5D i and 5E i)** or IPTG

(Fig. 5D ii and 5E ii) confirmed that the filaments indeed underwent depolymerisation in

the absence of continued protein synthesis within a period of approximately 20 minutes

(Fig. 5 D i and E i). These results suggest that both ParA$_F$ Q351H and W362E require a

critical concentration of protein to assemble into polymers and there exists a

cytoplasmic pool of unpolymerised subunits as well in addition to the filaments

observed.

ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E act as super-repressors of the *parAB$_F$* promoter

ParA$_F$ is known to weakly repress transcription from its own promoter by binding

to the four operator sequences. A winged helix-turn-winged helix (WTH) domain that is

distinct from the nsDNA binding residues is responsible for promoter sequence

recognition and binding (Hirano et al. 1998; Lemonnier et al. 2000; Libante et al. 2001;

Komai et al. 2011; Yates et al. 1999; Mori et al. 1989; Bouet et al. 2007; Ah-Seng et al.

2009; Ravin et al. 2003; Hayes et al. 1994; Abeles et al. 1985). This auto-regulatory

activity of ParA$_F$ is very weak but is enhanced in the presence of the ParBS$_F$ complex.

(Ravin et al. 2003; Mori et al. 1989; Hirano et al. 1998; Libante et al. 2001). While the

filaments formed by ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E were not nucleoid-associated, we

tested if ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E (presumably the cytosolic subunits) could at

least bind the specific DNA sequences in the promoter region of ParA$_F$ and act to

repress gene expression. In order to do so, we resorted to using an *in vivo* reporter

assay based on *lacZ* fusion to the P*parF* promoter and utilised the *E. coli* DLT1127

strain (PparF::lacZ; Ravin and Lane 1999). As reported earlier, we made use of ParA$_F$

constructs that carried a stop codon between ParA$_F$ and GFP (Mishra et al. 2022) **(Fig.**

6A). We transformed ParA$_F$ or the mutant plasmids into the DLT1127 strain of *E. coli*

carrying a mini-F plasmid containing ParBS$_F$ region but lacking ParA$_F$ (mini-F *ΔparA$_F$*

parBS$^+$) and assayed for promoter repression by spotting serial dilutions of the cultures

on X- Gal + IPTG plates. In the presence of ParBS$_F$, although ParA$_F$ and both the

mutants (Q351H and W362E) repressed the expression of LacZ from the P*parF*

promoter, the extent of repression by ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E appeared to be

stronger **(Fig. 6B; top panel)**. However, in the absence of the ParBS$_F$ complex, while

ParA$_F$ showed a reduced ability to repress LacZ expression as expected, ParA$_F$ Q351H

and ParA$_F$ W362E continued to strongly repress the expression of LacZ (**Fig. 6B,**

bottom panel). Further, quantification of the LacZ expression levels by β-galactosidase

assays using ONPG as a substrate (**Figure 9** below) also showed that the repressor

function of ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E were not responsive to the presence of the

ParBS$_F$ complex. Expression of LacZ was repressed by 74.27 % ± 3.22 (SD, n = 3) and

70.85 % ± 4.95 (SD, n = 3) by ParA$_F$ Q351H in the presence and absence of ParBS$_F$

complex, respectively. Repression of LacZ by ParA$_F$ W362E was weaker and showed

44.60 % ± 8.87 (SD, n = 3) and 44.03 % ± 1.16 (SD, n = 3) in the presence and

absence of ParBS$_F$ complex, respectively. On the contrary, ParA$_F$ showed a significant

repression of 74.04 % ± 2.05 (SD, n = 3) in the presence of the ParBS$_F$ complex

compared to a mere 6.40 % ± 9.83 (SD, n = 3) in its absence. These results suggested

that the repression of the ParA$_F$ promoter activity by ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E

resulted in a so-called super-repressor activity of ParA$_F$ independent of the ParBS$_F$

complex.

Polymerisation is an ATP-dependent process and requires the conformational

change to ParA$_F$-ATP* state

In vitro studies of ParA$_F$ and several ParA homologs have shown that polymerisation

was strictly an ATP-dependent process (Lim et al. 2005; Leonard et al. 2005; Bouet et

al. 2007; Parker et al. 2021). Thus, we wanted to test if the observed *in vivo*

polymerisation of ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP was dependent upon ATP binding. The residue

K120 in ParA$_F$ has been reported to be essential for ATP binding and hydrolysis

(Libante et al. 2001; Hatano et al. 2007). Changing this residue to glutamic acid (E) in

ParA$_{P1}$ has been shown to specifically affect ATP binding (Vecchiarelli et al. 2013a;

Chodha et al. 2023; Fung et al. 2001; Davis et al. 1996). We, therefore, generated ParA$_F$

double mutants (ParA$_F$ K120E W362E-GFP) and assessed their ability to form polymers

in *E. coli*. As compared to the single mutant ParA$_F$ W362E **(Fig. 7A)**, the double

mutation resulted in a complete loss of polymerisation and exhibited diffuse

fluorescence of ParA$_F$-GFP over the entire cytoplasm of the cell, underlining the role of

ATP binding in the polymerisation of these ParA$_F$ mutants **(Fig. 7A)**. These results

therefore suggest that the assembly of ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP into cytoplasmic filaments

was strictly an ATP dependent process.

ParA$_F$ has been proposed to undergo a conformational state change upon ATP-

binding (Libante et al. 2001; Vecchiarelli et al. 2010; Zhang and Schumacher 2017;

Caccamo et al. 2020; Dobruk-Serkowska et al. 2012; Baxter et al. 2020). Since

polymerisation of ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP was ATP-binding dependent, we next sought to

determine if polymerisation required ATP hydrolysis and the conformational change to

the ParA$_F$-ATP* state. Different mutations in the same lysine residue (K120) have been

reported to have different effects on ParA$_{P1}$ (Fung et al. 2001; Davis et al. 1996;

Vecchiarelli et al. 2013a). In ParA$_F$, both K120R and K120Q have been shown to

interact with ATP but fail to attain the ParA$_F$-ATP* conformational state, but only ParA$_F$

K120Q still retains its intrinsic ATP-hydrolysis activity similar to that of ParA$_F$ (Ah-Seng

et al. 2013; Libante et al. 2001; Le Gall et al. 2016). Therefore, we examined the effects

of these ATP mutant variants (K120R and K120Q) on the polymerisation of ParA$_F$

W362E-GFP. Both the double mutants, ParA$_F$ K120R W362E and ParA$_F$ K120Q

W362E, failed to assemble into polymers and exhibited only diffuse cytoplasmic

fluorescence, suggesting that a conformational change to ParA$_F$-ATP* state but not ATP

hydrolysis was necessary for the stabilisation of ParA$_F$ filaments. We also substituted

K120 with alanine in ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP, and surprisingly, we observed that ParA$_F$

K120A W362E-GFP was still able to assemble into polymers **(Fig. 7A)**. Furthermore,

the percentage of cells having cytoplasmic filaments or the average filament length in

the case of ParA$_F$ K120A W362E-GFP were not significantly different than for ParA$_F$

W362E-GFP **(Fig. 7 B and C)**. Thus, in contrast to the K120R and K120Q mutations,

the K120A mutation did not prevent the polymerisation of ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP.

The conformational change to the ParA$_F$-ATP* state is essential for the nucleoid

association and formation of ParA$_F$ foci in the presence of the ParBS$_F$ complex (Libante

et al. 2001). Accordingly, ParA$_F$ K120R and ParA$_F$ K120Q are defective in foci formation

(Hatano et al. 2007; Hu et al. 2021). We therefore reasoned that if ParA$_F$ K120A

retained the ability to undergo the conformational change to the ParA$_F$-ATP* state,

ParA$_F$ K120A-GFP should assemble into foci like that of wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP in the

presence of ParBS$_F$ complex **(Fig. 7D)**. Consistently, we observed that ParA$_F$ K120A-

GFP formed foci over the nucleoid region like ParA$_F$-GFP. Quantification of the

distribution of foci per cell showed only subtle differences between ParA$_F$-GFP and

ParA$_F$ K120A-GFP **(Fig. 7E)**. Taken together, these results suggest that ParA$_F$ K120A

undergoes the conformational change to ParA$_F$-ATP* state and that the assembly into

cytoplasmic filaments by the ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP requires the formation of ParA$_F$-ATP

dimers and the conformational change to its ParA$_F$-ATP* state.

Polar residues E375 in the last C-terminal helix and R320 in helix 14 play a role in polymerisation and plasmid maintenance function of ParA$_F$

Recent cryo-electron microscopic studies of ParA2$_{Vc}$ have revealed a polymeric structure of ParA bound to DNA, and the last C-terminal helix 16 constituted an important oligomer interface in the nucleoprotein filament complex (Parker et al. 2021). Moreover, we had earlier reported that the last C-terminal helix was essential for function in ParA$_F$. In a study involving multiple point mutations of the charged residues in the C-terminal helix 16 of ParA$_F$, we had found that E375A impacted nucleoid localisation of ParA$_F$ *in vivo* (Mishra et al. 2022). Therefore, we introduced E375A into ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP and tested their effects on the polymerisation of ParA$_F$. Further, we carried out mutational studies in the conserved residues proximal (e.g. R320 and K329) to the previously identified nsDNA binding residues and tested their effects on ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP. The double mutants, ParA$_F$ W362E E375A-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E R320A-GFP, failed to assemble into polymers and exhibited diffuse fluorescence throughout the cell **(Fig. 8A)**, suggesting that E375 in the last C-terminal helix and R320 might be involved in the polymerisation of ParA$_F$. Quantification of total fluorescence intensity in the cells expressing ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP, ParA$_F$ W362E E375A-GFP or ParA$_F$ W362E R320A-GFP did not show any significant differences, suggesting that the protein levels were similar in these cells **(Fig. 8B)** and that the mutations R320A and E375A affected polymerisation of ParA$_F$.

Next, in order to ascertain if polymerisation and, thereby, residues E375 and R320 were important for ParA$_F$ function, we determined if plasmid maintenance was affected by the E375A and R320A mutations. As described above, we utilised the two-

plasmid system, wherein we assessed the stability of the mini-F plasmid (pDAG198;

$\Delta parA_F$, $parBS^+$) and expressed $ParA_F$ or its variants from P_{trc} promoter in the

pDSW210 vector. We had earlier shown that $ParA_F$ E375A-GFP exhibited mild plasmid

loss compared to $ParA_F$-GFP (Mishra et al. 2022). Consistently, we found that $ParA_F$

E375A-GFP showed a plasmid loss of 1.6 ± 0.55 (SD, n = 3, at least 400 colonies were

tested for each experiment) per generation **(Fig. 8C)**. $ParA_F$ R320A-GFP showed a

higher plasmid loss of 3.6 ± 0.33 (SD, n = 3, at least 400 colonies were tested for each

experiment) and comparable to the plasmid loss in cultures lacking $ParA_F$ [3.4 ± 0.1

(SD, n = 3, at least 400 colonies were tested for each experiment)] **(Fig. 8C)**. Further,

we had also shown that $ParA_F$ E375A-GFP did not bind DNA and failed to form foci in

the presence of $ParBS_F$ complex (Mishra et al. 2022). We thus tested if $ParA_F$ R320A-

GFP also behaved similarly and assessed its localisation in both the presence and

absence of the $ParBS_F$ complex. We used a strain of *E. coli* expressing HupA-mCherry

to visualise the nucleoid. As a control, we also used $ParA_F$-GFP, and as expected, it

was found to be localised on the nucleoid in the absence of the $ParBS_F$ complex.

