TITLE

The balance between antiviral and antibacterial responses during *M. Tuberculosis* infection is

regulated by the ubiquitin ligase CBL

Authors:

Tina Truong1,2, Kelsey Martin1, Michelle Salemi3, Abigail Ray1,4, Brett S. Phinney3, Bennett H.

Penn1,5*

Affiliations:

1 Department of Internal Medicine, University of California, Davis, Davis, California, United States

of America

2 Graduate Group in Immunology, University of California, Davis, Davis, California, United States

of America

3 Proteomics Core Facility, University of California, Davis, Davis, California, United States of

America

4 Microbiology Graduate Group, University of California, Davis, Davis, California, United States

of America

5 Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology, University of California, Davis, Davis,

California, United States of America

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

As a first line of immune defense, macrophages must be able to appropriately sense and respond

to diverse types of pathogens. In addition, many pathogens activate multiple sensors and

generate complex signals in a responding cell. How macrophages integrate multiple pathogen-

associated signals into a coherent physiologic response is unclear. Upon entering a macrophage,

M. tuberculosis (*Mtb*) induces proinflammatory cytokines that activate antibacterial responses.

Surprisingly, it also triggers antiviral responses that actually hinder the host response to *Mtb*. The

ubiquitin ligase CBL suppresses these antiviral responses and shifts macrophages toward a more

antibacterial state during *Mtb* infection. However, the mechanisms by which CBL regulates

immune signaling are unknown. We found that CBL broadly suppresses the expression of antiviral

effector genes and then used quantitative mass-spectrometry to identify potential CBL substrates.

We identified over 46,000 ubiquitylated sites in *Mtb*-infected macrophages, and subsequent

analysis of CBL-deficient cells identified roughly 400 CBL-dependent ubiquitylation events,

highlighting potential substrates. Using genetic interaction analysis of CBL and its putative

substrates we identified the Fas associated factor 2 (FAF2) adapter protein as a key signaling

molecule protein downstream of CBL. Together, these analyses identify thousands of new

ubiquitin-mediated signaling events during the innate immune response and reveal an important

new regulatory hub in this response.

INTRODUCTION

Being among the first cells to respond to infection, tissue macrophages must be able to

sense and effectively respond to diverse types of pathogens, ranging from multicellular eukaryotic

parasites to bacteria and viruses. Longstanding clinical observations have suggested potential

antagonism between types of immune responses targeting different classes of microbe. Patients

with preceding influenza virus infection carry roughly a 100-fold higher near-term risk of

developing bacterial pneumonia from *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (1). Similarly, while CD4 T

helper 2 (Th2) cells are critical for responses to multicellular parasites, patients with Th2-dominant

immune responses in *Mycobacterium leprae* lesions harbor higher bacterial loads and experience

more severe disease (2).

Even in the simple scenario of a single immune cell encountering a lone pathogen, the

mechanisms by which the type of pathogen is discerned, and an appropriate response mounted

remains poorly understood. Dozens of individual sensors for diverse bacterial-, fungal-, and virus-

associated PAMPS have been described (3,4). However, most pathogens activate multiple

sensors simultaneously, and how these multiple signals are integrated into a coherent pathogen-

appropriate immune response remains unclear.

Mycobacterium tuberculosis (*Mtb*) persists as a threat to human health. It currently infects

one-third of the world's population, causing a chronic, often lifelong infection, and tuberculosis

(TB) kills an estimated 1-2 million people annually (5). Macrophages infected with *Mtb* are

immediately exposed to an array of cell wall-derived pathogen-associated molecular patterns

(PAMPs) such as lipoarabinomannan, lipoproteins, and peptidoglycan which activate cognate

receptors such as TLR2, NOD2 and CLEC4E (Mincle) (6–14). The outcome of many of these

signaling pathways is the activation of nuclear factor kappa B (NFκB) family transcription factors

and the upregulation of proinflammatory cytokines such as TNF and IL1B which activate potent

antibacterial responses and are critical for controlling *Mtb* replication (15–22).

Surprisingly, *Mtb* also activates numerous antiviral effectors in infected macrophages. *Mtb*

rapidly permeabilizes its phagosome and releases bacterial nucleic acids into the host cytosol

through unclear mechanisms (24–26). Bacterial DNA is recognized by cyclic GMP-AMP synthase

(cGAS) which then triggers STING-dependent activation of IRF3 and IRF7 transcription factors,

causing upregulation of hundreds of genes, including the type I interferons like interferon beta

(IFN-β) that propagate the signal to nearby cells (24,25,27–31). Bacterial RNA is also introduced

into the host cell, initiating signaling through the retinoic acid-Inducible gene I (RIG-I) sensor which

triggers MAVS-dependent activation of IRF3/IRF7with similar effects (25). While these initial

observations came from mouse models, gene expression analysis of TB patients has detected

similar activation of type I IFN in the peripheral blood of patients with active TB (32–34).

Several lines of evidence demonstrate that these antiviral responses interfere with the

antibacterial capacity of macrophages, and suggest that macrophages can be polarized into

antiviral or antibacterial states by their encounter with a pathogen. C3H-derived strains of mice

harbor a polymorphism causing loss of the SP140 transcriptional repressor, resulting in

hyperactivation IFN-β. These strains are highly susceptible to *Mtb*, succumbing rapidly with

dramatically increased bacterial burdens (35–39) – a phenotype that is rescued by the

administration of an IFN-β blocking antibody or by loss of the type I interferon receptor (IFNAR)

(39,40). B6 mice infected with *Mtb* produce lower levels of IFN-β following infection, but even in

this context, loss of MAVS or IFNAR results in decreased bacterial burden and increased survival

of infected animals (25,26) Thus, activation of antiviral responses within the host seems to actively

interfere with an effective antibacterial response to *Mtb*, and suggests that *Mtb* might introduce

nucleic acids into the host cell as a virulence strategy,

Ubiquitin signaling plays an important role in regulating both antibacterial and antiviral

responses in *Mtb*-infected macrophages. Ubiquitin ligases such as PARKIN and SMURF are

critical for targeting *Mtb* for autophagy (41–44). Separately, the ubiquitin ligases TRIM14 and CBL

have been shown to regulate the expression of type I interferon following *Mtb* infection (45,46).

CBL is targeted by the secreted *Mtb* virulence factor LpqN, which is required for *Mtb* replication

in mice. Proteomic analyses identified a physical interaction between LpqN and CBL, and the

growth of the attenuated *lpqN Mtb* mutant was rescued by disruption of host *Cbl* (45). While *Cbl*-

deficient macrophages are more permissive for *Mtb* replication, the opposite is seen with viral

challenge, as CBL-deficient macrophages more potently restrict viral replication (45). Together,

these findings suggest that CBL is an important regulator of antiviral versus antibacterial

polarization of macrophages. However, how CBL regulates this process are not known.

Here, we investigated the mechanisms by which CBL regulates immune signaling. We

found that it controls macrophage responses to multiple stimuli and represses the expression of

numerous antiviral effectors. We then used proteomics to identify potential CBL substrates in

macrophages as they respond to *Mtb* infection and identified the endoplasmic reticulum-localized

signaling adapter Fas-associated factor 2 (FAF2) as a protein that undergoes CBL-dependent

ubiquitylation. Notably, while CBL deficient macrophages are more permissive for *Mtb* growth,

simultaneous loss of FAF2 in double-knockout macrophages reverses this phenotype, suggesting

that the FAF2 pathway might be hijacked by *Mtb,* and that CBL acts to constrain FAF2 activity in

Mtb-infected macrophages.

RESULTS

CBL broadly suppresses antiviral effector expression.

Prior work has shown that CBL suppressed host antiviral responses in mouse primary

bone-marrow-derived macrophages (BMDMs) following *Mtb* infection (45). We began by

assessing whether this role of CBL was evolutionarily conserved, with CBL also regulating these

processes in human cells. We used shRNA to deplete CBL mRNA in the human THP-1 cell line

that differentiates into macrophage-like cells after stimulation with Phorbol-12-myristate-13-

acetate (PMA) and 1,25-dihydroxy-Vitamin D. We first assessed whether loss of CBL in human

macrophages would similarly rescue the growth of the CBL-sensitive *lpqN*::Tn mutant *Mtb* strain

(hereafter *lpqN* mutant) which lacks the effector that normally antagonizes CBL function, and

which is attenuated in both mouse BMDMs and in mice (45). Following differentiation, we infected

THP-1 control cells expressing a non-targeting shRNA, and CBL-depleted cells expressing a

CBL-specific shRNA (Fig 1A). To monitor bacterial replication, we used the *lpqN* mutant carrying

a bioluminescent *LuxBCADE* reporter operon (45), and then monitored bacterial growth by

quantifying bacterial luminescence over time. Consistent with prior observations in mouse

BMDMs, we found that loss of CBL also rescued the growth of the *lpqN* mutant in human

macrophages. (Fig 1B). The increased bacterial replication was confirmed by direct colony

forming unit (CFU) numeration (Fig S1A) and was associated with a more rapid loss of

macrophage viability in CBL-deficient macrophages over the course of infection (Fig 1C). The

effect of CBL on *Mtb* replication was independently confirmed using a second independent shRNA

in THP-1 cells (Fig S1B). To confirm these findings, we evaluated the role of CBL in a second

human macrophage line, HL-60. We used shRNA to deplete CBL (Fig 1D) and found that loss of

CBL similarly rescued the growth of *lpqN* mutant *Mtb* in these cells as well (Fig 1E).

Fig 1. CBL suppresses antiviral responses in human cells. (A) CBL expression analyzed by RT-qPCR analysis of THP-1 cells expressing CBL-specific shRNA and control non-targeting shRNA (B) Luminescent growth assay of CBL-sensitive *lpqN Mtb* mutant expressing *LuxBCADE* operon. (C) Phase-contrast microscopy images of infected macrophages prior to and 96 h post-infection (MOI=0.8, 10x magnification; scale bar 100μm). (D) RT-qPCR analysis of CBL expression in HL-60 cells. (E) Luminescent growth assay of *lpqN Mtb* in HL-60 cells. (F),(G) RT-qPCR analysis of *lpqN*-infected macrophages 6 h after infection. Analysis of (H) THP-1 or (I) HL60 cells transfected with either RNA or DNA as indicated. Means ± SEM are displayed. MOI= 0.8 for THP-1 growth assays, 1.0 for HL-60 growth assays, and MOI=10 for RNA analyses. Data is representative (median) of three or more independent experiments. Statistical significance testing by t-test indicated on plot, p-value: * ≤0.05, **≤0.01, ***≤0.001, ns >0.05.

