A network of coiled-coil and actin-like proteins controls the cellular organization of

magnetosome organelles in deep-branching magnetotactic bacteria

Virginia V. Russell[1], Anthony T. Iavarone[2], Ertan Ozyamak[1,3], Carly Grant[1,4] and Arash Komeili[1]

[1] Plant and Microbiology, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California, USA.

[2] QB3/Chemistry Mass Spectrometry Facility, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley,

California, USA.

[3] Current affiliation: Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, California, USA

[4] Current affiliation: Entrepreneurship Program, UCSF Rosenman Institute, San Francisco,

California, USA

Abstract

Magnetotactic Bacteria (MTB) are a diverse group of microorganisms that use magnetosomes,

organelles composed of magnetite or greigite, to navigate along geomagnetic fields. While MTB

span several phyla and exhibit diverse phenotypes, magnetosome formation has been

mechanistically studied in only two species of *Alphaproteobacteria*. Here, we use *Desulfovibrio*

magneticus RS-1 to uncover the mechanisms behind tooth-shaped magnetosome assembly in

deep-branching MTB. Our findings reveal that RS-1 magnetic particles initially form randomly

within the cell before localizing to the positive cell curvature. Genetic and proteomic analyses

indicate that early biomineralization involves membrane-associated proteins found in all MTB,

while later stages depend on coiled-coil (Mad20, 23, 25, and 26) and actin-like (MamK and

Mad28) proteins, most of which are unique to deep-branching MTB. These findings suggest that

while biomineralization originates from a common ancestor, magnetosome chain formation has

diverged evolutionarily among different MTB lineages.

Introduction

Magnetotactic Bacteria (MTB) are a diverse group of microorganisms that navigate

along geomagnetic fields to locate low-oxygen environments in a process termed magneto-

aerotaxis. This ability relies on magnetosomes—specialized organelles containing magnetic

crystals of magnetite (Fe_3O_4) or greigite (Fe_3S_4) 50-70 nm in diameter, enclosed by a lipid

bilayer membrane with unique set of proteins[1,2]. Depending on the species, magnetosomes

form single or multiple chains, that allow for alignment with external fields[3]. These features have

made MTB models for studying bacterial organelle formation, biomineralization, and the global

geochemical cycling of iron[4]. MTB have also been deployed as potential vehicles for a variety of

biotechnological applications[5]. A key bottleneck in the study of MTB has been the limited

number of model organisms that sufficiently represent the mechanistic diversity and evolution of

magnetosome formation.

MTB are a polyphyletic group of microorganisms that belong to *Alphaproteobacteria*,

Gammaproteobacteria, *Candidatus Etaproteobacteria* classes in the *Pseudomonadota* phylum,

and the phyla *Desulfobacterota*, *Nitrospirota, Candidatus Omnitrophota*, and *Elusimicrobiota*

(Figure 1B). Metagenomic studies suggest MTB may also exist in the *Latescibacteria*,

Planctomycetes, *Nitrospinota*, *Fibrobacterota*, *Riflebacteria*, *Hydrpgendentota*, *Myxococcota*,

Bdellovibrionota phyla and possibly more[2,6]. MTB exhibit diverse phenotypes, including

variations in crystal shape, chain organization, and magnetosome composition[3]. Phylogeny

correlates with some of these features; for instance, *Alphaproteobacteria* produce

cubooctahedral and prismatic magnetite crystals, while *Desulfobacterota* and other deep-

branching MTB (*Nitrospirota*, *Omnitrophota*, *Elusimicrobiota*) form irregular tooth-shaped

magnetite crystals thought to represent the ancestral magnetosome form[3](Figure 1C).

Despite the vast diversity of MTB, most mechanistic studies have focused on two

Alphaproteobacterial species, *Magnetospirillum magneticum* AMB-1 and *Magnetospirillum*

gryphiswaldense MSR-1, which contain a conserved magnetosome gene cluster (MGC). The

MGC spans ~100 kilobases and includes 50-100 genes, with 29 necessary and sufficient for

magnetosome formation[7]. Among these, only five core genes (*mamA*, *B*, *I*, *E*, and *Q*) are shared

across all MTB[8,9]. Many genes critical for magnetosome formation in *Alphaproteobacteria* are

absent in other MTB. Other sets of conserved genes, called *mad* (**ma**gnetosome **d**eep

branching) are found in all deep-branching MTB, *man* (**ma**gnetosome **n**itrospirota) genes are

found in *Nitrospirota*, and *mae* (**ma**gnetosome **e**lusimicrobiota) genes are found in

Elusimicrobiota[8]. However, few non-*Alphaproteobacterial* MTB are cultured, and most lack

genetic systems, limiting insights into *mad* gene function and irregular tooth-shaped

magnetosome formation. This is a critical barrier in the study of MTB as tooth-shaped

magnetosomes are common in nature[3], yet their biomineralization mechanisms remain

unknown.

The most promising model for deep-branching MTB is *Desulfovibrio magneticus* RS-1, a

sulfate-reducing obligate anaerobe from the *Desulfobacterota* phylum[10,11]. RS-1 synthesizes a

single chain of irregular tooth-shaped magnetite magnetosomes, organized into subchains of

contiguous crystals separated by gaps along the positive cell curvature (Supplemental Figure

S4E, Figure 2D-*ii*). It is one of the few cultured non-Alphaproteobacterial MTB with a sequenced

genome and the only deep-branching strain with tools for heterologous gene expression and

genome editing[12–14]. Previous studies of RS-1 have highlighted several features distinguishing it

from *Alphaproteobacterial* models. First, RS-1 produces tooth-shaped crystals. Second, unlike

Alphaproteobacteria, mature RS-1 crystals appear to lack a lipid membrane[15], though its MGC

contains transmembrane domain proteins. Genetic studies show mutations in these genes

disrupt magnetite formation, implying the involvement of a magnetosome membrane at some

stage[12]. Finally, RS-1, like all deep-branching MTB, contains a suite of *mad* genes, most of

which do not have known functions.

77   Here, we comprehensively characterize the RS-1 biomineralization process using

proteomics and genetics to define new pathways of magnetosome formation unique to deep-

branching MTB. Using a conditional biomineralization assay combined with genetics and

proteomics, we define specific steps in magnetic particle growth and identify specific factors

associated with the progression of biomineralization and magnetosome chain formation. We find

that early steps of biomineralization utilize proteins enriched in transmembrane domains

including some encoded by *mam* genes common to all MTB. In contrast, localization,

organization and positioning of the magnetosome chain rely on a suite of coiled-coil domain-

containing Mad proteins as well as the actin-like proteins, MamK and Mad28. These findings

indicate a complex evolutionary history where iron biomineralization is ancestral feature of all

MTB while chain formation follows a divergent group-specific path.

Results

Hydrogen inhibition of magnetosome synthesis

92   Our first goal was to develop a robust system to visualize the steps of magnetosome

formation in RS-1. In other MTB, magnetite is not formed under iron-limiting conditions. Addition

of iron then triggers synchronized magnetosome chain development[16]. However, transitioning

from iron-limited to iron-replete conditions in RS-1 leads to the accumulation of ferrosomes[15] —

organelles involved in storage and detoxification of iron[17,18]. The abundance and appearance of

ferrosomes in electron microscopy obscure magnetosomes, making it impossible to visualize

the early stages of magnetite biomineralization. To overcome this limitation, we sought an

alternative method of magnetosome inhibition that avoids iron starvation.

Serendipitously, we discovered that growth in hydrogen instead of nitrogen headspace

significantly reduces RS-1's magnetic response (measured as the coefficient of magnetism

(C_{Mag})[19]) (Figure 2A). A trace magnetic response at high hydrogen concentrations suggested the

need for hydrogen exposure throughout the culture medium. To test this, we flushed both the

headspace and medium with 5% hydrogen and grew cells while spinning. Under these

conditions, cultures showed no magnetic response as indicated by a C_{Mag} of 1 (Figure 2C), and

absence of magnetosomes when viewed by transmission electron microscopy (TEM) (Figure

2D).

One explanation for these observations is that hydrogen inhibits RS-1 growth, indirectly

preventing magnetosome formation. However, growth measurements showed similar final cell

densities in hydrogen and nitrogen (Figure 2B), with hydrogen-grown cells doubling faster (6 vs.

8 hours) (Figure 2B). Another possibility is that hydrogen limits iron uptake, restricting

magnetosome production. To test this, we used the post-iron-starvation accumulation of

ferrosomes as a proxy for iron uptake. Cells were grown in hydrogen and iron-limiting conditions

and subsequently exposed to iron with either a nitrogen or hydrogen headspace. Ferrosomes

were formed in both nitrogen and hydrogen (Figure 2E *iii* and *iv*), but magnetosomes formed

only in nitrogen conditions (Figure 2E-*iv*). This indicates hydrogen does not inhibit iron uptake.

Finally, abundance of magnetosome proteins does not change significantly at a global level

(Extended Results).

Characteristics of early and late stages of biomineralization

We next hypothesized that switching from hydrogen to nitrogen conditions under iron

replete conditions could restore magnetosome formation without ferrosome interference. To test

this, RS-1 was grown with 10% hydrogen to eliminate magnetosomes, then transferred to

nitrogen infused medium. As predicted, magnetic response increased over time (Figure 2F), no

ferrosomes were formed, and only magnetosomes were observed (Figure 2G *i-iii*). This

transition provides a reliable method to synchronize magnetosome formation and study

biomineralization.

To capture early stages of biomineralization, RS-1 was incubated shaking in hydrogen-

infused medium for several passages to eliminate existing magnetosomes (Figure 2D-*i*). Cells

were then transferred to nitrogen-infused medium and harvested once a measurable magnetic

response (C_{Mag} 1.05-1.15) was detected. Early timepoints in biomineralization showed an

average of 3 magnetosomes per cell (Figure 3A, 3C). Many cells contained both mature and

immature crystals (Figure 3A-*ii*). The median crystal length was 38 nm, with a bimodal

distribution indicating both immature and mature crystals present (Figure 3D). Similarly, the

shape factor (width-to-length ratio) followed a bimodal pattern, with peaks around 1 for

immature and 2 for mature crystals (Figure 3E). During the late stages of biomineralization (C_{Mag}

1.3-1.5), cells contained complete magnetosome chains composed of smaller subchains (Figure
3B), averaging 12 crystals per cell (Figure 3C), all localized to the positive cell curvature. The
average crystal length was 51 nm with a shape factor of 1.7, both fitting a normal distribution
due to presence of fewer immature crystals (Figure 3D, 3E). These findings point to a crystal
growth pattern similar to that proposed for other deep-branching MTB[20]. RS-1 crystals nucleate
and grow equidimensionally to approximately 30 nm before elongating anisotropically at one
end to produce a tooth-shaped morphology (Figure 3G). High-magnification TEM images
revealed two mature magnetosome morphologies: curved and straight (Figure 3F *ix* and *x*).
Perhaps, during elongation, crystals develop into either a straight or curved form (Figure 3F-*v*,
3F-*vi*).
While observing biomineralization stages, we discovered that subcellular magnetosome
location correlates with crystal maturation. In early stages, nearly all mature crystals are
positioned at the positive cell curvature, where magnetosome chains typically form, but only
about 25% of immature crystals are located there (Figure 3H, 3I). In contrast,
Alphaproteobacterial MTB such as AMB-1 and MSR-1, localize magnetosome membranes to
the positive curvature before biomineralization begins[2,21].
153
Distinct proteomes differentiate early- and late-stage magnetosomes
We next investigated if specific cohorts of proteins were associated with distinct
biomineralization stages. Cells from early and late stages were harvested and lysed, and
magnetosomes were isolated using a magnetic column. Proteomic analysis of cell lysates and
magnetosome fractions via liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry focused on RS-1 MGC-
encoded proteins enriched at each stage. Early-stage magnetosomes were enriched for Mad10,
MamB, MamA, Mad4, FmpA, FmpB, and MamEO-Cter (Figure 3J), many of which contain
predicted transmembrane domains. Late-stage magnetosomes were enriched for Mad20,
Mad23, Mad28, and MamK, all of which lack transmembrane domains (Supplemental Figure
3A). The actin-like domains in Mad28 and MamK (Supplemental Figure 3A) suggest roles in
chain alignment and organization. These results reveal a shift in membrane association and
chain organization from early to late stages.
166
Early magnetosome proteins regulate biomineralization activity
We next turned to genetics to provide functional evidence for stage-specific action of
magnetosome proteins. Previous studies using chemical and UV mutagenesis identified RS-1
mutants with severe biomineralization defects, including several alleles of *mamB* that lack a

magnetic response and do not produce crystals[12]. This phenotype corroborates our finding that

MamB preferentially associates with early-stage magnetosomes (Figure 3J).