Consistent with our results, $ParA_F$ E375A-GFP was found to be evenly distributed

throughout the cell in the absence of the $ParBS_F$ complex **(Fig. 8D)**. On the contrary,

$ParA_F$ R320A-GFP showed mild localisation to the nucleoid, but unlike $ParA_F$-GFP,

fluorescence was found to be distributed in nucleoid free regions of the cell as well **(Fig.**

8D). Further, in the presence of the $ParBS_F$ partitioning complex, only $ParA_F$-GFP

exhibited foci formation and both $ParA_F$ E375A and $ParA_F$ R320A resulted in

predominantly diffuse fluorescence throughout the cytoplasm of the cell. However,

$ParA_F$ R320A exhibited mild foci consistent with its slight nucleoid association **(Fig. 8E)**.

Our results here show that E375 and R320 are crucial for the polymerisation of ParA$_F$,

and mutations in these residues affect the nucleoid localisation and plasmid

maintenance function of ParA$_F$. These results further suggest that oligomerisation or

formation of higher order structure by ParA$_F$ might be crucial for plasmid partitioning *in*

vivo.

E375A and R320A mutations affect the super repression activity of ParA$_F$ W362E

We next tested if the introduction of E375A or R320A into ParA$_F$ W362E also

abrogated their ability to act as super-repressors of transcription at the P*parF* promoter

site using the above-described LacZ reporter and β-galactosidase assays.

Quantification of the β-galactosidase activity in the DLT1127 strain (P*parA*::*lacZ*::*kan*)

carrying the various ParA$_F$ constructs showed that the double mutants, ParA$_F$ W362E

E375A and ParA$_F$ W362E R320A exhibited a decreased ability to repress LacZ

expression as compared to ParA$_F$ W362E, indicating that E375A and R320A mutations

affected their ability to function as super-repressors **(Fig. 9)**. We used both null

hypothesis statistical testing (NHST) and estimation statistics (Claridge-Chang and

Assam 2016; Ho et al. 2019) to assess statistical significance of the data. The effect

size, defined as the difference in the means, the precision of the difference given by the

95 % CI, and p-values for NHST are given in **Table 1 (i – iii)**. While the introduction of

R320A into ParA$_F$ W362E led to a difference of -40.1 [-57.8, -22.4] as compared to

ParA$_F$ W362E, the effect size in the case of ParA$_F$ W362E E375A was -33.6 [-36.5, -

30.8] **(Table 1 i)**.

We also assessed the effect of the E375A and R320A single mutations on the

repression ability of ParA$_F$. In the absence of the ParBS$_F$ complex, the β-galactosidase

activity in the strain carrying ParA$_F$ E375A or ParA$_F$ R320A was not significantly different

from those carrying ParA$_F$ **(Table 1 ii)**. However, in the presence of the ParBS$_F$

complex, both ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A repressed LacZ expression with a

difference of 43.4 [30.3, 56.4] and 35.3 [21.5, 49.2], respectively, as compared to the

vector control (pDSW210-GFP) **(Table 1 iii)**. On the contrary, ParA$_F$ strongly reduced

the expression of LacZ with an effect size of 74 [61.3, 86.7] compared to pDSW210-

GFP. Thus, in comparison to ParA$_F$, ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A showed a slightly

reduced level of repression and had an effect size of -30.7 [-43.7, -17.6] and -38.7 [-

52.6, -24.8], respectively **(Table 1 ii)**., showing that ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A

were moderately defective in repressing the transcriptional activity from the P$_{parA}$

promoter. Nonetheless, ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A showed enhanced

transcriptional repression in the presence of the ParBS$_F$ complex as compared to its

absence, with an effect size of 30.3 [16.0, 44.6] and 24.2 [7.7, 40.6] **(Table 1 iii)**,

suggesting that the E375A and R320A mutations did not affect the ParB and nucleotide

binding functions of ParA$_F$.

Discussion

DNA partitioning by the ParA family of proteins, such as ParA$_F$ (SopA), depends

upon its ability to bind the nucleoid. It is the nucleoid-bound ParA$_F$ that facilitates the

process of plasmid segregation by interacting with the ParB-*parC* complex (SopB-

sopC), which is essentially the plasmid cargo. While initial reports indicated that

cytomotive filaments of ParA$_F$ were responsible for the plasmid movements away from

the mid-cell (Lim et al. 2005; Leonard et al. 2005; Gitai 2006; Hatano et al. 2007; Bouet

et al. 2007), studies from several species of ParA proteins have shown that the ParA

proteins interact as ATP-bound dimers with DNA (Vecchiarelli et al. 2010, 2013a; Havey

et al. 2012; Lim et al. 2014; Zhang and Schumacher 2017; Köhler et al. 2022; Leonard et

al. 2005; Hwang et al. 2013). However, recent studies have suggested that the binding

of ParA to the nucleoid is cooperative and a cryo-EM study of ParA2$_{Vc}$ revealed a

filament structure of ParA bound to the DNA, suggesting that cooperativity could

possibly involve oligomerisation of ParA (Chodha et al. 2023; Köhler et al. 2022; Parker

et al. 2021). Thus, the exact function and mechanism of assembly of ParA into higher-

order structures remains unclear. Polymerisation of ParA$_F$ has been demonstrated *in*

vitro (Bouet et al. 2007) in the presence of ATP, and filaments have also been observed

in a few cells expressing wild-type ParA$_F$ (Lim et al. 2005; Hatano et al. 2007).

A spontaneous mutant of ParA$_F$ (M315I Q351H) has been shown to form static

polymeric structures in *E. coli* (Lim et al. 2005). Our studies reported here show that

another mutation at position W362 of ParA$_F$ to either E or A also resulted in the

assembly of ParA$_F$ into cytoplasmic polymers similar to those formed by ParA$_F$ M315I

Q351H (SopA1). Further, a single mutation Q351H was sufficient to stabilise ParA$_F$

filaments. Similar assembly of polymers by ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H (SopA1), ParA$_F$

Q351H, W362E or the W362A mutants in the absence of the ParBS$_F$ complex or in a

heterologous eukaryotic host, fission yeast, suggested that the mutations helped

stabilise an otherwise transient polymeric form of ParA$_F$ independent of the partition

complex. Moreover, both ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E were able to induce the

polymerisation of wild-type ParA$_F$ when co-expressed and resulted in the formation of

cytoplasmic filaments of WT-ParA$_F$-GFP, even though ParA$_F$ Q351H exhibited a much

stronger effect compared to ParA$_F$ W362E.

However, both the mutants (Q351H and W362E), like SopA1 (M315I Q351H),

were defective in plasmid maintenance, showing that the static or stable polymers of

ParA$_F$ did not drive DNA segregation. Further, super-resolution imaging using 3D-SIM

revealed that ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP filaments exhibited nucleoid

binding defects, consistent with their inability to maintain plasmids. There is ample

evidence supporting non-specific DNA binding and dynamic localisation of ParA$_F$ to the

nucleoid driving the process of plasmid segregation. These results show that

polymerisation in the absence of nucleoid binding does not facilitate plasmid partitioning

and maintenance. Moreover, *in vitro* polymerisation studies using light-scattering in the

presence of nsDNA have implicated DNA as a polymerisation inhibitor (Bouet et al.

2007). Thus, in contrast to Soj and ParA2$_{Vc}$ that form nucleoprotein filaments in the

presence of non-specific DNA (Leonard et al. 2005; Hui et al. 2010; Parker et al. 2021),

the lack of non-specific DNA binding by ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H (SopA1), ParA$_F$ Q351H

and ParA$_F$ W362E could have possibly induced polymerisation. However, K340A, a

mutation known to abolish the nsDNA binding in ParA$_F$, does not assemble into such

micron-long filaments (Castaing et al. 2008), suggesting that the residues Q351 and

W362 in the C-terminal region may play a crucial stabilising role in polymerisation of

ParA$_F$.

Furthermore, the polymers formed by ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E underwent

depolymerisation within 20 minutes when new protein synthesis was stopped,

suggesting a need for a critical protein concentration to be maintained in cells for

polymerisation. Disassembly of filaments upon inhibition of protein synthesis suggested

that the maintenance of the polymers required continual protein synthesis and the

existence of a cytoplasmic pool of ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E proteins as well as

the polymeric form. Consistent with the inability of ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E

proteins to associate with the bacterial nucleoid, both mutations resulted in super-

repression of transcription from the ParA$_F$ promoter (P$_{parA}$), i.e. enhanced transcriptional

repression in the absence of the ParBS$_F$ complex. These findings are consistent with

the recent reports on ParA$_{P1}$ DNA binding mutants. The absence of nsDNA binding

results in an excess-free pool of ParA that becomes available to bind the promoter and

function as super-repressors (Baxter et al. 2020). Thus, the inability of ParA$_F$ Q351H

and ParA$_F$ W362E to bind nsDNA might create an excess of the free cytoplasmic pool of

the protein, which can then exhibit heightened auto-repression activity. We believe that

while the filaments may not associate with the nucleoid, the available cytoplasmic pool

might interact with the specific ParA$_F$ operator sites, forming a stable complex, acting to

prevent transcription effectively. Thus, the mutations (Q351H and W362E) do not impair

the ability of ParA$_F$ to bind with specific DNA. These results suggested that the

mutations Q351H and W362E did not affect the overall structural integrity of the protein.

The mutations Q351H and W362E possibly stabilise the trimer of dimer structures of

ParA$_F$ that have been described recently (Boudsocq et al. 2021), enabling the formation

of a tighter complex with the ParA$_F$ promoter sites and might be conducive to the

organisation of larger filamentous structure beyond a threshold of protein

concentrations.

Consistent with the earlier *in vitro* studies (Fung et al. 2001; Libante et al. 2001),

polymerisation of ParA$_F$ Q351H and W362E was an ATP-dependent process since

introducing a mutation that prevents ATP-binding (K120E) completely abolished

filament assembly. Mutational studies of the conserved K120 residue in the Walker A

motif have also shown that the residue is also crucial for the necessary conformational

change from ParA$_F$-ATP to ParA$_F$-ATP* (Libante et al. 2001; Ah-Seng et al. 2013).

