Proteomic characterization of extracellular vesicles from 12 commensal bacterial species

Roselydiah Nasipwondi Makunja[1], Arina Maltseva[1], Tiina Pessa-Morikawa[1], Masuma Khatun[2], Johanna Muurinen[1], Maria[3], Mari Heinonen[4], Anna Kaisanlahti[5], Subhashini Muhandiram[6], Justus Reunanen[7], Terhi Ruuska-Loewald[5], Tuula Anneli Nyman[3], Mikael Niku[1*]*

1: Veterinary Biosciences, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
2: Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland
3: Department of Immunology and transfusion medicine, University of Oslo and University Hospital, Oslo, Norway.
4: Department of Production Animal Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
5: Research Unit of Clinical Medicine and Biocenter Oulu, University of Oulu, and Department of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, Oulu University Hospital, Oulu, Finland
6: Institute of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Sciences, Estonian University of Life Sciences, Tartu, Estonia
7: Research Unit of Translational Medicine and Biocenter Oulu, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

*Corresponding author

Funding: This work was supported by the Research Council of Finland (grant number 347925), the European Union through HORIZON Coordination and Support Actions under grant agreement No 101079349 "OH-Boost", and the Finnish Foundation of Veterinary Research.

Abstract

Bacterial extracellular vesicles (bEVs) produced by intestinal commensal bacteria mediate host-microbe interactions, but their proteomes have been explored in only a small number of species. We characterized bEVs from *in vitro* cultures of 12 species of Actinomycetota, Bacillota (Firmicutes), Bacteroidota, Fusobacteria, Pseudomonadota, and Verrucomicrobia. This is the first report of bEVs from *Veillonella magna*, an exceptional gram-negative Bacillota, and the gram-positives *Peptostreptococcus russellii* and *Turicibacter sanguinis*. The morphology and protein subcellular localization patterns of bEVs reflected the envelope structures of their parent bacteria. Notably, *V. magna* may be able to produce both outer membrane and cytoplasmic membrane vesicles. The proteome compositions were dictated by phylogeny, suggesting largely non-selective packaging of proteins. Annotation of protein functions indicated roles in nutrient

metabolism and transport, and in host immune system modulation. Peptidoglycan modifying enzymes and the abundant bacteriophage proteins in *Enterobacter cloacae* and *Limosilactobacillus reuteri* bEVs may be involved in vesicle biogenesis. The functions of many abundant bEV proteins are unknown. The most abundant bEV proteins were largely species-specific, but we identified several conserved proteins that may be used as markers to distinguish commensal bEVs from host EVs. Comparison to previous *in vitro* and fecal metaproteomics data indicates that bEV proteome compositions are reproducible.

Keywords

Bacterial extracellular vesicles, outer-membrane vesicles, gram-positive, gram-negative, proteome, intestinal commensal bacteria

1 Introduction

Bacterial extracellular vesicles (bEVs) are membrane-derived lipid bilayer nanoparticles,

secreted by both gram-negative and gram-positive bacteria, ranging in size from 40 to 400 nm

(1). Their biogenesis is influenced by the structure of the cell envelope, which differs between

gram-negative and gram-positive bacteria (2, 3). In gram-negative bacteria, bEVs are secreted by

outer membrane blebbing or phage-mediated explosive cell lysis, while in gram-positive

bacteria, they are produced through budding or blebbing of the cytoplasmic membrane or phage-

mediated bubbling cell death (1). The bEV cargo consists of proteins, nucleic acids, lipids, and

small-molecular metabolites, which may be delivered to other microbial or host cells (4, 5).

Compared to simple diffusion, bEVs can deliver highly concentrated signals over extended

distances, referred to as quantal secretion (1). During transit, the cargo is protected from

environmental inactivators and degrading enzymes (6).

In the intestine, commensal bEVs play diverse roles in bacteria-bacteria and bacteria-host

interactions (7-9). They aid bacteria in nutrient acquisition, niche competition, and adaptation to

environmental stress (10). bEVs carry enzymes that degrade complex carbohydrates, supporting

the growth and survival of both the producer and other members of the microbial community

(11). bEVs prime the host immune system against viral (12) and bacterial infections (13); they

may have anti-inflammatory properties (14-16) and improve epithelial barrier integrity (14, 17).

The immunomodulatory effects of bEVs may be even more potent than those of the producing

bacteria since they can be internalized by host cells, thereby activating intracellular immune

receptors (12, 18). Thus, bEVs hold promise for therapeutic applications, including

immunotherapy, management of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), cancer treatment, and drug

delivery (4, 19, 20).

Commensal bEVs and especially their proteomes have only been characterized from a small part

of the intestinal microbiota, with most studies focusing on a few bacterial species such as

Akkermansia muciniphila (21-26), *Bacteroides fragilis* (18, 27-29), and *Bifidobacterium longum*

(30, 31). They are usually studied *in vitro*, as *in vivo* research is complicated by a lack of markers

for distinguishing bacterial from host extracellular vesicles (EVs) (4, 32). The growth conditions,

bacterial strains, and bEV processing workflows may significantly influence the observed bEV

composition (4, 19, 32, 33).

In the current study, we assessed the structures and proteomes of bEVs derived from gram-

negative and gram-positive commensal bacteria, representing all major phyla and orders of the

mammalian intestinal microbiota. We searched for conserved proteins that could serve as

markers for bEVs in animal samples. To assess the effects of bEV processing workflows and

experimental methods on the observed bEV characteristics, we compared our data to previous

bEV studies from the same bacterial species.

Materials and methods

The experimental protocol has been submitted to the EV-TRACK knowledgebase (EV-TRACK ID: EV250029) (34).

Bacterial culture

The bacterial strains (Table 1) were obtained from culture collections, except for *Lactobacillus amylovorus* and *Limosilactobacillus reuteri*, which were in-house isolates from sow feces collected from Finnish pig farms (35). The cultured strains were verified by MALDI-TOF and/or Sanger sequencing of the 16S rRNA genes.

The bacteria were cultured anaerobically at +37 °C, without shaking (Table 1). Most of the bacteria were cultured in the Brain Heart Infusion broth (BHI; Merck Millipore #53286). For some species indicated in the BHI medium was supplemented with yeast extract (5 g/l), hemin (5 mg/l), vitamin K (1 mg/l), cellobiose (1 g/l), maltose (1 g/l), and cysteine (1 g/l). *L. reuteri* and *L. amylovorus* were cultured in deMan, Rogosa and Sharpe broth (MRS; Oxoid / Thermo Fisher Scientific #CM0359). We also tested Gifu Anaerobic Medium (GAM; Nissui Pharmaceutical #05433), but it contained high concentrations of EV-like particles and filtration resulted in poor bacterial growth.

For the final 30 ml cultures (each species with three replicates) used for EV isolation, the culture media were pre-filtered using 0.45 µm and 0.1 µm sterilization filters (Acrodisk Supor, Pall Lab/Cytiva) to deplete EV-like particles. The EVs were collected when the cultures were clearly cloudy (depending on bacterial strain, 1–4 days).

The following strains did not grow in our experimental conditions: *Alistipes senegalensis* (DSM 25460*)*, *Anaerostipes hadrus* (DSM 3319), *Eubacterium biforme* (DSM 3989), and *Prevotella histicola* (DSM 26979).

Table 1. Bacterial strains and culture media. BHI: Brain Heart Infusion broth (BHI). BHI+: BHI with supplements. MRS: deMan, Rogosa and Sharpe broth. The Bacillota phylum was previously Firmicutes.

Phylum	Order	*Species*	Strain	Medium
Actinomycetota	Bifidobacteriales	*Bifidobacterium longum sp. suis*	DSM 20211	BHI
Actinomycetota	Coriobacteriia	*Collinsella aerofaciens*	DSM 3979	BHI+
Bacillota	Lactobacillales	*Enterococcus faecalis*	ATCC 29212	BHI
Bacillota	Lactobacillales	*Lactobacillus amylovorus*	in-house (35)	MRS
Bacillota	Lactobacillales	*Limosilactobacillus reuteri*	in-house (35)	MRS
Bacillota	Lactobacillales	*Streptococcus salivarius*	DSM 20067	BHI
Bacillota	Clostridiales	*Clostridium leptum*	DSM 753	BHI
Bacillota	Clostridiales	*Flavonifractor plautii*	DSM 4000	BHI
Bacillota	Eubacteriales	*Faecalibacterium prausnitzii*	DSM 107838	BHI+
Bacillota	Eubacteriales	*Peptostreptococcus russellii*	DSM 23041	BHI
Bacillota	Erysipelotrichales	*Turicibacter sanguinis*	DSM 14220	BHI
Bacillota	Erysipelotrichales	*Floccifex porci*	DSM 104670	BHI+
Bacillota	Erysipelotrichales	*Holdemanella biformis*	DSM 3989	BHI+
Bacillota	Veillonellales	*Veillonella magna*	DSM 19857	BHI
Bacteroidota	Bacteroidales	*Bacteroides fragilis*	DSM 2151	BHI
Pseudomonadota	Burkholderiales	*Escherichia coli*	ATCC 35328	BHI
Pseudomonadota	Burkholderiales	*Sutterella parvirubra*	DSM 19354	BHI+
Pseudomonadota	Enterobacteriales	*Enterobacter cloacae*	ATCC 13047	BHI
Verrucomicrobia	Verrucomicrobiales	*Akkermansia muciniphila*	DSM 22959	BHI
Fusobacteria	Fusobacteriales	*Fusobacterium nucleatum sp. animalis*	DSM 19679	BHI

Isolation of bacterial extracellular vesicles

Bacterial cells were removed by centrifugation for 10 min at $3100 \times g$ (4000 rpm) using an Eppendorf 5810 R Centrifuge, with swing-bucket rotor A-4-81. The supernatants were filtered through a 0.22 µm sterilization filter (Millex-GP, Merck Millipore) using a peristaltic pump and stored overnight at +4 °C. EVs were collected by ultracentrifugation of 3×22 ml culture supernatant per species at $110000 \times g$ for 2 hours at +4 °C, using Optima LE-80K ultracentrifuge with a Ti 50.2 rotor, k-factor 143.3 (Beckman Coulter), and resuspended in 500 µl phosphate-buffered saline (PBS, 0.22 µm pre-filtered). Size exclusion chromatography was performed using 70 nm qEV Original columns (Izon Science). 500 µl per sample was loaded, and 3×0.5 ml fractions were collected by washing with PBS. Finally, samples were concentrated by ultrafiltration at $3200 \times g$ using 10 kDa MWCO 4 ml Amicon Ultra tubes (Merck), loading 1.5 ml per sample and collecting 100 µl.

