DivIVA controls the dynamics of septum splitting and cell elongation in

Streptococcus pneumoniae

Jennyfer Trouve[1], André Zapun[1], Laure Bellard[1], Dimitri Juillot[2], Anais Pelletier[3], Celine Freton[3],

Morgane Baudoin[4], Rut Carballido-Lopez[2], Nathalie Campo[5,6], Yung-Sing Wong[4], Christophe

Grangeasse[3] and Cecile Morlot[1,*]

[1] Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, CEA, IBS, 38000 Grenoble, France.
[2] Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, AgroParisTech, Micalis Institute, 78350, Jouy-en-Josas, France.
[3] Molecular Microbiology and Structural Biochemistry (MMSB), CNRS, Univ. Lyon 1, UMR 5086,
Lyon 69007, France.
[4] Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, DPM, 38000 Grenoble, France.
[5] Laboratoire de Microbiologie et Génétique Moléculaires, UMR5100, Centre de Biologie Intégrative,
Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique, 31062 Toulouse, France.
[6] Université Paul Sabatier (Toulouse III), 31062 Toulouse, France.

* Correspondence: cecile.morlot@ibs.fr

Running title: role of DivIVA in ovococci morphogenesis

ABSTRACT

Bacterial shape and division rely on the dynamics of cell wall assembly, which involves regulated synthesis and cleavage of the peptidoglycan. In ovococci, these processes are coordinated in an annular mid-cell region with nanometric dimensions. More precisely, the cross-wall that is synthesized by the divisome is split to generate lateral wall, whose expansion is insured by insertion of so-called peripheral peptidoglycan by the elongasome. Septum cleavage and peripheral peptidoglycan synthesis are thus crucial remodeling events for ovococcal cell division and elongation. The structural DivIVA protein has long been known as a major regulator of these processes but its mode of action remains unknown. Here, we integrate click chemistry-based peptidoglycan labeling, direct stochastic optical reconstruction microscopy and in silico modeling, as well as epifluorescence and stimulated emission depletion microscopy to investigate the role of DivIVA in *Streptococcus pneumoniae* cell morphogenesis. Our work reveals two distinct phases of peptidoglycan remodeling along the cell cycle, that are differentially controlled by DivIVA. In particular, we show that DivIVA ensures homogeneous septum cleavage and peripheral peptidoglycan synthesis around the division site, and their maintenance throughout the cell cycle. Our data additionally suggest that DivIVA impacts the contribution of the elongasome and class A PBPs to cell elongation. We also report the position of DivIVA on either side of the septum, consistent with its known affinity for negatively curved membranes. Finally, we take the opportunity provided by these new observations to propose hypotheses for the mechanism of action of this key morphogenetic protein.

IMPORTANCE

This study sheds light on fundamental processes governing bacterial cell growth and division, using integrated click chemistry, advanced microscopy and computational modeling approaches. More precisely, it addresses mechanisms involved in the regulation of cell wall synthesis and remodeling in *Streptococcus pneumoniae*. This bacterium belongs to the morphological group of ovococci, which includes many human pathogens, such as streptococci and enterococci. In this study, we have dissected the function of DivIVA, which is a structural protein involved in cell division, cell morphogenesis and chromosome partitioning in Gram-positive bacteria. This work unveils the role of DivIVA in the orchestration of cell division and elongation along the pneumococcal cell cycle. It not only helps understanding how ovoid bacteria proliferate, but also offers an opportunity to consider how DivIVA

might serve as a scaffold and sensor for particular membrane regions, and thus be involved in various

processes associated with the cell cycle.

KEYWORDS

Cell morphogenesis, cell division, cell elongation, peptidoglycan, cell wall, DivIVA, *Streptococcus*

pneumoniae, ovococci, click chemistry, super-resolution microscopy, dSTORM, stimulated-

emission-depletion microscopy.

INTRODUCTION

Peptidoglycan (PG) is a three-dimensional network made of repeated *N*-acetylglucosamine-*N*-

acetylmuramic acid disaccharide units cross-linked by short peptides (Vollmer et al., 2008a). PG

confers resistance to turgor pressure and a specific cellular shape adapted to the environment of

the bacterium. This shape is tuned by the dynamics of PG synthesis and remodeling (Pinho et al.,

2013; Trouve et al., 2021b), whose enzymatic actors are well known but whose organizational and

regulatory factors remain poorly understood.

Assembly of the PG at the cell surface is performed by transglycosylase activities, which

polymerize the PG precursor unit lipid II (a membrane-anchored disaccharide pentapeptide) into

glycan chains, and by transpeptidase activities, which crosslink the peptide chains. PG synthases

include SEDS proteins (Shape, Elongation, Division and Sporulation), which carry transglycosylase

activities, and Penicillin-Binding Proteins (PBPs) (Meeske et al., 2016; Sauvage et al., 2008). Class A

PBPs (called aPBPs henceforth) are bifunctional enzymes carrying both transglycosylase and

transpeptidase domains, while class B PBPs (bPBPs) are monofunctional transpeptidases (Meeske

et al., 2016; Sauvage et al., 2008). bPBPs work in tandem with a cognate SEDS protein and

participate to the cell division or cell elongation complexes called the divisome or the elongasome,

respectively (Käshammer et al., 2023; Reichmann et al., 2019; Sjodt et al., 2020; Taguchi et al.,

2019; Zapun et al., 2012). aPBPs work independently from these two machineries, presumably

filling in gaps and/or densifying the PG mesh (Cho et al., 2016; Straume et al., 2021; Vigouroux et

al., 2020). PG remodeling on the other hand involves hydrolytic activities that cleave specific bonds

within the nascent PG, allowing for example daughter cell separation or insertion of new material

into the PG network (Vollmer et al., 2008b).

In this work, we investigated PG synthesis and remodeling in the opportunistic human
pathogen *Streptococcus pneumonia*e. This bacterium belongs to the morphological group of ovococci
(*e. g*. streptococci and enterococci), whose shape results from septal and peripheral PG syntheses,
which respectively allow cell division and cell elongation (Briggs et al., 2021; Zapun et al., 2008). In *S.*
pneumoniae, the divisome and elongasome contain the bPBP2x/FtsW and bPBP2b/RodA pairs,
respectively (Briggs et al., 2021; Perez et al., 2019; Philippe et al., 2014; Straume et al., 2017; Zapun
et al., 2012). None of the three pneumococcal aPBPs (aPBP1a, aPBP2a and aPBP1b) is essential but
inactivation of both aPBP1a a and aPBP2a is lethal (Paik et al., 1999). Furthermore, aPBP1a
modifies septal PG synthesized by the PBP2x/FtsW divisome pair (Straume et al., 2020). PG
hydrolases related to cell division include the amidase/endopeptidase PcsB, the glucosaminidase
LytB, and the muramidase Pmp23/MpgB (Bai et al., 2014; Barendt et al., 2009; Bartual et al., 2014;
De Las Rivas et al., 2002; Jacq et al., 2018; Taguchi et al., 2021). On the other hand, the muramidase
MltG/MpgA works in conjunction with the elongasome (Tsui et al., 2016).

Because PG synthetic and hydrolytic activities happen in regions with nanometer-scale
dimensions, investigating their dynamics requires super-resolution microscopy methods that break
the light diffraction barrier (Schermelleh et al., 2019). Recently, the combination of click-chemistry
bio-orthogonal labeling with dSTORM (direct Stochastic Optical Reconstruction Microscopy) and *in*
silico modeling improved our understanding of cell morphogenesis in the ovoid-shaped bacterium *S.*
pneumoniae (Trouve et al., 2021b, 2021a). Proteins in charge of septal and peripheral PG synthesis
are recruited to mid-cell by the cytoskeletal protein FtsZ at the beginning of the cell cycle, and their
activities are first confounded within an annular region whose nanometric dimensions approximate
that of the ring formed by FtsZ (Jacq et al., 2015; Trouve et al., 2021b). Later on, two synthesis
regions progressively separate, the inner one corresponding to septal PG synthesis and the outer
one to peripheral PG (Fig. S1A) (Perez et al., 2021; Trouve et al., 2021b). Importantly for this work,
the study of PG dynamics by dSTORM brought support to a mechanism in which PG synthesis by the
divisome at the membrane invagination front forms a septal matrix that is split at its periphery by
hydrolases to form the new cell hemispheres. Peripheral PG is inserted by the elongasome at the
periphery of the septum, into freshly cleaved septal material or concomitantly with the cleavage
(Fig. S1A) (Trouve et al., 2021b). In this model, septum remodeling through cleavage and
incorporation of peripheral PG would thus be a key event allowing both cell separation and cell
elongation. Because they modify septal PG, aPBPs probably also influence septum cleavage and/or
peripheral PG insertion (Straume et al., 2020).

With regards to the mechanisms of septum remodeling, the membrane-associated coiled-coil
protein DivIVA is thought to be a main player (Halbedel and Lewis, 2019; Hammond et al., 2019).
In *S. pneumoniae*, DivIVA is found at the division site and the cell poles, and it interacts with many
elongation and division proteins, including bPBP2x, bPBP2b and aPBP1a (Fadda et al., 2007; Fleurie
et al., 2014; Hammond et al., 2019; Straume et al., 2017). Deletion of the *divIVA* gene results in
chains of short pneumococcal cells, indicative of impaired cell separation and elongation (Fadda et
al., 2003; Fleurie et al., 2014; Straume et al., 2017). In *Streptococcus suis*, DivIVA interacts with
MltG/MpgA and its absence causes a cell elongation defect (Jiang et al., 2023). Altogether, these
observations point to a functional link between DivIVA and cell growth, but its exact function
remains unknown.

Here, we used state-of-the-art fluorescence microscopy methods to investigate the role of
DivIVA in *S. pneumoniae* cell morphogenesis. Using conventional fluorescence microscopy and
STED (stimulated-emission-depletion), we describe the localization of DivIVA on both sides of the
division site. Importantly, by combining bio-orthogonal PG labeling, dSTORM imaging and *in silico*
modeling to analyze PG synthesis in *divIVA* mutants, we reveal that the dynamics of septum
remodeling displays two phases along the pneumococcal cell cycle. During these two phases,
DivIVA promotes both splitting of the septum and peripheral PG synthesis, ensuring that these two
activities are synchronous around the septal periphery and maintained all along the division cycle.