Accordingly, earlier localisation studies on the various ParA$_F$ K120 substitutions have

shown that the K120R and K120Q mutants fail to form foci in the presence of the

ParBS$_F$ complex (Hatano et al. 2007). The ability of ParA$_F$ K120A to form foci similar to

that of wild-type ParA$_F$ in the presence of the ParBS$_F$ complex suggests that among the

various K120 mutants, K120A alone could support the conformational change from

ParA$_F$-ATP to ParA$_F$-ATP*. Further, our studies on combining the K120 mutations with

W362E show that only ParA$_F$ K120A W362E retained the ability to assemble into

filaments. Moreover, previous *in vitro* studies had indicated that ParA$_F$ assembly into

filaments possibly depended upon the conformational change induced by ATP. These

results suggest that, like nsDNA binding, polymerisation of ParA$_F$ was also dependent

upon the conformational change to the ParA$_F$-ATP* state. It is plausible that the

mutations Q351H and W362E abolish the ATP hydrolysis activity of ParA$_F$ and stabilise

the polymeric state. Interestingly, while the ATP-hydrolysis mutants K120Q or K120A by

themselves do not form ParA filaments, yet another mutant, ParA$_F$ V125A, which is also

defective in ATP-hydrolysis, has been shown to assemble into polymers *in vivo*

(Castaing 2009). Thus, inhibition of ATP-hydrolysis by mutations in the residues other

than the conserved K120 in the Walker A motif might result in the stabilisation of ParA$_F$

polymers.

Clearly, further biochemical experiments on these mutants will be required in the

future to address these possibilities and gain insights. On the other hand, we have

utilised the ability of ParA$_F$ W362E to form stable filaments to identify new residues

crucial for polymerisation for ParA$_F$. Mutations in residues proximal to the previously

identified nsDNA binding residues (Castaing et al. 2008) and the C-terminal helix

(Mishra et al. 2022) in ParA$_F$ revealed R320 (in helix 14) and E375 in helix 16,

respectively, as being critical for the polymerisation of ParA$_F$ W362E. Both ParA$_F$

W362E R320A and ParA$_F$ W362E E375A failed to form filaments and exhibited reduced

transcriptional repression activity at the ParA$_F$ promoter, suggesting a role for E375 and

R320 in oligomerisation/ polymerisation. Accordingly, the single mutants ParA$_F$ R320A

and ParA$_F$ E375A also showed reduced promoter repression in the presence of the

ParBS$_F$ complex as compared to the WT-ParA$_F$. Nonetheless, both ParA$_F$ R320A and

ParA$_F$ E375A responded to ParB and were able to repress the transcriptional activity at

the ParA$_F$ promoter in the presence of the ParBS$_F$ partitioning complex, albeit to a

lesser extent than wild-type ParA$_F$. Transcriptional repression at the ParA promoter

requires nucleotide binding (Lemonnier et al. 2000; Libante et al. 2001; Ah-Seng et al.

2013; Baxter et al. 2020). These results, therefore, suggest that the mutations R320A

and E375A retained their ability to bind nucleotide and associate with specific promoter

DNA sequences to prevent transcription of ParA$_F$ in response to ParBS$_F$. Therefore, we

infer that the loss of plasmid maintenance observed for ParA$_F$ R320A and ParA$_F$ E375A

was not due to the lack of ATP binding by the mutants but possibly due to their defects

in oligomerisation. These results are thus consistent with the recently proposed role of

helix 14 and the last C-terminal helix 16 in intra-subunit contacts within $ParA_{Vc}$ filaments

(Parker et al., 2021) and co-operative binding of ParA to nsDNA, which may involve

polymerisation, albeit transient (Parker et al. 2021; Chodha et al. 2023).

We envisage a model wherein upon ATP binding, $ParA_F$ undergoes the

conformational change to the $ParA_F$-ATP* state as proposed earlier and binds co-

operatively to nsDNA within the high-density regions (Le Gall et al. 2016; McLeod et al.

2017) via assembly into higher-order structures (Hui et al. 2010; Parker et al. 2021).

However, the stabilisation of oligomeric structures by the mutants Q351H or W362E

results in the formation of long cytoplasmic filaments incompatible with nsDNA binding,

resulting in a failure to associate with the nucleoid. Although further biochemical and

electron microscopy studies are required to elucidate the oligomerisation of $ParA_F$ and

its precise roles *in vivo*, one possibility could be that the polymerisation of $ParA_F$ could

act as a sequestration mechanism to regulate any excess $ParA_F$ from the system.

Alternately, our studies here lead us to speculate that the last C-terminal helix of $ParA_F$

might be a key player in facilitating nsDNA binding and the segregation of plasmids by

regulating $ParA_F$ oligomerisation **(Fig. 10)**. Further identification of ParA mutants

specifically defective in polymerisation but not in ATP-binding and formation of the ATP-

bound sandwich dimers or ParA-ATP* state, and similar studies across other members

of the ParA family of DNA partitioning proteins and their genetic and biochemical

characterisation should lead to a better insight into the physiological role of

polymerisation by the ParA family of proteins.

Materials and Methods

Strains, Plasmids, Media and Growth Conditions

$E.\ coli$ and $S.\ pombe$ strains were cultured as described previously (Srinivasan et al. 2007; Mishra et al. 2021). While $E.\ coli$ was grown at 37°C in LB medium, $S.\ pombe$ was grown at 30°C in Yeast Extract with Supplements (YES) medium or Edinburgh Minimal Medium (EMM) supplemented with adenine (0.225 mg/ml), histidine (0.225 mg/ml) and leucine (0.225 mg/ml) or uracil (0.1125 mg/ ml) as necessary but lacking thiamine. Antibiotics carbenicillin and chloramphenicol in LB medium were used at a concentration of 100 µg/ mL and 34 µg/ mL, respectively. Kanamycin was used at 50 µg/ mL (for plasmids) or 25 µg/ mL in the case of single-copy chromosomal integrations. Chloramphenicol was added at a 50 µg/ mL concentration to inhibit protein synthesis in cells and at 50 µg/ mL concentration to condense nucleoids (Sun and Margolin 2004; Zusman et al. 1973). Cephalexin at a final concentration of 25 µg/ mL (Pogliano et al. 1997) was added to inhibit cell division for 30 minutes. $E.\ coli$ DH5α was used for cloning purposes. All the plasmids used in this study were created using Gibson assembly (Gibson et al. 2009) or Restriction Free cloning (van den Ent and Löwe 2006) and site-directed mutations were introduced by the method of Stratagene QuikChange^{TM} using Q5 polymerase (NEB). In experiments relating to promoter repression, a stop codon (TAA) was introduced between the ParA$_F$ and the GFP coding sequences, as previously reported (Mishra et al. 2022). The strains and plasmids used in this study have been listed in **Supplementary Table S1**, and the oligonucleotides used for generating the constructs have been listed in **Supplementary Table S2**. Expression of ParA$_F$-GFP from the weak P$_{Trc}$ promoter of the pDSW210 vector was

achieved by adding 50 μM or 100 μM isopropyl-β-D-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) as

mentioned in the text.

Live Cell Imaging-

Live-cell imaging of *E. coli* and *S. pombe* was carried out as previously described

(Srinivasan et al. 2007, 2008; Mishra et al. 2022) using an epifluorescence microscope

(DeltaVision Elite^{TM}) equipped with 7-color solid-state illumination (Spectra Light Engine

from Lumencor^{TM}). A 100 x oil immersion of NA 1.4 (UPLSAPO100XO) or a phase

objective lens (PLN100XOPH) of NA 1.4 was used, and images were acquired using a

CCD camera (CoolSNAP^{TM} HQ2). Excitation filters and emission filters of - 390/18 and

435/48 (DAPI), 475/28 nm and 525/48 nm (GFP) and 575/25 nm and 625/45 nm

(mCherry) were used, respectively. Briefly, cells were pelleted down by centrifuging at

2000 x g for 5 min and spotted on LB (for *E. coli*) or EMM without thiamine (for *S.*

pombe) agarose pads (1.5 % agarose). Nucleoids in *E. coli* were visualised by

incubating cells with 0.5 μg/ml 4′,6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI) for 15–20 min prior

to centrifugation. Alternatively, an MG1655-derived strain of *E. coli* expressing HupA-

mCherry from its chromosomal locus was used to visualise the nucleoid. Membranes

were stained with FM4-64 and additives such as antibiotics, IPTG, 2% glucose,

chloramphenicol at 50 ug/ml to prevent protein synthesis or 100 ug/ml to condense

nucleoids (Zusman et al. 1973; Sun and Margolin 2004) and cephalexin at 25 μg/ml to

prevent cell division (Pogliano et al. 1997) were all added to the agarose pads where

mentioned in the text. 3D-SIM imaging was carried out using a DeltaVision OMX-SR

Blaze microscope equipped with a PCO Edge 4.2 sCMOS camera, and a 60x, NA 1.42

oil-immersion objective lens was used to acquire raw images. An exposure time of 2 – 5

ms was used to acquire each image, and Z-stacks were obtained at a step size of 0.125

µm to cover the width of the bacterial cell. 3D-SIM images were reconstructed using the

SI reconstruction module of SoftWorx^{TM} software. All images were acquired using

SoftWorx^{TM} software and processed with Fiji v-1.53c or v-1.54f (Schindelin et al. 2012).

The deconvolution of images was performed using SoftWorx^{TM} software's in-built

algorithm - DECON3D: 3D iterative constrained deconvolution with not more than 10

iterations.

Plasmid Stability Assay

Plasmid stability assay was performed using a two-plasmid system (Ah-Seng et

al. 2013), as described previously (Mishra et al. 2021, 2022). Briefly, bacterial cultures

carrying the plasmids were sub-cultured 1:1000, maintained in exponential phase by

sub-culturing (1:100) twice into a fresh LB media and allowed to grow for 40

generations. Various dilutions of the culture were plated on carbenicillin plates and

incubated at 37 °C. Colonies were then patched on plates containing chloramphenicol

to estimate the retention of the mini-F plasmid. The plasmid loss rate was calculated

following the equation $L = 100\left[1 - \left(\frac{Ff}{Fi}\right)^{\left[\frac{1}{n}\right]}\right]$ as reported previously (Ravin and Lane

1999). "Fi" is the initial fraction of cells containing plasmid, and "Ff" is the number of

cells carrying the plasmid after 40 generations (n) of growth.