In contrast to *mamB*, mutants in *fmpA* and *fmpB* can still produce some magnetic

particles[12]. Both FmpA and FmpB contain transmembrane domains and serine

protease/denitrogenase Fe-Mo domains and are enriched on magnetosomes at the early stages

of biomineralization (Supplemental Figure 3A and Figure 3J). Detailed TEM analysis revealed

distinct defects for each strain: *fmpA* mutants produce misshaped circular or symmetrical

crystals (Figure 4A, G), while *fmpB* mutants form smaller WT-like crystals, some of which are

misshaped (Figure 4B, H). Consistent with previous findings[12], both mutants exhibit significantly

fewer crystals per cell, smaller crystal sizes, and a reduced shape factors as compared to WT

(Figure 4D, 4E, and 4F).

In addition to the defects in crystal shape and size, *fmpA* and *fmpB* mutants exhibited

abnormal crystal placement with most crystals not localized to the cell's positive curvature

(Figure 4J). The crystals of the *fmpA* mutant also fail to form chains, while only 5% of *fmpB*

mutant cells show chain organization (Figure 4I). These findings suggest FmpA and FmpB are

crucial for early magnetosome synthesis and indicate that biomineralization likely initiates away

from the positive curvature. We propose that crystal nucleation occurs throughout the cell and

crystals are later transported to the positive curvature post-maturation. Without FmpA and

FmpB, crystals could remain "stuck" at nucleation sites, blocking their relocation and preventing

new crystal formation, resulting in fewer crystals in mutant cells (Figure 4D).

Initiation of chain formation by Mad10

Mad10 is more abundant in early-stage magnetosome samples than in late stages and

has the highest abundance ratio among MGC proteins at the magnetosome compared to the

cell lysate under all conditions (Supplemental Figure 8A). Previous studies identified Mad10 as

a magnetite-binding protein[22,23] and hypothesized a role in magnetite nucleation or shape

control. To investigate its function, we deleted *mad10* in RS-1 via allelic exchange. The Δ*mad10*

mutant shows a significantly reduced magnetic response, which is restored by plasmid-based

mad10 expression (Supplemental Figure 1B, 1C). Despite the low Cmag, however, crystal size

and shape remain unchanged and, instead, magnetosomes cluster in a single location within

the cell (Figure 5A, Supplemental Figure 1I). Crystal numbers also vary widely per cell

(Supplemental Figure 1D), likely due to unequal distribution during cell division. These findings

indicate that Mad10 is essential for magnetosome chain organization but not for crystal size or

shape regulation (Figure 5A).

A module of Mad proteins assembles the magnetosome subchain

We next targeted genes encoding proteins more abundant in late stages of biomineralization (Figure 3J) and neighboring genes potentially belonging to the same operon (Figure 1A). All deletions were successfully complemented via plasmid-based expression (Supplemental Figures 1C, 6A-G). Mutants exhibited a range of defects which were quantified based on chain placement, magnetosome distribution, and chain/subchain phenotypes (Supplemental Figure 7F-I).

This analysis identified Mad20, Mad23, Mad25, and Mad26 as a module for magnetosome subchain assembly in RS-1. In the Δ*mad23* mutant, single magnetosomes are dispersed, with the fewest crystals per subchain among mutants and WT (Figure 5C, Supplemental Figure 1E, 6J). The strain also has the lowest C_{Mag} of all chain organization mutants (Supplemental Figure 1B), suggesting Mad23 connects individual magnetosomes to form subchains. In contrast, the Δ*mad20* mutant forms distinct subchains, some linear, and others in the form of rings, clusters, or curved lines (Figure 5B). It has fewer subchains than WT (Supplemental Figure 1F, 6I), but each contains more magnetosomes (Supplemental Figure 1E). This suggests Mad20 regulates crystal influx into subchains; without it, excess crystals cause curling and distortion (Supplemental Figure 6I). Δ*mad25* and Δ*mad26* mutants show similar phenotypes (Figure 5D-E), with subchain and crystal numbers comparable to WT (Supplemental Figure 1F, D). However, most subchains cluster or form rings, especially in Δ*mad26*, where ~80% cluster and 15% form rings (Supplemental Figure 7E). These findings indicate Mad25 and Mad26 are essential for maintaining subchain linearity.

Overall, these mutants reveal an RS-1 magnetosome chain organization distinct from *Alphaproteobacterial* MTB. In AMB-1, for example, TEM shows subchains of magnetic particles, separated by empty magnetosome membranes all of which are organized into a continuous chain[24]. In contrast to AMB-1, some RS-1 mutants exhibit clusters, rings, or curved subchains within the same cell, suggesting subchains are a fundamental structural unit of chain architecture in RS-1.

MamK and Mad28 control subchain separation and chain localization

Mad28 and MamK were selected for genetic analysis due to their higher abundance in late-stage magnetosomes (Figure 3J) and their actin-like domains (Supplemental Figures S3A and S5). *mamK* is present in nearly all MTB and is well-studied in AMB-1 and MSR-1[21,25,26]. In AMB-1, *mamK* deletion disrupts chain cohesion[21], creating gaps that affect equal distribution

during cell division[27]. In MSR-1, *mamK* deletion results in mislocalized chains, mostly away from

the mid-cell[28]. Similarly, in RS-1, we find that MamK plays a role in chain organization. Deletion

of *mamK* eliminated the subchain phenotype (Figure 5G, Supplemental Figure 1F), leading to a

single continuous chain, which sometimes wrapped around itself, resembling multiple chains.

These mutants also had more crystals per cell compared to WT (Figure 5N, Supplemental

Figure 1D).

RS-1, contains another magnetosome gene with an actin-like domain,

mad28[9,29](Supplemental Figure 3A), found in all deep-branching MTB and previously suggested

to have a similar role to MamK [29]. Surprisingly, deleting *mad28* in RS-1 resulted in a phenotype

distinct from that of the Δ*mamK*. In Δ*mad28*, WT-like subchain organization was retained.

However, chains were no longer exclusively localized to the positive cell curvature and were

found pole-to-pole at mid-cell, as well as organized diagonally or transversely across the cell

(Figure 5F, 5J, 5K).

To further distinguish between the Δ*mad28* and Δ*mamK* strains, we examined chain

formation in a biomineralization time-course experiment. In Δ*mad28*, chain assembly followed

the WT pattern, with a single mature crystal forming first, followed by subchain development and

crystal incorporation (Figure 5I-K). However, chains were mispositioned from the start, forming

pole-to-pole or diagonal/transverse orientations instead of localizing to the positive curvature as

in WT (Figure 5J-K). In contrast, Δ*mamK* exhibited a distinct chain formation pattern. Early

biomineralization resembled WT, but as crystals matured, subchains failed to develop, resulting

in a single continuous chain (Figure 5L). Δ*mamK* mutants also had more magnetosomes per

cell and a higher C_{Mag} than WT at both biomineralization stages (Figure 5N, 5M, Supplemental

Figure 1B), a phenotype not observed in other *mamK* mutants[21,28]. These findings suggest that

Mad28 aligns magnetosomes to the positive curvature early in chain formation, while MamK

distributes subchains along the cell length, ensuring proper alignment and potentially regulating

magnetosome production.

Interaction Network of chain organization proteins

Bioinformatic analysis shows that Mad10, 20, 23, 25, and 26 contain coiled-coil domains

which can facilitate a variety of protein-protein interactions[30] (Supplemental Figure 3A). Mad23

also has HEAT repeat domains, known for similar functions. Additionally, MamK and Mad28 can

form homo- and heteropolymers[29]. Thus, we hypothesized that these chain formation proteins

may interact with one another. To explore potential interactions, we conducted Bacterial

Adenylate Cyclase Two-Hybrid (BACTH) assays[31] (Supplemental Figure 2). We created N- and

C-terminal fusions to T25 and T18 domains for each protein and tested all interaction

combinations (Supplemental Figure 9). Interactions were classified based on color intensity:

dark blue spots as strong (+++), medium blue as moderate (++), and light blue as minor (+)

(Supplemental Figure 2B). Our results reveal an extensive and complex network of potential

interactions. All proteins exhibited self-interactions in at least one fusion combination. Mad25

interacted with all tested proteins, while Mad20, 23, 26, and MamK interacted with three or

more. Mad10, interacted with itself, Mad23, and Mad25. Mad28 interacted only with Mad25

(Supplemental Figure 2A-D). These findings provide further evidence for the existence of a

distinct chain organization pathway in deep-branching MTB, dependent on the interactions of

coiled-coil and actin-like proteins.

Discussion

In this study, we used a new workflow to track biomineralization in *Desulfovibrio*

magneticus RS-1, a representative of deep-branching MTB, to describe an organelle assembly

process distinct from *Alphaproteobacterial* species. Our work suggests a new model of

magnetosomes formation with the following steps (Figure 6):

Step 1: Nucleation and Growth. Biomineralization initiates at randomly distributed membrane-

bounded nucleation sites that are likely membrane-enclosed. Mutations in *fmpA* and *fmpB*

impair crystal maturation, reduce crystal numbers, and disrupt localization to the positive

curvature, linking biomineralization to chain formation. **Step 2: Crystal Maturation and**

Localization. As crystals mature, they are transported to the cell's positive curvature. Based on

findings here and in previous work, we suggest that at some stage during biomineralization

magnetite crystals are released from the membrane. Mad10, previously shown to interact with

magnetite[22], may facilitate this transition. Bacterial two-hybrid results suggest an assembly

pathway where Mad10 interacts with Mad23, which subsequently connects to Mad25. **Step 3:**

Subchain Assembly. Initially, one or two mature crystals appear at the positive curvature.

Mad23 links accumulating crystals to form subchains, which may be stabilized by Mad25 and

Mad26. **Step 4: Chain Elongation and Positioning.** In parallel to the previous steps,

subchains are distributed along the cell length by MamK, while Mad28 ensures their localization

to the positive curvature. MamK's role in chain organization is conserved across MTB, as RS-1

MamK can partly complement *mamK* loss in MSR-1[29]. However, RS-1 MamK has unique

functions, as its absence results in the loss of subchains and the formation of longer chains with

more crystals per cell. Interestingly, Mad28 from deep-branching MTB partially complements

MamK loss in MSR-1[29], but our findings suggest Mad28 primarily localizes the chain, while

MamK organizes it.

This model reveals several key differences between RS-1 and other established model

organisms. First, biomineralization in RS-1 occurs one or a few crystals at a time and is a

prerequisite step for chain formation, whereas in Alphaproteobacterial MTB, magnetosome

membranes form chains independently of biomineralization[32]. Second, RS-1 magnetosomes

have a dynamic proteome that changes with biomineralization stages, while, with a few

exceptions, AMB-1 and MSR-1 maintain a largely constant proteome[2,33,34]. Finally, RS-1 and

Alphaproteobacterial MTB use different sets of proteins for chain formation. The domain

architecture of their respective magnetosome proteins provide further evidence for the unique

features of each MTB group. For instance, 67% of AMB-1 magnetosome proteins, but only 38%

RS-1's, are predicted to contain transmembrane domains (Supplemental Figure 4A-B).

However, nearly ~24% (10 proteins) of RS-1 magnetosome proteins contain predicted coiled-

coil domains, in contrast to ~6% (3 proteins) of AMB-1's magnetosome proteins (Supplemental

Figure 4C-D). Additionally, other than MamK, all known magnetosome chain formation factors of

AMB-1 and MSR-1 (MamJ, MamY, LimJ, MamK-like, McaA, and McaB) are absent in RS-1.

Similarly, MTB of the deep-branching *Elusimicrobiota* phylum which do not form organized

magnetosome chains are missing MamK as well as the chain formation Mad proteins.

Therefore, we suggest that these coiled-coil proteins, which may organize into intermediate

filaments similar to other bacterial proteins, along with the actin-like MamK and Mad28,

represent a mode of chain organization unique to deep-branching MTB.

Collectively, our findings shed further light on the evolution and diversification of

magnetosomes. Nearly all MTB share genes involved in membrane formation (*mamQ*), iron

transport (*mamB*), and chain organization (*mamK*), likely forming the foundations of an ancient

iron-accumulating organelle. Diverse magnetosome phenotypes, such as crystal shape

variations, may have emerged through addition of subgroup-specific proteins to this core

system. In our model, RS-1 and other deep-branching MTB evolved to organize biominerals into

chains using Mad proteins, while Alphaproteobacterial MTB developed a system to align

magnetosome membranes into chains using Mam proteins. This evolutionarily distinct solution

may have arisen to combat the previously described conflict between magnetocrystalline

orientation of tooth-shaped magnetosomes and their function as a navigational tool[35,36].