Characterization of bacterial extracellular vesicles by NTA and electron microscopy

Particle concentration and size were measured with the ZetaView PMX-120 nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA) instrument (Particle Metrix GmbH, Ammersee, Germany) equipped with a Z NTA cell assembly, a blue (488 nm, 40 mW) laser, and a CMOS camera with 640 x 480-pixel resolution. Samples were diluted in a total volume of 1 ml of particle-free ultra-pure milli-Q water to obtain 50–200 particles per frame. Videos in NTA mode were recorded at 11 positions across the measurement chamber in two-second increments at 30 FPS framerate with camera shutter speed at 100 s^{-1} and sensitivity at 85. The temperature was controlled at 22°C for NTA. Videos were processed, and outliers (>10% CV) were removed using the Grubbs method with the built-in ZetaView software (version 8.05.12 SP2). Particles between 10-1000 nm in diameter with a minimum trace length of 15 frames and a minimum brightness of 20 were included in the analysis. Culture media without bacteria were used as negative controls (nine replicates of BHI medium, out of which one replicate was removed as an outlier due to much higher particle concentration and different size range; and three replicates of MRS medium).

EVs were prepared for electron microscopy (EM) as in Puhka *et al*. (36) by loading to carbon-coated and glow-discharged 200 mesh copper grids with a pioloform support membrane. EVs were fixed with 2% paraformaldehyde in NaPO4 buffer, stained with 2% neutral uranyl acetate, and further stained and embedded in uranyl acetate and methyl cellulose mixture (1.8/0.4 %). EVs were viewed with transmission EM (TEM) using Jeol JEM-1400 (Jeol Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) operating at 80 kV. Images were taken with Gatan Orius SC 1000B CCD-camera (Gatan Inc., USA) with 4008 × 2672 px image size and no binning.

LC-MS/MS analysis of bacterial extracellular vesicle proteomes

For the isolation and preparation of bEV proteins, a magnetic bead-based method was used for most species. Here, the EV proteins were precipitated with 70% acetonitrile onto magnetic beads (MagReSynAmine, Resyn Biosciences), and then washed on the beads with 100% acetonitrile, 70% ethanol, and then resuspended in 100 µl of 50 mM ammoniumbicarbonate. The proteins were reduced by the addition of 0.5M DTT to a final concentration of 10 mM and incubation at 56°C for 30 min. To alkylate proteins, 2.7µl of 550 mM iodoacetamide (IAA) was added to a final concentration of 15 mM, and samples were incubated at room temperature in the dark for 30 min. 0.5 µg trypsin was added to each sample for overnight on-beads protein digestion at 37°C. The resulting peptides were concentrated using the STAGE-TIP method with a C18 resin disk (Affinisep).

An earlier non-bead-based protocol was used for EV proteins of *E. faecalis, E. cloacae, L.*
amylovorus, L. reuteri, B. longum sp. *suis* and *B. fragilis*. Here, 80 µl of each EV sample was
mixed with ProteaseMax surfactant (Promega) in 50 mM ammonium bicarbonate to a final
concentration of 0.1%. Samples were vortexed for one minute and heated at 95°C for five
minutes. Protein reduction and alkylation were performed as reported above. Trypsin digestion
was performed in solution.

The liquid chromatography and tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) analysis was performed
using a nanoElute UHPLC coupled to a timsTOFfleX mass spectrometer (Bruker Daltonics,
Bremen, Germany) via a CaptiveSpray ion source. Peptides were separated on a 25 cm reversed-
phase C18 column (1.6 µm bead size, 120 Å pore size, 75 µm inner diameter, Ion Optics) with a
flow rate of 0.3 µl/min and a solvent gradient from 0-35% B in 60 min. Solvent B was 100%
acetonitrile in 0.1% formic acid, and solvent A 0.1% formic acid in water. The mass
spectrometer was operated in data-dependent Parallel Accumulation-Serial Fragmentation
(PASEF) mode. Mass spectra for MS and MS/MS scans were recorded between m/z 100 and
1700. Ion mobility resolution was set to 0.85–1.35 V·s/cm over a ramp time of 100 ms. Data-
dependent acquisition was performed using 10 PASEF MS/MS scans per cycle with a near 100%
duty cycle. A polygon filter was applied in the m/z and ion mobility space to exclude low m/z,
singly charged ions from PASEF precursor selection. An active exclusion time of 0.4 min was
applied to precursors that reached 20,000 intensity units. Collisional energy was ramped stepwise
as a function of ion mobility.

Protein identification was performed using the MaxQuant software (versions 2.1.3.0,2.4.3.0 and
2.4.7.0) (37). Parameters were set as follows: fixed modification: carbamidomethylation (C),
protein N-acetylation, and methionine oxidation as variable modifications. The first search error
window of 20 ppm, and mains search error of 4.5 ppm. Trypsin without proline restriction
enzyme option was used, with two allowed miscleavages. Minimal unique peptides were set to 1,
and the false discovery rate (FDR) allowed was 0.01 (1%) for peptide and protein identification.
Species-specific databases were generated from proteomes downloaded from NCBI Genomes. In
addition, human, bovine, and pig databases downloaded from Uniprot were included in the
MaxQuant searches. The generation of reversed sequences was selected to assign FDR rates.

Most of the bacteria were analyzed in three culture replicates. For *F. nucleatum* sp. *animals*, *H.*
biformis, P. russellii, S. salivarius and *T. sanguinis*, the replicates were pooled for LC-MS/MS
analysis, due to low signal intensities.

Prediction of protein cellular localization and function

The cellular localization of bEV proteins was predicted using PSORTb version 3.0.3 web server (38) and DeepLocPro (39). Analysis was performed for each species separately, using the default parameters and the species gram type. DeepLocPro predictions were used in cases where PSORTb predictions returned an "unknown". Some of the 50S ribosomal proteins were erroneously predicted as outer membrane or extracellular by DeepLocPro; these were reclassified as cytoplasmic. Eight *V. magna* proteins were predicted by DeepLocPro as cell wall proteins; since gram-negative bacteria do not have an actual cell wall, and these proteins are known to span several envelope layers, they were reclassified as unknown.

Protein functions were predicted as clusters of orthologous groups (COG) using eggNOG-mapper v2 (40). Proteins without eggnog annotations were predicted using PANNZER2 (41), converting the Gene Ontology biological functions to COGs using a Python script by Szczerbiak *et al*. (42). Remaining unannotated proteins were processed using the NCBI CD-Search Tool (43).

Comparative analysis of bacterial extracellular vesicle proteomes

To compare bEV proteome compositions across species, we defined protein orthogroups using OrthoFinder v2.5.5 (44) with default parameters. *F. nucleatum* was excluded from this analysis due to the small number of identified proteins. For the quantitative analyses, the remaining data were quantile normalized with the limma R package (45). For inference of the proteome similarity tree and the proteomic versus consensus phylogenetic trees comparison, orthogroup abundances were averaged across replicates by species, and orthogroups with averaged relative abundance values not reaching 0.1% in at least one species were removed to minimize the effect of the total number of identified proteins on tree topology. For the nonmetric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) ordination, orthogroups detected in less than 2 samples were excluded. Orthogroups detected in five out of seven gram-positive species or all of the four remaining gram-negative species were regarded as conserved. The lower threshold value in gram-positive species was chosen due to protein-poor bEV proteomes obtained for *B. suis*, *S. salivarius,* and *T. sanguinis* (less than 50 orthogroups identified). The Venn diagrams were created with the eulerr R package (46).

For the proteomic similarity tree, bEV proteomes averaged by species were clustered using the Jaccard distance matrix (vegdist function of the vegan package, method = "jaccard", binary = FALSE), with complete linkage as the grouping algorithm (47) and plotted with the dendextend

package (48). Branch support was assessed by approximately unbiased (AU) p-values using

multiscale bootstrap resampling (49) with 5,000 iterations in the pvclust package (50). This

number of iterations ensured accurate estimation of AU p-values (standard errors were less than

0.025). The phylogenetic tree for the tanglegram calculation was taken as the phy file from the

NCBI Taxonomy Common Tree tool. Before comparison, phylogenetic and proteomic trees were

made ultrametric using non-negative least squares with the phangorn package (51). The

topological similarity between the proteomic and phylogenetic trees was evaluated using the

Fowlkes-Mallows index (52). The index measures the similarity between two dendrograms. It

quantifies how similarly the trees are partitioned into clusters, with values of the index ranging

from 0 (no similarity) to 1 (perfect agreement). The index estimates the similarity of the

compositions of clusters obtained when the trees are split at various numbers of clusters (k). The

number of clusters (k) varies from 2 up to (N-1), where (N) is the total number of end branches

in each tree (proteomic and phylogenetic). This allows comparison of the overall clustering

structure between the two trees. Correspondence between inter-species distances on the trees was

measured using the coefficient of cophenetic correlation (53). Fowlkes-Mallows index,

cophenetic correlation value, and tanglegrams were calculated and plotted with the dendextend

package (48).

The proteome ordinations were visualized using nMDS based on Euclidean distances among the

samples (vegan package) (47). All plots were drawn with the ggplot2 package (54). Heatmaps

were created with the ComplexHeatmap package (55). The values of molecular weight for

detected proteins in proteomes were predicted with the Peptides package (56) to test possible

correlations with bEV size or gram type.

Comparison to fecal extracellular vesicle metaproteomic datasets

Peptide-level fecal EV proteome datasets (with protein identifications based on trEMBL) were

obtained from the PRIDE repository (accessions PXD045755 and PXD047510) (57, 58).

