Surface-mediated Bacteriophage Defense Incurs Fitness Tradeoffs for Interbacterial Antagonism

Chia-En Tsai[1,2,5], Feng-Qi Wang[2,5], Chih-Wen Yang[3], Ling-Li Yang[2], Yung-Chih Chen[2], Po-Yin Chen[1,2], Ing-Shouh Hwang[3], See-Yeun Ting[1,2,4†]

[1] Molecular and Cell Biology, Taiwan International Graduate Program, Academia Sinica and National Defense Medical Center, Taipei, 11490, Taiwan

[2] Institute of Molecular Biology, Academia Sinica, Taipei 11529, Taiwan

[3] Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei 115201, Taiwan

[4] Genome and Systems Biology Degree Program, National Taiwan University, Taipei 106319, Taiwan

[5] These authors contributed equally

†Correspondence: syting@gate.sinica.edu.tw

Keywords:

Phage; Lipopolysaccharide; Interbacterial Antagonism; Bacterial Immunity; Tail Spike Protein

ABSTRACT

Bacteria in polymicrobial habitats are constantly exposed to biotic threats from bacteriophages, antagonistic bacteria, and predatory eukaryotes. These antagonistic interactions play crucial roles in shaping the evolution and physiology of bacteria. To survive, bacteria have evolved mechanisms to protect themselves from such attacks, but the fitness costs of resisting one threat and rendering bacteria susceptible to others remain unappreciated. Here, we examined the fitness consequences of bacteriophage resistance in *Salmonella enterica*, revealing that phage-resistant variants exhibited significant fitness loss upon co-culture with competitor bacteria. These phage-resistant strains display varying degrees of lipopolysaccharide (LPS) deficiency and increased susceptibility to contact-dependent interbacterial antagonism, such as the type VI secretion system (T6SS). Utilizing mutational analyses and atomic force microscopy, we show that the long-modal length O-antigen of LPS serves as a protective barrier against T6SS-mediated intoxication. Notably, this competitive disadvantage can also be triggered independently by phages possessing LPS-targeting endoglycosidase in their tail spike proteins, which actively cleave the O-antigen upon infection. Our findings reveal two distinct mechanisms of phage-mediated LPS modifications that modulate interbacterial competition, shedding light on the dynamic microbial interplay within mixed populations.

INTRODUCTION

Microbial communities are frequently subjected to antagonistic interactions within their environments, predominantly from bacteriophages, bacterial competitors, and unicellular predatory eukaryotes. Phages, the most abundant biological entities on Earth, possess the capacity to devastate entire bacterial populations through lytic cycles[1]. Similarly, bacterial competitors

employ a diverse array of specialized mechanisms, such as the production of antibiotics, secretion

of antimicrobial peptides, deployment of toxin delivery systems, and utilization of membrane-

puncturing nanomachines, all aimed at inhibiting or killing rival bacteria[2-5]. Moreover, unicellular

eukaryotic predators, such as free-living protozoa, exert predation pressure on bacterial

populations through phagocytosis[6]. Collectively, these antagonistic interactions impose significant

selective pressures on bacteria that profoundly influence their evolution, ecology, and physiology.

To survive in such hostile environments, bacteria have evolved a broad spectrum of defense

mechanisms against biotic threats[7]. To mitigate or evade phage infection, bacteria have developed

strategies targeting nearly every stage of the phage life cycle[8]. Extracellular defenses, including

mutations   or   downregulation   of   surface   receptors   (*e.g.,*   membrane   proteins   and

lipopolysaccharides), can prevent phage attachment and subsequent infection[9, 10]. Intracellularly,

widely distributed defense systems—such as restriction-modification systems, CRISPR-Cas

systems, and abortive infection mechanisms, act to neutralize phages post-entry[8, 11, 12]. Parallel to

these antiviral defenses, bacteria have also evolved strategies to counteract the antagonism posed

by competitor bacteria. For instance, the acquisition of immunity determinants endows resistance

against specific interbacterial toxins and antimicrobial compounds[13, 14]. Furthermore, general

stress responses and competition-sensing pathways enhance bacterial resilience to antimicrobial

agents in both environmental and clinical contexts[15-17]. This dynamic interplay between microbial

offense and defense underscores the central importance of these interactions in shaping microbial

communities.

Although biotic pressures imposed by other microbes significantly drive the evolution of

bacterial immunity, accumulating evidence indicates that this evolutionary process is frequently

associated with fitness trade-offs[18]. A prominent example is bacterial surface modifications that

hinder phage attachment but concurrently compromise bacterial fitness upon encountering

antibiotics or host immune systems[10, 19-21]. Similarly, CRISPR-Cas immunity has been shown to

impose an increased metabolic burden on host cells, which may limit its distribution across

bacterial taxa[22-25]. Furthermore, though a mucoid phenotype confers partial protection against

bacteriophage infection, it often incurs fitness costs in the context of bacterial competition[26-28].

Recent research on *Escherichia coli* has also demonstrated that genetic variants resistant to

interbacterial intoxication may suffer from growth defects and increased susceptibility to

antimicrobial agents and environmental stresses[29]. Such fitness trade-offs associated with

antagonistic coevolution are highly context-dependent[30], but predicting their impact on microbial

community composition remains challenging due to the mechanisms underlying these fitness costs

frequently being poorly characterized.

In this study, we report that though bacteria develop surface modifications to protect

against viral infection, these modifications result in significant trade-offs in interbacterial

competition with antagonistic bacteria. We provide evidence that lipopolysaccharide (LPS), a

major component of the bacterial outer membrane, plays a previously unappreciated role in

protecting against contact-dependent killing by bacterial competitors. Remarkably, we have

discovered that mutations in LPS biosynthesis genes, as well as interactions with phages encoding

LPS-targeting endoglycosidase in their tail spike proteins, contribute to the observed competitive

disadvantage. Our study identifies two distinct mechanisms by which phage-mediated LPS

modifications influence interbacterial competition, highlighting the role of antagonistic

coevolution in shaping bacterial composition within polymicrobial communities.

RESULTS

Phage-resistant *S. enterica* Displays Competitive Fitness Deficits in Co-culture with Bacterial Competitors

To investigate if phage-resistant bacteria incur fitness consequences when interacting with bacterial competitors, we began by obtaining phage-resistant variants of the model bacterium, *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium, from an established transposon insertion library for pairwise bacterial co-culture experiments[31, 32] (Figure 1a). We reasoned that using this model bacterium and the mutant library would facilitate the identification of underlying pathways associated with competitive fitness costs. Consequently, we isolated distinct *S. enterica* variants that were resistant to model phages from different families of Caudovirales: Felix O1 (Myoviridae)[33], P22 (Podoviridae)[34], and Chi (Siphoviridae)[35] (Supplementary Figure 1a, b). Mutants exhibiting no significant growth defects under standard conditions were selected for further analysis (Supplementary Figures 1c, d). We then co-cultured individual strains with competitor bacteria, *i.e.*, Enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* (EHEC) or *Enterobacter cloacae,* in a one-to-one ratio in both liquid and solid media. We selected EHEC and *E. cloacae* due to their ecological overlap with *S. enterica* in the mammalian gastrointestinal tract, where they frequently co-occur during infections, representing a relevant model for studying competitive interactions in both environmental and clinical contexts[36-38].

Compared to the wild-type *S. enterica* strain, we found that none of the phage-resistant mutants exhibited competitive fitness differences in liquid broth co-culture assays with EHEC or *E. cloacae* (Figure 1b). However, in solid media, though phage-resistant mutants exhibited no observable fitness cost when incubated with EHEC, strains resistant to the Felix O1 and P22 phages displayed significant competitive disadvantage (relative survival < 1) upon co-cultured with *E. cloacae* (Figure 1c). This competitive phenotype was restricted to solid media, where cell-

cell contacts are relatively stable, indicating that the stress imposed by *E. cloacae* is likely contact-

dependent[39]. Interestingly, resistant strains against phage Chi did not present a similar fitness

disadvantage, indicating that bacteriophage-specific resistance mechanisms might underlie the

competitive trade-offs in *S. enterica* (Figure 1c). These findings prompted us to prioritize

investigating: (1) which gene mutations in *S. enterica* conferring resistance to phages Felix O1 and

P22 impose interbacterial competitive disadvantages on the bacteria; and (2) what mechanism in

E. cloacae is critical for the competitive phenotype observed in our co-culture assay.

Mutations in LPS Biosynthesis Genes Confer Competitive Disadvantages on *S. enterica*

To escape viral infection, bacteria often evolve and modify their surface receptors to

prevent phage entry[40]. Previous studies have identified LPS on the outer bacterial membrane as

the primary receptor for phages Felix O1 and P22[41, 42]. Accordingly, we postulated that our phage-

resistant *S. enterica* strains likely harbor mutations in LPS-related genes, thereby influencing their

susceptibility to *E. cloacae*. Indeed, we identified disruptive transposon insertions concentrated in

genes associated with the LPS biosynthesis pathway in our phage-resistant strains, indicating an

impairment in the outer membrane cell envelope of these mutants (Supplementary Figures 2a, b).

To confirm this finding, we compared LPS levels in these mutants relative to the wild-type strain.

LPS PAGE profiles revealed a significant reduction in LPS levels, particularly of the O-antigen,

in the Felix O1- and P22-resistant strains compared to wild-type (Figures 2a, b). In contrast, the

phage Chi-resistant *S. enterica* variants had transposon insertions in genes unrelated to LPS

biosynthesis, and their LPS levels were comparable to wild-type bacteria (Supplementary Figures

2c, d). Additionally, many of the Felix O1- and P22-resistant strains exhibited auto-aggregation in

unicellular culture (Supplementary Figures 2e, f), a phenotype associated with LPS deficiency[43,]

[44]. These findings indicate that disruption of LPS biosynthesis genes contributes to the competitive

fitness defects observed in *S. enterica* co-cultured with *E. cloacae* (Figure 1c).

Phage-resistant *S. enterica* Strains are More Susceptible to T6SS-mediated Intoxication

Next, we sought to elucidate the underlying cell contact-dependent mechanisms utilized by

E. cloacae in competing with *S. enterica*. Prior studies have shown that *E. cloacae* relies on

functional secretory systems, such as the type VI secretion system (T6SS) and the contact-

dependent growth inhibition (CDI) pathway, to outcompete their bacterial rivals[45, 46]. These

secretory systems translocate antibacterial toxins into neighboring cells upon direct cell-cell

interaction, facilitating potent mechanisms of contact-dependent intoxication between bacteria[47,

48]. Therefore, we hypothesized that the competitive fitness trade-offs observed in the phage-

resistant strains might be attributable to interbacterial antagonism mediated by these secretory

systems.

To determine if such antagonistic pathways in *E. cloacae* contribute to the competitive

defects of the Felix O1- and P22-resistant *S. enterica* strains, we subjected them to pairwise

competition under contact-promoting conditions against *E. cloacae* mutant strains in which the

T6SS (Δ*tssM*) or CDI (Δ*cdiA*) had been inactivated[45, 46]. Consistent with our co-culture

experiments, the phage-resistant variants displayed reduced competitiveness when incubated with

wild-type *E. cloacae* (Figures 2c, d). Notably, T6SS inactivation abrogated the competitive defect

of the phage-resistant strains, whereas the competitive phenotype persisted in competition with *E.*

cloacae Δ*cdiA* (Figures 2e-h). These results support the notion that the competitive fitness deficit

in the phage-resistant strains arises from T6SS-mediated interbacterial antagonism.

