Variations in kinase and effector signaling logic in a two component signaling network

Danielle Swingle[1,2], Leah Epstein[1,2], Ramisha Aymon[1,3], Eta A. Isiorho[1], Rinat R. Abzalimov[1], Denize C. Favaro[1], Kevin H. Gardner[1,3,4*]

[1]: Structural Biology Initiative, CUNY Advanced Science Research Center, New York, NY 10031

[2]: Ph.D. Program in Biochemistry, The Graduate Center – City University of New York, New York, NY 10016

[3]: Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, City College of New York, New York, NY 10031

[4]: Ph.D. Programs in Biochemistry, Biology, and Chemistry, The Graduate Center – City University of New York, New York, NY 10016

*: direct correspondence to kgardner@gc.cuny.edu

ORCIDs:

Danielle Swingle: 0000-0003-3691-4560 / Leah Epstein: 0009-0004-9282-0715 / Ramisha Aymon: 0009-0003-0781-4760 / Eta A. Isiorho: 0000-0002-6242-9297 / Rinat R. Abzalimov: 0000-0003-2110-1532 / Denize C. Favaro: 0000-0001-5563-2548 / Kevin H. Gardner: 0000-0002-8671-2556

Classification: Biological Sciences / Biochemistry

Keywords: histidine kinase, bacterial signal transduction, general stress response, protein structure/function, two-component system

Running title: Variations in two component kinase and effector signaling logic

Abstract

The general stress response (GSR) protects bacteria from a wide range of stressors. In

Alphaproteobacteria, GSR activation is coordinated by HWE/HisKA2 family histidine kinases

(HKs), which can exhibit non-canonical structure and function. For example, while most light-

oxygen-voltage sensor-containing HKs are light activated dimers, the *Rubellimicrobium*

thermophilum RT-HK has inverted "dark on, light off" signaling logic with a tunable

monomer/dimer equilibrium. Here, we further investigate these atypical behaviors of RT-HK and

characterize its downstream signaling network. Using hydrogen-deuterium exchange mass

spectrometry, we find that RT-HK uses a signal transduction mechanism similar to light-

activated systems, despite its inverted logic. Mutagenesis reveals that RT-HK

autophosphorylates *in trans*, with changes to the Jα helix linking sensor and kinase domains

affecting autophosphorylation levels. Exploring downstream effects of RT-HK, we identified two

GSR genetic regions, each encoding a copy of the central regulator PhyR. *In vitro*

measurements of phosphotransfer from RT-HK to the two putative PhyRs revealed that RT-HK

signals only to one, and does so at an increased intensity in the dark, consistent with its

reversed logic. X-ray crystal structures of both PhyRs revealed a substantial shift within the

receiver domain of one, suggesting a basis for RT-HK specificity. We probed further down the

pathway using nuclear magnetic resonance to determine that the single NepR homolog

interacts with both unphosphorylated PhyRs, and this interaction is decoupled from activation in

one PhyR. This work expands our understanding of HWE/HisKA2 family signal transduction,

revealing marked variations from signaling mechanisms previously identified in other GSR

networks.

Significance

The Alphaproteobacterial general stress response (GSR) crucially handles responses to

an array of stressors. In a typical photosensitive GSR pathway, blue light illumination stimulates

light-oxygen-voltage histidine kinase (LOV-HK) phosphorylation of a single PhyR response

regulator, regulating downstream stress gene transcription. The GSR regulators highlighted in

this study expand this signaling paradigm at three levels: 1) The LOV-HK RT-HK is dark-

activated, 2) only one of two PhyR homologs is apparently accessible to HK phosphodonors,

and 3) the other PhyR homolog shows negative cooperativity for activation and partner binding.

Our work enhances the current understanding of this complex stress response, introduces novel

regulatory modes, and underscores the necessity of testing structural and functional models

derived from homology.

Introduction

Bacteria are relatively simple organisms that directly face complex environmental

challenges, such as fluctuations in nutrient availability, osmolarity, pH, and temperature. To

sense and adapt to their changing surroundings, bacteria commonly use two-component

systems (TCSs), minimally comprised of a sensor histidine kinase (HK) and cognate response

regulator (RR)[3,4]. Signal input to the HK's sensor domain modulates autophosphorylation of a

conserved histidine residue within its dimerization and histidine phosphotransfer (DHp) domain

by an ATP molecule bound to its catalytic ATP-binding (CA) domain. This phosphoryl group is

subsequently transferred to a conserved aspartate residue within the receiver (REC) domain of

the RR. This relay ultimately affects cellular output, typically via RR-mediated transcription[5-7].

The vast number of HKs can be classified into families based chiefly on their primary

sequence features. Among these groupings, the lesser-studied HWE/HisKA2[8,9] superfamily is

distinguished by a motif near the phosphoacceptor histidine residue (H-box), a conserved

arginine (R-box), a long ATP lid, and a glutamate that replaces the first asparagine of the N-box.

These unique features evidently result in higher-order differences that further distinguish this

family. First, while canonical HKs are membrane-bound and strictly homodimeric, many of the

HWE/HisKA2 HKs characterized thus far are soluble and non-dimeric. This phenomenon is

exemplified most dramatically by the monomeric EL346[10] and the hexameric EsxG[11] proteins.

With only two full-length structures solved to date[10,12], there is still much to be learned about the

primary sequence features that underly higher order structural differences and how this family

fits into the broader structural picture of sensor HKs.

Another defining characteristic of HWE/HisKA2 family members is their involvement in

the general stress response (GSR) networks of *Alphaproteobacteria*[13-20]. The GSR is a gene

expression program that enables bacteria to cope with a range of adverse conditions such as

oxidative stress, heat shock, and UV exposure[2,13,21]. This response works using a so-called

"partner-switching" mechanism, whereby HK activity – and subsequent phosphorylation of a

downstream PhyR regulator[22-27] – controls the activity of a transcriptional inhibitor known as

NepR. In the absence of stress, transcription is prevented by NepR binding to the σ^{EcfG} general

transcription factor. Stress activates an HWE/HisKA2 HK, phosphorylating the PhyR and

promoting sequestration of NepR away from σ^{EcfG}, allowing transcription of stress-responsive

genes to occur. Details of the mechanism which links PhyR phosphorylation to NepR binding

remain unclear, as initial models[25,28] have proposed that phosphorylation of the PhyR REC

domain produces an open state that allows NepR to bind its σ-like (SL) domain, while more

recent studies suggest that nascent interaction of NepR with unphosphorylated PhyR precedes

PhyR phosphorylation and open state formation[29].

From this basic architecture, several variations on GSR signaling have been observed,

from multiple paralogous copies of various GSR key components[2,13,21,27,30-32] to differences in

the signaling logic of the histidine kinases which control pathway activity. One example of the

latter is provided by our prior work on a novel HWE/HisKA2 from *Rubellimicrobium*

thermophilum DSM 16684[33] called RT349[34] (referred to here as RT-HK). This protein contains a

light-oxygen-voltage (LOV)[14,35,36] sensor domain, which detects blue light via the photoreduction

of a bound flavin cofactor and concomitant formation of a covalent protein/flavin adduct. As

seen for some of its HWE/HisKA2 relatives, we determined that RT-HK is not strictly dimeric;

instead, its dimer-leaning equilibrium shifts towards more compact/monomeric conformations

under lit conditions and in the absence of ATP[34]. More unexpectedly, we found that its net

kinase activity is higher in the dark than in the light[34]. To our knowledge, RT-HK is the only

naturally occurring LOV-HK with its signaling logic inverted from the more standard light-

activated mode, though we note that genetic studies of *E. litoralis* DSM 8509 suggest the

presence of a dark-activated GSR under partial control of a LOV-HK[37]. A similar inverted logic

has been conferred upon some engineered light-sensing HKs via alterations to the helical

linkers between the sensor and catalytic domains (stemming from the Jα helix in LOV systems),

but no generally applicable pattern for achieving this outcome has been established[38,39].

Here, we further investigated RT-HK's oligomeric state and reversed signaling logic, as

well as its downstream partners. We found that RT-HK likely uses a signal transduction

mechanism similar to light-activated systems, as well as an *in trans* mode of

autophosphorylation, and the length and register of its Jα linker can be altered to affect net

autophosphorylation levels. Exploring downstream effects of RT-HK, we identified two homologs

of PhyR in the genome, RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′. *In vitro* phosphotransfer measurements

showed that RT-HK only specifically signals to RT-PhyR, and at an increased intensity in the

dark consistent with autophosphorylation levels. Crystal structures of both PhyR variants

uncovered a substantial structural shift in RT-PhyR′ immediately following its phosphorylation

site, suggesting a possible mechanism of RT-HK preference for RT-PhyR. Further down the

GSR pathway, we observed unexpected interaction modes between the single NepR homolog

and both unphosphorylated PhyRs, as the RT-PhyR':NepR interaction is decoupled from

phosphorylation, indicating a phosphorylation-independent function for this homolog. Thus, this

system exhibits signaling variations at three levels – HK reversed logic, HK phosphorylation of

RT-PhyR′, and binding of RT-PhyR′ to RT-NepR′ – that broaden our view of the signaling

paradigms in this class of bacterial two-component pathways.

Results

Light signal propagation in a dark-activated histidine kinase

We set out to further investigate the inverted signaling logic and oligomeric state

equilibrium of RT-HK we previously identified[34], seeking to better characterize how RT-HK is

able to take the same light input as other studied natural LOV-HKs and return an opposite

output. In these systems, the light signal is propagated across a considerable distance of

approximately 60 Å from the flavin cofactor within the LOV domain to the ATP in the kinase

domain (**Figure 1a**). While the dynamics of light signaling have been examined in some LOV-

HKs[40-45], this is the first time it has been explored in a naturally occurring dark-activated system.