We next determined whether antiviral gene expression was also regulated by CBL in

human cells. Consistent with prior observations in mouse macrophages, we found that depletion

of CBL resulted in an increased expression of antiviral effectors was increased in THP-1 and HL-

60 cells following *Mtb* infection (Fig 1F,G). We next used defined PAMPs to selectively stimulate

different pathways leading to IFN-β activation to assess if CBL was regulating a single pathway

or multiple pathways. Work from several groups has shown that *Mtb* activates IFN-β both through

the cGAS DNA sensing pathway as well as the RIG-I RNA sensing pathway (24-25,31-32). To

assess which pathways are regulated by CBL, we individually transfected THP-1 and HL-60

macrophages with either dsDNA, a known agonist for cGAS, or with 5′-phosphorylated RNA, a

known agonist for RIG-I, in order to evaluate the role of CBL. We found that in response to either

DNA or 5' phosphorylated RNA, loss of CBL resulted in an increased expression of IFN-β in THP-

1 cells (Fig 1H). In HL-60 cells we observed a similar role for CBL in regulating RNA-stimulated

IFN-β responses. However, following DNA stimulation HL-60 cells displayed only weak induction

of IFN-β, and did so independently of CBL (Fig 1I). Taken together these data support a model

where the role of CBL in innate immunity is evolutionarily conserved, acting to suppress

expression of antiviral effectors such as IFN-β in multiple different contexts.

We next sought to determine whether CBL selectively regulated a restricted group of

genes, such as IFIT1 and IFN-β, or whether it orchestrated broad transcriptional changes in

macrophages as they responded to *Mtb*. To assess this, we infected THP-1 cells with *Mtb*, using

the *lpqN* mutant strain so that CBL activity would be unconstrained by the bacterial effector. We

infected both control and CBL-deficient THP-1 cells for 6 h, when many immune-related genes

are strongly induced, and prepared RNA for expression profiling by RNA-Seq. As expected, *Mtb*

infection of control cells triggered widespread gene expression changes with upregulation of 735

genes and downregulation of 423 genes (FDR ≤0.05, Log2 fold-change > 0.5) and strong

induction of both proinflammatory and antiviral effectors. (Fig S2A, Table S1). CBL-deficient cells

regulated most of these same genes in a similar manner following *Mtb* infection. However, one

set of genes showed distinct CBL-dependent transcriptional changes, with 204 genes

hyperactivated and 62 genes depressed in CBL-deficient cells following *Mtb* infection (Fig 2A and

Table S1). Interestingly, while CBL regulates the production of IFN-β in these cells (Fig 1G, 1I) it

does not regulate the response of cells to IFN-β stimulation (Fig S2B), suggesting that the broad

CBL-dependent gene expression changes are due to cell-intrinsic mechanisms and not the

indirect effects of type I interferon.

Fig 2. CBL regulates a complex transcriptional program. (A) RNA-Seq differential gene expression analysis of THP-1 macrophages expressing CBL-specific shRNA vs control non-targeting shRNA 6 h after infection with *lpqN*-mutant *Mtb.* (B) Biological processes transcriptionally regulated by CBL. (C), (D) Differential expression of immune response genes in CBL-deficient cells. (E) ENCODE Transcription factor binding site enrichment of CBL-regulated genes (F) RT-qPCR analysis of CBL-regulated genes after indicated stimuli. Differentially-expressed genes for analyses in (B-E) defined by RNA-Seq FDR<0.05 and Log2 fold-change>0.5.

We further analyzed the set of genes regulated by CBL to evaluate what cellular processes

were being affected, and what transcription factors might be mediating the regulatory effects of

CBL. We performed systematic pathway enrichment analysis using the Gene Ontology and

KEGG Databases and identified several clusters of functionally-related genes regulated by CBL.

Supporting the hypothesis that CBL broadly suppresses antiviral responses, we found a

significant over-representation of antiviral defense genes in the set of CBL-regulated genes (10-

fold over-representation, FDR <0.02). We also found significant associations with several other

pathways including IL-10 production and global protein translation (Fig 2B-D).

In addition, we analyzed the set of genes transcriptionally regulated by CBL to determine

whether any associations existed between these genes and characterized transcriptional

regulators. We assessed this by systematically querying the ENCODE Chip-Seq database (47)

with the set of genes regulated by CBL. In uninfected cells, there were no transcriptional

regulators enriched at these genes. In contrast, in *Mtb*-infected cells, analysis of the 266 CBL-

responsive genes using ENCODE showed an association with several transcriptional regulators

(Fig 2E). The most significant association was seen with for the NFkB family member RELA, with

an odds-ratio (OR) of 2.6 p 1≤E-9) found at a set of immune-related genes, with additional

associations noted for STAT2 (OR=5.3, p≤2E-7), ATF1 (OR=2.5, p≤1.1E-8), and MYC (OR=2.1,

p≤5E-8, Fig 2E).

We also assessed whether genes we identified as regulated by CBL during *Mtb* infection

were also regulated by CBL in response to other stimuli. We selected TLR8 and CXCL10, two

genes identified by our RNA-Seq analysis of *Mtb*-infected macrophages whose expression was

suppressed by CBL and examined their regulation in cells exposed other PAMPs - either

cytoplasmic dsDNA to activate cGAS or 5'-phosphorylated RNA to activate RIG-I. In both cases

we found hyperactivation of these genes in CBL-deficient cells, although the patterns differed

somewhat. For TLR8 we detected basal de-repression in unstimulated cells and hyperactivation

following Mtb infection and either DNA or RNA stimulation. For CXCL10, there was no basal de-

repression, and while CXCL10 was strongly regulated by CBL during *Mtb* infection, it showed only

modest increases in expression in CBL-deficient cells stimulated with DNA or RNA (Fig 2F). Taken

together, these results demonstrate that CBL regulates a broad subset of antiviral response genes

in macrophages, along with regulation of several other processes, and that it does so in response

to multiple stimuli, perhaps by regulating events upstream of RELA or STAT2.

CBL enzymatic activity is required to regulate macrophage responses to Mtb

We next sought to determine the mechanisms by which CBL regulates immune responses.

CBL is a RING-domain E3 ligase that was initially characterized as a proto-oncogene,

ubiquitylating activated receptor tyrosine kinases to target them for degradation (48–50).

Subsequent studies using an enzymatically inactive CBL point mutant showed that CBL also has

important non-enzymatic functions, and can act as a signaling scaffold that potentiates

phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase and SRC-family kinase activity (51). This non-enzymatic function

plays an important role in vivo, as several of the developmental defects *Cbl*$^{-/-}$ mice could be

rescued by expression of enzymatically-inactive CBL (52).

To test whether CBL was acting enzymatically to ubiquitylate key substrates during innate

immune responses, or whether it was acting as a signaling adapter protein, we performed genetic

complementation analysis in CBL-deficient macrophages, re-introducing either wild type CBL or

catalytically inactive mutants. To study human macrophages, we used shRNA-expressing CBL-

deficient THP-1 cells. For mouse cells, we used Cas9-expressing conditionally-immortalized

macrophages (CIMs) expressing an sgRNA targeting *Cbl* (hereafter *Cbl$^{-/-}$)*. CIM cells carry a

HOXB8-ER estrogen-regulatable transcription factor that maintains the cells as immortalized

monocyte precursors in the presence of estrogen, but upon estrogen withdrawal allows

differentiation into macrophages closely recapitulating the physiology of primary mouse BMDMs

(53). For both mouse and human cells, we used lentiviral vectors to deliver either catalytically

inactive CBL (human C381A, mouse C379A) or WT CBL (Fig 3A). In both cases, CBL expression

was restored to ~50% of endogenous levels, without evidence of destabilization of the mutant

protein (Fig 3B). As seen previously (45), CBL-deficient macrophages were more permissive for

Mtb replication than control cells, and as expected, in both mouse and human macrophages, re-

introduction of WT CBL significantly restricted the growth of *Mtb* (Fig 3C,D). In contrast, re-

introduction of catalytically-inactive CBL failed to complement the defective host response,

demonstrating that enzymatic activity is needed for CBL function in this context. Interestingly, cells

expressing inactive CBL actually had higher bacterial loads than CBL-deficient cells, suggesting

that catalytically-inactive CBL might act as a dominant-negative isoform, perhaps by interfering

with the activity of other signaling molecules such as the related CBL-family ligase CBLB.

Identifying potential CBL substrates

Given that the enzymatic activity of CBL was necessary to regulate immune signaling, we

next sought to identify CBL substrates in this context. Several growth factor receptors including

EGFR, and CSF1R have been characterized as CBL substrates in other settings (48–50).

However, the CBL substrates during innate immune responses are not known. We used *Cbl$^{-/-}$* CIM

cells to study ubiquitylation because of the near-complete loss of CBL protein in the polyclonal

population of cells expressing a CBL-specific sgRNA, and their larger *Mtb* growth phenotype

relative to human cells partially depleted of CBL via shRNA (Fig 3B-D). Using the *lpqN* mutant

strain that is unable to antagonize CBL activity, we infected cells for 6 h, and added the

proteasome inhibitor bortezomib for the final 2 h to stabilize ubiquitylated proteins and facilitate

their detection by mass-spectrometry (MS).

Fig 3. CBL-dependent ubiquitylation is required to restrict *Mtb* growth in mouse and human macrophages. (A) CBL domain structure and catalytic site mutants. (B) Immunoblot of wild-type and mutant CBL protein re-introduced into CBL-deficient human (THP-1) and mouse (CIM) macrophages. (C), (D) Luminescent growth assay of *lpqN Mtb* in CBL-deficient macrophages in which CBL expression was restored with either wild-type or mutant CBL. (E) Experimental design for ubiquitylation proteomics using di-Gly MS. (F) diGly-MS analysis of ubiquitylation in control CIM cells expressing a non-targeting sgRNA 6 h after infection with the *lpqN Mtb* mutant. Green (increased) and blue (decreased) indicate peptides with p-val ≤0.01 and Log2 fold-change >2. (G) Comparison of ubiquitylation versus total-protein changes in control cells following infection. Green (increased) and blue (decreased) denote data points where the change in di-Gly peptide abundance was >3 standard-deviations greater than the change in protein abundance. (H) Subset of CBL-dependent changes (I) diGly-MS analysis of ubiquitylation 6 h post-infection in control vs. *Cbl*^{−/−} cells infected with *lpqN Mtb*. (J) Ubiquitylation versus total-protein changes in control vs. *Cbl*^{−/−} cells (K) Biological process of proteins with CBL-dependent ubiquitylation. Cells were infected at MOI=0.8 for growth assays and MOI=10 for diGly-MS. Di-gly MS was analysis of 3 independent experiments. Growth assays are representative (median) of at 3 or more replicates.