LPS O-antigen Protects *S. enterica* from T6SS-mediated Assaults

Although the T6SS is an effective antibacterial mechanism, target cells can evade being

killed by avoiding direct contact with T6+ bacteria[49]. One strategy to do so is for target cells to

produce extracellular biopolymers, such as secreted exopolysaccharides, membrane-attached

capsules, or colanic acid, all of which may act as a physical barrier against T6SS-mediated

attacks[15, 50, 51]. LPS, a major component of Gram-negative bacterial surfaces, is known to confer

protection against external stresses such as antibiotics, antimicrobial peptides, and host immune

systems[52, 53]. Therefore, the observed competitive disadvantage we observed in LPS-deficient *S.*

enterica led us to explore the function of LPS in protecting against T6SS-mediated assaults.

LPS is comprised of lipid A covalently linked to core oligosaccharides (core OS) and

repetitive O-units (O-antigen) (Figure 3a). First, we sought to determine if the sugar composition

of the core OS is involved in protecting *S. enterica* against T6SS. We constructed in-frame

deletions of LPS-related genes in *S. enterica* differing in core OS structures (*i.e.,* WaaL, WaaJ,

WaaO, WaaG for the main chain OS structure, or WaaK, WaaB, WaaQ, WaaY for the side chain)[54]

(Figure 3a). If the LPS structure exerts a protective role, we anticipated that mutants hosting these

mutated genes would exhibit competitive fitness defects upon co-incubation with *E. cloacae*

carrying an active T6SS. Indeed, though mutations in the LPS-related genes did not result in

significant growth defects in unicellular cultures (Supplementary Figures 3a-c), strains deficient

in the genes essential for building the main chain OS structure displayed lower interbacterial

competitiveness than the wild-type strain (Figures 3b, c and Supplementary Figure 3d), similar to

the results we observed for LPS-deficient phage-resistant variants (Figures 2c, d). In contrast, *S.*

enterica mutants in which the side chain OS structure was perturbed presented indistinguishable

competitiveness to wild-type, except for the WaaK-deficient strain (Figures 3d, e and

Supplementary Figure 3e). Previous studies demonstrated that WaaK is required for proper ligation

of O-antigen to the core OS of LPS[55]. Indeed, LPS PAGE profiles supported the findings that O-

antigen levels in the ΔwaaK strain were reduced significantly, *i.e.*, to levels similar to those in the

O-antigen ligase-knockout cells (ΔwaaL) (Figure 3e). Together, these results indicate that the O-

antigen extending from the core OS plays a crucial role in protecting *S. enterica* from T6SS-

mediated interbacterial antagonism.

O-antigens are hypervariable repeat polysaccharides that present heterogeneity and a wide

range of chain lengths, which determine the uniqueness of bacterial serotypes[56]. Previous studies

have demonstrated that chain length regulators, such as WzzB and FepE, determine O-antigen

length and degree of polymerization in *S. enterica*[57, 58]. LPS PAGE profiles indicated that WzzB

is responsible for producing long (L)-modal length O-antigen chains (16-35 sugar repeat units),

whereas FepE is responsible for very long (VL) ones (>100 sugar repeat units) (Figure 3f). To

better define the protective role of O-antigen in protecting against interbacterial antagonism, we

constructed ΔwzzB and ΔfepE strains and subjected them to competition assays against *E. cloacae*

carrying an active T6SS. Interestingly, only the ΔwzzB cells displayed significant competitive

defects, whereas ΔfepE cells showed wild-type levels of protection (Figure 3g). In addition, both

mutants showed comparable survival in competition with *E. cloacae* ΔtssM (Supplementary Figure

3f). Therefore, our mutational analyses and LPS PAGE profiles indicated that L-modal length O-

antigen is sufficient to protect *S. enterica* from T6SS intoxication.

LPS-mediated Protection Against T6SS Attack Extends to Other Gram-negative Bacteria

Though LPS structure varies among Gram-negative species[56, 59], we speculated that its

intrinsic protective capacity against T6SS could be broadly conserved. We tested this hypothesis

by examining the protective function of LPS from the distantly related model species: Enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* (EHEC) and *Citrobacter rodentium*. We constructed LPS-deficient strains (Δ*waaO*) of these species and then subjected them to pairwise competition assays against *E. cloacae* with or without an active T6SS. Compared to the wild-type strain, LPS-deficient cells presented significant competitive deficits when incubated with *E. cloacae* carrying a functional T6SS (Figures 3h, i). Inactivation of the T6SS abrogated the fitness defects of those variants in the competition assay, supporting the notion that LPS-mediated protection against the T6SS is conserved beyond *S. enterica* (Supplementary Figure 3g).

LPS-targeting Endoglycosidase in Phage Tail Spike Protein Increases Susceptibility to Interbacterial Antagonism

We have demonstrated herein that mutations in *S. enterica* genes involved in LPS biosynthesis lead to increased susceptibility to T6SS-mediated attacks. Nevertheless, apart from genetic variations in bacteria altering LPS structures, external stresses can also induce LPS modifications, thereby compromising their protective capacity against antimicrobials from predators and hosts, as well as environmental factors[60]. Consequently, we wanted to examine if external stress-mediated LPS modification could influence the susceptibility of *S. enterica* during interbacterial competition.

In our investigation into potential external modifiers of LPS, we found that many phages, including our model phage P22, encode a dual-function tail spike protein (TSP) with LPS-targeting endoglycosidase activity[61] (Figure 4a, Supplementary Figure 1a). This phage protein mediates recognition of the bacterial host LPS receptor and hydrolyzes the O-antigen, allowing phages to penetrate the bacterial cell envelope and inject their DNA upon viral infection[41, 62] (Figures 4b, c).

Notably, the TSP is highly active and stable under extreme conditions, making it an ideal external

agent to test our hypothesis without genetically manipulating *S. enterica*[63].

Consistent with previous reports, the TSP from phage P22 could be heterologously

expressed and affinity-purified in high amounts[64] (Supplementary Figure 4a). LPS PAGE profiles

indicated that wild-type TSP, but not the catalytic aspartate mutant TSP_{D392N}, degraded the O-

antigen of *S. enterica* (Figure 4d). Cells treated with TSP (wild-type or D392N) did not exhibit

detectable growth defects in monoculture (Supplementary Figure 4b), but phage titers were

dramatically reduced, indicating that TSP treatment prevents P22 from recognizing the LPS

receptor (Figure 4e). Next, we assessed if TSP-treated *S. enterica* exhibits increased susceptibility

to T6SS-mediated assaults. Indeed, TSP-treated cells showed reduced interbacterial

competitiveness when co-incubated with *E. cloacae* possessing an active T6SS compared to the

control experiment using either wild-type cells or cells treated with TSP_{D392N} (Figure 4f). The

resulting competitive fitness defect was similar to that observed for the LPS-deficient strain

($\Delta waaL$) (Figure 4f). Inactivation of the T6SS abrogated the fitness defects in TSP-treated cells

(Figure 4g). These results indicate that external LPS modifiers from phages, such as TSP with

endoglycosidase activity, can sensitize *S. enterica* to T6SS-mediated attacks.

Phage-carrying Endoglycosidase Sensitizes *S. enterica* to Interbacterial Antagonism in

Mixed Populations

Our data to this point support a model whereby the endoglycosidase activity of TSP cleaves

LPS O-antigen on bacterial cell surfaces, thereby sensitizing the bacteria to T6SS-mediated

assaults (Figure 4f, g). However, treating cells with concentrated, purified TSP might yield non-

physiologically relevant outcomes. In natural polymicrobial communities, TSP is anchored to the

phage tail baseplate during viral particle assembly[65], so the free-form of TSP is likely present at

much lower concentrations than those used in our assays. Therefore, we investigated if the

presence of intact phage virions containing enzymatically active TSP could sensitize target bacteria

to interbacterial antagonism (Figure 5a).

Remarkably, when we incubated *S. enterica* with both phage P22 and *E. cloacae* carrying

an active T6SS, *S. enterica* survival significantly decreased (Figure 5b). The deficient fitness

phenotype was abolished when the T6SS of *E. cloacae* was inactivated or when *S. enterica* was

incubated with Felix O1 or Chi phages, which lack endoglycosidase activity in their tail spikes or

tail fibers[33, 66] (Figures 5b, c). These results corroborate our hypothesis that phages containing an

endoglycosidase targeting LPS sensitize host bacteria to T6SS-mediated attacks in mixed

microbial populations.

To validate this finding, we first ensured that *S. enterica* did not develop resistance to P22

during the phage-bacterium co-culture assay. Reinfecting surviving *S. enterica* with P22 resulted

in plaque titers comparable to those before the experiment, indicating that the competitive

phenotype was unlikely due to genetic adaptation (Supplementary Figure 5a). Next, we confirmed

that P22 does not cross-infect *E. cloacae*, as revealed by no P22 plaques being observed even at a

high plaque-forming unit (PFU) concentration using *E. cloacae* as the host (Supplementary Figure

5b). To further minimize the impact of viral infection from different phages, we subjected phages

to 254 nm UV-C irradiation to crosslink their DNA, preventing DNA injection into *S. enterica*

while retaining the enzymatic activity of TSP in the tail spikes (Figure 5d). Strikingly, though

phage titers decreased dramatically following UV treatment, the competitive fitness deficits

against the T6SS persisted in assays with *E. cloacae* and UV-treated P22 (Figures 5e-g). Again, no

detectable competitive fitness differences were observed when *S. enterica* was incubated with UV-

treated Felix O1 or Chi (Figures 5f, g and Supplementary Figures 5c, d). Together, these outcomes

strongly indicate that bacteriophages with endoglycosidase activity in their TSPs for binding and

hydrolyzing LPS increase the susceptibility of *S. enterica* to interbacterial antagonism in mixed

microbial populations.

Evidence that the O-antigen of LPS Serves as a Physical Barrier against Interacting Bacteria

The LPS-containing outer membrane of Gram-negative species serves as a barrier against

various harmful agents, including hydrophobic antibiotics, antimicrobial peptides, detergents, and

bile acids[67, 68]. The structural complexity of LPS is critical for regulating membrane permeability,

which may be compromised by any modifications[69]. Previous studies have demonstrated that LPS

remodeling can alter the negative charge on the bacterial surface or affect the binding of divalent

cations, thereby impacting the stability of the outer membrane[70]. Therefore, one plausible

explanation for the observed interbacterial competitive defects displayed by our LPS O-antigen-

deficient variants is an increase in permeability of their outer membrane. To investigate this

possibility, we performed two standard outer membrane permeability assays: *i*) N-phenyl-1-

napthylamine (NPN) uptake; and *ii*) vancomycin (VAN) sensitivity. NPN is a hydrophobic

fluorescent probe that exhibits increased fluorescence upon interacting with the hydrophobic core

of a disrupted membrane, making it a reliable indicator of membrane permeability[71]. Vancomycin,

a glycopeptide antibiotic, is typically ineffective against Gram-negative bacteria due to its large

molecular size and inability to penetrate an intact outer membrane. However, its efficacy can

increase if membrane integrity is compromised[72]. Therefore, these assays can provide robust

measures of outer membrane permeability.

In the NPN uptake assay, we observed that wild-type cells pretreated with the metal

chelator ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA) showed a significant increase in NPN

fluorescence, indicative of membrane disruption. However, no significant difference in NPN

uptake was observed between the wild-type cells and the O-antigen-deficient mutants (*i.e.,* Δ*wzzB*,

which lacks L-modal length O-antigen, and Δ*waaL* that lacks all O-antigens) (Figure 6a). Similarly,

in the VAN sensitivity assay, neither mutant strain demonstrated increased sensitivity to

vancomycin compared to the wild-type strain (Figure 6b). These results are in line with previous

studies on LPS in *E. coli*, which have shown that the core OS of LPS is particularly crucial for

maintaining outer membrane permeability[73]. As both the Δ*wzzB* and Δ*waaL* mutants preserve the

core OS structure, their increased susceptibility to T6SS-mediated attacks is unlikely to be

attributable to compromised outer membrane permeability.