We began at the global level, using limited trypsinolysis to probe the accessibility of RT-HK

under different illumination conditions (dark vs. lit) and nucleotide states (apo vs. AMP-PNP-

bound). Using SDS-PAGE analyses of these experiments, we found that RT-HK is markedly

more protease-susceptible under lit than dark conditions (**Figure 1b**). More specifically,

quantitation of the intact protein band in these gels (**Figure 1c**) showed that both illumination

and nucleotide state influenced protein accessibility, with a rank order of protease stability being

lit apo > lit AMP-PMP > dark apo > dark AMP-PNP. This trend is reminiscent of that seen for

RT-HK oligomeric state, where the equilibrium was shifted towards monomer in the lit apo state

and dimer in the dark ATP state[34].

To further elucidate the relationship between RT-HK oligomeric state and activity, we

investigated the autophosphorylation mechanism, seeking to establish if this HK phosphorylates

its conserved phosphoacceptor His residue using the γ-phosphate of the ATP molecule bound

either to the same monomer subunit (*in cis*) or the opposite subunit (*in trans*). The mechanism

Figure 1: RT-HK protease accessibility is dependent on illumination and nucleotide-binding state, and autophosphorylates *in trans*. a) AlphaFold[1] model of dimeric RT-HK (top) and domain architecture (bottom) and with domains colored correspondingly. The predicted phosphoacceptor histidine residue is shown as sticks, and bound FMN and ATP molecules are shown as spheres, with the distance between them highlighted. **b)** SDS-PAGE gels showing trypsin cleavage pattern of RT-HK over time in dark, lit, apo, and AMP-PNP-bound states. **c)** Intensity of intact protein band over time, with points fit to an exponential curve. **d)** Multiple sequence alignment of RT-HK with other well-studied HKs. Dashed boxes are drawn around the predicted phosphoacceptor His and Mg-chelating Asn residues. **e)** RT-HK AlphaFold model with mutated H152 and N256 residues shown as sticks. **f)** Phosphoimaged SDS-PAGE gels of autophosphorylation assay reactions show substantial ^{32}P incorporation only in wild-type (WT) and H152A/N256A mixed (Mix) samples (n=3).

can be determined by assaying kinase activity on samples composed of a blend of two RT-HK

variants which each contain one of two mutants, one deficient in the phosphoacceptor His

residue and the other deficient in a conserved Mg^{2+}-chelating Asn. Neither of these mutants can

autophosphorylate as a homodimer, but when the two are heterodimerized, activity will be

restored only if the HK uses a *trans* mechanism[46]. We identified the appropriate RT-HK point

mutations needed for this assay, H152A and N256A, by using a multiple sequence alignment[47]

(**Figure 1d**) and predicted structural model[1] (**Figure 1e**). As expected, each of these mutants

alone did not incorporate a measurable amount of ^{32}P from the γ-^{32}P-ATP substrate in

autophosphorylation assays (**Figure 1f**), but we observed restored kinase activity in samples

mixing the two mutants. These results indicate that RT-HK autophosphorylates *in trans*.

Notably, we saw higher kinase activity of the mixed samples in the dark than in the light,

demonstrating that the signaling logic was not affected by the mutations.

The accessibility of RT-HK to hydrogen-deuterium exchange (HDX) was next assessed

at the peptide level using a mass spectrometry readout (HDX-MS). Exchange was measured in

six different states, varying lit and dark conditions of the LOV domain with either apo, ADP, or

AMP-PNP nucleotide states of the kinase domain. Mapping the difference in deuterium uptake

between lit and dark conditions in apo, AMP-PNP-, and ADP-bound nucleotide states onto the

RT-HK AlphaFold model (**Figure 2**) illustrates several key areas of difference. Intriguingly,

peptides throughout the LOV domain exhibited bimodal distributions (**Figure S1**), with an

increased ratio of the fast-exchanging population consistently present under lit conditions,

regardless of nucleotide state. For two LOV domain peptides with unimodal distributions (17-22

& 70-79) as well as a peptide in the Jα linker helix (127-148), we observed increased exchange

under lit conditions. These data are consistent with prior HDX studies of LOV domains and

proteins by NMR[48,49] or MS[50]. The pattern changes substantially in DHp and CA regions, where

nucleotide is essential for large-scale HDX. This is exemplified by a peptide from the DHp

region (182-189), which experienced similar exchange under dark and lit conditions in the apo

state but showed higher exchange in the dark once nucleotide was added. A peptide at the

interface between the DHp and CA (213-231) shows nucleotide dependence only in the light. In

the ATP lid region of the CA domain (286-315), the peptide shows decreased exchange when

AMP-PNP is bound, especially in the dark. Overall exchange in the DHp-CA domains is similar

between both nucleotide states, with ADP having a more muted effect. All-in-all, it is clear that

nucleotide is required for post-LOV signal transmission and the DHp is at the heart of this

process.

Figure 2: Different regions of RT-HK are differentially affected by light or nucleotide state as assayed by HDX-MS. RT-HK AlphaFold models are colored according to deuterium uptake differences (lit-dark %D) in apo, AMP-PNP-, and ADP-bound states at 300 s, with red (or blue) reflecting increased (or decreased) exchange in the light, respectively. Chiefly bimodal regions are colored dark grey. Uptake plots are shown for selected peptides whose positions are indicated by residue numbers on the models. Error bars represent standard deviation of 3 replicates.

Our HDX-MS results highlighted the importance of Jα-containing peptides in signal

transduction, prompting us to look further into this region. Previous work on chimeric engineered

light-sensing HKs has shown that altering the length of this helix can markedly affect how light

input controls net kinase activity[38,39,51]. This phenomenon is generally attributed to

conformational changes in the coiled-coil linker between the light-sensing and effector modules

of the HK. Intriguingly, the predicted RT-HK structural model has a pronounced break in the

coiled-coil between the Jα helix and DHp, likely caused by residue P143 (**Figure 3a**). Four

residues surrounding this region were systematically deleted and the effect on net kinase

activity was assessed *in vitro* using a γ-^{32}P-ATP substrate (**Figure 3b**).

Figure 3: Deletions in Jα linker affect net RT-HK autophosphorylation levels and signaling logic. a) Schematic showing positions of amino acid deletions for each construct (top) and AlphaFold model of RT-HK with deleted residues shown as sticks (bottom). **b)** Autophosphorylation assays (plots above, phosphoimages below) are plotted as concentration vs. time for each protein, with dark measurements shown as black lines and lit shown in red. The bar plot shows the initial velocity measured from the linear portion of each curve, with dark measurements shown in dark grey and lit measurements in red. Each point/bar indicates the mean and all error bars span +/- one SD (n=3).

As expected, the wild-type RT-HK showed a sizeable increase in net

autophosphorylation in the dark state as compared to the lit state. Surprisingly, removing a

single residue to produce the Jα1 mutant caused a drop in dark state activity, resulting in a

modest reversal of the signaling logic. The next amino acid deletion (notably, the P143 residue

likely "kinking" this region) had the opposite effect – activity in both states increased greatly

compared to wild type and the reversed signaling logic was restored. The activity of Jα3 was

comparable to wild type, though attenuated in the dark state. And lastly, Jα4 showed a similar

effect to Jα1, with a sharp drop in net autophosphorylation levels and another slight reversal of

the signaling logic. All-in-all, these results suggest a helical-type periodicity of approximately 3.8

residues, highlighting the importance of the Jα helix and subsequent coiled coil in transmitting

signal between sensor and effector domains.

The role of a dark-activated LOV-HK in a paralogous GSR

After investigating how the light signal propagates through the RT-HK molecule, we set

out to identify signaling partner/s and determine if the reversed logic is transferred downstream.

Recognizing that HWE/HisKA2 family HKs are often involved in the GSR[13-20], we searched the

R. thermophilum DSM 16684 genome for homologs of the key players: the sigma factor σ^{EcfG},

the anti-sigma factor NepR, and the anti-anti-sigma factor PhyR response regulator. This search

revealed two sets of GSR genes encoded in separate genomic loci, which we refer to as GSR

and GSR′ (**Figure 4a**). GSR′ exhibits the typical organization, containing one copy each of

NepR, PhyR, and σ^{EcfG} (RT-NepR′, RT-PhyR′, and RT-$\sigma^{EcfG′}$), as well as another HWE-family

HK (distinct from RT-HK). Surprisingly, the GSR region also contains its own copies of PhyR

and σ^{EcfG} (RT-PhyR and RT-σ^{EcfG}). It is uncommon to find multiple copies of GSR regulators

within a single organism and several studies have focused on this phenomenon[27,32,52].

With these two putative downstream PhyR partners in hand, we explored the ability of

RT-HK to phosphorylate each using an *in vitro* phosphotransfer assay[53] (**Figure 4b**). We

measured such phosphotransfer at two timepoints: a short timepoint (30 s) to identify the

kinetically preferred cognate partner, coupled with a longer timepoint (10 min) to characterize

any non-specific transfer. At the short timepoint, we observed transfer only to RT-PhyR,

suggesting that it is the cognate partner of RT-HK. Further, the intensity of the phosphorylated

RT-PhyR bands were higher in the dark condition at both timepoints, indicating RT-HK's

reversed logic had been transferred downstream. Notably, RT-PhyR′ was phosphorylated only

at the longer timepoint and without a marked illumination dependence, suggesting that it is a

non-specific partner.