RESULTS

DivIVA localizes as a double ring at constricting division sites
Several studies have shown that DivIVA localizes at the division site in various bacterial species and
in some cases at the cell poles, including in *S. pneumoniae* (Cramer et al., 2024; Fadda et al., 2007;
Fleurie et al., 2014; Sutton et al., 2023). To further document the localization and dynamics of the
pneumococcal DivIVA, we constructed a functional DivIVA-HT fusion at the endogenous *divIVA*
locus (Fig. S2). Observation of DivIVA-HT using conventional fluorescence microscopy confirmed
its septal and polar localization (Fig. 1A). Interestingly, it also showed an enrichment of the protein
at mid- and late-division sites (constricting sites) compared with early-division sites (non-
constricted sites) and cell poles (Fig. 1B). The localization of DivIVA at mid-cell is thus correlated
with division stages during which the septum is being remodeled (Trouve et al., 2021b).

STED microscopy further revealed the localization of DivIVA as a double band at mid-cell (Fig. 1C-

D). These double bands, which correspond to the 2D projection of rings, are separated by a median

distance of 93 ± 13 nm (n = 14).

DivIVA affects the dynamics of the pneumococcal cell cycle

In the absence of DivIVA, *S. pneumoniae* cells are still able to form complete septa but they do not

cleave them efficiently, forming chains of more than 70 μm (Fig. 2A) (Fadda et al., 2007; Fleurie et

al., 2014; Straume et al., 2017). To further characterize these defects, we analyzed the Δ*divIVA*

strain by dSTORM following a short labeling pulse with the azido-D-Ala-D-Ala (aDA-DA) probe,

which is incorporated into the growing PG (Trouve et al., 2021b, 2021a). The labeled cell chains

display band-like patterns that result from the 2D projection of annular PG synthesis regions. The

length of the labeled bands therefore measures the outer diameter of the pulse-labeled synthesis

rings. Since they do not separate, the cells of the Δ*divIVA* strain could not be classified along the cell

cycle as routinely performed with the wild-type (WT) strain (Fig. S1B) (Trouve et al., 2021b).

Instead, we sought to classify the labeled PG synthesis sites. We observed an alternation of

constricted and non-constricted labeling bands of various intensities (Fig. 2A). Interpreting the

parental relationships between bands was complicated by the fact that a given site is not

necessarily surrounded by sites of a single generation, but can also be bracketed by sites of

different generations (Fig. 2B). We therefore based our classification on the diameter of the site

considered with respect to that of its neighbors (Fig. 2C). We identified three classes of PG

synthesis sites: the early-division class (E) harbors large diameters (> 800 nm) and no visible

constriction, the mid-division group (M) exhibits visible constriction (d_M) and neighboring sites that

are even more constricted ($d < d_M$), and the late-division group (L) includes constricted sites (d_L)

flanked by sites that are less constricted ($d > d_L$). Our analysis revealed that most of the PG

synthesis sites fall into the late-division group in the Δ*divIVA* strain, with 30%, 17% and 53% (n =

200) of the sites assigned to the early-, mid- and late-division classes, respectively (Fig. 2D). To

compare these proportions with that of the WT strain, the cell categories reported previously were

converted into categories of labeled bands by adding two early-division sites for each late division

cell (Fig. S1B), since these were defined as displaying a constricted site surrounded by two new

daughter sites (Trouve et al., 2021b). The division sites of the WT strain are thus distributed with

proportions of early-, mid- and late-division of 68, 18 and 14%, respectively. Since cells were

labeled during steady-state growth, the proportion of each labeled sites reflects the relative

duration of the corresponding stage of the cell cycle. In the absence of DivIVA, the late-division

stage is therefore longer than the earlier stages. Consistent with this observation and with a defect

in septum splitting, the median diameters of the labeling sites in the Δ*divIVA* strain are higher than

in the WT strain (Fig. 2E).

Quantification of the number of localizations further shows that compared to the WT strain,

less PG is synthesized in the absence of DivIVA (Fig. 2F). Whereas PG insertion remains robust

along the whole cell cycle of WT cells, it dwindles to 27% of its maximum during late-division

stages when *divIVA* is deleted. Also of note, the shortest labeled diameters measured in WT cells

are at 150 nm, whereas the smallest diameter in the absence of DivIVA is about 280 nm (Fig. 2E). It

is unclear whether cells fail to complete their cell division or if it continues at an extremely slow

rate at which labeling is not detected.

The pneumococcal cell cycle consists of two elongation phases

When scanning Δ*divIVA* cell chains, symmetrical patterns, sometimes of up to seven bands, can be

found (Fig. 3). This number indicates that following a round of division, the cell cycles of the

descendants can remain synchronized for two more rounds of division (see Fig. 2B). Labeling

bands arising from a fourth generation are much less frequent, implying that the rate of cell cycle

progression between cells vary sufficiently to nullify synchronization beyond three or four

generations. We distinguished four typical symmetrical patterns. In one pattern (Fig. 3A), four long

weakly-labeled bands (grey arrowheads, early stages) surround a short middle weakly-labeled

band (central orange arrowhead, late stage) and two strongly-labeled bands of intermediate length

(lateral orange arrowheads, late stage). In the second pattern (Fig. 3B), the central weakly-labeled

band (central orange arrowhead, late stage) is flanked by four strongly-labeled bands (grey

arrowheads, early stages), which sandwich two bands of smaller diameter (lateral orange

arrowheads, late stages). The third pattern (Fig. 3C) is similar to the previous one, but the two

small diameter bands show a weak labeling. A fourth pattern shows a series of weakly labeled

bands (Fig. 3D).

To understand the dynamics of PG synthesis underlying the observed dSTORM patterns, we

previously developed a dynamic geometrical model of cell wall expansion. This model was

parametrized using measurements taken on experimental data and could successfully recapitulate

the labeling patterns of the WT strain (Fig. S1B) (Trouve et al., 2021b). Interestingly, to reproduce

the patterns obtained with the Δ*divIVA* strain, this model had to be refined. Whereas modeling data

from WT strains required an acceleration of the elongation rate to account for the thickening of the

labeling bands along the cell cycle (Trouve et al., 2021b), the statistics of the band diameters and

number of localizations measured for the Δ*divIVA* mutant (Fig. 2E-F) suggested a deceleration of

the cell elongation. Different functions were trialed to model a deceleration of the elongation rate,

but the morphology of the Δ*divIVA* strain and the labeling patterns could best and most simply be

mimicked with two successive phases of constant elongation rates. Two additional parameters

were thus added to the model to define when the second phase starts, and how reduced is its rate

compared to the first phase. The absence of small labeled rings was modeled by a complete stop of

the cell cycle at a fraction of the full cell length. The other parameters of the model remain.

Regarding the cells, they are the length/diameter ratio, the time of completion of the septum

closure and the time of the start of the next generation. Regarding the labeling patterns, the

parameters are the start and the length of the pulse. In contrast to the WT strain for which the

values of the parameters were obtained by fitting of the model functions to experimental

measurements (Trouve et al., 2021b), the number of measurable, well-defined symmetrical

patterns of the different types was not sufficient to perform meaningful fitting. Instead, the values

of the parameters were manually adjusted to best represent the Δ*divIVA* observations. The

modeled labeling patterns and cell wall representations are shown alongside dSTORM images in

Fig. 3. The chosen values are given in Table 1. Graphs of the modeled evolution of the cell length,

outer and inner diameter of the septum with the chosen parameters are given in supplementary

Fig. S3. The first pattern (Fig. 3A) is produced when the labeling takes place when the second

generation (yellow arrowheads) is producing most of its septum whereas the septum of the first

generation (teal arrowhead) has already closed and the third-generation division has just started

(pink arrowheads) (see Fig. S3 for the position of the green labeling pulse). In the second pattern

(Fig. 3B), the pulse starts slightly later, while septum synthesis of the second generation is already

well advanced (Fig. S3, orange labeling pulse). To generate the third pattern (Fig. 3C), a short pulse

occurs as the third division cycle is in the first (fast) phase, whereas the second- and first-

generation cycles are in the second slower phase and after septal closure (Fig. S3, cyan labeling

pulse). The weak labeling is the result of slow peripheral PG insertion. The fourth pattern (Fig. 3D)

appears when the labeling pulse occurs while three successive divisions have closed their septum

and ceased to incorporate PG material but a fourth division (blue arrowheads) has just started (Fig.

S3, yellow labeling pulse). The experimental data acquired on the Δ*divIVA* strain are thus

consistent with a biphasic model of the pneumococcal cell cycle in which the elongation rate is

reduced during the second phase.

Septal synthesis is maintained but septum splitting and peripheral synthesis are impaired in the absence of DivIVA

To further analyze the dynamics of PG synthesis in the Δ*divIVA* strain, we analyzed tilted cells in which the radial architecture of the labeled regions can be observed (Fig. 4A). To account for the difference in cell diameter between the WT and Δ*divIVA* strains, we normalized the width of the septal plate (measured as the distance *r*, Fig. 4B) to the mean value of early-stage labeling diameters ($d(E)_{WT}$ = 850 nm; $d(E)_{\Delta divIVA}$ = 980 nm), as those have not yet initiated constriction. At mid- and late-division stages, the *r/d(E)* ratio is greater than in the WT strain (Fig. 4C), consistent with active septal PG synthesis and defective septum splitting in Δ*divIVA* cells. In this orientation, WT cells at mid- and late-division stages show inner and outer labeling rings, respectively corresponding to septal and peripheral PG synthesis (Fig. 4A, patterns *d* to *f*) (Trouve et al., 2021b). Cells harboring these concentric patterns represent 4% (n = 148) of the whole WT cell population. In Δ*divIVA* cells, similar concentric patterns are observed in a larger proportion of the cell population (15%, n = 148) (Fig. 4A, patterns *c* to *f*), which is consistent with impaired septum splitting. Indeed, since septal PG is synthesized at the leading edge of the growing septum and peripheral PG is synthesized at its periphery, deficient cleavage of the septum favors the separation of the two sites of synthesis. The experimental labeling patterns were correctly reproduced when septal synthesis was maintained until septum closure, and the rate of septum splitting and concomitant peripheral PG insertion was severely reduced in a second phase of the cell cycle (Fig. 4A).

