An Interbacterial Cysteine Protease Toxin Inhibits Cell Growth by Targeting Type II DNA Topoisomerases GyrB and ParE

Pin-Yi Song[1,2,6], Chia-En Tsai[1,2,6], Yung-Chih Chen[2], Yu-Wen Huang[2], Po-Pang Chen[2,3], Tzu-Haw Wang[4], Chao-Yuan Hu[2], Po-Yin Chen[1,2], Chuan Ku[4,5], Kuo-Chiang Hsia[1,2,3], See-Yeun Ting[1,2,5,7†]

[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 Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, College of Life Sciences, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Taipei 11221, Taiwan

[4] Institute of Plant and Microbial Biology, Academia Sinica, Taipei 115201, Taiwan

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

[6] These authors contributed equally

[7] Lead contact

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

Keywords:

Papain-like cysteine protease, Antibacterial toxin, DNA topoisomerase, Interbacterial antagonism

Abstract

Bacteria deploy a diverse arsenal of toxic effectors to antagonize competitors, profoundly influencing the composition of microbial communities. Previous studies have identified an interbacterial toxin predicted to exhibit proteolytic activity that is broadly distributed among Gram-negative bacteria. However, the precise mechanism of intoxication remains unresolved. Here, we demonstrate that one such protease toxin from *Escherichia coli*, Cpe1, disrupts DNA replication and chromosome segregation by cleaving conserved sequences within the ATPase domain of type II DNA topoisomerases GyrB and ParE. This cleavage effectively inhibits topoisomerase-mediated relaxation of supercoiled DNA, resulting in impaired bacterial growth. Cpe1 belongs to the papain-like cysteine protease family and is associated with toxin delivery pathways, including the type VI secretion system and contact-dependent growth inhibition. The structure of Cpe1 in complex with its immunity protein reveals a neutralization mechanism involving competitive substrate binding rather than active site occlusion, distinguishing it from previously characterized effector-immunity pairs. Our findings unveil a unique mode of interbacterial intoxication and provide insights into how bacteria protect themselves from self-poisoning by protease toxins.

Introduction

Bacteria in natural environments exist within complex communities, where interactions—both cooperative and antagonistic—are pivotal to their survival. A key aspect of bacterial competition is the acquisition of limited resources, which has driven the evolution of a wide array of interbacterial antagonistic mechanisms, including the production of antibiotics, antimicrobial peptides, and diffusible proteinaceous toxins[1,2]. More recently, sophisticated mechanisms for

distinguishing kin and antagonizing competitors have been identified[3-8]. Among these, Gram-

negative bacteria utilize specialized secretion systems, such as contact-dependent growth

inhibition (CDI), the type IV secretion system (T4SS), and the type VI secretion system (T6SS),

to translocate toxins into neighboring cells in a contact-dependent manner, whereas Gram-positive

bacteria rely on the Esx secretion system for similar antagonistic interactions[9]. These secretion

systems allow pathogenic bacteria to establish dominance in polymicrobial infections and enable

commensal bacteria to establish compatibility within microbial consortia[10-12].

Interbacterial toxins delivered via these systems enhance the competitive fitness of the

producing bacteria by inhibiting or killing competitors. Depending on their biochemical properties,

the impact of these effectors on target cells can vary considerably. For instance, a wide variety of

antibacterial toxins induce cell lysis by disrupting the cellular membrane or degrading cell wall

peptidoglycans[9,13-17]. Pore-forming toxins exert their toxicity by inserting themselves into the

cellular membrane and causing its depolarization[18-20]. Some toxins are translocated into the

cytoplasm, where they compromise DNA/RNA integrity or deplete the cellular energy resources

of target cells[21-26]. Post-translationally modified toxins have been found to target essential proteins

involved in bacterial cell division and protein synthesis[27-30]. This broad spectrum of targets allows

the toxins to act across phylogenetically diverse bacteria. Most of the intoxication mechanisms of

these antibacterial toxins are inherently indiscriminate. Therefore, bacteria encode specific

immunity proteins adjacent to their cognate toxin genes to prevent self-intoxication or harm to kin

cells. These immunity proteins typically neutralize toxins by occluding their active sites[31]. In some

cases, other neutralization mechanisms, such as enzymatic antagonism of effector activity or

structural disruption of the effector domain, have also been reported[27,32].

Although significant progress has been made in identifying novel interbacterial toxins in

recent years, detailed characterizations of their intoxication mechanisms remain lacking[33-35]. For

example, comparative genomic, advanced genetic screening, and structure-based searching

approaches have uncovered novel effectors with conserved catalytic residues indicative of protease

and peptide amidase activities, which inhibit bacterial growth during interbacterial competition[36-

38]. However, their natural substrates and precise biochemical activities have yet to be elucidated.

In this study, we describe an interbacterial toxin that targets the essential type II DNA

topoisomerases GyrB and ParE via papain-like cysteine protease (PLCP) activity. This toxin is

phylogenetically widespread and shares hallmarks of interbacterial effectors secreted via the T6SS

and CDI pathways. Homologs of this toxin are similar to PLCPs associated with ATP-binding

cassette (ABC) transporters involved in bacterial protein export. However, their role in

interbacterial antagonism, specifically in targeting and damaging essential proteins, has not been

elucidated. Interestingly, our structural analyses further reveal that protection against the PLCP

toxins is conferred by cognate immunity proteins, which block substrate binding rather than

occlude the active site, thereby inactivating the toxicity. Our findings not only expand our

understanding of protease effectors in interbacterial conflict but also uncover a previously

undescribed mode of immunity protection.

Results

Papain-like Cysteine Protease Antibacterial Effectors Are Found in Different Gram-negative

Bacteria

Previous studies on T6SS–associated protease effectors, such as EvpQ from *Edwardsiella*

piscicida and TsaP from *Escherichia coli*, have predicted their classification within the family of

PLCPs[36,37]. The defining feature of this protease family is a conserved catalytic triad, consisting

of a cysteine (Cys) thiol group, a histidine (His) imidazolium ring, and a third residue—either

aspartate (Asp) or asparagine (Asn)—that orients and activates the imidazolium ring for peptide

bond hydrolysis (**Figure 1a**). PLCPs in bacteria have been well characterized for their roles as

virulence factors in both animal and plant infections[39-41], as well as for functioning as maturation

proteases in a variety of ABC transporters, where they specifically recognize and cleave signal

peptides before substrate export[42-44]. However, their function as antibacterial toxins has yet to be

fully understood[33].

To explore the prevalence of PLCPs involved in interbacterial antagonism, we conducted

a homology search against the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) non-

redundant database using PSI-BLAST[45], employing the cysteine protease domains of EvpQ and

TsaP as queries[36,37]. Homologous genes with more than 10% sequence identity were retrieved, and

their gene neighborhoods were analyzed to infer potential roles in interbacterial competition. The

low sequence identity threshold was selected to ensure identification of both EvpQ- and TsaP-like

proteins. Consequently, we identified 155 unique genes encoding PLCP domains associated with

either the T6SS or CDI pathways. Of these, 70 were located at the C-terminus of T6SS toxin-

delivery proteins (*e.g.*, PAAR, VgrG, and Rhs)[46,47], and the remaining 85 were linked to the CdiA

carrier protein in the CDI pathway[48] (**Figure 1b, Supplementary Figure 1a,** and **Supplementary**

Table 1). Multiple sequence alignments of these homologs, along with representative PLCPs from

ABC transporters (*e.g.,* ComA and LahT), confirmed the presence of the conserved catalytic triad

(Cys, His, Asp/Asn)[49,50] (**Figure 1c**).

Phylogenetic analysis of the identified protease domain sequences revealed close

similarities to EvpQ and TsaP[36,37] (**Figure 1d** and **Supplementary Figure 2**). These toxin

homologs are distributed across Phylum Pseudomonadota, including in Alpha-, Beta-, Gamma-,

and Delta-proteobacteria, and they are found in bacteria across a range of ecological niches,

including within animal and insect hosts and in the environment. Additionally, fifteen T6SS–

associated homologs were identified in distantly related phyla, such as Acidobacteriota,

Actinomycetota, Chloroflexota, Cyanobacteria, and Myxococcota (**Figure 1d, Supplementary**

Figures 1-2, and **Supplementary Table 1**). Although we detected no clear correlation between

phylogeny, taxonomy, and toxin-delivery pathway, the phylogenetic similarity of these homologs

from diverse phyla implies that horizontal gene transfer may have contributed to the evolutionary

dissemination of PLCP toxins.

To prevent self-intoxication, toxin-producing bacteria carry immunity proteins, typically

encoded adjacent to the toxin genes in the genome[31]. Consistent with this scenario, we found that

the majority of the identified PLCP toxin genes are followed in the respective genomes by putative

immunity genes (**Figure 1b** and **Supplementary Figure 1b**). The putative immunity proteins

range from 79 to 239 amino acids and exhibit considerable sequence divergence, likely reflecting

their specificity towards their cognate PLCP toxins. Supporting this idea, the sequence identity

between each immunity gene and its corresponding PLCP toxin is positively correlated, evidencing

their coevolutionary nature (**Supplementary Table 1**). Together, these findings suggest that PLCP

toxins, along with their cognate immunity proteins, are found in various Gram-negative bacterial

species. For clarity in this study, we have designated the identified PLCP toxin as Cpe1 (cysteine

protease effector 1) and the cognate immunity protein as Cpi1 (**Figures 1b, d**).

The Structure of the Cpe1–Cpi1 Complex Reveals a Distinct Toxin-Neutralization

Mechanism

Pioneering studies by Li *et al.* and Lu *et al.* have demonstrated that bacteria, such as *E.*

piscicida and *E. coli*, utilize T6SS–associated Cpe1 effectors to mediate interbacterial

antagonism[36,37]. However, the precise mechanisms underlying Cpe1-induced toxicity remain

unclear. To elucidate the mode of action of Cpe1, we employed structural biology approaches to

gain insights into its toxic activity. Notably, overexpression of the Cpe1 toxin domain (Cpe1$_{tox}$) in

E. coli cells resulted in growth inhibition, yielding insufficient amounts of purified protein for

structural analyses (**Figure 2a**). Time-lapse microscopy revealed that this growth inhibition was

accompanied by reduced cell proliferation and continued elongation, consistent with the proposed

cytotoxic activity of Cpe1[37] (**Figure 2b** and **Videos 1-2**). To circumvent this limitation, we co-

purified Cpe1$_{tox}$ with its cognate immunity protein, Cpi1, which allowed us to obtain well-

diffracting crystals (**Supplementary Figure 3a**). Using selenomethionine-substituted protein, we

determined the crystal structure of the Cpe1$_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex at a resolution of 1.87 Å (**Figure 2c**

and **Supplementary Table 2**).

In our crystal structure, Cpe1 features a six-stranded antiparallel β-sheet flanked by five α-

helices on either side, forming the typical α/β core that is characteristic of the PLCP family[51]. The

catalytic triad—Cys, His, Asp—is clearly evident and aligns with prior functional predictions[33,51]

(**Figure 2c**). Despite sharing limited sequence identity with ABC transporter-associated proteases,

a structural homology search using the DALI server identified ComA (Z-score = 16.3; RMSD of

1.9 Å across 121 aligned Cα atoms) and LahT (Z-score = 15.9; RMSD of 1.8 Å across 117 aligned

Cα atoms) as the closest homologs[50,52,53] (**Figure 2d**). A structural comparison revealed a high

conservation of the spatial arrangement of the catalytic triad of Cpe1. Overlaying the Cα atom of

the Cpe1 and LahT catalytic residues yielded minor RMSD values (Cys: 0.583Å; His: 0.843Å;

Asp: 0.711Å), whereas the catalytic triad of ComA presented a slight shift relative to Cpe1 (RMSD:

Cys: 2.444Å, His: 1.812Å, Asp: 1.680Å) with a 39.4° rotation of the cysteine residue (**Figure 2d**).
These differences may reflect variations in substrate specificity or catalytic efficiency. Overall, the
resolved Cpe1 structure is consistent with its predicted protease function, indicating that its
proteolytic activity relies on the common catalytic thiol mechanism (**Figure 1a**).

In line with our structural data, mutational analyses revealed that the substitution of the
catalytic cysteine with alanine (Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}) abolished Cpe1-mediated toxicity (**Figure 2a**).
Moreover, the catalytically inactive Cpe1 mutant failed to induce the cell elongation phenotype
observed for wild-type Cpe1, further demonstrating that Cpe1 toxicity is linked to its PLCP activity
(**Figure 2b** and **Video 3**). To assess if the catalytic activity of Cpe1 is important for interbacterial
antagonism, we performed a growth competition assay using an *E. coli* strain (ATCC-11775)
harboring the wild-type Cpe1 toxin and an active T6SS as the donor strain, competing against a
recipient *E. coli* model strain (MG1655). Notably, recipient cells exhibited a significant fitness
defect when co-cultured with donor cells expressing wild-type Cpe1 (**Figure 2e**). However, this
competitive advantage was markedly reduced when donor cells expressed the inactive Cpe1
(Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}). These findings demonstrate that the catalytic activity of Cpe1 plays a crucial role
in mediating interbacterial competition.

Interestingly, although Cpi1 binds to Cpe1 and they share a large interface (1050 Å^2), our
crystal structure reveals that Cpi1 does not sterically occlude the active site of Cpe1. Instead, Cpi1
primarily interacts with a shallow hydrophobic concave region on the surface of Cpe1 that is
located adjacent to the catalytic pocket (**Figures 2c, f**). This binding region consists of a cluster of
non-polar residues—L387, M390, A408, M426, W428, and V434—the hydrophobic properties of
which are conserved across many T6SS– and CDI–associated Cpe1 toxins (**Supplementary
Figure 1a**). We did not identify any enzymatic domain in or significant structural homologs of

Cpi1, suggesting that its neutralization mechanism depends on binding to the hydrophobic concave

region of Cpe1 rather than occlusion of its active site.

To examine the importance of the Cpe1–Cpi1 interaction, we assessed the ability of Cpi1

variants displaying impaired Cpe1 binding to protect against toxicity. By scanning the Cpe1–Cpi1

interface, we identified four candidate residues (I47, M61, M64, and K72) in Cpi1, where

substitutions were predicted to disrupt the Cpe1–Cpi1 interaction (**Figures 2g**). Single-residue

substitutions did not significantly affect the ability of Cpi1 to inhibit Cpe1 toxicity, as these

variants retained their immunity function and still bound Cpe1 in co-immunoprecipitation assays

(**Figures 2h, i**). However, when we mutated all four residues (Cpi1^{mut4}), the resulting mutant

lacked the ability to neutralize Cpe1 toxicity and failed to bind Cpe1 *in vitro*, despite being

expressed at levels comparable to that of wild-type protein (**Figures 2h, i**, and **Supplementary**

Figure 3b). In addition, the Cpi1 quadruple mutant did not provide full protection during

interbacterial competition (**Figure 2e**). These findings indicate that the interaction between Cpe1

and Cpi1 is critical for the immunity function of Cpi1 and that disruption of this interaction

abrogates its protective effect (**Figures 2a, b**, and **Video 4**).

The Hydrophobic Concave Surface Is Critical for Cpe1 Toxicity

Our structural analysis revealed that Cpe1 shares significant similarities with the cysteine

protease domains of ComA and LahT[50,52] (**Figure 2d**). Previous biochemical and structural studies

of these proteases have shown that, similar to Cpe1, they also possess hydrophobic concave

surfaces adjacent to their catalytic pockets, which are critical for specific recognition of protein

substrates[50,52] (**Supplementary Figure 4**). Previous studies have also shown that blocking these

hydrophobic regions with high-affinity inhibitors leads to protease dysfunction and impaired

substrate transport[50,54]. Given that Cpi1 neutralizes Cpe1 toxicity by interacting with its

hydrophobic concave region (**Figure 2f**), we hypothesized that Cpe1 might employ a substrate

recognition mechanism analogous to that of ComA and LahT. To test this hypothesis, we

introduced mutations into hydrophobic residues within the concave region of Cpe1 (*i.e.,* L387,

M426, W428) and assessed their impact on toxicity (**Figure 2f**). Supporting our hypothesis,

ectopic expression of the Cpe1 variants in model *E. coli* resulted in a marked reduction in toxicity

compared to wild-type Cpe1, without affecting protein expression levels (**Figure 3a**). These

findings support the notion that the hydrophobic concave region is important for the cytotoxic

activity of Cpe1 and may also contribute to substrate recognition.