Figure 4: RT-HK reversed signaling logic is transferred to downstream partner RT-PhyR. a) Architecture of the two GSR loci in *R. thermophilum* DSM 16684 with genomic locations specified below. Arrows indicate open reading frames. Promoter regions (grey arrows) were predicted from the consensus sequence GGAAC-N$_{16-17}$-C/GGTT[2]. **b)** Phosphoimaged gels tracking the *in vitro* transfer of a ^{32}P-labeled phosphoryl group from RT-HK to RT-PhyR (left) and RT-PhyR′ (right). Experiments were performed in dark (top) and lit (bottom) conditions, and samples were taken at 30 s and 10 min timepoints. A negative control (phosphorylated RT-HK only) was run at each timepoint in the left-most lane and triplicate samples were run in consecutive lanes. The top band in each lane corresponds to the mass of phosphorylated RT-HK and bands below this correspond to the mass of the phosphorylated PhyR homolog.

229   Though there are clear differences between the ability of the two PhyR paralogs to

230   interact with RT-HK, the root of these differences is not immediately apparent from their primary

231   sequences, as they share 64% identity and generally align well with PhyRs from other

232   organisms (**Figure S2**). To provide a structural basis for RT-HK specificity among these two

233   related proteins, we solved the crystal structures of RT-PhyR (1.99 Å resolution; PDB ID: 9BY5)

234 and RT-PhyR′ (2.83 Å resolution; PDB ID: 9CB6); data collection and refinement statistics for

235 both structures are summarized in **Table S1**. RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′ were solved as a

236 crystallographic trimer and a tetramer, respectively.

237  In the structures of both RT-PhyR (**Figure 5a**) and RT-PhyR′ (**Figure 5b**), we observed

238 a typical arrangement between the sigma-like (SL) and receiver (REC) domains. The fold of the

239 SL domain is a seven α-helical bundle consisting of the σ2 (α1-3) and σ4 (α5-7) regions, which

240 are connected by a disordered loop that includes α4. Unsurprisingly, no electron density was

241 present for the disordered loop in RT-PhyR′. However, we were able to model this loop into

Figure 5: Comparisons of RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′ crystal structures. a) RT-PhyR (PDB ID: 9BY5) and **b)** RT-PhyR′ (PDB ID: 9CB6) crystal structures with domains and secondary structure elements labeled. The phosphoacceptor D residues are shown as sticks. **c)** Aligned RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′ crystal structures highlight differences in the position of the β3-α10 loop and α10 helix (white arrows). **d)** Aligning several known PhyR structures (labeled according to first two letters of their host organism; BQ PhyR: 5UXW, BA PhyR: 4G97, CV PhyR: 3N0R) to the RT-PhyR/RT-PhyR overlay illustrate that the RT-PhyR′ β3 loop–α10 helix position is the outlier. The green zoomed-in region highlights the unique position of Q193 in RT-PhyR′ near phosphoacceptor D191. Surface representation comparisons illustrate the limited solvent accessibility of D191 in RT-PhyR′.

monomer B of the RT-PhyR structure, where it adopts an atypical position (**Figure S3**). The C-

terminal end of the SL domain leads into the REC domain, which displays the canonical α/β fold

in both proteins.

Aligning the two PhyR paralog structures shows a reasonably high degree of overall

similarity (2.7 Å Cα RMSD) (**Figure 5c**), with a notable major shift in the position of the loop

connecting the β3 strand (immediately following the phosphoacceptor D residue) and

subsequent α10 helix (α3 in standard REC nomenclature). Adding other PhyR structures into

the alignment (**Figure 5c**), it is evident that RT-PhyR′ adopts an unusual conformation not

routinely seen in other REC domains. This large-scale shift in RT-PhyR′ is likely related to the

unique position of a conserved Q residue (Q193), which "leans in" and diminishes the solvent

accessibility of the phosphoacceptor D (D191) (**Figure 5d**). Two residues in the α9 helix of RT-

PhyR′ also adopt distinct positions: a well-conserved R at the N-terminus (R173) and another R

at the C-terminus (R184) "reach out" toward the typical position of the β3 loop and α10 helix,

respectively (**Figure S4**).

Continuing to the next steps of the signaling pathway, we used ^{15}N/^{1}H TROSY

experiments with uniformly ^{15}N-labeled RT-PhyR or RT-PhyR′ to investigate their functional

properties and interactions with the single *R. therm.* NepR homolog, RT-NepR′ (**Figure 4a**).

When titrated with the phosphoryl group analog BeF$_3^-$, both spectra showed extensive chemical

shift perturbations, with slow exchange behavior (**Figure 6a**). RT-PhyR′ reached saturation at

the highest BeF$_3^-$ titration point, whereas RT-PhyR did not, suggesting weaker binding by RT-

PhyR. Similar slow exchange phenomena were observed when titrating RT-NepR′ to each

homolog (**Figure 6b**), but only RT-PhyR′ reached saturation at the highest titration point of RT-

NepR′. This suggests that RT-PhyR has a lower affinity for RT-NepR′ than RT-PhyR′ does,

similar to the BeF$_3^-$ observations. We underscore that the substantial chemical shift

perturbations we observed for RT-NepR′ titrations into the apo-forms (i.e. no BeF$_3^-$) of both

PhyR proteins were unexpected, as comparable studies in other PhyR/NepR pairs showed no

interaction [24,25,27] or much smaller peak shifts[20,29].

Figure 6: RT-PhyR binds RT-NepR′ and BeF$_3^-$ with positive cooperativity while RT-PhyR′ binds these ligands with negative cooperativity. ^{15}N/^{1}H TROSY of 210 μM ^{15}N-labeled RT-PhyR (left) and 220 μM ^{15}N-labeled RT-PhyR′ (right). Proteins were titrated with **a)** BeF$_3^-$, **b)** RT-NepR′, or **c)** both at concentrations indicated in panel insets. Chemical shift perturbations that best illustrate the effects of each condition are expanded in each panel.

To explore the coupling of PhyR proteins binding to BeF$_3^-$ and RT-NepR′, and thus

investigate the phosphorylation dependence of this interaction, we titrated BeF$_3^-$ into RT-PhyR

or RT-PhyR′ samples that were pre-equilibrated with RT-NepR′ (**Figure 6c**). We observed

markedly different results compared to the single titrations above: For RT-PhyR, we saw many

peaks shift into positions distinct from those seen when the protein was titrated with either

substance alone, indicating a synergistic effect. On the other hand, addition of BeF$_3^-$ to RT-

NepR′-equilibrated RT-PhyR′ did not cause any substantial spectral shifts, showing that RT-

PhyR′ binds RT-NepR′ to the exclusion of BeF_3^- rather than cooperatively.

Discussion

Here we aimed to investigate the unusual features of RT-HK oligomeric state and

signaling logic seen in our prior study[34] and to probe interactions between downstream partners.

We started with RT-HK itself, using low-resolution limited trypsinolysis to investigate its structure

and dynamics in various conditions and nucleotide states (**Figure 1b**). The effect of these

conditions on protease accessibility (**Figure 1c**) were reminiscent of those seen for oligomeric

state[34], prompting an investigation into the autophosphorylation mechanism of RT-HK.

We used mutagenesis to determine that RT-HK uses an *in trans* mechanism (**Figure 1f**).

This result was somewhat unexpected based on the AlphaFold model of RT-HK, as prior

investigations of the relationship between autophosphorylation mechanism and helix bundle

loop handedness in a number of HisKA family systems[54] suggested that the left-handed loop

predicted for RT-HK should confer *cis* autophosphorylation. While such a discrepancy may stem

from either *bona fide* mechanistic differences or inaccuracies in the AlphaFold prediction, we

note that a similar conflict was seen for the His_KA3 family HK DesK, which has an

experimentally-solved structure[55,56], leading us to attribute this to the former.

RT-HK solvent accessibility was next assessed at the peptide-level using HDX-MS

(**Figure 2**). Bimodal distributions were seen for m/z spectra of peptides throughout the LOV

domain, indicating the existence of two distinct states/conformations (**Figure S1**). A relatively

higher abundance of the fast-exchanging population under lit conditions suggests that a higher

proportion of the LOV domain adopts the associated conformation in the light. At the C-terminus

of the LOV domain, in the Jα linker helix, exchange increased under lit conditions in the apo and

AMP-PNP-bound states. This result is consistent with the widely-held observation that the Jα

helix plays a key role in transmitting light-mediated conformational changes[39,48,51,57]. For

example, undocking of the Jα from the LOV domain upon illumination has been seen in

AsLOV2[48,58,59] and increased accessibility of the Jα helix has been seen in lit-state EL222[49]. Our

HDX-MS measurements also highlight that nucleotide is essential for building a light responsive

state, as evidenced by changes in the DHp and CA regions upon nucleotide addition. These

results are generally comparable to EL346[42], where light-induced changes are also seen

throughout the DHp in the nucleotide-bound states. In both cases, an increase in exchange is

seen in the helix surrounding the phosphoacceptor histidine. Overall, RT-HK evidently makes

use of a signal transduction mechanism similar to other light-activated systems, despite its

reversed signaling logic.