Methods

Multiple-sequence alignments and tree construction

Dataset was designed by searching IMG/M ER[37] for all known MTB species with homologs for all five of the core *mam* genes selected: *mamK*, *mamA*, *mamB*, *mamM* and *mamQ*. Next, the dataset was refined to encompass only species with available genomes and accessible TEM images, enabling the identification of magnetosome gene sets (*mam*, *mms*, *mad*, *man* and *mae*) for each species, along with their respective crystal shapes and compositions. Supplemental table 1 is a list of all species included in designing the phylogenetic tree for this analysis. Once the dataset was complete, the 16S DNA sequences for each species were obtained from NCBI or IMG-M [37] (Supplemental table 1). Sequences were aligned using MAFFT version 7.490 using the scoring matrix 1PAM/ k=2 [38]. Next, the aligned sequences were used to generate the maximum likelihood tree using PhyMLTree version 3.3.20180621 using GTR substitution model with 1000 bootstraps [39]. Additionally, the tree was rooted with *Omnitrophus magneticus* SKK-01.

General Culturing for RS-1

Desulfovibrio magneticus RS-1 strains were grown at 30°C anaerobically in RS-1 growth medium (RGM), as described previously [12,15]. For growth with hydrogen, the medium was gassed with 10% hydrogen balanced with Nitrogen prior to autoclaving the medium. Additionally, after inoculating, the headspace was re-gassed with the same concentration of hydrogen/nitrogen gas mixture for 10 minutes. All hydrogen cultures were grown spinning on a wheel in the 30°C incubator. Cultures with nitrogen in the headspace that were used as controls for these hydrogen cultures were grown on a wheel in the incubator. All other nitrogen cultures were grown without shaking.

For experiments with different concentrations of hydrogen (Figure 2A), RS-1 WT strain was grown at 30°C anaerobically in RS-1 growth medium (RGM), as described above. Initially, all culture tubes were purged with nitrogen gas. Subsequently, prior to inoculation, varying volumes of nitrogen from the headspace were displaced and substituted with an equivalent volume of 100% hydrogen gas, aiming to achieve distinct concentrations of hydrogen in the headspace. Afterwards, RS-1 was inoculated into the culture tubes. Optical density and magnetic response via C_{mag} was monitored throughout growth as previously described [12].

Culturing for proteomics

Cultures for hydrogen vs. nitrogen consisted of 350 mL cultures with 2/3 volume of headspace, which were prepared by gassing either with nitrogen or 10% hydrogen and grown

by shaking at room temperature. At late exponential phase, cultures were harvested by

centrifugation at 8,000 rpm using the Beckman Model J2-21M/E centrifuge. Cell pellets were

stored at -80°C until lysis and preparation for proteomic analysis. To examine different stages of

biomineralization, 300 mL initial cultures were grown with hydrogen in the headspace to remove

all magnetosomes. C_{mag} was measured as described previously[12] and TEM images were taken

of initial cultures to ensure no magnetosomes were present. Then 10 1L bottles of RGM-X

medium were prepared by infusing the medium with nitrogen and gassing the headspace with

nitrogen. Each of the 3 biological replicates consisted of 10 1L bottles, which were inoculated

with the same starting culture. Three bottles were used for late biomineralization, which were

inoculated with 10 mL of starting culture, and seven bottles were used for early

biomineralization samples, which were inoculated with 20 mL of the starting culture. The

cultures were grown in a 30°C incubator and OD and C_{mag} were taken 2X daily. When cultures

reached a C_{mag} of 1.05-1.15 seven of the bottles were harvested for early biomineralization

samples by centrifugation at 8,000 RPM. Subsequently, when the final 3 bottles had a C_{mag}

between 1.30-1.5 they were harvested for late stages of biomineralization samples also by

centrifugation at 8,000 RPM. Cell pellets were stored at -80°C until it was time to prepare

samples for proteomics. Each biological replicate originated from a single colony, which was

inoculated into 200 mL pre-culture bottles grown with hydrogen. Each 200 mL pre-culture was

subsequently used to inoculate a set of ten 1L bottles, resulting in three 10L cultures derived

from three separate colonies.

Collecting proteins associated with magnetosomes using a magnetic column

After harvesting cultures, cell pellets were resuspended in buffer A (25 mM Tris, pH 7.0,

100 mM sucrose, 1 µg/mL Leupeptin, 1 µg/mL Pepstatin A, and 1 mM PMSF. Cells were lysed

three times at 25 kpi using the Single Shot feature of the Multi Cycle (MC) Cell Disruptor from

Constant Systems[40]. Magnetic LS Columns (130-042-401) from Miltenyi Biotec were used to

separate the magnetosomes from the cell lysate. Magnetic columns were primed with a wash

with buffer A, followed by the attachment of magnets to the outside of the columns.

Subsequently, the cell lysate was passed through the column by gravity flow. Flow through

fractions were passed over the column two more times and buffer A was used for three

additional washes. Following wash cycles, the magnets were detached from the column, and

500 µL of buffer A was pipetted into the column. The plunger provided with the column was then

to provide additional force to collect all of the magnetosomes. Some of the cell lysate from each

sample was also saved as a control. Next, a Bradford assay was conducted on all samples to

determine the protein concentration, and if necessary, samples were concentrated during this

stage. Finally, all samples were trypsin-digested as previously described[17] to prepare them for

liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry, as detailed below.

Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry

Trypsin-digested protein samples were each analysed in triplicate using an Acquity M-

class ultra-performance liquid chromatography (UPLC) system that was connected in line with a

Synapt G2-Si mass spectrometer (Waters, Milford, MA) as described elsewhere[17]. Data

acquisition and analysis were performed using MassLynx (version 4.1, Waters) and Progenesis

QI for Proteomics software (version 4.2, Waters Nonlinear Dynamics). Data were searched

against the *Desulfovibrio magneticus* strain RS-1 translated protein database to identify

peptides[41].

Plasmid and cloning and deletion

All plasmids used in this study for generating deletions and for their complementations in

RS-1, as well as for plasmids used in the BACTH assays, are listed in Supplemental table 3. In-

frame deletion vectors targeting *mad10*, *mad20*, *mad23*, *mad25*, *mad26, mad28* and *mamK*

were constructed by amplifying upstream and downstream homology regions of RS-1 genomic

DNA, using the primers listed in Supplementary Table 3. The homology regions were then

inserted into the XbaI site of pAK1127 using the Gibson cloning method. The P*npt* -*strAB*

cassette was subsequently inserted between the upstream and downstream homology regions

of the deletion vector. Plasmids were transformed into E. coli WM3064 and then transferred to

D. magneticus RS-1 using conjugation methods as described previously [13]. Allelic replacement

of *mad10, mad20, mad23, mad25, mad26, mad28* or *mamK* with *strAB* was achieved with

streptomycin selection and using two counterselections, 5-Flurouracil and sucrose. All deletions

were confirmed by PCR followed by full genomic Illumina sequencing using SeqCenter

(https://www.seqcenter.com).

To generate plasmids used to complement deletion strains, the genes *mad10*, *mad20*,

mad23, *mad25*, *mad26, mad28* and *mamK* were individually amplified using primers listed in

Supplemental table 4 and were cloned into pAK906 (containing the *npt* promoter) and pAK907

(containing a *mamA* promoter) using Gibson assembly. Both complementation plasmids for

each gene were tested by transformation into the respective RS-1 deletion strain. Each strain,

containing different versions of the complementation plasmid, was grown in liquid culture and

evaluated by C_{mag} measurements and TEM to determine which provided the best

complementation. The plasmid that most effectively restored the phenotype was selected for

further experiments.

To generate plasmids used in the BACTH studies, *mad10, mad20, mad23, mad25,*

mad26, mad28 and *mamK* were either synthesized by Twist Bioscience

(https://www.twistbioscience.com) or PCR amplified using the primers listed in Supplementary

Table 4 and were cloned into pKT25 or pKNT25 (the N or the C-termini of the T25 fragment)

and pUT18 or pUT18C (the N or the C-termini of the T18 fragment) vectors in frame with the

T25 and T18 fragment open reading frames by Gibson assembly.

Biomineralization time course using hydrogen

RS-1 strains were grown at 30°C anaerobically, as described above. Initial cultures were

all grown with medium infused with 10% hydrogen and headspace was purged again with 10%

hydrogen after inoculation. All hydrogen cultures were grown on a wheel in the incubator.

Additionally, all cultures were transferred for supplementary growth into hydrogen tubes to

ensure the removal of all magnetosomes. Varying volumes (1mL, 0.5 mL, 0.2 mL, and 0.1 mL)

of hydrogen grown cultures were transferred into nitrogen-infused medium, aiming to capture all

stages of biomineralization more effectively. Optical density and magnetic response via C_{mag}

was monitored throughout growth as previously described [12] and at different stages of

biomineralization samples were saved for TEM imaging. The progression of biomineralization

stages was tracked using C_{mag}, with values ranging from 1.05 to 1.10 classified as early stages,

1.15 to 1.20 as middle stages, and 1.3 to 1.6 as late stages.

Bacterial adenylate cyclase two-hybrid (BACTH) assays

The assay was performed as described in the Euromedex BACTH system kit manual. N-

and C-terminal T18 and T25 fusions of Mad10, Mad20, Mad23, Mad25, Mad26, Mad28 and

MamK proteins were constructed using plasmid pKT25, pKNT25, pUT18C, and pUT18 in *E. coli*

K12 strain DH5-alpha. All plasmids were sequence-verified to show T18/T25 magnetosome

protein fusions were correct. The fusions were then co-transformed into competent *E. coli*

DHM1 cells (lacking endogenous adenylate cyclase activity) in all pairwise combinations, plated

on LB agar plates containing 100 µg/mL carbenicillin and 50 µg/mL kanamycin, and incubated

at 30 °C overnight. Several colonies of T18/T25 co-transformants were isolated and grown in LB

liquid medium with 100 µg/mL carbenicillin and 50 µg/mL kanamycin overnight at 30 °C with 220

rpm shaking. Overnight cultures were spotted on indicator plates containing minimal

M63/maltose medium with agar supplemented with 40 µg/mL X-gal, 50 µg/ml carbenicillin; and

25 µg/ml kanamycin. Plates were incubated 4 to 8 days at 30 °C before imaging. Bacteria

expressing interacting hybrid proteins will show blue, while bacteria expressing non-interacting

proteins will remain white. Different concentrations of IPTG (0, 0.1 mM and 0.5 mM) were tested

in the overnight culture as well as on the indicator plates with little to no difference. Therefore,

IPTG was not included in the final cultures and plates of this experiment.

Electron microscopy

Whole-cell TEM imaging was performed as described previously [15]. All TEM was done

using the Tecnai 12 at the EM-Lab at the University of California, Berkeley (https://em-

lab.berkeley.edu/EML/index.php). Magnetosomes were measured manually using ImageJ. Cells

were also counted manually.

Acknowledgement

A.K. and V.V.R. are supported through the National Institute of General Medical Sciences

(R35GM127114). The QB3/Chemistry Mass Spectrometry Facility at the University of California,

Berkeley received support from the National Institutes of Health (grant 1S10OD020062-01).

Additionally, V.V.R. was supported through the Genetics Training Grant, which receives funds

from the National Institutes of Health (Grant #: 1T32GM132022). Thank you to the staff at the

University of California Berkeley Electron Microscope Laboratory for advice and assistance in

electron microscopy.

Figure 1. *Phylogenetic tree of MTB with their magnetosome gene composition and*

magnetosome crystal shape

(A) Magnetosome gene cluster in RS-1. All *mam* genes are in yellow, all *mad* genes are in blue

and *fmp* genes are in purple. Genes outlined in red (*mamK*, *mad10*, *mad20*, *mad23*, *mad25*,

mad26 and *mad28*) were the focus of this study. Outlined in dotted red (*fmpA* and *fmpB*) are

genes mutated in a previous study[12], but examined further in this study. (B) 16S maximum

likelihood tree. MAFFT was used for alignment of 16S genes. Maximum likelihood tree was built

using PhyML Tree[39] with GTR substitution model and 1000 bootstraps. (C) For each MTB

species the classification of the type of magnetosome genes (*mam*, *mms*, *mad*, *man* or *mae*)

are provided as well as the magnetosome mineral composition and shape. White asterisks

indicate the potential presence of *mad* genes, which were previously reported as missing[8] (*see*

Supplemental Figure S3-B). (D) Deep-branching MTB species that contain the *mad* genes

studied here. Red asterisks represent uncertainty due to a lack of a completed genome on

NCBI. *Supplemental table 1* contains all the data (NCBI genome IDs, 16S gene ID and

references) used to generate the phylogenetic tree (B), magnetosome gene information (A, C &

D), and literature with crystal TEM images and chemical composition (C).