Given that the T6SS punctures and injects toxins into interacting bacteria in a contact-

dependent manner[74], we next hypothesized that the O-antigen of LPS might act as a physical

barrier, partially hindering T6SS-mediated penetration by limiting close-range interaction. To test

this hypothesis, we immobilized *S. enterica* wild-type and O-antigen-deficient mutants on a mica

substrate and employed atomic force microscopy (AFM) to characterize bacterial surface

morphology[75] (Figure 6c). Interestingly, the resolved AFM images reveal distinct and clear

grooved structures on the surfaces of both the wild-type and Δ*wzzB* mutant (Figures 6d, e). In

contrast, the Δ*waaL* mutant, which retains only the core OS, displayed a more flattened surface

(Figure 6f). A similar groove-like surface morphology has been observed in other bacteria[76, 77], and

flattened cell surfaces have been noted in O-antigen-deficient cells[78].

To gain more insight into the mechanical properties of LPS, we further analyzed the force-

distance curves, which represent the interaction between the AFM tip and the bacterial surface

(Figure 6g). The force-distance profiles of both wild-type and mutant strains exhibited two distinct force-slope changes, indicative of interactions with two different substrates (Supplementary Figure 6). The first substrate corresponds to the LPS layer, and the second stiffer substrate represents the outer membrane and cell wall (Figure 6c). For a more precise description, we defined point 1 as the initial contact between the AFM tip and the LPS layer ($x = 0$, $y = 0$), and point 2 as the transition point between the LPS layer and the outer membrane (Figure 6g). By measuring the distance between points 1 and 2, we determined that LPS length in wild-type cells is 5.39±1.16 nm, consistent with predictions for intact LPS structures (Figure 6h). In contrast, Δ*wzzB* cells, which lack L-modal O-antigen, exhibited a reduced LPS length of 3.96±0.424 nm, and Δ*waaL* cells that retain only the core OS had an LPS length of 3.39±0.41 nm (Figures 6i, j). LPS length in wild-type cells was significantly more variable than in the mutants, implying heterogeneity in LPS structure (Figure 6k). The loss of L-modal O-antigen in Δ*wzzB* led to a marked reduction in the force region, similar to the reduction observed in the Δ*waaL* mutant (Figure 6k). These LPS lengths are comparable to those reported in studies of *E. coli* strains with the core OS but lacking O-antigen, for which LPS length was approximately 3±2 nm[76]. The reduction in LPS length we determined for our O-antigen-deficient mutants indicates that the O-antigen functions as a physical barrier, potentially hindering close interactions with competing bacteria.

DISCUSSION

Bacterial integrity has been shaped over billions of years through interactions with other microorganisms, with antagonistic interactions serving as a key driver of bacterial evolution and physiology[7]. Extensive research has elucidated the diverse mechanisms bacteria employ to defend themselves from biotic threats, highlighting their importance in the survival and adaptation of

bacterial species. Although these defensive adaptations offer clear evolutionary benefits, they are

not without fitness costs[18, 25]. Our results demonstrate that though modification of surface receptors

enables bacterial populations to effectively resist and adapt rapidly to phage infection, such

adaptation imposes significant fitness costs, increasing susceptibility to contact-dependent killing

by other antagonistic bacteria. These findings emphasize the fine balance between adaptation and

vulnerability in microbial interactions, suggesting that antagonistic coevolution plays a pivotal role

in shaping the dynamics of bacterial communities.

Our results reveal a hitherto unappreciated dual role for LPS as both a receptor for phage

adsorption and a protective barrier against close-contact bacterial competitors. Our observation

that T6SS-mediated interbacterial antagonism is more effective against LPS-deficient strains

implies a significant evolutionary trade-off, wherein resistance to phage predation may increase

susceptibility to other biotic threats. Furthermore, our results indicate that the protective function

of LPS against the T6SS is likely conserved across different Gram-negative bacteria, as evidenced

by the similar competitive fitness defects observed in LPS-deficient variants of *E. coli* and *C.*

rodentium. This evolutionary conservation points to broader ecological implications, with

modifications of the LPS potentially significantly influencing microbial community composition

across different populations.

The extent to which LPS protects against other contact-dependent killing mechanisms

beyond the T6SS remains unclear. For example, bacterial genera such as *Xanthomonas* and

Stenotrophomonas possess a Type IV Secretion System (T4SS) specialized in transferring toxic

effectors into neighboring cells in a contact-dependent manner, leading to cell death[79-81]. The

evidence presented in our study supports that LPS functions as a physical barrier, potentially

hindering close contact with interacting bacteria. Therefore, it is plausible that LPS might similarly

interfere with toxin delivery by other bacterial nanomachines, representing a broader defensive

strategy against diverse biotic threats.

Interestingly, our study has also revealed that phages can influence interbacterial

competition in ways beyond direct lysis. Specifically, phages with endoglycosidase activity in their

TSPs can degrade the O-antigen of target bacteria, thereby sensitizing them to interbacterial

antagonism. This scenario adds a new dimension to our understanding of phage-bacterial

interactions, whereby phages not only act as predators but also modulate bacterial interactions by

compromising the structural integrity of bacterial membranes. Notably, purified TSP, unlike whole

phage particles, do not promote resistant mutations as they do not directly kill bacteria[82]

(Supplementary Figure 4b). Our discovery reveals a plausible mechanism by which TSP facilitates

the clearance of target cells, with antagonistic bacteria that occupy the same ecological niches

potentially eliminating competitors more effectively when the LPS of those competitors is cleaved

by exogenous TSP[64].

We propose a working model of how phages may act as a key modulator of interbacterial

competition within bacterial communities (Figure 7). In the absence of phages, bacterial

competitors deploy specialized weaponry, such as the T6SS, to antagonize rivals and promote

niche partitioning. However, in the presence of phages, two distinct scenarios could alter this

dynamic: (1) bacteria may develop protective modifications on their surfaces to prevent phage

adsorption, reducing the likelihood of infection; or (2) phages equipped with LPS-targeting

endoglycosidases in their TSPs cleave the LPS of recipient cells. Both scenarios increase the

susceptibility of target cells to contact-dependent killing, facilitating niche invasion and leading to

the competitive exclusion of target populations. This phage-driven enhancement of bacterial

competition introduces a novel layer of complexity to microbial interactions, emphasizing the dual

evolutionary pressures imposed by both phage predation and bacterial antagonism. Our findings

underscore the critical role phages play in influencing bacterial competition and shaping microbial

community structure. The interplay between bacterial defense mechanisms and phage-mediated

pressures indicates that, beyond their traditional role as predators, phages may act as indirect

facilitators of interbacterial interactions. This model establishes a framework for future studies to

investigate these dynamics across diverse microbial ecosystems and environmental contexts,

which is essential for a comprehensive understanding of microbial ecology.

Further research should focus on how these interactions influence the long-term stability

and composition of bacterial populations in natural settings. In addition, the therapeutic potential

of phage-derived enzymes, such as TSP, should be explored in greater detail, particularly given the

growing global threat of antibiotic resistance. Phage-derived enzymes could offer a novel approach

to antimicrobial therapy by targeting bacterial defenses and enhancing the efficacy of conventional

treatment strategies[83].

METHODS

Bacteria, bacteriophages, and culture conditions

The bacterial and phage strains used in this study are listed in Supplementary Table 1. The

following *Escherichia coli* strains were used: DH5α and PIR1 for cloning and plasmid

maintenance; S17-1 λ pir for conjugal transfer of the pRE118 plasmid into *S. enterica*, *E. coli*, and

C. rodentium; and BL21 (DE3) for overproduction and purification of TSP protein samples.

Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium ATCC-14028, *Enterobacter cloacae* ATCC-13047, and

enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* EDL933 were used for bacterial co-culture and competition

assays. Bacterial strains were routinely grown in Luria Bertani (LB) medium or Brain Heart

Infusion (BHI) medium with appropriate antibiotics at 37 °C and shaking at 200 rpm. Antibiotics were used at the following concentrations: 50 µg/mL for kanamycin, 25 µg/mL for chloramphenicol, 50 µg/mL for streptomycin, and 50 µg/mL for nalidixic acid.

Plasmid construction

All plasmids and primers used in our study are listed in Supplementary Table 1. In-frame chromosomal deletions were created using pRE118 for *S. enterica*, *E. coli*, and *C. rodentium*. To generate chromosomal mutation constructs, 800 bp regions flanking the mutation site were PCR amplified, sewed together, and inserted into the vector via Gibson assembly at *XbaI* and *SacI* restriction sites[84]. For P22 TSP purification constructs, the amino acid residues spanning 109-666 were PCR amplified and cloned into pETDuet-1 with N-terminal His6-tagged via Gibson assembly at *BamHI* and *NotI* restriction sites. TSP catalytic mutant D392N was generated using site-directed mutagenesis[85].

Generation of mutant strains of *S. enterica*, *E. coli*, and *C. rodentium*

To generate deletions in *S. enterica*, *E. coli*, and *C. rodentium*, mutation constructs cloned into pRE118 were transformed into conjugative *E. coli* S-17 λ pir[86]. Conjugative donor cells carrying the deletion construct and recipient cells were grown overnight on LB plates containing the appropriate antibiotics. The donor and recipient cells were then mixed at a 10:1 ratio, spotted onto LB agar plates, and incubated at 37 °C for 6 hours to allow transfer of the deletion plasmid via conjugation. The cell mixtures were scraped into LB medium and plated onto LB agar supplemented with kanamycin and chloramphenicol (for *S. enterica* and *E. coli*) or kanamycin and nalidixic acid (for *C. rodentium*) to select for cells containing the chromosomally inserted deletion

construct. The merodiploid strains were grown overnight in non-selective LB medium at 37 °C,

followed by counter-selection on nutrient agar supplemented with 10% (*w/v*) sucrose at room

temperature. Kanamycin-sensitive colonies were picked, and the deletions were confirmed by

colony PCR and Sanger sequencing. The chloramphenicol-resistant *S. enterica* and *E. coli* strains

were generated using pGRG37 methods[87].

Phage propagation

S. enterica ATCC-14028 was used as the host for phage propagation to obtain a high-titer

phage lysate (>10^8 PFU). An overnight culture was diluted in 50 mL of fresh LB broth to an OD_{600}

of 0.015 and incubated at 37 °C until the OD_{600} reached 0.2. Phage lysate was then added at a low

multiplicity of infection (MOI = 0.1), and the culture was incubated at 37 °C for 6 hours. After

incubation, the mixture was centrifuged at 6,000 x *g* for 10 minutes and filtered through a 0.2-µm

filter. The phage lysate was stored at 4 °C until use, and the phage titer was determined by spot

assays.

Spot assay

To calculate the phage titer, 100 µL of mid-log phase *S. enterica* (OD_{600} = 0.5 – 0.8) was mixed

with either 4 mL of prewarmed 0.7% (*w/v*) soft LB agar or 8 mL of 0.5% (*w/v*) soft BHI agar and

immediately poured onto 1.5% (*w/v*) regular LB agar plates. Then, 2 µL of 10-fold serially diluted

phage lysate was spotted onto the bacterial lawn. The plates were allowed to dry at room

temperature and subsequently incubated at 37 °C overnight. The number of visible single plaques

in each spot was counted to calculate the phage titer.