The dynamics of septum splitting and peripheral synthesis, or in other words cell elongation, were previously documented for WT strains using pulse-chase labeling experiments (Trouve et al., 2021b). Pulse-labeled PG is remodeled during the chase period, resulting in pulse-chase localization patterns that are wider than pulse patterns. In our model of pneumococcal PG synthesis, the septal PG is rapidly cleaved during early division, so that it is repositioned as hemispheric wall almost immediately after synthesis (Fig. S1A) (Trouve et al., 2021b). In a WT strain, when this stage (E) is observed in a pulse-chase experiment, the pulse-labeled PG splits into two bands during the chase, due to synthesis of unlabeled PG at mid-cell (Fig. 5A, grey arrowhead). At mid- (M) and late (L) division stages, septum cleavage lags behind septal PG synthesis, resulting in septum formation. In a pulse-chase experiment, a labeled septum is formed during the pulse and is cleaved during the chase. The cell wall that is repositioned laterally during the chase thus contains a mixture of labeled septally-synthesized PG and unlabeled peripheral PG (Trouve et al., 2021b). Such remodeling appears as "butterfly-like" patterns (Fig. 5A, pink and orange

arrowheads). Throughout the cell cycle, the rate of septal cleavage and peripheral PG insertion can

be assessed by measuring the "width of the chase" (W_{CHASE}), which is the distance separating the

external borders of the labeled patterns in pulse-chased cells (Fig. 5B).

During early division, the median width of the chased region in $\Delta divIVA$ cells ($W_{CHASE}(E)$ = 270

nm, n = 119) is rather similar to that of the WT strain ($W_{CHASE}(E)$ = 260 nm, n = 123) (Fig. 5C). By

contrast, W_{CHASE} is reduced in the absence of DivIVA at mid- ($W_{CHASE}(M)$ = 280 nm, n = 57) and in

particular at late-division ($W_{CHASE}(L)$= 80 nm, n = 162) when compared to the WT strain ($W_{CHASE}(M)$

= 415 nm, n = 122; $W_{CHASE}(L)$= 430 nm, n = 119). These measurements confirm that elongation

slows down dramatically during the cell cycle in the absence of DivIVA, whereas it accelerates in the

WT strain. The geometrical model correctly reproduces the observed chased patterns (Fig. 5D).

Only sites that were labeled early during the first phase of rapid PG synthesis show significant

parting of split labeled bands. Sites that were labeled late during the first (rapid) phase or during

the second (slow) phase show little splitting of the bands.

In addition to the double-band patterns described above, 10% of the $\Delta divIVA$ early-division

sites (n = 301) showed asymmetric separation of the labeled region, resulting in "Y-like"

localization patterns (Fig. 5E). This proportion is probably underestimated since it only includes

"Y-like" patterns correctly oriented in the XY plane and does not consider similar patterns oriented

in the Z axis. Asymmetric pulse-chase labeling patterns are never observed in early-division WT

cells, in which pulse-labeled regions are always chased as parallel bands (Fig. 5A). In the absence of

DivIVA, the presence of Y-like labelings indicate that septal splitting and associated peripheral PG

synthesis are non-uniformly distributed around the division site.

The contribution of the elongasome and aPBPs to cell elongation is modified in the absence

of DivIVA

S. pneumoniae cell elongation is known to rely on peripheral PG synthesis by the elongasome,

which is formed by the RodA/bPBP2b pair (Perez et al., 2021; Straume et al., 2017; Vollmer et al.,

2019). On the other hand, given that peripheral PG is inserted into cleaved septal regions and that

septal PG is modified by aPBPs (Straume et al., 2020; Trouve et al., 2021b), it is possible that aPBPs

influence peripheral PG insertion and thus cell elongation. Since the later process is impaired in

$\Delta divIVA$ cells, we sought to investigate the interplay between DivIVA and the elongasome or aPBPs

using pulse-chase experiments (Fig. 6A and 6C). Consistent with a previous study by Tsui et al,

deletion of *pbp2b* in a WT background required the combined inactivation of *mltG*, which was

obtained by mutating the catalytic tyrosine (Y488D mutation) (Tsui et al., 2016). Measurement of

W_{CHASE} was used to estimate the cell elongation. Compared to WT cells, W_{CHASE} is reduced by a factor

of 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 at early-, mid- and late-division stages in $\Delta pbp2b\ mltG_{Y488D}$ cells (Fig. 6B). In a WT

background, bPBP2b-based peripheral PG synthesis is therefore a major contributor to all

elongation phases. Interestingly, cell elongation is also diminished in mid- to late-division stages in

the absence of aPBP1a or aPBP2a.

As reported previously (Fleurie et al., 2014), we could not delete the *pbp2b* gene in the $\Delta divIVA$

background, indicating that bPBP2b is still essential in the absence of DivIVA. As in a WT strain, we

had to inactivate MltG to suppress the requirement for bPBP2b. However, in the $\Delta divIVA$

background, bPBP2b inactivation had a milder effect on cell elongation. Indeed, compared to

$\Delta divIVA$ cells, W_{CHASE} is either not reduced during early- and mid-division, or reduced by a factor of

1.2 at the late-division stage in $\Delta divIVA\ \Delta pbp2b\ mltG_{Y488D}$ cells (Fig. 6D). In the absence of DivIVA,

the elongasome contribution to the cell elongation is thus diminished all along the cell cycle.

The comparison of the width of the chase between $\Delta divIVA$ and $\Delta divIVA\ \Delta pbp1a$ cells shows a

reduction in cell elongation at all stages of the cell cycle, especially in early- and late-division stages,

upon *pbp1a* deletion (Fig. 6D). This is slightly different from the WT strain, in which the absence of

aPBP1a has no effect on W_{CHASE} during early-division (Fig. 6B). In a WT genetic background, the

contribution of aPBP1a to early-elongation is probably masked by the strong contribution of the

elongasome. The contribution of aPBP1a to early-division is therefore revealed by the absence of

DivIVA, as the role of bPBP2b is minimal in this genetic background. In $\Delta divIVA$ cells, aPBP1a

appears important for cell elongation all along the cell cycle.

The situation is somewhat different for aPBP2a. In the presence of DivIVA, aPBP2a mainly

contributes to mid- and late-division stages (Fig. 6B). By contrast, in $\Delta divIVA\ \Delta pbp2a$ cells, W_{CHASE}

does not decrease at these stages compared to $\Delta divIVA$ cells, indicating a decreased participation of

aPBP2a to cell elongation in the absence of DivIVA (Fig. 6D). On the other hand, when compared to

$\Delta divIVA$ cells, W_{CHASE} is reduced by a factor of 1.4 during early-division in $\Delta divIVA\ \Delta pbp2a$ cells.

Here again, the role of aPBP2a during early cell elongation is therefore revealed in the absence of

DivIVA.

In conclusion, the absence of DivIVA affects not only peripheral PG synthesis by the

elongasome, but also the contribution of aPBP1a and aPBP2a to cell elongation.

DISCUSSION

DivIVA is anchored in the plasma membrane by an N-terminal motif composed of a hydrophobic
residue flanked by positively charged amino acids (Choukate and Chaudhuri, 2020; Oliva et al.,
2010). The central part of DivIVA forms coiled coils of varying length in different Gram-positive
species. It assembles as a tetramer formed by the antiparallel association of two parallel coiled-coil
dimers. Depending on the organism, there is an additional non-conserved C-terminal tail.
Tetramers of DivIVA from *Bacillus subtilis* were found to assemble *in vitro* into large lattice-like
structures (Oliva et al., 2010). Most importantly, DivIVA binds preferentially to negatively curved
membrane regions, which accounts for its concentration at the cell poles and as two rings bordering
the invaginating membrane, as previously reported for *B. subtilis* (Cramer et al., 2024), and
established in this work for *S. pneumoniae*.

As a scaffold protein with an affinity for negatively curved membranes, DivIVA may have been
used and reused by the mechanisms of evolution as a platform for processes that must occur at
such places in bacteria. For examples, DivIVA directs apical growth in corynebacteria and
mycobacteria (Kang et al., 2008; Letek et al., 2008), it participates indirectly to positioning of the
division site in *B. subtilis* by interacting with the Min system (Eswaramoorthy et al., 2011), and it is
involved in chromosome partitioning by positioning the ParB protein at poles (Giacomelli et al.,
2022). In ovococci such as *S. pneumoniae*, the absence of DivIVA causes major morphological
defects, as the Δ*divIVA* strain grows as chains of lentil-shaped cells, compressed in the direction of
the long axis (this work and (Fleurie et al., 2014; Straume et al., 2017)). DivIVA is thus required for
proper ovoid shape, but how does it fulfill its morphogenetic function?

Here, we have shown that in *S. pneumoniae*, DivIVA is more concentrated at the division site
than at the cell poles, suggesting that it plays a major function at the sites of active PG synthesis.
The current model proposes that the ovoid shape of *S. pneumoniae* results from a finely balanced
and interconnected synthesis of septal and peripheral PG, respectively required for cell division and
elongation. The latter is thought to result primarily from the action of the RodA/bPBP2b
glycosyltransferase/transpeptidase couple associated with the hydrolase MltG/MpgA. Indeed, the
absence of a functional elongasome (RodA/bPBP2b/MltG) engenders chains of shorter cells (this
work and (Berg et al., 2013; Straume et al., 2017)), and our dSTORM data show that elongation is
actually impaired at all stages of the cell cycle. Cells without DivIVA display a similar morphology,
but we show in this case that elongation is only impaired at mid and late stages of the cell cycle.
Surprisingly, in the same cells, the elongasome appears to be inactive in early and mid stages. Early
elongation in Δ*divIVA* cells must therefore rely on another machinery than that of the elongasome.
Observations made in aPBP mutants may shed some light on this. Indeed, in the absence of DivIVA,

our data reveal a contribution of aPBP1a and aPBP2a to early elongation that is not detected in an

otherwise WT background. Therefore, DivIVA seems to affect in some way the function of the

elongasome and aPBPs, whose contribution to cell elongation seems to compensate each other

during the early stage of the cell cycle.

Regardless of the enzymatic machineries involved, a major observation allowed by our

dSTORM data is the existence of two cell growth phases during the pneumococcal cell cycle, as the

absence of DivIVA does not affect early elongation (first phase) but dramatically impairs mid and

late growth stages (second phase). More precisely, septation proceeds normally during the second

phase but splitting of the septum and concomitant peripheral synthesis are drastically slowed

down, leading to chains of shorter cells. From different attempts at simulating the labeling patterns

with a geometrical model of the cell growth, it appears that the deceleration of septum splitting and

peripheral synthesis must be abrupt rather that gradual. Later, it is possible that the elongation

process ceases completely as no labeling of division sites of small diameter could be detected. Since

long Δ*divIVA* cell chains still have extremities, the division of some rare cells may proceed to

completion through septal splitting possibly decoupled from peripheral synthesis. Alternatively,

long chains may be broken by the occasional lysis of some cells.