Figure 2. *Hydrogen inhibits magnetosome synthesis but not ferrosome production*

(A) Different concentration of hydrogen gas was added to the headspace and the magnetic

response, C_{mag} was measured over growth. (B) Growth curve of WT RS-1 grown with nitrogen

(blue) or hydrogen (orange) in the headspace. Inlet graph shows the doubling time for both

conditions. (C) RS-1 grown spinning on a wheel with either nitrogen (blue) or hydrogen

(orange). C_{mag} values indicate no magnetic response for cultures grown with hydrogen in the

headspace. (D) TEM images of cultures from (C). (E) Initial cultures were either grown with or

without iron to simulate iron starvation. Pre-cultures were transferred into either hydrogen or

nitrogen conditions. (E*i*) TEM image of a cell grown in hydrogen with no iron starvation, (E *ii*)

TEM image of a cell grown in nitrogen with no iron starvation, and (E *iii* and *iv*) are TEM images

after iron starvation for cells grown in hydrogen (*iii*) or nitrogen (*iv*). Blue lines indicate

magnetosomes and yellow triangles point to ferrosomes. (F) Growth curve (blue line) of a

culture transitioning from hydrogen to nitrogen conditions to initiate biomineralization. The C_{Mag}

curve (orange line) of the same culture demonstrates biomineralization initiation and

progression during growth. (F *i-iii*) indicate time points at which samples were collected for TEM

imaging in (G *i-iii*).

Figure 3. *Proteomic analysis of magnetosome proteins at different stages of biomineralization*

(A-B) TEM images of chains representing early and late stages of biomineralization. (C) Violin

plots depicting the number of magnetosomes per cell for cells in early and late stages of

biomineralization. (D) Violin plots illustrating measurements of magnetosome length and (E)

shape factor (length/width) for crystals found in early and late stages of biomineralization, n=212

for early stages and n=214 for late stages. (F) TEM images of RS-1 magnetosomes at different

stages of growth. All scale bars are 25 nm. (G) Each point is the measurement of the length and

width of one crystal from WT (AK80). Yellow dots represent crystals from cells at early stages of

biomineralization. Blue dots represent crystals from cells at late stages of biomineralization. The

dotted line represents the median width of crystals from late stages of biomineralization. Dashed

line shows a slope (m) of 1. (H) TEM images of early stage biomineralization of WT cells. Yellow

triangles point to immature crystals that are included as zoomed-in images in the inset. Blue line

indicates mature magnetosomes. The white scale bars for the zoomed-in crystals are all 25 nm.

(I) The proportion of magnetosomes positioned at the positive curvature of the cell for both

immature (yellow bar) and mature (blue bar) crystals during this stage, 140 cells counted; n=254

immature crystals, and n=394 mature crystals. (J) The log_{10} maximum fold change of

magnetosome protein abundance detected in the crystal fraction at different stages of

biomineralization. Yellow bars represent proteins more abundant at the early stage and blue

bars represent proteins more abundant at the late stage of biomineralization.

Figure 4. *Characterization of fmpA and fmpB mutants*

A-C) (*i*) TEM images of *fmpA* and *fmpB* mutant strains (scale bars 500 nm for main image and

100 nm for inset). (*ii*) Cartoon diagram of each strain. (D) Violin plots depicting the number of

crystals per cell for each strain. (E) Violin plots illustrating measurements of magnetosome

length, and (F) shape factor (length/width) for crystals in each strain. Data for (D), (E), and (F)

are based on n=200 per strain. (G-H) Crystal morphology for each mutant, scale bars are 25

nm. (I) Percentage of cells exhibiting a chain phenotype, defined as having more than one

 crystal aligned in a row, for each strain. (J) Percent of cells with crystals located at the positive

curvature in the cell. (I-J) Over 200 cells were counted.

Figure 5. *Deletions of* mad *genes and mamK result in a variety of chain formation and*

localization defects

(A-H) Phenotypes of different magnetosome gene deletion mutants and WT RS-1 with scale

bars representing 500 nm. (*i*) is a TEM image ofor each strain and (*ii*) shows a cartoon diagram

of representative magnetosome chain morphology. (I-L) TEM images of biomineralization time

course of Δ*mad28*, Δ*mamK* and WT with scale bars representing 500 nm. Yellow triangles point

at individual magnetosomes, whereas blue lines indicate chains or subchains of crystals. (I)

Biomineralization time course of wildtype. (J) shows the phenotype for Δ*mad28* where the chain

localizes to the mid-cell, whereas (K) shows the phenotype for Δ*mad28* where the chain

localizes diagonally or transversally. (L) Biomineralization time course for Δ*mamK*, shows no

subchains forming. (M) Growth curve and C_{mag} curve for WT, Δ*mad28* and Δ*mamK*. (N *i*) Violin

plots depicting the number of magnetosomes per cell for WT, Δ*mad28* and Δ*mamK* at early

stages of biomineralization, over 100 cells counted for each strain. (N *ii*) Violin plots illustrating

the number of magnetosomes per cell for WT, Δ*mad28* and Δ*mamK* at late stages of

biomineralization, over 100 cells counted for each strain.

Figure 6. *Model of Magnetosome synthesis and chain organization in RS-1*

Model of the different stages of biomineralization in *Desulfovibrio magneticus* RS-1. ***Step 1:***

Nucleation and Growth. Biomineralization begins at nucleation sites randomly distributed within

the cell. ***Step 2:*** *Crystal Maturation and Localization.* Maturing crystals are transported to the

cell's positive curvature by a cohort of Mad proteins. ***Step 3:*** *Subchain Assembly.* As crystals

reach the positive curvature, the process shifts to organizing them into subchains. ***Step 4:***

Chain Elongation and Centering. Subchains are extended and aligned along the cell length by

MamK, while Mad28 ensures the chain remains localized at the positive curvature.

References:

1. Amor, M., Mathon, F. P., Monteil, C. L., Busigny, V. & Lefevre, C. T. Iron-biomineralizing organelle in magnetotactic bacteria: function, synthesis and preservation in ancient rock samples. *Environmental Microbiology* **22**, 3611–3632 (2020).

2. Wan, J. *et al.* Biomineralization in magnetotactic bacteria: From diversity to molecular discovery-based applications. *Cell Reports* **43**, 114995 (2024).

3. Lefevre, C. T. & Bazylinski, D. A. Ecology, Diversity, and Evolution of Magnetotactic Bacteria. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* **77**, 497–526 (2013).

4. Amor, M. *et al.* Magnetotactic Bacteria Accumulate a Large Pool of Iron Distinct from Their Magnetite Crystals. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **86**, e01278-20 (2020).

5. Vargas, G. *et al.* Applications of Magnetotactic Bacteria, Magnetosomes and Magnetosome Crystals in Biotechnology and Nanotechnology: Mini-Review. *Molecules* **23**, 2438 (2018).

6. Lin, W. *et al.* Genomic expansion of magnetotactic bacteria reveals an early common origin of magnetotaxis with lineage-specific evolution. *ISME Journal* **12**, 1508–1519 (2018).

7. Kolinko, I. *et al.* Biosynthesis of magnetic nanostructures in a foreign organism by transfer of bacterial magnetosome gene clusters. *Nature Nanotech* **9**, 193–197 (2014).

8. Uzun, M. *et al.* Recovery and genome reconstruction of novel magnetotactic Elusimicrobiota from bog soil. *The ISME Journal* **17**, 204–214 (2023).

9. Liu, P. *et al.* Key gene networks that control magnetosome biomineralization in magnetotactic bacteria. *National Science Review* **10**, nwac238 (2023).

10. Sakaguchi, T., Burgess, J. G. & Matsunaga, T. Magnetite formation by a sulphate-reducing bacterium. *Nature* **365**, 47–49 (1993).

11. Sakaguchi, T., Arakaki, A. & Matsunaga, T. Desulfovibrio magneticus sp. nov., a novel sulfate-reducing bacterium that produces intracellular single-domain-sized magnetite particles. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **52**, 215–221 (2002).

12. Rahn-Lee, L. *et al.* A Genetic Strategy for Probing the Functional Diversity of Magnetosome Formation. *PLoS Genet* **11**, e1004811 (2015).

13. Grant, C. R., Rahn-lee, L. & Legault, K. N. Genome Editing Method for the Anaerobic Magnetotactic. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **84**, 1–12 (2018).

14. Nakazawa, H. *et al.* Whole genome sequence of *Desulfovibrio magneticus* strain RS-1 revealed common gene clusters in magnetotactic bacteria. *Genome Res.* **19**, 1801–1808 (2009).

15. Byrne, M. E. *et al. Desulfovibrio magneticus* RS-1 contains an iron- and phosphorus-rich
organelle distinct from its bullet-shaped magnetosomes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **107**,
12263–12268 (2010).

16. Komeili, A., Vali, H., Beveridge, T. J. & Newman, D. K. Magnetosome vesicles are present
before magnetite formation, and MamA is required for their activation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
U.S.A. **101**, 3839–3844 (2004).

17. Grant, C. R. *et al.* Distinct gene clusters drive formation of ferrosome organelles in bacteria.
Nature **606**, 160–164 (2022).

18. Pi, H. *et al.* Clostridioides difficile ferrosome organelles combat nutritional immunity. *Nature*
623, 1009–1016 (2023).

19. Schüler, D., Uhl, R. & Bäuerlein, E. A simple light scattering method to assay magnetism in
Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense. FEMS Microbiology Letters **132**, 139–145 (1995).

20. Li, J. *et al.* Crystal growth of bullet-shaped magnetite in magnetotactic bacteria of the
Nitrospirae phylum. *J. R. Soc. Interface.* **12**, 20141288 (2015).

21. Komeili, A., Li, Z., Newman, D. K. & Jensen, G. J. Magnetosomes Are Cell Membrane
Invaginations Organized by the Actin-Like Protein MamK. *Science* **311**, 242–245 (2006).

22. Pohl, A. *et al.* Decoding Biomineralization: Interaction of a Mad10-Derived Peptide with
Magnetite Thin Films. *Nano Lett.* **19**, 8207–8215 (2019).

23. Pohl, A. *et al.* Magnetite-binding proteins from the magnetotactic bacterium *Desulfamplus*
magnetovallimortis BW-1. *Nanoscale* **13**, 20396–20400 (2021).

24. Wan, J. *et al.* McaA and McaB control the dynamic positioning of a bacterial magnetic
organelle. *Nat Commun* **13**, 5652 (2022).

25. Abreu, N. *et al.* Interplay between Two Bacterial Actin Homologs, MamK and MamK-Like, Is
Required for the Alignment of Magnetosome Organelles in Magnetospirillum magneticum
AMB-1. *J Bacteriol* **196**, 3111–3121 (2014).

26. Toro-Nahuelpan, M. *et al.* Segregation of prokaryotic magnetosomes organelles is driven by
treadmilling of a dynamic actin-like MamK filament. *BMC Biol* **14**, 88 (2016).

27. Taoka, A. *et al.* Tethered Magnets Are the Key to Magnetotaxis: Direct Observations of
Magnetospirillum magneticum AMB-1 Show that MamK Distributes Magnetosome
Organelles Equally to Daughter Cells. *mBio* **8**, e00679-17 (2017).

28. Katzmann, E., Scheffel, A., Gruska, M., Plitzko, J. M. & Schüler, D. Loss of the actin-like
protein MamK has pleiotropic effects on magnetosome formation and chain assembly in
Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense. Molecular Microbiology **77**, 208–224 (2010).

29. Awal, R. P. *et al.* Experimental analysis of diverse actin-like proteins from various

magnetotactic bacteria by functional expression in *Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense*. *mBio*

14, e01649-23 (2023).

30. Liu, Y., Van Den Ent, F. & Löwe, J. Filament structure and subcellular organization of the

bacterial intermediate filament–like protein crescentin. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **121**,

e2309984121 (2024).

31. Fields, S. & Song, O. A novel genetic system to detect protein–protein interactions. *Nature*

340, 245–246 (1989).

32. Müller, F. D., Schüler, D. & Pfeiffer, D. A Compass To Boost Navigation: Cell Biology of

Bacterial Magnetotaxis. *J Bacteriol* **202**, (2020).

33. Bickley, C. D., Wan, J. & Komeili, A. Intrinsic and extrinsic determinants of conditional

localization of Mms6 to magnetosome organelles in *Magnetospirillum magneticum* AMB-1. *J*

Bacteriol **206**, e00008-24 (2024).

34. Arakaki, A. *et al.* Comparative Subcellular Localization Analysis of Magnetosome Proteins

Reveals a Unique Localization Behavior of Mms6 Protein onto Magnetite Crystals. *J*

Bacteriol **198**, 2794–2802 (2016).

35. Chariaou, M. *et al.* Anisotropy of Bullet-Shaped Magnetite Nanoparticles in the

Magnetotactic Bacteria Desulfovibrio magneticus sp. Strain RS-1. *Biophysical Journal* **108**,

1268–1274 (2015).

36. Kovács, A. *et al.* Influence of crystal shape and orientation on the magnetic microstructure

of bullet-shaped magnetosomes synthesized by magnetotactic bacteria. *Geo-bio interfaces*

1, e1 (2024).

37. Chen, I.-M. A. *et al.* The IMG/M data management and analysis system v.7: content updates

and new features. *Nucleic Acids Research* **51**, D723–D732 (2023).