Transposon mutant library construction

      The *S. enterica* transposon mutant library was constructed as described previously, with slight modifications[88]. In brief, *S. enterica* cultures were harvested at mid-log phase ($OD_{600} = 0.5$) and gently washed with sterilized 10% (*w/v*) glycerol. The EZ-Tn5<KAN-2> Tnp transposome complex (Epicentre BioTechnologies) was added to the electrocompetent cells, which were incubated on ice for 10 minutes. The mixture was then transferred to an ice-cold 1-mm electroporation cuvette and electroporated at 2,450 V. Pre-warmed SOC medium was added, and the cells were allowed to recover at 37 °C for 90 minutes. Tn5 mutants were selected on LB agar plates containing kanamycin, pooled, and stored in LB medium with 50% (*w/v*) glycerol at -80 °C. Approximately 12,000 Tn5::KanR insertion mutants were collected.

Isolation of phage-resistant variants

      The *S. enterica* transposon library was inoculated into fresh LB broth containing kanamycin and incubated at 37 °C until the culture reached the early log phase ($OD_{600} = 0.2$). Phage lysate containing 10^8 PFU was then added to the culture, which was incubated at 37 °C for 1 hour. The OD_{600} was monitored hourly until the culture reached mid-log phase ($OD_{600} = 0.5$). Bacterial samples from the infected culture were plated on LB agar containing kanamycin and incubated at 37 °C overnight. Colonies of *S. enterica* that grew on the plates were picked and tested for phage resistance by spot assay. To confirm that the phage-resistant variants were not lysogens, the putative phage-resistant cells were treated with mitomycin C and plated on an *S. enterica* lawn for further analysis.

Identification of bacteriophage-resistant mutations

The workflow for identifying phage-resistant mutations is depicted in Supplementary

Figure 2a. Phage-resistant strains were grown in LB broth at 37 °C overnight, followed by genomic

DNA (gDNA) extraction using a DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit (Qiagen). Primer extension with

single primer (EzTn_s) was performed to amplify a fragment of the Tn5-gDNA junction. The

extension cycle included a manual hot start, with initial denaturation at 95 °C for 2 minutes,

followed by the addition of polymerase. The linear extension products were purified using

SPRIselect Bead-Based Reagent (Beckman Coulter). A deoxycytidine homopolymer tail (C-tail)

was added to the 3' end of the linear extension products using terminal deoxynucleotidyl

transferase (TdT; New England Biolabs). The reaction was carried out at 37 °C for 1 hour, followed

by enzyme inactivation at 75 °C for 20 minutes. The C-tailed products were then purified again

using SPRIselect Bead-Based Reagent. The purified C-tailed products were enriched by PCR using

Tn5_F and Tn5_R primers. Finally, the PCR products were heated at 65 °C for 15 minutes and

analyzed on 1.5% agarose gels. DNA fragments ranging from 300 to 500 bp were gel extracted for

Sanger sequencing and BLAST analysis.

Monoculture bacterial growth in LB broth

Bacteria were cultured overnight and subsequently diluted to an OD_{600} of 0.1 in LB broth.

A total of 100 µL of the diluted cells was transferred to 96-well, clear-bottom microplates, and the

growth rate was measured every 10 minutes for 12 hours using an Infinite F200 series plate reader

(Tecan). To prevent cell aggregation, 10 seconds of shaking was applied prior to each measurement.

Blank media and the wild-type strain were included on each plate, and at least three biological

replicates were measured for each sample.

Monoculture bacterial growth on solid agar

Overnight cultures grown in LB medium were pelleted, washed, and adjusted to an OD_{600} = 20. Cell mixture (5 µL) was spotted onto nitrocellulose filters placed on LB agar plates and incubated at 37 °C for 12 hours. Cells were then scraped from the nitrocellulose and resuspended in 200 µL of LB broth. Initial and post-co-culture cell counts were determined by performing 10-fold serial dilutions and plating the dilutions on LB agar plates containing the appropriate antibiotic.

LPS analysis

LPS was analyzed as previously described, with some modifications[89]. In brief, overnight bacterial culture (10 OD_{600}) was pelleted and resuspended in 150 µL of Dissociation Buffer A (0.5 M Tris-HCl pH 6.8, 10% (*w/v*) glycerol, 10% (*w/v*) SDS, 5% (*v/v*) β-mercaptoethanol), followed by boiling for 10 minutes. After cooling to room temperature, the samples were centrifuged at 18,000 x *g* for 15 minutes. The supernatant (100 µL) was diluted into 900 µL of Dissociation Buffer B (0.5 M Tris-HCl pH 6.8, 10% (*w/v*) glycerol, 0.05% (w/v) bromophenol blue) supplemented with 1 µL of 20 mg/mL proteinase K, and incubated at 37 °C for 1 hour. The samples were separated on 12% or 20% (*w/v*) SDS-PAGE and stained using a Pro-Q Emerald 300 Lipopolysaccharide Gel Stain Kit (Invitrogen) for imaging.

Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) analysis

For TEM analysis, 4 µL droplets of phage lysate (~10^{10} PFU/mL) were placed on copper grids (300 mesh) coated with a carbon-coated formvar film (Ted Pella Inc., Redding, CA). The phage lysate was allowed to settle for 1 minute at room temperature and then dried using 3M filter paper. Negative staining was performed with 1% (*w/v*) uranyl acetate for 30 seconds, after which

the excess stain was removed with 3M filter paper. The sample was gently washed three times with

sterilized distilled deionized water, and the grid was air-dried overnight at room temperature.

Phage morphology was visualized using a Talos 120 C transmission electron microscope (Thermo,

Waltham, US).

Bacterial co-culture experiments

Overnight cultures grown in LB medium were pelleted, washed, and adjusted to an OD_{600}

of 5 for liquid co-culture assays or to an OD_{600} of 20 for assays on solid agar. Cells were mixed at

a 1:1 ratio in LB broth and incubated at 37 °C for 1 hour. For solid agar experiments, 5 μL of the

cell mixture was spotted onto nitrocellulose filters placed on LB agar plates and incubated at 37

°C for 3 hours. Cells were then scraped from the nitrocellulose and resuspended in 200 μL of LB

broth. Initial and post-co-culture cell counts were determined by performing 10-fold serial

dilutions and plating the dilutions on LB agar plates containing the appropriate antibiotics. Relative

survival of the bacteria was calculated as the ratio of post-co-culture colony forming units (CFUs)

to the average CFUs of wild-type *S. enterica*.

Macroscopic cell aggregation assay

Macroscopic cell aggregation assays were performed as described previously, with slight

modifications[90]. Bacterial cultures were grown overnight at 37 °C in LB broth containing

kanamycin. After incubation, the cultures were vortexed and transferred to a 2-mm cuvette. The

bacterial cultures were then allowed to settle at room temperature for 22 hours to observe cell

aggregation.

Bacterial competition assays

Competition assays were performed as described previously, with slight modifications[91]. The bacterial strains used in the assays were cultured overnight at 37 °C, harvested by centrifugation, washed, and resuspended in LB medium. *E. cloacae* was used as the donor strain, whereas *S. enterica*, *E. coli*, and *C. rodentium* served as the recipient strains. Donor and recipient cells were mixed at a 10:1 ratio, and a 5 μL aliquot of the mixture was spotted onto nitrocellulose filters placed on pre-warmed LB agar plates. The plates were incubated at 37 °C for 1 hour. Cells were then scraped from the nitrocellulose and resuspended in 200 μL of LB broth. Initial and post-competition CFU counts were determined by performing 10-fold serial dilutions and plating on LB agar plates containing the appropriate antibiotics. The bacterial relative protective index was calculated as the ratio of the output recipient-to-donor ratio divided by the input recipient-to-donor ratio, followed by normalization to the protective index of wild-type *S. enterica*.

To assess if phage-derived external modifiers of LPS could influence bacterial susceptibility to T6SS-mediated attacks, wild-type *S. enterica* cells were treated with purified TSP (10 nM), live phages (10^5 PFU/mL), or UV-inactivated phages (10^5 PFU/mL) for 10 minutes at 37 °C. Treated cells were then mixed with *E. cloacae* at a 10:1 donor-to-recipient ratio, and the mixture was spotted onto nitrocellulose filters placed on pre-warmed LB agar plates. After incubation at 37 °C for 1 hour, cells were collected by scraping them from the filters and resuspending them in 200 μL of LB broth. Initial and post-co-culture CFU counts were determined through serial dilutions and plating on LB agar with selective antibiotics. The bacterial relative protective index was calculated as the ratio of the output recipient-to-donor ratio divided by the input recipient-to-donor ratio and normalized to the protective index of wild-type *S. enterica*.

P22 TSP purification

Purification of recombinant P22 TSP (wild-type and D392N mutant) was performed as described previously[92]. In brief, the N-terminal His$_6$-tagged TSP was expressed in *E. coli* BL21 (DE3). An overnight culture was diluted 100-fold into 1 L of LB medium containing carbenicillin and incubated at 37 °C until the culture reached mid-log phase (OD_{600} = 0.6 - 0.8). TSP expression was induced by adding 1 mM IPTG and incubating at 37 °C for 4 hours. Cells were harvested by centrifugation at 4 °C and resuspended in 20 mL of resuspension buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 300 mM NaCl, 5 mM imidazole pH 7.0, 1 mM DTT, and a protease inhibitor cocktail). The resuspended cells were disrupted by sonication, and cell debris was removed by centrifugation at $40,000 \times g$ for 30 minutes at 4 °C. The soluble His$_6$-TSP was purified from the supernatant using gravity flow through a 2 mL Ni-NTA agarose column. Bound proteins were eluted using a linear imidazole gradient (25 to 300 mM). Purified proteins were analyzed by 12.5% (*w/v*) SDS-PAGE followed by Coomassie Brilliant Blue staining.

Bacteriophage inactivation by UV treatment

The purified phage stock was diluted to ~10^9 PFU/mL, and 1 mL aliquots were placed in Petri dishes covered with parafilm. The dishes were exposed to 254 nm UV light using a Stratalinker UV Crosslinker 1800 (Stratagene, La Jolla, CA) for the indicated time intervals. Phage infection efficiency following UV treatment was assessed by spot assay (Figure 5e, Supplementary Figures 5c, d).

Membrane permeability assays

Outer membrane permeability was assessed using NPN uptake and VAN sensitivity assays,

as described previously[71, 93]. For the NPN uptake assay, mid-log phase cultures ($OD_{600} = 0.5$) were

pelleted and gently washed with 5 mM HEPES buffer (pH 7.2). An equal volume of HEPES buffer

containing 20 µM NPN was added to the samples and mixed thoroughly. As a control, 1 mM EDTA

was added to wild-type cells. Fluorescence was measured using an optical-bottom black plate in a

SpectraMax iD5 microplate reader (Molecular Devices) with excitation at 350 nm and emission at

420 nm, recorded at 30-second intervals for 10 minutes. Data collected over 10 minutes were

averaged, and NPN uptake activity was normalized by subtracting the background fluorescence in

the absence of NPN. For the VAN sensitivity assay, overnight cultures were diluted to an OD_{600} of

0.05 in 25 mL of LB broth, followed by the addition of 150 µg/mL vancomycin. As a control, 1

mM EDTA was added to wild-type cells. After 2 hours of incubation at 37 °C, CFUs were

determined by performing 10-fold serial dilutions and plating on LB agar.

Atomic force microscopy (AFM)

Atomic force microscopy (AFM) sample preparation was performed as described

previously, with some modifications[94]. An overnight bacterial culture was diluted 100-fold and

incubated at 37 °C until it reached mid-log phase ($OD_{600} = 0.6 – 0.8$). Cells were harvested by

centrifugation at $OD_{600} = 1$, washed, and then resuspended in 10 mM HEPES buffer (pH 7.4)[95].