We then used di-Gly enrichment MS to globally monitor changes in ubiquitylation in *Mtb*-

infected cells. Lysates were prepared from uninfected and infected cells, and from control and

Cbl^{-/-} cells, and digested with trypsin. We then enriched ubiquitylated peptides by

immunoprecipitation with an antibody that recognizes the di-Gly remnant of ubiquitin that remains

conjugated to the ubiquitin-modified Lys residue following trypsinization and analyzed the

samples by liquid chromatography tandem MS (LC-MS/MS), using label-free quantification (Fig

3E and Ref. 54–59). Of note, the ubiquitin-like proteins ISG15 and NEDD8 leave an

indistinguishable di-Gly-Lys remnant. However, these modifications account for only ~5% of

identified di-Gly modified residues, and the vast majority of di-Gly sites are ubiquitin-modified (60–

62). In addition, since CBL is a ubiquitin-specific ligase, any CBL-dependent di-Gly modifications

should represent CBL-dependent ubiquitylation. Thus, we will hereafter refer to di-Gly-modified

sites as ubiquitylation, recognizing that a small percentage of non-CBL-dependent sites are

modified by ISG15 or NEDD8.

Overall, we identified ~76,000 unique peptides in macrophages, encompassing ~46,000

unique di-Gly-modified sites. This dataset creates the most detailed atlas of ubiquitin modification

in macrophages to date, with roughly 10-fold more sites identified than currently available

datasets of this specialized cell type. As expected, in control cells, we saw numerous ubiquitin

changes in response to *Mtb* with a total of 1,793 ubiquitylation sites increasing (Log2 fold-change

>1, FDR <0.05) and 197 sites decreasing (Fig 3F, Table S2). Since the quantity of a ubiquitylated

peptide in a sample can change because of either a change in the stoichiometry of ubiquitylation

at a given site, or because of a change in abundance of the protein itself, we sought to

deconvolute these processes. We examined changes in protein abundance in the same samples

by quantitative LC-MS/MS (Table S3) and analyzed the change in ubiquitylation at each site

relative to the change in protein expression. This analysis demonstrated a range of stoichiometry

changes. For proteins such as RSAD2 and IL1B, the increased quantity of ubiquitylated peptides

was largely due to increased protein expression (Fig 3G). Conversely, proteins like IKBKE and

GABARAP had large changes in ubiquitylation stoichiometry with minimal change in overall

protein levels. Overall, changes in abundance of a ubiquitylated peptide and protein abundance

were poorly correlated (R^2=0.36) and in roughly 70% of cases the changes in stoichiometry was

3 standard-deviations greater than protein abundance (Fig 3H) indicating that in a majority of

cases the change in abundance of a ubiquitylated peptide was independent of protein abundance

and due to a change in the stoichiometry of ubiquitylation.

We next examined ubiquitylation in CBL-deficient macrophages following *Mtb* infection.

As expected, the loss of CBL did not change the abundance of most ubiquitylated peptides,

consistent with a complex ubiquitin signaling landscape involving numerous E3 ligases. However,

there was also a clear subset of peptides that underwent CBL-dependent ubiquitylation, including

well-established CBL substrates such as the receptor tyrosine kinases MET and CSFR1. As

anticipated, most changes seen in *Cbl*$^{-/-}$ cells were peptides with decreased ubiquitylation; there

were 430 ubiquitylation sites that decreased (Log2FC >1.0, FDR<0.05) and 90 sites increased in

abundance (Fig 3I). Changes in the stoichiometry of ubiquitylation drove the changes in

abundance of the di-Gly peptides, with very little correlation between changes in abundance for

ubiquitylated peptides and protein expression (R^2=0.09, Fig 3J).

Systematic analysis of the proteins with CBL-dependent ubiquitylation demonstrated the

enrichment of several pathways and processes; several had clear immune-related functions such

as regulation of phagocytosis (7.1-fold over-representation, p≤0.01), vacuolar acidification (13.7-

fold, p=0.02), NFkB regulation (7.2-fold, p=0.02), and IFNGR signaling (4.2-fold, p≤0.01). There

were also factors known to be involved in the immune response to *Legionella pneumophila* (5.3-

fold, p≤0.01), *Salmonella enterica* (3.2-fold , p ≤0.001, and *Mtb* itself (3.1- fold, p<0.01). Several

other unanticipated pathways were also over-represented in the set of proteins with CBL-

dependent ubiquitylation, including endoplasmic reticulum-associated protein degradation

(ERAD) pathway (6.2-fold-fold over-representation, p≤0.001) and iron uptake (6.1-fold, p≤1E-4).

Taken together, these findings suggest that the set of proteins ubiquitylated by CBL extends far

beyond its established role in growth-factor signaling at the plasma membrane and includes

several other cellular processes throughout the cytoplasm and on membrane-bound organelles.

Function of proteins with CBL-dependent ubiquitylation

We next sought to identify which proteins with CBL-dependent ubiquitylation played

important roles during *Mtb* infection. We identified a subset of 43 proteins that had peptides with

at least 80% reduction in ubiquitylation in *Cbl*$^{-/-}$ cells. Of these, 20 had annotated functions

associated in some way with innate immunity (Fig 4A), and we analyzed this set of 20 proteins

for CBL-dependent functions during *Mtb* infection. We hypothesized that if a protein is an

important substrate of CBL, then loss of that protein should either phenocopy the CBL mutant (if

positively regulated by CBL) or reverse the CBL phenotype (if inhibited by CBL). To analyze each

of these factors we designed a lentiviral vector with two sgRNA cassettes, thereby allowing us to

generate mutant CIM cell lines lacking either CBL or a putative CBL substrate, as well as double-

mutant cells lacking both simultaneously (Fig 4B). Editing efficiency of >80% was confirmed by

either TIDE analysis of genomic DNA (85), or by immunoblot of the targeted protein (Fig 4C).

Fig 4. FAF2 promotes *Mtb* replication in the absence of CBL. (A) Examples of changes in ubiquitylation and total protein for immune regulators in *Mtb*-infected *Cbl*$^{-/-}$ CIM cells 6 h post-infection. (B) Experimental design for creation of cells lacking both *Cbl* and putative substrates. (C) Immunoblot of FAF2 protein in CIM cells expressing either non-targeting or *Faf2*-specific sgRNA. (D) Luminescent growth assay of *lpqN*-mutant *Mtb*. (E) Location of ubiquitylated residues on FAF2 and Log2 fold-change of ubiquitylation at each residue site in *Mtb*-infected *Cbl*$^{-/-}$ cells vs. control cells. (F) Immunoblot of FAF2 protein levels in *Mtb*-infected control and *Cbl*$^{-/-}$ cells. Representative data of four independent experiments are shown. Error bars represent SEM.

We then infected each of these mutant cell lines with the CBL-sensitive *lpqN Mtb* mutant

and assessed bacterial growth. As expected, the growth of *Mtb* was more rapid in CBL-deficient

cells (Fig 4D), and in most cases, loss of a putative substrate in these CBL-deficient cells did not

alter the replication of *Mtb* (data not shown). However, disruption of the Fas-associated factor 2

(*Faf2*) locus in CBL-deficient cells significantly altered the antibacterial capacity of these cells

toward *Mtb*. FAF2 is an ER-localized signaling adapter protein, and our di-Gly MS analysis found

it to be heavily ubiquitylated in macrophages, with 9 different ubiquitylated Lys residues. In $Cbl^{-/-}$

cells, a single residue (K246) showed a specific loss of ubiquitylation, with other Lys residues

relatively unaffected (Fig 4E). In contrast to the other genes tested, disruption of FAF2 in CBL-

deficient cells restored the ability of these cells to restrict *Mtb* replication, with bacterial growth

rates approaching that seen in control macrophages that received a non-targeting sgRNA.

Given the established role of CBL in targeting cell-surface receptors for degradation, we

tested the idea that CBL similarly targets FAF2 for degradation through ubiquitylation. However,

FAF2 protein levels did not change following Mtb infection and were unaltered in CBL-deficient

macrophages (Fig 4F). This suggests that rather than regulating FAF2 levels, CBL-dependent

ubiquitylation is instead regulating the function of FAF2, perhaps by altering its protein-protein

interactions. Taken together, these genetic analyses show that while multiple proteins undergo

CBL-dependent ubiquitylation, FAF2 seems to be an important regulatory hub downstream of

CBL as macrophages respond to *Mtb* infection.

DISCUSSION

Immune response polarization

Macrophages must be able to sense and effectively respond to diverse types of

pathogens. Both clinical data and animal models indicate that while a particular type of immune

response may be beneficial in some circumstances, it can be detrimental in others. Tissue

macrophages act as first responders in many infections, acting both to clear pathogens and to

direct subsequent immune responses. However, how a macrophage determines the type of
pathogen it is encountering and translates that into an appropriate response remains unclear.

Mtb exposes an infected macrophage to an array of PAMPS; some are distinctively
bacterially-derived molecules such as peptidoglycan or lipoarabinomannan, which activate NOD2
and TLR2 respectively. Activation of these sensors results in the release of cytokines with potent
antibacterial activities such as TNF and IL1B (5–8,10,11). However, *Mtb*, as well as a number of
other intracellular bacterial pathogens, including *Listeria monocytogenes,* and *Chlamydia*
trachomatis, also activate cytosolic nucleic-acid sensors such as cGAS and induce expression of
type I interferon and other antiviral effectors (63–66). While type I interferon potently inhibits
viruses and can inhibit the growth of some bacteria such as *C. trachomatis*, it impairs antibacterial
responses to *Mtb* and *L. monocytogenes* in mice (63–66)*.*

The observation that antiviral responses can actively antagonize the antibacterial capacity
of a macrophage suggests that macrophages might become polarized into antibacterial versus
antiviral states. It also suggests that pathogens infecting macrophages like *Mtb,* and *L.*
monocytogenes might seek to subvert this process as a virulence strategy. In the case of *Mtb*, it
seems to do so through several mechanisms. First, upon perforation of its phagosome, *Mtb*
exposes bacterial dsDNA to the host cell cytoplasm which initiates a cascading activation of
cGAS, STING, TBK1, and IRF3. IRF3 then triggers a complex transcriptional program, inducing
the expression of IFN-β, as well as hundreds of other downstream genes, many of which have
potent antiviral activity (24–31). Second, in parallel, *Mtb* also releases bacterial RNA into the host
cytosol, thereby activating a similar RIG-I, MAVS, TBK1, and IRF3 pathway resulting in IFN-β
expression (25). *Mtb* also introduces the LpqN virulence factor into host cells which interferes with
the ability of the CBL ubiquitin ligase to regulate this process, thereby amplifying antiviral
responses (45).