The role of Jα helix properties in LOV-HK signal transmission has been a focus of many

studies involving the chimeric engineered YF1 system[39,51,57], which also exhibits a "dark active,

lit inactive" reversed logic. A common theme among these works is the importance of the

heptad periodicity of the coiled-coil linker helix between sensory and output modules in defining

signaling logic. Though this exact pattern was not found to be applicable to another inverted

chimeric light-sensing HK (with a phytochrome-type photosensory module sensor domain)[38],

both systems highlight the general importance of the continuous coiled-coil linker. Since the

structural model of RT-HK shows a proline-mediated break in its analogous linker, we made

systematic deletions to alter the length (and potentially linearize) this region while assessing its

role in signal transduction (**Figure 3a**). We saw a clear stepwise change in net dark state

activity as single residue deletions were made (**Figure 3c**): Jα1 dropped below WT; Jα2 greatly

increased; Jα3 saw a decrease relative to Jα2; and Jα4 exhibited the least activity overall. This

pattern is strikingly similar to the periodicity of a coiled coil linker, similar to what has been

observed for YF1[39,51,57].

To investigate how RT-HK passes its signal to downstream partners, we next sought to

identify cognate RR proteins. HWE/HisKA2 family HKs are well-established as sensory proteins

in the GSR networks of *Alphaproteobacteria*[13-20]. We discovered that the *R. therm.* genome

includes two homologous copies each of the key GSR regulators σ^{EcfG} and PhyR. Since multiple

genomic copies of σ^{EcfG} are seen more commonly than PhyR, work elucidating the interplay

between paralogs in other organisms[27,32,52] has mostly focused on σ^{EcfG}. Only two studies have

addressed systems with multiple PhyR copies, including one in *S. meliloti* (one σ^{EcfG}, two

NepRs, and two PhyRs; both NepRs interact with both PhyRs and with the single σ^{EcfG}, but to

different extents[27]) and another in *S. granuli* (all three GSR proteins are duplicated; both NepRs

interact with both σ^{EcfG} proteins and both PhyRs to varying extents[32]). While some organisms

have the same combination of GSR regulators as *R. therm.*[60], they have not been systematically

studied to the best of our knowledge. In general though, the combinations of GSR protein

copies and interactions among them tend to vary between systems[31,61,62]; an observation

consistent with the hypothesis that multiple copies have diverged to assume different regulatory

roles.

To probe the roles of the GSR paralogs in *R. therm.*, we began with *in vitro*

phosphotransfer measurements from RT-HK to both PhyR proteins (**Figure 4b**). These

experiments revealed RT-PhyR as the cognate partner and indicated that phosphotransfer was

more efficient in the dark state. On the other hand, the level of non-specific phosphotransfer to

RT-PhyR′ was not dependent on the dark or lit state of RT-HK, though it seems unlikely to be

an *in vivo* substrate regardless. Instead, our data support a model where the dark state signal of

RT-HK is further propagated by the action of RT-PhyR.

X-ray crystal structures of both PhyR homologs (**Figure 5**) present potential structural

bases for two key events: 1) RT-HK specificity (**Figure 4b**) and 2) the anomalies in

phosphorylation/RT-NepR′ binding observed in NMR experiments (**Figure 6**). The RT-PhyR

structure has typical SL and REC domain folds, as well as density for the typically flexible α4

helix. This helix plays a role in NepR binding[23,25,28], acting as a "molecular doorstop" to prevent

NepR displacement by the REC domain[21], and adopts distinct positions based on the presence

of NepR. Alignment of the RT-PhyR SL domain with PhyR structures from other organisms

reveals a shift in this region (**Figure S3**) where its α4 helix is situated between the expected

NepR-bound and unbound positions. This could explain the propensity for RT-PhyR (and

possibly RT-PhyR′, which had insufficient density for us to model the α4 helix into any of the

monomers) to bind RT-NepR′ in their unphosphorylated states (**Figure 6**). However, we are

wary of overinterpreting this particular detail, as intermolecular interactions between RT-PhyR

molecules in the crystal involve the α4 helix, so this position may be artificially stabilized.

Though RT-PhyR′ also adopts typical SL and REC domain folds, its β3 loop-α10 helix is

markedly shifted relative to RT-PhyR and PhyRs from various other organisms (**Figure 5d**). We

also observed discrepancies in the RT-PhyR′ structure at the residue level (**Figure 5d & S4**),

including the "leaning-in" Q193, which decreases the solvent accessibility of the

phosphoacceptor D, limiting its ability to be phosphorylated by an HK partner. We note that this

site is accessible to BeF_3^- in our NMR experiments, leaving open the potential for small

molecule phosphodonors like acetyl phosphate to control the system. The RT-PhyR′ structural

shifts also likely play a role in altering signal propagation from the SL to the REC (**Figure S4**).

The function of the two PhyR paralogs along subsequent steps of the GSR pathway was

assessed in a series of NMR titration experiments. Addition of the phosphoryl group analog

BeF_3^- produced substantial chemical shift perturbations in the spectra of both RT-PhyR and RT-

PhyR′, indicating widespread conformational changes upon activation (**Figure 6a**). These

results appear to support the broadly accepted hypothesis that REC domain phosphorylation

produces the PhyR open state necessary for PhyR/NepR complex formation[22-27]. However,

additional NMR experiments surprisingly showed large chemical shift perturbations upon

addition of RT-NepR′ to both BeF$_3^-$-free PhyRs (**Figure 6b**). These results are consistent with a

more complex mechanism, such as the one previously proposed where nascent NepR binding

and PhyR phosphorylation act cooperatively to form the inhibitory PhyR~P/NepR complex[29].

Indeed, our results for RT-PhyR indicate a synergistic effect expected from such a mechanism.

However, the analogous interactions seem to be inverted in RT-PhyR′, (**Figure 6c**), which

exclusively binds RT-NepR′ when provided with both RT-NepR′ and BeF$_3^-$, suggesting a

negatively cooperative function for this paralog. Ultimately, *in vivo* confirmation of interactions

between GSR proteins and their functional importance will be advantageous, but our

biochemical and structural data make strong predictions regarding the differential roles of RT-

PhyR and RT-PhyR′.

Taken together, our results support the model depicted in **Figure 7**. In the dark, RT-HK

increases its net *in trans* autophosphorylation and signals to its cognate partner RT-PhyR much

more efficiently than to RT-PhyR′. Still, both proteins adopt distinct conformations upon addition

of a phosphoryl group analog. In the absence of phosphorylation, both PhyRs interact

extensively with RT-NepR′, each adopting a third conformation. In RT-PhyR, these two

Figure 7: Summary of proposed binding modes for *R. therm.* PhyR homologs. This model illustrates the distinct conformations adopted by RT-PhyR (left) and RT-PhyR′ (right) identified in this study. RT-HK is depicted in blue and RT-NepR′ is in green. The relative sizes of the reaction arrows indicate the equilibrium position.

pathways from the unphosphorylated conformation evidently act synergistically to promote

formation of the final phosphorylated RT-NepR′-bound complex, as previously proposed for *C.*

crescentus[29]. In contrast, the absence of a conformation representing the final phosphorylated

RT-PhyR′/RT-NepR′ complex strongly suggests a phosphorylation-independent function for this

homolog, the details of which remain unclear. All-in-all, these results supplement the existing

variety and degree of interactions among copies of GSR regulators. This undoubtedly reflects a

wealth of GSR regulatory modes between organisms which have yet to be fully characterized.

Experimental Procedures

Cloning, protein expression and purification

DNA encoding sequences of RT-HK, RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′ (NCBI Gene locus tags

RUTHE_RS05260, RUTHE_RS05225, and RUTHE_RS12555, respectively) were amplified

from *Rubellimicrobium thermophilum* DSM 16684 genomic DNA and Jα deletion genes were

ordered from Twist Biosciences. Genes were cloned into the pHis-Gβ1-parallel expression

vector[63]. The resulting RT-HK plasmid was used as a template to produce H152A and N256A

mutants by site-directed mutagenesis. All constructs were verified by DNA sequencing before

being transformed into *Escherichia coli* BL21(DE3) cells (Stratagene). Cells were grown in LB

containing 100 µg/mL ampicillin at 37°C and proteins were overexpressed as previously

described[42]. Cells were harvested, resuspended in buffer containing 50 mM Tris (pH 8.0), 100

mM NaCl, and 10 mM $MgCl_2$, and lysed by sonication. Lysates were centrifuged at 20,000 xg

and 4°C for 45 min. Supernatants were filtered through 0.45 µm and bound to a Ni^{2+} Sepharose

affinity column (GE Healthcare). The His6-Gβ1 tagged protein was washed with 4 column

volumes of cell resuspension buffer supplemented with 20 mM imidazole and eluted with 250

mM imidazole. Eluted proteins were incubated with His_6-TEV protease and exchanged into

imidazole-deficient buffer by dialysis overnight at 4°C. Proteins were separated from the tags

and His$_6$-TEV protease by Ni^{2+} affinity chromatography and were further purified by size-

exclusion chromatography on either a HiLoad 16/600 Superdex 200 pg or a Superdex 200

Increase HiScale 16/40 (GE Healthcare) equilibrated with 50 mM Tris (pH 7.0) (for RT-PhyR,

RT-PhyR′, and RT-NepR′) or 10 mM MES (pH 6.5) (for RT-HK and mutants), and 100 mM

NaCl, 10 mM MgCl$_2$, and 1 mM DTT. For light-sensitive proteins, all purification steps were

performed under dim red light. Concentrations were determined from the theoretical absorption

coefficient, ε_{280} for PhyRs and RT-NepR', calculated from the sequence using the ExPASy

ProtParam server[64], and ε_{446} = 11,800 M^{-1} cm^{-1} for all variations of RT-HK.