Promoter repression assay

Qualitative assessment to detect the LacZ activity was carried out on LB agar

plates containing IPTG (200 µM) and X-gal (40 µg/ mL). Overnight cultures carrying the

various ParA$_F$ constructs were diluted 1:100 into fresh LB, and growth was continued

until the cultures reached an OD$_{600}$ of 0.2. The cultures were induced with 100 µM IPTG

for 2 hours. Subsequently, serial dilutions of the cultures (adjusted to the same OD$_{600}$)

were spotted on indicator plates- X-gal (40 µg/ mL) + IPTG (0.2 mM). These plates were

then incubated overnight at 37 °C, following which they were imaged using a CCD

colour camera on a mobile phone device and the white balance was corrected using the

ImageJ plugin. For quantitative estimates of the LacZ expression, β-galactosidase

assays were performed as described (Griffith and Wolf 2002). Cultures were centrifuged

at 1523 x g, 10 min, 4 °C and the pellet was resuspended in Z-buffer (0.06 M Na$_2$HPO$_4$,

0.04 M NaH$_2$PO$_4$, 0.01 M KCl, 0.001 M MgSO$_4$, pH 7.0). 50 µM β-mercaptoethanol was

added to the Z-buffer immediately before use. A 2 mL culture adjusted to an OD$_{600}$ of

0.6 was used for all assays. Cells were permeabilised by the addition of 20 µL

Chloroform and 20 µL of 0.1 % SDS solution. Samples were then vigorously vortexed

for one to 2 minutes and incubated at 28 °C for 10 minutes. Nitrophenyl-β-D-

galactopyranoside (ONPG) at a final concentration of 0.13 mM was used as the

substrate for the reaction and recorded as time point zero (t_0) for the assay. When

ONPG is hydrolysed by β-galactosidase into galactose and o-nitrophenol, the solution

colour turns yellow. When sufficient yellow colour had developed (assessed visually),

the reaction was stopped by the addition of 100 µL of 1 M solution of Na$_2$CO$_3$ and the

time was recorded (in minutes). Values of the β- galactosidase activity were determined

in Miller units using the formula: $MU = 1000 \times \left[\frac{\{OD_{420} - (1.75 \times OD_{550})\}}{T \times V \times OD_{600}} \right]$, where MU is Miller

Units, OD_{420}, OD_{550} and OD_{600} are measure optical density at 420 nm, 550 nm and 600

nm, respectively. T is the total reaction time in minutes, and V is the volume of culture

used in milli-litres (mL).

Statistical Methods

A single colony of bacteria or a patch of yeast cells from freshly streaked out cells on

agar plates from frozen glycerol stocks and grown independently were considered biological

replicates (n). Except where mentioned in the text, every experiment was performed at

least 3 or more times (independent biological replicates, n ≥ 3). All error bars represent

the standard deviation from the central tendency value mean. In the case of the plasmid

stability assays, the loss rate of mini-F plasmid was compared to the cultures that

carried the wild-type $ParA_F$, wherein the plasmid loss rate was always zero. Therefore, a

one-sample t-test was used to calculate p-values for evaluating the statistical

significance of the plasmid loss rates among various mutants. The online web server

https://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/oneSampleT1/ was used to obtain the p-values.

For other experiments pertaining to the promoter repression assays, where p-values are

mentioned, either two-tailed Student's t-test or one-tailed Student's t-test was used,

wherein the repression values were already expected to be only higher, as in the case

of vector control (normalised to zero) and ParBS (which is expected to enhance

repression). As an alternative to null-hypothesis significance tests (NHST), we also

used estimation statistics to determine the effect size and the precision of the effect size

was given by the 95 % confidence intervals (Claridge-Chang and Assam 2016; Ho et al.

2019). Superplots were plotted as described (Lord et al. 2020) using Excel Office 365.

Effect size is defined as the difference between the mean values of the samples being

compared, and statistical significance is assumed when 95% CI values do not

encompass zero (Cumming et al. 2007; Vaux 2014; Pollard et al. 2019).

Acknowledgement

The authors thank all the members of the RS lab for their helpful suggestions and

technical help. DM and NM received financial support and fellowship from DAE, which is

acknowledged. RS is the recipient of research grants from DST-SERB

(CRG/2021/000337) that supported this work. Intra-mural funding from the Department

of Atomic Energy (DAE) is acknowledged. The authors sincerely thank Drs. Anjana

Badrinarayanan (NCBS, TIFR, DAE) and Gayathri Pananghat for their suggestions,

helpful discussions and comments on the manuscript. The authors thank Drs. Jean

Yves-Bouet (LMGM, Toulouse, France), David Lane (CBI-Toulouse, France), Tushar

Beuria (ILS, Bhubaneswar) and Mohan Chandra Joshi (JMI, New Delhi), for the

generous gifts of strains and plasmid. pDSW210 was originally a gift from Dr. David

Weiss (Univ. of Iowa), and the *E. coli ΔminB* strain was originally obtained from Dr.

Lutkenhaus (Univ. of Kansas).

Author Contributions

NM, DM and IAP performed experiments. NM and DM carried out microscopy, acquired

images and analysed them. IAP performed and analysed certain experiments pertaining

to promoter repression and analysed images. NM quantified, analysed and organised

the data. NM and DM contributed to writing the draft manuscript. RS and NM edited the

manuscript. RS conceptualised the work, RS and NM designed experiments, analysed

and interpreted the data.

References:

Abeles AL, Friedman SA, Austin SJ. 1985. Partition of unit-copy miniplasmids to

daughter cells. *J Mol Biol* **185**: 261–272.

Ah-Seng Y, Lopez F, Pasta F, Lane D, Bouet J-Y. 2009. Dual role of DNA in regulating

ATP hydrolysis by the SopA partition protein. *J Biol Chem* **284**: 30067–30075.

Ah-Seng Y, Rech J, Lane D, Bouet J-Y. 2013. Defining the role of ATP hydrolysis in

mitotic segregation of bacterial plasmids. *PLoS Genet* **9**: e1003956.

Anand SP, Akhtar P, Tinsley E, Watkins SC, Khan SA. 2008. GTP-dependent

polymerization of the tubulin-like RepX replication protein encoded by the pXO1

plasmid of Bacillus anthracis. *Mol Microbiol* **67**: 881–890.

Barillà D, Carmelo E, Hayes F. 2007. The tail of the ParG DNA segregation protein

remodels ParF polymers and enhances ATP hydrolysis via an arginine finger-like

motif. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**: 1811–1816.

Barillà D, Rosenberg MF, Nobbmann U, Hayes F. 2005. Bacterial DNA segregation

dynamics mediated by the polymerizing protein ParF. *EMBO J* **24**: 1453–1464.

Basi G, Schmid E, Maundrell K. 1993. TATA box mutations in the

Schizosaccharomyces pombe nmt1 promoter affect transcription efficiency but not the

transcription start point or thiamine repressibility. *Gene* **123**: 131–136.

Baxter JC, Waples WG, Funnell BE. 2020. Nonspecific DNA binding by P1 ParA

determines the distribution of plasmid partition and repressor activities. *J Biol Chem*

295: 17298–17309.

Boudsocq F, Salhi M, Barbe S, Bouet J-Y. 2021. Three para dimers cooperatively

assemble on type ia partition promoters. *Genes* **12**.

Bouet J-Y, Ah-Seng Y, Benmeradi N, Lane D. 2007. Polymerization of SopA partition

ATPase: regulation by DNA binding and SopB. *Mol Microbiol* **63**: 468–481.

Brooks AC, Hwang LC. 2017. Reconstitutions of plasmid partition systems and their

mechanisms. *Plasmid* **91**: 37–41.

Caccamo M, Dobruk-Serkowska A, Rodríguez-Castañeda F, Pennica C, Barillà D,

Hayes F. 2020. Genome segregation by the venus flytrap mechanism: probing the

interaction between the ParF ATPase and the parG centromere binding protein. *Front*

Mol Biosci **7**: 108.

Castaing J-P, Bouet J-Y, Lane D. 2008. F plasmid partition depends on interaction of

SopA with non-specific DNA. *Mol Microbiol* **70**: 1000–1011.

Castaing J-P. 2009. La ségrégation du plasmide F d'*Escherichia coli* : Étude du rôle de

la fixation de l'ATPase SopA à l'ADN. Doctoral dissertation.

Cerceo E, Deitelzweig SB, Sherman BM, Amin AN. 2016. Multidrug-Resistant Gram-

Negative Bacterial Infections in the Hospital Setting: Overview, Implications for

Clinical Practice, and Emerging Treatment Options. *Microb Drug Resist* **22**: 412–431.

Chodha SS, Brooks AC, Davis PJ, Ramachandran R, Chattoraj DK, Hwang LC. 2023.

Kinetic principles of ParA2-ATP cycling guide dynamic subcellular localizations in

Vibrio cholerae. *Nucleic Acids Res* **51**: 5603–5620.

Claridge-Chang A, Assam PN. 2016. Estimation statistics should replace significance

testing. *Nat Methods* **13**: 108–109.

Cumming G, Fidler F, Vaux DL. 2007. Error bars in experimental biology. *J Cell Biol*

177: 7–11.

Davis MA, Radnedge L, Martin KA, Hayes F, Youngren B, Austin SJ. 1996. The P1

ParA protein and its ATPase activity play a direct role in the segregation of plasmid

copies to daughter cells. *Mol Microbiol* **21**: 1029–1036.

Dobruk-Serkowska A, Caccamo M, Rodríguez-Castañeda F, Wu M, Bryce K, Ng I,

Schumacher MA, Barillà D, Hayes F. 2012. Uncoupling of nucleotide hydrolysis and

polymerization in the ParA protein superfamily disrupts DNA segregation dynamics. *J*

Biol Chem **287**: 42545–42553.

Ebersbach G, Gerdes K. 2001. The double par locus of virulence factor pB171: DNA

segregation is correlated with oscillation of ParA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **98**: 15078–

15083.

Fung E, Bouet JY, Funnell BE. 2001. Probing the ATP-binding site of P1 ParA: partition

and repression have different requirements for ATP binding and hydrolysis. *EMBO J*

20: 4901–4911.

Gibson DG, Young L, Chuang R-Y, Venter JC, Hutchison CA, Smith HO. 2009.

Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases. *Nat Methods*

6: 343–345.

Gitai Z. 2006. Plasmid segregation: a new class of cytoskeletal proteins emerges. *Curr*

Biol **16**: R133-6.

Griffith KL, Wolf RE. 2002. Measuring beta-galactosidase activity in bacteria: cell

growth, permeabilization, and enzyme assays in 96-well arrays. *Biochem Biophys*

Res Commun **290**: 397–402.

Hatano T, Niki H. 2010. Partitioning of P1 plasmids by gradual distribution of the

ATPase ParA. *Mol Microbiol* **78**: 1182–1198.

Hatano T, Yamaichi Y, Niki H. 2007. Oscillating focus of SopA associated with

filamentous structure guides partitioning of F plasmid. *Mol Microbiol* **64**: 1198–1213.

Havey JC, Vecchiarelli AG, Funnell BE. 2012. ATP-regulated interactions between P1

ParA, ParB and non-specific DNA that are stabilized by the plasmid partition site,

parS. *Nucleic Acids Res* **40**: 801–812.

Hayes F, Radnedge L, Davis MA, Austin SJ. 1994. The homologous operons for P1 and

P7 plasmid partition are autoregulated from dissimilar operator sites. *Mol Microbiol* **11**:

249–260.