To further investigate if the hydrophobic concave region of Cpe1 is involved in substrate

binding, we carried out site-specific photo-crosslinking experiments, focusing on the residues for

which mutations abolished Cpe1-mediated toxicity (**Figure 3a**). We incorporated the photo-

reactive amino acid p-benzoyl-L-phenylalanine (Bpa) in place of the selected amino acids using

enhanced nonsense suppression[55] (**Figure 3b**). This crosslinking approach provides several

advantages, including the ability to introduce the Bpa crosslinker at a single site within Cpe1, and

its modestly larger size relative to phenylalanine increases the likelihood of capturing direct

interactions with substrates[56]. To prevent Cpe1 from cleaving its bound substrates, we introduced

the catalytically inactive C362A mutation into the Cpe1-Bpa variants for our crosslinking

experiments.

Cells expressing these Cpe1-Bpa variants were directly exposed to long-wavelength UV

irradiation (365 nm) to induce covalent crosslinking between Cpe1 and potential substrates

(**Figure 3b**). Following UV exposure, Cpe1-Bpa and its crosslinked products were purified using

the hexa-histidine tag located at the C-terminus of Cpe1 and analyzed by electrophoresis and

immunoblotting. As expected, we observed multiple crosslinked products migrating more slowly

by SDS-PAGE than Cpe1-Bpa monomers (*i.e.,* L387Bpa, M426Bpa, W428Bpa) (**Figure 3c**). The

molecular weights of the crosslinked products ranged from 30 kDa to 180 kDa, indicating

formation of Cpe1-substrate complexes. In contrast, our control samples, which did not incorporate

Bpa, presented no high-molecular-weight crosslinked adducts on the gels. Additionally, levels of

the Cpe1-Bpa monomers (L387Bpa, M426Bpa, W428Bpa) slightly decreased after UV irradiation,

further supporting that Cpe1-Bpa bound and crosslinked to its substrates via the hydrophobic

concave region. This decrease in level upon UV irradiation was not observed for a parallel control

experiment, indicating that the crosslinking was specific to the modified Cpe1-Bpa variants

(**Figure 3c**).

Cpe1 Targets the Essential Type II DNA Topoisomerases GyrB and ParE

To define potential protein substrates of the Cpe1 toxin, we subjected purified Cpe1-Bpa

crosslinked adducts to mass spectrometric analysis. To minimize false-positive results that could

obscure our identification of physiological targets, we applied a stringent cutoff, focusing on

proteins with >10 unique peptides, an intensity index >5, and consistent detection across three

replicates. Given that many interbacterial toxins associated with the T6SS and CDI pathways are

known to target essential cellular components to inhibit or kill competing cells[48], we focused our

analysis on essential proteins, though we are aware that non-essential proteins might also

contribute to critical cellular processes.

Our mass spectrometry analysis revealed 51 cytosolic proteins that were consistently

detected across all three Cpe1-Bpa crosslinking experiments (**Supplementary Table 3**). Among

these, eight were identified as essential for *E. coli* viability, each playing a critical role in diverse

cellular processes[57,58]. These proteins included the type II DNA topoisomerases GyrB and ParE,

essential for DNA replication and chromosome segregation; NusA, NusG, and RpoB, involved in

transcription; FtsZ, critical for cell division; and AccA and DapE, vital for metabolism (**Figure**

3d).

To validate the substrates of Cpe1, we performed an *in vitro* protease cleavage assay by

incubating purified candidate target proteins with Cpe1$_{tox}$. In this assay, Cpe1$_{tox}$ is expected to

recognize and cleave the targets, with proteolytic cleavage being confirmed by SDS-PAGE

analysis, whereby a reduction in molecular weight and the presence of cleavage fragments

indicated substrate digestion. As a result, we observed that two out of the eight essential proteins—

type II DNA topoisomerases GyrB and ParE—displayed clear molecular weight reductions upon

being incubated with Cpe1$_{tox}$ but not with the catalytically inactive Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A} (**Figures 3e, f** and

Supplementary Figures 5a-f). Moreover, adding the immunity protein Cpi1 to the reaction

inhibited the proteolytic activity of Cpe1 (**Supplementary Figures 5g, h**). Notably, incubating

either GyrB or ParE with wild-type Cpe1$_{tox}$ resulted in relatively short but consistent fragments

(~12 to 14 kDa), indicating that the cleavage events are specific and may occur toward the termini

of these proteins. Collectively, these findings support a model in which Cpe1 targets the essential

proteins GyrB and ParE, potentially impairing vital cellular functions as part of a competitive

inhibition strategy.

Cpe1 Cleaves a Consensus Sequence Containing Double Glycine Motifs within GyrB and

ParE

Many proteases in the PLCP family cleave peptide bonds at sequence-specific sites[51].

Notably, homologs of Cpe1, such as ComA and LahT, recognize and cleave their native substrates

at sequences containing a double glycine (GG) motif[50,59,60] (**Supplementary Figures 6a, b**).

Accordingly, we hypothesized that Cpe1 might also target its substrates, GyrB and ParE, at a

consensus sequence containing two consecutive glycine residues. Protein sequence alignment of

GyrB and ParE revealed four consensus sequences containing GG motifs (**Figure 3g**). Two of

these motifs, located near the N-terminal ATPase domain: $G_{101}G_{102}$ and $G_{113}G_{114}$ in GyrB, and

$G_{97}G_{98}$ and $G_{109}G_{110}$ in ParE, were prioritized for further investigation, as cleavage at these sites

would generate ~12 to 14 kDa fragments, *i.e.,* matching those observed in our *in vitro* cleavage

assays (**Figures 3e, f**).

To confirm these cleavage sites, we purified variants of GyrB and ParE in which one

glycine residue had been deleted from each GG motif, and then subjected them to $Cpe1_{tox}$ cleavage

assays. Our results showed that removing one of the $G_{101}G_{102}$ residues in GyrB or from $G_{97}G_{98}$ in

ParE significantly reduced $Cpe1_{tox}$-mediated cleavage (**Figures 3h, i**). In contrast, mutations in the

other GG motifs had no effect on cleavage by $Cpe1_{tox}$. To further characterize the cleavage sites of

Cpe1 on its substrates, we analyzed Cpe1-cleaved GyrB and ParE fragments through in-gel

digestion followed by mass spectrometry (**Supplementary Figures 6c, d**). LC-MS/MS analysis

demonstrated that both GyrB and ParE were cleaved precisely between the glycine residues in the

GG motifs located within their ATPase domains (**Supplementary Figures 6e, f**). Together, these

findings support the notion that Cpe1 selectively targets consensus sequences containing the

$G_{101}G_{102}$ motif in GyrB and the $G_{97}G_{98}$ motif in ParE, reinforcing the substrate specificity of Cpe1

(**Figure 3g**).

Cpe1-mediated Proteolysis Disrupts DNA Topology and Inhibits Chromosome Segregation

in Bacteria

GyrB and ParE are members of the type II DNA topoisomerases, forming the hetero-

tetrameric DNA gyrase (GyrB$_2$/GyrA$_2$) and topoisomerase IV (ParE$_2$/ParC$_2$) complexes,

respectively, in bacteria[61]. These enzymes are well characterized for their roles in catalyzing the

relaxation of supercoiled DNA in an ATP-dependent manner, thereby facilitating critical biological

processes that require modification of DNA topology[62]. Malfunction of DNA gyrase impairs DNA

replication, transcription, and repair, whereas inhibition of topoisomerase IV results in abnormal

catenation of daughter chromosomes following replication, ultimately blocking cell division[63].

These essential activities make both proteins appealing targets for antimicrobial agents in clinical

settings[64,65]. Notably, the consensus sequence recognized by Cpe1 is located within a loop

connecting helix 3 and helix 4 in the ATPase domain of GyrB and ParE[66,67] (**Figures 4a, b**). This

loop is highly conserved across different bacterial species[68] (**Figures 4c, d**), and has been

previously identified as a critical region involved in ATP-binding, dimerization, and

conformational changes triggered by ATP hydrolysis[67,69,70]. Therefore, cleavage of the loops in

GyrB and ParE by Cpe1 would paralyze topoisomerase function, conferring a competitive fitness

advantage to antagonistic bacteria by inhibiting DNA replication and chromosome segregation in

their rivals.

If GyrB and ParE are indeed substrates of Cpe1, we reasoned that Cpe1 intoxication would

impair the ability of both enzymes to maintain DNA topology, specifically by decreasing negative

supercoiling of cellular DNA. Therefore, we used a high-copy plasmid, pET, isolated from *E. coli*

ectopically expressing Cpe1 to visualize changes in DNA topology via high-resolution agarose gel

electrophoresis with chloroquine, allowing the resolution of negatively supercoiled DNA. As

predicted, plasmid DNA topoisomers extracted from Cpe1-intoxicated cells (0.5 and 1 hour of

induction) displayed a significant decrease in negatively supercoiled DNA bands[71] (**Figure 4e**). In

contrast, plasmid DNA from cells expressing the catalytic mutant Cpe1[C362A] showed a high level

of plasmid DNA in a relaxed state, *i.e.,* similar to the vector control. This observation mirrors the

effects reported previously when the ATPase domains of GyrB or ParE were inhibited or mutated,

supporting that the observed changes were attributable to disruption of type II DNA topoisomerase

activity[69,72,73].

Inactivation of topoisomerase IV is known to result in DNA knotting and catenation,

leading to an accumulation of unsegregated DNA at the center of bacterial cells[74]. Fluorescence

microscopy validated this notion, revealing unsegregated and condensed DNA in elongated

bacteria subjected to Cpe1 intoxication (**Figure 4f** and **Supplementary Figure 7**), representing a

phenotype reminiscent of cells treated with novobiocin, an antibiotic that inhibits the ATPase

activities of both GyrB and ParE[75,76]. In contrast, sister nucleoids formed and segregated normally

in dividing cells expressing either the Cpe1[C362A] variant or those co-expressing Cpe1 and its

cognate immunity protein, Cpi1 (**Figure 4f** and **Supplementary Figure 7**). Given that

chromosome partitioning is critical for successful cell division, next we examined if Cpe1

intoxication also disrupts the bacterial cell division machinery. To test this possibility, we

conducted Cpe1 intoxication experiments on *E. coli* expressing fluorescently labeled cell division

protein FtsZ (*i.e.,* FtsZ-mNeonGreen)[77]. As expected, the Z-ring structure that is essential for cell

division failed to form at the septa of Cpe1-intoxicated bacteria (**Supplemental Figures 8a, b**).

These findings collectively support a model in which Cpe1 targets and cleaves the consensus loops

in ATPase domains of GyrB and ParE, disrupting their topoisomerase activity and thereby

inhibiting DNA replication, chromosome segregation, and cell division, ultimately resulting in the

cessation of bacterial growth (**Figure 4g**).

Cpi1 Confers Competitive Inhibition against Cpe1

Our identification of GyrB and ParE as substrates of Cpe1 prompted us to investigate the mechanism by which Cpi1 inhibits Cpe1. Based on the $Cpe1_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex structure, toxicity assays, and site-specific crosslinking experiments, we suspected that Cpi1 binds competitively at the hydrophobic concave region of Cpe1, overlapping with the binding regions of GyrB and ParE, thereby neutralizing Cpe1-mediated intoxication. This competitive inhibition model was supported by AlphaFold3 (AF3) predictions, which revealed that the binding regions for GyrB and ParE on Cpe1 partially overlap with those of Cpi1 in the predicted structures[78] (**Figure 5a**, and **Supplementary Figures 9a, b**). Notably, the loop sequence containing the Cpe1 cleavage site on GyrB actually extends into the catalytic pocket of Cpe1 in the AF3 model structure, supporting our prior characterization of its protease activity and substrate specificity (**Supplementary Figure 9c**).

To test the competitive inhibition model, we began by conducting *in vitro* competitive binding assays to determine if Cpi1 could displace substrate interactions with Cpe1 (**Figure 5b**). In our assay, catalytically inactive $Cpe1^{C362A}$ was incubated with the substrate (*e.g.,* the ATPase domain of ParE), which was tagged with a C-terminal strep tag to allow complex formation. The Cpe1/ParE complex was then immobilized on streptavidin resin. The ATPase domain of ParE served as a representative substrate due to its ease of purification and susceptibility to cleavage by wild-type Cpe1, similar to full-length ParE (**Supplementary Figure 9d**). Following complex formation, increasing concentrations of wild-type Cpi1 were added, followed by washing to remove unbound $Cpe1^{C362A}$. As a result, $Cpe1^{C362A}$ levels bound to $ParE_{ATPase}$ were markedly reduced in the presence of Cpi1 in a concentration-dependent manner, indicating that Cpi1 displaced $ParE_{ATPase}$ from its interaction with $Cpe1^{C362A}$ (**Figure 5c**). In contrast, in a control experiment using $Cpi1^{mut4}$, in which the Cpe1-binding residues had been mutated (**Figure 2j**), no

significant changes in Cpe1^{C362A} level were observed (**Figure 5d**). These findings support that

Cpi1 competitively interacts with the substrate-binding site on Cpe1. Based on the observed

competition, we reasoned that Cpi1 should exhibit a higher binding affinity to Cpe1 than its target

substrates. Using biolayer interferometry, we confirmed that Cpi1 binds to Cpe1^{C362A} with an

approximately 40-fold higher affinity than ParE$_{ATPase}$ *in vitro* (K$_d$: Cpe1^{C362A} –Cpi1 = 8.58 nM;

Cpe1^{C362A}–ParE$_{ATPase}$ = 343 nM). However, binding affinity was too low to be measured when

Cpi1^{mut4} was used (**Figures 5e, f** and **Supplementary Figure 9e**). Collectively, these results

support a model whereby Cpi1 neutralizes Cpe1-mediated intoxication by employing a

competitive inhibition mechanism.

Discussion

Our study characterizes a widely distributed class of antibacterial effectors displaying

papain-like cysteine protease activity, referred to herein as Cpe1, which is found in diverse Gram-

negative bacteria. By targeting essential cellular processes in bacteria, these Cpe1 effectors play a

critical role in bacterial competition, broadening the known repertoire of bacterial toxins involved

in interbacterial antagonism. We have demonstrated that Cpe1 exerts its toxic effect by cleaving

key protein substrates, specifically the type II DNA topoisomerases GyrB and ParE, which are

indispensable for DNA replication and chromosome segregation. Cpe1 mediates this cleavage by

targeting consensus sequences containing GG motifs within the ATPase domains of these proteins,

thereby inactivating the topoisomerase function and halting the DNA replication machinery and

cell growth. This mechanism provides a competitive advantage to Cpe1-producing strains.

Our phylogenetic analysis reveals a complex evolutionary trajectory for Cpe1 homologs,

underscoring their occurrence across diverse bacterial phyla and their functional association with

secretion systems such as the T6SS and CDI pathways (**Figure 1d**). The broad distribution of Cpe1

homologs indicates that horizontal gene transfer has facilitated adaptation of these protease

effectors to diverse ecological niches, enabling bacteria to assert competitive dominance in various

environments. Furthermore, the lack of correlation between phylogeny and pathway association

among Cpe1 homologs supports that selective pressures favor the adoption of Cpe1-like effectors

across multiple bacterial lineages, thereby enhancing bacterial fitness in different ecological

contexts.

Papain-like cysteine proteases are versatile enzymes that cleave peptide bonds in protein

targets and are frequently employed as toxic effectors by bacterial pathogens. For example, the

bacterial effector OspD3, secreted by *Shigella flexneri*, cleaves host kinases RIPK1 and RIPK3 to

evade necroptosis-mediated immune responses during infection[39]. Similarly, the YopT effector

from *Yersinia sp.* cleaves Rho-family GTPases, such as RhoA, leading to disruption of the actin

cytoskeleton[79]. Additionally, AvrPphB from *Pseudomonas syringae*, induces plant cell death by

cleaving the PBS1 kinase through its cysteine protease activity[80,81]. Our findings provide

compelling evidence of bacteria leveraging a PLCP-mediated mechanism to intoxicate competing

bacteria, as demonstrated by Cpe1 cleavage of essential DNA topoisomerases. Given that

interbacterial interactions predate the evolution of eukaryotic cells, it is plausible that PLCP toxins

targeting eukaryotic hosts evolved from ancestral PLCPs possessing antibacterial activity.

We identified several cellular proteins crosslinked to Cpe1-Bpa from our crosslinking mass

spectrometry experiments (**Figures 3b-d**). In addition to GyrB and ParE, six other essential

proteins were detected, namely NusA, NusG, RpoB, FtsZ, AccA, and DapE. However, Cpe1

exhibited cleavage activity toward GyrB and ParE in our *in vitro* protease cleavage assays, but

not against these other six targets (**Figures 3e, f** and **Supplementary Figures 5a-f)**. These false-

positive identifications might be due to non-specific interactions with heterologous Cpe1-Bpa

expression. Our further analysis of the cleavage sites revealed that Cpe1 recognizes a consensus

sequence, LHAGGKF, within a loop region of its substrates and cleaves the peptide bond

immediately following the double glycine residues. Deletion of these glycine residues in GyrB and

ParE significantly reduced Cpe1 activity *in vitro* (**Figures 3h, i**). The contribution of other amino

acid residues within the consensus sequence to Cpe1 activity remains unclear, as does the influence

of substrate three-dimensional structure on Cpe1 specificity and cleavage. Systematic analysis of

cleavage sequences and structural determinants is required to determine if Cpe1 can recognize and

cleave additional substrates in bacteria.