Peptides designated as human were removed. The remaining peptides were analyzed using

UniPept (59). We included only those peptides that could be assigned to the genera listed in

Table 2 (that is, assigned to the correct bacterial class and not assigned to another order, family,

or genus). Average relative intensities were then calculated for unique protein groups. Samples

with less than 10 identified protein groups were excluded from further analysis. Protein

localizations were predicted from the amino acid sequences available in Uniprot or Uniparc, as

described above.

Results

Morphological characteristics of bEVs

Extracellular vesicles were detected in samples of 12 bacterial species by both nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The NTA-based mean bEV diameters ranged from 146–178 nm in gram-positive bacteria and 104–247 nm in gram-negative bacteria (Table 2). The bEV diameters were typically smaller by TEM in comparison to NTA measurements.

Based on TEM, most bEVs were likely composed of a single membrane (Fig. 1). A lipid bilayer approximately 8–10 nm thick was visible in most gram-negative bEVs, as well as in *Limosilactobacillus reuteri* and *Turicibacter sanguinis*. In the other samples, the bilayer structure was less distinct. A vesicle with double bilayer membranes was observed in *Enterobacter cloacae*. *Veillonella magna* displayed two types of bEVs: large, crumpled vesicles and small, rounded vesicles. In *Streptococcus salivarius*, most objects appeared as chain-like structures with a diameter of 20–25 nm (see top right of the image), compatible with the chains of very small vesicles previously reported in *S. pneumoniae* (60). Electron-dense material was observed in *Bacteroides fragilis, Bifidobacterium longum* sp. *suis, Enterococcus faecalis,* and *Akkermansia muciniphila* bEVs, and as central foci inside *L. reuteri* vesicles.

In the other eight species, bEVs could not be unequivocally documented, and they were excluded from further analyses. NTA-based bEV concentrations were insufficient for TEM in *E. coli*, *Flavonifactor plautii*, *Floccifex porci*, *Lactobacillus amylovorus,* and *Sutterella parvirubra*. In *Holdemanella biformis* samples, the bEV concentration was not above the level of the negative controls. TEM did not reveal EV-like particles in *Collinsella aerofaciens* and *Clostridium leptum*. *C. aerofaciens* exhibited likely protein aggregates without obvious vesicle structure. In *C. leptum* samples, we only observed long fibers with diameters ranging from 2.5–3 nm in the TEM.

Table 2. Bacterial extracellular vesicle diameters (nm; mean ± STDEV) and concentrations (particles/ml; mean ± STDEV). NTA: nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA); TEM: transmission electron microscopy. Brain Heart Infusion broth (BHI) and deMan, Rogosa and Sharpe (MRS) culture media were used as negative controls. The Bacillota phylum was previously Firmicutes.

Phylum	Species	Gram	NTA diam.	TEM diam.	NTA concentration
Actinomycetota	*Bifidobacterium longum sp. suis*	+	131 ± 47	99 ± 56	$1.6 \times 10^{10} \pm 2.5 \times 10^{9}$
Bacillota	*Enterococcus faecalis*	+	146 ± 61	96 ± 34	$1.1 \times 10^{11} \pm 4.3 \times 10^{10}$
Bacillota	*Limosilactobacillus reuteri*	+	143 ± 55	110 ± 41	$2.6 \times 10^{10} \pm 8.5 \times 10^{9}$
Bacillota	*Streptococcus salivarius*	+	124 ± 53	65 ± 19	$1.9 \times 10^{9} \pm 5.1 \times 10^{8}$
Bacillota	*Faecalibacterium prausnitzii*	+	247 ± 105	70 ± 21	$1.7 \times 10^{12} \pm 2.9 \times 10^{11}$
Bacillota	*Peptostreptococcus russellii*	+	104 ± 39	73 ± 16	$2.3 \times 10^{10} \pm 1.9 \times 10^{10}$
Bacillota	*Turicibacter sanguinis*	+	134 ± 55	50 ± 13	$6.5 \times 10^{9} \pm 5.4 \times 10^{9}$
Bacillota	*Veillonella magna*	−	167 ± 66	74 ± 31	$4.2 \times 10^{11} \pm 1.9 \times 10^{11}$
Bacteroidota	*Bacteroides fragilis*	−	150 ± 63	56 ± 19	$7.1 \times 10^{9} \pm 2.1 \times 10^{9}$
Pseudomonadota	*Enterobacter cloacae*	−	146 ± 53	69 ± 21	$5.0 \times 10^{10} \pm 3.9 \times 10^{10}$
Verrucomicrobiota	*Akkermansia muciniphila*	−	178 ± 112	78 ± 24	$8.7 \times 10^{10} \pm 3.2 \times 10^{9}$
Fusobacteria	*Fusobacterium nucleatum sp. animalis*	−	150 ± 64	85 ± 24	$1.9 \times 10^{10} \pm 1.5 \times 10^{10}$
BHI control			138 ± 63	NA	$1.4 \times 10^{9} \pm 1.8 \times 10^{9}$
MRS control			130 ± 61	NA	$6.0 \times 10^{8} \pm 9.2 \times 10^{7}$

Figure 1. Transmission electron microscopy of extracellular vesicles from gram-positive (+) and gram-negative bacteria (−). Scale bars: 100 nm.

Protein content of bEVs and association of protein diversity with vesicle size

Using high-resolution LC-MS/MS, we identified 17–1297 bacterial proteins per species. These comprised 43–92% of the total MS/MS signal intensity; the remainder were animal proteins most likely derived from the culture media (Table 3). The numbers of identified bacterial proteins were associated with the NTA-measured EV concentrations (Spearman $\rho = 0.59$, $p = 0.049$). In samples with EV concentrations above 2×10^{10} particles/ml (Table 2), the identified bacterial proteins covered 15–49% of the reference proteomes of each species and constituted >85% of all identified proteins and >50% of the total MS/MS intensity (Table 3). In samples with lower EV concentrations, the protein coverages were lower; however, even for *F. nucleatum*, we were able to detect low-abundance proteins down to 0.3% of the total bacterial protein intensity.

The diversity of bacterial proteins (as measured by the numbers of abundant protein orthogroups) was significantly associated with NTA-measured EV diameters (Spearman $\rho = 0.67$; $p = 0.025$).

Table 3. Number of identified bacterial proteins.

Species	Number of bacterial proteins identified	% of the total number of proteins in samples	% of reference proteome	% of total MS/MS protein intensity
B. longum	63	50	3	9
E. faecalis	1269	92	46	94
L. reuteri	580	87	28	51
S. salivarius	80	46	4	15
F. prausnitzii	1297	94	49	91
P. russellii	526	90	31	50
T. sanguinis	30	43	1	65
V. magna	388	90	20	84
B. fragilis	324	68	8	29
E. cloacae	779	88	15	86
A. muciniphila	512	86	24	76
F. nucleatum	17	63	1	29

Predicted subcellular localizations of bEV proteins

The bacterial proteins identified in gram-positive bEV samples were predicted to be localized in the cytoplasmic membrane, cytoplasm, extracellular space, and cell wall (in the order of median relative abundances; Fig. 2). Gram-negative bEV samples contained proteins from the outer membrane, cytoplasm, extracellular space, periplasm and cytoplasmic membrane. In *F. nucleatum* bEVs, periplasmic and extracellular proteins were not observed, possibly due to the low number of identified proteins.

V. magna bEVs contained a larger share of cytoplasmic membrane and periplasmic proteins than the other gram-negative species, in terms of MS/MS signal intensity (Fig. 2A). Cytoplasmic proteins were relatively abundant in *A. muciniphila* and *F. nucleatum* bEVs. *S. salivarius* and *Peptostreptococcus russellii* bEVs contained a lower share of cytoplasmic membrane proteins compared to other gram-positive species. In *S. salivarius*, >60% of the total intensity consisted of four very abundant glucan-modifying enzymes predicted to be extracellular.

The shares of cytoplasmic membrane, cytoplasmic, and periplasmic proteins were generally higher in all species based on the number of identified proteins than by protein intensity (Fig. 2). This indicates a higher diversity of proteins in these compartments in comparison to the extracellular space, cell wall and outer membrane.

Figure 2. Predicted subcellular localizations of bacterial extracellular vesicle proteins. (A) relative MS/MS intensities; (B) relative numbers of identified proteins.

Predicted functions of bEV proteins

The most prevalent protein functional categories included cell wall/membrane/envelope biogenesis; nutrient transport and metabolism (especially carbohydrates, amino acids, and lipids); energy production and conversion; and translation, ribosomal structure, and biogenesis (Fig. 3). Proteins for RNA and DNA processing were observed in most species. There were no major differences in the predicted protein functional categories of gram-positive and gram-negative bEVs.

Phage proteins were detected in bEVs of several species (Fig. 3). In *E. cloacae*, we observed a high abundance of P2-type temperate phage proteins, with a major capsid protein among the top

10 most abundant bEV proteins. Also in *L. reuteri*, a major capsid protein was among the most

abundant proteins (>10% of the total bacterial protein intensity).

Many of the bEV proteins could not be assigned to a functional category. Among these, the *F.*

prausnitzii protein WP_015537825.1 (microbial anti-inflammatory molecule, MAM) and the *A.*

muciniphila proteins WP_197738471.1 (Amuc_1100), and WP_012420447.1 (Amuc_1409) are

known to mediate host-microbe interactions (61).

Figure 3. Predicted functions of bEV proteins. The heatmap shows the quantile-normalized
total MS/MS intensities of clusters of orthologous groups (COG) functional categories.
298

Correlations between bEV proteome compositions, phylogeny and gram type

The bEV proteome compositions primarily reflected phylogenetic relationships between the

bacterial species (Fig. 4). The *V. magna* proteome grouped with the other Bacillota (Firmicutes)

despite the difference in gram type. The cophenetic correlation coefficient between the

proteomic and phylogenetic trees was 0.46, indicating a moderate positive correlation between

bEV protein composition and bacterial phylogeny. The Fowlkes-Mallows index showed

significant non-random similarity between two trees in four out of nine numbers of clusters (two

to five clusters); the similarity was random only in one case with nine clusters. Most of the

protein orthogroups detected in more than one species (60% of all orthogroups) were shared

between gram-positive and gram-negative species. However, *B. longum* of the Actinomycetota

grouped with Bacillota, possibly indicating effects of gram type.