38. Katoh, K. & Standley, D. M. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:

improvements in performance and usability. *Mol Biol Evol* **30**, 772–780 (2013).

39. Guindon, S. *et al.* New algorithms and methods to estimate maximum-likelihood

phylogenies: assessing the performance of PhyML 3.0. *Syst Biol* **59**, 307–321 (2010).

40. Constant Systems | Multi Cycle Cell Disruptor. *Constant Systems*

https://constantsystems.com/products/multi-cycle-cell-disruptor/.

41. Ehrlich, H., Bailey, E., Wysokowski, M. & Jesionowski, T. Forced Biomineralization: A

Review. *Biomimetics* **6**, 46 (2021).

Extended Results:

Protein abundance during hydrogen-induced inhibition of magnetosome synthesis

We investigated whether hydrogen affects magnetosome protein expression by comparing proteomes of RS-1 cultures grown in hydrogen or nitrogen using liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry. Most magnetosome gene cluster (MGC) proteins showed similar levels, except Mad10, which was over 20 times more abundant in nitrogen (Supplemental Figure S8-B). However, Mad10 is not responsible for magnetosome inhibition under hydrogen conditions, as indicated by its magnetosome formation phenotype. In hydrogen-grown cells, hydrogenases, a response regulator, a signaling protein, and the ferric uptake regulator, Fur, were more abundant, while nitrogen-grown cells had higher levels of dehydrogenases and a carbon storage regulator (Supplemental Figure S8 C-F). These findings suggest potential molecular mechanisms for hydrogen's effect on magnetosome formation, warranting further investigation in the future.

Architecture of Chain organization proteins in RS-1

For each chain organization gene deleted in RS-1, predicted protein structures were modeled to visualize their structural features. Mad20, Mad25, and Mad26 all exhibited similar protein structures, characterized by long coiled-coil filament-like regions (Supplemental Figure S5 C-E), resembling the coiled-coil protein, Crescentin, found in *Caulobacter crescentus*[1]. These coiled-coil domains are predicted to facilitate strong protein-protein interactions, which was supported by bacterial two-hybrid assays, where all three proteins interacted extensively with each other as well as with other chain organization proteins (Supplemental Figure S2). Mad10 and Mad23, in contrast, have much shorter coiled-coil regions (Supplemental Figure S3A), which is also reflected in their 3D structural models (Supplemental Figure S5 A-B). While Mad10 lacks additional predicted domains, previous studies suggest it contains a magnetite-binding region[2]. Mad23, however, possesses a distinctive HEAT repeat domain in addition to its small coiled-coil region (Supplemental Figure S5 B-ii). HEAT domains are typically associated with protein-protein interactions, a hypothesis further supported by bacterial two-hybrid assays, where Mad23 showed strong interactions with Mad10 and Mad25 (Supplemental Figure S2).

Both Mad28 and MamK are predicted to contain actin-like domains and share highly similar predicted protein structures (Supplemental Figure S5 F-G). To further investigate their relationship, we performed both 3D structural and protein sequence alignments. While the sequence alignment revealed low similarity, the 3D structural alignment showed strong

alignment between the two proteins, suggesting that despite sequence divergence, their

structural similarities may indicate conserved functions. However, our genetic studies and

biomineralization time course analyses revealed distinct roles: MamK is essential for sub-chain

formation, while Mad28 is required for proper chain localization along the positive curvature

(Figure 5F-G). Additionally, the original *mad28* sequence from RS-1 in the NCBI database

before 2019 lacked the first 114 nucleotides or 38 amino acids, shown in green in Supplemental

Figure S5 H-J. However, this region is essential for restoring the wild-type phenotype in *mad28*

complementation experiments. Notably, this sequence is unique to Mad28 and does not align

with MamK in the 3D structural comparison (Supplemental Figure S5-H). This specific *mad28*

region is also present in Mad28 homologs from other deep-branching MTB, further supporting

its functional significance. Supplemental Figure S5-I highlights this region in green in MYR-1, a

deep-branching MTB from the *Nitrospirota* phylum.

    Extended data Figures:

Supplemental S1. *Characterization of magnetosome gene deletions in RS-1*

(A) Cartoon diagram of representative phenotype of each strain. (B) C_{Mag} values for each strain,

with cultures grown in triplicate. No plasmids were present in the cells. Error bars indicate

standard deviation. (C) C_{Mag} values for each mutant with an empty plasmid and for each mutant

with a plasmid constitutively expressing the deleted gene. The WT strain carries only an empty

plasmid. The dotted line in (B) and (C) represents the average C_{Mag} of WT. (D) Violin plots

displaying the number of crystals per cell for each strain. (E) Violin plots illustrating the number

of crystals per subchain for each strain. (F) Violin plots representing the number of subchains

per cell for each strain. All statistical tests used on (D), (E), and (F) are stated in *Supplemental*

table 8. (G-I) The percentage of cells exhibiting specific phenotypes, based on a count of 200

cells per strain. (G) The percentage of cells with crystals localized at the positive curvature of

the cell, (H) shows the percentage of cells with magnetosomes displaying a chain phenotype,

and (I) indicates the percentage of cells with all magnetosomes in the cell clustered together.

Supplemental S2. *Interactions of magnetosome chain organization proteins*

A Bacterial Adenylate Cyclase Two-Hybrid (BACTH) assay was conducted to assess

interactions among magnetosome chain organization proteins—Mad10, Mad20, Mad23, Mad25,

Mad26, Mad28, and MamK. Co-transformed E. coli DHM1 expressing T18- and T25-fusion

proteins were spotted onto M63 maltose-mineral salts agar, where blue coloration indicates high

β-galactosidase activity, signifying a positive interaction, while white indicates no interaction.

The positive control (leucine zipper) resulted in dark blue spots, while the negative controls (empty vector combinations) produced white spots, as expected. (A) Photographic images of spots for each interaction combination. (B) A table summarizing all interaction combinations, scored based on results from (A) and categorized by color intensity: dark blue spots indicate strong interaction (+++), medium blue spots represent moderate (++), light blue spots signify minor (+), and white denotes no interaction (-). (C) A table highlighting the most significant interactions. (D) A visual diagram illustrating these interactions: black arrows represent medium interactions, including bidirectional interactions (fusion with T25 and T18 interacting with their corresponding fusion partners), red arrows highlight strong bidirectional interactions, open blue circles indicate observed self-interactions, and filled blue circles denote strong self-interactions.

Supplemental S3. *Protein domains of magnetosome genes in this study and mad gene*

comparisons between deep branching MTB.

(A) Domains of proteins studied here. Protein domains were identified using InterPro [3] and

uploaded on to Geneious [4] to generate domain maps. Mad28 shows an alternative start site that

was not included in the original NCBI annotation and Δ*mad28* could only be complemented

when including the alternative start site. (B) Magnetosome gene cluster comparison between

DUR002 and DUR003 *(Elusimicrobiota)* and RS-1 *(Desulfobacterota* representative*),* and

between DUR002 and DUR003 and MYR-1, LBB01, LBB02, and HCH-1 *(Nitrospirota*

representatives*)*. This analysis is to indicate, while DUR002 and DUR003 are stated to not

contain any mad genes[5] they do have homologues to some *mad* genes. Magnetosome gene

clusters were extracted from genomes available on NCBI manually and Clinker[6] was used to

compare the MGCs. Genes outlined in red are *mad* genes that show some homology in either

DUR002 or DUR003. Genes outlined in blue are *man* genes that show some homology in either

DUR002 or DUR003. The table on the right shows the proportions of identity and similarity for

homology of *mad8*, which was found to have homologs in both DUR002 and DUR003. The

black arrows indicate the *mad8* homology on the comparison map. *mad4*, *mad11* and *mad24*

from RS-1 also had homologs, but only in DUR003. In addition, *mad24* has a homolog to

DUR003 in two *Nitrospirota* representatives, HCH-1 and LBB02.

Supplemental S4. *Magnetosome gene cluster comparison between AMB-1 and RS-1.*

(A) Magnetosome gene clusters in AMB-1 and RS-1. Genes highlighted in red encode for

proteins with predicted transmembrane domains. (B) Table of the proportions of proteins with

predicted transmembrane domains to all proteins encoded by the magnetosome gene clusters

of AMB-1 and RS-1. TMHMM[7] was used to gather transmembrane domain predictions. (C)

Magnetosome gene cluster of AMB-1 and RS-1 with genes encoding proteins with predicted

coiled-coil domains highlighted in purple. (D) Table of the proportions of proteins with coiled-coil

domains compared to all proteins in the MGC for AMB-1 and RS-1. DeepCoil[8] was used to

obtain coiled-coil predictions.

Supplemental S5. *Predicted 3D Structures of magnetosome proteins deleted in RS-1 and*

alignments of MamK and Mad28

(A-I) Predicted protein structures of Mad proteins and MamK in this study were made with

Alphafold3[9] and visualized with ChimeraX[10]. 3D structures are colored according to Alphafold

confidence values, with blue at 100% confident and red 0% confidence. (B-*ii*) Indicates the

location of the HEAT domain (colored in red) in Mad23. (H) 3D alignment of protein structures of

Mad28 and MamK from RS-1. Protein structures were made with alphafold3 and then a 3D

alignment was preformed using ChimeraX[10]. Purple is the 3D predicted structure for MamK,

yellow is the predicted structure for Mad28 and green is the part of the structure that includes

the alternative start site for Mad28. Δ*mad28* would only complement with this sequence

included in the plasmid. (I) Predicted 3D structure of Mad28 from MYR-1, a deep-branching

MTB in the *Nitrospirota* phylum. The first 38 amino acids are highlighted in green to indicate

structural similarity to the corresponding region in RS-1's Mad28. (J) 2D protein sequence

alignment of MamK and Mad28 using MAFFT v7.490 plug-in on Geneious[4]. Blue highlighted

residues show similarities between sequences and dashes represent gaps. Green letters show

the sequence for the alternative start in Mad28.

Supplemental S6. *TEM images of complementation of deletion mutants*

(A-G) TEM images of deletion mutants and their respective complementation strains in RS-1. All

complementations were done by expressing the gene on a plasmid. (H) TEM images of WT and

a WT control with an empty plasmid. (I) Additional TEM images of Δ*mad20* in RS-1. These

images are to illustrate fewer subchains in each cell and more crystals per subchain in each cell

to complement the statistical data from Supplemental Figure S1. Perhaps rings form in this

mutant because subchains are too long, similar to the $\Delta mamK$ phenotype. (J) Additional TEM

images of $\Delta mad23$ in RS-1. These images are to illustrate the higher number of subchains in

each cell and fewer crystals per subchain in each cell to complement the statistical data from

Supplemental Figure S1. Subchains are more scattered in $\Delta mad23$.

Supplemental S7. *Additional mutant phenotypes and magnetosome chain and subchain*

categories

(A) Illustrations of the phenotypes of the different mutants in this study. (B-E) Additional

phenotype categories for all mutants. (F-I) Categories used to calculate mutant phenotypes in

Figure 4, Supplemental Figure S1, as well as (B-E) in this figure.

Supplemental S8. *Additional proteomics data.*

(A) Additional proteomic analysis of magnetosome proteins comparing protein abundance in the

cell lysate versus the magnetosome fraction. The abundance of magnetosome proteins is

represented as greater than 1 when they are more prevalent in the magnetosome fraction and

as less than 1 when they are more abundant in the cell lysate. (B) The maximum fold change of

magnetosome proteins detected in cell lysates under both nitrogen and hydrogen conditions.

Blue bars represent proteins more abundant in nitrogen condition and orange bars represent

proteins more abundant in hydrogen condition. (C) and (D) Additional proteomic data comparing

protein abundance in nitrogen versus hydrogen conditions, highlighting non-magnetosome

proteins with significant maximum fold changes. (E) and (F) display the gene names and locus

IDs corresponding to all bars in (C) and (D), respectively.

Supplemental S9. *BACTH images of plates for all interactions.*

862 Image of all plates used to construct the table of all of the interactions in Supplemental Figure

863 S2. The illustration on the bottom right shows the layout for each plate which included for

864 controls:

866 **Extended data Table:**

Phyla	Organiam	16S gene ID	Genome ID	Shape reference	MGC reference
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum magneticum* AMB-1	D17514.1	NCBI:txid342108	[11]	[12]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum magnetotacticum* MS-1	IMG: 2647169949	NCBI:txid272627	[13]	[14]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum caucaseum* SO-1	JX502622.2	NCBI:txid1244869	[15]	[15–17]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum* ME-1	IMG: 2676550241	NCBI:txid1639348	[18]	[16,17,19]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum* XM-1	KP966105.1	NCBI:txid1663591	[20]	[16,21]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum marisnigri* SP-1	KC252630.3	NCBI:txid1285242	[15]	[17,22]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum kuznetsovii* LBB-42	NR_180134.1	NCBI:txid2053833	[23]	[16,23]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense* MSR-1	NR_121771.1	NCBI:txid431944	[24,25]	[26]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum moscoviense* BB-1	KF712468.2	NCBI:txid1437059	[15]	[17,22]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum* sp. LM-5	IMG: 2894467686	NCBI:txid2681466	[27]	[17]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum* sp. SS-4	IMG: 2894461381	NCBI:txid2681465	[27]	[17]
Alpha	*Magnetospirillum* sp. UT-4	IMG: 2894472958	NCBI:txid2681467	[27]	[17]

Alpha	*Rhodospirillaceae* LM-1	JF490044.1	NCBI:txid1008128	[27]	[17]
Alpha	*Magnetospira* QH-2	EU675666.1	NCBI:txid1288970	[28]	[29]
Alpha	*Ca. Terasakiella magnetica* PR1	IMG: 2752957094	NCBI:txid1867952	[30]	[30]
Alpha	*Magnetovibrio blakemorei* MV-1	L06455.1	NCBI:txid28181	[31]	[32]
Gamma	Strain BW-2	HQ595728.1	NCBI:txid947515	[33]	[34]
Gamma	SHHR-1	KX344069.1	NCBI:txid1899433	[35]	[16]
Gamma	Strain SS-5	HQ595729.1	NCBI:txid947516	[33]	[36]
Eta	*Ca. Magnetococcus massalia* MO-1	EF643520.2	NCBI:txid451514	[37]	[38]
Eta	*Magnetococcus* MC-1	IMG: 640720050	NCBI:txid156889	[39]	[40]
Eta	*Magnetofaba australis* IT-1	JX534168.1	NCBI:txid1434232	[41]	[41]
Eta	*Ca. Magnetaquicoccus inordinatus* UR-1	IMG: 2881921666	NCBI:txid2496818	[42]	[42]
Desulfobacterota	*Ca. Magnetoglobus multicellularis*	IMG: 2559591426	NCBI:txid890399	[43,44]	[45]
Desulfobacterota	*Ca. Magnetananas rongchenensis* RPA	KF925363.1	NCBI:txid1463558	[46]	[46]
Desulfobacterota	*Ca. Magnetomorum* HK-1	IMG: 2648890082	NCBI:txid1509431	[47]	[48]
Desulfobacterota	*Desulfamplus magnetovallimortis* BW-1	JN252194.1	NCBI:txid1073250	[49]	[50]
Desulfobacterota	*Desulfovibrio magneticus* RS-1	NR_074958.1	NCBI:txid573370	[51,52]	[53]

Desulfo-bacterota	*Desulfovibrio* FSS-1	LC311577.1	NCBI:txid27 30080	54	54
Desulfo-bacterota	*Delta Proteobacterium* FH-1	JF330268	NCBI:txid99 9117	50	50
Desulfo-bacterota	*Desulfonatronum* ML-1	HQ595725.1	NCBI:txid94 7513	55	50
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Magnetoovum chiemensis* WYHC-5	OL423397.1	NCBI:txid16 09970	56	56
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Magnetobacterium casensis* MYR-1	MT703955.1	NCBI:txid14 55061	57	58
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Magnetobacterium bavaricum* TM-1	X71838.1	NCBI:txid29 290	59	60
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Nitrospirae* YQR-1	ON340538.1		16	16
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Magnetomonas plexicatena* LBB-01	MK632185.1	CP049016.1	61	61
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Magnetominusculus linsii* LBB-02	MK632186.1		61	61
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Nitrospirae* MYC-10	ON342894.1		16	16
Nitro-spirota	*Ca. Magnetocorallium paracelense* XS-1	OQ281288.1	NCBI:txid30 21403	62	62
Elusi-microbiota	*Ca. Liberimonas magnetica* DUR002	KY516811	GCA_02052 3885.1	5	5
Elusi-microbiota	*Ca. Obscuribacterium magneticum* DUR003	JQ369221	GCA_02052 3905.1	5	5
OP3	*Ca. Omnitrophus magneticus* SKK-01	JN412733.1	NCBI:txid17 4292	63	60

868 **Supplemental Table 1.** *Table of species and reference used for phylogenetic tree construction*

 Supplemental Tables

Strain	Description	Reference
AK80	WT	[64]
AK268	WT, Δ*upp*	[65]
AK350	Δ*mad23*, Δ*upp*	This study
AK377	Δ*mad20*, Δ*upp*	This study
AK378	Δ*mad25*, Δ*upp*	This study
AK380	Δ*mad10*, Δ*upp*	This study
AK382	Δ*mad28*, Δ*upp*	This study
AK383	Δ*mad26*, Δ*upp*	This study
AK220	Δ*mamK*	This study

873 **Supplemental Table 2.** *Table of all strains used in this study*

Plasmid	Description	Backbone	Reference
PAK906	Complementation backbone with pNTP		[64]
PAK907	Complementation backbone with pmamA		[64]
pAK914	Deletion backbone with SacB only		[64]
pAK1127	Deletion backbone with Upp and SacB		[65]
pAK1452	mad10 deletion plasmid with Strep	pAK1127	This study
pAK1384	mad20 deletion plasmid with StrAB	pAK1127	This study
pAK1268	mad23 deletion with strAB for selection and upp counterselection (pCG116)	pAK1127	This study
pAK1386	mad25 deletion plasmid with StrAB	pAK1127	This study
pAK1387	mad26 deletion plasmid with StrAB	pAK1127	This study
pAK1388	mad28 deletion plasmid with StrAB	pAK1127	This study
pAK966	mamK deletion plasmid with strAB in pAK914	pAK914	This study
pAK1481	pAK906–mad10 Complementation	pAK906	This study
pAK1454	pAK906–mad20 complementation	pAK906	This study
pAK1507	pAK906–mad23 complementation	pAK906	This study
pAK1480	pAK907–mad25 Complementation	pAK907	This study
pAK1488	pAK907–mad26 Complementation	pAK907	This study

pAK1518	pAK907– mad28 Complementation (with alt Start)	pAK907	This study
pAK1489	pAK906–mamK Complementation	pAK906	This study
pAK318	pKT25		EUROMEDEX
pAK319	pKNT25		EUROMEDEX
pAK320	pUT18		EUROMEDEX
pAK321	pUT18C		EUROMEDEX
pAK322	pKT25-zip		EUROMEDEX
pAK323	pUT18C-zip		EUROMEDEX
pAK1525	KT25-mad10	pAK318	This study
pAK1526	mad10-KNT25	pAK319	This study
pAK1527	mad10-UT18	pAK320	This study
pAK1528	UT18C-mad10	pAK321	This study
pAK1529	KT25-mad20	pAK318	This study
pAK1530	mad20-KNT25	pAK319	This study
pAK1531	mad20-UT18	pAK320	This study
pAK1532	UT18C-mad20	pAK321	This study
pAK1541	KT25-mad23	pAK318	This study
pAK1542	mad23-KNT25	pAK319	This study
pAK1543	mad23-UT18	pAK320	This study
pAK1544	UT18C-mad23	pAK321	This study
pAK1549	KT25-mad25	pAK318	This study
pAK1550	mad25-KNT25	pAK319	This study
pAK1551	mad25-UT18	pAK320	This study
pAK1552	UT18C-mad25	pAK321	This study
pAK1553	KT25-mad26	pAK318	This study
pAK1554	mad26-KNT25	pAK319	This study
pAK1555	mad26-UT18	pAK320	This study
pAK1556	UT18C-mad26	pAK321	This study
pAK1557	KT25-mad28	pAK318	This study
pAK1558	mad28-KNT25	pAK319	This study
pAK1559	mad28-UT18	pAK320	This study
pAK1560	UT18C-mad28	pAK321	This study

pAK1561	KT25-mamK		pAK318	This study
pAK1562	mamK-KNT25		pAK319	This study
pAK1563	mamK-UT18		pAK320	This study
pAK1564	UT18C-mamK		pAK321	This study

875 **Supplemental Table 3.** *Table of all plasmids used in this study*

876 All of the plasmids used for this study and the previously published backbones used to generate

877 the plasmids used for this research.

Primer	Sequence	Description
VR123-F	AAACGCAAAAGAAAATGCCGATATCCTATTG GCCTCTAGAGGAATTCCAGGATTCCCTCA	mad20 deletion upstream
VR124-R	GGATCCCCCATCCACTAAATTTAAATAGGATC CTCTGTCCTTAATCTTGGCC	mad20 deletion upstream
VR125-F	GGATCCTATTTAAATTTAGTGGATGGGGGAT CCAGGATCGCCAACAATGCCTG	mad20 deletion downstream
VR126-R	TGGCGGTCATGGTCTTTTCGGCGAGCTTCTC TAGAAGCTCCGCTTCAAGAACCAC	mad20 deletion downstream
VR127-F	AAACGCAAAAGAAAATGCCGATATCCTATTG GCCTCTAGACAAGTGGAGTTAGGGTGATT	mad25 deletion upstream
VR128-R	CATATGCCCATCCACTAAATTTAAATACATAT GGTCAGCTTTAAAAAGGGCCA	mad25 deletion upstream
VR129-F	CATATGTATTTAAATTTAGTGGATGGGCATAT GTGTTCGGCCATTGCCGTTAT	mad25 deletion downstream
VR130-R	TGGTGGCGGTCATGGTCTTTTCGGCGAGCTT CTCTAGACCTCGTCTCTCTAACACAAA	mad25 deletion downstream
VR131-F	AAACGCAAAAGAAAATGCCGATATCCTATTG GCCTCTAGACATCAAAAGCATGGAAGGGC	mad26 deletion upstream
VR132-R	GGATCCCCCATCCACTAAATTTAAATAGGATC CTTCGCGCTGCATTCCGTCCA	mad26 deletion upstream
VR133-F	GGATCCTATTTAAATTTAGTGGATGGGGGAT CCACTATTGCCTTGAATAAATG	mad26 deletion downstream
VR134-R	TGGTGGCGGTCATGGTCTTTTCGGCGAGCTT CTCTAGAGCATCCAAGCGTTCTTTTTG	mad26 deletion downstream

VR135-F	AAACGCAAAAGAAAATGCCGATATCCTATTG GCCTCTAGAAACGGTTTACAGCGGATACA	mad28 deletion upstream
VR136-R	GGATCCCCCATCCACTAAATTTAAATAGGATC CGCATCCAAGCGTTCTTTTTG	mad28 deletion upstream
VR137-F	GGATCCTATTTAAATTTAGTGGATGGGGGAT CCGGCCCTGACCGAGGCGGATT	mad28 deletion downstream
VR138-R	TGGCGGTCATGGTCTTTTCGGCGAGCTTCTC TAGACAAAATGGAGATTGGAGGAA	mad28 deletion downstream
VR147-F	AGGCGGGCATGGCCAAGATTAAGGACAGAG GATCCCTGCTAAAGGAAGCGGAACACG	Add StrAB-mad20-F
VR148-R	ATTCGCTATCAGGCATTGTTGGCGATCCTGG ATCCCTAGTATGACGTCTGTCGCACCT	Add StrAB-mad20-R
VR149-F	AGGGGCCATGGCCCTTTTTAAAGCTGACCAT ATGCTGCTAAAGGAAGCGGAACACG	Add StrAB-mad25-F
VR150-R	GAAAAAGCATAACGGCAATGGCCGAACACAT ATGCTAGTATGACGTCTGTCGCACCT	Add StrAB-mad25-R
VR151-F	GGGCAAACACTCCCGGTCGATTCCGGACAG GATCCCTGCTAAAGGAAGCGGAACACG	Add StrAB-mad26-F
VR152-R	ATCACAGTTCATTTATTCAAGGCAATAGTGGA TCCCTAGTATGACGTCTGTCGCACCT	Add StrAB-mad26-R
VR153-F	ATATTCGAGCAAAAGAACGCTTGGATGCGG ATCCCTGCTAAAGGAAGCGGAACACG	Add StrAB-mad28-F
VR154-R	GGTATGGCTAATCCGCCTCGGTCAGGGCCG GATCCCTAGTATGACGTCTGTCGCACCT	Add StrAB-mad28-R
VR319-F	GTCATGGTCTTTTCGGCGAGCTTCTCTAGAA TCTCCAAAAAGTTGCTGGGC	mad10 deletion upstream
VR320-R	CCCATCCACTAAATTTAAATAGGATCCTCTTC CATGGCGTCCTCCG	mad10 deletion upstream
VR321-F	TATTTAAATTTAGTGGATGGGGGATCCCCAG TGCGCAGCCGGCCTGA	mad10 deletion downstream
VR322-R	GAAAATGCCGATATCCTATTGGCCTCTAGAT CGCGGCCTGGGCC	mad10 deletion downstream

VR323-F	CGACAATGCGCGGAGGACGCCATGGAAGAGCTGCTAAAGGAAGCGGAACAC	Add StrAB-mad10-F
VR324-R	GAGATGATCTCAGGCCGGCTGCGCACTGGGCTAGTATGACGTCTGTCGCACC	Add StrAB-mad10-R
VR277-F	AGACAGGATGAGGATCGTTTCGCGTCGACTGATCATCTCCCGGCGGG	mad20 complementation in pAK906
VR278-R	GGGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTGCGCCGCTCCTGGATTC	mad20 complementation in pAK906
CG220-R	GAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTCTAGAACTTGCTTTTCCGCCGTCATAC	mad23 complementation in pAK906
CG221-F	CAAGAGACAGGATGAGGATCGTTTCGCGATGGAAGACGCCATGAGCTC	mad23 complementation in pAK906
VR335-F	AAGCCAAGAAAAACGTCGCCAACGTCGACTATGGCCCTTTTTAAAGCTGACG	mad25 complementation in pAK907
VR336-R	GGGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTCTACCCGTCTGCGACGTC	mad25 complementation in pAK907
VR337-F	AGACAGGATGAGGATCGTTTCGCGTCGACTATGGAAGAAAATACCCGCTACA	mad10 complementation in pAK906
VR338R	GGGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTTCAGGCCGGCTGCG	mad10 complementation in pAK906
VR355-F	AAGCCAAGAAAAACGTCGCCAACGTCGACTATGGACGGAATGCAGCGC	mad26 complementation in pAK907

VR356-R	GGGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTTCATTTATTCAAGGCAATAGTCAGT	mad26 complementation in pAK907
VR357-F	AGACAGGATGAGGATCGTTTCGCGTCGACTATGTCCGGAAGCAACGTGC	mamK complementation in pAK906
VR358-R	GGGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTTTAATCCTTTCGCAGCTCGTC	mamK complementation in pAK906
VR375-F	AAGCCAAGAAAAACGTCGCCAACGTCGACTACAGCTCTGGCGCTCTTG	mad28 complementation in pAK907 (with pmad28 & alt-start)
VR372-R	GGGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTCTAATCCGCCTCGGTCAGG	mad28 complementation in pAK907 (with pmad28 & alt-start)
VR390-F	CGGGCTGCAGGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCATGGAAGAAAATACCCGCTACA	KT25_mad10
VR391-R	TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCGAATTCTCAGGCCGGCTGCG	KT25_mad10
VR392-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGATGGAAGAAAATACCCGCTACA	KNT25_mad10-noStop
VR393-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGCGGCCGGCTGCGCA	KNT25_mad10-noStop
VR394-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGATGGAAGAAAATACCCGCTACA	UT18_mad10-NoStop
VR395-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGCGGCCGGCTGCGCA	UT18_mad10-NoStop
VR396-F	CGCCACTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCATGGAAGAAAATACCCGCTACA	UT18C_mad10
VR397-R	TAGTTATATCGATGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACTCAGGCCGGCTGCG	UT18C_mad10
VR398-F	CGGGCTGCAGGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCATGGCCAAGATTAAGGACAGACT	KT25_mad20

VR399-R	TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCGAATTCT CAGGCATTGTTGGCGATCC	KT25_mad20
VR400-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGCCAAGATTAAGGACAGACT	KNT25_mad20-noStop
VR401-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC GGCATTGTTGGCGATCCTCT	KNT25_mad20-noStop
VR402-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGCCAAGATTAAGGACAGACT	UT18_mad20-NoStop
VR403-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC GGCATTGTTGGCGATCCTCT	UT18_mad20-NoStop
VR404-F	CGCCACTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCA TGGCCAAGATTAAGGACAGACT	UT18C_mad20
VR405-R	TAGTTATATCGATGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACTC AGGCATTGTTGGCGATCC	UT18C_mad20
VR422-F	CGGGCTGCAGGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCC ATGGAAGACGCCATGAGCTC	KT25_mad23
VR423-R	TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCGAATTCC TAACTCCACTTGTAGCGCA	KT25_mad23
VR424-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGAAGACGCCATGAGCTC	KNT25_mad23-noStop
VR425-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC ACTCCACTTGTAGCGCATGC	KNT25_mad23-noStop
VR426-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGAAGACGCCATGAGCTC	UT18_mad23-NoStop
VR427-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC ACTCCACTTGTAGCGCATGC	UT18_mad23-NoStop
VR428-F	CGCCACTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCA TGGAAGACGCCATGAGCTC	UT18C_mad23
VR429-R	TAGTTATATCGATGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCT AACTCCACTTGTAGCGCA	UT18C_mad23
VR438-F	CGGGCTGCAGGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCC ATGGCCCTTTTTAAAGCTGACG	KT25_mad25

VR439-R	TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCGAATTCC TACCCGTCTGCGACGTC	KT25_mad25
VR440-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGCCCTTTTTAAAGCTGACG	KNT25_mad25-noStop
VR441-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC CCCGTCTGCGACGTCG	KNT25_mad25-noStop
VR442-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGCCCTTTTTAAAGCTGACG	UT18_mad25-NoStop
VR443-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC CCCGTCTGCGACGTCG	UT18_mad25-NoStop
VR444-F	CGCCACTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCA TGGCCCTTTTTAAAGCTGACG	UT18C_mad25
VR445-R	TAGTTATATCGATGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCT ACCCGTCTGCGACGTC	UT18C_mad25
VR446-F	CGGGCTGCAGGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCC ATGGACGGAATGCAGCGC	KT25_mad26
VR447-R	TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCGAATTCT CATTTATTCAAGGCAATAGTCAGT	KT25_mad26
VR448-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGACGGAATGCAGCGC	KNT25_mad26-noStop
VR449-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC TTTATTCAAGGCAATAGTCAGTTCA	KNT25_mad26-noStop
VR450-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGGACGGAATGCAGCGC	UT18_mad26-NoStop
VR451-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC TTTATTCAAGGCAATAGTCAGTTCA	UT18_mad26-NoStop
VR452-F	CGCCACTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCA TGGACGGAATGCAGCGC	UT18C_mad26
VR453-R	TAGTTATATCGATGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACTC ATTTATTCAAGGCAATAGTCAGT	UT18C_mad26
VR454-F	CGGGCTGCAGGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCC ATGTCCCAAGAGGATAAGGCG	KT25_mad28

VR455-R	TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCGAATTCC TAATCCGCCTCGGTCAGG	KT25_mad28
VR456-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGTCCCAAGAGGATAAGGCG	KNT25_mad28-noStop
VR457-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC ATCCGCCTCGGTCAGGG	KNT25_mad28-noStop
VR458-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGTCCCAAGAGGATAAGGCG	UT18_mad28-NoStop
VR459-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC ATCCGCCTCGGTCAGGG	UT18_mad28-NoStop
VR460-F	CGCCACTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCA TGTCCCAAGAGGATAAGGCG	UT18C_mad28
VR461-R	TAGTTATATCGATGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCT AATCCGCCTCGGTCAGG	UT18C_mad28
VR462-F	CGGGCTGCAGGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCC ATGTCCGGAAGCAACGTGC	KT25_mamK
VR463-R	TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCGAATTCT TAATCCTTTCGCAGCTCGTC	KT25_mamK
VR464-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGTCCGGAAGCAACGTGC	KNT25_mamK-noStop
VR465-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC ATCCTTTCGCAGCTCGTCC	KNT25_mamK-noStop
VR466-F	ACAGCTATGACCATGATTACGCCAAGCTTGA TGTCCGGAAGCAACGTGC	UT18_mamK-NoStop
VR467-R	CCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCTGCAGGC ATCCTTTCGCAGCTCGTCC	UT18_mamK-NoStop
VR468-F	CGCCACTGCAGGTCGACTCTAGAGGATCCCA TGTCCGGAAGCAACGTGC	UT18C_mamK
VR469-R	TAGTTATATCGATGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACTT AATCCTTTCGCAGCTCGTC	UT18C_mamK

879 **Supplemental Table 4.** *Table of all primers used in this study*

Figure	Strain/ Condition	Compared with: Strain/ Condition	Mann-Whitney U test pValue	Significance	Welch's T-Test pValue	Significance
Figure 3C	Early	Late	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 3D	Early	Late	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 3E	Early	Late	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 3I	Immature crystals	Mature crystals	---	---	0.0006	***

881 **Supplemental Table 5.** *Table of all statistical tests used for figure 3 in this study*

Figure	Strain/ Condition	Compared with: Strain/ Condition	One way ANOVA test pValue	Significance	Mann-Whitney U test pValue	Significance
Figure 4D	*fmpA*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 4D	*fmpB*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 4E	*fmpA*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 4E	*fmpB*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 4F	*fmpA*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 4F	*fmpB*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****

883 **Supplemental Table 6.** *Table of all statistical tests used for Figure 4 in this study*

Figure	Strain/ Condition	Compared with: Strain/ Condition	One way ANOVA test pValue	Significance	Mann-Whitney U test pValue	Significance
Figure 5N*i*	Δ*mamK*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****
Figure 5N*i*	Δ*mad28*	WT	0.9378	ns	0.4697	ns
Figure 5N*ii*	Δ*mamK*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****

| Figure 5N*ii* | Δ*mad28* | WT | 0.0703 | ns | 0.0053 | ** |

885 **Supplemental Table 7.** *Table of all statistical tests used for figure 5 in this study*

		Compared with:	One way ANOVA test		Mann-Whitney U test	
Supplemental Figure	Strain/ Condition	Strain/ Condition	pValue	Significance	pValue	Significance
Figure S1D	Δ*mad10*	WT	0.1364	ns	0.0005	***
Figure S1D	Δ*mad20*	WT	0.7606	ns	0.3754	ns
Figure S1D	Δ*mad23*	WT	0.7606	ns	0.5328	ns
Figure S1D	Δ*mad25*	WT	0.3521	ns	0.0147	*
Figure S1D	Δ*mad26*	WT	0.4881	ns	0.111	ns
Figure S1D	Δ*mad28*	WT	0.7606	ns	0.3365	ns
Figure S1D	Δ*mamK*	WT	<0.0001	****	<0.0001	****

		Compared with:	One way ANOVA test	
Supplemental Figure	Strain/Condition	Strain/Condition	pValue	Significance
Figure S1E	Δ*mad10*	WT	<0.0001	****
Figure S1E	Δ*mad20*	WT	0.0001	***
Figure S1E	Δ*mad23*	WT	0.5127	ns
Figure S1E	Δ*mad25*	WT	0.9895	ns
Figure S1E	Δ*mad26*	WT	0.0953	ns
Figure S1E	Δ*mad28*	WT	0.0381	*
Figure S1E	Δ*mamK*	WT	<0.0001	****

		Compared with:	Kruskal-Wallis test	
Supplemental Figure	Strain/Condition	Strain/Condition	pValue	Significance
Figure S1F	Δ*mad10*	WT	<0.0001	****
Figure S1F	Δ*mad20*	WT	<0.0001	****
Figure S1F	Δ*mad23*	WT	0.2744	ns

Figure S1F	Δmad25	WT	0.0073	**
Figure S1F	Δmad26	WT	0.0805	ns
Figure S1F	Δmad28	WT	0.0007	***
Figure S1F	ΔmamK	WT	<0.0001	****

890 **Supplemental Table 8.** *Tables of all statistical tests used for Supplemental Figure S1 in this*

891 *study*

References:

1. Liu, Y., Van Den Ent, F. & Löwe, J. Filament structure and subcellular organization of the bacterial intermediate filament–like protein crescentin. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **121**, e2309984121 (2024).

2. Pohl, A. *et al.* Decoding Biomineralization: Interaction of a Mad10-Derived Peptide with Magnetite Thin Films. *Nano Lett.* **19**, 8207–8215 (2019).

3. Paysan-Lafosse, T. *et al.* InterPro in 2022. *Nucleic Acids Research* **51**, D418–D427 (2023).

4. Kearse, M. *et al.* Geneious Basic: An integrated and extendable desktop software platform for the organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 1647–1649 (2012).

5. Uzun, M. *et al.* Recovery and genome reconstruction of novel magnetotactic Elusimicrobiota from bog soil. *The ISME Journal* **17**, 204–214 (2023).

6. Gilchrist, C. L. M. & Chooi, Y.-H. clinker & clustermap.js: automatic generation of gene cluster comparison figures. *Bioinformatics* **37**, 2473–2475 (2021).

7. Hallgren, J. *et al.* DeepTMHMM predicts alpha and beta transmembrane proteins using deep neural networks. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.08.487609 (2022).

8. Ludwiczak, J., Winski, A., Szczepaniak, K., Alva, V. & Dunin-Horkawicz, S. DeepCoil—a fast and accurate prediction of coiled-coil domains in protein sequences. *Bioinformatics* **35**, 2790–2795 (2019).