Also very interestingly, the resolution attained by dSTORM in pulse-chase labeling experiments

has revealed Y-shaped labeling patterns in Δ*divIVA* cells, while pulse-labeled regions are always

chased as parallel labeling rings in WT cells. These observations suggest that during the chase time,

the elongation due to septal splitting and peripheral synthesis sometimes progresses at different

speeds along the perimeter of the septum in the Δ*divIVA* strain, whereas the rate of elongation is

identical around the septal circumference in WT cells.

Our detailed dSTORM localization of PG assembly in a *divIVA* deletion strain thus shows that

DivIVA is necessary i) to maintain elongation passed a threshold time point during the cell cycle,

and ii) to coordinate the related processes around the mid cell perimeter. How can DivIVA achieve

such temporal and spatial regulation? Interestingly, the bi-phasic elongation process evidenced in

this work is reminiscent of the bi-phasic dynamic behavior of DivIVA, which was shown to move in

a directed manner around early-division sites and more diffusively around mid- and late-division

sites (Perez et al., 2019). A hypothesis that would unify all the observations reported to date would

thus be to consider that DivIVA is a physical sensor of membrane curvature, which would guide its

localization in regions where septum splitting and peripheral synthesis need to be stimulated.

Let us first consider how should evolve the force that favors septum splitting (Fig. 7A). The

surface tension resulting from the turgor pressure ΔP is $\gamma = \Delta P R/4$ where R is the radius of

curvature. At the junction of the septal and peripheral surfaces, for every segment s of the
circumference of the septum, this surface tension generates a force, tangential to the peripheral
surface away from the septum with a value $|\vec{F}_s| = \gamma s$. This force can be decomposed in a component
parallel to the septal plane $|\vec{F}_{||}| = \cos\theta|\vec{F}_s|$, and a component perpendicular to the septal plane $|\vec{F}_\perp| =$
$\sin\theta|\vec{F}_s|$, where θ is the angle between the new peripheral wall and the septal wall. This angle is
$\pi/2$ at the start and increases towards π at the end of the division. Therefore, the component
perpendicular to the septal plane $\vec{F}_\perp$, which should help tearing apart the septum, progressively
vanishes as the division progresses. A good analogy of this phenomenon is the removal of an
adhesive tape from a surface: it is easier if you pull perpendicularly to the surface than if you pull at
a shallow angle. Thus, the turgor pressure and the cell geometry provide a force $\vec{F}_\perp$ that can help
septum splitting. The stretched septal PG at the periphery could be a better substrate for the
cleaving enzyme.

The fact that in the absence of DivIVA, septum splitting and associated peripheral PG synthesis
proceed normally during early division and then slows dramatically, suggests that a different or
autonomous driving force exists at the beginning but is not present at the end of the process. The
mechanical force $\vec{F}_\perp$ described above could fulfill this role since it diminishes necessarily during cell
separation (Fig 7A). This waning force could reach a threshold where it is not sufficient and DivIVA
would kick-in to stimulate further septum splitting. DivIVA, by virtue of its affinity for negatively
curved membranes would be pre-localized exactly where required. In this scheme, DivIVA may be
considered as an activator of septum splitting and the associated peripheral PG synthesis. How
DivIVA achieves such activation remains mysterious. One common hypothesis is to propose that
DivIVA acts as a platform protein that interacts directly or indirectly with proteins of the cell wall
metabolism to concentrate them and/or activate them at specific locations. Based on the defective
peripheral synthesis observed in Δ*divIVA* cells, elongasome proteins appear as putative partners of
DivIVA. In agreement with this idea, DivIVA was shown to localize (but not activate) MltG/MpgA
through a direct physical interaction in *Streptococcus suis* (Jiang et al., 2023). MltG/MpgA might
thus use DivIVA as a localization platform. This hypothesis seems less likely for bPBP2b as it
remains localized in the absence of DivIVA, but we cannot exclude that DivIVA induces local
variations in bPBP2b concentrations that were not detected in the study by Fleurie et al (Fleurie et
al., 2014). An alternative hypothesis would be that DivIVA might indirectly activate peripheral
synthesis, again through a physical mechanism based on its negative-curve-affinity (Fig 7B). Let us
assume two additional features for DivIVA: a resting conformational angle ϕ_{rest} in the longitudinal
plane comprised somewhere between $\pi/2$ and π, and anchoring points to the cell wall at both

extremities (through some relay proteins). At the beginning of the division, the DivIVA angle would
be greater than that of the membrane at the periphery of the septum ($\phi = \phi_{rest} > \theta$). Since θ
increases as the septum is cleaved, at some point the DivIVA resting angle becomes smaller than
that of the membrane ($\phi_{rest} < \theta$) and DivIVA would be stretched ($\phi = \theta$). In this new configuration,
DivIVA experiences a tension that may be translated into an activation signal to interacting PG
synthases/hydrolases, or it could transfer tension to the periphery of the septal PG itself, taking
over the function of the diminishing splitting force $\vec{F}_\perp$. Note that the two hypothetical modes of
action are not mutually exclusive.

If the affinity of DivIVA for the membrane increases with the curvature, and if septum splitting
and peripheral synthesis are positively regulated by the presence of DivIVA, these two conditions
would ensure an orderly symmetrical proceeding of the division around the cell circumference. If
division were to occur faster in one region of the circumference (Fig. 7C right), the peripheral
membrane curvature in that region would become smaller than in the rest of the cell
circumference; the concentration of DivIVA would then decrease in this region of faster division
and increase elsewhere, where it would stimulate the process. The sliding and modification of the
local concentration of DivIVA along the septal circumference according membrane curvature would
thus automatically adjust the amount of cell wall metabolism required to ensure the even
progression of the division. In Δ*divIVA* cells, heterogeneous septum splitting and/or peripheral
synthesis would not be corrected by DivIVA, resulting in circularly asymmetrical PG labeling
profiles, observed as Y-shaped labeling patterns in our dSTORM images.

The biphasic dynamic behavior of DivIVA evidenced by Perez et al. can also be explained by its
affinity for negatively curved membranes (Perez et al., 2019). When the septum is not yet formed, if
FtsZ drives membrane invagination at the division site, places of maximal negative membrane
curvature necessarily follow the localization of the Z-ring around the cell perimeter. The affinity of
DivIVA for negative membrane curvature would result in DivIVA moving directionally around the
mid-cell circumference, seemingly "following" FtsZ treadmilling during early division. Past the very
early stage, a maximal negative curvature is established at the periphery of the septal plate,
whereas FtsZ remains localized at the leading edge of the closing septum. Consequently,
positioning of DivIVA would not depend on FtsZ treadmilling after the initial moments of the cell
division process. At these later stages, the localization of DivIVA molecules around the septal
periphery would depend on modulation of the negative curvatures resulting from septum splitting,
as proposed above.

Although the mode of action of DivIVA remains to be elucidated, our work improves our

understanding of the cell cycle in *S. pneumoniae* and highlights a regulatory function for DivIVA. It

sets the ground for further investigation, which should include cellular studies of DivIVA dynamics,

biophysical studies of DivIVA interaction with the membrane, as well as high-resolution structural

studies in the cell, such as cryo-correlative light and electron microscopy (cryo-CLEM), to correlate

the localization of DivIVA with the architecture of cellular ultrastructures.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacterial strains and growth conditions

The pneumococcal strains used in this study are listed in Table S1 and the strain construction is

described in *Supplementary Methods*. For PG labeling, 50 µL of glycerol stocks, frozen at OD_{600nm} =

0.3, were used to inoculate 1 mL of BHI medium. Cultures were grown at 37°C in a static CO_2

incubator, diluted twice into 10 mL of pre-warmed BHI medium (1/10th volume) to reach steady-

state growth, and treated for PG labeling when OD_{600nm} reached 0.3.

To localize DivIVA, cultures were inoculated at OD_{600nm} = 0.006 in C+Y medium and grown at 37°C

to an OD_{600nm} of 0.3. These cultures were diluted into C+Y medium (1/50th volume) and incubated at

37°C to an OD_{600nm} of 0.1. The cells were then incubated 10 min at 37°C with 20 nM HT-JFX646

ligand. For STED Microscopy, to fix the cells, 300 µL of culture were mixed with 100 µL of fixation

solution (0.5 M KPO_4 pH 7, 8% paraformaldehyde, 0.08% glutaraldehyde) and incubated for 15 min

at room temperature followed by 15 min on ice. Cells were then washed twice with 300 µL of 0.1 M

KPO_4 and finally concentrated 3 times. 0.8 µL of the cell suspension was immobilized on a 1.2% C+Y

agarose-coated microscopy slide with a cover glass (# 1.5) for cell imaging.

Epifluorescence and STED microscopy

Epifluorescence snapshots were performed on a previously described setup, equipped with a 100 x

objective and with laser excitation at 561 nm set at 30% of the maximum excitation power with

exposure time of 500 ms (Billaudeau et al., 2017). Demographs showing the fluorescence intensity

of DivIVA in relation to cell length was generated using MicrobeJ (version 5.13n), with specific

parameters previously reported (Juillot et al., 2024) : area (0.6-20 µm^2), length (0.5-max µm), width

(0.5-2 µm), circularity (0-1), curvature (0-max), sinuosity (0-max), angularity (0-0.25 rad), solidity

(0-0.85 max), and intensity (0-max). Cells with regular morphology that were initially excluded
from the segmentation due to proximity to other cells were included manually in the analysis.
Adjacent ovoid cells were meticulously examined to ensure accurate classification as one late-
division cell or two separated daughter cells. The resulting data were normalized as per MicrobeJ's
guidelines.

Heatmaps illustrating the average intensity of DivIVA-HT within cells was produced with MicrobeJ,
using cell categorization parameters previously reported as follows (Juillot et al., 2024): from left
to right, [SHAPE.length/SHAPE.width] ≤ 1.7; [SHAPE.length/SHAPE.width] > 1.7 and
[SHAPE.length] ≤ 1.6; [SHAPE.length/SHAPE.width] > 1.7 and [SHAPE.length] > 1.6;
[SHAPE.length/SHAPE.width] > 2 and [SHAPE.circularity] < 0.8; [SHAPE.length/SHAPE.width] > 2
and [SHAPE.circularity] < 0.7.