Hirano M, Mori H, Onogi T, Yamazoe M, Niki H, Ogura T, Hiraga S. 1998.

Autoregulation of the partition genes of the mini-F plasmid and the intracellular

localization of their products in Escherichia coli. *Mol Gen Genet* **257**: 392–403.

Ho J, Tumkaya T, Aryal S, Choi H, Claridge-Chang A. 2019. Moving beyond P values:

data analysis with estimation graphics. *Nat Methods* **16**: 565–566.

Hui MP, Galkin VE, Yu X, Stasiak AZ, Stasiak A, Waldor MK, Egelman EH. 2010.

ParA2, a Vibrio cholerae chromosome partitioning protein, forms left-handed helical

filaments on DNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **107**: 4590–4595.

Hu L, Rech J, Bouet J-Y, Liu J. 2021. Spatial control over near-critical-point operation

ensures fidelity of ParABS-mediated DNA partition. *Biophys J* **120**: 3911–3924.

Hu L, Vecchiarelli AG, Mizuuchi K, Neuman KC, Liu J. 2017. Brownian Ratchet

Mechanism for Faithful Segregation of Low-Copy-Number Plasmids. *Biophys J* **112**:

1489–1502.

Hu L, Vecchiarelli AG, Mizuuchi K, Neuman KC, Liu J. 2015. Directed and persistent

movement arises from mechanochemistry of the ParA/ParB system. *Proc Natl Acad*

Sci USA **112**: E7055-64.

Hwang LC, Vecchiarelli AG, Han Y-W, Mizuuchi M, Harada Y, Funnell BE, Mizuuchi K.

2013. ParA-mediated plasmid partition driven by protein pattern self-organization.

EMBO J **32**: 1238–1249.

Jalil MB, Al Atbee MYN. 2022. The prevalence of multiple drug resistance Escherichia

coli and Klebsiella pneumoniae isolated from patients with urinary tract infections. *J*

Clin Lab Anal **36**: e24619.

Köhler R, Kaganovitch E, Murray SM. 2022. High-throughput imaging and quantitative

analysis uncovers the nature of plasmid positioning by ParABS. *eLife* **11**.

Komai M, Umino M, Hanai R. 2011. Mode of DNA binding by SopA protein of

Escherichia coli F plasmid. *J Biochem* **149**: 455–461.

Koonin EV. 1993. A superfamily of ATPases with diverse functions containing either

classical or deviant ATP-binding motif. *J Mol Biol* **229**: 1165–1174.

Lane D, Rothenbuehler R, Merrillat AM, Aiken C. 1987. Analysis of the F plasmid

centromere. *Mol Gen Genet* **207**: 406–412.

Larsen RA, Cusumano C, Fujioka A, Lim-Fong G, Patterson P, Pogliano J. 2007.

Treadmilling of a prokaryotic tubulin-like protein, TubZ, required for plasmid stability in

Bacillus thuringiensis. *Genes Dev* **21**: 1340–1352.

Le Gall A, Cattoni DI, Guilhas B, Mathieu-Demazière C, Oudjedi L, Fiche J-B, Rech J,

Abrahamsson S, Murray H, Bouet J-Y, et al. 2016. Bacterial partition complexes

segregate within the volume of the nucleoid. *Nat Commun* **7**: 12107.

Lee PS, Grossman AD. 2006. The chromosome partitioning proteins Soj (ParA) and

Spo0J (ParB) contribute to accurate chromosome partitioning, separation of replicated

sister origins, and regulation of replication initiation in Bacillus subtilis. *Mol Microbiol*

60: 853–869.

Lemonnier M, Bouet JY, Libante V, Lane D. 2000. Disruption of the F plasmid partition

complex in vivo by partition protein SopA. *Mol Microbiol* **38**: 493–505.

Leonard TA, Butler PJ, Löwe J. 2005. Bacterial chromosome segregation: structure and

DNA binding of the Soj dimer--a conserved biological switch. *EMBO J* **24**: 270–282.

Leonard TA, Butler PJG, Löwe J. 2004. Structural analysis of the chromosome

segregation protein Spo0J from Thermus thermophilus. *Mol Microbiol* **53**: 419–432.

Libante V, Thion L, Lane D. 2001. Role of the ATP-binding site of SopA protein in

partition of the F plasmid. *J Mol Biol* **314**: 387–399.

Lim GE, Derman AI, Pogliano J. 2005. Bacterial DNA segregation by dynamic SopA

polymers. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **102**: 17658–17663.

Lim HC, Surovtsev IV, Beltran BG, Huang F, Bewersdorf J, Jacobs-Wagner C. 2014.

Evidence for a DNA-relay mechanism in ParABS-mediated chromosome segregation.

eLife **3**: e02758.

Lord SJ, Velle KB, Mullins RD, Fritz-Laylin LK. 2020. SuperPlots: Communicating

reproducibility and variability in cell biology. *J Cell Biol* **219**.

Lutkenhaus J. 2012. The ParA/MinD family puts things in their place. *Trends Microbiol*

20: 411–418.

Machado E, Costa P, Carvalho A, On Behalf Of The Sarel Investigators. 2022.

Occurrence of Healthcare-Associated Infections (HAIs) by Escherichia coli and

Klebsiella spp. Producing Extended-Spectrum β-lactamases (ESBL) and/or

Carbapenemases in Portuguese Long-Term Care Facilities. *Pathogens* **11**.

McLeod BN, Allison-Gamble GE, Barge MT, Tonthat NK, Schumacher MA, Hayes F,

Barillà D. 2017. A three-dimensional ParF meshwork assembles through the nucleoid

to mediate plasmid segregation. *Nucleic Acids Res* **45**: 3158–3171.

Meynell E, Meynell GG, Datta N. 1968. Phylogenetic relationships of drug-resistance

factors and other transmissible bacterial plasmids. *Bacteriol Rev* **32**: 55–83.

Mishra D, Jakhmola A, Srinivasan R. 2022. A role for the last C-terminal helix of the F

plasmid segregating protein SopA in nucleoid binding and plasmid maintenance.

Plasmid **119–120**: 102617.

Mishra D, Pahujani S, Mitra N, Srivastava A, Srinivasan R. 2021. Identification of a

Potential Membrane-Targeting Sequence in the C-Terminus of the F Plasmid

Segregation Protein SopA. *J Membr Biol* **254**: 243–257.

Møller-Jensen J, Borch J, Dam M, Jensen RB, Roepstorff P, Gerdes K. 2003. Bacterial

mitosis: ParM of plasmid R1 moves plasmid DNA by an actin-like insertional

polymerization mechanism. *Mol Cell* **12**: 1477–1487.

Moran RA, Anantham S, Pinyon JL, Hall RM. 2015. Plasmids in antibiotic susceptible

and antibiotic resistant commensal Escherichia coli from healthy Australian adults.

Plasmid **80**: 24–31.

Mori H, Mori Y, Ichinose C, Niki H, Ogura T, Kato A, Hiraga S. 1989. Purification and

characterization of SopA and SopB proteins essential for F plasmid partitioning. *J Biol*

Chem **264**: 15535–15541.

Motallebi-Veshareh M, Rouch DA, Thomas CM. 1990. A family of ATPases involved in

active partitioning of diverse bacterial plasmids. *Mol Microbiol* **4**: 1455–1463.

Niki H, Hiraga S. 1997. Subcellular distribution of actively partitioning F plasmid during

the cell division cycle in E. coli. *Cell* **90**: 951–957.

Ogura T, Hiraga S. 1983. Partition mechanism of F plasmid: two plasmid gene-encoded

products and a cis-acting region are involved in partition. *Cell* **32**: 351–360.

Pande V, Mitra N, Bagde SR, Srinivasan R, Gayathri P. 2022. Filament organization of

the bacterial actin MreB is dependent on the nucleotide state. *J Cell Biol* **221**.

Parker AV, Mann D, Tzokov SB, Hwang LC, Bergeron JRC. 2021. The structure of the

bacterial DNA segregation ATPase filament reveals the conformational plasticity of

ParA upon DNA binding. *Nat Commun* **12**: 5166.

Phan MD, Forde BM, Peters KM, Sarkar S, Hancock S, Stanton-Cook M, Ben Zakour

NL, Upton M, Beatson SA, Schembri MA. 2015. Molecular characterization of a

multidrug resistance IncF plasmid from the globally disseminated Escherichia coli

ST131 clone. *PLoS ONE* **10**: e0122369.

Pogliano J, Pogliano K, Weiss DS, Losick R, Beckwith J. 1997. Inactivation of FtsI

inhibits constriction of the FtsZ cytokinetic ring and delays the assembly of FtsZ rings

at potential division sites. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **94**: 559–564.

Pollard DA, Pollard TD, Pollard KS. 2019. Empowering statistical methods for cellular

and molecular biologists. *Mol Biol Cell* **30**: 1359–1368.

Ravin N, Lane D. 1999. Partition of the linear plasmid N15: interactions of N15 partition

functions with the sop locus of the F plasmid. *J Bacteriol* **181**: 6898–6906.

Ravin NV, Rech J, Lane D. 2003. Mapping of functional domains in F plasmid partition

proteins reveals a bipartite SopB-recognition domain in SopA. *J Mol Biol* **329**: 875–

889.

Ringgaard S, van Zon J, Howard M, Gerdes K. 2009. Movement and equipositioning of

plasmids by ParA filament disassembly. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **106**: 19369–19374.

Roberts MAJ, Wadhams GH, Hadfield KA, Tickner S, Armitage JP. 2012. ParA-like

protein uses nonspecific chromosomal DNA binding to partition protein complexes.

Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **109**: 6698–6703.

Salje J, Gayathri P, Löwe J. 2010. The ParMRC system: molecular mechanisms of

plasmid segregation by actin-like filaments. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **8**: 683–692.

Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, Kaynig V, Longair M, Pietzsch T, Preibisch S,

Rueden C, Saalfeld S, Schmid B, et al. 2012. Fiji: an open-source platform for

biological-image analysis. *Nat Methods* **9**: 676–682.

Schumacher MA, Ye Q, Barge MT, Zampini M, Barillà D, Hayes F. 2012. Structural

mechanism of ATP-induced polymerization of the partition factor ParF: implications for

DNA segregation. *J Biol Chem* **287**: 26146–26154.

Simonsen GS. 2018. Antimicrobial resistance surveillance in Europe and beyond. *Euro*

Surveill **23**.

Srinivasan R, Mishra M, Murata-Hori M, Balasubramanian MK. 2007. Filament

formation of the Escherichia coli actin-related protein, MreB, in fission yeast. *Curr Biol*

17: 266–272.

Srinivasan R, Mishra M, Wu L, Yin Z, Balasubramanian MK. 2008. The bacterial cell

division protein FtsZ assembles into cytoplasmic rings in fission yeast. *Genes Dev* **22**:

1741–1746.