Exactly how the expression of antiviral effectors such as IFN-β antagonizes the

antibacterial state of a macrophage is unclear. Integrating the results of different studies that

examined different viral response regulators suggests that the transcriptional program controlling

the expression of antiviral proteins such as IFN-β is likely to be comprised of several distinct

modules, as the perturbation of different regulators causes distinct *Mtb*-related phenotypes. For

example, in isolated ex vivo macrophages, disruption of CBL, TRIM14, or IRF7 alters the

expression of antiviral effectors and alters the ability of a macrophage to restrict *Mtb* replication

(45,46,67). In contrast, perturbation of RIG-I, SP140 or IFNAR has no effect on *Mtb* replication in

isolated macrophages but profoundly alters *Mtb* susceptibility in mice (25,39,40,67–70). This

suggests that while all these pathways regulate IFN-β signaling, they might differ in their

regulation of other target genes, and that these differences drive distinct physiologic states in *Mtb*-

infected macrophages. It also suggests that the additional regulatory inputs impinging on an

infected macrophage during a complex immune response in vivo create a distinct environment

where type I interferon signaling becomes a dominant factor.

CBL Substrates

Although the mechanisms by which CBL regulates growth factor signaling are known in

detail, the mechanisms by which it regulates innate immunity are not. CBL was initially

characterized as a proto-oncogene that ubiquitylates activated receptor tyrosine kinases, thus

targeting them for degradation, and was later found to have non-enzymatic functions in activating

phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase and SRC-family kinases (48,49,51,71). We found that the enzymatic

activity of CBL was needed for its ability to regulate immune responses during *Mtb* infection and

identified the signaling adapter protein FAF2 as a critical intermediary factor, disruption of FAF2

rescued the impaired responses in CBL-deficient cells. This suggests a scenario where FAF2

might somehow be hijacked by *Mtb* to impair host defenses, and that CBL normally acts to

constrain FAF2 activity in *Mtb*-infected macrophages.

FAF2 is known to regulate a diverse set of physiologic processes, and thus the manner

by which FAF2 regulates the innate immune response to *Mtb* is uncertain. FAF2 was originally

characterized as a member of a family of ubiquitin regulatory X (UBX) domain proteins regulating

the endoplasmic-reticulum-associated degradation pathway (ERAD) (72). FAF2 was also

subsequently shown to act as a positive regulator of STING, MTOR, and NFκB activation (73–

75). Which of these pathways is the critical one downstream of FAF2 during *Mtb* infection is an

important remaining question.

It is also unclear what function the CBL-dependent ubiquitylation of FAF2 at K246 plays.

A straightforward explanation would have been that CBL inhibits FAF2 by targeting it for

degradation, analogous to the regulation of growth-factor receptors (49,76,77). However, our data

demonstrate that this is not the case. Instead, it seems that ubiquitylation alters FAF2 functionality,

perhaps by modulating its interactions with STING, MTOR, or NFκB or their regulators. Future

genetic experiments analyzing FAF2 alleles with mutations in K246 should provide insight into the

function of FAF2 ubiquitylation, as will biochemical experiments analyzing the activation state of

these different pathways.

Ubiquitylation during *Mtb* infection

These studies also create a detailed atlas of protein ubiquitylation in macrophages as they

respond to a pathogen, generating intriguing new hypotheses about how ubiquitin signaling might

regulate innate immunity. Although numerous proteomics studies have analyzed ubiquitylation in

mammalian cells, few of these focused on immune cells, and only a handful have examined

signaling during innate immune responses to pathogens. Such studies in activated immune cells

have provided important insights by identifying specific ubiquitylation events contributing to

autophagy and DNA repair processes during infection that alter immune responses (78,79). Here,

we identified ~46,000 unique di-Gly-modified Lys residues, significantly broadening the scope of

the ubiquitin-mediated signaling events taking place in macrophages as they respond to a

pathogen. These analyses reveal a number of previously unknown ubiquitylation events on critical

immune regulators, including the secreted cytokines IL1A and TNFSF13B, the endosomal

peptidoglycan transporter SLC15A3, and the cytoplasmic peptidoglycan sensor NOD2 (Table S2).

Thus, this dataset suggests multiple new mechanisms by which ubiquitin signaling might be

regulating other critical immune responses.

Limitations

While our RNA-Seq data show clear CBL-dependent transcriptional changes in CBL-

depleted THP-1 macrophages, this is an imperfect model system. The expression of CBL is only

reduced ~85% by shRNA, and it is possible that residual CBL activity could be masking some

changes. Although we also used CRISPR/Cas9 genome-editing to generate *CBL*$^{-/-}$ THP-1 clones,

we observed marked clone-to-clone variability in *Mtb*-related phenotypes. In addition, the

response of cell lines such as THP-1 cells to immune stimuli is often muted relative to primary

macrophages (53). For example, we note that while changes in IFN-β expression were readily

detectible in *Mtb*-infected THP-1 cells by RT-qPCR, the overall transcript levels were too low for

reliable quantification by RNA-Seq. Separately, our MS studies had some limitations. They

identified a large number of peptides with the di-Gly-Lys remnant, and while ~95% of di-Gly

modifications result from ubiquitylation, NEDD8 and ISG15 both leave identical di-Gly remnants.

Our current data are unable to distinguish the small subset of Lys residues modified by these

other ubiquitin-related proteins. However, since CBL is believed to be a ubiquitin-specific ligase

the set of CBL-dependent changes are likely due to ubiquitin. Finally, for those proteins with CBL-

dependent ubiquitylation, we cannot distinguish at this time between direct ubiquitylation by CBL

versus indirect effects of CBL mediated by another E3 ligase or deubiquitinase that it regulates.

SUPPLEMENTAL FIG LEGENDS

Fig S1. (A) CFU determination in THP-1 cells expressing either CBL-specific or non-targeting

control shRNA 5d after infection with *lpqN Mtb.* (B) Luminescent growth assay of *lpqN Mtb* in a

secondary independent CBL shRNA in THP-1 cells.

Fig S2. (A) RNA-seq analysis of control THP-1 cells expressing a non-targeting shRNA,

comparing uninfected and *lpqN Mtb*-infected cells. (B) RT-qPCR analysis of IFIT1 in IFN-β

stimulated THP-1 cells.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Key Reagent Table

REAGENT OR RESOURCE	SOURCE	IDENTIFIER
Antibodies		
Rabbit c-CBL antibody	Cell Signaling Technology	Cat # 2747
β-Actin (C4) Alexa Fluor® 680	Santa Cruz Biotechnology	Cat # sc-47778 AF680
PTMScan® Ubiquitin Remnant Motif (K-ε-GG)	Cell Signaling Technology	Cat # 5562S
FAF2 antibody	Proteintech	Cat # 16251-1-AP
IRDye® 800CW Donkey anti-Mouse IgG Secondary Antibody	Li-cor	Cat # 926-32212
IRDye® 800CW Goat anti-Rabbit IgG Secondary Antibody	Li-cor	Cat # 926-32211
Primer and guide sequences		
qPCR_*IFNβ* Human F	This paper	CTTCTCCACTACAGCTCTTTCC

qPCR_*IFNβ* Human R	This paper	GCCAGGAGGTTCTCAACAATA
qPCR_*IFIT1* Human F	This paper	CCAGAAATAGACTGTGAGGAAGG
qPCR_*IFIT1* Human R	This paper	CCCTATCTGGTGATGCAGTAAG
qPCR_*β-ACTIN* Human F	This paper	GACCACCTTCAACTCCATCAT
qPCR_*β-ACTIN* Human R	This paper	CCTGCTTGCTAATCCACATCT
ms_*Actin*_qpcr_FW	This paper	GGTGTGATGGTGGGAATGG
ms_*Actin*_qpcr_RV	This paper	GCCCTCGTCACCCACATAGGA
ms_*Ifnβ*_qPCR_FW	This paper	TCCGAGCAGAGATCTTCAGGAA
ms_*Ifnβ*_qPCR_RV	This paper	TGCAACCACCACTCATTCTGAG
ms_*Ifit1*_qPCR_FW	This paper	CGTAGCCTATCGCCAAGATTTA
ms_*Ifit1*_qPCR_RV	This paper	AGCTTTAGGGCAAGGAGAAC
		AGTTACGCGTCTCTAAACCCATG
Lg_m*Faf2*gRNA_Rv	This paper	TTCCAGTTATGCTGCGGGAAAGAGTGGTCT CATACAG
Lg_m*Faf2*geno_Fw	This paper	CTAGTAGTTACAGTGTGCTTGC
Lg_m*Faf2*geno_Rv	This paper	CTGTGAACATTTCTGTTGCTCC
		GAAGTCTGCTAACATGCGGTGACG
		TCGAGGAGAATCCTGGCCCAATGGCCAAG
T2A_BSF_F	This paper	CCTTTGTCTCAAG

		GACGTCACCGCATGTTAGCAGACTTCCCCTG
		CCCTCGCCGGAGCCGGGCCCCTTCT
Strep_T2A_R	This paper	CGAACTGGGGGTGGCTCCAG
		CTTTGTACAAGAAAGCTGGGTCTAGAT
Bla_R_	This paper	TTAGCCCTCCCACACATAACCAGAGGGC

Bacterial strains

| CDC1551 *lpqN*:Tnhimar1 mutant | BEI Resources | Cat # NR-18454 |

Cell lines

THP-1	ATCC	TIB-202
HL-60	ATCC	CCL-240
HOXB8-ER Rosa26Cas9 CIM	Gift from Greg Barton, UC Berkeley	N/A
B16	ATCC	CRL-6475
3T3-MCSF	Gift from Russell Vance, UC Berkeley	

Chemicals

Middlebrook OADC	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat # b12351
BD DIFCO™ Middlebrook 7H9	Becton Dickinson (BD)	Cat # 271310
BD DIFCO™ Middlebrook 7H10	Becton Dickinson (BD)	Cat # 262710
PTMScan Lys-C Protease	Cell Signaling Technology	Cat # 39003
Sequencing Grade Modified Trypsin	Promega	Cat # V5111
Bortezomib	Cell Signaling Technology	Cat # 2204S
cOmplete™, Mini, EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail	Sigma Aldrich	Cat # 11836170001
Bovine growth serum	Hycolone	SH30541.03
Fetal bovine serum	Corning	5-015-CV