Limited trypsinolysis

Reactions were performed on 30 µM RT-HK in a buffer containing 50mM Tris (pH 8.0),

100 mM NaCl, 10 mM MgCl$_2$, and 1 mM DTT. Samples of apo and 1.6 mM AMP-PNP-

equilibrated proteins were equilibrated in lit and dark conditions. Trypsin was added in a 1:1400

ratio to RT-HK, and aliquots were removed to a 4 mM PMSF quench solution at timepoints of 0,

0.5, 1, 5, 10, 20, 30, 45, and 60 min. Samples were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and

visualized using Coomassie blue stain.

Production of H152A/N256A heterodimer

Samples of ~100 µM H152A and N256A mutants in buffer containing 10 mM MES (pH

6.5), 100 mM NaCl, 10 mM MgCl$_2$, and 1 mM DTT were mixed and allowed to equilibrate at 4°C

for 30 min. The mixture was then added to a dialysis cassette and placed in 500 mL of the same

buffer supplemented with 6 M urea and allowed to stir at room temperature for 4 hr. The

cassette was then placed into 1 L of the original buffer and stirred overnight at 4°C. The mixture

was then reconstituted with 250 µM FMN by 30 min equilibration at 4°C and subsequently

separated on a Superdex 200 Increase HiScale 16/40 (GE Healthcare).

Autophosphorylation assays of cis/trans and Jα mutants

Experiments were performed as previously described[10,42]. Reactions contained 20 µM

protein (40 µM for the heterodimer) in a buffer of 10 mM HEPES (pH 8.0), 100 mM NaCl, 5 mM

$MgCl_2$, 2 mM DTT, and 10% glycerol. A mixture of unlabeled ATP and 10 µCi [γ-^{32}P] ATP was

added to each protein to initiate the reaction (final ATP concentration 500 µM). Aliquots were

removed at time points of approximately 1, 1.5, 2.5, 4, 8, 6, and 32 min for Jα deletion

experiments and 30 min only for cis/trans experiments, then quenched in a 4x SDS-gel loading

buffer.

Hydrogen-deuterium exchange mass spectrometry

30 µM RT-HK was prepared in buffer containing 10 mM MES, pH 6.0, 25 mM NaCl, 5

mM $MgCl_2$, and 1 mM DTT and incubated in dark or light conditions with 1.6 mM ADP or AMP-

PNP for 30 min. Subsequent labeling and quenching was handled by the automated LEAP HDX

platform (Trajan). Labeling was initiated in the same buffer prepared with 100% D_2O for a

precise amount of time before rapid mixing with a quench buffer containing 2 M GdHCl, 3%

acetonitrile, and 1% formic acid at 0°C. Next, samples were digested on a Waters Enzymate

BEH Pepsin Column before being eluted through a C18 analytical column (Hypersil Gold, 50

mm length × 1 mm diameter, 1.9 µm particle size, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and injected into a

Bruker maXis-II ESI-QqTOF high-resolution mass spectrometer. Processing of raw mass

spectrometry data files was done with Bruker Compass Data Analysis 5.3 and Biotools 3.2

software. Identified peptides were then disambiguated using the PIGEON tool[65]. All data files

were then imported into version 3.3 of the HDExaminer software from Sierra Analytics to

calculate exchange rate profiles.

Phosphotransfer assays

Phosphotransfer from RT-HK to RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′ was measured as described

previously[24,53]. Reactions took place in a buffer containing 10 mM HEPES (pH 8.0), 100 mM

NaCl, 5 mM MgCl$_2$, and 2 mM DTT. A mixture of unlabeled ATP and 24 µCi [γ-^{32}P] ATP was

added to RT-HK to initiate autophosphorylation (final ATP concentration 500 µM, and final HK

concentration 10 µM). This reaction was allowed to occur for 10 min before a negative control

aliquot was placed into 4x SDS-gel loading quench buffer, and the rest was mixed with an equal

amount of RR candidate (final concentration both proteins 5 µM). Aliquots of this mixture were

removed at 30 s and 10 min timepoints and placed into quench buffer. For dark measurements,

all steps were performed under dim red light. For lit measurements, the samples were

illuminated with a blue LED panel just prior to and throughout the course of the experiment.

Samples were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis, gels were dried and exposed to a storage

phosphoscreen, and bands were visualized by phosphoimaging with a Typhoon FLA 9500 (GE

Healthcare).

Crystallization and structure determination of RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′

Commercially available NeXtal PEGs and ComPAS suite screens were employed to find

suitable conditions. Crystals of RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′ were optimized and grown at room

temperature using sitting-drops vapor diffusion method in the presence of 5 and 10 mM MgCl$_2$,

respectively. The RT-PhyR crystallization buffer consisted of 16% (w/v) PEG 10000 and 0.1 M

Tris (pH 8.5). RT-PhyR′ was crystallized from a solution of 0.2 M KSCN, 20% (w/v) PEG2250,

and 0.1 M BIS-TRIS propane (pH 6.0). Resulting crystals were cryoprotected with LV CryoOil

(MiTeGen), looped, and flash-cooled in liquid N$_2$ prior to data collection. Data were collected at

the National Synchrotron Light Source II(NSLS-II) light source at Brookhaven National

Laboratory using the FMX (17-ID-2) beamline for RT-PhyR and the AMX (17-ID-1) beamline for

RT-PhyR′. Data were processed using the autoPROC toolbox[66], resulting in datasets at 1.99 Å

(RT-PhyR) and 2.83 Å (RT-PhyR′) resolution. Balbes[67] was used to produce search models,

and structures were determined by molecular replacement with Phaser[68]. Several cycles of

refinement were conducted using Coot[69] and Phenix[68]. Final data collection, processing, and

refinement parameters are provided in **Table S1**.

Titration experiments with BeF$_3^-$ and RT-NepR′

Starting samples contained 215 µM ^{15}N-labeled RT-PhyR and RT-PhyR′ in 50 mM Tris

(pH 7.0), 100 mM NaCl, 10 mM MgCl$_2$, and 5% D$_2$O. These were titrated with BeF$_3^-$ (using a

fresh 400 mM stock solution prepared by mixing 400 mM BeCl$_2$ and 1.2 M NaF) to

concentrations ranging from 1.5-20 mM, or with RT-NepR′ (using a 220 µM stock solution) to

concentrations ranging from 70-140 µM (while RT-PhyR/′ concentrations decreased

accordingly). ^{15}N/^{1}H TROSY (^{15}N/^{1}H-WADE-TROSY[70]) spectra were collected at 313.1K on a

Bruker Avance III HD spectrometer equipped with a 5mm TCI CryoProbe and operating at a ^{1}H

frequency of 800.05 MHz. NMRFx Analyst[71] was used for data processing and analysis.

Data availability— Structure factors and atomic coordinates have been deposited in the Protein

Data Bank with PDB IDs 9BY5 and 9CB6.

Supporting information – This article contains supporting information, including Table S1 and

Figures S1-2.

Acknowledgements – The authors would like to thank Sean Crosson (Michigan State University)

and members of the Gardner Laboratory for useful discussions. We would also like to

acknowledge Joseph DiCandia for assistance with figure building and manuscript review. This

research used the AMX and FMX beamlines of the National Synchrotron Light Source II, a U.S.

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

Science by Brookhaven National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-SC0012704. The Center for

BioMolecular Structure (CBMS) is primarily supported by the National Institutes of Health,

National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) through a Center Core P30 Grant (P30

GM133893), and by the DOE Office of Biological and Environmental Research (KP1607011).

Funding and additional information— This work was supported by the National Institutes of

Health grants R01 GM106239 (to K.H.G.) and T32 GM136499 (supporting L.E.), and National

Science Foundation grant 1852496 (supporting R.A.), and the Mina Rees Dissertation

Fellowship from the CUNY Graduate Center (to D.S.). The content is solely the responsibility of

the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of

Health.

Conflicts of interest – The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest with the

contents of this article.

Abbreviations – CA, catalytic ATP-binding; DHp, dimerization histidine phosphotransfer; HK,

histidine kinase; GSR, general stress response; HDX-MS, hydrogen-deuterium exchange mass

spectrometry; LOV, Light-Oxygen-Voltage; NMR, nuclear magnetic resonance; REC, receiver

domain; RR, response regulator; SL, sigma-like domain; TCS, two-component system; TROSY,

transverse relaxation-optimized spectroscopy.

References

1.   Abramson J, Adler J, Dunger J, Evans R, Green T, Pritzel A, Ronneberger O, Willmore
L, Ballard AJ, Bambrick J, Bodenstein SW, Evans DA, Hung CC, O'Neill M, Reiman D,
Tunyasuvunakool K, Wu Z, Zemgulyte A, Arvaniti E, Beattie C, Bertolli O, Bridgland A,

Cherepanov A, Congreve M, Cowen-Rivers AI, Cowie A, Figurnov M, Fuchs FB, Gladman H,
Jain R, Khan YA, Low CMR, Perlin K, Potapenko A, Savy P, Singh S, Stecula A,
Thillaisundaram A, Tong C, Yakneen S, Zhong ED, Zielinski M, Zidek A, Bapst V, Kohli P,
Jaderberg M, Hassabis D, Jumper JM. Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions
with AlphaFold 3. Nature. 2024;630(8016):493-500. Epub 20240508. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-
07487-w. PubMed PMID: 38718835; PMCID: PMC11168924.