For immobilization, 200 µL of the bacterial suspension was applied to freshly cleaved mica and

incubated for 20 minutes at room temperature. Following immobilization, the sample was gently

rinsed with Milli-Q water to remove any non-adherent cells, then air-dried in a desiccator for 30

minutes prior to AFM measurements.

AFM measurements were carried out using a Multimode NanoScope V system (Bruker

AXS) with PeakForce Tapping (PFT) and Force Volume (FV) mapping modes. A commercial tip

holder equipped with silicon (Si) cantilevers (FMAuD, NanoSensor), a spring constant of 2.0 N/m,

and a resonance frequency of 70.0 kHz was employed. PFT mode was used for high-resolution

imaging with a peak force setpoint of 1 nN and modulation of 2 kHz in the Z-ramp. For mechanical

mapping and force spectroscopy, FV mode was employed to collect force-distance (F-Z) curves

across the sample surface. Force spectroscopy was conducted using 32×32 pixels in the XY scan

area with 512 points per force curve at a 3 Hz Z-ramp for data acquisition and analysis. The force-

distance curves were calibrated from the original force-displacement (F-D) data following standard

processing protocols[96]. AFM imaging was restricted to isolated bacterial cells to prevent

confounding effects from cell aggregation. The AFM instrument was housed in a humidity-

controlled environment (~35%) to reduce capillary forces between the AFM tip and the bacterial

surface. Raw AFM images were processed and analyzed using Nanoscope Analysis software

(Bruker AXS).

To analyze force-distance curves, the initial jump-in force (point 1) was defined as the

contact point on the LPS layer, corresponding to a tip-sample distance of 0 nm and a tip-sample

interaction force of 0 nN. Two distinct interaction profiles from each force curve were identified

by slope changes, in which the increase of the slope represented the contact of a stiffer substrate.

The length of the LPS layer was measured as the distance between point 1 and point 2 (Figure 6g).

Ten force curves were obtained from multiple cells at different locations to ensure representative

sampling.

Quantification and statistical analysis

Statistical significance in bacterial conjugation and survival assays was assessed by

unpaired two-tailed t-tests between relevant samples. Details of statistical significance are

provided in the figure legends.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Ting laboratory members for helpful discussions and critical reading of the

manuscript; Dr. Joseph Mougous, Dr. Shu-Jung Chang, and Dr. Sue Lin-Chao for sharing reagents;

Dr. Soo-Chen Cheng and Dr. Jun-Yi Leu for sharing equipment; Dr. Shu-Yun Tung, Dr. Hsin-Nan

Lin, Dr. Chen-Hsin Yu, Ms. Wen-Li Pon, and Ms. Shin-Yi Du for technical assistance; and Dr.

John O'Brien for manuscript editing. We acknowledge funding support from Academia Sinica

(AS-CDA-112-L05 to S.-Y.T.) and the National Science and Technology Council, Taiwan (111-

2311-B-001-006-MY2, 112-2311-B-001-020, and 113-2628-B-001-008-MY3 to S.-Y.T.).

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Isolation of phage-resistant *S. enterica* for pairwise co-culture experiments. (a)

Schematic workflow for isolating phage-resistant strains from a transposon library (Tn-library)

pool containing approximately 12,000 mutants. Phages from different families of Caudovirales

were used for selection: Felix O1, P22, and Chi (**Supplementary Figure 1a**). Spot assays were

employed to validate the resistance of the isolated strains to phage infections (**Supplementary**

Figure 1b). Validated resistant variants were subsequently co-cultured with *E. coli* or *E. cloacae*

in liquid broth or on solid agar. The survival of *S. enterica* was quantified by counting CFUs on

selective media. **(b, c)** Relative survival of the indicated *S. enterica* strains relative to wild-type *S.*

enterica grown in co-culture with *E. coli* or *E. cloacae* in LB broth **(b)** or solid agar **(c)**. Relative

survival was determined by comparing CFU ratios of phage-resistant variants and the wild-type

control. Data in **(b)** and **(c)** are represented as means ± SD (n=3). Asterisks indicate statistically

significant differences between the survival of a mutant strain and the wild-type control (p < 0.05).

Figure 2. Phage-resistant strains exhibited LPS deficiency and increased susceptibility to

T6SS-mediated antagonism by *E. cloacae*. (a, b) 12% LPS PAGE profiles showing the levels of

LPS produced by the indicated *S. enterica* strains: **(a)** LPS from the Felix O1-resistant strains; **(b)**

LPS from the P22-resistant strains. A schematic representation of LPS is shown on the left. **(c-h)**

Protectiveness of the indicated *S. enterica* phage-resistant strains relative to the wild-type strain

after competition with *E. cloacae* wild-type **(c, d)**, Δ*tssM* **(e, f)**, and Δ*cdiA* **(g, h)**. Data in **(c-h)** are

presented as means ± SD (n=6). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between the

relative protective index of a mutant strain and the wild-type control (p < 0.05).

Figure 3. LPS protects bacteria from T6SS-mediated assaults. (a) Schematic representation of

the LPS structure in *S. enterica*. Glycosyltransferases involved in LPS biosynthesis are indicated.

(b, d, g) Protectiveness of the indicated *S. enterica* mutant strains relative to the wild-type strain

after competition with wild-type *E. cloacae*. **(c, e, f)** LPS PAGE profiles: **(c)** 20% gel; **(e, f)** 12%

gel, showing LPS levels produced by the indicated *S. enterica* mutant strains. **(h)** Protectiveness

of the indicated bacterial species (Δ*waaO* mutant) relative to the wild-type strain after competition

with wild-type *E. cloacae*. **(i)** 12% LPS PAGE profiles showing LPS levels produced by the

indicated *S. enterica*, *E. coli*, and *C. rodentium* strains. Data in **(b, d, g, h)** are presented as means

± SD (n=6). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between the relative protective

index of a mutant strain and the wild-type control (p < 0.05).

Figure 4. Purified TSP increases the susceptibility of *S. enterica* to T6SS-mediated

intoxication. (a) Schematic illustration of the phage P22. **(b)** Crystal structure of the P22 TSP

(PBD: 1TYX)[97] with the O-antigen substrate bound in the catalytic pocket. The D392 residue is

highlighted in pink. **(c)** Schematic representation of O-antigen digestion by phage P22 containing

enzymatically active TSP. **(d)** 12% LPS PAGE profiles showing LPS levels from wild-type *S.*

enterica treated with different concentrations of purified TSP (wild-type or D392N mutant) for 10

minutes at room temperature. LPS extracted from the Δ*waaL* strain is shown as a control. **(e)** 10-

fold serial dilution spot assay of P22 phage on wild-type *S. enterica* treated with 10 nM purified

TSP. The image is representative of triplicate experiments. **(f, g)** Protectiveness of the wild-type *S.*

enterica strain treated with purified TSP (wild-type or D392N mutant) relative to the mock-treated

S. enterica after competition with *E. cloacae* wild-type **(f)** or Δ*tssM* **(g)**. Data in **(f, g)** are presented

as means ± SD (n=6). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between the relative

protective index of TSP-treated *S. enterica* and the mock-treated control (p < 0.05).

Figure 5. Phage P22 sensitizes *S. enterica* to T6SS-mediated attacks in mixed populations. (a)

Schematic representation of phages with or without LPS-targeting endoglycosidase during

infection of *S. enterica*. *E. cloacae* carrying a functional T6SS is depicted at the top. **(b, c)**

Protectiveness of the wild-type *S. enterica* strain treated with different phages (Felix O1, P22, or

Chi) relative to the mock-treated *S. enterica* after competition with *E. cloacae* wild-type **(b)** or

Δ*tssM* **(c)**. **(d)** Schematic of P22 with UV$_{254nm}$ treatment. **(e)** 10-fold serial dilution spot assay of

UV-inactivated P22 phage on wild-type *S. enterica*. The image is representative of triplicate

experiments. **(f, g)** Protectiveness of the wild-type *S. enterica* strain treated with UV-inactivated

phage particles (Felix O1, P22, or Chi) relative to the mock-treated *S. enterica* after competition

with *E. cloacae* wild-type **(f)** or Δ*tssM* **(g)**. Data in **(b, c, f, g)** are presented as means ± SD (n=6).

Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between the relative protective index of

phage-treated or UV-inactivated phage-treated *S. enterica* and the mock-treated control ($p < 0.05$).

Figure 6. Evidence that the O-antigen of LPS serves as a physical barrier. (a, b) Measurements

of outer membrane permeability of *S. enterica* wild-type, Δ*wzzB*, and Δ*waaL*. 1 mM EDTA was

added to the wild-type as the control. **(a)** NPN uptake assay; **(b)** VAN sensitivity assay. **(c)**

Schematic representation of the atomic force microscopy (AFM) setup. *S. enterica* cells were

immobilized on freshly prepared mica substrates. A laser beam reflected on the back of the

cantilever is used to measure the force interactions between the probe and sample. The feedback

control system between the photodetector and the X-Y-Z scanner enables precise detection of the

surface morphology of the cells. (Zoom-in) A detailed view of the AFM measurement on the

bacterial surface. **(d-f)** AFM height images of *S. enterica* wild-type **(d)**, Δ*wzzB* **(e)**, and Δ*waaL* **(f)**

were obtained using PeakForce Tapping (PFT) mode. The image scan size is 1 μm x 1 μm. **(g)**

Schematic of the AFM force-distance curve obtained from *S. enterica* samples using Force Volume

(FV) mapping mode. The point at which the tip contacts the sample is defined as zero (point 1),

while slope changes indicate a transition to a stiffer substrate (point 2). **(h-j)** Force-distance curves

from *S. enterica* wild-type **(h)**, Δ*wzzB* **(i)**, and Δ*waaL* **(j)**. Ten curves were captured from each

sample at randomly selected locations, with the longest and shortest LPS lengths highlighted. Red

arrows mark points 1 and 2. **(k)** LPS length of *S. enterica* wild-type, Δ*wzzB*, and Δ*waaL* was

determined from force-distance curves by measuring the distance between point 1 and point 2.

Figure 7. Working model of how phages modulate interbacterial competition within

microbial communities. Bacterial interactions are shaped either in the absence (left) or presence

(right) of phages. **(a)** Bacteria inhabit polymorphic environments. **(b)** In the presence of P22 phage,

bacterial surfaces can be modified via two distinct mechanisms. **(c)** LPS-modified strains are

selected due to their resistance to phage adsorption, leading to their dominance within *S. enterica*

populations. **(d)** TSP from the P22 phage specifically cleaves the bacterial O-antigen of LPS,

resulting in a shortened structure. **(e)** LPS deficiency increases the susceptibility of *S. enterica* to

contact-dependent killing by close proximity bacterial competitors. **(f)** Phage-mediated surface

modifications influence the outcome of interbacterial competition, driving dynamic shifts in mixed

bacterial populations.

Figure S1. Validation of phage resistance in isolated mutants and monocultural growth

experiment. (a) TEM images of model phages used in the study: Felix O1 (left), P22 (middle),

and Chi (right). Scale bar = 0.1 μm. **(b)** 10-fold serial dilution spot assay of phages Felix O1 (left),

P22 (middle), and Chi (right) on the indicated phage-resistant *S. enterica* strains. The image is

representative of triplicate experiments. **(c)** Growth curves of the indicated phage-resistant *S.*

enterica strains in LB broth at 37 °C. Wild-type, Δ*waaL*, and Δ*waaG* strains are shown as controls.