Phorbol 12-myristate 13 acetate (PMA)	Sigma Aldrich	Cat # P8139
1α,25-Dihydroxyvitamin D3 (Vitamin D)	Santa Cruz	Cat # 32222-06-3
SYBR™ Gold Nucleic Acid Gel Stain	Invitrogen	Cat # S11494
Poly(ethylene glycol) 8000	Sigma	Cat # 81268
Lipofectamine 2000	Invitrogen	Cat # 11668030

Consumables

500mg Sep-Pak C18 columns	Waters	Cat # WAT036790
PureLink™ RNA Mini Kit	Invitrogen	Cat # 12183018A
Maxima H Minus Reverse Transcriptase	Thermo Scientific	Cat # EP0753
0.45 µm Acrodisc Syringe Filters	Pall	Cat # 4614

Recombinant DNA

lentiGuide Puro	Addgene	Plasmid #52963
pENTR1a	Thermo	A10462
pLenti CMV blast DEST	Addgene	Plasmid #17451

pLenti CMV no selection

marker   This paper

pLKO.1 puro   Addgene   Plasmid #8453

Software and websites

Prism v9.0   GraphPad

Rstudio   Posit

Synthego guide design tool   Synthego   https://design.synthego.com

TIDE analysis   https://tide.nki.nl/

Other

Odyssey CLx   Li-Cor

Glomax Explorer   Promega

CFX Connect Real-Time System   BIO-RAD

Whole-body exposure chamber

099C A4212   Glas-Col

433   **Deposited data**

434   At the time of publication raw MS data files will be deposited at MasIVE

435   https://massive.ucsd.edu/ProteoSAFe. RNA-Seq data will be deposited at GEO

436   https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov /geo/info/seq.html. Processed MS and RNA-Seq data will be

437   available as supplementary data files at the time of publication.

Cell Lines

THP-1 human monocytes (ATCC TIB-202) and HL-60 promyeloblast cells (ATCC CCL-240) were purchased from ATCC. THP-1 cells were cultured in RPMI media containing 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS), 10mM HEPES, 1mM sodium pyruvate, 4500 mg/L glucose, and 0.05 mM 2-mercaptoethanol. HL-60 cells are cultured in RPMI containing 10% bovine growth serum (BGS), 15% fetal bovine serum (FBS), 1mM sodium pyruvate, 2mM L-glutamine, and 1X MEM non-essential amino acids solution. HOXB8-ER and Cas9-expressing conditionally immortalized macrophages (CIMs) were cultured in RPMI media containing 10% FBS, 10mM HEPES, 1mM sodium pyruvate, 2mM L-glutamine, 1.5ul 2-mercaptoethanol, 2% GM-CSF as conditioned media from B16 cells murine melanoma cells, and 2uM β-estradiol as previously described (53), prior to differentiation. THP-1 and HL-60 cells were differentiated with DMEM supplemented with 10% FBS, 1mM pyruvate, 2mM L-glutamine, 10ng/ml phorbol 12-myristate 13 acetate (PMA), and 0.1ng/ml 1,25 dihydroxy-vitamin D. Cells were differentiated for 72 h before experiments. CIM cells were differentiated by washing to removal of β-estradiol and then culture with DMEM supplemented with 10% FBS, 2mM L-glutamine, 1mM sodium pyruvate, 10% MCSF (derived from 3T3 MCSF conditioned media) for 7 days prior to experiments.

All cell lines generated using lentiviral vectors followed the same steps of transfection of HEK 293T Lenti-X cells with the transfer vector expressing the gene of interest, alongside the packaging plasmids psPAX2 and the envelope plasmid VSV-G. Viral supernatant is harvested 48 hours after transfection and either filtered with a 0.45 μm syringe filter and for CIM cell transduction, concentrated using A PEG-8000 solution (80). For transduction, viral supernatant with Polybrene 8ug/ml is added for 12h to THP-1 and HL-60 cells. CIM cells are transduced through spinfection and spun for 2h at 1000 RPM at 32C and then incubated for 6h before washing and culture in fresh media. Selective antibiotics were as follows: THP-1 and HL-60 cells are

462   selected with 0.5 μg/ml of Puromycin or 4 μg/ml of Blasticidin. CIM cells are selected with 8 μg/ml

463   of Puromycin or 4 μg/ml of Blasticidin.

Bacterial Strains

465   *Mtb* was cultured in 7H9 (BD) supplemented with 0.5% glycerol, 10% oleic acid-albumin-dextrose-

466   catalase (OADC, Middlebrook), and 0.1% Tween-80 in bottles gently rotated at 40 RPM at 37° C

467   or on 7H10 plates supplemented with 10% OADC, 0.5% glycerol, and 0.1% Tween 80 at 37° C.

Macrophage Infection for RNA harvest:

Mtb strains were prepared for inoculation by washing twice in PBS with 10% heat-inactivated

horse serum, gently sonicated, and spun at 500 rpm for 5 m to generate a fine bacterial

suspension. Bacteria were opsonized in 10% heat-inactivated horse serum and macrophages

were infected at an MOI = 10 for 6hr by spinfection at 1200RPM for 10 minutes followed by

washing in PBS. After incubation, wells are washed once with 1X PBS and harvested in Trizol for

RNA extraction.

Macrophage Infection for Lux assay:

For luminescent growth assays, cells are plated in triplicate in 96 well plates at a density of 8 x

10^4 cells/well for THP-1 cells and 1.5 x 10^5 cells/ well for CIM cells. Macrophage cell density at

the time of infection was carefully matched between control and experimental cell lines to within

<15% variance by plating sets of control wells across a gradient of densities and using SYBR gold

to quantify nucleic acid content of plated experimental and control cells. Macrophages are infected

at a MO1 = 0.8, and after spinfection plates are incubated for 30 minutes at 37° C. After the

incubation, the monolayers were washed with PBS containing 1% heat-inactivated horse serum

twice, and bacterial luminescence was measured over time in a GloMax Explorer warmed to 37

degrees C. Macrophage growth media was changed every other day. Colony-forming units

(CFUs) were quantified by lysing triplicate wells of macrophages in sterile water and plated in

serially dilutions on 7H10 agar with supplemented with OADC and 0.1% Tween-80. Plates were

incubated at 37° C for 3 weeks prior to CFU enumeration.

Western Blots

Protein in cell lysates was quantified by BCA. 30-50ug of protein lysate was separated by SDS-

PAGE and transferred onto nitrocellulose membranes and blocked with LiCor blocking buffer at

0.5x for 1h. Primary antibodies were used at varying dilutions and incubated 1.5h at room-

temperature or, in the case of anti-CBL antibody, 4° C overnight. Secondary antibodies were used

at 1:10,000 dilution for 1h. After probing for indicated antibodies, the membranes were imaged on

an Odyssey scanner (Licor).

RNA Purification

496   Nucleic acid-stimulated macrophages were lysed in PureLink lysis buffer per manufacturer

497   instructions. *Mtb*- infected macrophages were lysed in Trizol. In both cases, lysates were purified

498   with silica spin columns (Purelink) per manufacturer instructions.

Macrophage nucleic acid stimulation and RT-qPCR

500   Differentiated THP-1 and HL-60 cells are plated at 8 x 10^5/ well in a 12-well plate. Cells are

501   stimulated with 10ng of RNA or 20ng of DNA delivered by Lipofectamine 2000 as per manufacturer

502   instructions and incubated for 6h. After RNA purification, cDNA was generated using 500ng total

503   RNA with Maxima H minus reverse transcriptase and diluted 1:10 before qPCR analysis with the

504   indicated primers and SYBR Green I detection of products.

RNA-seq

Differentiated THP-1 cells were infected at MOI=10 for 6 h with *lpqN Mtb* in three independent

experiments on different days. RNA was purified and barcoded 3'Tag-Seq libraries prepared using

the QuantSeq FWD kit (Lexogen, Vienna, Austria) for multiplexed sequencing according to the

recommendations of the manufacturer by the UC Davis DNA Sequencing core. The fragment size

distribution of the libraries was verified via micro-capillary gel electrophoresis on a Bioanalyzer

2100 (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA). The libraries were quantified by fluorometry on a Qubit

instrument (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA), and pooled in equimolar ratios. Twelve libraries

were sequenced on one lane of an Aviti sequencer (Element Biosciences, San Diego, CA) with

single-end 100 bp reads. The sequencing generated more than 4 million reads per library.

Analysis of human data: HTStream was used to remove PhiX, adapter sequences, polyA tails,

low quality sequences from end of reads, N bases, and reads less than 50 basepairs. After

preprocessing, STAR was used to align reads to GRCh38.p13 human genome. UMI-tools was

used to remove PCR duplicates post-alignment. Next, feature Counts was use to count reads

whose alignment overlapped with genes using the gencode genome corresponding to the human

genome version used. Annotation used was version 41. R was used for limma-voom pipeline on

R with multiple testing correction using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure.

Plasmid Construction for short shRNA and sgRNA delivery

shRNA expression plasmids were constructed by digesting pLKO.1 cloning vector with AgeI and

EcoRI and annealed oligonucleotides containing the 21 shRNA encoding sequence were inserted,

For sgRNA, 20 nucleotide targeting sequences were designed to target regions in the first exon

of each locus using the Synthgo design tool. The targeting sequence is then fused by overlap-

extension PCR to a second-generation tracRNA (81) and inserted into the HpaI and XhoI sites of

pSicoR . The dual-guide sgRNA vector was constructed using a synthesized gene block

containing the two guides of interest and an H1 promoter from Integrated DNA technologies (IDT)

that were digested with BsmBI v2 on both ends and ligated to BsmBI v2 digested Lentiguide Puro

vector (Addgene) with a second-generation tracRNA (81). Evaluation of editing efficiency was

performed using TIDE.

CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing.

After lentiviral delivery of sgRNA cells were selected for 1 week with puromycin. The genome

editing efficiency of the polyclonal population evaluated by PCR amplification of the targeted exon

followed by Sanger sequencing and TIDE analysis. The polyclonal population was used for

experiments

Site-directed mutagenesis

The wildtype and ligase mutant copies of CBL for both THP-1 and CIM cells contain synonymous

mutations at the targeting sites of either the RNAi or CAS9 system to prevent degradation. Site-

directed mutagenesis was carried out to generate catalytically inactive CBL mutants using

pENTR1a plasmids (Addgene). Mutagenesis was validated through Sanger sequencing.