2.   Francez-Charlot A, Kaczmarczyk A, Fischer HM, Vorholt JA. The general stress
response in Alphaproteobacteria. Trends in microbiology. 2015;23(3):164-71. Epub 2015/01/15.
doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2014.12.006. PubMed PMID: 25582885.

3.   Mascher T, Helmann JD, Unden G. Stimulus perception in bacterial signal-transducing
histidine kinases. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2006;70(4):910-38. Epub 2006/12/13. doi:
10.1128/MMBR.00020-06. PubMed PMID: 17158704; PMCID: PMC1698512.

4.   West AH, Stock AM. Histidine kinases and response regulator proteins in two-
component signaling systems. Trends Biochem Sci. 2001;26(6):369-76. Epub 2001/06/19.
PubMed PMID: 11406410.

5.   Wang S. Bacterial Two-Component Systems: Structures and Signaling Mechanisms. In:
Huang C, editor. Protein Phosphorylation in Human Health: InTech; 2012.

6.   Mechaly AE, Soto Diaz S, Sassoon N, Buschiazzo A, Betton JM, Alzari PM. Structural
Coupling between Autokinase and Phosphotransferase Reactions in a Bacterial Histidine
Kinase. Structure. 2017;25(6):939-44 e3. Epub 2017/05/30. doi: 10.1016/j.str.2017.04.011.
PubMed PMID: 28552574.

7.   Kenney LJ, Anand GS. EnvZ/OmpR Two-Component Signaling: An Archetype System
That Can Function Noncanonically. EcoSal Plus. 2020;9(1). Epub 2020/02/01. doi:
10.1128/ecosalplus.ESP-0001-2019. PubMed PMID: 32003321; PMCID: PMC7192543.

8.   Herrou J, Crosson S, Fiebig A. Structure and function of HWE/HisKA2-family sensor
histidine kinases. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2017;36:47-54. Epub 2017/02/15. doi:
10.1016/j.mib.2017.01.008. PubMed PMID: 28193573; PMCID: PMC5534388.

9.   Karniol B, Vierstra RD. The HWE histidine kinases, a new family of bacterial two-
component sensor kinases with potentially diverse roles in environmental signaling. J Bacteriol.
2004;186(2):445-53. Epub 2004/01/02. PubMed PMID: 14702314; PMCID: PMC305753.

10.   Rivera-Cancel G, Ko WH, Tomchick DR, Correa F, Gardner KH. Full-length structure of
a monomeric histidine kinase reveals basis for sensory regulation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2014;111(50):17839-44. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1413983111. PubMed PMID: 25468971; PMCID:
PMC4273353.

11.   Wojnowska M, Yan J, Sivalingam GN, Cryar A, Gor J, Thalassinos K, Djordjevic S.
Autophosphorylation activity of a soluble hexameric histidine kinase correlates with the shift in
protein conformational equilibrium. Chem Biol. 2013;20(11):1411-20. Epub 2013/11/12. doi:
10.1016/j.chembiol.2013.09.008. PubMed PMID: 24210218; PMCID: PMC3899027.

12.   Rinaldi J, Arrar M, Sycz G, Cerutti ML, Berguer PM, Paris G, Estrin DA, Marti MA, Klinke
S, Goldbaum FA. Structural Insights into the HWE Histidine Kinase Family: The Brucella Blue

Light-Activated Histidine Kinase Domain. J Mol Biol. 2016;428(6):1165-79. Epub 2016/02/07.
doi: 10.1016/j.jmb.2016.01.026. PubMed PMID: 26851072.

13.   Staron A, Mascher T. General stress response in alpha-proteobacteria: PhyR and
beyond. Mol Microbiol. 2010;78(2):271-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2010.07336.x. PubMed
PMID: 20979331.

14.   Correa F, Ko WH, Ocasio V, Bogomolni RA, Gardner KH. Blue light regulated two-
component systems: enzymatic and functional analyses of light-oxygen-voltage (LOV)-histidine
kinases and downstream response regulators. Biochemistry. 2013;52(27):4656-66. doi:
10.1021/bi400617y. PubMed PMID: 23806044; PMCID: PMC3830641.

15.   Kaczmarczyk A, Hochstrasser R, Vorholt JA, Francez-Charlot A. Complex two-
component signaling regulates the general stress response in Alphaproteobacteria. Proc Natl
Acad Sci U S A. 2014;111(48):E5196-204. Epub 2014/11/19. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1410095111.
PubMed PMID: 25404331; PMCID: PMC4260549.

16.   Foreman R, Fiebig A, Crosson S. The LovK-LovR two-component system is a regulator
of the general stress pathway in Caulobacter crescentus. J Bacteriol. 2012;194(12):3038-49.
Epub 2012/03/13. doi: 10.1128/JB.00182-12. PubMed PMID: 22408156; PMCID: PMC3370868.

17.   Ocasio VJ, Correa F, Gardner KH. Ligand-induced folding of a two-component signaling
receiver domain. Biochemistry. 2015;54(6):1353-63. doi: 10.1021/bi501143b. PubMed PMID:
25629646; PMCID: PMC4423417.

18.   Metzger LC, Francez-Charlot A, Vorholt JA. Single-domain response regulator involved
in the general stress response of Methylobacterium extorquens. Microbiology (Reading).
2013;159(Pt 6):1067-76. Epub 20130417. doi: 10.1099/mic.0.066068-0. PubMed PMID:
23596318.

19.   Kaczmarczyk A, Hochstrasser R, Vorholt JA, Francez-Charlot A. Two-tiered histidine
kinase pathway involved in heat shock and salt sensing in the general stress response of
Sphingomonas melonis Fr1. J Bacteriol. 2015;197(8):1466-77. Epub 20150209. doi:
10.1128/JB.00019-15. PubMed PMID: 25666137; PMCID: PMC4372748.

20.   Kim HS, Caswell CC, Foreman R, Roop RM, 2nd, Crosson S. The Brucella abortus
general stress response system regulates chronic mammalian infection and is controlled by
phosphorylation and proteolysis. J Biol Chem. 2013;288(19):13906-16. doi:
10.1074/jbc.M113.459305. PubMed PMID: 23546883; PMCID: PMC3650426.

21.   Fiebig A, Herrou J, Willett J, Crosson S. General Stress Signaling in the
Alphaproteobacteria. Annu Rev Genet. 2015;49:603-25. Epub 2015/10/08. doi:
10.1146/annurev-genet-112414-054813. PubMed PMID: 26442844; PMCID: PMC4710059.

22.   Francez-Charlot A, Frunzke J, Reichen C, Ebneter JZ, Gourion B, Vorholt JA. Sigma
factor mimicry involved in regulation of general stress response. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2009;106(9):3467-72. Epub 2009/02/17. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0810291106. PubMed PMID:
19218445; PMCID: PMC2642658.

23.   Herrou J, Foreman R, Fiebig A, Crosson S. A structural model of anti-anti-sigma
inhibition by a two-component receiver domain: the PhyR stress response regulator. Mol

Microbiol. 2010;78(2):290-304. Epub 2010/08/26. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2010.07323.x.
PubMed PMID: 20735776; PMCID: PMC2959141.

24.   Correa F, Gardner KH. Basis of Mutual Domain Inhibition in a Bacterial Response
Regulator. Cell Chem Biol. 2016;23(8):945-54. doi: 10.1016/j.chembiol.2016.07.010. PubMed
PMID: 27524295; PMCID: PMC5159254.

25.   Campagne S, Damberger FF, Kaczmarczyk A, Francez-Charlot A, Allain FH, Vorholt JA.
Structural basis for sigma factor mimicry in the general stress response of Alphaproteobacteria.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012;109(21):E1405-14. Epub 2012/05/03. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1117003109. PubMed PMID: 22550171; PMCID: PMC3361459.

26.   Gourion B, Rossignol M, Vorholt JA. A proteomic study of Methylobacterium extorquens
reveals a response regulator essential for epiphytic growth. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2006;103(35):13186-91. Epub 2006/08/24. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0603530103. PubMed PMID:
16926146; PMCID: PMC1559774.

27.   Bastiat B, Sauviac L, Bruand C. Dual control of Sinorhizobium meliloti RpoE2 sigma
factor activity by two PhyR-type two-component response regulators. J Bacteriol.
2010;192(8):2255-65. Epub 20100212. doi: 10.1128/JB.01666-09. PubMed PMID: 20154128;
PMCID: PMC2849433.

28.   Herrou J, Rotskoff G, Luo Y, Roux B, Crosson S. Structural basis of a protein partner
switch that regulates the general stress response of alpha-proteobacteria. Proc Natl Acad Sci U
S A. 2012;109(21):E1415-23. Epub 2012/05/03. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1116887109. PubMed
PMID: 22550172; PMCID: PMC3361416.

29.   Luebke JL, Eaton DS, Sachleben JR, Crosson S. Allosteric control of a bacterial stress
response system by an anti-sigma factor. Mol Microbiol. 2018;107(2):164-79. Epub 20171208.
doi: 10.1111/mmi.13868. PubMed PMID: 29052909; PMCID: PMC5760481.

30.   Jans A, Vercruysse M, Gao S, Engelen K, Lambrichts I, Fauvart M, Michiels J.
Canonical and non-canonical EcfG sigma factors control the general stress response in
Rhizobium etli. Microbiologyopen. 2013;2(6):976-87. Epub 20131028. doi: 10.1002/mbo3.137.
PubMed PMID: 24311555; PMCID: PMC3892343.