(d) CFUs of the indicated phage-resistant *S. enterica* strains grown at 37 °C for 12 hours on LB

agar plates. Wild-type, Δ*waaL* (ΔL), and Δ*waaG* (ΔG) strains are shown as controls.

Figure S2. Characterization of transposon insertion mutations in phage-resistant _S. enterica_ isolates. (a) Schematic workflow for identifying phage-resistant mutations. Detailed procedures are provided in the Methods section. **(b)** Mutated genes in the P22-resistant and Felix O1-resistant _S. enterica_ isolates. Scale bar = 500 bp. **(c)** Mutated genes in the Chi-resistant _S. enterica_ isolates. Scale bar = 1000 bp. **(d)** 12% LPS PAGE profiles showing LPS levels from the indicated Chi-resistant _S. enterica_ strains. A schematic representation of LPS is shown on the left. **(e, f)** Macroscopic aggregation analysis to assess LPS deficiency in the indicated Felix O1-resistant **(e)** or P22-resistant **(f)** _S. enterica_ strains. The images are representative of triplicate experiments.

Figure S3. LPS-deficient _S. enterica_ mutants shows no significant growth or competition defects. (a-c) Growth curves of the indicated _S. enterica_ LPS mutants in LB broth at 37 °C. The wild-type strain is shown as a control. **(d-f)** Protectiveness of the indicated _S. enterica_ mutant strains relative to the wild-type strain after competition with _E. cloacae_ Δ_tssM_. **(g)** Protectiveness of the indicated bacterial species (Δ_waaO_ mutant) relative to the wild-type strain after competition with _E. cloacae_ Δ_tssM_. Data in **(d-g)** are presented as means ± SD (n=6).

Figure S4. TSP-treated _S. enterica_ shows no significant growth defect. (a) Coomassie-stained 12.5% SDS-PAGE analysis of the purified TSP (left) and the D392N catalytic mutant (right). **(b)** Growth curves of wild-type _S. enterica_ incubated with 10 nM of purified TSP (wild-type or D392N mutant) at 37 °C. Mock-treated wild-type _S. enterica_ and the Δ_waaL_ mutant are shown as controls.

Figure S5. Supporting evidence that phage P22 sensitizes *S. enterica* to T6SS-mediated

attacks. (a) 10-fold serial dilution spot assay of phages Felix O1 (left), P22 (middle), and Chi

(right) on wild-type *S. enterica* before and after the competition assay (Figure 5b). **(b)** 10-fold

serial dilution spot assay of phages Felix O1 (left), P22 (middle), and Chi (right) on wild-type *S.*

enterica and *E. cloacae.* **(c, d)** 10-fold serial dilution spot assay of UV-inactivated Felix O1 phage

(c) or Chi phage **(d)** on wild-type *S. enterica*. The images are representative of triplicate

experiments.

Figure S6. The slope of AFM force-distance curves. Two distinct slopes from each force-

distance curve were obtained for *S. enterica* wild-type, Δ*wzzB*, and Δ*waaL* strains. Ten curves were

divided into two segments by point 2, as shown in Figure 6g. The slope measured from the first

segment corresponds to the LPS layer (left), while the second segment represents the outer

membrane (right).

Supplementary Table 1. Strains, Recombinant DNA, and Oligonucleotides used in this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

C.-E.T., F.-Q.W., C.-W.Y., I.-S.H., P.-Y.C., and S.-Y.T. designed the study. C.-E.T., F.-Q.W.,

C.-W.Y., L.-L.Y., and Y.-C.C. performed experiments. C.-E.T., F.-Q.W., C.-W.Y., I.-S.H., and S.-

Y.T. analyzed data. C.-E.T., F.-Q.W., C.-W.Y., P.-Y.C., I.-S.H., and S.-Y.T. wrote the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1.   Brussow, H. & Hendrix, R.W. Phage genomics: small is beautiful. *Cell* **108**, 13-16 (2002).
2.   Garcia-Bayona, L. & Comstock, L.E. Bacterial antagonism in host-associated microbial
communities. *Science* **361** (2018).

3.   Cotter, P.D., Ross, R.P. & Hill, C. Bacteriocins - a viable alternative to antibiotics? *Nat Rev*
Microbiol **11**, 95-105 (2013).
4.   Klein, T.A., Ahmad, S. & Whitney, J.C. Contact-Dependent Interbacterial Antagonism
Mediated by Protein Secretion Machines. *Trends Microbiol* **28**, 387-400 (2020).
5.   Chassaing, B. & Cascales, E. Antibacterial Weapons: Targeted Destruction in the
Microbiota. *Trends Microbiol* **26**, 329-338 (2018).
6.   Hoque, M.M., Espinoza-Vergara, G. & McDougald, D. Protozoan predation as a driver of
diversity and virulence in bacterial biofilms. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **47** (2023).
7.   Smith, W.P.J., Wucher, B.R., Nadell, C.D. & Foster, K.R. Bacterial defences: mechanisms,
evolution and antimicrobial resistance. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **21**, 519-534 (2023).
8.   Murtazalieva, K., Mu, A., Petrovskaya, A. & Finn, R.D. The growing repertoire of phage
anti-defence systems. *Trends Microbiol* (2024).
9.   Kulikov, E.E., Golomidova, A.K., Prokhorov, N.S., Ivanov, P.A. & Letarov, A.V. High-
throughput LPS profiling as a tool for revealing of bacteriophage infection strategies. *Sci*
Rep **9**, 2958 (2019).
10.   Kaur, G., Agarwal, R. & Sharma, R.K. Bacteriophage Therapy for Critical and High-
Priority Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria and Phage Cocktail-Antibiotic Formulation
Perspective. *Food Environ Virol* **13**, 433-446 (2021).
11.   Doron, S. *et al.* Systematic discovery of antiphage defense systems in the microbial
pangenome. *Science* **359** (2018).
12.   Vassallo, C.N., Doering, C.R., Littlehale, M.L., Teodoro, G.I.C. & Laub, M.T. A functional
selection reveals previously undetected anti-phage defence systems in the E. coli
pangenome. *Nat Microbiol* **7**, 1568-1579 (2022).
13.   Kennedy, N.W. & Comstock, L.E. Mechanisms of bacterial immunity, protection, and
survival during interbacterial warfare. *Cell Host Microbe* **32**, 794-803 (2024).
14.   Peterson, S.B., Bertolli, S.K. & Mougous, J.D. The Central Role of Interbacterial
Antagonism in Bacterial Life. *Curr Biol* **30**, R1203-R1214 (2020).
15.   Hersch, S.J. *et al.* Envelope stress responses defend against type six secretion system
attacks independently of immunity proteins. *Nat Microbiol* **5**, 706-714 (2020).
16.   Cornforth, D.M. & Foster, K.R. Competition sensing: the social side of bacterial stress
responses. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **11**, 285-293 (2013).
17.   LeRoux, M., Peterson, S.B. & Mougous, J.D. Bacterial danger sensing. *J Mol Biol* **427**,
3744-3753 (2015).
18.   Mangalea, M.R. & Duerkop, B.A. Fitness Trade-Offs Resulting from Bacteriophage
Resistance Potentiate Synergistic Antibacterial Strategies. *Infect Immun* **88** (2020).
19.   Chan, B.K. *et al.* Phage selection restores antibiotic sensitivity in MDR Pseudomonas
aeruginosa. *Sci Rep* **6**, 26717 (2016).
20.   Levin, B.R. & Bull, J.J. Population and evolutionary dynamics of phage therapy. *Nat Rev*
Microbiol **2**, 166-173 (2004).
21.   Yu, T. *et al.* Sub-MIC antibiotics increased the fitness cost of CRISPR-Cas in Acinetobacter
baumannii. *Front Microbiol* **15**, 1381749 (2024).
22.   Vale, P.F. *et al.* Costs of CRISPR-Cas-mediated resistance in Streptococcus thermophilus.
Proc Biol Sci **282**, 20151270 (2015).
23.   Westra, E.R. *et al.* Parasite Exposure Drives Selective Evolution of Constitutive versus
Inducible Defense. *Curr Biol* **25**, 1043-1049 (2015).

24.   Meaden, S. *et al.* Correction: Phage gene expression and host responses lead to infection-
846   dependent costs of CRISPR immunity. *ISME J* **15**, 2491 (2021).
847   25.   Zaayman, M. & Wheatley, R.M. Fitness costs of CRISPR-Cas systems in bacteria.
848   *Microbiology (Reading)* **168** (2022).
849   26.   Chaudhry, W. *et al.* Mucoidy, a general mechanism for maintaining lytic phage in
850   populations of bacteria. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **96** (2020).
851   27.   Wielgoss, S., Bergmiller, T., Bischofberger, A.M. & Hall, A.R. Adaptation to Parasites and
852   Costs of Parasite Resistance in Mutator and Nonmutator Bacteria. *Mol Biol Evol* **33**, 770-
853   782 (2016).
854   28.   Scanlan, P.D. & Buckling, A. Co-evolution with lytic phage selects for the mucoid
855   phenotype of Pseudomonas fluorescens SBW25. *ISME J* **6**, 1148-1158 (2012).
856   29.   MacGillivray, K.A. *et al.* Trade-offs constrain adaptive pathways to the type VI secretion
857   system survival. *iScience* **26**, 108332 (2023).
858   30.   Gomez, P. & Buckling, A. Bacteria-phage antagonistic coevolution in soil. *Science* **332**,
859   106-109 (2011).
860   31.   York, D., Welch, K., Goryshin, I.Y. & Reznikoff, W.S. Simple and efficient generation in
861   vitro of nested deletions and inversions: Tn5 intramolecular transposition. *Nucleic Acids*
862   *Res* **26**, 1927-1933 (1998).
863   32.   Trotereau, J. *et al.* Construction and characterization of a saturated Tn-seq library of
864   Salmonella Typhimurium ATCC 14028. *Microbiol Resour Announc* **12**, e0036523 (2023).
865   33.   Whichard, J.M. *et al.* Complete genomic sequence of bacteriophage felix o1. *Viruses* **2**,
866   710-730 (2010).
867   34.   Vander Byl, C. & Kropinski, A.M. Sequence of the genome of Salmonella bacteriophage
868   P22. *J Bacteriol* **182**, 6472-6481 (2000).
869   35.   Lee, J.H., Shin, H., Choi, Y. & Ryu, S. Complete genome sequence analysis of bacterial-
870   flagellum-targeting bacteriophage chi. *Arch Virol* **158**, 2179-2183 (2013).
871   36.   Nguyen, Y. & Sperandio, V. Enterohemorrhagic E. coli (EHEC) pathogenesis. *Front Cell*
872   *Infect Microbiol* **2**, 90 (2012).
873   37.   Davin-Regli, A. & Pages, J.M. Enterobacter aerogenes and Enterobacter cloacae; versatile
874   bacterial pathogens confronting antibiotic treatment. *Front Microbiol* **6**, 392 (2015).
875   38.   Galan, J.E. Salmonella Typhimurium and inflammation: a pathogen-centric affair. *Nat Rev*
876   *Microbiol* **19**, 716-725 (2021).
877   39.   Vis, M.A.M., Ito, K. & Hofmann, S. Impact of Culture Medium on Cellular Interactions in
878   in vitro Co-culture Systems. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol* **8**, 911 (2020).
879   40.   Rostol, J.T. & Marraffini, L. (Ph)ighting Phages: How Bacteria Resist Their Parasites. *Cell*
880   *Host Microbe* **25**, 184-194 (2019).
881   41.   Baxa, U. *et al.* Interactions of phage P22 tails with their cellular receptor, Salmonella O-
882   antigen polysaccharide. *Biophys J* **71**, 2040-2048 (1996).
883   42.   Hudson, H.P., Lindberg, A.A. & Stocker, B.A. Lipopolysaccharide core defects in
884   Salmonella typhimurium mutants which are resistant to Felix O phage but retain smooth
885   character. *J Gen Microbiol* **109**, 97-112 (1978).
886   43.   Nakao, R., Ramstedt, M., Wai, S.N. & Uhlin, B.E. Enhanced biofilm formation by
887   Escherichia coli LPS mutants defective in Hep biosynthesis. *PLoS One* **7**, e51241 (2012).
888   44.   Ge, H. *et al.* The rfbN gene of Salmonella Typhimurium mediates phage adsorption by
889   modulating biosynthesis of lipopolysaccharide. *Microbiol Res* **250**, 126803 (2021).