STED microscopy images were acquired with a STEDYCON (Abberior Instruments GmbH). Pulsed
laser at 640 nm was used for fluorescence excitation. A pulsed 775 nm STED depletion laser was
additionally used. The 640 nm excitation laser and the 775 nm depletion laser were set at 10% of
their maximum power. The optical setup was connected to an AxioImager Z2 fluorescence
microscope (Zeiss) with a 100× oil immersion PlanApochromat objective lens (NA = 1.46).
Acquisition software was STEDYCON Smart control. Measurements were performed with a pixel
dwell time of 10 μs.

Preparation of PG labeling reagents

All starting materials were obtained from commercial sources and were used without further
purification. NMR spectra were acquired on a Bruker Advance 400 MHz for ^{1}H-NMR experiments
and 100 MHz for ^{13}C-NMR experiments. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to the
solvents: [1]H δ(CD_3OD) = 3.3 ppm, [13]C δ(CD_3OD) = 49.15 ppm. Accurate mass spectra were recorded
on a time-of-flight (TOF) spectrometer (Waters, XEVO G2-S QTof) and on a LTQ Orbitrap XL
spectromer with ElectroSpay Ionization (ESI, Thermo Scientific).

The aDA-DA probe (((R)-2-amino-3-azidopropanoyl)-D-alanine) was synthesized as previously
described (Trouve et al., 2021b). Briefly, 2-(trimethylsilyl)ethyl (*tert*-butoxycarbonyl)-D-alaninate
was obtained according to the Van Nieuwenhze's process and the (R)-3-azido-2-((*tert*-
butoxycarbonyl)amino)propanoic acid was obtained according to the Webb's process (described
for the L enantiomer) (Liechti et al., 2014; McAllister et al., 2011).

The N-Boc deprotection of 2-(trimethylsilyl)ethyl (*tert*-butoxycarbonyl)-D-alaninate was

performed in a solution of 4 N HCl in dioxane for 3 h to give, after removal of solvent, trituration in

dried ether, and drying under high vacuum (4 h), the corresponding salt in quantitative yield. This

latter and the (*R*)-3-azido-2-((*tert*-butoxycarbonyl)amino)propanoic acid (1.4 equivalent) were

dissolved in dry CH_2Cl_2. HATU (1.1 equivalent), di-isopropyl ethyl amine (DIPEA, 2.3 equivalent)

was added and the mixture was stirred overnight. After removal of the solvent, ethyl acetate was

added and the solution was washed with an aqueous solution of 10% citric acid followed by 5%

$NaHCO_3$. The combined organic layers were dried ($MgSO_4$) and evaporated. After purification flash

chromatography, the resulting 2-(trimethylsilyl)ethyl ((*R*)-3-azido-2-((*ter*-

butoxycarbonyl)amino)propanoyl)-D-alaninate was obtained in 63% yield. The final deprotections

were performed by addition of trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) at 0°C followed by stirring for 4 h at room

temperature. The solvent was evaporated and dried under high vacuum (oil pump). The compound

was purified by HPLC to yield ((*R*)-2-ammonio-3-azidopropanoyl)-D-alaninate 2,2,2-

trifluoroacetate (aDADA) as a white solid.

Frozen aliquots of a 500-mM stock solution of aDA-DA in 100% DMSO were diluted to 10 mM in

commercial DPBS (calcium- and magnesium-free, from ThermoFisher) and stored at -20°C for

subsequent use.

Powder of DBCO-AF647 (Jena Bioscience) was resuspended at 10 mM into 100% DMSO, diluted to

500 μM into DPBS and stored at -20°C for subsequent use.

PG labeling in *S. pneumoniae* cells

Cells in exponential growth phase (OD_{600nm} 0.3) were incubated for 5 min at 37°C in BHI medium

containing 2 mM aDA-DA (Pulse labeling). For Pulse-Chase labeling experiments, after the 5-min

Pulse labeling with aDA-DA, cells were pelleted (7,000 × g, 5 min, 20°C) and resuspended into fresh,

pre-warmed BHI medium. Incubation at 37°C was continued for 15 min. Following Pulse or Pulse-

Chase labeling, cells were fixed overnight on ice, in the culture medium supplemented with 0.5-X

DPBS and 2% (v/v) paraformaldehyde (PFA). Following fixation, cells were pelleted, resuspended

into DPBS containing 35 μM DBCO-AF647 and incubated for 1 h at 20°C (click reaction). Cells were

then washed twice with 1 mL of DPBS and were resuspended into the dSTORM buffer, which

contains 25 mM NaCl, 75 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 10% (w/v) D-glucose, 100 mM cysteamine (β-

mercaptoethylamine) and 1X GLOX mix [40 μg·mL^{-1} catalase from bovine liver (Sigma-Aldrich), 0.5

mg·mL^{-1} glucose oxidase type VII from *Aspergillus niger* (Sigma-Aldrich)]. Further details regarding

the labeling procedure and alternative strategies can be found in (Trouve et al., 2021a).

dSTORM data acquisition

To perform dSTORM on cells oriented along their longitudinal axis, the samples were mounted

between a slide (High-precision, No. 1.5H, 24 X 50 mm, 170 ± 5 mm, Marienfeld) and a coverslip

(High-precision, No. 1.5H, 22 X 22 mm, 170 ± 5 μm, Marienfeld) previously treated with ozone and

eventually sealed with colorless nail polish.

To orient cells with a tilt angle, 8 μL of sample was loaded on a slide and covered with 18 μL of

dSTORM buffer containing 0.9% (w/v) low-melting agarose. The slide was then turned over onto a

coverslip. After solidification, the agarose pad was sealed with colorless nail polish.

dSTORM images were acquired at 27°C with a SAFe360 Abbelight PALM/STORM setup based on an

Olympus IX83 inverted microscope equipped with a Oxxius laser combiner and two sCMOS

Hamamatsu ORCA-Fusion cameras controlled via the NEO software. The emitted signal was

collected by a 100x oil immersion apochromatic objective (UPLAPO100XOHR, Olympus) and then

filtered by a band-pass filter FF01-698/70 (Semrock). First, diffraction-limited images were

acquired by illuminating the sample at 640 nm with 1% of the maximal laser power (2 kW·cm^{-2}).

For single-molecule localization microscopy, the samples were exposed to a continuous 640 nm

illumination with a constant laser power density of 2 kW·cm^{-2}. dSTORM data were collected over

15,000 frames recorded with an exposure time of 50 ms. The blinking density was maintained all

along the data collection by ramping up a 405-nm laser from 0% to 15% of a maximal value of 50

W·cm^{-2} For homogenous excitation of the sample, the field of excitation parameter in the NEO

software was adjusted to cover the region of interest (ASTER illumination) (Mau et al., 2021).

dSTORM image reconstruction

Data processing was performed with the ThunderSTORM plugin in ImageJ/FIJI (Ovesný et al., 2014;

Schindelin et al., 2012; Schneider et al., 2012), including determination of the localization precision

and quantification of the number of localizations. Potential drift was corrected with the cross-

correlation tool in ThunderSTORM (Ovesný et al., 2014). Image rendering was achieved through

normalized Gaussian blurring with a reconstructed pixel size of 10 nm. The spatial resolution of the

reconstructed dSTORM images was calculated using the FIRE ImageJ/FIJI plugin (Nieuwenhuizen et

al., 2013). Further details for dSTORM data acquisition and image reconstruction can be found in

(Trouve et al., 2021a).

Measurement of the labeling patterns

Measurements of the labeled regions were performed in ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012). The values

of the diameter d and of the width of the chase W_{CHASE} (as defined in figures 2C and 5B) were

obtained by plotting the signal intensity along a line positioned over the labeling of interest and

measuring the distance between the points at half the maximal intensity.

For radial labeling patterns (in vertical or angled bacteria), the diameters d_{out} and d_{in} used to

calculate the radial thickness r of the labeled region, as defined in figure 4B, were measured as

above along a line positioned across the longest axis of the elliptic patterns.

Geometrical model of cell growth and labeling

The basis of the geometrical model was similar to that developed previously for WT strains (Trouve

et al., 2021b). The animated geometrical model was implemented using the free open source 3D

animation software Art of Illusion© by Peter Eastman. The mature cell was modeled as an ellipsoid

of length L and diameter D. Taking the longitudinal axis as the x axis, the equator as its origin, and L

the length of a mature single cell, the radius of the cell around this axis (R_{out}) is given by the elliptic

curve:

$$R_{out(x)} = \sqrt{y_{out}^2 + z_{out}^2} = \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{x}{L/2}\right)^2}$$

622   Taking l as the distance between two parting equators, as the new cell length $l/2$ grows along x

623   with time, R_{out} at $x = l/2$ is the radius of the septal outer edge circle ($R_{out} = d_{out}/2$). Taking the length

624    $C,$ at which the septum is closed, the radius of the septal inner edge circle ($R_{in} = d_{in}/2$) at $x = l/2$ is

625   given by:

$$R_{in(x)} = \sqrt{y_{in}^2 + z_{in}^2} = \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{x}{C/2}\right)^2}$$

626   That points on the inner septal edge follow an elliptic path towards the point of closure is an

627   assumption that was found to match the observations of the WT strains. We have set $R_{max} = D/2 =$

628   1, so that in the above equations, $L/2$ takes the numerical value of the elliptic factor $E = L/D$.

629   To account for the acceleration of the growth along the *x* axis observed in WT strains, *l/2*
630   depends on time according to:

$$l/2_{(t)} = \frac{(1 + At)}{2(1 + A)}$$

where *A* is an acceleration factor. Note that in this equation, *t* and *A* are dimensionless and *t* is
expressed as a fraction of the generation time, which is defined as 1. The (1+*A*) denominator is a
normalization factor that ensures that a division is completed at *t* = 1.

Since the acceleration was not observed in the Δ*divIVA* strain, *A* was set to 0 to describe the
deletion phenotype. Instead, three additional parameters were introduced in the model. A time
point after the initiation of the division at which the cell elongation slows down (T_s), and the factor
by which the elongation rate is diminished ("brake" factor *B*). When *B* is set to 1, growth continues
unchanged after T_s at the normalized rate of 1 and the division cycle is completed at *t* = 1. If *B* is set
as a fraction of 1, the cell elongation continues at rate *B* after T_s, and the division ends at *t* = T_s + (1-
T_s)/*B*, which is greater than 1.

$$l/2_{(t<T_s)} =$$

$$l/2_{(t>T_s)} = LT_s + BL(t - T_s)$$

The third parameter that was added determines a point at which all processes stop. For
practical reason of programming in Art of Illusion©, this event was defined as a fraction (*S*) of the
length that the cell would have attained without growth arrest, rather than as a time.