The *F. nucleatum* proteome was not included in these phylogenetic analyses due to the small

number of identified proteins.

Figure 4. bEV proteome compositions and phylogenetic relationships. (A) nMDS ordination using Euclidean distance matrix of proteome composition (Stress = 0.1). Replicate samples are shown. For some of the species, replicates were pooled to increase LC-MS/MS intensity. The dotted line shows the species of the Bacillota (Firmicutes) phylum. (B) Comparison of proteome composition tree based on bEV protein similarity (complete linkage, non-binary Jaccard distances) and the NCBI common phylogeny tree, which reflects the expected evolutionary relationships derived from nucleotide sequence data. Tree branch colors indicate phyla; connector line colors indicate gram type.

Conserved and abundant bEV proteins

Conserved protein orthogroups were defined as those present in at least five gram-positive species and in four gram-negative species. We identified 14 orthogroups that were conserved in bEVs from both gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria (Fig. 5A). These were predominantly cytoplasmic proteins (Fig. 5B). Glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH), elongation factor Tu (Ef-Tu), DNA-directed RNA polymerase subunit beta, and several ribosomal proteins had the highest median MS/MS signal intensities. Although these proteins were abundant in some species, the medians were all below 2% of total MS/MS intensity.

An additional 29 orthogroups were conserved in gram-positive bEVs only (Fig. 5A). Among all the proteins conserved in gram-positive bEVs, the most abundant were GAPDH, Ef-Tu and PBP1A family penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs).

Eighteen orthogroups were conserved in gram-negative bEVs only. The most abundant among all the proteins conserved in gram-negative bEVs included TonB-dependent receptor, S41 family peptidase, GAPDH, DNA-directed RNA polymerase, and some ribosomal proteins. TonB-dependent receptor, BamA/TamA family outer membrane protein assembly factors, and the 30S ribosomal protein S14 were found exclusively in gram-negative bEVs.

Figure 5. Conserved bEV proteins. A. A heatmap of normalized MS/MS intensities of bEV proteins conserved in gram-positive or gram-negative bacteria. B. The predicted subcellular localizations for bEV proteins conserved in gram-positive bacteria, gram-negative bacteria, and across all species (as relative numbers of identified proteins).

We assessed the ten most abundant proteins in each species. A majority of them were species-
specific, with only a small proportion shared across several species (Fig. 6A). The top 10
proteins accounted for 21–94% of the total MS/MS signal intensity per species and were often
predicted to be involved in cell envelope biogenesis, carbohydrate processing or translation;
however, in many cases, the functions of these proteins are unknown.

In *V. magna*, the most abundant protein was a cobalt chelatase involved in vitamin B_{12}
production (Fig. 6A). In *L. reuteri*, the abundant proteins were mostly related to ATP synthesis.
A. muciniphila bEVs were abundant in chaperonin GroEL, while in *B. longum*, the PBP1A
protein dppA accounted for over 23% of total bacterial protein intensity. *T. sanguinis* bEVs were
abundant in DNA repair proteins and *P. russellii* bEVs in oxidative stress proteins. Phage
components were among the ten most abundant bEV proteins in *L. reuteri* and *E. cloacae*. In *T.*
sanguinis, >20% of total bacterial protein intensity consisted of a single cytoplasmic membrane
protein with unknown function.

In gram-positive bEVs, the majority of the most abundant proteins were predicted to be localized
in the cytoplasm, cytoplasmic membrane, or the extracellular space (Fig. 6B). In gram-negatives,
the most abundant proteins were in outer membrane and cytoplasm, followed by periplasm and
the extracellular space (Fig. 6B).

Figure 6. Most abundant bEV proteins. A. Quantile-normalized abundances of proteins which were among the 10 most abundant in at least one bacterial species. B. Predicted subcellular localizations for the most abundant bEV proteins in gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria (as relative numbers of identified proteins).

Comparison to previously published bEV data

We compared our data to previously published *in vitro* bEV proteomics data (available for five species) and fecal EV metaproteomics data (two datasets in which sufficient numbers of peptides could be assigned at the genus level). The bacterial strains and culture media used in the *in vitro* studies differed, except for *E. cloacae*, which was the same strain.

In *B. longum,* the subcellular distribution of bEV proteins was similar, despite the difference in the number of identified proteins (63 in our data versus 552 in the previous study) (Fig. 7A) (31). The intensity shares of the major protein functional categories (>5%) were also similar, except for defense mechanisms and the posttranslational modification functional category, which were much less abundant in our data (Fig. 7B).

There was also a high degree of similarity in protein subcellular localizations and functional categories in the *E. faecalis* protein datasets (Fig. 7A) (62). With >1100 identified proteins in both datasets, all functional categories with an intensity above 5% matched between the two datasets. The differences in the categories of posttranslational modifications and defense mechanisms were mainly the result of a few individual proteins having higher intensity in either dataset, while the number of proteins per category was similar.

For *B. fragilis,* the protein subcellular localizations were relatively similar, with a higher proportion of proteins in the outer membrane and fewer in the periplasmic space in our data (Fig. 7A) (27). There was also a good match of functional annotations, with some exceptions (Fig. 7B). Carbohydrate transport and metabolism had a lower total number of proteins in our dataset but contained one protein with very high relative intensity (34%) that was not present in the previously published dataset. In the category of amino acid transport, the previously published dataset had only a slightly higher number of proteins, but several of them had higher individual intensities than the sum intensity of all these proteins in our dataset.

E. cloacae datasets showed the largest variation in protein localizations between our data and previously published data (Fig. 7A) (63). The share of outer membrane proteins was much higher in our data, and extracellular proteins were lower. The functional annotations were similar with two major exceptions (Fig. 7B): cell motility proteins were much more abundant in the previously published dataset, due to the very high intensity (50%) of the flagellin FliC. The cell wall/membrane/envelope biogenesis category was much more abundant in our data, with several outer membrane proteins (Omp) comprising >40% of total intensity.

For *F. nucleatum*, we detected a smaller number of proteins than in the previously published

dataset (17 versus 98) (64). The share of cytoplasmic proteins was higher and outer membrane

proteins lower in our data (Fig. 7A). The relative intensities of several of the functional

categories also differed, albeit several with lower intensity still had similar levels in both datasets

(Fig. 7B). Major differences in the categories cell motility-intracellular trafficking and

posttranslational modification, both consisting of only a few proteins in each dataset, were due to

vastly higher intensities of one or two proteins.

In the fecal EV metaproteomics data, the localizations of proteins assigned to the genus

Faecalibacterium (57, 58) were quite similar to our *F. prausnitzii* data, although the fecal data

had a higher share of extracellular proteins (Fig. 7A). The fecal *Bacteroides* proteomes (57, 58)

contained fewer cytoplasmic and periplasmic proteins than both *in vitro* datasets; this may be in

part because conserved proteins often cannot be assigned to a specific genus and were therefore

omitted in our analysis. We did not compare the functional annotations to the fecal EV

metaproteomics datasets, as species-level annotation was not possible.

Figure 7. Comparison of predicted subcellular localizations (A) and functions (B) of bEV proteins in our data (UH) and previously published data (LIT; literature). *B. longum (31), E. faecalis* (62), the *Faecalibacterium* genus in fecal metaproteomics data 1 & 2 (57, 58), *B. fragilis* (27), the *Bacteroides* genus in fecal metaproteomics data 1 & 2 (57, 58), *F. nucleatum (64), E. cloacae* (63).

Discussion

We characterized the extracellular vesicle proteomes of 12 commensal bacterial species,

representing the six major phyla of the mammalian intestinal microbiota. Predicted protein

functions suggest possible roles for commensal bEVs in nutrient processing and host immune

system modulation. We identified conserved proteins that may be used as markers for

differentiating bacterial versus host EVs. Of note, this is the first report of bEVs secreted by *V.*

magna, representing an exceptional class of gram-negative Bacillota (Firmicutes), as well as for

T. sanguinis and *P. russellii*. We provide the first publicly available proteome of *F. prausnitzii*

EVs.

The structures and proteomes of bEVs from gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria reflected

the distinct architectures of their parent cells (1). In gram-positive bacteria, a thick peptidoglycan

cell wall surrounds the cytoplasmic membrane. They secrete cytoplasmic membrane vesicles

(CMVs) by membrane blebbing or explosive cytoplasmic membrane vesicles (ECMVs) by

bubbling cell death, through holes degraded in the cell wall (1). In our data, gram-positive bEVs

were often irregularly shaped and contained proteins primarily localized to the cytoplasmic

membrane and cytoplasm, with varying amounts of extracellular and cell wall proteins.

Gram-negative bacteria have a cytoplasmic membrane and an outer membrane separated by a

periplasmic space containing a thin peptidoglycan layer. Here, bEV biogenesis by blebbing

produces two types of vesicles: outer membrane vesicles (OMVs), which have a single

membrane and periplasmic cargo, but no cytoplasmic cargo; and outer-inner membrane vesicles

(OIMVs) with a double membrane and cytoplasmic material. Biogenesis by explosive cell lysis

generates explosive OMVs (EOMVs) and explosive OIMVs (EOIMVs), both containing

cytoplasmic material, with EOIMVs having more than one vesicle in a larger vesicle (1). In our

data, the gram-negative bEVs were mostly spherical with a distinct bilayer membrane, and

contained outer membrane, cytoplasmic, extracellular, periplasmic and cytoplasmic membrane

proteins. The high share of cytoplasmic proteins suggests biogenesis by explosive cell lysis; thus,

the gram-negative bEVs were likely a mixture of EOMVs and OMVs in most cases. *A.*

muciniphila samples had a very high abundance of cytoplasmic proteins, in agreement with a

previous report (21).