Stephens C, Arismendi T, Wright M, Hartman A, Gonzalez A, Gill M, Pandori M, Hess

D. 2020. F Plasmids Are the Major Carriers of Antibiotic Resistance Genes in Human-

Associated Commensal Escherichia coli. *mSphere* **5**.

Sun Q, Margolin W. 2004. Effects of perturbing nucleoid structure on nucleoid

occlusion-mediated toporegulation of FtsZ ring assembly. *J Bacteriol* **186**: 3951–3959.

Surovtsev IV, Campos M, Jacobs-Wagner C. 2016. DNA-relay mechanism is sufficient

to explain ParA-dependent intracellular transport and patterning of single and multiple

cargos. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **113**: E7268–E7276.

TerBush AD, MacCready JS, Chen C, Ducat DC, Osteryoung KW. 2018. Conserved

dynamics of chloroplast cytoskeletal ftsz proteins across photosynthetic lineages.

Plant Physiol **176**: 295–306.

TerBush AD, Osteryoung KW. 2012. Distinct functions of chloroplast FtsZ1 and FtsZ2 in

Z-ring structure and remodeling. *J Cell Biol* **199**: 623–637.

Tinsley E, Khan SA. 2006. A novel FtsZ-like protein is involved in replication of the

anthrax toxin-encoding pXO1 plasmid in Bacillus anthracis. *J Bacteriol* **188**: 2829–

2835.

van den Ent F, Löwe J. 2006. RF cloning: a restriction-free method for inserting target

genes into plasmids. *J Biochem Biophys Methods* **67**: 67–74.

van den Ent F, Møller-Jensen J, Amos LA, Gerdes K, Löwe J. 2002. F-actin-like

filaments formed by plasmid segregation protein ParM. *EMBO J* **21**: 6935–6943.

Vaux DL. 2014. Basic statistics in cell biology. *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol* **30**: 23–37.

Vecchiarelli AG, Han Y-W, Tan X, Mizuuchi M, Ghirlando R, Biertümpfel C, Funnell BE,

Mizuuchi K. 2010. ATP control of dynamic P1 ParA-DNA interactions: a key role for

the nucleoid in plasmid partition. *Mol Microbiol* **78**: 78–91.

Vecchiarelli AG, Havey JC, Ing LL, Wong EOY, Waples WG, Funnell BE. 2013a.

Dissection of the ATPase active site of P1 ParA reveals multiple active forms

essential for plasmid partition. *J Biol Chem* **288**: 17823–17831.

Vecchiarelli AG, Hwang LC, Mizuuchi K. 2013b. Cell-free study of F plasmid partition

provides evidence for cargo transport by a diffusion-ratchet mechanism. *Proc Natl*

Acad Sci USA **110**: E1390-7.

Vecchiarelli AG, Mizuuchi K, Funnell BE. 2012. Surfing biological surfaces: exploiting

the nucleoid for partition and transport in bacteria. *Mol Microbiol* **86**: 513–523.

Vecchiarelli AG, Neuman KC, Mizuuchi K. 2014. A propagating ATPase gradient drives

transport of surface-confined cellular cargo. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **111**: 4880–4885.

Volante A, Alonso JC. 2015. Molecular Anatomy of ParA-ParA and ParA-ParB

Interactions during Plasmid Partitioning. *J Biol Chem* **290**: 18782–18795.

Walker JE, Saraste M, Runswick MJ, Gay NJ. 1982. Distantly related sequences in the

alpha- and beta-subunits of ATP synthase, myosin, kinases and other ATP-requiring

enzymes and a common nucleotide binding fold. *EMBO J* **1**: 945–951.

Watanabe E, Wachi M, Yamasaki M, Nagai K. 1992. ATPase activity of SopA, a protein

essential for active partitioning of F plasmid. *Mol Gen Genet* **234**: 346–352.

World Health Organization (GLASS). 2021. *Global Antimicrobial Resistance and Use*

Surveillance System (GLASS) Report: 2021. World Health Organization

https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240027336 (Accessed June 12, 2022).

Yates P, Lane D, Biek DP. 1999. The F plasmid centromere, sopC, is required for full

repression of the sopAB operon. *J Mol Biol* **290**: 627–638.

Yong D, Toleman MA, Giske CG, Cho HS, Sundman K, Lee K, Walsh TR. 2009.

Characterization of a new metallo-beta-lactamase gene, bla(NDM-1), and a novel

erythromycin esterase gene carried on a unique genetic structure in Klebsiella

pneumoniae sequence type 14 from India. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **53**: 5046–

5054.

Zhang H, Schumacher MA. 2017. Structures of partition protein ParA with nonspecific

DNA and ParB effector reveal molecular insights into principles governing Walker-box

DNA segregation. *Genes Dev* **31**: 481–492.

Zusman DR, Carbonell A, Haga JY. 1973. Nucleoid condensation and cell division in

Escherichia coli MX74T2 ts52 after inhibition of protein synthesis. *J Bacteriol* **115**:

1167–1178.

1025

1026

1027

1028 **Figures, Figure Legends and Tables**

Figure 1

Figure 1. ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E assemble into cytoplasmic filaments in *E. coli*.

(A) In the presence of the ParBS complex, wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP appears as a haze or forms foci. ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP (SopA1-GFP), ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E assemble into linear cytoplasmic filaments. ParA$_F$ and the various mutants described were expressed from the weak P$_{trc}$ promoter in pDSW210 as C-terminal GFP fusions by the addition of 100 µM IPTG for 2 hours in *E. coli* MC4100. Cultures were grown to an OD$_{600}$ of 0.2 before the addition of IPTG for protein expression. A mini-F plasmid carried the *parBS* locus under the constitutive P$_{LtetO}$ promoter and lacked ParA$_F$ (*ΔparA$_F$ parBS$^+$*). **(B)** Quantification of percentage of cells carrying ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP (SopA1-GFP), ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP filaments. Percentage of cells having filaments were 56.5 % ± 11.27, 41.3 % ± 14.8 and 38.0 % ± 17.9 (95% CI, n=3; number of cells counted > 100 for each experiment) in the case of ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP, ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP, respectively. **(C)** Quantification of loss of the mini-F plasmids in cultures carrying wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP, ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP (SopA1-GFP), ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP. While ParA$_F$-GFP maintained the plasmids stably, the loss of plasmids in all ParA$_F$ mutants was similar to that of the vector control (lacking ParA$_F$ but expressing GFP alone). The partitioning complex ParBS (where indicated) was provided from a mini-F plasmid (pDAG198; *ΔparA$_F$ parBS$^+$*) that lacked ParA$_F$ but carried the *parBS* locus under the constitutive P$_{LtetO}$ promoter. The same two plasmids were used for the plasmid stability assays in **(A)**. Cells were mounted onto a 1.6% LB agarose slide and imaged using an epifluorescence microscope. A two-sided Student's -t-test was used to calculate P-values in case of **(B)**,

and since we expect the plasmid loss in ParA$_F$ mutants to be only higher than in ParA$_F$, a one-sided one-sample t-test was used to assess the significance in this case **(C)**. ns represents a p-value > 0.05. All experiments were repeated at least thrice (n = 3, three biological replicates). Error bars in **(B)** are inferential and represent the 95% confidence interval and the error bars in **(C)** represent the standard deviation (SD) of the mean. Scale bars represent 3 µm for all images.

Figure 2

Figure 2

D

Figure 2. Assembly of ParA$_F$ Q351H, ParA$_F$ W362E or ParA$_F$ W362A into cytoplasmic filaments is independent of the *parBS* partitioning complex.

(A) In the absence of the *parBS* complex, ParA$_F$-GFP does not form foci but appears to be over the nucleoid. ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP (SopA1-GFP), ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP, ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362A-GFP assemble into straight cytoplasmic filaments, even in the absence of the *parBS* complex. **(B)** The percentage of cells having cytoplasmic filaments was similar in the case of ParA$_F$ M315I Q351H-GFP [39.2 % ± 3.37 (95% CI, n=3; number of cells counted > 100 for each experiment)], ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP [48.7 ± 9.5 (95% CI, n = 3; number of cells counted > 150 for each experiment)], ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP [42.8 ± 8.2 (95% CI, n = 3; number of cells counted > 150 for each experiment)] and ParA$_F$ W362A-GFP filaments [53.8 ± 15.1 (95% CI, n = 3; number of cells counted > 150 for each experiment)]. **(C)** Superplots showing the quantification of the length of the cytoplasmic filaments assembled by ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP. No significant difference was observed with an average length of 0.88 µm ± 0.08 (SD, n = 3; number of cells counted > 73 < 121) in the case of ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and 0.71 µm ± 0.06 (SD, n = 3; number of cells counted > 59 < 99) in the case of ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP. ParA$_F$ and the various mutants described were expressed from the weak P$_{trc}$ promoter in pDSW210 as C-terminal GFP fusions by the addition of 100 µM IPTG for 2 hours in *E. coli* MC4100. Cultures were grown to an OD$_{600}$ of 0.2 before the addition of IPTG for protein expression. **(D)** *S. pombe* cultures carrying pREP42-ParA$_F$-GFP or ParA$_F$ mutants M315I Q351H, Q351H or W362E were grown in EMM medium in the absence of thiamine for 20 – 24 hours to allow for the expression of the ParA$_F$-GFP protein. ParA$_F$ localised to the nucleus (possibly by diffusion and retention due to DNA binding activity), and ParA$_F$

M315I Q351H-GFP (SopA1-GFP), ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP assembled into polymers in the cytoplasm. Bacterial cells or yeast cells were mounted onto a 1.6% agarose slide and imaged using an epifluorescence microscope. A two-sided Student's -t-test was used to calculate P-values in the case of **(B and C)**. ns represents a p-value > 0.05. All experiments were repeated at least thrice (n = 3, three biological replicates). Error bars are inferential and represent the 95% confidence interval in **(B)** and represent the standard deviation (SD) of the mean in **(C)**. Scale bars represent 3 μm for all images.

Figure 3

Figure 3. Residues Q351 and W362 influence non-specific DNA binding by ParA$_F$.

(A) Filaments formed by ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP are not nucleoid-associated. The ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP filaments appeared to be localised in the space between the nucleoid and the inner membrane, while ParA$_F$-GFP localised over the nucleoids. Nucleoids were stained with DAPI, and the plasma membrane was stained using FM4-64. **(B)** Super-resolution imaging using 3D structured illumination microscopy (3D-SIM) showing the filaments assembled by **(i)** ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and **(ii)** ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP are not associated with the nucleoid. DNA was stained with DAPI and pseudo-coloured red. Cell outlines were obtained from the phase contrast images. **(C)** Filaments formed by ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP are found in the nucleoid-free spaces in the cytoplasm of *E. coli*. Wild-type ParA$_F$-GFP localised to the nucleoid. Nucleoids were visualised by staining with DAPI and pseudo-coloured red in the images. Cells were treated with 25 µg/ mL cephalexin for 30 minutes to prevent cell division and 100 µg/ mL chloramphenicol for 10 minutes to condense the nucleoids so that the nucleoid-free space appears pronounced. Scale bars represent 3 µm in all images except in **(B)**, where the scale bar is 1 µm.