The start and length of the labeling pulse can also be defined. In contrast to the WT strains,
where the evolution of the various distances (length *l*, inner and outer septal diameter d_{in} and d_{out}
could be fitted to measurements to extract values of the model parameters, the parameter
describing the Δ*divIVA* strain were manually adjusted to best reproduce the observations, due to
the greater heterogeneity of the cell sizes and morphologies. Nevertheless, all the simulated
labeling patterns presented were generated with the same set of parameters, which are given in
Table 1.

QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Statistics were performed using Excel and figures were prepared using LabPlot2. The statistical
details describing the quantification and measurements of localization patterns (including the

definition of center, dispersion and precision of measures, the statistical tests used, the exact value

of the *n* number of analyzed cells) can be found in the *Results* section and in the figure legends.

MATERIALS AND DATA AVAILABILITY

There are restrictions to the availability of the aDA-DA probe. Due to the time required for chemical

synthesis, this material will be available through a collaboration with Yung-Sing Wong (yung-

sing.wong@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr).

The datasets generated during this study will be made available on the Zenodo platform upon

acceptation of the manuscript [accession # To be named/zenodo.org].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank members of the Morlot and Grangeasse laboratories for advice and encouragement, O.

Glushonkov and J.P. Kleman for advices and support regarding dSTORM. Support for this work

comes from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-16-CE11-0016 and ANR-23-CE11-0029 to

CM, ANR-19-CE15-0011 to CG, Labex ARCANE ANR-17-EURE-0003 to YSW, and ANR-17-CE13-

0031 to RCL and NC). This work used the platforms of the Grenoble Instruct-ERIC centre (ISBG;

UMS 3518 CNRS-CEA-UGA-EMBL) within the Grenoble Partnership for Structural Biology (PSB),

supported by FRISBI (ANR-10-INBS-05-02) and GRAL, financed within the University Grenoble

Alpes graduate school (Ecoles Universitaires de Recherche) CBH-EUR-GS (ANR-17-EURE-0003).

IBS acknowledges integration into the Interdisciplinary Research Institute of Grenoble (IRIG, CEA).

680 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

681 JT, AZ, RCL, NC, YSW, CG and CM designed research; JT, AZ, LB, DJ, AP, CF and MB performed

682 experiments; JT, AZ, DJ, NC, YSW, CG and CM analyzed data; JT, AZ and CM wrote the manuscript; JT,

683 AZ, RCL, NC, YSW, CG and CM revised the manuscript.

Declaration of Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Inclusion and Diversity Statement

While citing references scientifically relevant for this work, we also actively worked to promote gender balance in our reference list.

References

Bai, X.-H., Chen, H.-J., Jiang, Y.-L., Wen, Z., Huang, Y., Cheng, W., Li, Q., Qi, L., Zhang, J.-R., Chen, Y., Zhou, C.-Z., 2014. Structure of pneumococcal peptidoglycan hydrolase LytB reveals insights into the bacterial cell wall remodeling and pathogenesis. J. Biol. Chem. 289, 23403–23416. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M114.579714

Barendt, S.M., Land, A.D., Sham, L.-T., Ng, W.-L., Tsui, H.-C.T., Arnold, R.J., Winkler, M.E., 2009. Influences of Capsule on Cell Shape and Chain Formation of Wild-Type and pcsB Mutants of Serotype 2 Streptococcus pneumoniae. J. Bacteriol. 191, 3024–3040. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.01505-08

Bartual, S.G., Straume, D., Stamsås, G.A., Muñoz, I.G., Alfonso, C., Martínez-Ripoll, M., Håvarstein, L.S., Hermoso, J.A., 2014. Structural basis of PcsB-mediated cell separation in Streptococcus pneumoniae. Nat. Commun. 5, 3842. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms4842

Berg, K.H., Stamsås, G.A., Straume, D., Håvarstein, L.S., 2013. Effects of Low PBP2b Levels on Cell Morphology and Peptidoglycan Composition in Streptococcus pneumoniae R6. J. Bacteriol. 195, 4342–4354. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00184-13

Billaudeau, C., Chastanet, A., Yao, Z., Cornilleau, C., Mirouze, N., Fromion, V., Carballido-López, R., 2017. Contrasting mechanisms of growth in two model rod-shaped bacteria. Nat. Commun. 8, 15370. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15370

Briggs, N.S., Bruce, K.E., Naskar, S., Winkler, M.E., Roper, D.I., 2021. The Pneumococcal Divisome: Dynamic Control of Streptococcus pneumoniae Cell Division. Front. Microbiol. 12, 737396. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2021.737396

Cho, H., Wivagg, C.N., Kapoor, M., Barry, Z., Rohs, P.D.A., Suh, H., Marto, J.A., Garner, E.C., Bernhardt, T.G., 2016. Bacterial cell wall biogenesis is mediated by SEDS and PBP polymerase families functioning semi-autonomously. Nat. Microbiol. 16172. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.172

Choukate, K., Chaudhuri, B., 2020. Structural basis of self-assembly in the lipid-binding domain of mycobacterial polar growth factor Wag31. IUCrJ 7, 767–776. https://doi.org/10.1107/S2052252520006053

Cramer, K., Reinhardt, S.C.M., Auer, A., Shin, J.Y., Jungmann, R., 2024. Comparing divisome organization between vegetative and sporulating Bacillus subtilis at the nanoscale using DNA-PAINT. Sci. Adv. 10, eadk5847. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adk5847

De Las Rivas, B., García, J.L., López, R., García, P., 2002. Purification and polar localization of pneumococcal LytB, a putative endo-beta-N-acetylglucosaminidase: the chain-dispersing murein hydrolase. J. Bacteriol. 184, 4988–5000. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.184.18.4988-5000.2002

Eswaramoorthy, P., Erb, M.L., Gregory, J.A., Silverman, J., Pogliano, K., Pogliano, J., Ramamurthi, K.S., 2011. Cellular architecture mediates DivIVA ultrastructure and regulates min activity in Bacillus subtilis. mBio 2, e00257-11. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00257-11

Fadda, D., Pischedda, C., Caldara, F., Whalen, M.B., Anderluzzi, D., Domenici, E., Massidda, O., 2003. Characterization of divIVA and Other Genes Located in the Chromosomal Region Downstream of the dcw Cluster in Streptococcus pneumoniae. J. Bacteriol. 185, 6209–6214. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.185.20.6209-6214.2003

Fadda, D., Santona, A., D'Ulisse, V., Ghelardini, P., Ennas, M.G., Whalen, M.B., Massidda, O., 2007. Streptococcus pneumoniae DivIVA: localization and interactions in a MinCD-free context. J. Bacteriol. 189, 1288–1298. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.01168-06

Fleurie, A., Manuse, S., Zhao, C., Campo, N., Cluzel, C., Lavergne, J.-P., Freton, C., Combet, C., Guiral, S., Soufi, B., Macek, B., Kuru, E., VanNieuwenhze, M.S., Brun, Y.V., Guilmi, A.-M.D., Claverys, J.-P., Galinier, A., Grangeasse, C., 2014. Interplay of the Serine/Threonine-Kinase StkP and the Paralogs DivIVA and GpsB in Pneumococcal Cell Elongation and Division. PLOS Genet 10, e1004275. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004275

Giacomelli, G., Feddersen, H., Peng, F., Martins, G.B., Grafemeyer, M., Meyer, F., Mayer, B., Graumann, P.L., Bramkamp, M., 2022. Subcellular Dynamics of a Conserved Bacterial Polar Scaffold Protein. Genes 13, 278. https://doi.org/10.3390/genes13020278

Halbedel, S., Lewis, R.J., 2019. Structural basis for interaction of DivIVA/GpsB proteins with their ligands. Mol. Microbiol. 111, 1404–1415. https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.14244

Hammond, L.R., White, M.L., Eswara, P.J., 2019. ¡VIVA la DivIVA! J. Bacteriol. 201, e00245-19. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00245-19

Jacq, M., Adam, V., Bourgeois, D., Moriscot, C., Guilmi, A.-M.D., Vernet, T., Morlot, C., 2015. Remodeling of the Z-Ring Nanostructure during the Streptococcus pneumoniae Cell Cycle Revealed by Photoactivated Localization Microscopy. mBio 6, pii: e01108-15. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01108-15

Jacq, M., Arthaud, C., Manuse, S., Mercy, C., Bellard, L., Peters, K., Gallet, B., Galindo, J., Doan, T., Vollmer, W., Brun, Y.V., VanNieuwenhze, M.S., Guilmi, A.M.D., Vernet, T., Grangeasse, C., Morlot, C., 2018. The cell wall hydrolase Pmp23 is important for assembly and stability of the division ring in Streptococcus pneumoniae. Sci. Rep. 8, 7591. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-25882-y

Jiang, Q., Li, B., Zhang, L., Li, T., Hu, Q., Li, H., Zou, W., Hu, Z., Huang, Q., Zhou, R., 2023. DivIVA Interacts with the Cell Wall Hydrolase MltG To Regulate Peptidoglycan Synthesis in Streptococcus suis. Microbiol. Spectr. 11, e0475022. https://doi.org/10.1128/spectrum.04750-22

Juillot, D., Billaudeau, C., Barbotin, A., Lablaine, A., Mortier-Barrière, I., Polard, P., Campo, N., Carballido-Lopez, R., 2024. Transient inhibition of cell division in competent pneumococcal cells results from deceleration of the septal peptidoglycan complex (preprint). Microbiology. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.28.582556

Kang, C.-M., Nyayapathy, S., Lee, J.-Y., Suh, J.-W., Husson, R.N., 2008. Wag31, a homologue of the cell division protein DivIVA, regulates growth, morphology and polar cell wall synthesis in mycobacteria. Microbiol. Read. Engl. 154, 725–735. https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.2007/014076-0

Käshammer, L., van den Ent, F., Jeffery, M., Jean, N.L., Hale, V.L., Löwe, J., 2023. Cryo-EM structure of the bacterial divisome core complex and antibiotic target FtsWIQBL. Nat. Microbiol. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-023-01368-0