V. magna may produce EVs from both the outer membrane and the cytoplasmic membrane:

electron micrographs showed two different types of single-membrane vesicles, and the samples

contained equal shares of outer membrane and cytoplasmic membrane proteins. This is

unexpected, as gram-negative bacteria are not known to secrete vesicles composed solely of

cytoplasmic membrane (1). This warrants further research on EV biogenesis mechanisms in

Negativicutes. In *E. cloacae* bEVs, a rare double membrane vesicle was observed, consistent

with a previous report (63). Electron-dense material was observed in *B. fragilis* and *A.*

muciniphila bEVs, and as central foci in *L. reuteri* bEVs, possibly representing cytoplasmic

components (65).

bEV diameters did not show marked differences between gram types or taxa. They were largely

consistent with previous studies, including *B. fragilis* (18), *E. cloacae* (63), *S. salivarius* (66), *B.*

longum (5)*, E. faecalis* (67), *L. reuteri* (68) and *A. muciniphila* (69). Our *F. prausnitzii* bEVs

were larger than those reported by Ye et al. (70), which may be due to technical factors such as

isolation and purification methods or potential strain differences (71). Electron microscopy

typically showed smaller bEV sizes compared to NTA. This may be because NTA measures the

hydrodynamic diameters rather than exact membrane-bound dimensions, the lower sensitivity of

NTA to small particles, or the shrinkage during the EM fixation (72, 73).

Our proteomics data likely covers most of the major bEV proteins, even in the species with the

lowest vesicle yields. A 100-nm bEV is expected to contain approximately 4000 protein

molecules, based on consensus estimates of cytoplasmic and membrane protein concentrations

(74-76). In all proteomes with >60 identified proteins, the intensity ratio of the most abundant vs.

least abundant proteins was above 4000, implying that theoretically, we detected down to one

molecule per a vesicle. The bEV proteomes with >500 identified proteins covered 15–50% of the

reference genomes. However, this represents the pooled proteome of a large number of vesicles,

and a single vesicle would probably contain a smaller number of detected proteins. If only

proteins with relative intensity above 1/4000 are considered (theoretically representing the

protein packaging capacity of a single 100-nm vesicle), the genome coverage was 4–16%. As

expected, bEVs with larger diameters were associated with higher diversities of abundant

proteins.

Functional annotation of bEV proteomes revealed abundant cell envelope-modifying proteins,

suggesting involvement in vesicle biogenesis by blebbing. Peptidoglycan biosynthesis and

remodeling proteins were present in both gram-positive and gram-negative bEVs, and included

Mur ligases and transferases, penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs), and MreB-C rod-shape

determining proteins (77, 78). These have been previously reported for bEVs of *E. cloacae* (79)

and several other species (80). Bacterial growth and division involve the synthesis of new

peptidoglycan and the degradation of old peptidoglycan by hydrolases (78, 81). This creates weakened regions that permit the membrane to bleb from the cell (2, 82). The enrichment of the peptidoglycan biosynthesis and remodeling proteins at sites of active cell wall turnover promotes their incorporation into bEVs (78).

Phage-mediated bEV biogenesis has been demonstrated in gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria (1, 83, 84). We identified phage proteins and the recombinase A (RecA) in bEVs from *E. cloacae, L. reuteri*, *A. muciniphila*, *F. prausnitzii*, *E. faecalis,* and *V. magna*. Major capsid proteins were abundant in *E. cloacae* and *L. reuteri* bEVs; small amounts of phage holins were detected in these species and *F. prausnitzii*. Genotoxic stress can activate RecA, which induces the expression of lytic genes such as endolysins and holins from prophages. Holins create holes in the cytoplasmic membrane, allowing endolysins to access and weaken the peptidoglycan layer. This promotes vesicle biogenesis by bubbling cell death in gram-positive bacteria or cell lysis in gram-negative bacteria (83-87). Phage proteins were reported in *E. cloacae* and *E. faecalis* bEVs previously (63, 79).

Nutrient metabolism and transport proteins were the most common functional group in almost all species, and were often highly abundant. Cobalt chelatase, which is involved in vitamin B_{12} metabolism, was abundant in bEVs of *V. magna* and *F. prausnitzii*. These enzymes provide vitamin B_{12} to other microbes and the host (88). GAPDH, the key glycolytic enzyme with additional roles in iron uptake and membrane trafficking (75, 76, 101), was present in bEVs from most species. Glycoside hydrolases were abundant in *S. salivarius* bEVs and present in lower amounts in other species. They break down complex polysaccharides, providing nutrients for both the producing bacteria and other microbes (11, 89, 90). ABC transporters responsible for the transport of iron, oligopeptides, and amino acids across membranes (10, 91) were abundant in *B. longum* and widely detected across species. TonB-dependent receptors, which facilitate the uptake and delivery of nutrients (10, 92), were found in the bEVs of all gram-negative species. SusC/RagA and SusD/RagB family nutrient uptake outer membrane proteins, involved in the uptake of complex polysaccharides (93), were exclusively detected in *B. fragilis* bEVs.

The bEV proteomes of all species included known immunomodulators (61). The elongation factor EF-Tu has cell surface moonlighting functions in adhesion and immune system modulation (94). It was detected in bEVs from nine species and was particularly abundant in *E. faecalis* and *P. russellii*. The OmpA outer membrane porin family of commensal bacteria can promote intestinal homeostasis by inducing IL-22 (95). They were present in all gram-negative

bEV samples, with high abundances in *E. cloacae* and *B. fragilis*. The *F. prausnitzii* microbial anti-inflammatory molecule (MAM) downregulates NF-κB signaling in epithelial cells (96, 97). The chaperonin/heat shock protein GroEL, known for its immunoregulatory activity (98), was especially abundant in *A. muciniphila* bEVs. The *A. muciniphila* bEVs also contained less abundant proteins that have been reported to modulate gut barrier integrity (99), epithelial stem cells (100) and GLP-1 secretion (101).

The functions of many abundant bEV proteins are unknown, especially in *T. sanguinis*, *F. prausnitzii*, and *B. fragilis*. This limits our understanding of the potential roles of bEVs and encourages experimental studies on these proteins.

The bEV proteome compositions primarily reflected phylogenetic relationships of the producing bacteria. This was especially evident in the *V. magna* bEV proteome, which clustered with other Bacillota bEVs despite the difference in gram type. Thus, bEVs largely inherit the proteome compositions of their parent cells, regardless of the differences in biogenesis mechanisms. This suggests the majority of proteins were loaded into bEVs non-selectively.

To identify potential markers differentiating bEVs from host EVs, we assessed for conserved bEV proteins. Although the majority of the abundant bEV proteins were species-specific, we detected 14 orthologous proteins in the bEVs of most gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria. These were primarily predicted to be cytoplasmic, and as such, not ideal as universal bEV markers, since OMVs of gram-negative bacteria lack cytoplasmic proteins (1). The most abundant of the broadly conserved bEV proteins included Ef-Tu, GAPDH, DNA-directed RNA polymerase subunit beta, and certain ribosomal proteins. EF-Tu is listed among the top 50 most conserved bEV proteins deposited in the EVpedia database (102) and may be partially localized on the cell surface (94). GAPDH has been proposed as a target for vaccines against bacterial infections due to its abundance, partial membrane localization, involvement in virulence, and limited homology with host GAPDH (103). The 30S ribosomal protein S4 was found in most bacterial species and does not have mitochondrial orthologues present in animal EVs.

TonB-dependent receptor was the most prevalent outer-membrane protein and is a potential marker for gram-negative bEVs. BamA/TamA family outer membrane protein and 30S ribosomal protein S14 were also exclusively detected in gram-negative bEVs, although less abundant. PBP1A is a potential marker for gram-positive bEVs, although related proteins were also present in some gram-negative bEVs.

bEV proteomes are likely affected by experimental methods, bacterial growth conditions, and the

strain of the producing bacteria (1). However, the predicted localization patterns of proteins

observed in our study were consistent with those reported in the literature, including *in vitro*

bEVs from *F. nucleatum* (64), *B. fragilis* (27), and *E. faecalis* (62), as well as *Bacteroides* and

Faecalibacterium proteomes extracted from fecal EV metaproteomes (57, 58). This suggests that

the types of bEVs obtained from different experimental procedures, growth conditions, and

bacterial strains are reproducible. The lower proportion of cytoplasmic proteins detected in the

fecal bEV data may be attributed to their conserved nature, which prevents the assignment of

peptides to specific taxa.

There was also a general similarity in the predicted functions between our proteomic data and

previously published *in vitro* data. This was particularly evident in *E. faecalis* bEVs, with both

studies detecting large numbers of proteins (62). In other species, observed differences were

mostly due to individual proteins present at highly different intensities. For example, our *B.*

fragilis data included a highly abundant outer membrane protein with unknown function that was

absent in the previous study (27).

In some species, we detected fewer proteins compared to the literature datasets, likely due to low

bEV concentrations. *B. longum* bEVs contained considerably fewer proteins in our study (31).

This probably affected the detection of proteins of the smaller functional categories, although the

intensity shares of the subcellular localizations and the major functional categories were similar.

For *F. nucleatum* bEVs, despite differences in culture media, strain, and the very low number of

identified proteins in our dataset, there were similarities in both cellular localization patterns and

the distribution of protein functional categories (64).

Limitations of the work

The culture conditions were not optimized for each species, as we used a standardized protocol,

and the growth phases of the cultures were not controlled. These may affect the yields, types, and

compositions of bEVs (104). The observed bEV concentrations probably do not indicate the EV

production capacity of these species *in vivo*. In bEV extraction, we used a 0.22 μm filter, which

may have excluded some of the larger bEVs, but it was necessary to reliably remove bacterial

cells. Protein amounts injected in LC-MS/MS were not equalized, as we aimed for maximal

resolution for each species. The number of identified bacterial proteins is therefore not directly

comparable between species, but the relative ratios of the subcellular localizations and main
functional categories can be compared.

Conclusions

Our study provides an overview of commensal bEV proteomes across the major phyla of the
mammalian intestinal microbiota.

The bEV compositions reflected the envelope structures of gram-positive and gram-negative
bacteria. The gram-negative Bacillota *V. magna* (and possibly other Negativicutes) may have an
exceptional ability to produce both outer membrane and cytoplasmic membrane vesicles.
Peptidoglycan modifying enzymes observed in several species and bacteriophage proteins very
abundant in *E. cloacae* and *L. reuteri,* probably mediate bEV biogenesis.

Commensal bEVs are likely involved in nutrient metabolism and transport as well as in the
modulation of the host immune system. The functions of many abundant bEV proteins are
unknown.