Following validation, gateway cloning was used to move the mutated CBL open reading frame

from pENTR1a into lentiviral pDEST vectors (Addgene). For THP-1 cells, constructs were cloned

into a pLenti CMV Blast vector (Addgene). For CIM cells, constructs were fused by overlap

extension PCR directly to a T2A peptide and blasticidin resistance gene and were cloned into

pLenti CMV modified to remove other antibiotic resistance genes (82).

Ubiquitination Proteomics

3×10^7 cells were plated 24h before infection. Cells were infected with *lpqN Mtb* at an MOI = 10

for 6 hours. 2h prior to harvest, the 1μM of Bortezomib is added. For harvest, cells were washed

1X with PBS then scraped in ice-cold methanol+ 0.1 glycine pH 2.5 to precipitate protein, and

inactivate proteases and *Mtb.* Cells were scrapped and removed from the BSL3. Chloroform was

added to 20% volume to assist precipitation, incubated on ice for 10 min. and samples centrifuged

to pellet protein. The pellets were washed once with ice-cold methanol, recentrifuged, and dried.

Protein was resolubilized in in 9M Urea 25 mM HEPES pH 8.5,1 mM chloroacetamide (CAM),

0.5x Complete-mini protease inhibitor, and 0.5 mM EDTA with sonication. Proteins were then

reduced for 45 min with 5 mM dithiothreitol (DTT) at room temperature and alkylated with 20mM

CAM for 20 minutes at room temperature and in the dark. BCA assay was performed, samples

diluted 1:4 in HEPES pH 8.0 and 2.5 mg of protein digested with Lys-C at enzyme to substrate

ratio 1:100 at 37°C for 2h. Subsequently, samples were digested overnight at 37°C with trypsin

enzyme to substrate ratio 1ug:100ug. Digestion was stopped with 0.5% TFA and then incubated

on ice for 15 min to allow urea to precipitate and samples centrifuged to pellet debris. Peptides

were desalted with 500 mg Sep-Pal C18 columns as per manufacturer instructions and

lyophilized.

Immunoprecipitation of di-Gly-containing peptides

2.5mg of lyophilized peptides were resuspended with 0.5x immunoaffinity purification (IAP) buffer

(50mM MOPS, pH7.2; 10mM sodium phosphate; 50mM NaCl) and sonicated. 10 ul cross-linked

anti-K-ε-GG antibody beads were washed 3x in PBS. Samples were then mixed with 10 ul cross-

linked anti-K-ε-GG antibody beads and incubated at 4°C for 2h. The peptide-bead mixture was

then washed four times with PBS and one time with 0.1x IAP. Peptides were eluted with 100ul

0.15% TFA and analyzed by LC-MS/MS with on-tip clean up prior to MS run.

Mass-Spectrometry

Chromatography was performed on an Evosep 1 using either the 60spd (di-Gly) or 30spd

(total protein) method. Each sample was loaded onto a disposable Evotip C18 trap column

(Evosep Biosytems, Denmark) as per the manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, Evotips were wetted

with 2-propanol, equilibrated with 0.1% formic acid, and then samples were loaded using

centrifugal force at 1200g. Evotips were subsequently washed with 0.1% formic acid, and then

200 μL of 0.1% formic acid was added to each tip to prevent drying. The tipped samples were

subjected to nanoLC on a Evosep One instrument (Evosep Biosystems). Tips were eluted directly

onto a PepSep analytical column, dimensions: 150umx10cm C18 column (PepSep, Denmark)

with 1.5 μm particle size (100 Å pores) (Bruker Daltronics), and a ZDV spray emitter (Bruker

Daltronics). Mobile phases A and B were 100% water with 0.1% formic acid (v/v) and 100%

Acetonitrile 0.1% formic acid (v/v), respectively. The standard pre-set method of 30 samples-per-

day was used, which is a 44 min minute run or 60 spd which is a 21 min run.

Mass Spectrometry – Performed on a hybrid trapped ion mobility spectrometry-quadrupole

time of flight mass spectrometer (timsTOF Pro 2 and timsTOF HT, (Bruker Daltonics, Bremen,

Germany) with a modified nano-electrospray ion source (CaptiveSpray, Bruker Daltonics). In the

experiments described here, the mass spectrometer was operated in diaPASEF mode.

Desolvated ions entered the vacuum region through the glass capillary and deflected into the

TIMS tunnel which is electrically separated into two parts (dual TIMS). Here, the first region is

operated as an ion accumulation trap that primarily stores all ions entering the mass spectrometer,

while the second part performs trapped ion mobility analysis.

DIA PASEF: The dual TIMS analyzer was operated at a fixed duty cycle close to 100%

using equal accumulation and ramp times of 75 ms each. For the 30spd Evosep run, Data-

independent analysis (DIA) scheme consisted of one MS scan followed by MSMS scans taken

with 6x3= 18 precursor windows at width of 50Th per 6x3= 560 ms cycle, over the mass range

8x3= 300-1200 Dalton. The TIMS scans layer the doubly and triply charged peptides over an ion

mobility -1/k0- range of 0.707-1.29 V*sec/cm2. The collision energy was ramped linearly as a

function of the mobility from 59 eV at 1/K0=1.2 to 20 eV at 1/K0=0.7. For the 60spd Evosep run,

Data-independent analysis (DIA) scheme consisted of one MS scan followed by MS/MS scans

taken with 5x7= 35 precursor windows at width of 30^{Th} = 763 ms cycle time over the mass range

286-1307 Dalton. The TIMS scans layer the doubly and triply charged peptides over an ion

mobility -1/k0- range of 0.7-1.3 V*sec/cm2. The collision energy was ramped linearly as a function

of the mobility from 59 eV at 1/K0=1.2 to 20 eV at 1/K0=0.

Data Analysis

LCMS files were processed with Spectronaut version 18.4(Biognosys, Zurich, Switzerland) using

DirectDIA analysis mode. Mass tolerance/accuracy for precursor and fragment identification was

set to default settings. The unreviewed FASTA for Mus Musculus, UP000000589, downloaded

from Uniprot and a universal library of common laboratory contaminants (Frankenfield et al, 2022).

For di-Gly analysis, a maximum of two missing cleavages were allowed, the required minimum

peptide sequence length was 7 amino acids, and the peptide mass was limited to a maximum of

4600 Da. Carbamidomethylation of cysteine residues was set as a fixed modification, and

methionine oxidation, acetylation of protein N termini and ubiquitination as variable modifications.

A decoy false discovery rate (FDR) at less than 1% for peptide spectrum matches and protein

group identifications was used for spectra filtering (Spectronaut default). Decoy database hits,

proteins identified as potential contaminants, and proteins identified exclusively by one site

modification were excluded from further analysis. For total protein: DIA data was analyzed using

Spectronaut 18. using the direct DIA workflow with PTM localization selected. Trypsin/P Specific

was set for the enzyme allowing two missed cleavages. Fixed Modifications were set for

Carbamidomethyl, and variable modifications were set to Acetyl (Protein N-term), Oxidation, and

ubiquitination. For DIA search identification, PSM and Protein Group FDR were set at 0.01%.

Mass-spectrometry statistical analysis was performed in Spectronaut® (Biognosys) using t-test

with multiple testing correction.

Pathway enrichment analysis

Functional and pathway enrichment analysis for RNAseq Ubiquitination Proteomics

Gene ontology and pathway analysis were carried out on the set of genes with FDR <= 0.5 and

LogFC <= 0.5 using the DAVID database (Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated

Discovery; https://david.ncifcrf.gov/) (84). The significantly enriched biological pathways were

identified with FDR <0.05. The pathways were visualized using R.

Statistics

Statistical significance for RT-qPCR data was performed using GraphPad Prism version 10

(GraphPad Software, LLC) using two-tailed Student t-test when comparing. Statistical analysis

for RNA-sequencing datasets was performed using the limma-voom pipeline on R with multiple

testing corrections using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure. Ubiquitination statistical analysis was

carried out within Spectronaut® (Biognosys) using the integrated statistical package with

randomized imputation of values near the limit of detection if a peptide was undetectable in a

particular sample, and performs t-tests with multiple testing correction and FDR calculation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sebastian Winter and Jeroen Saeij for their input on this manuscript. We

would like to thank the DNA Technologies and Bioinformatics cores at UC Davis that assisted with

the sequencing and processing of the RNA-seq analysis. BHP was funded by NIH 1R01AI144149.

References

1. Shrestha S, Foxman B, Weinberger DM, Steiner C, Viboud C, Rohani P. Identifying the

interaction between influenza and pneumococcal pneumonia using incidence data. Sci Transl

Med. 2013 Jun 26;5(191):191ra84.

2. Yamamura M, Uyemura K, Deans RJ, Weinberg K, Rea TH, Bloom BR, et al. Defining

Protective Responses to Pathogens: Cytokine Profiles in Leprosy Lesions. Science. 1991 Oct

11;254(5029):277–9.

3. Mogensen TH. Pathogen Recognition and Inflammatory Signaling in Innate Immune

Defenses. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2009 Apr;22(2):240–73.

4. Li D, Wu M. Pattern recognition receptors in health and diseases. Sig Transduct Target Ther.

2021 Aug 4;6(1):1–24.

5.   TB mortality [Internet]. [cited 2024 Apr 17]. Available from: https://www.who.int/teams/global-
tuberculosis-programme/tb-reports/global-tuberculosis-report-2023/tb-disease-burden/1-2-
tb-mortality

6.   Ferwerda G, Girardin SE, Kullberg BJ, Le Bourhis L, de Jong DJ, Langenberg DML, et al.
NOD2 and toll-like receptors are nonredundant recognition systems of Mycobacterium
tuberculosis. PLoS Pathog. 2005 Nov;1(3):279–85.

7.   Bowdish DME, Sakamoto K, Kim MJ, Kroos M, Mukhopadhyay S, Leifer CA, et al. MARCO,
TLR2, and CD14 are required for macrophage cytokine responses to mycobacterial trehalose
dimycolate and Mycobacterium tuberculosis. PLoS Pathog. 2009 Jun;5(6):e1000474.

8.   Underhill DM, Ozinsky A, Smith KD, Aderem A. Toll-like receptor-2 mediates mycobacteria-
induced proinflammatory signaling in macrophages. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1999 Dec
7;96(25):14459–63.