45.   Beck, C.M. *et al.* CdiA from Enterobacter cloacae delivers a toxic ribosomal RNase into
target bacteria. *Structure* **22**, 707-718 (2014).

46.   Whitney, J.C. *et al.* Genetically distinct pathways guide effector export through the type
VI secretion system. *Mol Microbiol* **92**, 529-542 (2014).

47.   Hood, R.D. *et al.* A type VI secretion system of Pseudomonas aeruginosa targets a toxin to
bacteria. *Cell Host Microbe* **7**, 25-37 (2010).

48.   Aoki, S.K. *et al.* Contact-dependent inhibition of growth in Escherichia coli. *Science* **309**,
1245-1248 (2005).

49.   Hersch, S.J., Manera, K. & Dong, T.G. Defending against the Type Six Secretion System:
beyond Immunity Genes. *Cell Rep* **33**, 108259 (2020).

50.   Toska, J., Ho, B.T. & Mekalanos, J.J. Exopolysaccharide protects Vibrio cholerae from
exogenous attacks by the type 6 secretion system. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **115**, 7997-
8002 (2018).

51.   Flaugnatti, N. *et al.* Human commensal gut Proteobacteria withstand type VI secretion
attacks through immunity protein-independent mechanisms. *Nat Commun* **12**, 5751 (2021).

52.   West, N.P. *et al.* Optimization of virulence functions through glucosylation of Shigella LPS.
Science **307**, 1313-1317 (2005).

53.   Papo, N. & Shai, Y. A molecular mechanism for lipopolysaccharide protection of Gram-
negative bacteria from antimicrobial peptides. *J Biol Chem* **280**, 10378-10387 (2005).

54.   Bertani, B. & Ruiz, N. Function and Biogenesis of Lipopolysaccharides. *EcoSal Plus* **8**
(2018).

55.   Kaniuk, N.A., Vinogradov, E. & Whitfield, C. Investigation of the structural requirements
in the lipopolysaccharide core acceptor for ligation of O antigens in the genus Salmonella:
WaaL "ligase" is not the sole determinant of acceptor specificity. *J Biol Chem* **279**, 36470-
36480 (2004).

56.   Di Lorenzo, F. *et al.* A Journey from Structure to Function of Bacterial Lipopolysaccharides.
Chem Rev **122**, 15767-15821 (2022).

57.   Bastin, D.A., Stevenson, G., Brown, P.K., Haase, A. & Reeves, P.R. Repeat unit
polysaccharides of bacteria: a model for polymerization resembling that of ribosomes and
fatty acid synthetase, with a novel mechanism for determining chain length. *Mol Microbiol*
7, 725-734 (1993).

58.   Murray, G.L., Attridge, S.R. & Morona, R. Regulation of Salmonella typhimurium
lipopolysaccharide O antigen chain length is required for virulence; identification of FepE
as a second Wzz. *Mol Microbiol* **47**, 1395-1406 (2003).

59.   Zhang, G., Meredith, T.C. & Kahne, D. On the essentiality of lipopolysaccharide to Gram-
negative bacteria. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **16**, 779-785 (2013).

60.   Simpson, B.W. & Trent, M.S. Pushing the envelope: LPS modifications and their
consequences. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **17**, 403-416 (2019).

61.   Steinbacher, S. *et al.* Phage P22 tailspike protein: crystal structure of the head-binding
domain at 2.3 A, fully refined structure of the endorhamnosidase at 1.56 A resolution, and
the molecular basis of O-antigen recognition and cleavage. *J Mol Biol* **267**, 865-880 (1997).

62.   Eriksson, U., Svenson, S.B., Lonngren, J. & Lindberg, A.A. Salmonella phage glycanases:
substrate specificity of the phage P22 endo-rhamnosidase. *J Gen Virol* **43**, 503-511 (1979).

63.   Steinbacher, S. *et al.* Crystal structure of P22 tailspike protein: interdigitated subunits in a
thermostable trimer. *Science* **265**, 383-386 (1994).

64. Waseh, S. *et al.* Orally administered P22 phage tailspike protein reduces salmonella
colonization in chickens: prospects of a novel therapy against bacterial infections. *PLoS*
One **5**, e13904 (2010).
65. Tang, J. *et al.* Peering down the barrel of a bacteriophage portal: the genome packaging
and release valve in p22. *Structure* **19**, 496-502 (2011).
66. Sonani, R.R., Esteves, N.C., Scharf, B.E. & Egelman, E.H. Cryo-EM structure of
flagellotropic bacteriophage Chi. *Structure* **32**, 856-865 e853 (2024).
67. Snyder, D.S. & McIntosh, T.J. The lipopolysaccharide barrier: correlation of antibiotic
susceptibility with antibiotic permeability and fluorescent probe binding kinetics.
Biochemistry **39**, 11777-11787 (2000).
68. Delcour, A.H. Outer membrane permeability and antibiotic resistance. *Biochim Biophys*
Acta **1794**, 808-816 (2009).
69. Zgurskaya, H.I., Lopez, C.A. & Gnanakaran, S. Permeability Barrier of Gram-Negative
Cell Envelopes and Approaches To Bypass It. *ACS Infect Dis* **1**, 512-522 (2015).
70. Vaara, M. Agents that increase the permeability of the outer membrane. *Microbiol Rev* **56**,
395-411 (1992).
71. Helander, I.M. & Mattila-Sandholm, T. Fluorometric assessment of gram-negative
bacterial permeabilization. *J Appl Microbiol* **88**, 213-219 (2000).
72. Bolla, J.M. *et al.* Strategies for bypassing the membrane barrier in multidrug resistant
Gram-negative bacteria. *FEBS Lett* **585**, 1682-1690 (2011).
73. Wang, Z., Wang, J., Ren, G., Li, Y. & Wang, X. Influence of Core Oligosaccharide of
Lipopolysaccharide to Outer Membrane Behavior of Escherichia coli. *Mar Drugs* **13**,
3325-3339 (2015).
74. Allsopp, L.P. & Bernal, P. Killing in the name of: T6SS structure and effector diversity.
Microbiology (Reading) **169** (2023).
75. Dufrene, Y.F. Atomic force microscopy, a powerful tool in microbiology. *J Bacteriol* **184**,
5205-5213 (2002).
76. Strauss, J., Burnham, N.A. & Camesano, T.A. Atomic force microscopy study of the role
of LPS O-antigen on adhesion of E. coli. *J Mol Recognit* **22**, 347-355 (2009).
77. Kahli, H. *et al.* Impact of Growth Conditions on Pseudomonas fluorescens Morphology
Characterized by Atomic Force Microscopy. *Int J Mol Sci* **23** (2022).
78. Pagnout, C. *et al.* Pleiotropic effects of rfa-gene mutations on Escherichia coli envelope
properties. *Sci Rep* **9**, 9696 (2019).
79. Souza, D.P. *et al.* Bacterial killing via a type IV secretion system. *Nat Commun* **6**, 6453
(2015).
80. Bayer-Santos, E. *et al.* The opportunistic pathogen Stenotrophomonas maltophilia utilizes
a type IV secretion system for interbacterial killing. *PLoS Pathog* **15**, e1007651 (2019).
81. Sgro, G.G. *et al.* Bacteria-Killing Type IV Secretion Systems. *Front Microbiol* **10**, 1078
(2019).
82. Wang, H., Liu, Y., Bai, C. & Leung, S.S.Y. [Not Available]. *Acta Pharm Sin B* **14**, 155-169
(2024).
83. Knecht, L.E., Veljkovic, M. & Fieseler, L. Diversity and Function of Phage Encoded
Depolymerases. *Front Microbiol* **10**, 2949 (2019).
84. Gibson, D.G. *et al.* Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases.
Nat Methods **6**, 343-345 (2009).

85.   Kunkel, T.A. Rapid and efficient site-specific mutagenesis without phenotypic selection.
981   *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **82**, 488-492 (1985).

982   86.   Edwards, R.A., Keller, L.H. & Schifferli, D.M. Improved allelic exchange vectors and their
983   use to analyze 987P fimbria gene expression. *Gene* **207**, 149-157 (1998).

984   87.   McKenzie, G.J. & Craig, N.L. Fast, easy and efficient: site-specific insertion of transgenes
985   into enterobacterial chromosomes using Tn7 without need for selection of the insertion
986   event. *BMC Microbiol* **6**, 39 (2006).

987   88.   Mandal, R.K., Jiang, T. & Kwon, Y.M. Genetic Determinants in Salmonella enterica
988   Serotype Typhimurium Required for Overcoming In Vitro Stressors in the Mimicking Host
989   Environment. *Microbiol Spectr* **9**, e0015521 (2021).

990   89.   Liu, Q. *et al.* Immunogenicity and Cross-Protective Efficacy Induced by Outer Membrane
991   Proteins from Salmonella Typhimurium Mutants with Truncated LPS in Mice. *Int J Mol*
992   *Sci* **17**, 416 (2016).

993   90.   Chen, P.Y. *et al.* A whole-cell platform for discovering synthetic cell adhesion molecules
994   in bacteria. *Nat Commun* **15**, 6568 (2024).

995   91.   Ting, S.Y. *et al.* Targeted Depletion of Bacteria from Mixed Populations by Programmable
996   Adhesion with Antagonistic Competitor Cells. *Cell Host Microbe* **28**, 313-321 e316 (2020).

997   92.   Miller, S., Schuler, B. & Seckler, R. Phage P22 tailspike protein: removal of head-binding
998   domain unmasks effects of folding mutations on native-state thermal stability. *Protein Sci*
999   **7**, 2223-2232 (1998).

1000   93.   Muheim, C. *et al.* Increasing the permeability of Escherichia coli using MAC13243. *Sci*
1001   *Rep* **7**, 17629 (2017).

1002   94.   Oh, Y.J. Use of Atomic Force Microscopy to Characterize LPS Perturbations. *Methods Mol*
1003   *Biol* **2548**, 279-287 (2022).

1004   95.   Singh, S. *et al.* LPS O Antigen Plays a Key Role in Klebsiella pneumoniae Capsule
1005   Retention. *Microbiol Spectr* **10**, e0151721 (2022).

1006   96.   Gavara, N. A beginner's guide to atomic force microscopy probing for cell mechanics.
1007   *Microsc Res Tech* **80**, 75-84 (2017).

1008   97.   Steinbacher, S. *et al.* Crystal structure of phage P22 tailspike protein complexed with
1009   Salmonella sp. O-antigen receptors. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **93**, 10584-10588 (1996).