Figure 4

A

	Phase Contrast	pDSW210 WT-ParA$_F$ -GFP	Merge

+ pBAD33 WT-ParA$_F$

+ pBAD33 ParA$_F$ Q351H

+ pBAD33 ParA$_F$ W362E

B

	Phase Contrast	pDSW210 WT-ParA$_F$ -GFP	Merge

+ pBAD33 ParA$_F$ Q351H

+ pBAD33 ParA$_F$ W362E

25 µg/ ml Cephalexin treated cells

Figure 4. Filament-forming mutants of ParA_F can induce the assembly of wild-type ParA_F-GFP into cytoplasmic filaments.

(A) Polymerisation of ParA$_F$-GFP upon co-expression of untagged ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E. ParA$_F$-GFP localises to the nucleoid upon co-expression with untagged ParA$_F$, but co-expression of untagged ParA$_F$ Q351H induces the assembly of ParA$_F$-GFP into cytoplasmic filaments. Untagged ParA$_F$ W362E can also induce the polymerisation of ParA$_F$-GFP but is very inefficient compared to ParA$_F$ Q351H, and ParA$_F$-GFP remains predominantly nucleoid localised. **(B)** Assembly of ParA$_F$-GFP into long filaments in cephalexin-treated cells upon co-expression of untagged ParA$_F$ Q351H. ParA$_F$-GFP was expressed from the weak P$_{trc}$ promoter of pDSW210 vector by the addition of 100 µM IPTG, and untagged versions of ParA$_F$, ParA$_F$ Q351H or ParA$_F$ W362E were co-expressed from the tightly regulated arabinose inducible promoter P$_{BAD}$ from pBAD33 vector. Cells were treated with 25 µg/ mL cephalexin in **(B)** to obtain filamentous cells and inhibit cell division for better visualisation of ParA$_F$ filaments. Scale bars represent 2 µm.

Figure 5

A ParA_F Q351H-GFP

+IPTG

0 min 10 min 20 min 30 min
40 min 50 min 60 min 70 min

3 µm

B ParA_F W362E-GFP

+IPTG

0 min 10 min 20 min 30 min
40 min 50 min 60 min 70 min

2 µm

C ParA_F Q351H-GFP

+IPTG

0 min After 20 min without IPTG

Figure 5

D

ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP

E

ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP

Figure 5. Maintenance of ParA_F Q351H and ParA_F W362E polymers requires continuous protein synthesis in cells.

(A – B) Time-lapse images showing the growth of ParA_F filaments formed by **(A)** ParA_F Q351H-GFP and **(B)** ParA_F W362E-GFP. Live cells were imaged on LB-agarose pads containing 100 µM IPTG and 25 µg/ mL cephalexin. Images were acquired every 10 minutes for a total of 70 minutes on a Delta Vision Elite™ microscope. Arrowheads depict the growing filaments. Cells were treated with cephalexin (25 µg/ mL) to prevent cell division to clearly visualise the growth of ParA_F filaments. **(C)** ParA_F Q351H-GFP filaments appear to shorten in the absence of the inducer IPTG. *E. coli* MC4100 cells carrying pDSW210-ParA_F Q351H-GFP were induced 100 µM IPTG and then placed on LB-agarose slides without IPTG. Images were acquired immediately after placing the cells on agarose slides, and the same field was imaged again after 20 minutes. **(D and E)** Time-lapse images showing the depolymerisation of ParA_F filaments assembled by **(D i)** ParA_F Q351H-GFP and **(E i)** ParA_F W362E-GFP in the absence of continued protein synthesis within a period of 20 minutes. Cultures were induced 100 µM IPTG for 2 hours prior to placing on LB-agarose pads and imaging. Chloramphenicol (50 µg/ mL) and 2 % glucose were added to the agarose pads to stop protein synthesis and repress the IPTG inducible promoter in the pDSW210 vector, respectively. Images were acquired every minute for a total of 20 minutes. **(D ii)** Time-lapse images of ParA_F Q351H-GFP and **(E ii)** ParA_F W362E-GFP showing the stable maintenance of filaments up to 40 minutes in the presence of continuous protein synthesis. Cultures were induced 100 µM IPTG for 2 hours prior to placing on LB-agarose pads and imaging. Cells were imaged on LB-

agarose pads containing 200 µM IPTG. Images were acquired every minute for a total of

40 minutes. Scale bars represent 3 µm.

Figure 6

A

(i)

(ii)

E. coli strain DLT1127 (Ppar_F::lacZ::kan)

+ pDSW210-ParA_F-Stop-GFP + P_{LtetO}- ΔparA parBS+

B

Figure 6. ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E act as transcriptional repressors of the ParA promoter and are independent of ParB

(A) Schematic showing the two-plasmid system and the LacZ-reporter strain used for determining the transcriptional repressor activity of ParA$_F$ in the presence or absence of ParBS complex. The strain DLT1127 carried the β-galactosidase gene *lacZ* under the promoter sequences of ParA$_F$. ParA$_F$ was expressed from the IPTG inducible weak P$_{trc}$ promoter in the pDSW210 vector, and the ParB was expressed from the constitutive promoter P$_{LtetO}$ and was carried on the mini-F plasmid lacking *parA$_F$* (*ΔparA parBS$^+$*). ParA$_F$ acts to strongly repress the expression of *lacZ* from the P$_{parA}$ promoter in the presence of ParB. **(B)** Qualitative β-galactosidase assay showing ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E acting as super-repressors of the P$_{parA}$ promoter by strongly preventing LacZ expression even in the absence of ParB. While cultures carrying vector control (expressing GFP) did not repress LacZ expression either in the presence or absence of ParBS, ParA$_F$ strongly reduced the expression of LacZ only in the presence of the ParBS complex (top panel). ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E acted independently of ParB and strongly repressed LacZ expression in the absence of ParB as well (bottom panel). Cultures of *E. coli* strain DLT1127 carrying pDSW210-GFP, pDSW210-ParA$_F$, pDSW210-ParA$_F$ Q351H or pDSW210-ParA$_F$ W362E were spotted on LB-agar plates containing appropriate antibiotics, 200 µM IPTG and 40 µM X-Gal and incubated overnight and imaged with CCD colour camera on a phone. Images were colour-corrected using the white-balance plugin in ImageJ v-1.54f.

Figure 7

A

	Phase Contrast	GFP	Merge
ParA$_F$-GFP W362E			
ParA$_F$-GFP W362E K120E			
ParA$_F$-GFP W362E K120Q			
ParA$_F$-GFP W362E K120R			
ParA$_F$-GFP W362E K120A			

B

ns

Percentage of Cells with Filaments

ParA-GFP (W362E)   ParA-GFP (W362E K120A)

C

p = 0.006

Filament Length (μm)

ParA-GFP (W362E)   ParA-GFP (W362E K120A)

D

	Phase Contrast	GFP	Nucleoid	Merge

+SopBC

ParA$_F$-GFP

ParA$_F$ K120A-GFP

E

Percentage of Cells

□ ParA-GFP
■ ParA-GFP (K120A)

p = 0.0027
p = 0.001
ns
p = 0.03
ns

Number of foci

Figure 7. Filament assembly by ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP requires ATP-binding and the conformation change to the ParA$_F$-ATP* state

(A) Images showing the effect of various mutations in the conserved K120 residue on the polymerisation by ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP. While ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP assembles into cytoplasmic filaments, the introduction of K120E, which abolishes ATP binding in ParA$_F$, fails to form polymers. The introduction of K120R, which retains the ATP binding but does not hydrolyse ATP, also fails to form filaments. However, the introduction of K120Q, which retains the basal ATP hydrolysis, also fails to form filaments. Although ParA$_F$ K120R and ParA$_F$ K120Q bind the nucleotide, both are defective in achieving the conformational change to ParA$_F$-ATP* state upon interaction with ATP, thus showing that ParA$_F$-ATP* state is important for the polymerisation of ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP. Changing K120 to alanine in ParA$_F$ W362E did not affect the filament assembly. **(B)** Quantification of the percentage of cells having cytoplasmic filaments in the ParA$_F$-W362E-GFP and ParA$_F$-W362E K120A-GFP. While in the case of ParA$_F$-W362E-GFP, 42.6 % ± 5.9 (SD, n = 3, at least a total of 150 cells were counted for each experiment) cells had polymers, 31.3 % ± 4.4 (SD, n = 3, at least a total of 150 cells were counted for each experiment) of cells had filaments in the case of ParA$_F$-W362E K120A-GFP and were not significantly different. The differences were not statistically significant and had a p-value > 0.05. **(C)** Superplots showing the quantification of the filament lengths in the ParA$_F$-W362E-GFP and ParA$_F$-W362E K120A-GFP. While in the case of ParA$_F$-W362E-GFP, the average length of the filament was 1.0 μm ± 0.08 (SD, n = 3, total number of cells counted were > 75 < 84 for each replicate), ParA$_F$-W362E K120A-GFP exhibited an average polymer length of 1.28 % ± 0.05 (SD, n = 3, total number of cells counted were > 40 < 42 for each replicate). The

effect size was 0.28 [0.14, 0.43]. **(D)** ParA$_F$ K120A-GFP interacts with the partitioning complex, ParBS and forms cloud-like structures and foci over the bacterial nucleoid similar to ParA$_F$-GFP, suggesting that K120A mutation allows the conformational change to the ParA$_F$-ATP* state and does not affect ATP-binding or nsDNA binding of ParA$_F$. **(E)** Quantification of the number of foci assembled per cell by ParA$_F$-GFP and ParA$_F$ K120A-GFP. A greater percentage of cells have single-foci in the case of ParA$_F$ K120A-GFP [30.3 ± 7.5 (SD, n = 3, a total of 100 cells were counted for each replicate)] as compared to ParA$_F$-GFP [1.7 ± 0.6 (SD, n = 3, a total of 100 cells were counted for each replicate)]. ns represents non-significant. The error bars in the graphs represent the standard deviation of the mean (SD), and the scale bars in the images represent 2 μm.

Figure 8

A

Figure 8

B

Fluorescence Intensity (AU x 10³)

p =0.161 (ns)
-6.8 [-17.8, 4.2] (x 10³)

p =0.428 (ns)
-2.9 [-11.9, 6.2] (x 10³)

pDSW210 ParA_F W362E-GFP

pDSW210 ParA_F W362E E375A-GFP

pDSW210 ParA_F W362E R320A-GFP

C

Percentage Loss per Generation

p <0.000005

p = 0.00002

p = 0.0037

pDSW210 (GFP)

pDSW210 ParA_F

pDSW210 ParA_F R320A-GFP

pDSW210 ParA_F E375A-GFP

Figure 8

Figure 8. Identification of E375 in helix 16 and R320 in helix 14 as possible interface residues critical for polymerisation of ParA$_F$.