9.   Blumenthal A, Kobayashi T, Pierini LM, Banaei N, Ernst JD, Miyake K, et al. RP105 facilitates
macrophage activation by Mycobacterium tuberculosis lipoproteins. Cell Host Microbe. 2009
Jan 22;5(1):35–46.

10. Means TK, Wang S, Lien E, Yoshimura A, Golenbock DT, Fenton MJ. Human toll-like
receptors mediate cellular activation by Mycobacterium tuberculosis. J Immunol. 1999 Oct
1;163(7):3920–7.

11. Bafica A, Scanga CA, Feng CG, Leifer C, Cheever A, Sher A. TLR9 regulates Th1 responses
and cooperates with TLR2 in mediating optimal resistance to Mycobacterium tuberculosis. J
Exp Med. 2005 Dec 19;202(12):1715–24.

12. Dorhoi A, Nouailles G, Jörg S, Hagens K, Heinemann E, Pradl L, et al. Activation of the NLRP3

inflammasome by Mycobacterium tuberculosis is uncoupled from susceptibility to active

tuberculosis. Eur J Immunol. 2012 Feb;42(2):374–84.

13. Mishra BB, Rathinam VAK, Martens GW, Martinot AJ, Kornfeld H, Fitzgerald KA, et al. Nitric

oxide controls the immunopathology of tuberculosis by inhibiting NLRP3 inflammasome-

dependent processing of IL-1β. Nat Immunol. 2013 Jan;14(1):52–60.

14. Ishikawa E, Ishikawa T, Morita YS, Toyonaga K, Yamada H, Takeuchi O, et al. Direct

recognition of the mycobacterial glycolipid, trehalose dimycolate, by C-type lectin Mincle. J

Exp Med. 2009 Dec 21;206(13):2879–88.

15. Bourigault ML, Segueni N, Rose S, Court N, Vacher R, Vasseur V, et al. Relative contribution

of IL-1α, IL-1β and TNF to the host response to Mycobacterium tuberculosis and attenuated

M. bovis BCG. Immun Inflamm Dis. 2014/11/18 ed. 2013 Oct;1(1):47–62.

16. Segueni N, Benmerzoug S, Rose S, Gauthier A, Bourigault ML, Reverchon F, et al. Innate

myeloid cell TNFR1 mediates first line defence against primary Mycobacterium tuberculosis

infection. Scientific Reports. 2016 Mar 2;6(1):22454.

17. Mayer-Barber KD, Barber DL, Shenderov K, White SD, Wilson MS, Cheever A, et al. Cutting

Edge: Caspase-1 Independent IL-1β Production Is Critical for Host Resistance to

Mycobacterium tuberculosis and Does Not Require TLR Signaling In Vivo. The Journal of

Immunology. 2010 Apr 1;184(7):3326–30.

18. Pattanaik KP, Ganguli G, Naik SK, Sonawane A. *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* EsxL induces

TNF-α secretion through activation of TLR2 dependent MAPK and NF-κB pathways.

Molecular Immunology. 2021 Feb 1;130:133–41.

19. Mayer-Barber KD, Andrade BB, Oland SD, Amaral EP, Barber DL, Gonzales J, et al. Host-

directed therapy of tuberculosis based on interleukin-1 and type I interferon crosstalk. Nature.

2014 Jul 3;511(7507):99–103.

20. Di Paolo NC, Shafiani S, Day T, Papayannopoulou T, Russell DW, Iwakura Y, et al.

Interdependence between Interleukin-1 and Tumor Necrosis Factor Regulates TNF-

Dependent Control of Mycobacterium tuberculosis Infection. Immunity. 2015 Dec

15;43(6):1125–36.

21. Mayer-Barber KD, Barber DL, Shenderov K, White SD, Wilson MS, Cheever A, et al.

Caspase-1 independent IL-1beta production is critical for host resistance to mycobacterium

tuberculosis and does not require TLR signaling in vivo. J Immunol. 2010 Apr 1;184(7):3326–

30.

22. Flynn JL, Goldstein MM, Chan J, Triebold KJ, Pfeffer K, Lowenstein CJ, et al. Tumor necrosis

factor-α is required in the protective immune response against Mycobacterium tuberculosis in

mice. Immunity. 1995;2(6):561–72.

23. 1.2   TB   mortality   [Internet].   [cited   2024   Apr   17].   Available   from:

https://www.who.int/teams/global-tuberculosis-programme/tb-reports/global-tuberculosis-

report-2023/tb-disease-burden/1-2-tb-mortality

24. Wassermann R, Gulen MF, Sala C, Perin SG, Lou Y, Rybniker J, et al. Mycobacterium

tuberculosis Differentially Activates cGAS- and Inflammasome-Dependent Intracellular

Immune Responses through ESX-1. Cell Host & Microbe. 2015 Jun 10;17(6):799–810.

25. Cheng Y, Schorey JS. Mycobacterium tuberculosis–induced IFN-β production requires

cytosolic DNA and RNA sensing pathways. J Exp Med. 2018 Nov 5;215(11):2919–35.

26. Stanley SA, Johndrow JE, Manzanillo P, Cox JS. The Type I IFN Response to Infection with

Mycobacterium tuberculosis Requires ESX-1-Mediated Secretion and Contributes to

Pathogenesis1. The Journal of Immunology. 2007 Mar 1;178(5):3143–52.

27. Creagh EM, O'Neill LAJ. TLRs, NLRs and RLRs: a trinity of pathogen sensors that co-operate

in innate immunity. Trends in Immunology. 2006 Aug 1;27(8):352–7.

28. Kawai T, Akira S. The roles of TLRs, RLRs and NLRs in pathogen recognition. Int Immunol.

2009 Apr;21(4):317–37.

29. Chen W, Han C, Xie B, Hu X, Yu Q, Shi L, et al. Induction of Siglec-G by RNA Viruses Inhibits

the Innate Immune Response by Promoting RIG-I Degradation. Cell. 2013 Jan

31;152(3):467–78.

30. Watson RO, Bell SL, MacDuff DA, Kimmey JM, Diner EJ, Olivas J, et al. The Cytosolic Sensor

cGAS Detects Mycobacterium tuberculosis DNA to Induce Type I Interferons and Activate

Autophagy. Cell Host & Microbe. 2015 Jun 10;17(6):811–9.

31. Collins AC, Cai H, Li T, Franco LH, Li XD, Nair VR, et al. Cyclic GMP-AMP Synthase Is an

Innate Immune DNA Sensor for Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Cell Host & Microbe. 2015 Jun

10;17(6):820–8.

32. Berry MPR, Graham CM, McNab FW, Xu Z, Bloch SAA, Oni T, et al. An interferon-inducible

neutrophil-driven blood transcriptional signature in human tuberculosis. Nature. 2010

Aug;466(7309):973–7.

33. Maertzdorf J, Repsilber D, Parida SK, Stanley K, Roberts T, Black G, et al. Human gene

expression profiles of susceptibility and resistance in tuberculosis. Genes Immun. 2011

Jan;12(1):15–22.

34. Maertzdorf J, Ota M, Repsilber D, Mollenkopf HJ, Weiner J, Hill PC, et al. Functional
Correlations of Pathogenesis-Driven Gene Expression Signatures in Tuberculosis. PLOS
ONE. 2011 Oct 28;6(10):e26938.

35. Moreira-Teixeira L, Tabone O, Graham CM, Singhania A, Stavropoulos E, Redford PS, et al.
Mouse transcriptome reveals potential signatures of protection and pathogenesis in human
tuberculosis. Nat Immunol. 2020 Apr 1;21(4):464–76.

36. Moreira-Teixeira L, Stimpson PJ, Stavropoulos E, Hadebe S, Chakravarty P, Ioannou M, et
al. Type I IFN exacerbates disease in tuberculosis-susceptible mice by inducing neutrophil-
mediated lung inflammation and NETosis. Nat Commun. 2020 Nov 4;11:5566.

37. Kramnik I, Dietrich WF, Demant P, Bloom BR. Genetic control of resistance to experimental
infection with virulent Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Proceedings of the National Academy of
Sciences. 2000 Jul 18;97(15):8560–5.

38. Kamath AB, Alt J, Debbabi H, Behar SM. Toll-Like Receptor 4-Defective C3H/HeJ Mice Are
Not More Susceptible than Other C3H Substrains to Infection with Mycobacterium
tuberculosis. Infect Immun. 2003 Jul;71(7):4112–8.

39. Ji DX, Yamashiro LH, Chen KJ, Mukaida N, Kramnik I, Darwin KH, et al. Type I interferon-
driven susceptibility to Mycobacterium tuberculosis is mediated by IL-1Ra. Nature
microbiology. 2019;4(12):2128–35.

40. Ji DX, Witt KC, Kotov DI, Margolis SR, Louie A, Chevée V, et al. Role of the transcriptional
regulator SP140 in resistance to bacterial infections via repression of type I interferons.
Stallings CL, Rath S, editors. eLife. 2021 Jun 21;10:e67290.

41. Franco LH, Nair VR, Scharn CR, Xavier RJ, Torrealba JR, Shiloh MU, et al. The Ubiquitin

Ligase Smurf1 Functions in Selective Autophagy of Mycobacterium tuberculosis and Anti-

tuberculous Host Defense. Cell Host Microbe. 2017 Sep 13;22(3):421–3.

42. Manzanillo PS, Ayres JS, Watson RO, Collins AC, Souza G, Rae CS, et al. The ubiquitin

ligase parkin mediates resistance to intracellular pathogens. Nature. 2013 Sep

26;501(7468):512–6.

43. Watson RO, Manzanillo PS, Cox JS. Extracellular M. tuberculosis DNA targets bacteria for

autophagy by activating the host DNA-sensing pathway. Cell. 2012 Aug 17;150(4):803–15.

44. Gutierrez MG, Master SS, Singh SB, Taylor GA, Colombo MI, Deretic V. Autophagy Is a

Defense Mechanism Inhibiting BCG and Mycobacterium tuberculosis Survival in Infected

Macrophages. Cell. 2004 Dec 17;119(6):753–66.

45. Penn BH, Netter Z, Johnson JR, Von Dollen J, Jang GM, Johnson T, et al. An Mtb-Human

Protein-Protein Interaction Map Identifies a Switch Between Host Anti-Viral and Anti-Bacterial

Responses. Mol Cell. 2018 Aug 16;71(4):637-648.e5.

46. Hoffpauir CT, Bell SL, West KO, Jing T, Wagner AR, Torres-Odio S, et al. TRIM14 Is a Key

Regulator of the Type I IFN Response during Mycobacterium tuberculosis Infection. J

Immunol. 2020 Jul 1;205(1):153–67.