In addition to elucidating the role of Cpe1 during interbacterial antagonism, our study

identifies a unique immunity mechanism that safeguards Cpe1-producing bacteria from self-

toxicity. The cognate immunity protein, Cpi1, binds to a conserved hydrophobic concave surface

adjacent to the catalytic pocket of Cpe1 (**Figure 2f**). This interaction prevents Cpe1 from accessing

its substrates without occluding the active site of the effector. The coevolutionary relationship

between Cpe1 and Cpi1 is evidenced by sequence conservation and structural complementarity.

The evolutionary advantage of this mode of inhibition likely lies in the enhanced binding affinity

afforded by the large surface area of hydrophobic interaction. Similar mechanisms have been

reported for other protease-inhibitor systems. For example, the anticoagulation factor triabin

inhibits thrombin protease by binding to regions outside of the catalytic pocket[82,83], and calpastatin

neutralizes calpain protease through an exosite interaction, tripling the binding surface compared

to other inhibitors[84,85]. Likewise, the anti-toxins of colicin, such as E3 rRNase and E9 DNase, are

known to neutralize these toxins by binding with high affinity to the exosites, effectively blocking

activity without overlapping the active site[86].

Bacterial toxins possessing protease activity have long been proven valuable tools in

investigating host cell biology due to their ability to manipulate with precision specific cellular

functions. For example, the identification of the protein targeted by the specific endopeptidase

activity of the tetanus and botulinum toxins provided fundamental insights into the role of SNARE

complex proteins in regulating exocytosis[87,88]. Our finding that Cpe1 specifically cleaves GyrB

and ParE has unveiled the possibility of applying this toxin to study DNA replication, catenation,

and chromosome segregation, among other aspects of cell biology. Although the general functions

of these topoisomerases are already well established, certain mechanistic aspects remain unclear[89].

Given its precise targeting of the ATPase domains of GyrB and ParE, Cpe1 could serve as a

valuable tool for dissecting the finer details of certain critical processes.

In conclusion, our study provides a detailed characterization of Cpe1 as a potent

interbacterial toxin that targets essential DNA topoisomerases in competitor cells. By broadening

the functional scope of PLCPs in bacterial competition and elucidating the molecular mechanisms

underlying immunity against Cpe1, our findings lay the groundwork for further exploration of how

PLCPs function within microbial communities. The substrate specificity and potent activity of

Cpe1 highlight its potential for applications in developing analogs or inhibitors that replicate its

targeting mechanism. Furthermore, insights into the Cpi1 immunity mechanism could inform the

engineering of bacterial strains presenting enhanced resistance to PLCP-mediated antagonism,

opening up avenues for biotechnological applications such as microbiome manipulation and the

creation of next-generation antibacterial therapies.

Methods

Bioinformatic Analysis of Cpe1 and Cpi1-related Proteins

The protein sequences of the full-length PLCP effectors EvpQ (GenBank: JACQ01000015.1, 119,565-120,092 basepairs) and TsaP (accession number: AJM72455.1) were obtained from the NCBI database, as described in previous studies[36,37]. The cysteine protease domains within these sequences were identified using the NCBI Conserved Domain Search tool[90] and subsequently used as seed sequences for PSI-BLAST[45]. PSI-BLAST was run iteratively until convergence, with a relatively lenient e-value cut-off of 0.01 to ensure inclusion of highly divergent homologs. To minimize false-positive hits, the retrieved sequences were filtered to retain only those with a minimum length of 100 amino acids.

Interbacterial PLCP effectors were manually curated based on their genomic context within gene clusters associated with contact-dependent antagonistic pathways (*i.e.,* T6SS, CDI)[91,92]. Effector-associated domains known to mediate interbacterial antagonism, such as PAAR, VgrG, and Rhs for T6SS, or VENN and filamentous hemagglutinin peptide repeats for CDI, were used to validate their functional relevance[46,47]. Taxonomic and strain-level information for the identified PLCP effectors was retrieved from NCBI. Multiple sequence alignments of the homologs were performed using ClustalW[93], and a maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree was constructed using the IQtree online tool with default parameters[94]. The resulting tree was visualized and edited using Figtree (http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/).

Bacteria and Culture Conditions

The bacterial strains used in this study are listed in **Supplementary Table 4**. 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 *E. coli*; and BL21 (DE3) for overproduction

and purification of protein samples. *E. coli* ATCC-11775 and MG1655 were used for toxicity assay

and bacterial competition assays. Bacterial strains were routinely grown in Luria Bertani (LB)

medium supplemented with appropriate antibiotics at 37°C with shaking at 200 rpm. Antibiotics

and chemicals were used at the following concentrations: 50 µg/mL for kanamycin, 25 µg/mL for

chloramphenicol, 150 µg/mL for carbenicillin, 0.25 mM isopropyl β-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside

(IPTG), 0.2% (*w/v*) L-(+)-arabinose, and 10% (*w/v*) sucrose.

Plasmid Construction

All plasmids and primers used in this study are listed in **Supplementary Table 4**.

Mutations in *E. coli* were generated using the pRE118 vector[95]. For chromosomal mutation

constructs, 800-basepair regions flanking the mutation site were amplified by polymerase chain

reaction (PCR), sewn together, and inserted into the vector using Gibson assembly at the *XbaI* and

SacI restriction sites[96]. Insertions at the Tn7 sites of *E. coli* strains were generated using the

pUC18mini R6K vector with the target genes amplified by PCR and inserted into the vector

through Gibson assembly at the *XhoI* and *SacI* restriction sites[97].

For co-expression and purification of the Cpe1$_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex, the *cpe1*$_{tox}$ and *cpi1* genes

were amplified and cloned into MCS (multiple cloning site)-1 (*BamH1* and *NotI* sites) and MCS-

2 (*NdeI* and *XhoI* sites) of the pETDuet-1 vector, respectively, resulting in N-terminal hexa-

histidine fusion to *cpe1*$_{tox}$. Candidate protein substrates of Cpe1$_{tox}$ were purified by cloning the

corresponding genes into MCS-1 of pETDuet-1. The *BamHI* and *NotI* sites were used to N-

terminally fuse hexa-histidine to substrates (*e.g.,* GyrB and ParE)[98]. Alternatively, the *NcoI* and

NotI sites were employed for C-terminal hexa-histidine fusions to substrates (*e.g.,* NusA, NusG,

RpoB, AccA, and DapE) or for expressing proteins without fusion tags (*e.g.,* FtsZ). For strep-tagged proteins (*e.g.,* Cpi1 variants and the ATPase domain of ParE) and His-tagged Cpi1, the corresponding genes were cloned into MCS-2 of pETDuet-1 using the *NdeI* and *XhoI* restriction sites.

Site-directed mutagenesis was performed to generate substitution mutants of toxin and immunity proteins in pBAD33 and pETDuet-1 plasmids. Primers containing the desired mutations were paired with a complementary primer in the opposite orientation to amplify a mutated copy of the plasmid. The template plasmid was digested using *DpnI*, and the resulting mutated amplicon was transformed into *E. coli* competent cells. Mutant plasmids were selected by growth on plates containing carbenicillin (for pETDuet-1) or chloramphenicol (for pBAD33).

Generation of Mutant Strains of *E. coli*

To generate mutations of *E. coli* ATCC-11775 strains, mutant constructs in pRE118 plasmid were transformed into *E. coli* S17-1 λ pir. *E. coli* S17-1 λ pir donor strains carrying the mutant constructs and *E. coli* ATCC-11775 recipient strains to be mutated were grown overnight on LB plates containing appropriate antibiotics, then scraped together to create a 1:1 mixture of each donor-recipient pair that was spread on an LB agar plate and incubated at 37°C for 6 hours to facilitate plasmid transfer via conjugation. Cell mixtures were then scraped into LB and plated on LB agar containing kanamycin and chloramphenicol to select for *E. coli* ATCC-11775 with integrated plasmid. *E. coli* ATCC-11775 merodiploid strains were then grown overnight in a non-selective LB medium at 37°C, followed by counter-selection by plating on nutrient agar plates supplemented with sucrose. Kanamycin-sensitive, sucrose-resistant colonies were screened for

allelic replacement by colony PCR, and mutations were confirmed by Sanger sequencing of the

PCR products.

To generate *E. coli* MG1655 strains with insertions at the Tn7 site, pUC18mini_R6K

plasmids carrying the insert fragments and the helper plasmid pTNS3 were co-transformed into *E.*

coli MG1655 through electroporation[97]. Following electroporation, the cell suspension was

incubated in SOB media at 37°C for 1 hour for recovery. The cells were then plated onto LB agar

containing kanamycin for selection. Kanamycin-resistant colonies were screened for the presence

of insertions using colony PCR, and mutations were confirmed by Sanger sequencing of the PCR

products.

Cpe1 Toxicity Assays

To assess the toxicity of $Cpe1_{tox}$ variants and the protective effect conferred by expression

of Cpi1 variants, overnight cultures of *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) harboring toxin and immunity genes in

pBAD33 and pETDuet-1 vectors, respectively, were used to inoculate LB medium. Cultures were

adjusted to an initial optical density (OD_{600}) of 0.05 and incubated at 37°C with shaking at 200

rpm for 4 hours in the presence of appropriate inducers. Following incubation, 10-fold serial

dilutions of each culture were prepared and plated onto LB agar to determine colony-forming units

(CFUs). Unless otherwise specified, $Cpe1_{tox}$ expression was induced by the addition of arabinose

to cultures harboring pBAD33, whereas expression of Cpi1 from pETDuet-1 was induced by the

addition of IPTG.

Bacterial Competition Assays

For each competition experiment, *E. coli* ATCC-11775 Δ*hns* was used as the donor strain, whereas *E. coli* MG1655 served as the recipient strain. The Δ*hns* mutation was introduced into the donor strain to upregulate T6SS activity as previously described[99-101]. The indicated *E. coli* donor and recipient strains were cultured for 16 hours in LB broth at 37°C. The overnight cultures were then refreshed by inoculating LB medium at a ratio of 3:100 (culture:medium) and incubated at 37°C for 5 hours. After incubation, cells were harvested by centrifugation at 17,900 × g for 1 minute. The supernatant was discarded, and the cell pellets were washed once with LB medium. The cells were centrifuged again, resuspended in LB, and normalized to an OD_{600} of 2. Donor and recipient strains were then mixed at a 50:1 (*v/v*) ratio, and the initial donor-to-recipient ratios were determined by performing 10-fold serial dilutions and plating on selective media. Competitions were initiated by spotting 3 × 5 μL of each mixture onto nitrocellulose filters placed on LB agar plates containing 3% (*w/v*) agar. The plates were incubated at 37°C for 6 hours. Following incubation, cells were harvested by scraping individual spots from excised sections of the nitrocellulose filter into LB medium. The suspensions were serially diluted and plated on selective media to quantify CFUs.

Analysis of Protein Expression Levels

To analyze the expression of Cpe1$_{tox}$ and Cpi1 variants, *E. coli* strains harboring the plasmids expressing the target proteins were cultured in LB medium supplemented with appropriate inducer at 37°C. Cells were harvested at an OD_{600} of 1, and cell pellets were resuspended in SDS sample buffer for analysis. The samples were boiled at 100°C for 10 minutes, and then subjected to SDS-PAGE. Proteins were transferred onto nitrocellulose membranes, which

were then blocked in TBST buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% (*v/v*) Tween-20)

containing 5% (*w/v*) non-fat milk for 30 minutes at room temperature. Blocked membranes were

incubated with primary antibodies (α-His, α-Strep, or α-RNA Polymerase β) diluted in TBST for

1 hour at room temperature. Following incubation, the membranes were washed with TBST and

subsequently incubated for 30 minutes at room temperature with a secondary antibody (α-mouse

IgG HRP-conjugated) diluted 1:5000 in TBST. After the wash with TBST, protein detection and

visualization were performed using a UVP BioSpectrum 815 system.

Protein Purification

To prevent cytotoxicity during overexpression in *E. coli*, all Cpe1$_{tox}$ constructs were co-

expressed with Cpi1 from pETDuet-1 in *E. coli* BL21 (DE3). Stationary-phase cultures of the

expression strains were used to inoculate 1 liter of LB broth supplemented with carbenicillin,

which was then incubated in a shaking (200 rpm) incubator at 37°C until the mid-log phase (OD$_{600}$

= 0.4 - 0.7). Protein expression was induced by adding IPTG, followed by incubation at 30°C for

5 hours. Cells were harvested by centrifugation at 7,000 × g for 30 minutes and resuspended in

lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 500 mM NaCl, 5 mM imidazole, 1 mM DTT, 5% (*w/v*)

glycerol, and 1 mg/mL lysozyme). Resuspended cells were incubated on ice for 30 minutes,

disrupted by sonication (10 pulses of 10 seconds each), and centrifuged at 40,000 × g for 30

minutes to remove cellular debris. His-tagged Cpe1$_{tox}$ and associated proteins were purified from

the supernatant using a 2 mL Ni-NTA agarose column by gravity flow. Bound proteins were eluted

using a linear imidazole gradient, reaching a final concentration of 300 mM. Purity was assessed

by SDS-PAGE, followed by Coomassie Brilliant Blue staining. For further purification, protein

samples were subjected to fast protein liquid chromatography (FPLC) using gel filtration on a

HiLoad 16/600 Superdex 200 pg column (GE Healthcare). Fractions demonstrating high purity were collected and used in biochemical assays. For selenomethionine-incorporated Cpe1$_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex, cells were grown in SelenoMethionine Medium Complete (Molecular Dimensions) under the same expression conditions described above. Cell lysis, Ni-NTA affinity purification, and gel filtration were performed as detailed for native proteins.

To obtain free Cpe1$_{tox}$ for experiments, a denaturation and refolding strategy was employed to separate His-tagged Cpe1$_{tox}$ from Cpi1. The protein mixture was first diluted 1:25 into denaturation buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 300 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT, and 8 M urea) to denature the protein complex. Denatured proteins were then loaded onto a column containing 1 mL of Ni-NTA agarose, allowing selective binding of His-tagged Cpe1$_{tox}$ while dissociated Cpi1 was removed in the flow-through. On-column refolding was achieved by sequential washing with renaturation buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 300 mM NaCl, and 1 mM DTT). The refolded protein was subsequently eluted with elution buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 300 mM NaCl, and 300 mM imidazole). Eluted protein samples were dialyzed against storage buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 300 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT, and 5% (*w/v*) glycerol) to remove residual imidazole and stabilize the protein. Dialyzed samples were then aliquoted and stored at −80°C for subsequent experiments.

To purify Cpe1 candidate protein substrates (GyrB, ParE, NusA, NusG, RpoB, AccA, and DapE) and Cpi1, His-tagged proteins were expressed in *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) transformed with the pETDuet-1 expression vector containing the corresponding coding regions. Cultures were grown in LB broth at 37°C to mid-log phase and induced with IPTG, followed by 2-hour incubation at 37°C. Cells were harvested by centrifugation, resuspended in lysis buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7, 300 mM NaCl, 10 mM imidazole, 1 mM DTT, and 1 mg/mL lysozyme), and incubated on ice for 30 minutes. The cells were disrupted by sonication (10 pulses, 10 seconds each), and the lysate

was cleared by centrifugation at 40,000 × g for 30 minutes. His-tagged proteins were purified from

the supernatant by means of gravity flow through a 1 mL Ni-NTA agarose column. Proteins bound

to the column were eluted with a linear imidazole gradient up to 300 mM. The purity of each

protein sample was verified by SDS-PAGE followed by Coomassie Brilliant Blue staining.

Purified proteins were resuspended and dialyzed into storage buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7, 300

mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT, and 5% (w/v) glycerol). Protein aliquots were frozen and stored at −80°C

for further use.

For purification of FtsZ, FtsZ was overproduced in *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) transformed with

the pETDuet-1 expression vector containing the FtsZ coding region. Cultures were grown in LB

medium at 37°C to mid-log phase and induced with IPTG, followed by 3-hour induction at 37°C.

The cells were harvested by centrifugation, resuspended in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8,

100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 5 mM $MgCl_2$, 1 mM PMSF, and 0.1 mg/mL lysozyme), and

incubated on ice for 30 minutes. Cell lysis was performed by sonication (10 pulses, 10 seconds

each), and the lysate was cleared by centrifugation at 40,000 × g for 30 minutes. To remove

unwanted proteins, the supernatant was subjected to ammonium sulfate fractionation. Proteins

precipitated at 20% (w/v) ammonium sulfate were discarded, whereas those precipitated at 30%

(w/v) ammonium sulfate were collected by centrifugation at 40,000 × g for 30 minutes. The

resulting pellet, enriched for FtsZ, was resuspended in buffer containing 20 mM Tris-HCl pH 8,

100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, and 5 mM $MgCl_2$. The resuspended proteins were dialyzed against

storage buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 100 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM EDTA, and 5% (w/v) glycerol),

aliquoted, and stored in a freezer at −80°C.

For purification of proteins with strep tags (*i.e.,* Cpi1 variants and the ATPase domain of

ParE), the proteins were overproduced in *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) transformed with the pETDuet-1

expression vector containing the respective gene coding regions. Cultures were grown in LB

medium at 37°C to mid-log phase and induced by the addition of IPTG. After 2-hour induction at

37°C, the cells were harvested by centrifugation and resuspended in lysis buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl

pH 7, 300 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT, and 1 mg/mL lysozyme). The cells were incubated on ice for 30

minutes, followed by sonication (10 pulses, 10 seconds each) to achieve lysis. Cellular debris was

removed by centrifugation at $40,000 \times g$ for 30 minutes. Strep-tagged proteins were purified from

the supernatant using a 1 mL gravity-flow column containing streptavidin resin (IBA Lifesciences

GmbH). Bound proteins were eluted with a buffer containing 20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7, 300 mM

NaCl, 1 mM DTT, and 2.5 mM desthiobiotin. Protein purity was evaluated by SDS-PAGE,

followed by Coomassie Brilliant Blue staining. Samples were further purified by means of FPLC

on a HiLoad 16/600 Superdex 200 pg column (GE Healthcare).

Crystallization and Structure Determination

The Cpe1$_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex was prepared for crystallization by dialyzing the purified

protein complex into a buffer containing 5 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7), 150 mM NaCl, and 0.5 mM tris(2-

carboxyethyl)phosphine (TCEP). The protein solution was then concentrated to 13.5 mg/mL using

spin filtration (10 kDa cutoff, Millipore). Crystallization trials were conducted using commercially

available screens from Hampton Research. Diffraction-quality crystals were obtained after two

weeks at 20°C using the hanging-drop vapor diffusion method with a protein-to-buffer ratio of 1:2.

The crystallization solution consisted of 0.4 M magnesium formate and 0.1 M sodium acetate (pH

4.6). Crystals of the selenomethionine-labeled Cpe1$_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex were grown under identical

conditions as the native complex, with the protein sample also concentrated to 13.5 mg/mL and

mixed at a 1:2 ratio with the same crystallization solution. Crystals were cryoprotected using a

solution of 20% (v/v) glycerol in the crystallization mother liquor prior to data collection.

Native and multiple-wavelength anomalous diffraction (MAD) datasets were collected at

beamlines TPS-05A and TLS-BL15A of the National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center

(Taiwan). Diffraction data were processed using the HKL2000 software suite[102]. Phase

determination was performed using PHENIX with data collected at the selenium peak wavelength

from selenomethionine-labeled crystals[103]. The initial model of the Cpe1$_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex was

constructed using the electron density map in Coot and subsequently refined using PHENIX[103,104].

The crystals belonged to the cubic space group P43212, with two protein complexes per

asymmetric unit. No residues were found in the disallowed regions of the Ramachandran plot.

Data collection and refinement statistics are provided in **Supplementary Table 2**.

Bpa Photo-Crosslinking Experiment

E. coli BL21 (DE3) cells were transformed with plasmids encoding Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}

containing a TAG stop codon at specific sites (*i.e.,* L387, M426, and W428) to incorporate Bpa

via nonsense suppression during translation. The transformation also included the Bpa-tRNA

plasmid (pSUPT/BpF), which encodes the tRNA and tRNA synthetase necessary for Bpa

incorporation, as described previously[105].

The transformed cells were grown in LB medium supplemented with 1.5 mM of Bpa at

37°C until reaching the mid-log phase. Protein expression was induced by adding IPTG and

arabinose, and the cultures were incubated at 30°C for 3 hours. Cells corresponding to 50 OD$_{600}$

units were harvested, resuspended in 1 mL of ice-cold phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), and

divided into two aliquots. One aliquot was exposed to 365 nm UV light (Stratalinker 1800 UV

irradiator) for 30 minutes at 4°C to induce crosslinking, while the other aliquot was kept on ice as

a non-crosslinked control. Cell lysis was performed by sonication in lysis buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl

pH 7.5, 300 mM NaCl, 10 mM imidazole, 8 M urea, and 1 mM DTT). The lysates were incubated

with Ni-NTA resin for 2 hours at 4°C to purify His-tagged proteins. Bound proteins, including

crosslinked products, were analyzed using immunoblotting and mass spectrometry.

Mass Spectrometry

For our interactome analysis, Bpa-crosslinked $Cpe1_{tox}^{C362A}$-protein complexes were

purified and immobilized on Ni-NTA resins. After washing four times in lysis buffer, the resins

were resuspended in 8 M urea and Tris-HCl pH 8. For cysteine alkylation, 10 mM TCEP and 40

mM 2-chloroacetamide (CAA) were added into the samples and incubated at 45°C for 30 minutes

with shaking (1500 rpm). The samples were diluted 4-fold with 50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8 and digested

by 0.4 μg Lys-C (Wako, Japan) treatment for 3 hours at room temperature and 1 μg of trypsin

(Sigma, MO) overnight at 37°C. Supernatants containing digested peptides were acidified by 1%

TFA, desalted using the Oasis HLB 1 cc Vac Cartridge (Waters Corp), reconstituted in 80%

acetonitrile (ACN), and vacuum-dried at 45°C.

NanoLC−nanoESi-MS/MS analysis was performed on a Thermo UltiMate 3000

RSLCnano system connected to a Thermo Orbitrap Fusion mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher

Scientific, Bremen, Germany) equipped with a nanospray interface (New Objective, Woburn, MA).

Peptide mixtures were loaded onto a 75 μm ID, 25 cm long PepMap C18 column (Thermo Fisher

Scientific) packed with 2 μm particles with a pore size of 100 Å and they were separated using a

segmented gradient from 5% to 25% solvent B (0.1% formic acid in ACN) in 82.5 minutes and to

35% solvent B in 7.5 minutes at a flow rate of 300 nL/minute. Solvent A was 0.1% formic acid in

water. The mass spectrometer was operated in the data-dependent mode. In brief, survey scans of

peptide precursors from 350 to 1600 m/z were performed at 120K resolution with a 2×10^5 ion

count target. Tandem MS was performed by isolation window at 1.6 daltons with the quadrupole,

HCD fragmentation with a normalized collision energy of 30, and MS 2 scan analysis at 30K

resolution in the orbitrap. The MS 2 ion count target was set to 5×10^4 and the max injection time

was 54 milliseconds. Only those precursors with charge states 2–6 were sampled for MS 2. The

instrument was run in top speed mode with 3-second cycles. The dynamic exclusion duration was

set to 11 seconds with a 10-ppm tolerance around the selected precursor and its isotopes.

Monoisotopic precursor selection was turned on. Raw data were processed using MaxQuant

software[106,107].

To identify digested peptides of Cpe1, the samples were prepared based on a previous study

with minor modifications[108]. The protein band from SDS-PAGE was manually excised and cut into

small pieces (0.5 mm^3). The excised gel pieces were washed with a solution containing 25 mM

NH_4HCO_3 and 40% methanol, followed by 100% ACN. The proteins in gel pieces were treated

with 10 mM DTT and then with 55 mM iodoacetamide. Proteins were digested with trypsin

(Promega) to a final substrate: trypsin ratio of 50:1 in buffer containing 25 mM ammonium

bicarbonate and 10% ACN for 12 to 16 hours at 37°C. The reaction was stopped by adding 5%

formic acid.

For MALDI-TOF analysis, an aliquot (0.5 μL) of the supernatant from the digest was

deposited onto a 384/600-μm MTP AnchorChip (Bruker Daltonik GmbH) target and allowed to

air dry at room temperature. Then, an aliquot (0.5 μL) of CHCA solution (1.4 mg/ml α-Cyano-4-

hydroxycinnamic acid in buffer containing 0.1% TFA, 1 mM ammonium phosphate, and 85%

ACN) was added to the chip and allowed to air dry. Further MALDI-TOF MS mass spectrometry

analysis was performed in positive ion mode with delayed extraction (reflection mode) on a Bruker

Autoflex maX MALDI-TOF/TOF mass spectrometer (Bremen, Germany) equipped with a 200 Hz

SmartBean Laser. Data acquisition and processing were done manually by using FlexControl 3.4

and Flex-Analysis 3.4 (Bruker Daltonik GmbH), respectively. The processed data were further

analyzed with Biotools 3.2 (Bruker) packaged by assessing the online Mascot server to identify

the corresponding polypeptides.

For tandem mass spectrometry analysis, peptides were analyzed using an UltiMate™ 3000

RSLCnano UHPLC system (Thermo Fisher Scientific) equipped with a capillary C18 column

(Waters, nanoEase, 130 Å, 1.7 μm, 75 μm × 250 mm). Separation was achieved with a gradient of

3% to 35% buffer B (0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile) in buffer A (0.1% formic acid in water) at a

flow rate of 300 nL/min. The system was subsequently washed with 80% buffer B and

reconditioned to 3% buffer B. The chromatography system was coupled to a Q-Exactive mass

spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) via a Nanospray Flex Ion source. The mass spectrometer

was operated in Full-MS/ddMS2 (Top N) mode, scanning a range of m/z 350–1600 at a resolution

of 70,000 FWHM with an AGC target of 3×10^6. MS2 spectra were acquired in HCD mode with

a normalized collision energy of 27%, a resolution of 17,500, an injection time of 100 ms, and an

AGC target of 1×10^5. The top ten precursors were selected for MS2 analysis using a 2.0 m/z

isolation window and a dynamic exclusion time of 20 seconds. Raw LC-MS/MS data were

analyzed using Proteome Discoverer 2.5 (Thermo Fisher Scientific). MS/MS spectra were filtered

using the Spectrum Selector in Proteome Discoverer with default settings. The spectra were

searched against the GyrB and ParE protein sequence databases using the SEQUEST HT and

Byonic algorithms. Searches were performed in semi-specific mode to identify peptides resulting

from specific cleavage at one terminus. The precursor mass tolerance was set to 10 ppm, and the

fragment mass tolerance was 0.02 Da. Trypsin was used as the protease in semi-specific mode.

Carbamidomethylation of cysteine was specified as a fixed modification, while N-terminal

acetylation and methionine oxidation were included as variable modifications. Peptide spectrum

matches (PSMs) were validated using Percolator, with a false discovery rate (FDR) threshold of

1%.

***In Vitro* Protease Cleavage Assay**

Purified protein substrates were incubated with Cpe1$_{tox}$ (wild-type or catalytic mutant) at a

10:1 ratio. Reactions were performed at 20°C for 5 minutes in a final volume of 20 μL containing

20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7, 300 mM NaCl, and 1 mM DTT. The reactions were stopped by cooling on

ice and the addition of an equal volume of SDS sample buffer. Samples were boiled and analyzed

by SDS-PAGE, followed by Coomassie Brilliant Blue staining.

Plasmid DNA Supercoiling Assay

To visualize variations of DNA topology in bacteria, we followed the procedures described

in a previous study with minor modifications[109]. Overnight precultures of strains carrying

pBAD33-Cpe1$_{tox}$ (wild-type or catalytic mutant) and the reporter plasmid pET were refreshed in

LB broth and incubated at 37°C with shaking (250 rpm). When cultures reached the mid-log phase,

cells were transferred to a medium containing arabinose inducer and incubated for an extended

period to induce Cpe1$_{tox}$ expression and intoxication. Cells were pelleted by centrifugation, and

plasmid DNA was purified using the QIAprep Spin Miniprep Kit (Qiagen) and eluted by 50 mM

Tris-HCl pH 8.5. DNA topoisomers were resolved on a 1% (*w/v*) agarose gel containing Tris-

acetate-EDTA (TAE) and 5 μg/ml chloroquine. The gels were run in TAE buffer with 5 μg/mL

chloroquine for 10 hours (140 volts for 30 minutes, followed by 110 volts for 9.5 hours), stained

with 0.5 μg/mL ethidium bromide in TAE buffer, destained in distilled water overnight, and imaged

with a Quantum CX5 imaging system (Vilber).

Fluorescence and Phase Contrast Microscopy

Imaging was performed using a DeltaVision Core Deconvolution Microscopy system with

an Olympus IX71 microscope and a 60x 1.42 NA oil-immersion objective. For fluorescence and

phase contrast microscopy, bacterial cultures at the mid-log phase were used to inoculate LB

medium supplemented with arabinose and IPTG for the expression of $Cpe1_{tox}$ and Cpi1,

respectively. After 3 hours of incubation at 37°C with shaking (200 rpm), cells were harvested by

centrifugation at $18,000 \times g$ for 1 minute. The culture supernatant was removed and washed with

ice-cold PBS. The washed cells were resuspended in PBS containing 70% ethanol for 15-minute

cell fixation on ice. The fixed cells were subjected to one PBS wash. Addition of DAPI to the cell

suspensions preceded a 5-minute incubation on ice in the dark. The cells were then washed with

PBS at $18,000 \times g$ for 1 minute. The cell suspensions were then adjusted to $OD_{600} = 0.5$ using PBS

and spotted on a 1.5% (*w/v*) agarose pad settled on a microscope slide.

For time-lapse imaging of living cells, single colonies from LB agar were inoculated into

LB media supplemented with appropriate antibiotics. After incubation for 16 hours at 37°C with

shaking (200 rpm), the cultures were adjusted to $OD_{600} = 0.5$ before spotting on a 1.5% (*w/v*)

agarose pad containing arabinose, IPTG, and appropriate antibiotics settled on a microscope slide.

Phase contrast images for each sample were acquired at 10-minute intervals.

Cpe1$_{\text{tox}}$–Cpi1/ParE$_{\text{ATPase}}$ Competitive Binding Assay

His-tagged Cpe1$_{\text{tox}}^{\text{C362A}}$ protein was incubated with an excess of strep-tagged ParE$_{\text{ATPase}}$

for 1 hour at 4°C, followed by incubation with streptavidin resin (IBA Lifesciences GmbH). After

binding, the resin was washed with ice-cold buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7, 300 mM NaCl, and 1

mM DTT) to remove unbound proteins. Increasing concentrations of indicated Cpi1 proteins (His-

tagged) were added and incubated at 4°C for 1 hour, followed by a single wash with ice-cold buffer.

Bound proteins were eluted with buffer containing 20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7, 300 mM NaCl, 1 mM

DTT, and 2.5 mM desthiobiotin. Eluted samples were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, followed by

Coomassie Brilliant Blue staining.

Biolayer Interferometry (BLI)

BLI was performed using an 8-channel Gator® Plus instrument (Gator Bio) with Data

Acquisition V 2.15.5.1221 software (Gator Bio). Experiments were conducted at 30°C with

shaking at 1000 rpm. We immobilized 500 nM strep-tagged Cpi1, Cpi1$^{\text{mut4}}$, or ParE$_{\text{ATPase}}$ onto

strep-tactin XT-coated biosensor tips (IBA Lifesciences). Equilibrium binding dose-response

curves were generated by varying the concentrations of His-tagged Cpe1$_{\text{tox}}^{\text{C362A}}$ in BLI buffer

(0.2% (*w/v*) BSA, 0.02% (*v/v*) Tween-20 in PBS). For Cpi1 and Cpi1$^{\text{mut4}}$, the association and

dissociation intervals were conducted 150 and 300 seconds, whereas both intervals were set as 120

seconds for ParE$_{\text{ATPase}}$. BLI data analysis included reference channel subtraction and Savitzky–

Golay filtering. Kinetic parameters were determined using a 1:1 global fitting model with R$_{\text{max}}$

values linked across sensors. The interaction between ParE$_{\text{ATPase}}$ and His-tagged Cpe1$_{\text{tox}}^{\text{C362A}}$

exhibited fast-on-fast-off kinetics. Therefore, steady-state analysis of the response curves was

employed to calculate the Kd and nominal R_{max} values. All data represent results from at least three

independent experiments.

Generation of Sequence Logos

Protein sequences of 35,812 GyrB homologs and 14,212 ParE homologs were retrieved

from the UniProt database[110]. Regions containing the consensus sequence (LHAGGKF) were

extracted and aligned using ClustalW[93]. The results were visualized as a sequence logo using the

WebLogo3 online tool[111]. Sequences flanking the substrate cleavage sites were obtained from

previous studies to generate the sequence logo for the consensus sequences on the substrates of

ComA and LahT[50,60]. Sequence conservation was analyzed according to the same ClustalW

alignment and visualization procedures.

Quantification and Statistical Analysis

Statistical significance in bacterial co-culture and competition assays was assessed by

unpaired two-tailed t-tests between relevant samples. Values for statistical significance are

provided in the figure legends.

Data Availability

The coordinates and structure factors for the $Cpe1_{tox}$–Cpi1 complex have been deposited

in the Protein Data Bank, with accession code 9L5U.

Acknowledgments

We thank Drs. Harmit Malik, Dor Salomon, Jun-Yi Leu, Erh-Min Lai, Chih-Horng Kuo, Chih-Yen King, and Ting laboratory members for helpful discussions; Drs. Joseph Mougous, Ming-Yang Ho, Hsin-Hung Chou, and Sue Lin-Chao for sharing reagents; Dr. Hung-Ta Chen for sharing equipment; Drs. Hsin-Nan Lin, Chen-Hsin Yu, Yae-Huei Liou, Sue-Ping Lee, Yung-Hsuan Wu, Shu-Yu Lin, Chuan-Chih Hsu, Chin-Wen Chen, Shu-Chuan Jao, Jin-Hsuan Yu, and Xin-Jie Huang 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., AS-IVA-112-L05 to K.-C.H., AS-CDA-110-L01 to C.K., AS-CFII-111-201 to the Academia Sinica Biophysics Core Facility, and AS-CFII-111-209 to the Academia Sinica Common Mass Spectrometry Facilities) 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., 112-2320-B-001-006-MY3 to K.-C.H., 111-2611-M001-008-MY3 to C.K., 112-2311-B-001-024-MY3 to the Proteomics Core Lab in the Institute of Plant and Microbial Biology at Academia Sinica).

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. PLCP toxins are found in distinct Gram-negative species and are associated with interbacterial toxin delivery pathways. (a) The enzymatic reaction mechanism of papain-like cysteine proteases (PLCPs). The catalytic triad of residues in PLCPs, composed of cysteine (Cys), histidine (His), and aspartate (Asp), facilitates peptide bond cleavage. Histidine and aspartate form

a proton-withdrawing group that activates the cysteine residue, converting it into a nucleophile.

The activated cysteine attacks the carbonyl carbon of the peptide bond, leading to hydrolysis and

bond cleavage. **(b)** Scaled depiction of representative genomic loci from the indicated species

(*Edwardsiella tarda*, *Escherichia coli*, *Myxococcales bacterium*, *Roseofilum reptotaenium*,

Citrobacter rodentium, *Rhizobium* sp., *Burkholderia* sp.) encoding predicted PLCP domain-

containing proteins (sky blue) and putative cognate immunity proteins (yellow). Regions encoding

N-terminal domains of T6SS-related proteins (PAAR, VgrG, Rhs) are shaded in gray. CDI-related

proteins (CdiA, CdiB) are depicted in light brown. Black bars designate locations of bases

encoding the catalytic triads of PLCPs. Cysteine residues targeted for mutagenesis in this study

are depicted in red. **(c)** Sequence logo generated from alignments of PLCP domains associated

with bacterial contact-dependent antagonism pathways (the locus tag numbers for genes encoding

the sequences we used are provided in **Supplementary Table 1**). Sequences from previously

characterized PLCPs (ComA$_{pep}$ and LahT$_{pep}$) and recently identified T6SS-associated PLCP toxins

(EvpQ and TsaP) are shown below for reference. **(d)** Maximum likelihood phylogeny of PLCP

effectors visualized as a radiating phylogenetic tree. Taxonomy is indicated by colored shadows,

and delivery pathways are indicated by colored tips. The scale bar represents the average number

of substitutions per site. See also **Supplementary Figure 2**.

Figure 2. Cpe1$_{tox}$-Cpi1 is a functional effector-immunity pair. (a) Viable *E. coli* cells recovered

from plating cultures carrying plasmids expressing the indicated proteins on inducing media. *E.*

coli carrying plasmid-borne Cpi1 or an empty vector was included to validate suppression of Cpe1

toxicity. **(b)** Representative micrographs of *E. coli* cells expressing empty vector, Cpe1$_{tox}$,

Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}, or co-expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$ and Cpi1. Frames were acquired 2 hours after induction of

protein expression. Scale bar, 2 μm. **(c)** Ribbon diagram representation of the X-ray crystal

structure of Cpe1$_{tox}$ (sky blue) in complex with Cpi1 (light gold). Residues of the catalytic triad of

Cpe1$_{tox}$ are indicated. **(d)** Structural alignments of Cpe1$_{tox}$ with previously characterized PLCPs:

ComA$_{pep}$ (PDB: 3K8U, light gray) and LahT$_{pep}$ (PDB: 6MPZ, dark gray). **(e)** Bacterial competition

experiments were conducted on a solid agar over a 6-hour period between the indicated donor and

recipient strains. *E. coli* ATCC-11775 Δ*hns* served as the donor strain, whereas *E. coli* MG1655

was used as the recipient strain. The Δ*hns* mutation in the donor strain was introduced to upregulate

T6SS activity, as described in previous studies[99-101]. **(f)** Depiction of Cpe1$_{tox}$ illustrating the

Cpe1$_{tox}$-Cpi1 interaction at the exosite formed by hydrophobic residues. **(g)** Magnified view of the

interface between Cpe1$_{tox}$ and Cpi1, highlighting the interacting residues on Cpi1 positioned near

the hydrophobic concave surface of Cpe1$_{tox}$. **(h)** Viable *E. coli* cells recovered from *E. coli* co-

expressing wild-type Cpe1$_{tox}$ and the indicated Cpi1 variants. **(i)** *In vitro* pull-down assay of

Cpe1$_{tox}$ and Cpi1. Cpe1$_{tox}$ proteins were pulled down by strep-tagged Cpi1 variants and

immobilized on streptavidin resin. Bound proteins were separated by SDS-PAGE followed by

Coomassie brilliant blue staining. Data in **(a)**, **(e)**, and **(h)** are represented as means ± SD. Asterisks

indicate significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in viability between populations **(a, h)** or statistically

significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between competitive indices of a given donor strain toward the

indicated recipients **(e)**. n.s. means no significance. See also **Supplementary Figure 3**,

Supplementary Table 2, and **Videos 1-4**.

Figure 3. Cpe1$_{tox}$ targets and cleaves the type II DNA topoisomerases GyrB and ParE. (a)

Viable *E. coli* cells recovered from expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$ with substitutions of indicated surface

residues from the hydrophobic concave region. The expression levels of wild-type and Cpe1$_{tox}$

variants were assessed by immunoblotting analysis, using the cytosolic protein RpoB as a loading

control (right panel). **(b)** Schematic workflow for identifying candidate substrates of Cpe1$_{tox}$

through Bpa crosslinking followed by LC-MS/MS protein identification. Bacteria carrying the

construct with a TAG stop codon at residues of interest were grown in medium supplemented with

Bpa. After incubation, cells were exposed to long-wavelength UV to activate formation of covalent

bonds between Bpa and the interacting residues. Cell lysates were incubated with Ni-NTA resin to

enrich for Cpe1$_{tox}$-Bpa crosslinks for further analysis. **(c)** SDS-PAGE gel analysis of crosslinked

protein complexes before and after UV$_{365nm}$ treatment. Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}-protein complexes enriched

by the Ni-NTA resin were boiled in SDS sample buffer and separated by SDS-PAGE, followed by

immunoblotting (α-His). **(d)** Essential proteins identified in the Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A} interactome and their

biological functions. The complete interactome dataset is available in **Supplementary Table 3**. **(e,**

f, h, i) *In vitro* Cpe1$_{tox}$ cleavage assays. Purified Cpe1$_{tox}$ (wild-type or catalytic mutant) were

incubated with purified candidate substrates, *i.e.,* GyrB **(e)** and ParE **(f)**, or their variants with

single-glycine deletion at the predicted cleavage sites **(h, i)**, to assess hydrolysis by Cpe1$_{tox}$.

Fragmented proteins are marked with red arrowheads. Rxn means reaction. **(g)** Double glycine

motifs in the consensus regions of *E. coli* GyrB and ParE. Locations of consensus regions between

GyrB and ParE containing double glycine motifs are indicated on the cartoon representation of the

full-length proteins. The sequences of the consensus regions are shown below, with the positions

of the double glycine motifs labeled. The GG motif (red) and the surrounding residues (blue) are

highlighted.

Figure 4. Cpe1$_{tox}$-mediated intoxication disrupts topoisomerase activity, thereby altering
DNA topology and impairing DNA replication and chromosome segregation. (a-b) Ribbon

diagrams of *E. coli* GyrB (a, top structure) and ParE (b, top structure) before and after cleavage by

Cpe1$_{tox}$. Crystal structures of the 43-kDa ATPase domain of *E. coli* GyrB (PDB: 4PRV) and ParE

(PDB: 1S16) were used. Residues of the consensus sequence (LHAGGKF) are shown in yellow.

Structure related to the small fragments after Cpe1$_{tox}$ cleavage are indicated as pink ribbons.

Predicted structures after cleavage at the double glycine motif demonstrated disruption of the

ATPase domain of both GyrB (a, bottom structure) and ParE (b, bottom structure). **(c, d)** Sequence

logos evidencing conservation of the consensus sequence (LHAGGKF) of GyrB **(c)** and ParE **(d)**

homologs. Cleavage at the double glycine motif is indicated by dashed lines and a scissors

illustration. **(e)** Plasmid DNA (pET) was analyzed by high-resolution agarose gel electrophoresis

following isolation from *E. coli* that had expressed Cpe1$_{tox}$ or the catalytic mutant for 0.5 or 1 hour.

(f) *E. coli* cells that had expressed Cpe1$_{tox}$, Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}, or Cpe1$_{tox}$ co-expressed with Cpi1 for

three hours. Cpe1$_{tox}$, or the catalytic mutant, was stained with DAPI (DNA; blue) and analyzed by

fluorescence microscopy. Phase-contrast (top), blue fluorescence (middle), and merged (bottom)

images are presented. Scale bar = 2 μm. Full-size images are available in **Supplementary Figure 7**.

(g) Working model of how Cpe1 intoxicates bacteria. During interbacterial competition, Cpe1

targets and cleaves the ATPase domains of GyrB and ParE in target cells. The cleavage leads to

accumulations of unrelaxed supercoils and precatenanes, disrupts DNA segregation, and ultimately

inhibits cell division and growth. In the Cpe1-producing cells or kin cells expressing the immunity

protein Cpi1, Cpe1 toxicity is neutralized through direct interaction between Cpe1 and Cpi1.

Figure 5. Cpi1 employs a competitive inhibitory mechanism to neutralize Cpe1. (a) The

Cpe1$_{tox}$-Cpi1 interface overlaps with the Cpe1$_{tox}$-substrate interaction site. Model predictions of

interaction between Cpe1$_{tox}$ and the ATPase domains of GyrB and ParE were constructed using

AlphaFold 3. See also **Supplementary Figures 9a, b** for confidence metrics. **(b)** Schematic

workflow for the *in vitro* competitive binding assay. Streptavidin resins bound to pre-formed

Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}-substrate complexes were prepared and incubated with either wild-type or mutant

Cpi1. After incubation, the resins were washed, and the bound proteins were eluted for analysis.

Competitive binding events are indicated by disruption of the Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}-substrate interaction,

leading to a decreased level of Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A} in the eluted fraction due to its removal during the

wash step. **(c, d)** Coomassie-stained SDS-PAGE demonstrating competitive binding events. **(e, f)**

Kinetic analysis of interactions between Cpi1 and Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A} **(e)** and ParE$_{ATPase}$ and Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}

(f) using biolayer interferometry (BLI). Data from three replicates have been plotted on an X-Y

scatter graph. The Y-axis represents the wavelength shift generated by binding of the two proteins,

normalized to the calculated Rmax (% Rmax) for each run. The X-axis represents reaction time

(in seconds). A vertical dashed line marks the transition from the association step to the

dissociation step. The mean kinetic parameters (K_d, K_{on}, and K_{off}) and their standard deviations are

indicated.

Supplementary Figure 1. Interbacterial PLCP effectors and their cognate immunity proteins

are distributed across various Gram-negative bacteria. Related to **Figure 1b. (a)** Multiple

sequence alignment of 155 unique sequences of interbacterial PLCP effectors. Sequences have

been ordered by relative identity to Cpe1$_{tox}$ of *E. coli* ATCC-11775 and are displayed in two

clusters divided according to the associated secretion systems (T6SS or CDI). Conserved residues

are indicated as follows: the catalytic triad residues are highlighted by red (Cysteine) and orange

(Histidine and Aspartate/Asparagine) shadows; and hydrophobic residues composing the surface

concave region are highlighted by blue shadows. The Phylum of each strain containing the

interbacterial PLCP effectors is indicated by colored boxes (as indicated in the legend). **(b)**

Sequences of the putative cognate immunity proteins related to the interbacterial PLCP effectors

in **(a)**. Conserved binding residues are highlighted in green shadows. Blank rows indicate an

absence of putative immunity proteins due to incomplete genomic data for certain bacterial species

in the NCBI database. See also **Supplementary Table 1** for detailed information.

Supplementary Figure 2. Interbacterial PLCP effectors exhibit no correlations in phylogeny,

associated secretion pathways, or taxonomy. Related to **Figure 1d**. Maximum likelihood

phylogeny of 155 unique PLCP effector sequences visualized as a rectangle tree. Branch support

values (SH-aLRT and ultrafast bootstrap) are displayed as symbols (filled diamond: SH-aLRT $\geq$

80%, hollow diamonds: ultrafast bootstrap $\geq$ 95%). Tips representing sequences of the closely-

related housekeeping PLCPs, ComA$_{pep}$ and LahT$_{pep}$, as well as the previously identified

interbacterial PLCP effectors EvpQ and TsaP, are highlighted in red. The taxonomy of strains

containing the PLCP effectors and their associated secretion pathways is indicated on the right as

colored boxes. The scale bar represents the average number of substitutions per site. See also

Supplementary Table 1 for detailed information.

1000

1001   **Supplementary Figure 3. Purification of the Cpe1$_{tox}$-Cpi1 complex and protein expression**

1002   **levels of Cpi1 variants.** Related to **Figure 2. (a)** Coomassie-stained SDS-PAGE analysis of the

1003   His-tagged Cpe1$_{tox}$ co-purified with Cpi1. **(b)** Protein expression levels of wild-type Cpi1 and

1004   variants, as assessed by immunoblotting analysis. The cytosolic protein RpoB was used as a

1005   loading control.

1006

Supplementary Figure 4. ComA_{pep} and LahT_{pep} feature hydrophobic concave regions on their surfaces near the catalytic pocket. Related to **Figure 3. (a, b)** Depiction of ComA_{pep} **(a)** and LahT_{pep} **(b)** illustrating the location of their respective catalytic pockets and hydrophobic concave surfaces. ComA_{pep} (PDB: 3K8U, light gray). LahT_{pep} (PDB: 6MPZ, dark gray).

Supplementary Figure 5. Cpe1_{tox} specifically targets and cleaves GyrB and ParE among eight candidate substrates identified from the interactome analysis. Related to **Figure 3. (a-f)** Coomassie-stained SDS-PAGE analysis of the *in vitro* cleavage assay of six candidate substrates of Cpe1_{tox}: AccA **(a)**, DapE **(b)**, FtsZ **(c)**, NusA **(d)**, NusG **(e)**, and RpoB **(f)**. **(g, h)** Presence of Cpi1 suppressed the cleavage of GyrB **(g)** and ParE **(h)** by Cpe1_{tox}. The substrates were incubated with Cpe1_{tox} (lanes 1 and 2), Cpe1_{tox}^{C362A} (lanes 3 and 4), or Cpe1_{tox} and Cpi1 (lanes 5 and 6). Cleaved fragments are indicated with red arrowheads.

Supplementary Figure 6. Cleavage sequences of ComA and LahT and mass spectrometric analysis of Cpe1-cleaved fragments. Related to **Figure 4. (a, b)** Sequence logos showing the consensus sequence recognized by ComA **(a)** and LahT **(b)**. **(c, d)** Mapping of peptide sequences from Cpe1_{tox}-digested GyrB **(c)** and ParE **(d)** fragments. Cpe1_{tox}-cleaved fragments, resolved by Coomassie-stained SDS-PAGE, were purified, trypsin-digested, and subjected to MALDI-TOF analysis. The intensity of the signals (Y-axis) from identified peptides and their coverage across the respective full-length protein (X-axis) are plotted below. Upper chart: peptides from the small fragment. Lower chart: peptides from the large fragment. **(e, f)** Tandem mass spectrum of indicated peptides from Cpe1_{tox}-cleaved GyrB **(e)** and ParE **(g)** fragments. Fragmentation ions (b, blue; y, red) with resolved spectra and the residues correlating to the LHAGGKF motif (bold) are indicated.

Supplementary Figure 7. Cpe1 intoxication inhibits chromosome segregation in *E. coli*. Related to **Figure 4f. (a)** Phase-contrast (top), blue fluorescence (middle), and merged (bottom) images of *E. coli* carrying an empty vector, *E. coli* expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$, *E. coli* expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}, or *E. coli* co-expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$ and Cpi1, after three hours of induction. Scale bar = 20 µm. The white borders demarcate the cropped images displayed in **Figure 4f**.

Supplementary Figure 8. Z-ring formation is disrupted in Cpe1-intoxicated *E. coli*. Related to **Figure 4f. (a)** Phase-contrast (top), blue fluorescence (second from top), green fluorescence (third from top), and merged (bottom) images of *E. coli* carrying an empty vector, shown before and after 2-hour incubation. **(b)** Fluorescence micrographs of *E. coli* intoxicated by Cpe1$_{tox}$. Phase-contrast (top), blue fluorescence (second from top), green fluorescence (third from top), and merged (bottom) images are presented. White borders indicate the zoomed-in regions shown in the bottom-right corner of each image. Scale bar = 20 µm.

Supplementary Figure 9. Interactions between Cpe1$_{tox}$ with the substrates and kinetics of Cpe1$_{tox}$ with Cpi1^{mut4}. Related to **Figures 5 a, e, f. (a, b)** Predicted assigned error (PAE) plots for the models of the Cpe1$_{tox}$-GyrB$_{ATPase}$ interaction **(a)** and the Cpe1$_{tox}$-ParE$_{ATPase}$ interaction **(b)** in **Figure 5a**. Accuracy of the predicted relative positions of subunits within the complex, as indicated by AlphaFold 3 prediction scores (iPTM). Confidence in the overall folding of the complex is indicated by pTM scores. **(c)** Predicted structure of Cpe1$_{tox}$-GyrB$_{ATPase}$ interaction, showing the entrance of the consensus loop of GyrB into the active site of Cpe1 (left panel). The magnified view of the active pocket (right panel) implies possible catalysis. **(d)** Cpe1$_{tox}$ targets the ATPase domain of ParE. Cleavage of full-length ParE and the ATPase domain by Cpe1$_{tox}$ was analyzed by

Coomassie-stained SDS-PAGE. Cleaved fragments are indicated with red arrowheads. **(e)** Results

of kinetic assays on interactions between Cpi1^{mut4} and Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A} using biolayer interferometry

(BLI). Data from three replicates have been plotted on an X-Y scatter graph. The Y-axis represents

wavelength shift (nm) generated by binding of the two proteins, which is nearly non-detectable

(N.D.). The X-axis represents reaction time in seconds. A vertical dashed line marks the transition

from the association step to the dissociation step. Kinetic parameters such as K$_d$, K$_{on}$, K$_{off}$, and

Rmax could not be calculated and are labeled as ND.

1060

1061 **Video 1. Time-lapse phase contrast microscopy series of *E. coli* containing an empty vector.**

1062 Related to **Figure 2.**

1063 **Video 2. Time-lapse phase contrast microscopy series of *E. coli* expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$.** Related to

1064 **Figure 2.**

1065

1066 **Video 3. Time-lapse phase contrast microscopy series of *E. coli* expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$^{C362A}.**

1067 Related to **Figure 2.**

1068

1069 **Video 4. Time-lapse phase contrast microscopy series of *E. coli* co-expressing Cpe1$_{tox}$ and**

1070 **Cpi1.** Related to **Figure 2.**

1071

1072 **Supplementary Table 1. Identified interbacterial PLCP effectors and their putative cognate**

1073 **immunity proteins.** Relevant to **Figure 1**, **Supplementary Figure 1**, and **Supplementary Figure**

1074 **2**.

1075

1076 **Supplementary Table 2. X-ray data collection and refinement statistics.** Relevant to **Methods**

1077 and **Figure 2**.

1078

1079 **Supplementary Table 3. The interactome of Cpe1 identified by Bpa-crosslinking and LC-**

1080 **MS/MS analysis.** Relevant to **Figure 3**.

1081

1082 **Supplementary Table 4. Strains, recombinant DNA, and oligonucleotides used in this study**.

1083

1084 ## Author Contributions

1085 P.-Y.S., C.-E.T., C.K., K.-C.H., and S.-Y.T. designed the study. P.-Y.S., C.-E.T., Y.-C.C., Y.-W.H.,

1086 P.-P.C., T.-H.W., P.-Y.C., and C.-Y.H. performed experiments. P.-Y.S., C.-E.T., P.-P.C., K.-C.H.,

1087 and S.-Y.T. analyzed data. P.-Y.S., C.-E.T., Y.-C.C., P.-P.C., P.-Y.C., K.-C.H., and S.-Y.T. wrote the

1088 manuscript.

1089

References
1.   Raaijmakers, J.M., and Mazzola, M. (2012). Diversity and natural functions of antibiotics
produced by beneficial and plant pathogenic bacteria. Annu Rev Phytopathol *50*, 403-424.
10.1146/annurev-phyto-081211-172908.
2.   Riley, M.A., and Wertz, J.E. (2002). Bacteriocins: evolution, ecology, and application. Annu
Rev Microbiol *56*, 117-137. 10.1146/annurev.micro.56.012302.161024.
3.   Aoki, S.K., Pamma, R., Hernday, A.D., Bickham, J.E., Braaten, B.A., and Low, D.A. (2005).
Contact-dependent inhibition of growth in Escherichia coli. Science *309*, 1245-1248.
10.1126/science.1115109.
4.   Cao, Z., Casabona, M.G., Kneuper, H., Chalmers, J.D., and Palmer, T. (2016). The type VII
secretion system of Staphylococcus aureus secretes a nuclease toxin that targets
competitor bacteria. Nat Microbiol *2*, 16183. 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.183.
5.   Hood, R.D., Singh, P., Hsu, F., Guvener, T., Carl, M.A., Trinidad, R.R., Silverman, J.M., Ohlson,
B.B., Hicks, K.G., Plemel, R.L., et al. (2010). A type VI secretion system of Pseudomonas
aeruginosa targets a toxin to bacteria. Cell Host Microbe *7*, 25-37.
10.1016/j.chom.2009.12.007.

6.   Jamet, A., Jousset, A.B., Euphrasie, D., Mukorako, P., Boucharlat, A., Ducousso, A., Charbit,
1107   A., and Nassif, X. (2015). A new family of secreted toxins in pathogenic Neisseria species.
1108   PLoS Pathog *11*, e1004592. 10.1371/journal.ppat.1004592.

1109   7.   Souza, D.P., Oka, G.U., Alvarez-Martinez, C.E., Bisson-Filho, A.W., Dunger, G., Hobeika, L.,
1110   Cavalcante, N.S., Alegria, M.C., Barbosa, L.R., Salinas, R.K., et al. (2015). Bacterial killing
1111   via a type IV secretion system. Nat Commun *6*, 6453. 10.1038/ncomms7453.

1112   8.   Vassallo, C.N., Cao, P., Conklin, A., Finkelstein, H., Hayes, C.S., and Wall, D. (2017).
1113   Infectious polymorphic toxins delivered by outer membrane exchange discriminate kin in
1114   myxobacteria. Elife *6*. 10.7554/eLife.29397.

1115   9.   Whitney, J.C., Peterson, S.B., Kim, J., Pazos, M., Verster, A.J., Radey, M.C., Kulasekara, H.D.,
1116   Ching, M.Q., Bullen, N.P., Bryant, D., et al. (2017). A broadly distributed toxin family
1117   mediates contact-dependent antagonism between gram-positive bacteria. Elife *6*.
1118   10.7554/eLife.26938.

1119   10.   Sana, T.G., Flaugnatti, N., Lugo, K.A., Lam, L.H., Jacobson, A., Baylot, V., Durand, E., Journet,
1120   L., Cascales, E., and Monack, D.M. (2016). Salmonella Typhimurium utilizes a T6SS-
1121   mediated antibacterial weapon to establish in the host gut. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *113*,
1122   E5044-5051. 10.1073/pnas.1608858113.

1123   11.   Speare, L., Cecere, A.G., Guckes, K.R., Smith, S., Wollenberg, M.S., Mandel, M.J., Miyashiro,
1124   T., and Septer, A.N. (2018). Bacterial symbionts use a type VI secretion system to eliminate
1125   competitors in their natural host. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *115*, E8528-E8537.
1126   10.1073/pnas.1808302115.

1127   12.   Verster, A.J., Ross, B.D., Radey, M.C., Bao, Y., Goodman, A.L., Mougous, J.D., and
1128   Borenstein, E. (2017). The Landscape of Type VI Secretion across Human Gut Microbiomes
1129   Reveals Its Role in Community Composition. Cell Host Microbe *22*, 411-419 e414.
1130   10.1016/j.chom.2017.08.010.

1131   13.   Russell, A.B., Hood, R.D., Bui, N.K., LeRoux, M., Vollmer, W., and Mougous, J.D. (2011).
1132   Type VI secretion delivers bacteriolytic effectors to target cells. Nature *475*, 343-347.
1133   10.1038/nature10244.

1134   14.   Russell, A.B., LeRoux, M., Hathazi, K., Agnello, D.M., Ishikawa, T., Wiggins, P.A., Wai, S.N.,
1135   and Mougous, J.D. (2013). Diverse type VI secretion phospholipases are functionally
1136   plastic antibacterial effectors. Nature *496*, 508-512. 10.1038/nature12074.

1137   15.   Fridman, C.M., Keppel, K., Gerlic, M., Bosis, E., and Salomon, D. (2020). A comparative
1138   genomics methodology reveals a widespread family of membrane-disrupting T6SS
1139   effectors. Nat Commun *11*, 1085. 10.1038/s41467-020-14951-4.

1140   16.   Sibinelli-Sousa, S., Hespanhol, J.T., Nicastro, G.G., Matsuyama, B.Y., Mesnage, S., Patel, A.,
1141   de Souza, R.F., Guzzo, C.R., and Bayer-Santos, E. (2020). A Family of T6SS Antibacterial
1142   Effectors Related to l,d-Transpeptidases Targets the Peptidoglycan. Cell Rep *31*, 107813.
1143   10.1016/j.celrep.2020.107813.

1144   17.   Le, N.H., Pinedo, V., Lopez, J., Cava, F., and Feldman, M.F. (2021). Killing of Gram-negative
1145   and Gram-positive bacteria by a bifunctional cell wall-targeting T6SS effector. Proc Natl
1146   Acad Sci U S A *118*. 10.1073/pnas.2106555118.

1147   18.   LaCourse, K.D., Peterson, S.B., Kulasekara, H.D., Radey, M.C., Kim, J., and Mougous, J.D.
1148   (2018). Conditional toxicity and synergy drive diversity among antibacterial effectors. Nat
1149   Microbiol *3*, 440-446. 10.1038/s41564-018-0113-y.

19. Mariano, G., Trunk, K., Williams, D.J., Monlezun, L., Strahl, H., Pitt, S.J., and Coulthurst, S.J.
(2019). A family of Type VI secretion system effector proteins that form ion-selective pores.
Nat Commun *10*, 5484. 10.1038/s41467-019-13439-0.
20. Halvorsen, T.M., Schroeder, K.A., Jones, A.M., Hammarlof, D., Low, D.A., Koskiniemi, S.,
and Hayes, C.S. (2024). Contact-dependent growth inhibition (CDI) systems deploy a large
family of polymorphic ionophoric toxins for inter-bacterial competition. PLoS Genet *20*,
e1011494. 10.1371/journal.pgen.1011494.
21. Ma, L.S., Hachani, A., Lin, J.S., Filloux, A., and Lai, E.M. (2014). Agrobacterium tumefaciens
deploys a superfamily of type VI secretion DNase effectors as weapons for interbacterial
competition in planta. Cell Host Microbe *16*, 94-104. 10.1016/j.chom.2014.06.002.
22. Whitney, J.C., Quentin, D., Sawai, S., LeRoux, M., Harding, B.N., Ledvina, H.E., Tran, B.Q.,
Robinson, H., Goo, Y.A., Goodlett, D.R., et al. (2015). An interbacterial NAD(P)(+)
glycohydrolase toxin requires elongation factor Tu for delivery to target cells. Cell *163*,
607-619. 10.1016/j.cell.2015.09.027.
23. Ahmad, S., Wang, B., Walker, M.D., Tran, H.R., Stogios, P.J., Savchenko, A., Grant, R.A.,
McArthur, A.G., Laub, M.T., and Whitney, J.C. (2019). An interbacterial toxin inhibits target
cell growth by synthesizing (p)ppApp. Nature *575*, 674-678. 10.1038/s41586-019-1735-9.
24. Mok, B.Y., de Moraes, M.H., Zeng, J., Bosch, D.E., Kotrys, A.V., Raguram, A., Hsu, F., Radey,
M.C., Peterson, S.B., Mootha, V.K., et al. (2020). A bacterial cytidine deaminase toxin
enables CRISPR-free mitochondrial base editing. Nature *583*, 631-637. 10.1038/s41586-
020-2477-4.
25. Bullen, N.P., Sychantha, D., Thang, S.S., Culviner, P.H., Rudzite, M., Ahmad, S., Shah, V.S.,
Filloux, A., Prehna, G., and Whitney, J.C. (2022). An ADP-ribosyltransferase toxin kills
bacterial cells by modifying structured non-coding RNAs. Mol Cell *82*, 3484-3498 e3411.
10.1016/j.molcel.2022.08.015.
26. Aoki, S.K., Diner, E.J., de Roodenbeke, C.T., Burgess, B.R., Poole, S.J., Braaten, B.A., Jones,
A.M., Webb, J.S., Hayes, C.S., Cotter, P.A., and Low, D.A. (2010). A widespread family of
polymorphic contact-dependent toxin delivery systems in bacteria. Nature *468*, 439-442.
10.1038/nature09490.
27. Ting, S.Y., Bosch, D.E., Mangiameli, S.M., Radey, M.C., Huang, S., Park, Y.J., Kelly, K.A., Filip,
S.K., Goo, Y.A., Eng, J.K., et al. (2018). Bifunctional Immunity Proteins Protect Bacteria
against FtsZ-Targeting ADP-Ribosylating Toxins. Cell *175*, 1380-1392 e1314.
10.1016/j.cell.2018.09.037.
28. Wang, D., Zhu, L., Zhen, X., Yang, D., Li, C., Chen, Y., Wang, H., Qu, Y., Liu, X., Yin, Y., et al.
(2022). A secreted effector with a dual role as a toxin and as a transcriptional factor. Nat
Commun *13*, 7779. 10.1038/s41467-022-35522-9.
29. Jurenas, D., Rey, M., Byrne, D., Chamot-Rooke, J., Terradot, L., and Cascales, E. (2022).
Salmonella antibacterial Rhs polymorphic toxin inhibits translation through ADP-
ribosylation of EF-Tu P-loop. Nucleic Acids Res *50*, 13114-13127. 10.1093/nar/gkac1162.
30. Dumont, B., Terradot, L., Cascales, E., Van Melderen, L., and Jurenas, D. (2024).
Thioredoxin 1 moonlights as a chaperone for an interbacterial ADP-ribosyltransferase
toxin. Nat Commun *15*, 10388. 10.1038/s41467-024-54892-w.

31.   Alcoforado Diniz, J., Liu, Y.C., and Coulthurst, S.J. (2015). Molecular weaponry: diverse
1193   effectors delivered by the Type VI secretion system. Cell Microbiol *17*, 1742-1751.
1194   10.1111/cmi.12532.

1195   32.   Bosch, D.E., Abbasian, R., Parajuli, B., Peterson, S.B., and Mougous, J.D. (2023). Structural
1196   disruption of Ntox15 nuclease effector domains by immunity proteins protects against
1197   type VI secretion system intoxication in Bacteroidales. mBio *14*, e0103923.
1198   10.1128/mbio.01039-23.

1199   33.   Zhang, D., de Souza, R.F., Anantharaman, V., Iyer, L.M., and Aravind, L. (2012). Polymorphic
1200   toxin systems: Comprehensive characterization of trafficking modes, processing,
1201   mechanisms of action, immunity and ecology using comparative genomics. Biol Direct *7*,
1202   18. 10.1186/1745-6150-7-18.

1203   34.   Nachmias, N., Dotan, N., Rocha, M.C., Fraenkel, R., Detert, K., Kluzek, M., Shalom, M.,
1204   Cheskis, S., Peedikayil-Kurien, S., Meitav, G., et al. (2024). Systematic discovery of
1205   antibacterial and antifungal bacterial toxins. Nat Microbiol *9*, 3041-3058.
1206   10.1038/s41564-024-01820-9.

1207   35.   Geller, A.M., Shalom, M., Zlotkin, D., Blum, N., and Levy, A. (2024). Identification of type
1208   VI secretion system effector-immunity pairs using structural bioinformatics. Mol Syst Biol
1209   *20*, 702-718. 10.1038/s44320-024-00035-8.

1210   36.   Li, D.Y., Liu, Y.L., Liao, X.J., He, T.T., Sun, S.S., Nie, P., and Xie, H.X. (2021). Identification and
1211   Characterization of EvpQ, a Novel T6SS Effector Encoded on a Mobile Genetic Element in
1212   Edwardsiella piscicida. Front Microbiol *12*, 643498. 10.3389/fmicb.2021.643498.

1213   37.   Lu, W., Lu, H., Wang, C., Wang, G., Dong, W., and Tan, C. (2023). Effectors of the Type VI
1214   Secretion System Have the Potential to Be Modified into Antimicrobial Peptides. Microbiol
1215   Spectr *11*, e0030823. 10.1128/spectrum.00308-23.

1216   38.   Wood, T.E., Howard, S.A., Forster, A., Nolan, L.M., Manoli, E., Bullen, N.P., Yau, H.C.L.,
1217   Hachani, A., Hayward, R.D., Whitney, J.C., et al. (2019). The Pseudomonas aeruginosa T6SS
1218   Delivers a Periplasmic Toxin that Disrupts Bacterial Cell Morphology. Cell Rep *29*, 187-201
1219   e187. 10.1016/j.celrep.2019.08.094.

1220   39.   Ashida, H., Sasakawa, C., and Suzuki, T. (2020). A unique bacterial tactic to circumvent the
1221   cell death crosstalk induced by blockade of caspase-8. EMBO J *39*, e104469.
1222   10.15252/embj.2020104469.

1223   40.   Gavin, H.E., Beubier, N.T., and Satchell, K.J. (2017). The Effector Domain Region of the
1224   Vibrio vulnificus MARTX Toxin Confers Biphasic Epithelial Barrier Disruption and Is
1225   Essential for Systemic Spread from the Intestine. PLoS Pathog *13*, e1006119.
1226   10.1371/journal.ppat.1006119.

1227   41.   Kitadokoro, K., Kamitani, S., Miyazawa, M., Hanajima-Ozawa, M., Fukui, A., Miyake, M.,
1228   and Horiguchi, Y. (2007). Crystal structures reveal a thiol protease-like catalytic triad in the
1229   C-terminal region of Pasteurella multocida toxin. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *104*, 5139-5144.
1230   10.1073/pnas.0608197104.

1231   42.   Havarstein, L.S., Diep, D.B., and Nes, I.F. (1995). A family of bacteriocin ABC transporters
1232   carry out proteolytic processing of their substrates concomitant with export. Mol
1233   Microbiol *16*, 229-240. 10.1111/j.1365-2958.1995.tb02295.x.

1234   43.   Kanonenberg, K., Spitz, O., Erenburg, I.N., Beer, T., and Schmitt, L. (2018). Type I secretion
1235   system-it takes three and a substrate. FEMS Microbiol Lett *365*. 10.1093/femsle/fny094.

44. Kieuvongngam, V., Olinares, P.D.B., Palillo, A., Oldham, M.L., Chait, B.T., and Chen, J. (2020).
Structural basis of substrate recognition by a polypeptide processing and secretion
transporter. Elife *9*. 10.7554/eLife.51492.
45. Altschul, S.F., Madden, T.L., Schaffer, A.A., Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Miller, W., and Lipman, D.J.
(1997). Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search
programs. Nucleic Acids Res *25*, 3389-3402. 10.1093/nar/25.17.3389.
46. Jurenas, D., and Journet, L. (2021). Activity, delivery, and diversity of Type VI secretion
effectors. Mol Microbiol *115*, 383-394. 10.1111/mmi.14648.
47. Gunther, P., Quentin, D., Ahmad, S., Sachar, K., Gatsogiannis, C., Whitney, J.C., and Raunser,
S. (2022). Structure of a bacterial Rhs effector exported by the type VI secretion system.
PLoS Pathog *18*, e1010182. 10.1371/journal.ppat.1010182.
48. Klein, T.A., Ahmad, S., and Whitney, J.C. (2020). Contact-Dependent Interbacterial
Antagonism Mediated by Protein Secretion Machines. Trends Microbiol *28*, 387-400.
10.1016/j.tim.2020.01.003.
49. Ishii, S., Yano, T., and Hayashi, H. (2006). Expression and characterization of the peptidase
domain of Streptococcus pneumoniae ComA, a bifunctional ATP-binding cassette
transporter involved in quorum sensing pathway. J Biol Chem *281*, 4726-4731.
10.1074/jbc.M512516200.
50. Bobeica, S.C., Dong, S.H., Huo, L., Mazo, N., McLaughlin, M.I., Jimenez-Oses, G., Nair, S.K.,
and van der Donk, W.A. (2019). Insights into AMS/PCAT transporters from biochemical and
structural characterization of a double Glycine motif protease. Elife *8*.
10.7554/eLife.42305.
51. Ozhelvaci, F., and Steczkiewicz, K. (2023). Identification and classification of papain-like
cysteine proteinases. J Biol Chem *299*, 104801. 10.1016/j.jbc.2023.104801.
52. Ishii, S., Yano, T., Ebihara, A., Okamoto, A., Manzoku, M., and Hayashi, H. (2010). Crystal
structure of the peptidase domain of Streptococcus ComA, a bifunctional ATP-binding
cassette transporter involved in the quorum-sensing pathway. J Biol Chem *285*, 10777-
10785. 10.1074/jbc.M109.093781.
53. Holm, L. (2022). Dali server: structural unification of protein families. Nucleic Acids Res *50*,
W210-W215. 10.1093/nar/gkac387.
54. Ishii, S., Fukui, K., Yokoshima, S., Kumagai, K., Beniyama, Y., Kodama, T., Fukuyama, T.,
Okabe, T., Nagano, T., Kojima, H., and Yano, T. (2017). High-throughput Screening of Small
Molecule Inhibitors of the Streptococcus Quorum-sensing Signal Pathway. Sci Rep *7*, 4029.
10.1038/s41598-017-03567-2.
55. Chin, J.W., Martin, A.B., King, D.S., Wang, L., and Schultz, P.G. (2002). Addition of a
photocrosslinking amino acid to the genetic code of Escherichiacoli. Proc Natl Acad Sci U
S A *99*, 11020-11024. 10.1073/pnas.172226299.
56. Kauer, J.C., Erickson-Viitanen, S., Wolfe, H.R., Jr., and DeGrado, W.F. (1986). p-Benzoyl-L-
phenylalanine, a new photoreactive amino acid. Photolabeling of calmodulin with a
synthetic calmodulin-binding peptide. J Biol Chem *261*, 10695-10700.
57. Karp, P.D., Weaver, D., Paley, S., Fulcher, C., Kubo, A., Kothari, A., Krummenacker, M.,
Subhraveti, P., Weerasinghe, D., Gama-Castro, S., et al. (2014). The EcoCyc Database.
EcoSal Plus *6*. 10.1128/ecosalplus.ESP-0009-2013.

58.   Baba, T., Ara, T., Hasegawa, M., Takai, Y., Okumura, Y., Baba, M., Datsenko, K.A., Tomita,
1280   M., Wanner, B.L., and Mori, H. (2006). Construction of Escherichia coli K-12 in-frame,
1281   single-gene knockout mutants: the Keio collection. Mol Syst Biol *2*, 2006 0008.
1282   10.1038/msb4100050.

1283   59.   Havarstein, L.S., Holo, H., and Nes, I.F. (1994). The leader peptide of colicin V shares
1284   consensus sequences with leader peptides that are common among peptide bacteriocins
1285   produced by gram-positive bacteria. Microbiology (Reading) *140 (Pt 9)*, 2383-2389.
1286   10.1099/13500872-140-9-2383.

1287   60.   Kotake, Y., Ishii, S., Yano, T., Katsuoka, Y., and Hayashi, H. (2008). Substrate recognition
1288   mechanism of the peptidase domain of the quorum-sensing-signal-producing ABC
1289   transporter ComA from Streptococcus. Biochemistry *47*, 2531-2538. 10.1021/bi702253n.

1290   61.   Levine, C., Hiasa, H., and Marians, K.J. (1998). DNA gyrase and topoisomerase IV:
1291   biochemical activities, physiological roles during chromosome replication, and drug
1292   sensitivities. Biochim Biophys Acta *1400*, 29-43. 10.1016/s0167-4781(98)00126-2.

1293   62.   Bush, N.G., Evans-Roberts, K., and Maxwell, A. (2015). DNA Topoisomerases. EcoSal Plus
1294   *6*. 10.1128/ecosalplus.ESP-0010-2014.

1295   63.   Wang, J.C. (2002). Cellular roles of DNA topoisomerases: a molecular perspective. Nat Rev
1296   Mol Cell Biol *3*, 430-440. 10.1038/nrm831.

1297   64.   Drlica, K., and Zhao, X. (1997). DNA gyrase, topoisomerase IV, and the 4-quinolones.
1298   Microbiol Mol Biol Rev *61*, 377-392. 10.1128/mmbr.61.3.377-392.1997.

1299   65.   Azam, M.A., Thathan, J., and Jubie, S. (2015). Dual targeting DNA gyrase B (GyrB) and
1300   topoisomerse IV (ParE) inhibitors: A review. Bioorg Chem *62*, 41-63.
1301   10.1016/j.bioorg.2015.07.004.

1302   66.   Vanden Broeck, A., Lotz, C., Ortiz, J., and Lamour, V. (2019). Cryo-EM structure of the
1303   complete E. coli DNA gyrase nucleoprotein complex. Nat Commun *10*, 4935.
1304   10.1038/s41467-019-12914-y.

1305   67.   Bellon, S., Parsons, J.D., Wei, Y., Hayakawa, K., Swenson, L.L., Charifson, P.S., Lippke, J.A.,
1306   Aldape, R., and Gross, C.H. (2004). Crystal structures of Escherichia coli topoisomerase IV
1307   ParE subunit (24 and 43 kilodaltons): a single residue dictates differences in novobiocin
1308   potency against topoisomerase IV and DNA gyrase. Antimicrob Agents Chemother *48*,
1309   1856-1864. 10.1128/AAC.48.5.1856-1864.2004.

1310   68.   Caron, P.R., and Wang, J.C. (1994). Appendix. II: Alignment of primary sequences of DNA
1311   topoisomerases. Adv Pharmacol *29B*, 271-297. 10.1016/s1054-3589(08)61143-6.

1312   69.   O'Dea, M.H., Tamura, J.K., and Gellert, M. (1996). Mutations in the B subunit of
1313   Escherichia coli DNA gyrase that affect ATP-dependent reactions. J Biol Chem *271*, 9723-
1314   9729. 10.1074/jbc.271.16.9723.

1315   70.   Lamour, V., Hoermann, L., Jeltsch, J.M., Oudet, P., and Moras, D. (2002). An open
1316   conformation of the Thermus thermophilus gyrase B ATP-binding domain. J Biol Chem *277*,
1317   18947-18953. 10.1074/jbc.M111740200.

1318   71.   Clark, D.J., and Leblanc, B. (2009). Analysis of DNA supercoiling induced by DNA-protein
1319   interactions. Methods Mol Biol *543*, 523-535. 10.1007/978-1-60327-015-1_30.

1320   72.   Lockshon, D., and Morris, D.R. (1983). Positively supercoiled plasmid DNA is produced by
1321   treatment of Escherichia coli with DNA gyrase inhibitors. Nucleic Acids Res *11*, 2999-3017.
1322   10.1093/nar/11.10.2999.

73. Mossessova, E., Levine, C., Peng, H., Nurse, P., Bahng, S., and Marians, K.J. (2000).
Mutational analysis of Escherichia coli topoisomerase IV. I. Selection of dominant-negative
parE alleles. J Biol Chem *275*, 4099-4103. 10.1074/jbc.275.6.4099.

74. Kato, J., Nishimura, Y., Imamura, R., Niki, H., Hiraga, S., and Suzuki, H. (1990). New
topoisomerase essential for chromosome segregation in E. coli. Cell *63*, 393-404.
10.1016/0092-8674(90)90172-b.

75. Smith, D.H., and Davis, B.D. (1967). Mode of action of novobiocin in Escherichia coli. J
Bacteriol *93*, 71-79. 10.1128/jb.93.1.71-79.1967.

76. Ouyang, X., Hoeksma, J., Lubbers, R.J.M., Siersma, T.K., Hamoen, L.W., and den Hertog, J.
(2022). Classification of antimicrobial mechanism of action using dynamic bacterial
morphology imaging. Sci Rep *12*, 11162. 10.1038/s41598-022-15405-1.

77. Moore, D.A., Whatley, Z.N., Joshi, C.P., Osawa, M., and Erickson, H.P. (2017). Probing for
Binding Regions of the FtsZ Protein Surface through Site-Directed Insertions: Discovery of
Fully Functional FtsZ-Fluorescent Proteins. J Bacteriol *199*. 10.1128/JB.00553-16.

78. Abramson, J., Adler, J., Dunger, J., Evans, R., Green, T., Pritzel, A., Ronneberger, O.,
Willmore, L., Ballard, A.J., Bambrick, J., et al. (2024). Accurate structure prediction of
biomolecular interactions with AlphaFold 3. Nature *630*, 493-500. 10.1038/s41586-024-
07487-w.

79. Shao, F., Merritt, P.M., Bao, Z., Innes, R.W., and Dixon, J.E. (2002). A Yersinia effector and a
Pseudomonas avirulence protein define a family of cysteine proteases functioning in
bacterial pathogenesis. Cell *109*, 575-588. 10.1016/s0092-8674(02)00766-3.

80. Shao, F., Golstein, C., Ade, J., Stoutemyer, M., Dixon, J.E., and Innes, R.W. (2003). Cleavage
of Arabidopsis PBS1 by a bacterial type III effector. Science *301*, 1230-1233.
10.1126/science.1085671.

81. Kourelis, J., van der Hoorn, R.A.L., and Sueldo, D.J. (2016). Decoy Engineering: The Next
Step in Resistance Breeding. Trends Plant Sci *21*, 371-373. 10.1016/j.tplants.2016.04.001.

82. Noeske-Jungblut, C., Haendler, B., Donner, P., Alagon, A., Possani, L., and Schleuning, W.D.
(1995). Triabin, a highly potent exosite inhibitor of thrombin. J Biol Chem *270*, 28629-
28634. 10.1074/jbc.270.48.28629.

83. Fuentes-Prior, P., Noeske-Jungblut, C., Donner, P., Schleuning, W.D., Huber, R., and Bode,
W. (1997). Structure of the thrombin complex with triabin, a lipocalin-like exosite-binding
inhibitor derived from a triatomine bug. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *94*, 11845-11850.
10.1073/pnas.94.22.11845.

84. Hanna, R.A., Campbell, R.L., and Davies, P.L. (2008). Calcium-bound structure of calpain
and its mechanism of inhibition by calpastatin. Nature *456*, 409-412.
10.1038/nature07451.

85. Moldoveanu, T., Gehring, K., and Green, D.R. (2008). Concerted multi-pronged attack by
calpastatin to occlude the catalytic cleft of heterodimeric calpains. Nature *456*, 404-408.
10.1038/nature07353.

86. Kleanthous, C., and Walker, D. (2001). Immunity proteins: enzyme inhibitors that avoid the
active site. Trends Biochem Sci *26*, 624-631. 10.1016/s0968-0004(01)01941-7.

87. Schiavo, G., and van der Goot, F.G. (2001). The bacterial toxin toolkit. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol
2, 530-537. 10.1038/35080089.

88. Schiavo, G., Benfenati, F., Poulain, B., Rossetto, O., Polverino de Laureto, P., DasGupta, B.R.,
and Montecucco, C. (1992). Tetanus and botulinum-B neurotoxins block neurotransmitter
release by proteolytic cleavage of synaptobrevin. Nature *359*, 832-835.
10.1038/359832a0.
89. Sutormin, D.A., Galivondzhyan, A.K., Polkhovskiy, A.V., Kamalyan, S.O., Severinov, K.V., and
Dubiley, S.A. (2021). Diversity and Functions of Type II Topoisomerases. Acta Naturae *13*,
59-75. 10.32607/actanaturae.11058.
90. Wang, J., Chitsaz, F., Derbyshire, M.K., Gonzales, N.R., Gwadz, M., Lu, S., Marchler, G.H.,
Song, J.S., Thanki, N., Yamashita, R.A., et al. (2023). The conserved domain database in
2023. Nucleic Acids Res *51*, D384-D388. 10.1093/nar/gkac1096.
91. Journet, L., and Cascales, E. (2016). The Type VI Secretion System in Escherichia coli and
Related Species. EcoSal Plus *7*. 10.1128/ecosalplus.ESP-0009-2015.
92. Jones, A.M., Low, D.A., and Hayes, C.S. (2017). Can't you hear me knocking: contact-
dependent competition and cooperation in bacteria. Emerg Top Life Sci *1*, 75-83.
10.1042/ETLS20160019.
93. Thompson, J.D., Higgins, D.G., and Gibson, T.J. (1994). CLUSTAL W: improving the
sensitivity of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting,
position-specific gap penalties and weight matrix choice. Nucleic Acids Res *22*, 4673-4680.
10.1093/nar/22.22.4673.
94. Trifinopoulos, J., Nguyen, L.T., von Haeseler, A., and Minh, B.Q. (2016). W-IQ-TREE: a fast
online phylogenetic tool for maximum likelihood analysis. Nucleic Acids Res *44*, W232-235.
10.1093/nar/gkw256.
95. Edwards, R.A., Keller, L.H., and Schifferli, D.M. (1998). Improved allelic exchange vectors
and their use to analyze 987P fimbria gene expression. Gene *207*, 149-157.
10.1016/s0378-1119(97)00619-7.
96. Gibson, D.G., Young, L., Chuang, R.Y., Venter, J.C., Hutchison, C.A., 3rd, and Smith, H.O.
(2009). Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases. Nat
Methods *6*, 343-345. 10.1038/nmeth.1318.
97. Choi, K.H., Gaynor, J.B., White, K.G., Lopez, C., Bosio, C.M., Karkhoff-Schweizer, R.R., and
Schweizer, H.P. (2005). A Tn7-based broad-range bacterial cloning and expression system.
Nat Methods *2*, 443-448. 10.1038/nmeth765.
98. Gross, C.H., Parsons, J.D., Grossman, T.H., Charifson, P.S., Bellon, S., Jernee, J., Dwyer, M.,
Chambers, S.P., Markland, W., Botfield, M., and Raybuck, S.A. (2003). Active-site residues
of Escherichia coli DNA gyrase required in coupling ATP hydrolysis to DNA supercoiling and
amino acid substitutions leading to novobiocin resistance. Antimicrob Agents Chemother
47, 1037-1046. 10.1128/AAC.47.3.1037-1046.2003.
99. Wan, B., Zhang, Q., Ni, J., Li, S., Wen, D., Li, J., Xiao, H., He, P., Ou, H.Y., Tao, J., et al. (2017).
Type VI secretion system contributes to Enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli virulence by
secreting catalase against host reactive oxygen species (ROS). PLoS Pathog *13*, e1006246.
10.1371/journal.ppat.1006246.
100. Brunet, Y.R., Khodr, A., Logger, L., Aussel, L., Mignot, T., Rimsky, S., and Cascales, E. (2015).
H-NS Silencing of the Salmonella Pathogenicity Island 6-Encoded Type VI Secretion System
Limits Salmonella enterica Serovar Typhimurium Interbacterial Killing. Infect Immun *83*,
2738-2750. 10.1128/IAI.00198-15.

101. Serapio-Palacios, A., Woodward, S.E., Vogt, S.L., Deng, W., Creus-Cuadros, A., Huus, K.E.,
1411     Cirstea, M., Gerrie, M., Barcik, W., Yu, H., and Finlay, B.B. (2022). Type VI secretion systems
1412     of pathogenic and commensal bacteria mediate niche occupancy in the gut. Cell Rep *39*,
1413     110731. 10.1016/j.celrep.2022.110731.

1414 102. Otwinowski, Z., and Minor, W. (1997). Processing of X-ray diffraction data collected in
1415     oscillation mode. Methods Enzymol *276*, 307-326. 10.1016/S0076-6879(97)76066-X.

1416 103. Adams, P.D., Afonine, P.V., Bunkoczi, G., Chen, V.B., Davis, I.W., Echols, N., Headd, J.J., Hung,
1417     L.W., Kapral, G.J., Grosse-Kunstleve, R.W., et al. (2010). PHENIX: a comprehensive Python-
1418     based system for macromolecular structure solution. Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr *66*,
1419     213-221. 10.1107/S0907444909052925.

1420 104. Emsley, P., and Cowtan, K. (2004). Coot: model-building tools for molecular graphics. Acta
1421     Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr *60*, 2126-2132. 10.1107/S0907444904019158.

1422 105. Ryu, Y., and Schultz, P.G. (2006). Efficient incorporation of unnatural amino acids into
1423     proteins in Escherichia coli. Nat Methods *3*, 263-265. 10.1038/nmeth864.

1424 106. Cox, J., and Mann, M. (2008). MaxQuant enables high peptide identification rates,
1425     individualized p.p.b.-range mass accuracies and proteome-wide protein quantification.
1426     Nat Biotechnol *26*, 1367-1372. 10.1038/nbt.1511.

1427 107. Tyanova, S., Mann, M., and Cox, J. (2014). MaxQuant for in-depth analysis of large SILAC
1428     datasets. Methods Mol Biol *1188*, 351-364. 10.1007/978-1-4939-1142-4_24.

1429 108. Shevchenko, A., Tomas, H., Havlis, J., Olsen, J.V., and Mann, M. (2006). In-gel digestion for
1430     mass spectrometric characterization of proteins and proteomes. Nat Protoc *1*, 2856-2860.
1431     10.1038/nprot.2006.468.

1432 109. Liu, Y., Hua, Z.C., and Leng, F. (2018). DNA Supercoiling Measurement in Bacteria. Methods
1433     Mol Biol *1703*, 63-73. 10.1007/978-1-4939-7459-7_4.

1434 110. UniProt, C. (2023). UniProt: the Universal Protein Knowledgebase in 2023. Nucleic Acids
1435     Res *51*, D523-D531. 10.1093/nar/gkac1052.

1436 111. Crooks, G.E., Hon, G., Chandonia, J.M., and Brenner, S.E. (2004). WebLogo: a sequence
1437     logo generator. Genome Res *14*, 1188-1190. 10.1101/gr.849004.

1438

Figure 1

Figure 1. PLCP toxins are found in distinct Gram-negative species and are associated with interbacterial toxin delivery pathways. (a) The enzymatic reaction mechanism of papain-like cysteine proteases (PLCPs). The catalytic triad of residues in PLCPs, composed of cysteine (Cys), histidine (His), and aspartate (Asp), facilitates peptide bond cleavage. Histidine and aspartate form a proton-withdrawing group that activates the cysteine residue, converting it into a nucleophile. The activated cysteine attacks the carbonyl carbon of the peptide bond, leading to hydrolysis and bond cleavage. **(b)** Scaled depiction of representative genomic loci from the indicated species (*Edwardsiella tarda*, *Escherichia coli*, *Myxococcales bacterium*, *Roseofilum reptotaenium*, *Citrobacter rodentium*, *Rhizobium* sp., *Burkholderia* sp.) encoding predicted PLCP domain-containing proteins (sky blue) and putative cognate immunity proteins (yellow). Regions encoding N-terminal domains of T6SS-related proteins (PAAR, VgrG, Rhs) are shaded in gray. CDI-related proteins (CdiA, CdiB) are depicted in light brown. Black bars designate locations of bases encoding the catalytic triads of PLCPs. Cysteine residues targeted for mutagenesis in this study are depicted in red. **(c)** Sequence logo generated from alignments of PLCP domains associated with bacterial contact-dependent antagonism pathways (the locus tag numbers for genes encoding the sequences we used are provided in **Supplementary Table 1**). Sequences from previously characterized PLCPs (ComA$_{pep}$ and LahT$_{pep}$) and recently identified T6SS-associated PLCP toxins (EvpQ and TsaP) are shown below for reference. **(d)** Maximum likelihood phylogeny of PLCP effectors visualized as a radiating phylogenetic tree. Taxonomy is indicated by colored shadows, and delivery pathways are indicated by colored tips. The scale bar represents the average number of substitutions per site. See also **Supplementary Figure 2**.

Figure 2. Cpe1_tox-Cpi1 is a functional effector-immunity pair. (a) Viable *E. coli* cells recovered from plating cultures carrying plasmids expressing the indicated proteins on inducing media. *E. coli* carrying plasmid-borne Cpi1 or an empty vector was included to validate suppression of Cpe1 toxicity. **(b)** Representative micrographs of *E. coli* cells expressing empty vector, Cpe1_tox, Cpe1_tox^C362A, or co-expressing Cpe1_tox and Cpi1. Frames were acquired 2 hours after induction of protein expression. Scale bar, 2 μm. **(c)** Ribbon diagram representation of the X-ray crystal structure of Cpe1_tox (sky blue) in complex with Cpi1 (light gold). Residues of the catalytic triad of Cpe1_tox are indicated. **(d)** Structural alignments of Cpe1_tox with previously characterized PLCPs: ComA_pep (PDB: 3K8U, light gray) and LahT_pep (PDB: 6MPZ, dark gray). **(e)** Bacterial competition experiments were conducted on a solid agar over a 6-hour period between the indicated donor and recipient strains. *E. coli* ATCC-11775 Δ*hns* served as the donor strain, whereas *E. coli* MG1655 was used as the recipient strain. The Δ*hns* mutation in the donor strain was introduced to upregulate T6SS activity, as described in previous studies[99-101]. **(f)** Depiction of Cpe1_tox illustrating the Cpe1_tox-Cpi1 interaction at the exosite formed by hydrophobic residues. **(g)** Magnified view of the interface between Cpe1_tox and Cpi1, highlighting the interacting residues on Cpi1 positioned near the hydrophobic concave surface of Cpe1_tox. **(h)** Viable *E. coli* cells recovered from *E. coli* co-expressing wild-type Cpe1_tox and the indicated Cpi1 variants. **(i)** *In vitro* pull-down assay of Cpe1_tox and Cpi1. Cpe1_tox proteins were pulled down by strep-tagged Cpi1 variants and immobilized on streptavidin resin. Bound proteins were separated by SDS-PAGE followed by Coomassie brilliant blue staining. Data in **(a)**, **(e)**, and **(h)** are represented as means ± SD. Asterisks indicate significant differences (p < 0.05) in viability between populations **(a, h)** or statistically significant differences (p < 0.05) between competitive indices of a given donor strain toward the indicated recipients **(e)**. n.s. means no significance. See also **Supplementary Figure 3**, **Supplementary Table 2**, and **Videos 1-4**.

Figure 3

Figure 3. Cpe1tox targets and cleaves the type II DNA topoisomerases GyrB and ParE. (a) Viable *E. coli* cells recovered from expressing Cpe1tox with substitutions of indicated surface residues from the hydrophobic concave region. The expression levels of wild-type and Cpe1tox variants were assessed by immunoblotting analysis, using the cytosolic protein RpoB as a loading control (right panel). **(b)** Schematic workflow for identifying candidate substrates of Cpe1tox through Bpa crosslinking followed by LC-MS/MS protein identification. Bacteria carrying the construct with a TAG stop codon at residues of interest were grown in medium supplemented with Bpa. After incubation, cells were exposed to long-wavelength UV to activate formation of covalent bonds between Bpa and the interacting residues. Cell lysates were incubated with Ni-NTA resin to enrich for Cpe1tox-Bpa crosslinks for further analysis. **(c)** SDS-PAGE gel analysis of crosslinked protein complexes before and after UV365nm treatment. Cpe1tox^C362A-protein complexes enriched by the Ni-NTA resin were boiled in SDS sample buffer and separated by SDS-PAGE, followed by immunoblotting (α-His). **(d)** Essential proteins identified in the Cpe1tox^C362A interactome and their biological functions. The complete interactome dataset is available in **Supplementary Table 3**. **(e, f, h, i)** *In vitro* Cpe1tox cleavage assays. Purified Cpe1tox (wild-type or catalytic mutant) were incubated with purified candidate substrates, *i.e.,* GyrB **(e)** and ParE **(f)**, or their variants with single-glycine deletion at the predicted cleavage sites **(h, i)**, to assess hydrolysis by Cpe1tox. Fragmented proteins are marked with red arrowheads. Rxn means reaction. **(g)** Double glycine motifs in the consensus regions of *E. coli* GyrB and ParE. Locations of consensus regions between GyrB and ParE containing double glycine motifs are indicated on the cartoon representation of the full-length proteins. The sequences of the consensus regions are shown below, with the positions of the double glycine motifs labeled. The GG motif (red) and the surrounding residues (blue) are highlighted.

Figure 4

Figure 4. Cpe1_tox-mediated intoxication disrupts topoisomerase activity, thereby altering DNA topology and impairing DNA replication and chromosome segregation. (a-b) Ribbon diagrams of *E. coli* GyrB (a, top structure) and ParE (b, top structure) before and after cleavage by Cpe1_tox. Crystal structures of the 43-kDa ATPase domain of *E. coli* GyrB (PDB: 4PRV) and ParE (PDB: 1S16) were used. Residues of the consensus sequence (LHAGGKF) are shown in yellow. Structure related to the small fragments after Cpe1_tox cleavage are indicated as pink ribbons. Predicted structures after cleavage at the double glycine motif demonstrated disruption of the ATPase domain of both GyrB (a, bottom structure) and ParE (b, bottom structure). **(c, d)** Sequence logos evidencing conservation of the consensus sequence (LHAGGKF) of GyrB **(c)** and ParE **(d)** homologs. Cleavage at the double glycine motif is indicated by dashed lines and a scissors illustration. **(e)** Plasmid DNA (pET) was analyzed by high-resolution agarose gel electrophoresis following isolation from *E. coli* that had expressed Cpe1_tox or the catalytic mutant for 0.5 or 1 hour. **(f)** *E. coli* cells that had expressed Cpe1_tox, Cpe1_tox^C362A, or Cpe1_tox co-expressed with Cpi1 for three hours. Cpe1_tox, or the catalytic mutant, was stained with DAPI (DNA; blue) and analyzed by fluorescence microscopy. Phase-contrast (top), blue fluorescence (middle), and merged (bottom) images are presented. Scale bar = 2 μm. Full-size images are available in **Supplementary Figure 7**. **(g)** Working model of how Cpe1 intoxicates bacteria. During interbacterial competition, Cpe1 targets and cleaves the ATPase domains of GyrB and ParE in target cells. The cleavage leads to accumulations of unrelaxed supercoils and precatenanes, disrupts DNA segregation, and ultimately inhibits cell division and growth. In the Cpe1-producing cells or kin cells expressing the immunity protein Cpi1, Cpe1 toxicity is neutralized through direct interaction between Cpe1 and Cpi1.

Figure 5

Figure 5. Cpi1 employs a competitive inhibitory mechanism to neutralize Cpe1. **(a)** The $Cpe1_{tox}$-Cpi1 interface overlaps with the $Cpe1_{tox}$-substrate interaction site. Model predictions of interaction between $Cpe1_{tox}$ and the ATPase domains of GyrB and ParE were constructed using AlphaFold 3. See also **Supplementary Figures 9a, b** for confidence metrics. **(b)** Schematic workflow for the *in vitro* competitive binding assay. Streptavidin resins bound to pre-formed $Cpe1_{tox}^{C362A}$-substrate complexes were prepared and incubated with either wild-type or mutant Cpi1. After incubation, the resins were washed, and the bound proteins were eluted for analysis. Competitive binding events are indicated by disruption of the $Cpe1_{tox}^{C362A}$-substrate interaction, leading to a decreased level of $Cpe1_{tox}^{C362A}$ in the eluted fraction due to its removal during the wash step. **(c, d)** Coomassie-stained SDS-PAGE demonstrating competitive binding events. **(e, f)** Kinetic analysis of interactions between Cpi1 and $Cpe1_{tox}^{C362A}$ **(e)** and $ParE_{ATPase}$ and $Cpe1_{tox}^{C362A}$ **(f)** using biolayer interferometry (BLI). Data from three replicates have been plotted on an X-Y scatter graph. The Y-axis represents the wavelength shift generated by binding of the two proteins, normalized to the calculated Rmax (% Rmax) for each run. The X-axis represents reaction time (in seconds). A vertical dashed line marks the transition from the association step to the dissociation step. The mean kinetic parameters (K_d, K_{on}, and K_{off}) and their standard deviations are indicated.