Letek, M., Ordóñez, E., Vaquera, J., Margolin, W., Flärdh, K., Mateos, L.M., Gil, J.A., 2008. DivIVA is required for
polar growth in the MreB-lacking rod-shaped actinomycete Corynebacterium glutamicum. J. Bacteriol.
190, 3283–3292. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.01934-07

Liechti, G.W., Kuru, E., Hall, E., Kalinda, A., Brun, Y.V., VanNieuwenhze, M., Maurelli, A.T., 2014. A new
metabolic cell-wall labelling method reveals peptidoglycan in *Chlamydia trachomatis* . Nature 506, 507–
510. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12892

Mau, A., Friedl, K., Leterrier, C., Bourg, N., Lévêque-Fort, S., 2021. Fast widefield scan provides tunable and
uniform illumination optimizing super-resolution microscopy on large fields. Nat. Commun. 12, 3077.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23405-4

McAllister, T.E., Nix, M.G., Webb, M.E., 2011. Fmoc-chemistry of a stable phosphohistidine analogue. Chem.
Commun. Camb. Engl. 47, 1297–1299. https://doi.org/10.1039/c0cc04238b

Meeske, A.J., Riley, E.P., Robins, W.P., Uehara, T., Mekalanos, J.J., Kahne, D., Walker, S., Kruse, A.C., Bernhardt,
T.G., Rudner, D.Z., 2016. SEDS proteins are a widespread family of bacterial cell wall polymerases. Nature
537, 634–638. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature19331

Nieuwenhuizen, R.P.J., Lidke, K.A., Bates, M., Puig, D.L., Grünwald, D., Stallinga, S., Rieger, B., 2013. Measuring
image resolution in optical nanoscopy. Nat. Methods 10, 557–562. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2448

Oliva, M.A., Halbedel, S., Freund, S.M., Dutow, P., Leonard, T.A., Veprintsev, D.B., Hamoen, L.W., Löwe, J., 2010.
Features critical for membrane binding revealed by DivIVA crystal structure. EMBO J. 29, 1988–2001.
https://doi.org/10.1038/emboj.2010.99

Ovesný, M., Křížek, P., Borkovec, J., Svindrych, Z., Hagen, G.M., 2014. ThunderSTORM: a comprehensive ImageJ
plug-in for PALM and STORM data analysis and super-resolution imaging. Bioinforma. Oxf. Engl. 30, 2389–
2390. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu202

Paik, J., Kern, I., Lurz, R., Hakenbeck, R., 1999. Mutational analysis of the Streptococcus pneumoniae
bimodular class A penicillin-binding proteins. J. Bacteriol. 181, 3852–3856.
https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.181.12.3852-3856.1999

Perez, A.J., Boersma, M.J., Bruce, K.E., Lamanna, M.M., Shaw, S.L., Tsui, H.-C.T., Taguchi, A., Carlson, E.E.,
VanNieuwenhze, M.S., Winkler, M.E., 2021. Organization of peptidoglycan synthesis in nodes and separate
rings at different stages of cell division of Streptococcus pneumoniae. Mol. Microbiol. 115, 1152–1169.
https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.14659

Perez, A.J., Cesbron, Y., Shaw, S.L., Bazan Villicana, J., Tsui, H.-C.T., Boersma, M.J., Ye, Z.A., Tovpeko, Y., Dekker,
C., Holden, S., Winkler, M.E., 2019. Movement dynamics of divisome proteins and PBP2x:FtsW in cells of
Streptococcus pneumoniae. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 116, 3211–3220.
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1816018116

Philippe, J., Vernet, T., Zapun, A., 2014. The Elongation of Ovococci. Microb. Drug Resist. 20, 215–221.
https://doi.org/10.1089/mdr.2014.0032

Pinho, M.G., Kjos, M., Veening, J.-W., 2013. How to get (a)round: mechanisms controlling growth and division
of coccoid bacteria. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 11, 601–614. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3088

Reichmann, N.T., Tavares, A.C., Saraiva, B.M., Jousselin, A., Reed, P., Pereira, A.R., Monteiro, J.M., Sobral, R.G.,
VanNieuwenhze, M.S., Fernandes, F., Pinho, M.G., 2019. SEDS-bPBP pairs direct lateral and septal
peptidoglycan synthesis in Staphylococcus aureus. Nat. Microbiol. 4, 1368–1377.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0437-2

Sauvage, E., Kerff, F., Terrak, M., Ayala, J.A., Charlier, P., 2008. The penicillin-binding proteins: structure and
role in peptidoglycan biosynthesis. FEMS Microbiol. Rev. 32, 234–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-
6976.2008.00105.x

Schermelleh, L., Ferrand, A., Huser, T., Eggeling, C., Sauer, M., Biehlmaier, O., Drummen, G.P.C., 2019. Super-
resolution microscopy demystified. Nat. Cell Biol. 21, 72–84. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41556-018-0251-
8

Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T., Preibisch, S., Rueden, C.,
Saalfeld, S., Schmid, B., Tinevez, J.-Y., White, D.J., Hartenstein, V., Eliceiri, K., Tomancak, P., Cardona, A.,
2012. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. Nat. Methods 9, 676–682.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2019

Schneider, C.A., Rasband, W.S., Eliceiri, K.W., 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis. Nat.
Methods 9, 671–675. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2089

Sjodt, M., Rohs, P.D.A., Gilman, M.S.A., Erlandson, S.C., Zheng, S., Green, A.G., Brock, K.P., Taguchi, A., Kahne, D.,
Walker, S., Marks, D.S., Rudner, D.Z., Bernhardt, T.G., Kruse, A.C., 2020. Structural coordination of
polymerization and crosslinking by a SEDS-bPBP peptidoglycan synthase complex. Nat. Microbiol. 5, 813–
820. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-020-0687-z

Straume, D., Piechowiak, K.W., Kjos, M., Håvarstein, L.S., 2021. Class A PBPs: It is time to rethink traditional
paradigms. Mol. Microbiol. 116, 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.14714

Straume, D., Piechowiak, K.W., Olsen, S., Stamsås, G.A., Berg, K.H., Kjos, M., Heggenhougen, M.V., Alcorlo, M.,
Hermoso, J.A., Håvarstein, L.S., 2020. Class A PBPs have a distinct and unique role in the construction of
the pneumococcal cell wall. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 117, 6129–6138.
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1917820117

Straume, D., Stamsås, G.A., Berg, K.H., Salehian, Z., Håvarstein, L.S., 2017. Identification of pneumococcal
proteins that are functionally linked to penicillin-binding protein 2b (PBP2b). Mol. Microbiol. 103, 99–116.
https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.13543

Sutton, J.A.F., Cooke, M., Tinajero-Trejo, M., Wacnik, K., Salamaga, B., Portman-Ross, C., Lund, V.A., Hobbs, J.K.,
Foster, S.J., 2023. The roles of GpsB and DivIVA in Staphylococcus aureus growth and division. Front.
Microbiol. 14, 1241249. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1241249

Taguchi, A., Page, J.E., Tsui, H.-C.T., Winkler, M.E., Walker, S., 2021. Biochemical reconstitution defines new
functions for membrane-bound glycosidases in assembly of the bacterial cell wall. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.
S. A. 118, e2103740118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2103740118

Taguchi, A., Welsh, M.A., Marmont, L.S., Lee, W., Sjodt, M., Kruse, A.C., Kahne, D., Bernhardt, T.G., Walker, S.,
2019. FtsW is a peptidoglycan polymerase that is functional only in complex with its cognate penicillin-
binding protein. Nat. Microbiol. 4, 587–594. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-018-0345-x

Trouve, J., Glushonkov, O., Morlot, C., 2021a. Metabolic biorthogonal labeling and dSTORM imaging of
peptidoglycan synthesis in Streptococcus pneumoniae. STAR Protoc. 2, 101006.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xpro.2021.101006

Trouve, J., Zapun, A., Arthaud, C., Durmort, C., Di Guilmi, A.M., Söderström, B., Pelletier, A., Grangeasse, C.,
Bourgeois, D., Wong, Y.-S., Morlot, C., 2021b. Nanoscale dynamics of peptidoglycan assembly during the
cell cycle of Streptococcus pneumoniae. Curr. Biol. CB 31, 2844-2856.e6.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.04.041

Tsui, H.-C.T., Zheng, J.J., Magallon, A.N., Ryan, J.D., Yunck, R., Rued, B.E., Bernhardt, T.G., Winkler, M.E., 2016.
Suppression of a deletion mutation in the gene encoding essential PBP2b reveals a new lytic
transglycosylase involved in peripheral peptidoglycan synthesis in Streptococcus pneumoniae D39. Mol.
Microbiol. 100, 1039–1065. https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.13366

Vigouroux, A., Cordier, B., Aristov, A., Alvarez, L., Özbaykal, G., Chaze, T., Oldewurtel, E.R., Matondo, M., Cava,
F., Bikard, D., van Teeffelen, S., 2020. Class-A penicillin binding proteins do not contribute to cell shape but
repair cell-wall defects. eLife 9, e51998. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.51998

Vollmer, W., Blanot, D., Pedro, M.A.D., 2008a. Peptidoglycan structure and architecture. FEMS Microbiol. Rev.
32, 149–167. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2007.00094.x

Vollmer, W., Joris, B., Charlier, P., Foster, S., 2008b. Bacterial peptidoglycan (murein) hydrolases. FEMS
Microbiol. Rev. 32, 259–286. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2007.00099.x

Vollmer, W., Massidda, O., Tomasz, A., 2019. The Cell Wall of Streptococcus pneumoniae. Microbiol. Spectr. 7.
https://doi.org/10.1128/microbiolspec.GPP3-0018-2018

Zapun, A., Noirclerc-Savoye, M., Helassa, N., Vernet, T., 2012. Peptidoglycan Assembly Machines: The
Biochemical Evidence. Microb. Drug Resist. 18, 256–260. https://doi.org/10.1089/mdr.2011.0236

Zapun, A., Vernet, T., Pinho, M.G., 2008. The different shapes of cocci. FEMS Microbiol. Rev. 32, 345–360.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2007.00098.x

899 **FIGURES AND FIGURE LEGENDS**

Figure 1. DivIVA localizes on both sides of constricting division sites in *S. pneumoniae*. Cells in exponential growth phase were incubated with HT-JFX646 ligand before fluorescence microcopy observation. **A.** Demograph showing the fluorescence intensity and diffraction-limited localization pattern of a DivIVA-HT fusion in 2,510 cells arranged according to their length. **B.** Heatmaps built from the localization patterns shown in (A) (n = 2,510), representing the average DivIVA-HT fluorescence intensity and localization along the cell cycle. Representative data are shown from two independent biological replicates. **C.** STED image showing the localization of DivIVA-HT as polar foci or as two bands flanking the division site. On the right panel, the cell contour is delineated with a dashed line and the blue line indicates a typical region used to generate intensity plot profiles. Scale bars, 1 μm. **D.** Violin plot showing the distribution of the distances separating DivIVA bands at midcell. The thin and thick dashed horizontal lines represent the quartiles (25th = 83 nm; 75th = 101 nm) and the median (93 nm) of two independent experiments, respectively. The median distance (n = 14) is indicated.