Elongation factor Tu and GAPDH are potential generic markers for bEVs. TonB-dependent
receptors and PBP1A may be used as markers for gram-negative and gram-positive bEVs,
respectively.

Our comparison to previous bEV studies suggests that bEV structures and their proteomic
profiles are largely reproducible, despite differences in bacterial growth conditions, bEV
isolation protocols, and analysis methods.

Author contributions

RNM: data analysis (lead), visualization (supporting), writing (lead). **AM**: proteomics and NTA data analysis (lead), visualization (lead), writing (supporting). **TPM**: data analysis and writing (supporting). **MK**: TEM and NTA data analysis and writing (supporting). **JM:** proteomics laboratory analysis (supporting), writing (supporting) **MS**: proteomics laboratory analysis (lead), writing (supporting). **MH**: bacterial strains (supporting), writing (supporting). **AK**: metaproteomics data analysis (supporting), writing (supporting). **SM:** methodology and writing (supporting). **JR:** resources, conceptualization and writing (supporting). **TRL**: resources and writing (supporting). **TAN**: proteomics laboratory analysis (lead), proteomics data analysis and writing (supporting). **MN**: conceptualization, funding acquisition, methodology, resources, supervision, writing (lead), data analysis, visualization (supporting).

Acknowledgments

We thank chief laboratory technician Kirsi Lahti for performing bacterial culture, and Dr. Ulla Hynönen, Dr. Silja Åvall-Jääskeläinen, Dr. Kaisa Hiippala, Dr. Reetta Satokari and prof. Willem de Vos for expert consultation. We acknowledge the services of the University of Helsinki: the EV Core Facility in Viikki for EV isolation and NTA analysis, the HiPREP Core in the FIMM Technology Centre supported by HiLIFE and Biocenter Finland for electron microscopy, the Electron Microscopy Unit of the Institute of Biotechnology for providing the facilities, the Clinical Microbiology Laboratory of the Veterinary Teaching Hospital (YESLAB) for the MALDI identifications of the *in vitro* cultured bacteria, and the DNA Sequencing and Genomics Laboratory (supported by HiLIFE and Biocenter Finland funding), Institute of Biotechnology for DNA sequencing.

Mass spectrometry-based proteomic analyses were performed by the Proteomics Core Facility, Department of Immunology, University of Oslo/Oslo University Hospital, which is supported by the Core Facilities program of the South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority. The core facility is a member of the National Network of Advanced Proteomics Infrastructure (NAPI), funded by the Research Council of Norway INFRASTRUKTUR-program (project number: 295910).

Disclosure of interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

References

1. Toyofuku M, Schild S, Kaparakis-Liaskos M, Eberl L. Composition and functions of bacterial membrane vesicles. Nature reviews Microbiology. 2023;21(7):415-30. doi: 10.1038/s41579-023-00875-5.

2. Schwechheimer C, Kuehn MJ. Outer-membrane vesicles from Gram-negative bacteria: biogenesis and functions. Nature reviews Microbiology. 2015;13(10):605-19. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3525.

3. Brown L, Wolf JM, Prados-Rosales R, Casadevall A. Through the wall: extracellular vesicles in Gram-positive bacteria, mycobacteria and fungi. Nature reviews Microbiology. 2015;13(10):620-30. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3480.

4. Tarashi S, Zamani MS, Omrani MD, Fateh A, Moshiri A, Saedisomeolia A,… Kubow S. Commensal and pathogenic bacterial-derived extracellular vesicles in host-bacterial and interbacterial dialogues: two sides of the same coin. Journal of Immunology Research. 2022;2022(1):8092170. doi: 10.1155/2022/8092170.

5. Morishita M, Sagayama R, Yamawaki Y, Yamaguchi M, Katsumi H, Yamamoto A. Activation of Host Immune Cells by Probiotic-Derived Extracellular Vesicles via TLR2-Mediated Signaling Pathways. Biological & pharmaceutical bulletin. 2022;45(3):354-9. doi: 10.1248/bpb.b21-00924.

6. Beveridge TJ. Structures of gram-negative cell walls and their derived membrane vesicles. Journal of bacteriology. 1999;181(16):4725-33. doi: 10.1128/JB.181.16.4725-4733.1999.

7. Liu Y, Defourny KAY, Smid EJ, Abee T. Gram-positive bacterial extracellular vesicles and their impact on health and disease. Frontiers in microbiology. 2018;9:1502. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.01502.

8. Díaz-Garrido N, Badia J, Baldomà L. Microbiota-derived extracellular vesicles in interkingdom communication in the gut. J Extracell Vesicles. 2021;10(13):e12161. doi: 10.1002/jev2.12161.

9. Gul L, Modos D, Fonseca S, Madgwick M, Thomas JP, Sudhakar P,… Korcsmaros T. Extracellular vesicles produced by the human commensal gut bacterium Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron affect host immune pathways in a cell-type specific manner that are altered in inflammatory bowel disease. Journal of Extracellular Vesicles. 2022;11(1):e12189. doi: 10.1002/jev2.12189.

10. Juodeikis R, Carding SR. Outer membrane vesicles: biogenesis, functions, and issues. Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews : MMBR. 2022;86(4):e00032-22. doi: 10.1128/mmbr.00032-22.

11. Rakoff-Nahoum S, Coyne MJ, Comstock LE. An ecological network of polysaccharide utilization among human intestinal symbionts. Current Biology. 2014;24(1):40-9. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2013.10.077.

12. Erttmann SF, Swacha P, Aung KM, Brindefalk B, Jiang H, Härtlova A, . . . Gekara NO. The gut microbiota prime systemic antiviral immunity via the cGAS-STING-IFN-I axis. Immunity. 2022;55(5):847-61. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2022.04.006.

13. Li M, Lee K, Hsu M, Nau G, Mylonakis E, Ramratnam B. Lactobacillus-derived extracellular vesicles enhance host immune responses against vancomycin-resistant enterococci. BMC microbiology. 2017;17(1):1-8. doi: 10.1186/s12866-017-0977-7.

14. Fábrega M-J, Rodríguez-Nogales A, Garrido-Mesa J, Algieri F, Badía J, Giménez R,… Baldomà L. Intestinal anti-inflammatory effects of outer membrane vesicles from Escherichia coli Nissle 1917 in DSS-experimental colitis in mice. Frontiers in Microbiology. 2017;8:1274. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2017.01274.

15. Hiippala K, Barreto G, Burrello C, Diaz-Basabe A, Suutarinen M, Kainulainen V,… Eklund KK. Novel Odoribacter splanchnicus strain and its outer membrane vesicles exert immunoregulatory effects in vitro. Frontiers in microbiology. 2020;11:575455. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.575455.

16. Seo MK, Park EJ, Ko SY, Choi EW, Kim S. Therapeutic effects of kefir grain Lactobacillus-derived extracellular vesicles in mice with 2,4,6-trinitrobenzene sulfonic acid-induced inflammatory bowel disease. Journal of Dairy Science. 2018;101(10). doi: 10.3168/jds.2018-15014.

17. Alvarez C-S, Badia J, Bosch M, Giménez R, Baldomà L. Outer membrane vesicles and soluble factors released by probiotic Escherichia coli Nissle 1917 and commensal ECOR63 enhance barrier function by regulating expression of tight junction proteins in intestinal epithelial cells. Frontiers in microbiology. 2016;7:1981. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.01981.

18.   Gilmore WJ, Johnston EL, Bitto NJ, Zavan L, O'Brien-Simpson N, Hill AF, Kaparakis-Liaskos M. Bacteroides fragilis outer membrane vesicles preferentially activate innate immune receptors compared to their parent bacteria. Frontiers in Immunology. 2022;13:970725. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2022.970725.

19.   Liu C, Yazdani N, Moran CS, Salomon C, Seneviratne CJ, Ivanovski S, Han P. Unveiling clinical applications of bacterial extracellular vesicles as natural nanomaterials in disease diagnosis and therapeutics. Acta Biomaterialia. 2024;180. doi: 10.1016/j.actbio.2024.04.022.

20.   Humaira, Ahmad I, Shakir HA, Khan M, Franco M, Irfan M. Bacterial extracellular vesicles: potential therapeutic applications, challenges, and future prospects. Journal of Basic Microbiology. 2024;64(10):e2400221. doi: 10.1002/jobm.202400221.

21.   Zhao S, Xiang J, Abedin M, Wang J, Zhang Z, Zhang Z,… Xiao J. Characterization and Anti-Inflammatory Effects of Akkermansia muciniphila-Derived Extracellular Vesicles. Microorganisms. 2025;13(2):464. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms13020464.

22.   Zheng T, Hao H, Liu Q, Li J, Yao Y, Liu Y,… Yi H. Effect of extracelluar vesicles derived from Akkermansia muciniphila on intestinal barrier in colitis mice. Nutrients. 2023;15(22):4722. doi: 10.3390/nu15224722.

23.   Chelakkot C, Choi Y, Kim D-K, Park HT, Ghim J, Kwon Y,… Gho YS. Akkermansia muciniphila-derived extracellular vesicles influence gut permeability through the regulation of tight junctions. Experimental & molecular medicine. 2018;50(2):e450-e. doi: 10.1038/emm.2017.282.

24.   Chen Y, Ou Z, Pang M, Tao Z, Zheng X, Huang Z,… Chen P. Extracellular vesicles derived from Akkermansia muciniphila promote placentation and mitigate preeclampsia in a mouse model. Journal of Extracellular Vesicles. 2023;12(5):12328. doi: 10.1002/jev2.12328.

25.   Hong M-G, Song E-J, Yoon HJ, Chung W-H, Seo HY, Kim D,… Kim SI. Clade-specific extracellular vesicles from Akkermansia muciniphila mediate competitive colonization via direct inhibition and immune stimulation. Nature Communications. 2025;16(1):2708. doi: 10.1038/s41467-025-57631-x.

26.   Ashrafian F, Shahriary A, Behrouzi A, Moradi HR, Keshavarz Azizi Raftar S, Lari A,… Khatami S. Akkermansia muciniphila-derived extracellular vesicles as a mucosal delivery vector for amelioration of obesity in mice. Frontiers in microbiology. 2019;10:2155. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2019.02155.

27.   Zakharzhevskaya NB, Vanyushkina AA, Altukhov IA, Shavarda AL, Butenko IO, Rakitina DV,… Kulikov EE. Outer membrane vesicles secreted by pathogenic and nonpathogenic Bacteroides fragilis represent different metabolic activities. Scientific reports. 2017;7(1):5008. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-05264-6.

28.   Chen C, He Y-Q, Gao Y, Pan Q-W, Cao J-S. Extracellular vesicles of Bacteroides fragilis regulated macrophage polarization through promoted Sema7a expression. Microbial Pathogenesis. 2024;187:106527. doi: 10.1016/j.micpath.2023.106527.

29.   Ferreira TG, Trindade CNdR, Bell P, Teixeira-Ferreira A, Perales JE, Vommaro RC,… Ferreira EdO. Identification of the alpha-enolase P46 in the extracellular membrane vesicles of Bacteroides fragilis. Memorias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz. 2018;113(3):178-84. doi: 10.1590/0074-02760170340.

30.   Nishiyama K, Takaki T, Sugiyama M, Fukuda I, Aiso M, Mukai T,… Okada N. Extracellular vesicles produced by Bifidobacterium longum export mucin-binding proteins. Applied and environmental microbiology. 2020;86(19):e01464-20. doi: 10.1128/AEM.01464-20.

31.   Mandelbaum N, Zhang L, Carasso S, Ziv T, Lifshiz-Simon S, Davidovich I,… Cooks T. Extracellular vesicles of the Gram-positive gut symbiont Bifidobacterium longum induce immune-modulatory, anti-inflammatory effects. npj Biofilms and Microbiomes. 2023;9(1):30. doi: 10.1038/s41522-023-00400-9.

32.   Stentz R, Jones E, Juodeikis R, Wegmann U, Guirro M, Goldson AJ,… Brown IR. The proteome of extracellular vesicles produced by the human gut bacteria Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron in vivo is influenced by environmental and host-derived factors. Applied and Environmental Microbiology. 2022;88(16):e00533-22. doi: 10.1128/aem.00533-22.

33.   Yu MSC, Chiang DM, Reithmair M, Meidert A, Brandes F, Schelling G,… Zenner C. The proteome of bacterial membrane vesicles in Escherichia coli—a time course comparison study in two different media. Frontiers in Microbiology. 2024;15:1361270. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2024.1361270.

34.   Van Deun J, Mestdagh P, Agostinis P, Akay Ö, Anand S, Anckaert J,… Consortium E-T. EV-TRACK:
transparent reporting and centralizing knowledge in extracellular vesicle research. Nature Methods.
2017;14(3):228-32. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.4185.
35.   König E, Sali V, Heponiemi P, Salminen S, Valros A, Junnikkala S, Heinonen M. Herd-level and
individual differences in fecal lactobacilli dynamics of growing pigs. Animals. 2021;11(1):113. doi:
10.3390/ani11010113.
36.   Puhka M, Nordberg ME, Valkonen S, Rannikko A, Kallioniemi O, Siljander P, Af Hällström TM.
KeepEX, a simple dilution protocol for improving extracellular vesicle yields from urine. European journal
of pharmaceutical sciences. 2017;98:30-9. doi: 10.1016/j.ejps.2016.10.021.
37.   Cox J, Mann M. MaxQuant enables high peptide identification rates, individualized p.p.b.-range
mass accuracies and proteome-wide protein quantification. Nature Biotechnology. 2008;26(12):1367-
72. doi: 10.1038/nbt.1511.
38.   Yu NY, Wagner JR, Laird MR, Melli G, Rey S, Lo R,… Foster LJ. PSORTb 3.0: improved protein
subcellular localization prediction with refined localization subcategories and predictive capabilities for
all prokaryotes. Bioinformatics. 2010;26(13):1608-15. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btq249.
39.   Moreno J, Nielsen H, Winther O, Teufel F. Predicting the subcellular location of prokaryotic
proteins with DeepLocPro. Bioinformatics. 2024;40(12):btae677. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btae677.
40.   Cantalapiedra CP, Hernández-Plaza A, Letunic I, Bork P, Huerta-Cepas J. eggNOG-mapper v2:
functional annotation, orthology assignments, and domain prediction at the metagenomic scale.
Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2021;38(12):5825-9. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msab293.
41.   Törönen P, Holm L. PANNZER—a practical tool for protein function prediction. Protein Science.
2022;31(1):118-28. doi: 10.1002/pro.4193.
42.   Szczerbiak P, Szydlowski LM, Wydmański W, Renfrew PD, Koehler Leman J, Kosciolek T. Large
protein databases reveal structural complementarity and functional locality. bioRxiv. 2024:2024-08.
43.   Marchler-Bauer A, Bo Y, Han L, He J, Lanczycki CJ, Lu S,… Gonzales NR. CDD/SPARCLE: functional
classification of proteins via subfamily domain architectures. Nucleic acids research. 2017;45(D1):D200-
D3. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkw1129.
44.   Emms DM, Kelly S. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative genomics.
Genome biology. 2019;20(1):1-14. doi: 10.1186/s13059-019-1832-y.
45.   Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu DI, Hu Y, Law CW, Shi W, Smyth GK. limma powers differential
expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. Nucleic acids research. 2015;43(7):e47-
e. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkv007.
46.   Larsson J. eulerr: Area-Proportional Euler and Venn Diagrams with Ellipses. R package version
7.0.2; 2024.
47.   Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D,… Solymos P. vegan:
Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-6. 2019.
48.   Galili T. dendextend: an R package for visualizing, adjusting and comparing trees of hierarchical
clustering. Bioinformatics. 2015;31(22):3718-20. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btv428.
49.   Shimodaira H. Approximately unbiased tests of regions using multistep-multiscale bootstrap
resampling. The Annals of Statistics. 2004;32(6). doi: 10.1214/009053604000000823.
50.   Suzuki R, Shimodaira H. Pvclust: an R package for assessing the uncertainty in hierarchical
clustering. Bioinformatics. 2006;22(12):1540-2. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btl117.
51.   Schliep KP. phangorn: phylogenetic analysis in R. Bioinformatics. 2011;27(4):592-3. doi:
10.1093/bioinformatics/btq706.
52.   Fowlkes EB, Mallows CL. A method for comparing two hierarchical clusterings. Journal of the
American statistical association. 1983;78(383):553-69. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1983.10478008.
53.   Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ. The comparison of dendrograms by objective methods. Taxon. 1962;11(2):33-
40. doi: 10.2307/1217208.
54.   Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis: Springer-Verlag New York; 2016.
55.   Gu Z. Complex heatmap visualization. Imeta. 2022;1(3):e43. doi: 10.1002/imt2.43.
56.   Osorio D, Rondón-Villarreal P, Torres R. Peptides: a package for data mining of antimicrobial
peptides. The R Journal. 2015;7(1):4-14. doi: 10.32614/RJ-2015-001.

57.   Kaisanlahti A, Turunen J, Byts N, Samoylenko A, Bart G, Virtanen N,… Reunanen J. Maternal
microbiota communicates with the fetus through microbiota-derived extracellular vesicles. Microbiome.
2023;11(1):249. doi: 10.1186/s40168-023-01694-9.
58.   Mishra S, Tejesvi MV, Hekkala J, Turunen J, Kandikanti N, Kaisanlahti A,… Reunanen J. Gut
microbiome-derived bacterial extracellular vesicles in patients with solid tumours. Journal of Advanced
Research. 2025;68:375-86. doi: 10.1016/j.jare.2024.03.003.
59.   Vande Moortele T, Devlaminck B, Van de Vyver S, Van Den Bossche T, Martens L, Dawyndt P,…
Verschaffelt P. Unipept in 2024: Expanding Metaproteomics Analysis with Support for Missed Cleavages
and Semitryptic and Nontryptic Peptides. Journal of Proteome Research. 2025;24(2):949-54. doi:
10.1021/acs.jproteome.4c00848.
60.   Mehanny M, Koch M, Lehr C-M, Fuhrmann G. Streptococcal extracellular membrane vesicles are
rapidly internalized by immune cells and alter their cytokine release. Frontiers in immunology.
2020;11:80. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2020.00080.
61.   Balint D, Brito IL. Human-gut bacterial protein-protein interactions: understudied but impactful
to human health. Trends in Microbiology. 2024;32(4):325-32. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2023.09.009.
62.   Costantini PE, Vanpouille C, Firrincieli A, Cappelletti M, Margolis L, Ñahui Palomino RA.
Extracellular vesicles generated by gram-positive bacteria protect human tissues ex vivo from HIV-1
infection. Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology. 2022;11:822882. doi:
10.3389/fcimb.2021.822882.
63.   Bhar S, Edelmann MJ, Jones MK. Characterization and proteomic analysis of outer membrane
vesicles from a commensal microbe, Enterobacter cloacae. Journal of proteomics. 2021;231:103994. doi:
10.1016/j.jprot.2020.103994.
64.   Liu J, Hsieh C-L, Gelincik O, Devolder B, Sei S, Zhang S,… Chang Y-F. Proteomic characterization of
outer membrane vesicles from gut mucosa-derived fusobacterium nucleatum. Journal of proteomics.
2019;195:125-37. doi: 10.1016/j.jprot.2018.12.029.
65.   Pérez-Cruz C, Delgado L, López-Iglesias C, Mercade E. Outer-inner membrane vesicles naturally
secreted by gram-negative pathogenic bacteria. PLoS one. 2015;10(1):e0116896. doi:
10.1371/journal.pone.0116896.
66.   Kulig K, Kowalik K, Surowiec M, Karnas E, Barczyk-Woznicka O, Zuba-Surma E,… Karkowska-
Kuleta J. Isolation and characteristics of extracellular vesicles produced by probiotics: yeast
Saccharomyces boulardii CNCM I-745 and bacterium Streptococcus salivarius K12. Probiotics and
Antimicrobial Proteins. 2024;16(3):936-48. doi: 10.1007/s12602-023-10085-3.
67.   Ma RY, Deng ZL, Du QY, Dai MQ, Luo YY, Liang YE,… Zhao WH. Enterococcus faecalis extracellular
vesicles promote apical periodontitis. Journal of Dental Research. 2024;103(6):672-82. doi:
10.1177/00220345241230867.
68.   Dean SN, Leary DH, Sullivan CJ, Oh E, Walper SA. Isolation and characterization of Lactobacillus-
derived membrane vesicles. Scientific reports. 2019;9(1):877. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-37120-6.
69.   Kang C-s, Ban M, Choi E-J, Moon H-G, Jeon J-S, Kim D-K,… Kim Y-K. Extracellular Vesicles Derived
from Gut Microbiota, Especially Akkermansia muciniphila, Protect the Progression of Dextran Sulfate
Sodium-Induced Colitis. PLoS ONE. 2013 Oct 24;8(10). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0076520.
70.   Ye L, Wang Y, Xiao F, Wang X, Li X, Cao R,… Zhang T. F. prausnitzii-derived extracellular vesicles
attenuate experimental colitis by regulating intestinal homeostasis in mice. Microbial cell factories.
2023;22(1):235. doi: 10.1186/s12934-023-02243-7.
71.   Rodovalho VdR, da Luz BSR, Nicolas A, Jardin J, Briard-Bion V, Folador EL,… Azevedo VAdC.
Different culture media and purification methods unveil the core proteome of Propionibacterium
freudenreichii-derived extracellular vesicles. Microlife. 2023;4:uqad029. doi: 10.1093/femsml/uqad029.
72.   Van der Pol E, Coumans FAW, Grootemaat AE, Gardiner C, Sargent IL, Harrison P,… Nieuwland R.
Particle size distribution of exosomes and microvesicles determined by transmission electron
microscopy, flow cytometry, nanoparticle tracking analysis, and resistive pulse sensing. Journal of
Thrombosis and Haemostasis. 2014;12(7):1182-92. doi: 10.1111/jth.12602.