47. Landt SG, Marinov GK, Kundaje A, Kheradpour P, Pauli F, Batzoglou S, et al. ChIP-seq

guidelines and practices of the ENCODE and modENCODE consortia. Genome Res. 2012

Sep;22(9):1813–31.

48. Andoniou CE, Lill NL, Thien CB, Lupher ML, Ota S, Bowtell DD, et al. The Cbl proto-oncogene

product negatively regulates the Src-family tyrosine kinase Fyn by enhancing its degradation.

Molecular and Cellular Biology. 2000;20(3):851–67.

49. Duan L, Miura Y, Dimri M, Majumder B, Dodge IL, Reddi AL, et al. Cbl-mediated

ubiquitinylation is required for lysosomal sorting of epidermal growth factor receptor but is

dispensable for endocytosis. Journal of Biological Chemistry. 2003;278(31):28950–60.

50. Andoniou CE, Thien CB, Langdon WY. The two major sites of cbl tyrosine phosphorylation in

abl-transformed cells select the crkL SH2 domain. Oncogene. 1996 May 2;12(9):1981–9.

51. Arron JR, Vologodskaia M, Wong BR, Naramura M, Kim N, Gu H, et al. A positive regulatory

role for Cbl family proteins in tumor necrosis factor-related activation-induced cytokine

(trance) and CD40L-mediated Akt activation. J Biol Chem. 2001 Aug 10;276(32):30011–7.

52. Thien CB, Blystad FD, Zhan Y, Lew AM, Voigt V, Andoniou CE, et al. Loss of c-Cbl RING

finger function results in high-intensity TCR signaling and thymic deletion. The EMBO Journal.

2005;24(21):3807–19.

53. Roberts AW, Popov LM, Mitchell G, Ching KL, Licht DJ, Golovkine G, et al. Cas9+

conditionally-immortalized macrophages as a tool for bacterial pathogenesis and beyond.

Garrett WS, Kana BD, editors. eLife. 2019 Jun 17;8:e45957.

54. Fulzele A, Bennett EJ. Ubiquitin diGLY proteomics as an approach to identify and quantify

the ubiquitin-modified proteome. Methods Mol Biol. 2018;1844:363–84.

55. Denis NJ, Vasilescu J, Lambert JP, Smith JC, Figeys D. Tryptic digestion of ubiquitin

standards reveals an improved strategy for identifying ubiquitinated proteins by mass

spectrometry. Proteomics. 2007 Mar;7(6):868–74.

56. Kim W, Bennett EJ, Huttlin EL, Guo A, Li J, Possemato A, et al. Systematic and quantitative
assessment of the ubiquitin-modified proteome. Mol Cell. 2011 Oct 21;44(2):325–40.

57. Wagner SA, Beli P, Weinert BT, Nielsen ML, Cox J, Mann M, et al. A proteome-wide,
quantitative survey of in vivo ubiquitylation sites reveals widespread regulatory roles. Mol Cell
Proteomics. 2011 Oct;10(10):M111.013284.

58. Xu G, Paige JS, Jaffrey SR. Global analysis of lysine ubiquitination by ubiquitin remnant
immunoaffinity profiling. Nat Biotechnol. 2010 Aug;28(8):868–73.

59. Udeshi ND, Svinkina T, Mertins P, Kuhn E, Mani DR, Qiao JW, et al. Refined preparation and
use of anti-diglycine remnant (K-ε-GG) antibody enables routine quantification of 10,000s of
ubiquitination sites in single proteomics experiments. Mol Cell Proteomics. 2013
Mar;12(3):825–31.

60. Lumpkin RJ, Gu H, Zhu Y, Leonard M, Ahmad AS, Clauser KR, et al. Site-specific
identification and quantitation of endogenous SUMO modifications under native conditions.
Nat Commun. 2017 Oct 27;8:1171.

61. Lobato-Gil S, Heidelberger JB, Maghames C, Bailly A, Brunello L, Rodriguez MS, et al.
Proteome-wide identification of NEDD8 modification sites reveals distinct proteomes for
canonical and atypical NEDDylation. Cell Rep. 2021 Jan 19;34(3):108635.

62. Zhang Y, Thery F, Wu NC, Luhmann EK, Dussurget O, Foecke M, et al. The in vivo ISGylome
links ISG15 to metabolic pathways and autophagy upon Listeria monocytogenes infection.
Nat Commun. 2019 Nov 26;10(1):5383.

63. He R, Torres CA, Wang Y, He C, Zhong G. Type-I Interferon Signaling Protects against

Chlamydia trachomatis Infection in the Female Lower Genital Tract. Infect Immun. 2023 Jun

15;91(6):e0015323.

64. Prantner D, Darville T, Nagarajan UM. Stimulator of IFN gene is critical for induction of IFN-

beta during Chlamydia muridarum infection. J Immunol. 2010 Mar 1;184(5):2551–60.

65. Leber JH, Crimmins GT, Raghavan S, Meyer-Morse NP, Cox JS, Portnoy DA. Distinct TLR-

and NLR-Mediated Transcriptional Responses to an Intracellular Pathogen. PLOS

Pathogens. 2008 Jan 11;4(1):e6.

66. Woodward JJ, Iavarone AT, Portnoy DA. c-di-AMP secreted by intracellular Listeria

monocytogenes activates a host type I interferon response. Science. 2010 Jun

25;328(5986):1703–5.

67. Johnson JR, Parry T, Repasy T, Geiger KM, Verschueren E, Budzik JM, et al. Comparative

analysis of macrophage post-translational modifications during intracellular bacterial

pathogen infection [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2020 [cited 2024 Apr 25]. p. 2020.05.27.116772.

Available from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.27.116772v1

68. Bullen CK, Singh AK, Krug S, Lun S, Thakur P, Srikrishna G, et al. MDA5 RNA-sensing

pathway activation by Mycobacterium tuberculosis promotes innate immune subversion and

pathogen survival. JCI Insight. 2023 Oct 23;8(20):e166242.

69. Zhang L, Jiang X, Pfau D, Ling Y, Nathan CF. Type I interferon signaling mediates

Mycobacterium tuberculosis-induced macrophage death. J Exp Med. 2021 Feb

1;218(2):e20200887.

70. Kotov DI, Lee OV, Fattinger SA, Langner CA, Guillen JV, Peters JM, et al. Early cellular

mechanisms of type I interferon-driven susceptibility to tuberculosis. Cell. 2023 Dec

7;186(25):5536-5553.e22.

71. Miyake S, Lupher ML, Druker B, Band H. The tyrosine kinase regulator Cbl enhances the

ubiquitination and degradation of the platelet-derived growth factor receptor α. Proceedings

of the National Academy of Sciences. 1998;95(14):7927–32.

72. Christianson JC, Olzmann JA, Shaler TA, Sowa ME, Bennett EJ, Richter CM, et al. Defining

human ERAD networks through an integrative mapping strategy. Nat Cell Biol. 2011 Nov

27;14(1):93–105.

73. Yang L, Wang L, Ketkar H, Ma J, Yang G, Cui S, et al. UBXN3B positively regulates STING-

mediated antiviral immune responses. Nat Commun. 2018 Jun 13;9(1):2329.

74. Liu F, Tian T, Zhang Z, Xie S, Yang J, Zhu L, et al. Long non-coding RNA SNHG6 couples

cholesterol sensing with mTORC1 activation in hepatocellular carcinoma. Nat Metab. 2022

Aug;4(8):1022–40.

75. Gwon Y, Maxwell BA, Kolaitis RM, Zhang P, Kim HJ, Taylor JP. Ubiquitination of G3BP1

mediates stress granule disassembly in a context-specific manner. Science. 2021 Jun

25;372(6549):eabf6548.

76. Grøvdal LM, Stang E, Sorkin A, Madshus IH. Direct interaction of Cbl with pTyr 1045 of the

EGF receptor (EGFR) is required to sort the EGFR to lysosomes for degradation.

Experimental cell research. 2004;300(2):388–95.

77. Visser Smit GD, Place TL, Cole SL, Clausen KA, Vemuganti S, Zhang G, et al. Cbl Controls

EGFR Fate by Regulating Early Endosome Fusion. Science Signaling. 2009 Dec

22;2(102):ra86–ra86.

78. Budzik JM, Swaney DL, Jimenez-Morales D, Johnson JR, Garelis NE, Repasy T, et al.

Dynamic post-translational modification profiling of Mycobacterium tuberculosis-infected

primary macrophages. Elife. 2020 Jan 17;9:e51461.

79. Johnson JR, Crosby DC, Hultquist JF, Kurland AP, Adhikary P, Li D, et al. Global post-

translational modification profiling of HIV-1-infected cells reveals mechanisms of host cellular

pathway remodeling. Cell Rep. 2022 Apr 12;39(2):110690.

80. Torii S, Oishi W, Zhu Y, Thakali O, Malla B, Yu Z, et al. Comparison of five polyethylene glycol

precipitation procedures for the RT-qPCR based recovery of murine hepatitis virus,

bacteriophage phi6, and pepper mild mottle virus as a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from

wastewater. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 Feb 10;807:150722.

81. Tzelepis K, Koike-Yusa H, De Braekeleer E, Li Y, Metzakopian E, Dovey OM, et al. A CRISPR

Dropout Screen Identifies Genetic Vulnerabilities and Therapeutic Targets in Acute Myeloid

Leukemia. Cell Rep. 2016/10/21 ed. 2016 Oct 18;17(4):1193–205.

82. Liu Z, Chen O, Wall JBJ, Zheng M, Zhou Y, Wang L, et al. Systematic comparison of 2A

peptides for cloning multi-genes in a polycistronic vector. Sci Rep. 2017 May 19;7(1):2193.

83. Mohapatra B, Zutshi N, An W, Goetz B, Arya P, Bielecki TA, et al. An essential role of CBL

and CBL-B ubiquitin ligases in mammary stem cell maintenance. Development. 2017 Mar

15;144(6):1072–86.

84. Sherman BT, Hao M, Qiu J, Jiao X, Baseler MW, Lane HC, et al. DAVID: a web server for

functional enrichment analysis and functional annotation of gene lists (2021 update). Nucleic

Acids Research. 2022 Jul 5;50(W1):W216–21.

85. Brinkman EK, Chen T, Amendola M, van Steensel B. Easy quantitative assessment of

genome editing by sequence trace decomposition. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014 Dec

16;42(22):e168.

FIGURE 1

FIGURE 2

FIGURE 3

FIGURE 4

A

B

C

D

E

FAF2 Ubiquitylation Sites

F