Figure 2. dSTORM analysis of PG synthesis in Δ*divIVA* cells. A. *S. pneumoniae* Δ*divIVA* cells in exponential growth phase were grown for 5 min in the presence of 2 mM aDA-DA, fixed and incubated with 35 µM DIBO-AF647 for fluorescent labeling. Bright field (BF), fluorescence diffraction-limited (Diff. limited) and reconstructed dSTORM images are shown. The arrowheads point to division sites of different generations, with a color code identical to that of panel B. Scale bar, 500 nm. **B.** Schematic illustration of the successive generations observed in Δ*divIVA* cell chains. **C.** Schematic diagram of pulse-labeled Δ*divIVA* cells lying along their longitudinal axis. The dark grey, purple and orange bands correspond respectively to early- (E), mid- (M) and late-

division (L) pulse-labeling patterns, defined by their respective diameter (d). **D.** Zoom on
representative dSTORM images of $\Delta divIVA$ cells displaying early-, mid- and late-division pulse-
labeling patterns. Scale bar, 250 nm. **E.** Distribution of the diameters d among early- (E), mid- (M)
and late-division (L) pulse-labeling patterns in wild-type (WT) (n = 116) and $\Delta divIVA$ (n = 200) cell
populations. **F.** Distribution of the number of localizations among early- (E), mid- (M) and late-
division (L) pulse-labeling patterns in wild-type (WT) (n = 116) and $\Delta divIVA$ (n = 200) cell
populations. **E-F.** Data are represented with box plots showing the interquartile range (10th and
90th percentile), the median value and whiskers for minimum and maximum values. P-values from
the U test of Mann-Whitney between WT and $\Delta divIVA$ data sets are indicated with quadruple
asterisks when the observed difference is statistically significant (p-value < 0.0001).

Figure 3. Symmetrical banding patterns are reproduced by a dynamic geometrical model of
cell wall growth. *S. pneumoniae* Δ*divIVA* cells in exponential growth phase were grown for 15 min
(**A** and **B**) or 5 min (**C** and **D**) in the presence of 2 mM aDA-DA, fixed and incubated with 35 μM
DIBO-AF647 for fluorescent labeling. Reconstructed dSTORM (i), simulated labeling patterns (ii)
and corresponding simulated cell wall (iii) images are shown. Scale bars, 500 nm. The same model
parameters given in Table 1 were used for all the patterns, while the timing and duration of the
labeling pulse were changed to generate each pattern (see Fig. S3).

Figure 4. PG synthesis observed in tilted cells. **A**. Typical dSTORM localization patterns of
pulse-labeled PG in cells oriented vertically or at an angle in an agarose pad. Early- to late-division
stages are shown from top to bottom panels (*a-g*). Exponentially growing wild-type (WT) and
Δ*divIVA* cells were incubated for 5 min with aDA-DA, fixed, and labeled with DIBO-AF647 before
being trapped below an agarose pad. Scale bars, 500 nm. **B.** Schematic diagram representing a
mid-division cell oriented perpendicular to its longitudinal axis. This orientation allows observing
the septal (inner ring) and peripheral (outer ring) PG synthesis sites and measuring the radial
width (*r*) of the labeled region. **C.** Distribution of the radial width of labeling *r*, normalized to the
median largest diameter *d(E*) in early- (E), mid- (M) and late-division (L) pulse-labeling patterns in
WT (n = 170) and Δ*divIVA* (n = 149) cell populations. Data are represented with box plots showing
the interquartile range (10th and 90th percentile), the median value and whiskers for minimum and
maximum values. The quadruple asterisks represent a statistically significant difference between
WT and Δ*divIVA* datasets (U test of Mann-Whitney, p-value < 0.0001).

Figure 5. Pulse-chase labeling patterns of Δ*divIVA* cells. A. Representative dSTORM images of pulse-chase localization patterns in wild-type and Δ*divIVA* cells. Exponentially growing cells were incubated for 5 min with aDA-DA (pulse), grown for 15 min in the absence of the probe (chase), fixed, and labeled with DIBO-AF647 before dSTORM data collection. The grey, violet and orange arrowheads point to early-, mid- and late-division sites, respectively. Scale bars, 1 μm. **B.** Schematic representation of a pulse-chase labeled cell harboring two bands at an early-division site. The distance (W_{CHASE}) separating the longitudinal outer limits of the labeling pattern is shown. **C.**

Distributions of the W_{CHASE} of the labeling patterns in early- (E), mid- (M) and late-division (L) sites (WT, n(E) = 89, n(M) = 68 and n(L) = 12; Δ*divIVA*, n(E) = 43, n(M) = 34 cells and n(L) = 101). Data are represented with box plots showing the interquartile range (10th and 90th percentile), the median value and whiskers for minimum and maximum values. P-values from the U test of Mann-Whitney between different data sets are indicated with single or quadruple asterisks when the observed differences are statistically significant with p-values < 0.01 or < 0.0001, respectively. **D.** Typical symmetrical dSTORM localization patterns of pulse-chase labeled PG in Δ*divIVA* cells. Earlier to later division stages are shown from left to right panels. Panels (i), (ii) and (iii) are dSTORM images, simulations of the labeling patterns and corresponding cell wall, respectively. Scale bar, 1 μm. **E.** dSTORM images of asymmetrical pulse-chase labeling patterns found with Δ*divIVA* cells.

Figure 6. Effect of *pbp* gene deletion on Δ*divIVA* pulse-chase labeling patterns. A. Fields of wild-type (WT), Δ*pbp2b mltG(Y488D)*, Δ*pbp1a* and Δ*pbp2a* cells treated with the pulse-chase

labeling protocol and observed by dSTORM. Scale bar, 1 μm. **B.** Distributions of W_{CHASE} of the pulse-

chase labeling patterns observed in panel A (WT, n(E) = 132, n(M) = 123 and n(L) = 46; Δ*pbp2b*

mltG(Y488D), n(E) = 148, n(M) = 84 and n(L) = 65 cells; Δ*pbp1a*, n(E) = 140, n(M) = 116 and n(L) =

42 cells; Δ*pbp2a*, n(E) = 109, n(M) = 108 and n(L) = 40 cells). **C.** Fields of Δ*divIVA* mutant strains

cells treated with the pulse-chase labeling protocol and observed by dSTORM. Scale bar, 1 μm. **D.**

Distributions of W_{CHASE} of the pulse-chase labeling patterns observed in panel C (Δ*divIVA*, n(E) = 120,

n(M) = 57 and n(L) = 172 cells; Δ*divIVA* Δ*pbp2b mltG(Y488D)*, n(E) = 132, n(M) = 50 and n(L) = 120

cells; Δ*divIVA* Δ*pbp1a*, n(E) = 121, n(M) = 71 and n(L) = 109 cells; Δ*divIVA* Δ*pbp2a*, n(E) = 112, n(M)

= 42 and n(L) = 146 cells). **B** and **D**. Data are represented with box plots showing the interquartile

range (10th and 90th percentile), the median value and whiskers for minimum and maximum values.

P-values from the U test of Mann-Whitney between different data sets are indicated with double

asterisks when p-values < 0.01, triple asterisks when p-value < 0.001, quadruple asterisks when p-

values < 0.0001, or with "ns" when no significant difference is observed (p-value > 0.05).

Figure 7. Model for the role of DivIVA in maintaining homogenous septum remodeling and peripheral PG synthesis in space and time. A. Schematic representation of the division site, with θ being the angle between the septal and peripheral walls and $|\vec{F}_s|$ the tangential force exerted by the turgor pressure at the site of septum cleavage. Taking the septal plane as a reference, $|\vec{F}_s|$ can be decomposed in a parallel ($|\vec{F}_{||}| = \cos\theta|\vec{F}_s|$) and a perpendicular ($|\vec{F}_\perp| = \sin\theta|\vec{F}_s|$) component. $\vec{F}_\perp$, which contributes to septal PG cleavage, and decreases as the septum splits to generate new

hemispheres. **B.** In virtue of its polymeric nature and affinity for negatively curved membranes,

DivIVA might display a conformation of minimal energy defined by a resting angle (ϕ_{rest}). Once ϕ_{rest}

becomes smaller than θ, DivIVA stretching would generate a force that compensates the vanishing

of the $\vec{F}_\perp$ force, or activates the septum remodeling machinery. **C.** Schematic representation of how

negative curvature affinity of DivIVA (blue dots) could ensure uniform progression of splitting and

peripheral synthesis around the septum (blue ring). If splitting/peripheral synthesis occurs along

one section of the septum (red), the membrane curvature along this section decreases, leading to a

reduced concentration of DivIVA. The reduced amount of DivIVA would slow down the

splitting/synthesis in this region in comparison to the rest of the periphery, thus restoring a

uniform progression around the division site

1015

1016

1017

1018 **Table 1**. Parameters of the geometrical model used simulate the cell wall growth.

strain		WT[a]	Δ*divIVA*
Diameter	D (µm)	0.85	0.98
Length	L (µm)	1.05	0.91
Elliptic ratio	$E = L/D$	1.24	0.93
Start of next generation as a fraction of the generation time	N	0.9	0.68
Acceleration factor	A	0.9	0
Septum closure as a fraction of generation time	C	0.84	0.68
Time of slowing elongation as a fraction of generation time	T_S	n/a	0.58
"Brake" factor	B	n/a	0.13
Fraction of complete length at which all processes stop	S	n/a	0.8

1019 [a] Reported from (Trouve et al., 2021b).

1020

A

WT
L
E
M

ΔdivIVA
E
L
M

B

w_{CHASE}

C

W_{CHASE} (nm)

E	M	L	E	M	L
WT			ΔdivIVA		

D

i
ii
iii

i
ii
iii

i
ii
iii

E

0.5 μm