73. Noble JM, Roberts LM, Vidavsky N, Chiou AE, Fischbach C, Paszek MJ,… Kourkoutis LF. Direct comparison of optical and electron microscopy methods for structural characterization of extracellular vesicles. Journal of structural biology. 2020;210(1):107474. doi: 10.1016/j.jsb.2020.107474.

74. Dolgalev GV, Safonov TA, Arzumanian VA, Kiseleva OI, Poverennaya EV. Estimating total quantitative protein content in Escherichia coli, Saccharomyces cerevisiae, and HeLa Cells. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2023;24(3):2081. doi: 10.3390/ijms24032081.

75. Milo R. What is the total number of protein molecules per cell volume? A call to rethink some published values. Bioessays. 2013;35(12):1050-5. doi: 10.1002/bies.201300066.

76. Wishart DS, et al. E. coli Statistics. Escherichia coli Metabolome Database. 2025.

77. Galinier A, Delan-Forino C, Foulquier E, Lakhal H, Pompeo F. Recent advances in peptidoglycan synthesis and regulation in bacteria. Biomolecules. 2023;13(5):720. doi: 10.3390/biom13050720.

78. Miyachiro MM, Contreras-Martel C, Dessen A. Penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs) and bacterial cell wall elongation complexes. Macromolecular protein complexes II: structure and function. 2019:273-89. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-28151-9_8.

79. Afonina I, Tien B, Nair Z, Matysik A, Lam LN, Veleba M,… Wenk M. The composition and function of Enterococcus faecalis membrane vesicles. Microlife. 2021;2:uqab002. doi: 10.1093/femsml/uqab002.

80. Briaud P, Carroll RK. Extracellular vesicle biogenesis and functions in gram-positive bacteria. Infection and immunity. 2020;88(12):10-1128. doi: 10.1128/iai.00433-20.

81. Deatherage BL, Lara JC, Bergsbaken T, Barrett SLR, Lara S, Cookson BT. Biogenesis of bacterial membrane vesicles. Molecular microbiology. 2009;72(6):1395-407. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2009.06731.x.

82. Toyofuku M, Nomura N, Eberl L. Types and origins of bacterial membrane vesicles. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2019;17(1):13-24. doi: 10.1038/s41579-018-0112-2.

83. da Silva Barreira D, Lapaquette P, Novion Ducassou J, Couté Y, Guzzo J, Rieu A. Spontaneous Prophage Induction Contributes to the Production of Membrane Vesicles by the Gram-Positive Bacterium Lacticaseibacillus casei BL23. mBio. 2022;13(5):e02375-22. doi: 10.1128/mbio.02375-22.

84. Baeza N, Delgado L, Comas J, Mercade E. Frontiers | Phage-Mediated Explosive Cell Lysis Induces the Formation of a Different Type of O-IMV in Shewanella vesiculosa M7T. Frontiers in Microbiology. 2021/10/08;12. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2021.713669.

85. Turnbull L, Toyofuku M, Hynen AL, Kurosawa M, Pessi G, Petty NK,… Shimoni R. Explosive cell lysis as a mechanism for the biogenesis of bacterial membrane vesicles and biofilms. Nature communications. 2016;7(1):11220. doi: 10.1038/ncomms11220.

86. Toyofuku M, Zhou S, Sawada I, Takaya N, Uchiyama H, Nomura N. Membrane vesicle formation is associated with pyocin production under denitrifying conditions in P seudomonas aeruginosa PAO 1. Environmental Microbiology. 2014;16(9):2927-38. doi: 10.1111/1462-2920.12260.

87. Cahill J, Young R. Phage lysis: multiple genes for multiple barriers. Advances in virus research. 2019;103:33-70. doi: 10.1016/bs.aivir.2018.09.003.

88. Juodeikis R, Jones E, Deery E, Beal DM, Stentz R, Kräutler B,… Warren MJ. Nutrient smuggling: Commensal gut bacteria-derived extracellular vesicles scavenge vitamin B12 and related cobamides for microbe and host acquisition. Journal of Extracellular Biology. 2022;1(10):e61. doi: 10.1002/jex2.61.

89. Tian C-m, Yang M-f, Xu H-m, Zhu M-z, Zhang Y, Yao J,… Li D-f. Emerging role of bacterial outer membrane vesicle in gastrointestinal tract. Gut Pathogens. 2023;15(1):20. doi: 10.1186/s13099-023-00543-2.

90. Elhenawy W, Debelyy MO, Feldman MF. Preferential packing of acidic glycosidases and proteases into Bacteroides outer membrane vesicles. mBio. 2014;5(2):10-1128. doi: 10.1128/mBio.00909-14.

91. Köster W. ABC transporter-mediated uptake of iron, siderophores, heme and vitamin B12. Research in microbiology. 2001;152(3-4):291-301. doi: 10.1016/s0923-2508(01)01200-1.

92. Bolam DN, van den Berg B. TonB-dependent transport by the gut microbiota: novel aspects of an old problem. Current opinion in structural biology. 2018;51:35-43. doi: 10.1016/j.sbi.2018.03.001.

93.   Pollet RM, Martin LM, Koropatkin NM. TonB-dependent transporters in the Bacteroidetes:
unique domain structures and potential functions. Molecular Microbiology. 2021;115(3):490-501. doi:
10.1111/mmi.14683.
94.   Harvey KL, Jarocki VM, Charles IG, Djordjevic SP. The diverse functional roles of elongation factor
Tu (EF-Tu) in microbial pathogenesis. Frontiers in microbiology. 2019;10:2351. doi:
10.3389/fmicb.2019.02351.
95.   Wang Y, Ngo VL, Zou J, Gewirtz AT. Commensal bacterial outer membrane protein A induces
interleukin-22 production. Cell reports. 2024;43(6). doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2024.114292.
96.   Quévrain E, Maubert MA, Michon C, Chain F, Marquant R, Tailhades J,… Pigneur B. Identification
of an anti-inflammatory protein from Faecalibacterium prausnitzii, a commensal bacterium deficient in
Crohn's disease. Gut. 2016;65(3):415-25. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2014-307649.
97.   Auger S, Kropp C, Borras-Nogues E, Chanput W, Andre-Leroux G, Gitton-Quent O,… Langella P.
Intraspecific diversity of microbial anti-inflammatory molecule (MAM) from Faecalibacterium prausnitzii.
International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2022;23(3):1705. doi: 10.3390/ijms23031705.
98.   Al-Nedawi K, Mian MF, Hossain N, Karimi K, Mao YK, Forsythe P,… Bienenstock J. Gut commensal
microvesicles reproduce parent bacterial signals to host immune and enteric nervous systems. The
FASEB Journal. 2015;29(2):684-95. doi: 10.1096/fj.14-259721.
99.   Post SE, Brito IL. Structural insight into protein–protein interactions between intestinal
microbiome and host. Current Opinion in Structural Biology. 2022;74:102354. doi:
10.1016/j.sbi.2022.102354.
100.   Kang E-J, Kim J-H, Kim YE, Lee H, Jung KB, Chang D-H,… Lee C-H. The secreted protein
Amuc_1409 from Akkermansia muciniphila improves gut health through intestinal stem cell regulation.
Nature Communications. 2024;15(1):2983. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-47275-8.
101.   Yoon HS, Cho CH, Yun MS, Jang SJ, You HJ, Kim J-h,… Lee K. Akkermansia muciniphila secretes a
glucagon-like peptide-1-inducing protein that improves glucose homeostasis and ameliorates metabolic
disease in mice. Nature microbiology. 2021;6(5):563-73. doi: 10.1038/s41564-021-00880-5.
102.   Kim DK, Kang B, Kim OY, Choi Ds, Lee J, Kim SR,… Jang SC. EVpedia: an integrated database of
high-throughput data for systemic analyses of extracellular vesicles. Journal of extracellular vesicles.
2013;2(1):20384. doi: 10.3402/jev.v2i0.20384.
103.   Perez-Casal J, Potter AA. Glyceradehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase as a suitable vaccine
candidate for protection against bacterial and parasitic diseases. Vaccine. 2016;34(8):1012-7. doi:
10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.11.072.
104.   Zavan L, Bitto NJ, Johnston EL, Greening DW, Kaparakis-Liaskos M. Helicobacter pylori growth
stage determines the size, protein composition, and preferential cargo packaging of outer membrane
vesicles. Proteomics. 2019;19(1-2):1800209. doi: 10.1002/pmic.201800209.