31.   Francez-Charlot A, Frunzke J, Zingg J, Kaczmarczyk A, Vorholt JA. Multiple sigmaEcfG
and NepR Proteins Are Involved in the General Stress Response in Methylobacterium
extorquens. PLoS One. 2016;11(3):e0152519. Epub 20160330. doi:
10.1371/journal.pone.0152519. PubMed PMID: 27028226; PMCID: PMC4814048.

32.   de Dios R, Santero E, Reyes-Ramirez F. The functional differences between paralogous
regulators define the control of the general stress response in Sphingopyxis granuli TFA.
Environmental microbiology. 2022;24(4):1918-31. Epub 20220127. doi: 10.1111/1462-
2920.15907. PubMed PMID: 35049124; PMCID: PMC9303464.

33.   Denner EBM, Kolari M, Hoornstra D, Tsitko I, Kampfer P, Busse HJ, Salkinoja-Salonen
M. Rubellimicrobium thermophilum gen. nov., sp. nov., a red-pigmented, moderately
thermophilic bacterium isolated from coloured slime deposits in paper machines. Int J Syst Evol
Microbiol. 2006;56(Pt 6):1355-62. Epub 2006/06/02. doi: 10.1099/ijs.0.63751-0. PubMed PMID:
16738114.

662 34. Dikiy I, Swingle D, Toy K, Edupuganti UR, Rivera-Cancel G, Gardner KH. Diversity of
663 function and higher-order structure within HWE sensor histidine kinases. J Biol Chem.
664 2023;299(8):104934. Epub 20230617. doi: 10.1016/j.jbc.2023.104934. PubMed PMID:
665 37331599; PMCID: PMC10359499.

666 35. Swartz TE, Tseng TS, Frederickson MA, Paris G, Comerci DJ, Rajashekara G, Kim JG,
667 Mudgett MB, Splitter GA, Ugalde RA, Goldbaum FA, Briggs WR, Bogomolni RA. Blue-light-
668 activated histidine kinases: two-component sensors in bacteria. Science. 2007;317(5841):1090-
669 3. doi: 10.1126/science.1144306. PubMed PMID: 17717187.

670 36. Crosson S, Rajagopal S, Moffat K. The LOV domain family: photoresponsive signaling
671 modules coupled to diverse output domains. Biochemistry. 2003;42(1):2-10. Epub 2003/01/08.
672 doi: 10.1021/bi026978l. PubMed PMID: 12515534.

673 37. Fiebig A, Varesio LM, Alejandro Navarreto X, Crosson S. Regulation of the
674 Erythrobacter litoralis DSM 8509 general stress response by visible light. Mol Microbiol.
675 2019;112(2):442-60. Epub 2019/05/28. doi: 10.1111/mmi.14310. PubMed PMID: 31125464;
676 PMCID: PMC6703928.

677 38. Meier SSM, Multamaki E, Ranzani AT, Takala H, Moglich A. Leveraging the histidine
678 kinase-phosphatase duality to sculpt two-component signaling. Nature communications.
679 2024;15(1):4876. Epub 20240610. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-49251-8. PubMed PMID:
680 38858359; PMCID: PMC11164954.

681 39. Moglich A, Ayers RA, Moffat K. Design and signaling mechanism of light-regulated
682 histidine kinases. J Mol Biol. 2009;385(5):1433-44. Epub 2008/12/27. doi:
683 10.1016/j.jmb.2008.12.017. PubMed PMID: 19109976; PMCID: PMC3527124.

684 40. Rinaldi J, Gallo M, Klinke S, Paris G, Bonomi HR, Bogomolni RA, Cicero DO, Goldbaum
685 FA. The beta-scaffold of the LOV domain of the Brucella light-activated histidine kinase is a key
686 element for signal transduction. J Mol Biol. 2012;420(1-2):112-27. Epub 20120411. doi:
687 10.1016/j.jmb.2012.04.006. PubMed PMID: 22504229.

688 41. Lindner R, Heintz U, Winkler A. Applications of hydrogen deuterium exchange (HDX) for
689 the characterization of conformational dynamics in light-activated photoreceptors. Front Mol
690 Biosci. 2015;2:33. doi: 10.3389/fmolb.2015.00033. PubMed PMID: 26157802; PMCID:
691 PMC4477167.

692 42. Dikiy I, Edupuganti UR, Abzalimov RR, Borbat PP, Srivastava M, Freed JH, Gardner KH.
693 Insights into histidine kinase activation mechanisms from the monomeric blue light sensor
694 EL346. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2019;116(11):4963-72. Epub 2019/02/28. doi:
695 10.1073/pnas.1813586116. PubMed PMID: 30808807; PMCID: PMC6421462.

696 43. Engelhard C, Diensthuber RP, Moglich A, Bittl R. Blue-light reception through quaternary
697 transitions. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):1385. Epub 2017/05/05. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-01497-7.
698 PubMed PMID: 28469162; PMCID: PMC5431215.

699 44. Berntsson O, Diensthuber RP, Panman MR, Bjorling A, Gustavsson E, Hoernke M,
700 Hughes AJ, Henry L, Niebling S, Takala H, Ihalainen JA, Newby G, Kerruth S, Heberle J, Liebi
701 M, Menzel A, Henning R, Kosheleva I, Moglich A, Westenhoff S. Sequential conformational
702 transitions and alpha-helical supercoiling regulate a sensor histidine kinase. Nat Commun.

2017;8(1):284. Epub 20170818. doi: 10.1038/s41467-017-00300-5. PubMed PMID: 28819239;
PMCID: PMC5561222.

45.   Möglich A. Signal transduction in photoreceptor histidine kinases. Protein Sci.
2019;28(11):1923-46. Epub 2019/08/10. doi: 10.1002/pro.3705. PubMed PMID: 31397927;
PMCID: PMC6798134.

46.   Ninfa EG, Atkinson MR, Kamberov ES, Ninfa AJ. Mechanism of autophosphorylation of
Escherichia coli nitrogen regulator II (NRII or NtrB): trans-phosphorylation between subunits. J
Bacteriol. 1993;175(21):7024-32. Epub 1993/11/01. PubMed PMID: 8226644; PMCID:
PMC206830.

47.   Madeira F, Madhusoodanan N, Lee J, Eusebi A, Niewielska A, Tivey ARN, Lopez R,
Butcher S. The EMBL-EBI Job Dispatcher sequence analysis tools framework in 2024. Nucleic
Acids Res. 2024;52(W1):W521-W5. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkae241. PubMed PMID: 38597606;
PMCID: PMC11223882.

48.   Harper SM, Neil LC, Gardner KH. Structural basis of a phototropin light switch. Science.
2003;301(5639):1541-4. doi: 10.1126/science.1086810. PubMed PMID: 12970567.

49.   Nash AI, McNulty R, Shillito ME, Swartz TE, Bogomolni RA, Luecke H, Gardner KH.
Structural basis of photosensitivity in a bacterial light-oxygen-voltage/helix-turn-helix (LOV-HTH)
DNA-binding protein. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2011;108(23):9449-54. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1100262108. PubMed PMID: 21606338; PMCID: PMC3111320.

50.   Vide U, Kasapovic D, Fuchs M, Heimböck MP, Totaro MG, Zenzmaier E, Winkler A.
Illuminating the inner workings of a natural protein switch: Blue-light sensing in LOV-activated
diguanylate cyclases. Sci Adv. 2023;9(31). doi: ARTN eadh4721
10.1126/sciadv.adh4721. PubMed PMID: WOS:001041574600001.

51.   Diensthuber RP, Bommer M, Gleichmann T, Moglich A. Full-length structure of a sensor
histidine kinase pinpoints coaxial coiled coils as signal transducers and modulators. Structure.
2013;21(7):1127-36. doi: 10.1016/j.str.2013.04.024. PubMed PMID: 23746806.

52.   Lourenco RF, Kohler C, Gomes SL. A two-component system, an anti-sigma factor and
two paralogous ECF sigma factors are involved in the control of general stress response in
Caulobacter crescentus. Mol Microbiol. 2011;80(6):1598-612. Epub 2011/05/14. doi:
10.1111/j.1365-2958.2011.07668.x. PubMed PMID: 21564331.

53.   Laub MT, Biondi EG, Skerker JM. Phosphotransfer profiling: systematic mapping of two-
component signal transduction pathways and phosphorelays. Methods Enzymol. 2007;423:531-
48. Epub 2007/07/05. doi: 10.1016/S0076-6879(07)23026-5. PubMed PMID: 17609150.

54.   Ashenberg O, Keating AE, Laub MT. Helix bundle loops determine whether histidine
kinases autophosphorylate in cis or in trans. J Mol Biol. 2013;425(7):1198-209. doi:
10.1016/j.jmb.2013.01.011. PubMed PMID: 23333741; PMCID: PMC3636764.

55.   Trajtenberg F, Grana M, Ruetalo N, Botti H, Buschiazzo A. Structural and enzymatic
insights into the ATP binding and autophosphorylation mechanism of a sensor histidine kinase.
The Journal of biological chemistry. 2010;285(32):24892-903. Epub 20100527. doi:
10.1074/jbc.M110.147843. PubMed PMID: 20507988; PMCID: PMC2915725.

56.   Zschiedrich CP, Keidel V, Szurmant H. Molecular Mechanisms of Two-Component
Signal Transduction. J Mol Biol. 2016;428(19):3752-75. Epub 20160809. doi:
10.1016/j.jmb.2016.08.003. PubMed PMID: 27519796; PMCID: PMC5023499.

57.   Ohlendorf R, Schumacher CH, Richter F, Moglich A. Library-Aided Probing of Linker
Determinants in Hybrid Photoreceptors. ACS Synth Biol. 2016;5(10):1117-26. Epub 20160329.
doi: 10.1021/acssynbio.6b00028. PubMed PMID: 27002379.

58.   Harper SM, Christie JM, Gardner KH. Disruption of the LOV-Jalpha helix interaction
activates phototropin kinase activity. Biochemistry. 2004;43(51):16184-92. Epub 2004/12/22.
doi: 10.1021/bi048092i. PubMed PMID: 15610012.

59.   Halavaty AS, Moffat K. N- and C-terminal flanking regions modulate light-induced signal
transduction in the LOV2 domain of the blue light sensor phototropin 1 from Avena sativa.
Biochemistry. 2007;46(49):14001-9. Epub 2007/11/16. doi: 10.1021/bi701543e. PubMed PMID:
18001137.

60.   Paysan-Lafosse T, Blum M, Chuguransky S, Grego T, Pinto BL, Salazar GA, Bileschi
ML, Bork P, Bridge A, Colwell L, Gough J, Haft DH, Letunic I, Marchler-Bauer A, Mi H, Natale
DA, Orengo CA, Pandurangan AP, Rivoire C, Sigrist CJA, Sillitoe I, Thanki N, Thomas PD,
Tosatto SCE, Wu CH, Bateman A. InterPro in 2022. Nucleic Acids Res. 2023;51(D1):D418-D27.
doi: 10.1093/nar/gkac993. PubMed PMID: 36350672; PMCID: PMC9825450.

61.   Gottschlich L, Geiser P, Bortfeld-Miller M, Field CM, Vorholt JA. Complex general stress
response regulation in Sphingomonas melonis Fr1 revealed by transcriptional analyses.
Scientific reports. 2019;9(1):9404. Epub 20190628. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-45788-7. PubMed
PMID: 31253827; PMCID: PMC6599016.

62.   Kaczmarczyk A, Campagne S, Danza F, Metzger LC, Vorholt JA, Francez-Charlot A.
Role of Sphingomonas sp. strain Fr1 PhyR-NepR-sigmaEcfG cascade in general stress
response and identification of a negative regulator of PhyR. J Bacteriol. 2011;193(23):6629-38.
Epub 20110923. doi: 10.1128/JB.06006-11. PubMed PMID: 21949070; PMCID: PMC3232908.

63.   Sheffield P, Garrard S, Derewenda Z. Overcoming expression and purification problems
of RhoGDI using a family of "parallel" expression vectors. Protein Expr Purif. 1999;15(1):34-9.
Epub 1999/02/20. doi: 10.1006/prep.1998.1003. PubMed PMID: 10024467.

64.   Gasteiger E, Hoogland C, Gattiker A, Duvaud Se, Wilkins MR, Appel RD, Bairoch A.
Protein Identification and Analysis Tools on the ExPASy Server. In: Walker JM, editor. The
Proteomics Protocols Handbook. Totowa, NJ: Humana Press; 2005. p. 571-607.

65.   Chenlin Lu MLW, Andrew Reckers, Anum Glasgow. Site-resolved energetic information
from HX/MS experiments. bioRxiv. 2024.

66.   Vonrhein C, Flensburg C, Keller P, Sharff A, Smart O, Paciorek W, Womack T, Bricogne
G. Data processing and analysis with the autoPROC toolbox. Acta Crystallogr D Biol
Crystallogr. 2011;67(Pt 4):293-302. Epub 20110318. doi: 10.1107/S0907444911007773.
PubMed PMID: 21460447; PMCID: PMC3069744.

67.   Agirre J, Atanasova M, Bagdonas H, Ballard CB, Basle A, Beilsten-Edmands J, Borges
RJ, Brown DG, Burgos-Marmol JJ, Berrisford JM, Bond PS, Caballero I, Catapano L,

Chojnowski G, Cook AG, Cowtan KD, Croll TI, Debreczeni JE, Devenish NE, Dodson EJ, Drevon TR, Emsley P, Evans G, Evans PR, Fando M, Foadi J, Fuentes-Montero L, Garman EF, Gerstel M, Gildea RJ, Hatti K, Hekkelman ML, Heuser P, Hoh SW, Hough MA, Jenkins HT, Jimenez E, Joosten RP, Keegan RM, Keep N, Krissinel EB, Kolenko P, Kovalevskiy O, Lamzin VS, Lawson DM, Lebedev AA, Leslie AGW, Lohkamp B, Long F, Maly M, McCoy AJ, McNicholas SJ, Medina A, Millan C, Murray JW, Murshudov GN, Nicholls RA, Noble MEM, Oeffner R, Pannu NS, Parkhurst JM, Pearce N, Pereira J, Perrakis A, Powell HR, Read RJ, Rigden DJ, Rochira W, Sammito M, Sanchez Rodriguez F, Sheldrick GM, Shelley KL, Simkovic F, Simpkin AJ, Skubak P, Sobolev E, Steiner RA, Stevenson K, Tews I, Thomas JMH, Thorn A, Valls JT, Uski V, Uson I, Vagin A, Velankar S, Vollmar M, Walden H, Waterman D, Wilson KS, Winn MD, Winter G, Wojdyr M, Yamashita K. The CCP4 suite: integrative software for macromolecular crystallography. Acta Crystallogr D Struct Biol. 2023;79(Pt 6):449-61. Epub 20230530. doi: 10.1107/S2059798323003595. PubMed PMID: 37259835; PMCID: PMC10233625.

68.   Liebschner D, Afonine PV, Baker ML, Bunkoczi G, Chen VB, Croll TI, Hintze B, Hung LW, Jain S, McCoy AJ, Moriarty NW, Oeffner RD, Poon BK, Prisant MG, Read RJ, Richardson JS, Richardson DC, Sammito MD, Sobolev OV, Stockwell DH, Terwilliger TC, Urzhumtsev AG, Videau LL, Williams CJ, Adams PD. Macromolecular structure determination using X-rays, neutrons and electrons: recent developments in Phenix. Acta Crystallogr D Struct Biol. 2019;75(Pt 10):861-77. Epub 20191002. doi: 10.1107/S2059798319011471. PubMed PMID: 31588918; PMCID: PMC6778852.

69.   Emsley P, Lohkamp B, Scott WG, Cowtan K. Features and development of Coot. Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr. 2010;66(Pt 4):486-501. Epub 20100324. doi: 10.1107/S0907444910007493. PubMed PMID: 20383002; PMCID: PMC2852313.

70.   Manu VS, Olivieri C, Pavuluri K, Veglia G. Design and applications of water irradiation devoid RF pulses for ultra-high field biomolecular NMR spectroscopy. Phys Chem Chem Phys. 2022;24(31):18477-81. Epub 20220810. doi: 10.1039/d2cp01744j. PubMed PMID: 35895081; PMCID: PMC9578148.

71.   Norris M, Fetler B, Marchant J, Johnson BA. NMRFx Processor: a cross-platform NMR data processing program. J Biomol NMR. 2016;65(3-4):205-16. Epub 20160725. doi: 10.1007/s10858-016-0049-6. PubMed PMID: 27457481; PMCID: PMC4983292.

a)

FMN

60Å

H152

ATP

LOV	Jα	DHp	CA

1   130 143   200   349

b)

D APO

L APO

D AMP-PNP

L AMP-PNP

ladder   0 min   0.5 min   1 min   5 min   10 min   20 min   30 min   45 min   60 min

kDa

c)

Intact protein band intensity (AU)

- ○ D APO
- ● D AMP−PNP
- ○ L APO
- ● L AMP−PNP

Time (min)

d)

RT−HK	22	R E I Q **H** R V K N	36	I V T **N** A L E H A
NtrB	22	R G L A **H** E I K N	36	I V R **N** A L Q A L
EnvZ	21	A G V S **H** D L R T	35	M V V **N** A A R Y G
HK853	22	A N I S **H** E L R T	36	L L N **N** G V K Y S
FixL	22	S A L A **H** E I N Q	36	L F R **N** A L E A M
EL346	22	A E V Q **H** R V K N	36	V L T **N** A L Q H A
LOV−HK	22	R E I A **H** R F K N	36	L A T **N** A V K Y G
MS367	22	K E I Q **H** R V R N	36	L M T **N** A L K H A
RE356	22	R E L Q **H** R V K N	36	L L T **N** T F K H A

e)

H152

N256

Mg²⁺

ATP

f)

WT   H152A   N256A   Mix

D

L

a) RT-PhyR

REC · SL · D · α8 · α9 · α10 · α11 · α12 · β1 · β2 · β3 · β4 · β5 · α1 · α2 · α3 · α4 · α5 · α6 · α7

b) RT-PhyR'

REC · SL · D · α8 · α9 · α10 · α11 · α12 · β1 · β2 · β3 · β4 · β5 · α1 · α2 · α3 · α4 · α5 · α6 · α7

c)

18.6Å · 6.9Å · D · α8 · α9 · α10 · α11 · α12 · β1 · β2 · β4 · β5 · α1 · α2 · α3 · α4 · α5 · α7

PhyR REC
PhyR' REC

RT-PhyR SL
RT-PhyR' SL

d)

RT-PhyR   BA-PhyR
RT-PhyR'   CV-PhyR
BQ-PhyR

α9 · α10

Q193
D191

Q193
D191

Q193
D191

Q199
D197