(A) While ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP assembles into filaments, introducing either E375A or R320A abolishes polymerisation. **(B)** Quantification of the total fluorescence intensities (sum intensity) in cells expressing ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP, ParA$_F$ W362E E375A-GFP or ParA$_F$ W362E R320A-GFP showing no significant differences in protein levels. Mean values from three independent biological replicates (N=3, number of cells counted was>400 for each replicate) are plotted. The values from the replicates are shown as black dots, and the mean value is plotted as a bar, with the SD values as the error bars. The p-values and the effect size are mentioned. The effect size is given as the difference in the means, and the 95% CI is indicated within parentheses. **(C)** Cultures expressing ParA$_F$ W362E E375A-GFP or ParA$_F$ W362E R320A-GFP fail to main the mini-F plasmids (*ΔparA*, *parBS*$^+$) unlike cells expressing WT-ParA$_F$-GFP. Error bars represent SD values. **(D)** Unlike ParA$_F$-GFP, which co-localises with the bacterial nucleoid, ParA$_F$ E375A-GFP and ParA$_F$ R320A-GFP are distributed in the cytoplasm. However, ParA$_F$ R320A-GFP shows mild localisation on the nucleoids compared to ParA$_F$ E375A-GFP. **(E)** In the presence of the partitioning complex, ParA$_F$ E375A-GFP fails to form foci and remains distributed throughout the cytoplasm, but ParA$_F$ R320A-GFP shows weak foci formation. ParA$_F$-GFP, as expected, appears as a haze or foci. An *E. coli* MG1655 derivative strain expressing carrying HupA-mCherry from its chromosomal locus was used to visualise the nucleoid, and cultures were induced with 100 μM IPTG for 2 hours to allow for the expression of ParA$_F$-GFP, ParA$_F$ E375A-GFP or ParA$_F$ R320A-GFP from the pDSW210 vector. Scale bars represent 2 μm.

Figure 9

Figure 9. E375A and R320A mildly compromise the repressor activity of ParA$_F$ but remain responsive to the ParBS$_F$ partitioning complex.

Quantitative β-galactosidase assay showing the repression activity by ParA$_F$ and the various mutants on the P$_{parA}$ promoter. While the repression of ParA$_F$ is enhanced by the presence of the ParBS complex, ParA$_F$ Q351H-GFP and ParA$_F$ W362E-GFP strongly repress even in the absence of the ParB. Like ParA$_F$, ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A show increased repression activity in the presence of the ParBS complex than in the absence of ParBS, albeit to a lesser extent compared to wild-type ParA$_F$. The introduction of E375A or R320A mutations into ParA$_F$ W362E also drastically reduces their ability to repress LacZ expression. Miller units were calculated as described in the materials and methods section, and the values obtained were normalised with respect to the vector control, pDSW210-GFP. Further, since the expression of LacZ in the vector control culture (in the absence of ParA$_F$) was the maximum, normalised Miller units obtained in the case of pDSW210-GFP were considered as 100 % expressed or as 0 % repressed. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean (SD). Statistical significance test on the effect of ParBS on the repression activity was carried out using the estimated p-values from a one-tailed Student's t-test (since repression values are only expected to be higher in the presence of ParBS) and are indicated in the graph.

Figure 10

ParA$_F$ Protein	Function (Step) Affected				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Wild-type ParA$_F$	✓	✓	✓	✓	--
ParA$_F$ Q351H	✓	✓	X	X	✓
ParA$_F$ W362E	✓	✓	X	X	✓
ParA$_F$ R320A	✓	X	X	X	--
ParA$_F$ E375A	✓	X	X	X	--
ParA$_F$ W362E R320A	--	--	X	X	X
ParA$_F$ W362E E375A	--	--	X	X	X

Figure 10. Schematic showing the effect of various mutations on the oligomerisation of ParA_F protein.

Monomeric apo-ParA_F binds ATP to form the ATP sandwich dimer and undergoes a conformational change, resulting in the ParA_F-ATP* state. The ParA_F-ATP* binds the bacterial nucleoid as an ATP sandwich dimer, which could further undergo cooperative binding involving transient oligomerisation. The various steps are marked in roman numerals and the effect of various mutations is tabulated. A tick mark (✔) shows activity, a small cross mark shows (x) partial impairment of activity and a cross mark (X) shows the step likely affected by the mutation. The mutations Q351H and W362E result in the formation of stable cytoplasmic filaments that are incompatible with nsDNA binding (nucleoid localisation). The mutations in the C-terminal helix-14 (R320A) or helix-16 (E375A) abolish oligomerisation. The mutations R320A and E375A might possibly inhibit polymerisation either by blocking direct subunit interactions or preventing the conformational change to the ParA_F-ATP* state.

Table 1

(i)

ParA	Effect Size (ParA)	P-value (1-tailed)	Effect Size (ParA)	P-value (1-tailed)
	- ParBS		+ ParBS	
ParA W362E	NA	NA	NA	NA
ParA W362E E375A	-33.6 [-36.5, -30.8]	0.00002	-35.7 [-56.8, -14.6]	0.00628
ParA W362E R320A	-40.1 [-57.8, -22.4]	0.00275	-15.2 [-40, 9.6]	0.07322

(ii)

ParA	Effect Size (ParA)	P-value (1-tailed)	Effect Size (ParA)	P-value (1-tailed)
	- ParBS		+ ParBS	
ParA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ParA E375A	6.7 [-11.5, 24.8]	0.21140	-30.7 [-43.7, -17.6]	0.00006
ParA R320A	4.7 [-14.2, 23.6]	0.28783	-38.7 [-52.6, -24.8]	0.00009

(iii)

ParA	Effect Size (pDSW210)	P-value (1-tailed)	Effect Size (ParA)	P-value (1-tailed)	Effect Size (pDSW210)	P-value (1-tailed)	Effect Size (ParA)	P-value (1-tailed)	Effect Size (ParBS)	P-value (1-tailed)
	- ParBS				+ ParBS					
pDSW210-GFP	NA	NA	--	--	NA	NA	--	--	NA	NA
ParA	6.4 [-13.1, 25.9]	0.23681	NA	NA	74 [61.3, 86.7]	0.00007	NA	NA	67.6 [51.5, 83.7]	0.00015
ParA E375A	13.1 [-5.1, 31.2]	0.07939	6.7 [-11.5, 24.8]	0.21140	43.4 [30.3, 56.4]	0.00066	-30.7 [-43.7, -17.6]	0.00006	30.3 [16, 44.6]	0.00209
ParA R320A	11.1 [-7.8, 30]	0.11471	4.7 [-14.2, 23.6]	0.28783	35.3 [21.5, 49.2]	0.00180	-38.7 [-52.6, -24.8]	0.00009	24.2 [7.7, 40.6]	0.00754
ParA Q351H	70.8 [55.3, 86.4]	0.00020	64.4 [48.9, 80]	0.00027	74.3 [61.1, 87.4]	0.00009	0.2 [-12.9, 13.4]	0.46074	3.4 [-6, 12.9]	0.18623
ParA W362E	44 [30, 58]	0.00082	37.6 [23.6, 51.6]	0.00138	44.6 [27.1, 62.1]	0.00178	-29.4 [-46.9, -12]	0.00250	0.6 [-13.8, 14.9]	0.45868
ParA W362E E375A	10.4 [-13.4, 34.2]	0.12910	4 [-19.3, 27.3]	0.31173	8.9 [-12.3, 30.1]	0.13652	-65.1 [-70.2, -60.1]	0.00002	-1.5 [-4.4, 1.4]	0.07948
ParA W362E R320A	3.9 [-25.6, 33.4]	0.35112	-2.5 [-31.6, 26.6]	0.40120	29.4 [4.5, 54.3]	0.01650	-44.6 [-58.7, -30.6]	0.00103	25.5 [-14.2, 65.2]	0.05498

Table 1. Table showing the statistical analysis of the quantitative β-galactosidase assays for estimating promoter repression activity by the various ParA$_F$ mutants.

The table shows the statistical analysis for the repression activity by various ParA$_F$ mutants in comparison to the vector control (pDSW210-GFP) or with ParA$_F$, where the repression was normalised to 0 %. Estimation statistics were also used to assess the statistical significance of the repressor functions. Effect size is defined as the difference between the means of samples being compared, and the 95 % CI of the difference is given within the square parentheses. Statistical analysis showing the p-values and effect size, along with the 95 % CI of the difference, is tabulated. **(i)** Statistical analysis for the repression activity by ParA$_F$ W362E E375A and ParA$_F$ W362E R320A in comparison to ParA$_F$ W362E showing the effect size along with the 95 % CI of the difference. The double mutants ParA$_F$ W362E E375A and ParA$_F$ W362E R320A show reduced repression of the P$_{parA}$ promoter than ParA$_F$ W362E with an effect size of -33.6 [-36.5, -30.8] and -40.1 [-57.8, -22.4], respectively. **(ii)** In the presence of ParBS, ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A show a reduced repression activity than the WT-ParA$_F$ with an effect size of -30.7 [-43.7, -17.6] and -38.7 [-52.6, -24.8], respectively. **(iii)** Table shows the statistical analysis for the repression activity by various ParA$_F$ mutants in comparison to the vector control (pDSW210-GFP). The effect size and the 95 % CI of the difference in the absence of ParBS as well as in the presence of ParBS are tabulated. In the absence of ParBS, ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E act as super-repressors, showing an effect size of 70.8 [55.3, 86.4] and 44 [30, 58], respectively compared to pDSW210-GFP. When compared to ParA$_F$, ParA$_F$ Q351H and ParA$_F$ W362E show an effect size of 64.4 [48.9, 80] and 37.6 [23.6, 51.6], respectively. The statistical significance of the results for the effect of the

ParBS complex is also tabulated. Although ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A have reduced repression in the presence of ParBS compared to ParA$_F$, they are responsive to ParB and their ability to repress is still enhanced by the presence of the ParBS complex. While ParA$_F$ shows an effect size of 67.6 [51.5, 83.7], ParA$_F$ E375A and ParA$_F$ R320A show an effect size of 30.3 [16, 44.6] and 24.2 [7.7, 40.6], respectively. Results that are deemed statistically significant are shown in bold. P-values were obtained from a one-tailed Student's t-test (since repression values are expected to be only higher (0 % or greater than experimental samples lacking ParBS). P-values ≥ 0.05 (after rounding off to 2 decimals) were considered statistically non-significant. Effect sizes are easier to interpret, with negative values indicating reduced repression ability and positive values indicating increased repression than the test sample. The 95 % CI of the difference, when not encompassing zero, indicates a statistically significant difference.