9. Mirdita, M. *et al.* ColabFold: making protein folding accessible to all. *Nat Methods* **19**, 679–682 (2022).

10. Meng, E. C. *et al.* UCSF ChimeraX: Tools for structure building and analysis. *Protein Sci* **32**, e4792 (2023).

11. Li, J. & Pan, Y. Environmental Factors Affect Magnetite Magnetosome Synthesis in Magnetospirillum magneticum AMB-1: Implications for Biologically Controlled Mineralization. *Geomicrobiology Journal* **29**, 362–373 (2012).

12. Matsunaga, T. *et al.* Complete genome sequence of the facultative anaerobic
magnetotactic bacterium Magnetospirillum sp. strain AMB-1. *DNA Res* **12**, 157–166
(2005).

13. Maratea, D. & Blakemore, R. P. Aquaspirillum magnetotacticum sp. nov., a Magnetic
Spirillum. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **31**,
452–455 (1981).

14. Smalley, M. D., Marinov, G. K., Bertani, L. E. & DeSalvo, G. Genome Sequence of
Magnetospirillum magnetotacticum Strain MS-1. *Genome Announc* **3**, e00233-15
(2015).

15. Dziuba, M. *et al.* Magnetospirillum caucaseum sp. nov., Magnetospirillum marisnigri
sp. nov. and Magnetospirillum moscoviense sp. nov., freshwater magnetotactic
bacteria isolated from three distinct geographical locations in European Russia.
International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology **66**, 2069–2077
(2016).

16. Liu, P. *et al.* Key gene networks that control magnetosome biomineralization in
magnetotactic bacteria. *National Science Review* **10**, nwac238 (2023).

17. Monteil, C. L. *et al.* Repeated horizontal gene transfers triggered parallel evolution of
magnetotaxis in two evolutionary divergent lineages of magnetotactic bacteria. *The
ISME Journal* **14**, 1783–1794 (2020).

18. Ke, L. *et al.* Characteristics and optimised fermentation of a novel magnetotactic
bacterium, Magnetospirillum sp. ME-1. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* **365**, fny052
(2018).

19. Ke, L., Liu, P., Liu, S. & Gao, M. Complete Genome Sequence of Magnetospirillum
sp. ME-1, a Novel Magnetotactic Bacterium Isolated from East Lake, Wuhan, China.
Genome Announc **5**, e00485-17 (2017).

20. Wang, Y. *et al.* Characterizing and optimizing magnetosome production of
Magnetospirillum sp. XM-1 isolated from Xi'an City Moat, China. *FEMS Microbiology
Letters* **362**, fnv167 (2015).

21. Wang, Y. *et al.* Complete Genome Sequence of Magnetospirillum sp. Strain XM-1,
Isolated from the Xi'an City Moat, China. *Genome Announc* **4**, e01171-16 (2016).

22. Koziaeva, V. V. *et al.* Draft Genome Sequences of Two Magnetotactic Bacteria,

Magnetospirillum moscoviense BB-1 and Magnetospirillum marisnigri SP-1.

Genome Announc **4**, e00814-16 (2016).

23. Koziaeva, V. V. *et al.* Magnetospirillum kuznetsovii sp. nov., a novel magnetotactic

bacterium isolated from a lake in the Moscow region. *International Journal of*

Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology **69**, 1953–1959 (2019).

24. Fdez-Gubieda, M. L. *et al.* Magnetite Biomineralization in Magnetospirillum

gryphiswaldense: Time-Resolved Magnetic and Structural Studies. *ACS Nano* **7**,

3297–3305 (2013).

25. Schleifer, K. H. *et al.* The Genus *Magnetospirillum* gen. nov. Description of

Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense sp. nov. and Transfer of *Aquaspirillum*

magnetotacticum to *Magnetospirillum magnetotacticum* comb. nov. *Systematic and*

Applied Microbiology **14**, 379–385 (1991).

26. Wang, X. *et al.* Complete Genome Sequence of Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense

MSR-1. *Genome Announc* **2**, e00171-14 (2014).

27. Lefèvre, C. T. *et al.* Insight into the Evolution of Magnetotaxis in Magnetospirillum

spp., Based on *mam* Gene Phylogeny. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **78**, 7238–7248

(2012).

28. Zhu, K. *et al.* Isolation and characterization of a marine magnetotactic spirillum

axenic culture QH-2 from an intertidal zone of the China Sea. *Research in*

Microbiology **161**, 276–283 (2010).

29. Ji, B. *et al.* Comparative genomic analysis provides insights into the evolution and

niche adaptation of marine Magnetospira sp. QH-2 strain. *Environmental*

Microbiology **16**, 525–544 (2014).

30. Monteil, C. L. *et al.* Genomic study of a novel magnetotactic Alphaproteobacteria

uncovers the multiple ancestry of magnetotaxis. *Environmental Microbiology* **20**,

4415–4430 (2018).

31. Bazylinski, D. A. *et al.* Magnetovibrio blakemorei gen. nov., sp. nov., a

magnetotactic bacterium (Alphaproteobacteria: Rhodospirillaceae) isolated from a

salt marsh. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **63**,

1824–1833 (2013).

32. Trubitsyn, D. *et al.* Draft Genome Sequence of Magnetovibrio blakemorei Strain MV-
1, a Marine Vibrioid Magnetotactic Bacterium. *Genome Announc* **4**, e01330-16
(2016).

33. Lefèvre, C. T. *et al.* Novel magnetite-producing magnetotactic bacteria belonging to
the Gammaproteobacteria. *ISME J* **6**, 440–450 (2012).

34. Geurink, C. *et al.* Complete Genome Sequence of Strain BW-2, a Magnetotactic
Gammaproteobacterium in the Family Ectothiorhodospiraceae, Isolated from a
Brackish Spring in Death Valley, California. *Microbiol Resour Announc* **9**, e01144-19
(2020).

35. Li, J. *et al.* Single-Cell Resolution of Uncultured Magnetotactic Bacteria via
Fluorescence-Coupled Electron Microscopy. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **83**, e00409-17
(2017).

36. Trubitsyn, D. *et al.* Complete Genome Sequence of Strain SS-5, a Magnetotactic
Gammaproteobacterium Isolated from the Salton Sea, a Shallow, Saline, Endorheic
Rift Lake Located on the San Andreas Fault in California. *Microbiol Resour Announc*
10, e00928-20 (2021).

37. Lefèvre, C. T., Bernadac, A., Yu-Zhang, K., Pradel, N. & Wu, L.-F. Isolation and
characterization of a magnetotactic bacterial culture from the Mediterranean Sea.
Environmental Microbiology **11**, 1646–1657 (2009).

38. Ji, B. *et al.* The chimeric nature of the genomes of marine magnetotactic coccoid-
ovoid bacteria defines a novel group of Proteobacteria. *Environmental Microbiology*
19, 1103–1119 (2017).

39. Meldrum, F. C., Mann, S., Heywood, B. R., Frankel, R. B. & Bazylinski, D. A.
Electron microscopy study of magnetosomes in a cultured coccoid magnetotactic
bacterium. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological*
Sciences **251**, 231–236 (1993).

40. Schübbe, S. *et al.* Complete Genome Sequence of the Chemolithoautotrophic
Marine Magnetotactic Coccus Strain MC-1. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **75**, 4835–4852
(2009).

41. Morillo, V. *et al.* Isolation, cultivation and genomic analysis of magnetosome
biomineralization genes of a new genus of South-seeking magnetotactic cocci within
the Alphaproteobacteria. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **5**, (2014).

42. Koziaeva, V. *et al.* Genome-Based Metabolic Reconstruction of a Novel Uncultivated
Freshwater Magnetotactic coccus "Ca. Magnetaquicoccus inordinatus" UR-1, and
Proposal of a Candidate Family "Ca. Magnetaquicoccaceae". *Frontiers in*
Microbiology **10**, (2019).

43. Abreu, F. *et al.* Cell Adhesion, Multicellular Morphology, and Magnetosome
Distribution in the Multicellular Magnetotactic Prokaryote Candidatus Magnetoglobus
multicellularis. *Microscopy and Microanalysis* **19**, 535–543 (2013).

44. Abreu, F. *et al.* 'Candidatus Magnetoglobus multicellularis', a multicellular,
magnetotactic prokaryote from a hypersaline environment. *International Journal of*
Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology **57**, 1318–1322 (2007).

45. Abreu, F. *et al.* Deciphering unusual uncultured magnetotactic multicellular
prokaryotes through genomics. *The ISME Journal* **8**, 1055–1068 (2014).

46. Leão, P. *et al.* Ultrastructure of ellipsoidal magnetotactic multicellular prokaryotes
depicts their complex assemblage and cellular polarity in the context of
magnetotaxis. *Environmental Microbiology* **19**, 2151–2163 (2017).

47. Zhang, R. *et al.* Characterization and phylogenetic identification of a species of
spherical multicellular magnetotactic prokaryotes that produces both magnetite and
greigite crystals. *Research in Microbiology* **165**, 481–489 (2014).

48. Kolinko, S., Richter, M., Glöckner, F.-O., Brachmann, A. & Schüler, D. Single-cell
genomics reveals potential for magnetite and greigite biomineralization in an
uncultivated multicellular magnetotactic prokaryote. *Environmental Microbiology*
Reports **6**, 524–531 (2014).

49. Lefèvre, C. T. *et al.* A Cultured Greigite-Producing Magnetotactic Bacterium in a
Novel Group of Sulfate-Reducing Bacteria. *Science* **334**, 1720–1723 (2011).

50. Lefèvre, C. T. *et al.* Comparative genomic analysis of magnetotactic bacteria from
the Deltaproteobacteria provides new insights into magnetite and greigite
magnetosome genes required for magnetotaxis. *Environmental Microbiology* **15**,
2712–2735 (2013).

51. Sakaguchi, T., Burgess, J. G. & Matsunaga, T. Magnetite formation by a sulphate-
reducing bacterium. *Nature* **365**, 47–49 (1993).

52. Sakaguchi, T., Arakaki, A. & Matsunaga, T. Desulfovibrio magneticus sp. nov., a
novel sulfate-reducing bacterium that produces intracellular single-domain-sized
magnetite particles. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary*
Microbiology **52**, 215–221 (2002).

53. Nakazawa, H. *et al.* Whole genome sequence of *Desulfovibrio magneticus* strain
RS-1 revealed common gene clusters in magnetotactic bacteria. *Genome Res.* **19**,
1801–1808 (2009).

54. Shimoshige, H. *et al.* Isolation and cultivation of a novel sulfate-reducing
magnetotactic bacterium belonging to the genus Desulfovibrio. *PLoS ONE* **16**,
e0248313 (2021).

55. Lefèvre, C. T., Frankel, R. B., Pósfai, M., Prozorov, T. & Bazylinski, D. A. Isolation of
obligately alkaliphilic magnetotactic bacteria from extremely alkaline environments.
Environmental Microbiology **13**, 2342–2350 (2011).

56. Li, J. *et al.* Intracellular silicification by early-branching magnetotactic bacteria. *Sci.*
Adv. **8**, eabn6045 (2022).

57. Li, J. *et al.* Crystal growth of bullet-shaped magnetite in magnetotactic bacteria of
the *Nitrospirae* phylum. *J. R. Soc. Interface.* **12**, 20141288 (2015).

58. Lin, W. *et al.* Genomic insights into the uncultured genus 'Candidatus
Magnetobacterium' in the phylum Nitrospirae. *ISME J* **8**, 2463–2477 (2014).

59. Spring, S. *et al.* Dominating Role of an Unusual Magnetotactic Bacterium in the
Microaerobic Zone of a Freshwater Sediment. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **59**, 2397–
2403 (1993).

60. Kolinko, S., Richter, M., Glöckner, F.-O., Brachmann, A. & Schüler, D. Single-cell
genomics of uncultivated deep-branching magnetotactic bacteria reveals a
conserved set of magnetosome genes. *Environmental Microbiology* **18**, 21–37
(2016).

61. Uzun, M. *et al.* Detection of interphylum transfers of the magnetosome gene cluster
in magnetotactic bacteria. *Front. Microbiol.* **13**, 945734 (2022).

62. Zhao, Y. *et al.* Insight into the metabolic potential and ecological function of a novel
Magnetotactic Nitrospirota in coral reef habitat. *Front. Microbiol.* **14**, 1182330
(2023).
63. Kolinko, S. *et al.* Single-cell analysis reveals a novel uncultivated magnetotactic
bacterium within the candidate division OP3. *Environmental Microbiology* **14**, 1709–
1721 (2012).
64. Rahn-Lee, L. *et al.* A Genetic Strategy for Probing the Functional Diversity of
Magnetosome Formation. *PLoS Genet* **11**, e1004811 (2015).
65. Grant, C. R., Rahn-lee, L. & Legault, K. N. Genome Editing Method for the
Anaerobic Magnetotactic. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **84**, 1–12 (2018).
1083
1084