1010

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

a P22 phage
- Capsid
- Head-tail adaptor
- Tail spike protein
- Tail needle

b O-antigen
D392

c O-antigen cleaved by TSP
outer membrane

d *S. enterica* wild-type
– +TSP wt +TSP^D392N ΔwaaL
VL
L
S
Lipid A
1 10 100 1 10 100 (nM)

e *S. enterica* wt + P22 phage
TSP
–
wt
D392N
PFU dilution

f Donor: *E. cloacae* wt
Relative protectiveness
10^2
10^1
10^0
10^{-1}
10^{-2}
10^{-3}
10^{-4}
TSP: – wt D392N ΔwaaL
Recipient: *S. enterica* wt

g Donor: *E. cloacae* ΔtssM
Relative protectiveness
10^2
10^1
10^0
10^{-1}
10^{-2}
10^{-3}
10^{-4}
TSP: – wt D392N ΔwaaL
Recipient: *S. enterica* wt

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

(c) Phage selection

(e) Bacterial antagonism

(b) Phage invasion

(a) Bacterial polymorphisms

(f) Phage-bacteria interaction in modulating microbial community

(d) TSP cleavage activity of O-antigen

(e) Bacterial antagonism

S. enterica WT   LPS-deficient strain   Dead bacterial cell   P22 phage   Antagonistic bacteria   T6SS

LPS structure

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2

Supplementary Figure 4

a

Coomassie Brilliant Blue staining

b

Supplementary Figure 5

a

S. enterica wild-type

| Felix O1 | P22 | Chi |

Before competition

After competition

PFU dilution   PFU dilution   PFU dilution

b

| Felix O1 | P22 | Chi |

S. enterica wild-type

E. cloacae wild-type

PFU dilution   PFU dilution   PFU dilution

c

UV254nm time course   *S. enterica* wt

Felix O1 phage

0 min

1 min

3 min

5 min

PFU dilution

d

UV254nm time course   *S. enterica* wt

Chi phage

0 min

1 min

3 min

5 min

PFU dilution

Supplementary Figure 6

Supplementary Table 1. Strains, Recombinant DNA, and Oligonucleotides used in this study.

Strain	Source	Identifier
Escherichia coli DH5α	YB Biotech	Cat# XR-LYE678-80
Escherichia coli PIR1	Gift from Dr. Hsin-Hung David Chou	N/A
Escherichia coli BL21 pRIL (DE3)	Gift from Dr. Hung-Ta Chen	N/A
Escherichia coli S17-1 λ pir	Lab collection	N/A
Enterobacter cloacae	American Type Culture Collection	ATCC 13047
Enterobacter cloacae ΔtssM	Whitney et al., 2014	N/A
Enterobacter cloacae ΔcdiA	Beck et al., 2015	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium	American Type Culture Collection	ATCC 14028
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium LT2/(P22)+	Bioresource Collection and Research Center	BCRC 12459
Salmonella enterica bacteriophage Felix O1	Leibniz Institute DSMZ	DSM 18524
Salmonella enterica bacteriophage Chi	American Type Culture Collection	ATCC 9842-B1
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaL	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaJ	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaO	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaG	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaK	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaB	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaQ	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwaaY	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔwzzB	This paper	N/A
Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium Tn7::Chl ΔfepE	This paper	N/A
Enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 EDL933	American Type Culture Collection	ATCC-43895

Enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 EDL933 Tn7::Chl	This paper	N/A
Enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 EDL933 Tn7::Chl ΔwaaO	This paper	N/A
Citrobacter rodentium DBS100	American Type Culture Collection	ATCC-51459
Citrobacter rodentium DBS100 ΔwaaO	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R1	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R2	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R3	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R4	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R5	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R6	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R7	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R8	This paper	N/A
Felix O1-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R9	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R1	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R2	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R3	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R4	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R5	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R6	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R7	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R8	This paper	N/A
P22-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R9	This paper	N/A

Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R1	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R2	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R3	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R4	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R5	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R6	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R7	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R8	This paper	N/A
Chi-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium-R9	This paper	N/A

Recombinant DNA	Source	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaL*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaJ*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaO*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaG*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaK*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaB*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaQ*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwaaY*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔwzzB*	This paper	
pRE118_Sent*ΔfepE*	This paper	
pRE118_Ecoli*ΔwaaO*	This paper	
pRE118_Crod*ΔwaaO*	This paper	
pETDuet-1-His6_P22TSP	This paper	
pETDuet-1-His6_P22TSP D392N	This paper	
pGRG37	McKenzie et al. 2006	

Primer	Sequences (5'-3')	Identifier
Bacteria strain construction		
Sent_ΔwaaL_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC ATCAAAGCGGAACGCACAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaL_R1	TTTATCTATTGGTTAGCATCTT TTCTCCACAATAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaL_F2	GATGCTAACCAATAGATAAA AAAACGCGC	Mission Biotech

Sent_ΔwaaL_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGAACCAGAACTTCCTGATA ATG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaL_seq_F	TGATTCCCGTCGCTATTCGC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaL_seq_R	AGATCAGAGAGCGCAATCCG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaJ_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC GTACGCTACGCAGATTGTTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaJ_R1	ATTATTTGTGTGAATCCATTA CATCACCTATG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaJ_F2	AATGGATTCACACAAATAATT CCCCTCC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaJ_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGACCTTACCCTTAATACGA C	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaJ_seq_F	TGAAGACCAGCAGCGATTTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaJ_seq_R	ACGTGCTACATTGATCAGCG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaO_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC GTGATATGTATTGATGTCATC TC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaO_R1	TTTATTCAAGTCTGCTCATAG TGATCAC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaO_F2	TATGAGCAGACTTGAATAAA ACCCATAGGTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaO_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGAGTGACTTATCTTTCAAC TCAC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaO_seq_F	CTTCGTCGAGCTAAGCATG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaO_seq_R	TGTAGCGCCCGTATAATG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaG_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC AATCTCACCGATCAGTGG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaG_R1	CTCAACCATCAACTCTCATAG CAGGCTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaG_F2	TATGAGAGTTGATGGTTGAGC TGAAAGC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaG_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGACACTCATAAATTACTCA CTGAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaG_seq_F	AGATCAAAAACGCGCTATCG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaG_seq_R	GCAATGTCCAGTCTTCTTCC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaK_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC AAGATGTCATTGCAGTCAATG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaK_R1	ATCACTTATCTTTAATCATAA TAGCTATAATCCAGAATAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaK_F2	TATGATTAAAGATAAGTGATT GAGTCCTG	Mission Biotech

Sent_ΔwaaK_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGACATCGACATATGTCCGA TTC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaK_seq_F	GGTCCTACGTCCAGAAAGAC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaK_seq_R	TTTAGGACTTCGCTGCCTTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaB_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC GAAGACTACTGTGCTGAC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaB_R1	ATCACTTTTGTATTTTCATATA TACCCCAGAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaB_F2	TATGAAAATACAAAGTGAT CACTATGAGC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaB_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGATACAGTCTCAGCATCAA C	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaB_seq_F	TGGGCGTTGATACGATGCAC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaB_seq_R	ACTATGCCAGGGCTTCGTTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaQ_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC GTGCAGCGCAGCAATCAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaQ_R1	CTCATAGCAGCTTTTCCACAA GCGACTCTTTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaQ_F2	TGTGGAAAAGCTGCTATGAG AGTTGCCTTTTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaQ_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGACCATTAACTCCGCGATA TC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaQ_seq_F	GCGCATTAGCGATAACCAGG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaQ_seq_R	CCTGATAGGCTGGATGCAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaY_F1	for making Salmonella 14028 ChlR waaY/rfaY (EJJ31_RS00655) deletion with pRE118	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaY_R1	ATCAGCGTTTAATAATCATAA TGGAGATTTAGGG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaY_F2	TATGATTATTAAACGCTGATC AATGTAG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaY_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGAATTCGTCATAGAAACGT G	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaY_seq_F	GTTTAGCCGTACAGCATCAC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwaaY_seq_R	TAAGCTCAGATGGCATAGGG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwzzB_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC ACTCCAGGAAGGCGCTATTAA AC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwzzB_R1	CTTACAAGGCCACTGTCATAG ATACCCTAACTAAAAAAGG ATG	Mission Biotech

Sent_ΔwzzB_F2	TATGACAGTGGCCTTGTAAGC TTCTTTGCCGGATG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwzzB_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGATGTCGACGGCGCGC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwzzB_seq_F	CGTGATTGGGGAACAGTCTG	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔwzzB_seq_R	CTTGAGGCATTCCGTGATGC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔfepE_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC CTATACCGTCGCAAAAAACC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔfepE_R1	CATGCCATCTTTAGTCTGATT TACCCGAAAAGC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔfepE_F2	ATCAGACTAAAGATGGCATG CCGTATGAC	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔfepE_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGAAGGTATGTGAACATCAT C	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔfepE_seq_F	CCTATGCAAACCGCAACCACC C	Mission Biotech
Sent_ΔfepE_seq_R	CCGAATCCGTAGCCCGTTTGC	Mission Biotech
Ecoli_ΔwaaO_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC CGTTATGGCGCGGTAAAG	Mission Biotech
Ecoli_ΔwaaO_R1	TTTAGAAGCATTGAGACATAT TTATTCTGTATCCAAAATTTT G	Mission Biotech
Ecoli_ΔwaaO_F2	TATGTCTCAATGCTTCTAAAG ATTTAAGGTTAAAATAATTC	Mission Biotech
Ecoli_ΔwaaO_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGAGCGCTTGTCCAGTTCAA TTATATC	Mission Biotech
Ecoli_ΔwaaO_seq_F	GATGGTTGAACTTAAAGAGCC G	Mission Biotech
Ecoli_ΔwaaO_seq_R	CCTGGTAGTTCTCATCAATAC C	Mission Biotech
Crod_ΔwaaO_F1	CATGAATTCCCGGGAGAGCTC CGTTATGGCGCGGTAAAG	Mission Biotech
Crod_ΔwaaO_R1	TTTAGAAGCATTGAGACATAT TTATTCTGTATCCAAAATTTT G	Mission Biotech
Crod_ΔwaaO_F2	TATGTCTCAATGCTTCTAAAG ATTTAAGGTTAAAATAATTC	Mission Biotech
Crod_ΔwaaO_R2	CGACGGATCCCAAGCTTCTTC TAGAGCGCTTGTCCAGTTCAA TTATATC	Mission Biotech
Crod_ΔwaaO_seq_F	ATTAATGCATTTAGCCAGTGG C	Mission Biotech
Crod_ΔwaaO_seq_R	TGTATCTTCTGAAATTATGCG C	Mission Biotech

Plasmid construction		
pETDuet_TSP_F	ACCATCATCACCACAGCCAGGATCCAGATCAATATTCAATAGAAGC	Mission Biotech
pETDuet_TSP_R	GTTCGACTTAAGCATTATGCGGCCGCTAAAGTGTTGCCAAGGTTAATCTAACTAATTC	Mission Biotech
pETDuet_TSP_D392N_F	CCCCGTATGGAATGGATTCGATTTAGGTGCTGAC	Mission Biotech
pETDuet_TSP_D392N_R	CGAATCCATTCCATACGGGGTAAATAACGACC	Mission Biotech
pETDuet_Seq_F	ATGCGTCCGGCGTAGA	Mission Biotech
pETDuet_Seq_R	GATTATGCGGCCGTGTACAA	Mission Biotech
pRE118_seq_F	GGTTGAGAAGCGGTGTAAGTG	Mission Biotech
pRE118_seq_R	GCAGGTCGATCCCAAGCTTC	Mission Biotech
Transposon Insertion mapping		
EzTn5_s	GATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGCATGCA	Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc.
Tn5_F	TCGTCGGCAGCGTCAGATGTGTATAAGAGACAG	Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc.
Tn5_R	GTCTCGTGGGCTCGGAGATGTGTATAAGAGACAGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGG	Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc.