Genome location dictates the transcriptional response to sub-inhibitory

concentrations of PolC-inhibitors in *Clostridium difficile*

Erika van Eijk[1,§], Ilse M. Boekhoud[1,2,3,§], Ed J. Kuijper[1,3], Ingrid M.J.G. Bos-Sanders[1] , George Wright[2], Wiep

Klaas Smits[1,2,3]*

[1] Department of Medical Microbiology, Center for Infectious Diseases, Leiden University Medical Center,

Leiden, the Netherlands; [2] Centre for Microbial Cell Biology, Leiden, the Netherlands; [3] Netherlands

Centre for One Health, the Netherlands; [4] Acurx Pharmaceuticals, White Plains, NY, USA

Running title: *C. difficile* response to PolC-inhibition

Key words: RNAseq, DNA polymerase inhibitor, gene dosage, marker frequency analysis, sigma factor B,

stress response, PolC

[§] EVE and IMB contributed equally to this study.

* Corresponding author: Department of Medical Microbiology, Leiden University Medical Center, PO Box

9600, 2300RC, Leiden, The Netherlands, phone: +31-71-526 1229, e-mail: w.k.smits@lumc.nl

ORCID: EVE: 0000-0003-3003-9822; IMB: 0000-0002-6579-7124; EJK: 0000-0001-5726-2405; IMJGBS:

N/A; GW: 0000-0002-5812-6533; WKS: 0000-0002-7409-2847

Abstract

Clostridium difficile is a potentially lethal gut pathogen that causes nosocomial and community acquired infections. Limited treatment options and reports of reduced susceptibility to current treatment emphasize the necessity for novel antimicrobials. The DNA-polymerase of gram-positive organisms is an attractive target for the development of antimicrobials. ACX362E (N^2-(3,4-Dichlorobenzyl)-7-(2-[1-morpholinyl]ethyl)guanine; MorE-DCBG) is a DNA polymerase inhibitor in pre-clinical development as a novel therapeutic against *C. difficile* infection. This synthetic purine shows preferential activity against *C. difficile* Pol IIIC over those of other organisms *in vitro* and is effective in an animal model of *C. difficile* infection. In this study we have determined its efficacy against a large collection of clinical isolates. At concentrations below the minimal inhibitory concentration, the presumed slowing (or stalling) of replication forks due to ACX362E leads to a growth defect. We have determined the transcriptional response of *C. difficile* to replication inhibition and observed an overrepresentation of up-regulated genes near the origin of replication in the presence of PolC-inhibitors, but not when cells were subjected to sub-inhibitory concentrations of other antibiotics. This phenomenon can be explained by a gene dosage shift, as we observed a concomitant increase in the ratio between origin-proximal versus terminus-proximal gene copy number upon exposure to PolC-inhibitors. Moreover, we show that certain genes differentially regulated under PolC-inhibition are controlled by the origin-proximal general stress response regulator sigma factor B. Together, these data suggest that genome location both directly and indirectly determines the transcriptional response to replication inhibition in *C. difficile*.

Background

Clostridium difficile (*Clostridioides difficile* (1)) is a gram-positive, anaerobic bacterium that can

asymptomatically colonize the intestine of humans and other mammals (2-4). However, when the

normal flora is disturbed *C. difficile* can overgrow and cause fatal disease, as has been dramatically

demonstrated in the Stoke Mandeville Hospital outbreaks in 2004 and 2005 (5). The ability to form

highly resistant endospores coupled to its extensive antibiotic resistance have contributed to its success

as a nosocomial and community acquired pathogen (2-4). Recent years have seen an increase in the

incidence and severity of *C. difficile* infections (CDI), due to the emergence of certain PCR ribotypes (3,

6). Antibiotic use is a well-established risk factor for CDI (7), and the emergence of the epidemic PCR

ribotype 027 has been linked to fluoroquinolone resistance (8). At present two antibiotics,

metronidazole and vancomycin are commonly used to treat CDI and a third, fidaxomicin, is indicated for

the treatment of relapsing CDI (9, 10). Clearly, limited treatment options and reports of reduced

susceptibility to current treatment (11-13) emphasize the necessity for the development of novel

antimicrobials and a better understanding of tolerance and resistance towards existing therapeutics.

It is increasingly realized that off-target effects that occur when cells are exposed to

antimicrobials can contribute to their efficacy, but also facilitate the emergence of tolerance and/or

resistance (14). Antimicrobials may act as signaling molecules which modulate gene expression (14).

Additionally, in particular those targeting DNA replication (such as polymerase inhibitors) can cause

transcriptional effects as a result of differences in gene dosage (15).

The polymerase of gram-positive organisms is an attractive target for the development of novel

antimicrobials (16). First, these PolC-type polymerases are absent from gram-negative organisms and

humans (17, 18). HPUra, one of the first such compounds, is therefore highly active against a wide range

of gram-positive bacteria, but does not affect gram-negative bacteria (17, 18). Template-directed

elongation is blocked by the inhibitor through simultaneous binding to the cytosine of the DNA strand

and near the active site of PolC. Second, compounds can be derived that have an increased specificity

towards specific microorganisms. ACX362E **(Figure 1)** is a compound in pre-clinical development as a

novel therapeutic against *C. difficile* as it is shows preferential activity against *C. difficile* PolC over those

of other organisms *in vitro* (19, 20). PolC-inhibitors can cause a stress response and cell death after

prolonged exposure. In *Bacillus subtilis*, this stress is characterized by a combination of DNA damage

(SOS) response, and an SOS-independent pathway dependent on the DNA replication initiator DnaA (21,

22). In *Streptococcus pneumoniae* cells, devoid of an SOS-response, competence for genetic

transformation is induced upon replication stress (23). The response of *C. difficile* to this particular class

of compounds is unknown.

In this study, we characterized aspects of the action of PolC-inhibitors towards *C. difficile*.

Minimal inhibitory concentrations for HPUra and ACX362E were determined using agar dilution for a

large collection of clinical isolates. Next, we investigated the effects of sub-inhibitory levels of PolC-

inhibitors on growth of *C. difficile* in liquid medium and performed RNAseq analyses to determine the

transcriptional response to PolC-inhibitors in our laboratory strain 630Δ*erm.* Finally, marker frequency

analysis and transcriptional reporters were used to provide a mechanistic explanation for the observed

up-regulation of origin-proximal genes under conditions of replication inhibition.

Results

ACX362E is a potent inhibitor of diverse clinical isolates of C. difficile

To date, reports on activity of PolC-inhibitors towards *C. difficile* are limited. For only 4 and 23 *C. difficile*

strains minimal inhibitory concentrations were published (19, 20), and no analysis was performed on

possible differences in efficacy between various phylogenetic groups (24, 25). Therefore, we assessed

the sensitivity of a diverse collection of *C. difficile* clinical isolates towards PolC-inhibitors and

determined if ACX362E was indeed superior to the general PolC–inhibitor HPUra.

HPUra and ACX362E were tested by the agar dilution method, according Clinical and Laboratory

Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines for testing of antimicrobial susceptibility of anaerobes (26, 27),

against 364 *C. difficile* clinical isolates collected earlier in the framework of a pan-European study (6, 28).

We found that ACX362E (MIC_{50}: 2 μg/ml; MIC_{90}: 4 μg/ml) demonstrates lower inhibitory

concentrations than the general gram-positive PolC-inhibitors HPUra (MIC_{50}: 16 μg/ml; MIC_{90}: 32 μg/ml)

(**Figure 2, Supplemental Table 1),** consistent with previous *in vitro* activities against purified PolC (19).

We observed no significant difference in ACX362E susceptibility between clades **(Table 1)** and the

different PCR ribotypes demonstrated a similar distribution in MIC values (data not shown). No

resistance against either one of the PolC-inhibitors was among the clinical isolates tested (N=363),

suggesting that resistance against PolC-inhibitors is rare or absent in *C. difficile*. In contrast, the gram-

negative obligate anaerobe *Bacteroides fragilis* was resistant to both polymerase inhibitors under the

conditions tested (MIC >265 μg/ml), as expected for an organism lacking PolC. The gram-positive

bacterium *Staphylococcus aureus*, which was included as a control for the activity of HPUra against this

group of bacteria (16, 29), was highly sensitive to both HPUra and ACX362E, with MIC values of 2 μg/mL

and 1 μg/mL, respectively.

We conclude that ACX362E is highly active against diverse clinical isolates of *C. difficile* and

resistance is not a concern in currently circulating strains.

Treatment with ACX362E leads to a pleiotropic transcriptional response

In order to determine the transcriptional response of PolC-inhibitors, we established the optimal

concentration of sub-MIC levels of both inhibitors which affected growth of *C. difficile* in liquid medium.

The laboratory strain *C. difficile* 630Δ*erm* (PCR ribotype 012, MLST Clade 1)(30, 31) was grown in

medium with varying amounts of HPUra (10-80 μg/mL) or ACX362E (0.25-8 μg/mL). We found that the

effect on growth was more prominent from 4 hours post inoculation (**Supplemental Figure 1**). The

growth kinetics of *C. difficile* under the influence of varying concentrations of HPUra was marginally

affected when using concentrations from 10-40 µg/ml, at approximately 80 percent of the non-treated

culture. Growth kinetics of cultures containing PolC-inhibitors ACX362E ≥ 1 µg/ml were similar and

resulted in about 30 percent reduced growth compared to the untreated culture. We note that

concentrations up to the MIC (as determined by agar dilution) did not lead to a complete growth arrest.

We found that growth was abolished at >2-fold MIC in liquid culture (data not shown). Such a difference

between MIC values from agar dilution and (micro)broth has been observed before (32).

Above, we established that growth of *C. difficile* is inhibited at sub-MIC concentrations of PolC-

inhibitors. Slowing down or stalling of replication forks might lead to a stressed state, as observed for

other organisms (22, 23). As nothing is known about the effect of replication inhibition on the physiology

of *C. difficile*, we determined the transcriptional response to replication inhibition by sub-MIC levels of

PolC-inhibitors through strand-specific RNA sequencing (RNA-Seq).

C. difficile 630Δ*erm* was grown for 5h in medium with HPUra (35 µg/mL) or ACX362E (4 µg/mL)

starting from an OD_{600} of 0.05 after which cells were harvested for RNA isolation. Purified RNA was

converted to cDNA and used for RNA-Seq as described in the Materials and Methods. For ACX362E, 722

genes were differentially expressed, of which 438 genes were up-regulated and 284 genes were down-

regulated. The number of differentially expressed genes in HPUra treated samples was approximately 2-

fold lower: 360, of which 124 genes were up-regulated and 236 genes were down-regulated. The full list

of differentially regulated genes is available as **Supplementary Table 2** and the top 10 of up- and down-

regulated genes are shown in **Table 2** (HPura) and **Table 3** (ACX362E). Here, we highlight three aspects

of the results.

First, we performed a Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA)(33) via the Genome2D web server

(34) using the locus tags of the differentially regulated genes (**Supplementary Table 1**) as input. Among

the genes up-regulated by ACX362E, there is a strong overrepresentation of those involved in

translation, ribosome structure and ribosome biogenesis. Not unexpectedly, also replication,

recombination and repair processes are affected. This suggests that genes from these pathways show a

coordinated response in the presence of ACX362E. Among the genes down-regulated in the presence of

ACX362E, the levels of significance for specific processes are generally much lower, suggesting that there

is a more heterogeneous response among genes from the same pathway. Nevertheless, metabolic

pathways (especially carbon metabolism and coenzyme A transfer) and tellurite resistance were found

to be significantly affected. Strikingly, a GSEA analysis on lists of genes that are differentially expressed

in the presence of HPUra revealed similar processes to be affected.

The findings from the GSEA analysis prompted us to evaluate the overlap in the lists of

differentially regulated genes between the ACX362E and HPUra datasets in more detail. If both

compounds act via a similar mechanism, we expect a conserved response. Indeed, we observe that

>90% of the genes that are up-regulated in the presence of HPUra compared to the non-treated

condition, are also identified as up-regulated in the presence of ACX362E (**Figure 3A**). Though the

overlap is not as strong for the down-regulated genes, we find that >30% of the genes affected by HPUra

are also identified as affected by ACX362E (**Figure 3B**). Notably, the directionality of the response is

conserved, as no genes were found to be up-regulated in one but down-regulated in the other

condition. Based on these observations, we believe that the differentially expressed genes identified in

this study are representative for a typical response to inhibition of PolC in *C. difficile*.

Finally, we related the changes in transcription to genome location. *C. difficile* has a single

circular chromosome and one origin of replication (*oriC*) from which the process of DNA replication

occurs bi-directionally towards the terminus (*terC*) (**Figure 4A**). Though neither *oriC* nor *terC* has been

definitively defined for *C. difficile*, it is assumed that *oriC* is located at or near *dnaA* (CD0001;

CD630DERM_RS00005). The terminus region is generally located at the inflection point of a GC skew ([G

- C]/[G + C]) plot. Such a plot places the *terC* region around 2.2Mb from CD0001, near the CD1931

(CD630DERM_RS10465) open reading frame (**Figure 4A**) (35). We noted that the differential expression

appeared to correlate with genome location (**Table 2, Table 3** and **Supplemental Table 2**): many of the

up-regulated genes have either low or high gene identifiers (CD numbers) indicative of an origin

proximal location and, conversely, many of the down-regulated genes appear to be located away from

oriC. Though this correlation is not absolute, we observed a clear trend when plotting the mean fold-

change against genome location for all genes (**Figure 4B**).

Overall, our data shows that inhibition of DNA replication by PolC-inhibitors causes a consistent

and pleiotropic transcriptional response that is at least in part is directly dictated by genome location.

Gene dosage shift occurs at sub-inhibitory concentration of ACX362E PolC-inhibitor

A possible explanation for the relative up-regulation of *oriC*-proximal genes and down-regulation of

terC-proximal genes is a gene dosage shift (36-38), due to the fact that PolC-inhibition slows down

replication elongation but does not prevent re-initiation of DNA replication (23, 39). To determine if this

in fact occurs in *C. difficile* when replication elongation is inhibited, we performed a marker frequency

analysis (MFA) to determine the relative abundance of an origin proximal gene relative to terminus

proximal gene on chromosomal DNA isolated from treated and untreated cells.

We designed qPCR probes against the CD0001 and CD1931 regions, representing *oriC* and *terC*,

respectively (31, 35). Using these probes, we could show that *C. difficile* demonstrates multi-fork

replication in exponential growth phase and that the MFA assay detects the expected decrease in

oriC:*terC* ratio when cells enter stationary growth phase (data not shown). Next, we analyzed the effects

of PolC-inhibitors on the *oriC*:*terC* ratio. When cells were treated with HPUra (35 µg/mL), the MFA

showed a modest increase in *oriC:terC* ratio of 2,6-fold compared to untreated cells. However, when

cells were treated with ACX362E (4 µg/ml), the MFA showed a >8-fold increase in the *oriC:terC* ratio

compared to untreated cells. In contrast, such an increase was not observed for cells treated with

metronidazole (0.25 ug/mL; a DNA damaging agent), fidaxomicin (0.00125 ug/mL; an RNA polymerase

inhibitor) or surotomycin (0.625 ug/mL; a cell-wall synthesis inhibitor) (**Figure 5**) or chloramphenicol (2

μg/mL; a protein synthesis inhibitor)(data not shown).

We conclude that inhibition of PolC-activity, but not the actions of any of the other tested

antimicrobials, leads to a gene dosage shift in *C. difficile*.

Origin proximal sigB *contributes to the transcriptional response*

Elegant work in *S. pneumoniae* has shown that the transcriptional response to replication inhibition can

also be affected by origin-proximal regulators that respond to the gene dosage effect (23). In *C. difficile*

the gene encoding the general stress response sigma factor σ^B (*sigB*, CD0011) is located close to the

origin of replication (40). We wondered whether this regulator contributes to the transcriptional effects

observed in our studies.

First, we compared the list of differentially regulated genes from our study (**Supplemental Table**

2) to those under the control of σ^B (41). In contrast to most anaerobic gram-positive organisms, *C.*

difficile encodes a homolog of the general stress response sigma factor, σ^B (40, 42). A transcriptome

analysis comparing *sigB* mutant versus wild type cells was recently published (41). Strikingly, we find

~40% of the genes (21/58) identified as involved in stress response under the control of σ^B to be

differentially expressed in our ACX362E dataset (**Supplemental Table 3**). Similarly, we observed that

7/20 (~35%) of the genes containing a transcriptional start site with a σ^B consensus sequence are

differentially expressed in our ACX362E dataset (**Supplemental Table 3**). These data suggest that the

response to DNA replication inhibition is at least partially dependent on σ^B.

Next, a *sigB* mutant was constructed using Allele-Coupled Exchange (43) as described in the

Materials and Methods. The chromosomal deletion of *sigB* and absence of σ^B protein was verified by

PCR and Western Blot, respectively (**Supplemental Figure 2**). To directly demonstrate a role for *sigB* in

the regulation of genes with altered transcription upon PolC-inhibition, we fused the predicted

promoter regions of selected genes to a secreted luciferase reporter (44) and evaluated luminescence in

wild type and *sigB* mutant backgrounds, after 5-hour growth in the presence and absence of 4 µg/mL

ACX362E. All genes tested demonstrated a significant increase in promoter activity in a wild type

background in the presence of ACX362E compared to the non-treated control, validating the results

from the RNA-Seq analysis (**Figure 6**). Three distinct patterns were observed. For CD0350 (encoding a

hypothetical protein) and CD3963 (encoding a putative peptidoglycan-binding exported protein) there

was virtually no expression in a *sigB* mutant background (**Figure 6A** and **B**). We conclude that these

genes are strictly dependent on σ^B for their expression under the conditions tested. CD3614 (encoding a

hypothetical protein) shows a basal level of expression, but no significant increase in transcription levels

in the presence of ACX362E in a *sigB* mutant background compared to the non-treated control (**Figure**

6C). This suggests that the transcriptional up-regulation under these conditions is σ^B dependent, and

indicates that the basal level of transcription observed is likely independent of σ^B. Finally, CD3412 (*uvrB*,

encoding a subunit of an excinuclease) shows reduced transcriptional up-regulation in ACX362E treated

cells compared to non-treated controls (**Figure 6D**). Thus, the transcription of this particular gene under

conditions of ACX362E exposure is brought about by both a σ^B-dependent and a σ^B-independent

regulatory pathway.

Together, these results demonstrate that *sigB* controls the expression of at least a subset of

genes that are up-regulated under PolC-inhibition

Discussion

Resistance to PolC-inhibitors and specificity of ACX362E

Limited treatment options and reports of reduced susceptibility to current treatment (11, 12, 45)

emphasize the necessity for the development of novel antimicrobials. More broadly, reducing the

widespread and prolonged use of vancomycin, first-line therapy of severe CDI (9, 10), may also

contribute in minimizing the risk of inducing and shedding of vancomycin-resistant enterococci and

staphylococci (19, 20). As CDI can be induced by use of broad spectrum antibiotics (7), new

antimicrobials ideally should only target *C. difficile*, thereby maintaining integrity of the colonic

microbiota. In this study, we have tested inhibitors HPUra and ACX362E which specifically target the

PolC enzyme, essential for DNA replication. The majority of PolC-inhibitors target gram-positive bacteria

with low G+C content, but ACX362E has been reported to demonstrate increased specificity towards *C.*

difficile PolC *in vitro* and showed promising results for the efficacy *in vivo* based on a limited set of *C.*

difficile strains (19, 20). In our study, we have tested HPUra and ACX362E against a large collection of

clinical isolates consisting of many PCR ribotypes. We have established that ACX362E demonstrated

lower inhibitory concentrations than the general gram-positive PolC-inhibitor HPUra. The MIC_{50} and

MIC_{90} of ACX362E are similar to those of antimicrobials commonly used to treat *C. difficile* infection

(metronidazole: MIC_{50} = 2 ug/mL and MIC_{90} = 4 ug/mL; vancomycin MIC_{50} = 2 ug/mL and MIC_{90} = 4 ug/mL

(20); fidaxomicin = MIC_{50} = 0.125 ug/mL and MIC_{90} = 0.5 ug/mL (46)). We did not detect a significant

difference in MICs between clades and ribotypes, demonstrating that PolC-inhibitors have the potential

to be used as treatment for the majority - if not all - circulating *C. difficile* strains. This includes the

epidemic types of PCR ribotype 027 and 078 (8, 47). These results are in line with other work that

demonstrated only 2- to 4-fold differences in antimicrobial susceptibility between different clades for

metronidazole, fidaxomicin and semi-synthetic thiopeptide antibiotic LFF571 (28). Importantly, we did

not find any strains resistant to either HPUra or ACX362E. PolC-inhibitors are competitive inhibitors of

polymerase activity by binding in the active site. Mutations that abolish binding of HPUra or ACX362E

are likely to affect the essential enzymatic activity of the polymerase and for that reason unlikely to

occur *in vivo*. A single mutation (*azp-12*) has been described in *B. subtilis* that confers resistance to

HPUra (48). This T>G transversion results in the replacement of a serine with an alanine in the highly

conserved PFAM07733 domain of the polymerase (49). To our knowledge, it is unknown whether this

mutation prevents binding of HPUra to PolC of *B. subtilis*. Few other mutations have been described that

confer resistance against other PolC-inhibitors (50, 51). It will be of interest to see if similar mutations in

C. difficile result in resistance to HPUra and/or ACX362E and what the effect on binding of these

compounds to *C. difficile* PolC is.

In our experiments, we included *S. aureus* as a control for the activity of HPUra against gram-

positive bacteria. Surprisingly, we found that *S. aureus* was highly sensitive to both HPUra and ACX362E

and even more so than *C. difficile*. The reasons for this sensitivity are unknown. If ACX362E targets DNA

replication in *S. aureus*, we would also expect to find an increase in *oriC:terC* ratio upon ACX362E

exposure in this organism. It is conceivable that ACX362E also targets PolC of *S. aureus* and if so, this

information could be used to further characterize the interaction of ACX362E with PolC. Alternatively,

ACX362E may also affect the activity of the other PolIII-type polymerase, DnaE, in *S. aureus*. PolIII-

inhibitors can affect PolC, DnaE or both (51), though *in vivo* activity appears to correlate with PolC-

inhibition. Both C*. difficile* and *S. aureus* possess PolC and DnaE polymerase, but the DnaE enzymes are

of different families (DnaE1 in *C. difficile* and DnaE3 in *S. aureus*). The phylogenetic split coincides with

the taxonomic division as DnaE3-polymerases are found in the class Bacilli (which includes *S. aureus*),

whereas the DnaE1 polymerase are present in the classes Clostridia and Negativicutes (52). To test

whether a difference in activity of ACX362E towards different DnaE-type polymerases explain the

increased sensitivity of *S. aureus* compared to *C. difficile*, the activity of ACX362E towards purified DnaE

and PolC from both organisms should be determined. Finally, ACX362 may have off-target effects in *S.*

aureus unrelated to its replication-inhibitory activity.

Though it is clear that ACX362E inhibits *C. difficile* efficiently and shows limited activity towards

certain other anaerobes (19), these findings highlight the necessity to perform additional (microbiome)

studies to more clearly define the antimicrobial spectrum of this compound. It also shows that ACX362E

may have therapeutic potential outside treatment of CDI.

Regulators of the transcriptional response to PolC-inhibitors

The present study is the first to describe the transcriptional response of *C. difficile* to inhibition of DNA

replication. We find that ~200 genes show differential expression under conditions of PolC-inhibition by

both HPUra and ACX362E, when compared to non-treated cells (**Supplemental Table 2, Figure 3**). When

considering only ACX362E, approximately 13% of all genes in the genome show statistically significant

altered transcription. We demonstrate that this large reprogramming of transcription is likely to be

caused directly by a gene dosage shift (**Figure 4 and 5**).

In addition to direct effects, it is conceivable that at least part of the transcriptional response is

indirect. Our list of differentially regulated genes includes several putative regulators; sigma factors

(including *sigE*, *sigG* and *sigH*), transcription factors and anti-terminators. The relatively long time (5h) at

sub-MIC levels of antimicrobials may have contributed to secondary effects, through one or more of

these regulators. Though shorter induction times are thought to provoke more compound-specific

responses (53), we did observed a highly consistent transcriptional signature with both HPUra and

ACX362E (**Supplemental Table 2**, **Figure 3**).

Major stress response pathways are poorly characterized in *C. difficile*. On the basis of

experiments in other organisms (21-23, 54-56), we expect that inhibition of DNA replication inhibition

might possibly induce an SOS response (LexA)(57), a DnaA-dependent transcriptional response (21),a

heat shock response (HrcA/CtsR)(58) and/or a general stress response (σ^B)(42). Of these, the best

characterized stress response pathway in *C. difficile* is the one governed by σ^B (41). We noted a

significant overlap in putatively σ^B-dependent genes and those differentially expressed upon exposure

to PolC-inhibitors (**Supplemental Table 2**). In addition, our luciferase reporter fusions directly implicate

sigB in the expression and/or up-regulation of some of these (**Figure 6**). It should be noted that the *sigB*-

operon itself was not differentially expressed. This phenomenon has been observed before, and is

attributed to a transient up-regulation of *sigB* followed by a persistent response of σ^B-dependent gene

expression (58-60). In our experiment, cells were grown for 5h at sub-MIC levels of inhibitors, making it

unlikely that altered *sigB* transcription would still be detected. Though we do not favor this hypothesis,

σ^B activity might alternatively be regulated post-translationally.

To date, no genes have been identified that are regulated by DnaA in *C. difficile* and direct

regulation of genes through the other stress response pathways has not been demonstrated. Putative

LexA-regulated genes of *C. difficile* were identified *in silico* (61) and some of these (such as the *uvr*

excinuclease and 30S ribosomal protein S3) were differentially expressed in our dataset (**Supplemental**

Table 2). Indeed, we find that only part of the transcriptional up-regulation of *uvrB* as a result of

ACX362E exposure could be explained by *sigB* (**Figure 6D**), and LexA-dependent regulation might play a

role. Pleiotropic phenotypes have been described for a *C. difficile lexA* mutant (62) and it is likely that

other LexA targets than those identified *in silico* exist. No mutants of *hrcA* or *ctsR* have been described

for *C. difficile*, but transcriptome and proteome analyses have been performed with heat shocked cells

(42°C (60), or 41°C (59, 63, 64)). Similarities between these datasets and ours include genes encoding

proline racemase (*prdF*), chaperones (*groEL*, *groES*), thioredoxin systems (*trxA*, *trxB*) and Clp-proteases

(*clpC*, *clpP*).

Many parameters (such as the medium used, cell density, concentration of antibiotics, and

protocol used to arrest transcription between cell harvest and lysis) can influence overall transcription

signatures, and can also govern an incomplete overlap between our data and the stress regulons

determined by others (53).

Genome location contributes to the transcriptional response to PolC-inhibition

Our analysis of differential regulation in relation to genome location revealed a striking pattern of

relative up-regulation for *oriC*-proximal genes, and down-regulation for *terC*-proximal genes under

conditions of PolC inhibition (**Figure 4**). Antimicrobials directed at DNA replication in bacteria have a

profound negative effect on the processivity of replication forks, though initiation of DNA replication is

not or only marginally affected (23, 39). As a consequence, the presence of multiple replication forks

simultaneously increases the copy numbers of genes located in close proximity of the origin of

replication and such a gene dosage differences can result in functionally relevant transcriptional

differences, either directly or indirectly (15). We found an increase of *oriC:terC* ratio when performing

MFA on chromosomal DNA of cells subjected to a sub-inhibitory concentration of ACX362E (and HPUra,

albeit less pronounced) (**Figure 5**), consistent with findings in other organisms (23).

An example of direct regulation by gene dosage can be found in *Vibrio*, for instance, where the

location of ribosomal protein clusters close to the origin is crucial for fast growth, because increased

copy number under condition of multi-fork replication allows for higher expression levels (65). We note

that ribosomal gene clusters are up-regulated when DNA replication is inhibited in our experiments

(**Table 2**, **Table 3**, **Supplemental Table 2**), suggesting that a similar mechanism may be active in *C.*

difficile.

An example of indirect regulation as a result of gene dosage is the induction of competence

genes in *S. pneumoniae* (23). Competence is believed to be a stress response in this organism, that lacks

a canonical (σ^B-dependent) stress response pathway. Key regulatory genes for competence

development are located close to the origin, and replication inhibition therefore leads to the induction

of origin distal competence genes (23). In our experiments, the large overlap with the proposed σ^B

regulon (41), the origin proximal location of the *sigB* operon (8.5kb-10kb)(40) and the σ^B-dependence of

selected differentially expressed genes suggests that at least part of the transcriptional response to

PolC-inhibition can be explained by an indirect gene dosage effect. The positioning of stress-response

regulators close to *oriC* may therefore be a conserved strategy in bacteria to respond to DNA replication

insults that is independent of the nature of the regulator.

Though it is likely that an increase in gene copy number leads to an increase in transcription of

these genes, it is less clear whether this is the case for the observed down-regulation. Most methods of

normalization for transcriptome analyses are based on the assumption that there is no overall change in

transcription or that the number of transcripts per cells is the same for all conditions and this may not

be the case when a global copy number shift occurs (15). Absolute transcript levels for down-regulated

genes might therefore be similar under both conditions (but lower relative to *oriC*-proximal transcripts).

It is interesting that certain processes are highly enriched in the list of genes up-regulated under

conditions of PolC-inhibition (most notably ribosome function and DNA-related functions), whereas this

is less so for the down-regulated genes. This suggests that pathways susceptible to replication

dependent gene-dosage effects demonstrate a functional clustering of genes near *oriC*, whereas

clustering of genes from specific pathways in the *terC*-proximal region is less pronounced. Indeed, most

ribosomal gene clusters in *C. difficile* are located close to the origin of replication (31, 40) and also many

genes involved in DNA replication and repair are located in these regions. Consistent with this,

positioning of genes involved in transcription and translation close to the origin appears to be under

strong selection as such genomes tend to be more stable (66).

In conclusion, both direct and indirect effects of gene dosage shifts are likely to contribute to the

transcriptional response of *C. difficile* to replication inhibition.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial strains and culture conditions

Plasmids and bacterial strains used in this study can be found in **Table 4**. Note that this table only

contains laboratory strains; the clinical isolates used for the agar dilution experiments (see below) are

listed in **Supplemental Table 1**. *E. coli* was cultured aerobically at 37°C (shaking at 200 rpm) in Luria-

Bertani (LB) broth supplemented with 20 μg/ml chloramphenicol and 50 μg/ml kanamycin when

appropriate. *C. difficile* strains were cultured in Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) broth (Oxoid) supplemented

with 0,5% yeast extract (Sigma-Aldrich), *Clostridium difficile* Selective Supplement (CDSS, Oxoid) and

20μg/ml thiamphenicol when appropriate. *C. difficile* was grown anaerobically in a Don Whitley VA-1000

workstation in an atmosphere of 10% CO_2, 10% H_2 and 80% N_2. Liquid cultures were grown under gentle

agitation (120 rpm).

Agar dilution

HPUra and ACX362E were tested against a collection of *C. difficile* clinical isolates. 375 clinical isolates

have been collected during the ECDIS study (6). All strains were characterized by PCR ribotyping (67) and

by PCR to confirm the presence of genes encoding toxins A , B and binary toxin (68-70). Of the 375

clinical isolates, we excluded stocks that were found to contain more than one strain and isolates that

could not be recultured. Testing was therefore performed on 363 isolates (**Supplemental Table 1**). *C.*

difficile ATCC 700057, *B. fragilis* ATCC 25285 and *S. aureus* ATCC 29213 were used as controls (71).

The strains were tested for the different concentrations of antimicrobial using the agar dilution

method according to Clinical & Laboratory Standards Institute guidelines (26, 27). In short, the

antimicrobials were diluted into Brucella Blood Agar (BBA) supplemented with hemin and vitamin K1.

Bacterial isolates were cultured on blood agar plates and after 24 hours re-suspended to a turbidity of

0.5 McFarland in phosphate buffered saline (PBS). The strains were inoculated onto BBA solid media

containing the PolC-inhibitors using multipoint inoculators to a final concentration of 10^4 CFU per spot.

Each series of antimicrobial agents was tested from the lowest concentration to the highest

concentration. Two control plates without antibiotics were inoculated to control for aerobic

contamination and purity of anaerobic growth. At the end of the final series, two control plates were

inoculated to verify the final organism viability and purity. Plates were incubated anaerobically in a Don

Whitley VA-1000 workstation in an atmosphere of 10% CO_2, 10% H_2 and 80% N_2 and the MICs were

determined after 24 and 48 hours.

Sub-MIC determination

C. difficile 630Δ*erm* (30, 31) was grown in 20 mL Brain Heart Infusion (Oxoid) supplemented with 0.5%

yeast extract (Sigma-Aldrich) (BHI/YE) starting from an optical density measured at 600nm (OD_{600}) of

0.05 using an exponentially growing starter culture (3 biological replicates per concentration). To

determine the effects on growth at sub-inhibitory concentrations of ACX362E, cells were cultured in the

presence of the following concentrations; 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 8 µg/mL ACX362E and compared to an

untreated culture. To determine the effects on growth at sub-inhibitory concentrations of HPUra, cells

were cultured in the presence of the following concentrations: 10, 20, 40, 80 µg/mL HPUra and

compared to an untreated culture. The OD_{600} was monitored every hour until stationary phase was

reached.

Marker Frequency analysis

C. difficile 630Δ*erm* (30, 31) was grown in 20 mL BHI supplemented with 0.5% yeast extract with sub-

MIC amounts of antimicrobials (HPUra: 35 µg/mL; ACX362E: 4 µg/mL; metronidazole: 0.25 µg/mL;

fidaxomicin: 0.00125 µg/mL, surotomycin: 0.625 µg/mL), starting from an OD_{600} of 0.05 using an

exponentially growing starter culture. We confirmed that these concentrations did not lead to a >30%

reduction in growth compared to non-treated cultures (**Supplemental Figure 1** and data not shown). In

parallel, cultures were grown without inhibitors from the same starter culture. All conditions were

performed in biological triplicates. After 5 hours, 1mL cells was harvested (OD_{600} ~ 0.5), and stored at -

20°C. Isolation of chromosomal DNA was performed the next day with the QIAamp DNA Blood Mini kit

(Qiagen) according to the instructions of the manufacturer. Marker frequency analysis (MFA) was

performed to assess the relative abundance of origin proximal genes relative to terminus proximal

genes. As a proxy for *oriC*, a probe was designed that targets the CD0001 region (CD0001-probe-FAM).

By using plots of the GC skew ([G - C]/[G + C]) generated using DNAPlotter (72), the approximate

location of the terminus region for the *C. difficile* chromosome was determined and a probe targeting

this region (CD1931) was designed (CD-1931-probe-TXR). Probe design was performed with Beacon

Designer^{TM} (Premier Biosoft, Palo Alto CA, USA). Real-time PCR reactions were performed on a Biorad

CFX96^{TM} real-time PCR detection system (95°C 15 m, 39 × (94°C 30 s + 55°C 30 s + 72°C 30 s). Sequences

for primers and probes are listed in **Table 5**. For each biological replicate, three technical replicates were

performed. Amplification efficiency was determined using standard curves obtained from DNA late

stationary phase cells of strain 630Δ*erm*, for which an *oriC*:*terC* ratio of 1 was assumed. RT-PCR results

from antibiotic treated cells were normalized to the *oriC*:*terC* ratio of DNA samples (3 biological

replicates) from non-treated cells. Calculations were performed in Microsoft Office Excel 2010, plotted

using Prism 7 (GraphPad) and prepared for publication in Corel Draw Suite X8. Significance was

determined using a One-way ANOVA and a Tukey's test for multiple comparisons (GraphPad).

Growth and RNA isolation for RNA-Seq

For RNA-Seq analysis, *C. difficile* 630Δ*erm* (30, 31) was grown for 5h in BHI medium with HPUra (35

ug/mL) or ACX362E (4 μg/mL) starting from an OD_{600} of 0.05 using an exponentially growing starter

culture, after which cells (3mL) were harvested for RNA isolation. RNA isolation was performed with

NucleoSpin© RNA kit (Macherey-Nagel). Although the kit includes on column rDNAse digestion, a

second treatment was performed in solution and RNA was precipitated and recovered by NaAc

precipitation to remove residual DNA. Concentration determination and quality control (16S/23S ratio

and RNA integrity number [RIN]) was performed with a fragment analyzer (Agilent bio-analyzer),

according to the instructions of the manufacturer. Samples with a RIN>9 and 16S/23S ratio >1.4 were

submitted for analysis by RNA-Seq.

RNA-Seq

RNA-Seq was performed at a commercial provider (GenomeScan, Leiden, The Netherlands). In short,

the NEBNext Ultra Directional RNA Library Prep Kit for lllumina was used to process the samples. Sample

preparation was performed according to the protocol "NEBNext Ultra Directional RNA Library Prep Kit

for lllumina" (NEB #E7420S/L). Briefly, after selective removal of rRNA (Ribo-Zero rRNA Removal Kit for

gram-positive Bacteria) and fragmentation of the mRNA, cDNA synthesis was performed. cDNA was

ligated to the sequencing adapters and the resulting product was PCR amplified. Clustering and DNA

sequencing using the lllumina NextSeq 500 platform was performed according to manufacturer's

protocols. A concentration of 1.5 pM of DNA was used. Image analysis, base calling, and quality check

was performed with the Illumina data analysis pipeline RTA vl.18.64 and Bcl2fastq v2.17. Per sample,

four technical replicates were included in the RNA-Seq experiment. In case of insufficient reads, the

sample was re-run on another flow cell to reach satisfactory quantities (≥ 20 M).

Analysis of RNA-Seq data

Analysis of the data was performed using T-REx, a user-friendly webserver which has been optimized for

the analysis of prokaryotic RNAseq-derived expression data (73). The pipeline requires raw RNA

expression level data as an input for RNA-Seq data analysis. For data normalisation and determination of

the genes, the factorial design statistical method of the RNA-Seq analysis R-package EdgeR is

implemented in the T-Rex pipeline. Some samples displayed incomplete rRNA depletion and rRNA

mapping reads had to be removed manually prior to analysis.

To analyse the genome-wide pattern in differential gene expression a sliding window analysis

was performed essentially as described (23). In short, genome locations (start of the locus tag) were

coupled to the locus tags in the T-Rex output. Next, the median log(FC) was calculated for bins of 51 loci

with a stepsize of 1. For each bin of $[X_1, X_2...X_{51}]$ the median absolute deviation of the median

(MAD=median($|X_i$-median(X)$|$)) was calculated as an robust indication of the distribution around

calculated median values. Calculations were performed and three curves (median, median-MAD and

median+MAD) were plotted in Microsoft Office Excel 2010 and the graph was prepared for publication

using Adobe Photoshop CC and Corel Draw Suite X8.

A GSEA analysis (33) was performed via the Genome2D webserver (73), using our reference

genome sequence for *C. difficile* 630Δ*erm*, Genbank identifier LN614756.1 (listed in Genome2D as

"Clostridioides_difficile_630Derm")(31). As input a single list of locus tags was used of either up- or

down regulated genes. The output was copied to Microsoft Excel 2010. The single_list column was split,

and a column was inserted to calculate the significance of the overrepresentation using the formula "(#

hits in list/ClassSize)*-log(p-value; 2)" to allow for sorting of the output of the GSEA analysis by

significance.

Data for the RNA-Seq experiment has been deposited in the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO)

database (74), accession number GSE116503.

General molecular biological techniques

E. coli strain DH5α was used for maintenance of all plasmids. All plasmid transformations into *E. coli*

were performed using standard procedures (75). *E. coli* CA434 was used as a donor for conjugation of

plasmids into the recipient *C. difficile* (76). Conjugation was performed as previously described (76).

Briefly, 1 mL of an overnight culture of donor cells was mixed with 200 µl of the recipient and spotted

onto anaerobic BHI agar plates and incubated for 5-8 hours. After incubation cells were collected and

tenfold serial dilutions were plated onto fresh BHI plates containing thiamphenicol and CDSS.

Plasmid DNA was isolated using the Nucleospin Plasmid (Macherey-Nagel) mini prep kits per

manufacturer's instructions. *C. difficile* genomic DNA was isolated using the DNeasy Blood and Tissue kit

(Qiagen) with pre-treatment for gram-positives according to instructions of the manufacturer.

Construction of luciferase-reporter fusion plasmids

All PCR reactions for plasmid construction were carried out with Q5 polymerase (New England Biolabs).

Putative promoter regions were amplified using *C. difficile* 630Δ*erm* chromosomal DNA (31) as a

template.

The P_{CD3412} luciferase reporter plasmid was created by restriction-ligation using the restriction

enzymes *Kpn*I and *Sac*I. P_{CD3412} was amplified using primers oIB-26 and oIB-27 (**Table 5**). The resulting

dsDNA fragment was digested and ligated into KpnI-SacI digested pAP24 (44), yielding plasmid pIB27.

Plamids pIB68 (P_{CD0350}), pIB69 (P_{CD2963}) and pIB74 (P_{CD3614}) were constructed using a Gibson assembly (77).

The plasmid backbone of pAP24 was linearized by PCR using primers oWKS-1580/oWKS-1582, and the

predicted promoter areas of CD0350, CD2963 and CD3614 were amplified with primers oIB-80/oIB-94,

oIB-82/oIB-95, and oIB-92/oIB-100 respectively. Primers were designed using the NEBuilder assembly

tool v.1.12.17 (New England Biolabs) using a 30 bp overlap. For the assembly, 100 ng of vector DNA was

assembled to a five-fold molar excess of the PCR fragment of the desired promoter using a homemade

Gibson Assembly Master Mix at 50°C for 30 minutes (final concentration: 4 U/µl Taq Ligase (Westburg),

0.004 U/µl T5 exonuclease (New England Biolabs), 0.025 U/µl Phusion polymerase (Bioké), 5%

polyethyleneglycol (PEG-8000),10 mM MgCl$_2$, 100 mM Tris-Cl pH=7.5, 10 mM dithiothreitol, 0.2 mM

dATP, 0.2 mM dTTP, 0.2 mM dCTP, 0.2 mM dGTP, and 1 mM β-nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide) and

transformed into *E. coli* DH5α. Transformants were screened by colony PCR using primers oWKS-1240

and oWKS-1241. Transformants yielding PCR fragments of the correct size were verified by Sanger

sequencing.

Construction of C. difficile *IB54 (*ΔsigB*)*

The up- and downstream regions (both 950 bp each) of the *sigB* coding sequence were amplified with

primers oIB-44/oIB-45, and oIB-46/oIB-47, respectively. Vector pMTL-SC7315 (43) was linearized by PCR

using primers oWKS-1537/oWKS-1538. Assembly was done according to the method of Gibson (44, 77).

The assembled plasmid was transformed into *E. coli* DH5α and verified using PCR and Sanger

sequencing. Generation of the unmarked *sigB* deletion mutant was performed using Allele-Coupled

Exchange essentially as described (43, 78). Briefly, pIB54 was introduced into *C. difficile* 630Δ*erm* (31) by

conjugation. Transconjugants were grown for two days on BHI agar plates supplemented with yeast

extract, thiamphenicol and CDSS, struck onto fresh pre-reduced plates and incubated anaerobically at

37°C for two days. Single-crossover integration was confirmed using PCR, and those clones were plated

onto non-selective BHI agar plates to allow the second-crossover event to occur. Colonies were then

serially diluted and plated onto minimal agar supplemented with 50 µg/ml 5-fluorocytosine (Sigma) as

described (43). DNA was isolated from thiamphenicol-susceptible colonies and the chromosomal

deletion was verified by PCR using primers oIB-78/oIB-79 (**Supplemental Figure 1**) as well as Sanger

sequencing of the PCR product using primers oIB-53/oIB-76/oIB-78.

Luciferase reporter assay

Strains containing luciferase reporter plasmids were inoculated to an OD_{600}=0.05 from an exponentially

growing starter culture. Fresh inoculums were grown in BHI broth supplemented with yeast extract,

with or without 4 µg/ml ACX362E for 5 hours. The supernatants from 1mL of culture (harvested by

centrifugation for 10 min, 4°C, 8000 rpm) were analyzed in a GloMax®-Multi Microplate Multimode

Reader (Promega) as described before (44). Statistical significance of the data (p<0.05) was determined

by two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and a pairwise Tukey-Kramer test using Prism 7 (GraphPad).

Accession numbers

GEO GSE116503; GenBank LN614756.1

Author's contributions

EVE, IMB, EJK and WKS designed experiments. GW and EJK provided reagents or strains. EVE, IMB and

IMGJBS performed experiments. EVE, IMB and WKS analyzed data. EVE, IMB and WKS wrote the

manuscript. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported, in part, by a VIDI fellowship (864.13.003) from the Netherlands Organization

for Scientific Research, a Gisela Thier Fellowship from the Leiden University Medical Center and

intramural funds to WKS. Anne de Jong is acknowledged for expert assistance with the RNA-Seq analysis,

Els Wessels for assistance in designing the MFA real-time PCR and Jelle Slager for helpful suggestions for

the sliding window analysis.

Conflict of interest

EVE and WKS have performed research for Cubist. EJK has performed research for Cubist, Novartis and

Qiagen, and has participated in advisory forums of Astellas, Optimer, Actelion, Pfizer, Sanofi Pasteur and

Seres Therapeutics and currently holds an unrestricted research grant from Vedanta Biosciences Inc. GW

is a consultant for Acurx Pharmaceuticals. The companies had no role in the design of the experiments

or the decision to publish. IMB and IMGJSB: none to declare.

References

573   1.   Lawson PA, Citron DM, Tyrrell KL, Finegold SM. 2016. Reclassification of Clostridium difficile as
574   Clostridioides difficile (Hall and O'Toole 1935) Prevot 1938. Anaerobe 40:95-9.
575   2.   Leffler DA, Lamont JT. 2015. Clostridium difficile infection. N Engl J Med 372:1539-48.
576   3.   Smits WK, Lyras D, Lacy DB, Wilcox MH, Kuijper EJ. 2016. Clostridium difficile infection. Nat Rev
577   Dis Primers 2:16020.
578   4.   Abt MC, McKenney PT, Pamer EG. 2016. Clostridium difficile colitis: pathogenesis and host
579   defence. Nat Rev Microbiol 14:609-20.
580   5.   Anonymous (ed). 2006. Investigation into outbreaks of Clostridium difficile at Stoke Mandeville
581   Hospital, Buckinghamshire Hospitals NHS Trust. Commission for Healthcare Audit and
582   Inspection,
583   6.   Bauer MP, Notermans DW, van Benthem BH, Brazier JS, Wilcox MH, Rupnik M, Monnet DL, van
584   Dissel JT, Kuijper EJ, Group ES. 2011. Clostridium difficile infection in Europe: a hospital-based
585   survey. Lancet 377:63-73.
586   7.   Hensgens MP, Goorhuis A, Dekkers OM, Kuijper EJ. 2012. Time interval of increased risk for
587   Clostridium difficile infection after exposure to antibiotics. J Antimicrob Chemother 67:742-8.
588   8.   He M, Miyajima F, Roberts P, Ellison L, Pickard DJ, Martin MJ, Connor TR, Harris SR, Fairley D,
589   Bamford KB, D'Arc S, Brazier J, Brown D, Coia JE, Douce G, Gerding D, Kim HJ, Koh TH, Kato H,
590   Senoh M, Louie T, Michell S, Butt E, Peacock SJ, Brown NM, Riley T, Songer G, Wilcox M,
591   Pirmohamed M, Kuijper E, Hawkey P, Wren BW, Dougan G, Parkhill J, Lawley TD. 2013.
592   Emergence and global spread of epidemic healthcare-associated Clostridium difficile. Nat Genet
593   45:109-13.
594   9.   Debast SB, Bauer MP, Kuijper EJ, European Society of Clinical M, Infectious D. 2014. European
595   Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases: update of the treatment guidance
596   document for Clostridium difficile infection. Clin Microbiol Infect 20 Suppl 2:1-26.
597   10.   McDonald LC, Gerding DN, Johnson S, Bakken JS, Carroll KC, Coffin SE, Dubberke ER, Garey KW,
598   Gould CV, Kelly C, Loo V, Shaklee Sammons J, Sandora TJ, Wilcox MH. 2018. Clinical Practice
599   Guidelines for Clostridium difficile Infection in Adults and Children: 2017 Update by the
600   Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) and Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of
601   America (SHEA). Clin Infect Dis 66:e1-e48.
602   11.   Baines SD, O'Connor R, Freeman J, Fawley WN, Harmanus C, Mastrantonio P, Kuijper EJ, Wilcox
603   MH. 2008. Emergence of reduced susceptibility to metronidazole in Clostridium difficile. J
604   Antimicrob Chemother 62:1046-52.
605   12.   Chong PM, Lynch T, McCorrister S, Kibsey P, Miller M, Gravel D, Westmacott GR, Mulvey MR,
606   Canadian Nosocomial Infection Surveillance P. 2014. Proteomic analysis of a NAP1 Clostridium
607   difficile clinical isolate resistant to metronidazole. PLoS One 9:e82622.
608   13.   Moura I, Spigaglia P, Barbanti F, Mastrantonio P. 2013. Analysis of metronidazole susceptibility
609   in different Clostridium difficile PCR ribotypes. J Antimicrob Chemother 68:362-5.
610   14.   Davies J, Spiegelman GB, Yim G. 2006. The world of subinhibitory antibiotic concentrations. Curr
611   Opin Microbiol 9:445-53.
612   15.   Slager J, Veening JW. 2016. Hard-Wired Control of Bacterial Processes by Chromosomal Gene
613   Location. Trends Microbiol 24:788-800.
614   16.   Tarantino PM, Jr., Zhi C, Wright GE, Brown NC. 1999. Inhibitors of DNA polymerase III as novel
615   antimicrobial agents against gram-positive eubacteria. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 43:1982-7.
616   17.   Brown NC. 1970. 6-(p-hydroxyphenylazo)-uracil: a selective inhibitor of host DNA replication in
617   phage-infected Bacillus subtilis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 67:1454-61.

18.   Butler MM, Dudycz LW, Khan NN, Wright GE, Brown NC. 1990. Development of novel inhibitor
probes of DNA polymerase III based on dGTP analogs of the HPUra type: base, nucleoside and
nucleotide derivatives of N2-(3,4-dichlorobenzyl)guanine. Nucleic Acids Res 18:7381-7.
19.   Torti A, Lossani A, Savi L, Focher F, Wright GE, Brown NC, Xu WC. 2011. Clostridium difficile DNA
polymerase IIIC: basis for activity of antibacterial compounds. Curr Enzym Inhib 7:147-153.
20.   Dvoskin S, Xu WC, Brown NC, Yanachkov IB, Yanachkova M, Wright GE. 2012. A novel agent
effective against Clostridium difficile infection. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 56:1624-6.
21.   Goranov AI, Katz L, Breier AM, Burge CB, Grossman AD. 2005. A transcriptional response to
replication status mediated by the conserved bacterial replication protein DnaA. Proc Natl Acad
Sci U S A 102:12932-7.
22.   Goranov AI, Kuester-Schoeck E, Wang JD, Grossman AD. 2006. Characterization of the global
transcriptional responses to different types of DNA damage and disruption of replication in
Bacillus subtilis. J Bacteriol 188:5595-605.
23.   Slager J, Kjos M, Attaiech L, Veening JW. 2014. Antibiotic-induced replication stress triggers
bacterial competence by increasing gene dosage near the origin. Cell 157:395-406.
24.   Knetsch CW, Terveer EM, Lauber C, Gorbalenya AE, Harmanus C, Kuijper EJ, Corver J, van
Leeuwen HC. 2012. Comparative analysis of an expanded Clostridium difficile reference strain
collection reveals genetic diversity and evolution through six lineages. Infect Genet Evol
12:1577-85.
25.   He M, Sebaihia M, Lawley TD, Stabler RA, Dawson LF, Martin MJ, Holt KE, Seth-Smith HM, Quail
MA, Rance R, Brooks K, Churcher C, Harris D, Bentley SD, Burrows C, Clark L, Corton C, Murray V,
Rose G, Thurston S, van Tonder A, Walker D, Wren BW, Dougan G, Parkhill J. 2010. Evolutionary
dynamics of Clostridium difficile over short and long time scales. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
107:7527-32.
26.   CLSI. 2012. Methods for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing of Anaerobic Bacteria; Approved
Standard - Eighth edition, p 56, 8 ed. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
27.   Freeman J, Stott J, Baines SD, Fawley WN, Wilcox MH. 2005. Surveillance for resistance to
metronidazole and vancomycin in genotypically distinct and UK epidemic Clostridium difficile
isolates in a large teaching hospital. J Antimicrob Chemother 56:988-9.
28.   Debast SB, Bauer MP, Sanders IM, Wilcox MH, Kuijper EJ, Group ES. 2013. Antimicrobial activity
of LFF571 and three treatment agents against Clostridium difficile isolates collected for a pan-
European survey in 2008: clinical and therapeutic implications. J Antimicrob Chemother
68:1305-11.
29.   Pacitti DF, Barnes MH, Li DH, Brown NC. 1995. Characterization and overexpression of the gene
encoding Staphylococcus aureus DNA polymerase III. Gene 165:51-6.
30.   Hussain HA, Roberts AP, Mullany P. 2005. Generation of an erythromycin-sensitive derivative of
Clostridium difficile strain 630 (630Deltaerm) and demonstration that the conjugative
transposon Tn916DeltaE enters the genome of this strain at multiple sites. J Med Microbiol
54:137-41.
31.   van Eijk E, Anvar SY, Browne HP, Leung WY, Frank J, Schmitz AM, Roberts AP, Smits WK. 2015.
Complete genome sequence of the Clostridium difficile laboratory strain 630Deltaerm reveals
differences from strain 630, including translocation of the mobile element CTn5. BMC Genomics
16:31.
32.   Hastey CJ, Dale SE, Nary J, Citron D, Law JH, Roe-Carpenter DE, Chesnel L. 2017. Comparison of
Clostridium difficile minimum inhibitory concentrations obtained using agar dilution vs broth
microdilution methods. Anaerobe 44:73-77.
33.   Subramanian A, Tamayo P, Mootha VK, Mukherjee S, Ebert BL, Gillette MA, Paulovich A,
Pomeroy SL, Golub TR, Lander ES, Mesirov JP. 2005. Gene set enrichment analysis: a knowledge-

based approach for interpreting genome-wide expression profiles. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
102:15545-50.
34. Anonymous. Genome2D web server. http://genome2d.molgenrug.nl. Accessed
35. van Eijk E, Paschalis V, Green M, Friggen AH, Larson MA, Spriggs K, Briggs GS, Soultanas P, Smits
WK. 2016. Primase is required for helicase activity and helicase alters the specificity of primase
in the enteropathogen Clostridium difficile. Open Biol 6.
36. Sousa C, de Lorenzo V, Cebolla A. 1997. Modulation of gene expression through chromosomal
positioning in Escherichia coli. Microbiology 143 (Pt 6):2071-8.
37. Sauer C, Syvertsson S, Bohorquez LC, Cruz R, Harwood CR, van Rij T, Hamoen LW. 2016. Effect of
Genome Position on Heterologous Gene Expression in Bacillus subtilis: An Unbiased Analysis.
ACS Synth Biol 5:942-7.
38. Block DH, Hussein R, Liang LW, Lim HN. 2012. Regulatory consequences of gene translocation in
bacteria. Nucleic Acids Res 40:8979-92.
39. Samadpour AN, Merrikh H. 2018. DNA gyrase activity regulates DnaA-dependent replication
initiation in Bacillus subtilis. Mol Microbiol 108:115-127.
40. Sebaihia M, Wren BW, Mullany P, Fairweather NF, Minton N, Stabler R, Thomson NR, Roberts
AP, Cerdeno-Tarraga AM, Wang H, Holden MT, Wright A, Churcher C, Quail MA, Baker S, Bason
N, Brooks K, Chillingworth T, Cronin A, Davis P, Dowd L, Fraser A, Feltwell T, Hance Z, Holroyd S,
Jagels K, Moule S, Mungall K, Price C, Rabbinowitsch E, Sharp S, Simmonds M, Stevens K, Unwin
L, Whithead S, Dupuy B, Dougan G, Barrell B, Parkhill J. 2006. The multidrug-resistant human
pathogen Clostridium difficile has a highly mobile, mosaic genome. Nat Genet 38:779-86.
41. Kint N, Janoir C, Monot M, Hoys S, Soutourina O, Dupuy B, Martin-Verstraete I. 2017. The
alternative sigma factor sigma(B) plays a crucial role in adaptive strategies of Clostridium difficile
during gut infection. Environ Microbiol 19:1933-1958.
42. Hecker M, Pane-Farre J, Volker U. 2007. SigB-dependent general stress response in Bacillus
subtilis and related gram-positive bacteria. Annu Rev Microbiol 61:215-36.
43. Cartman ST, Kelly ML, Heeg D, Heap JT, Minton NP. 2012. Precise manipulation of the
Clostridium difficile chromosome reveals a lack of association between the tcdC genotype and
toxin production. Appl Environ Microbiol 78:4683-90.
44. Oliveira Paiva AM, Friggen AH, Hossein-Javaheri S, Smits WK. 2016. The Signal Sequence of the
Abundant Extracellular Metalloprotease PPEP-1 Can Be Used to Secrete Synthetic Reporter
Proteins in Clostridium difficile. ACS Synth Biol 5:1376-1382.
45. Lynch T, Chong P, Zhang J, Hizon R, Du T, Graham MR, Beniac DR, Booth TF, Kibsey P, Miller M,
Gravel D, Mulvey MR, Canadian Nosocomial Infection Surveillance P. 2013. Characterization of a
stable, metronidazole-resistant Clostridium difficile clinical isolate. PLoS One 8:e53757.
46. Goldstein EJ, Citron DM, Sears P, Babakhani F, Sambol SP, Gerding DN. 2011. Comparative
susceptibilities to fidaxomicin (OPT-80) of isolates collected at baseline, recurrence, and failure
from patients in two phase III trials of fidaxomicin against Clostridium difficile infection.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother 55:5194-9.
47. Knetsch CW, Kumar N, Forster SC, Connor TR, Browne HP, Harmanus C, Sanders IM, Harris SR,
Turner L, Morris T, Perry M, Miyajima F, Roberts P, Pirmohamed M, Songer JG, Weese JS, Indra
A, Corver J, Rupnik M, Wren BW, Riley TV, Kuijper EJ, Lawley TD. 2018. Zoonotic Transfer of
Clostridium difficile Harboring Antimicrobial Resistance between Farm Animals and Humans. J
Clin Microbiol 56.
48. Ott RW, Barnes MH, Brown NC, Ganesan AT. 1986. Cloning and characterization of the polC
region of Bacillus subtilis. J Bacteriol 165:951-7.

49.   Barnes MH, Hammond RA, Foster KA, Mitchener JA, Brown NC. 1989. The cloned polC gene of
Bacillus subtilis: characterization of the azp12 mutation and controlled in vitro synthesis of
active DNA polymerase III. Gene 85:177-86.
50.   Barnes MH, Hammond RA, Kennedy CC, Mack SL, Brown NC. 1992. Localization of the
exonuclease and polymerase domains of Bacillus subtilis DNA polymerase III. Gene 111:43-9.
51.   Barnes MH, Butler MM, Wright GE, Brown NC. 2012. Antimicrobials targeted to the replication-
specific DNA polymerases of gram-positive bacteria: target potential of dnaE. Infect Disord Drug
Targets 12:327-31.
52.   Timinskas K, Balvociute M, Timinskas A, Venclovas C. 2014. Comprehensive analysis of DNA
polymerase III alpha subunits and their homologs in bacterial genomes. Nucleic Acids Res
42:1393-413.
53.   Wecke T, Mascher T. 2011. Antibiotic research in the age of omics: from expression profiles to
interspecies communication. J Antimicrob Chemother 66:2689-704.
54.   Kazmierczak MJ, Mithoe SC, Boor KJ, Wiedmann M. 2003. Listeria monocytogenes sigma B
regulates stress response and virulence functions. J Bacteriol 185:5722-34.
55.   Weber H, Polen T, Heuveling J, Wendisch VF, Hengge R. 2005. Genome-wide analysis of the
general stress response network in Escherichia coli: sigmaS-dependent genes, promoters, and
sigma factor selectivity. J Bacteriol 187:1591-603.
56.   van Schaik W, van der Voort M, Molenaar D, Moezelaar R, de Vos WM, Abee T. 2007.
Identification of the sigmaB regulon of Bacillus cereus and conservation of sigmaB-regulated
genes in low-GC-content gram-positive bacteria. J Bacteriol 189:4384-90.
57.   Kreuzer KN. 2013. DNA damage responses in prokaryotes: regulating gene expression,
modulating growth patterns, and manipulating replication forks. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol
5:a012674.
58.   Helmann JD, Wu MF, Kobel PA, Gamo FJ, Wilson M, Morshedi MM, Navre M, Paddon C. 2001.
Global transcriptional response of Bacillus subtilis to heat shock. J Bacteriol 183:7318-28.
59.   Ternan NG, Jain S, Srivastava M, McMullan G. 2012. Comparative transcriptional analysis of
clinically relevant heat stress response in Clostridium difficile strain 630. PLoS One 7:e42410.
60.   Emerson JE, Stabler RA, Wren BW, Fairweather NF. 2008. Microarray analysis of the
transcriptional responses of Clostridium difficile to environmental and antibiotic stress. J Med
Microbiol 57:757-64.
61.   Walter BM, Rupnik M, Hodnik V, Anderluh G, Dupuy B, Paulic N, Zgur-Bertok D, Butala M. 2014.
The LexA regulated genes of the Clostridium difficile. BMC Microbiol 14:88.
62.   Walter BM, Cartman ST, Minton NP, Butala M, Rupnik M. 2015. The SOS Response Master
Regulator LexA Is Associated with Sporulation, Motility and Biofilm Formation in Clostridium
difficile. PLoS One 10:e0144763.
63.   Jain S, Graham C, Graham RL, McMullan G, Ternan NG. 2011. Quantitative proteomic analysis of
the heat stress response in Clostridium difficile strain 630. J Proteome Res 10:3880-90.
64.   Ternan NG, Jain S, Graham RL, McMullan G. 2014. Semiquantitative analysis of clinical heat
stress in Clostridium difficile strain 630 using a GeLC/MS workflow with emPAI quantitation.
PLoS One 9:e88960.
65.   Soler-Bistue A, Mondotte JA, Bland MJ, Val ME, Saleh MC, Mazel D. 2015. Genomic location of
the major ribosomal protein gene locus determines Vibrio cholerae global growth and
infectivity. PLoS Genet 11:e1005156.
66.   Couturier E, Rocha EP. 2006. Replication-associated gene dosage effects shape the genomes of
fast-growing bacteria but only for transcription and translation genes. Mol Microbiol 59:1506-
18.

67.   Bidet P, Lalande V, Salauze B, Burghoffer B, Avesani V, Delmee M, Rossier A, Barbut F, Petit JC.
2000. Comparison of PCR-ribotyping, arbitrarily primed PCR, and pulsed-field gel electrophoresis
for typing Clostridium difficile. J Clin Microbiol 38:2484-7.
68.   Kato H, Kato N, Watanabe K, Iwai N, Nakamura H, Yamamoto T, Suzuki K, Kim SM, Chong Y,
Wasito EB. 1998. Identification of toxin A-negative, toxin B-positive Clostridium difficile by PCR. J
Clin Microbiol 36:2178-82.
69.   Paltansing S, van den Berg RJ, Guseinova RA, Visser CE, van der Vorm ER, Kuijper EJ. 2007.
Characteristics and incidence of Clostridium difficile-associated disease in The Netherlands,
2005. Clin Microbiol Infect 13:1058-64.
70.   Stubbs S, Rupnik M, Gibert M, Brazier J, Duerden B, Popoff M. 2000. Production of actin-specific
ADP-ribosyltransferase (binary toxin) by strains of Clostridium difficile. FEMS Microbiol Lett
186:307-12.
71.   Anonymous. American Type Culture Collection.
72.   Anonymous. DNAPlotter. http://www.sanger.ac.uk/science/tools/dnaplotter. Accessed
73.   de Jong A, van der Meulen S, Kuipers OP, Kok J. 2015. T-REx: Transcriptome analysis webserver
for RNA-seq Expression data. BMC Genomics 16:663.
74.   Anonymous. Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO). https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/. Accessed
75.   Sambrook J, Russell DW. 2001. Molecular cloning : a laboratory manual. Cold Spring Harbor
Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.
76.   Purdy D, O'Keeffe TA, Elmore M, Herbert M, McLeod A, Bokori-Brown M, Ostrowski A, Minton
NP. 2002. Conjugative transfer of clostridial shuttle vectors from Escherichia coli to Clostridium
difficile through circumvention of the restriction barrier. Mol Microbiol 46:439-52.
77.   Gibson DG, Young L, Chuang RY, Venter JC, Hutchison CA, 3rd, Smith HO. 2009. Enzymatic
assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases. Nat Methods 6:343-5.
78.   van Leeuwen PT, van der Peet JM, Bikker FJ, Hoogenkamp MA, Oliveira Paiva AM, Kostidis S,
Mayboroda OA, Smits WK, Krom BP. 2016. Interspecies Interactions between Clostridium
difficile and Candida albicans. mSphere 1.

Tables

Table 1. Minimal inhibitory concentrations of PolC-inhibitors towards *C. difficile* stratified by clade.

Table 2. List of the genes most highly up- and down-regulated in the presence of HPUra compared to

non-treated cells.

Table 3. List of the genes most highly up- and down-regulated in the presence of ACX362E compared to

non-treated cells.

Table 4. Plasmids and strains used in this study.

Table 5. Oligonucleotides and probes used in this study.

811   **Figures**

813   **Figure 1. Mechanism of action of the PolC-inhibitors ACX362E. A.** Ternary complex of inhibitor

814   ACX362E, DNA ,and PolC**. B.** H-bonding between inhibitor molecule ACX362E and a cytosine residue of

815   DNA.

Figure 2. Minimal inhibitory concentrations of PolC-inhibitors. MIC was determined by agar dilution

according to CLSI standards (26) and is expressed in µg/mL. The distribution in the MIC for the collection

of clinical isolates (N=363) is given for the PolC-inhibitors HPUra (blue) and ACX362E (red).

Figure 3. Overlap in the transcriptional response to different PolC-inhibitors. A. Venn diagram of the

number of genes up-regulated in the presence of ACX362E (red), in the presence of HPUra (blue) or

under both conditions (overlapping region). **B.** Venn diagram of the number of genes down-regulated in

the presence of ACX362E (red), in the presence of HPUra (blue) or under both conditions (overlapping

region). The size of the circles is proportional to the number of genes that showed differential

expression.

Figure 4. Genome location correlates with differential expression upon PolC inhibition. A. Schematic

representation of the chromosome of *C. difficile*. Higher than average GC skew ([G - C]/[G + C]) (red) and

lower than average GC skew (blue) were calculated with DNAplotter (72). Vertical lines indicate the

position of the predicted origin (*oriC*) and terminus (*terC*) of replication. Arrows indicate the direction of

replication. **B.** Sliding window analysis (bins of 51 loci, stepsize 1) of the median log fold change (FC)

projected on a linear genome map. The *oriC* of the circular chromosome is located on either size of the

linear graph (0/4.29Mb), whereas *terC* is indicated with a vertical red line. The trend in log(FC) is

highlighted using a green line. Light blue shading indicates the median absolute deviation of the mean

(23).

Figure 5. Polymerase inhibitors lead to an increase in *oriC*:*terC* ratio. A marker frequency analysis of

the effects of sub-inhibitory amounts of polymerase inhibitors (red; HPUra: 35 ug/mL; ACX362E: 4

ug/mL) and three antibiotics with different modes of action (blue; metronidazole: 0.25 ug/mL;

fidaxomicin: 0.00125 ug/mL, surotomycin: 0.625 ug/mL) compared to non-treated cells (black).

Datapoints are averages of technical replicates (N=3). Black lines behind the datapoints indicate the

average of the biological replicates (N=3) and whiskers indicate the standard deviation of the mean.

Data have been normalized compared to the non-treated control. The mean of HPUra and ACX362E

treated samples is statistically different from the other samples (p<0.0001).

Figure 6. Genes differentially expressed due to polymerase inhibitors are regulated by σ^B. The putative

promoters of the indicated genes were fused transcriptionally to a plasmid-based luciferase reporter

(44). Luciferase activity was measured after 5 h of growth in liquid medium in the presence (+362E) or

absence (no Ab) of polymerase inhibitor ACX365. N.S. = non-significant, *=$p<0.05$, **=$p<0.005$,

***=$p<0.0005$, ****=$p<0.00005$. **A**. P$_{CD350}$-*sLuc*^{opt}. **B**. P$_{CD2963}$-*sLuc*^{opt} **C**. P$_{CD3614}$-*sLuc*^{opt} **D**. P$_{CD3412}$-*sLuc*^{opt}.

Supplemental information

Supplemental Table 1. Characteristics and minimal inhibitory concentrations of the clinical isolates used

in the agar dilution experiments.

Supplemental Table 2. Lists of the genes that are differentially expressed in the presence of PolC-

inhibitors compared to non-treated cells. **A**. HPUra differentially expressed genes. **B**. ACX362E

differentially expressed genes.

Supplemental Table 3. Overlap with published σ^B regulon. **A**. σ^B -dependent stress response genes

differentially regulated in the ACX362E dataset. **B**. Genes containing a σ^B consensus promoter

differentially regulated in the ACX362E dataset.

Supplemental Figure 1. Relative inhibition of growth by varying concentrations of PolC-inhibitors.

Supplemental Figure 2. Confirmation of the *sigB* mutant strain (IB54).

Supplemental information is also available from Figshare (doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.6740771).

Table 1.

	MIC$_{50}$	MIC$_{90}$	Range	No. of isolates	PCR Ribotypes
Clade 1					
HPUra	16	32	2-64	230	001, 002, 003, 005, 009, 010, 011, 012, 014, 015, 018, 025, 026, 029, 031, 037, 050, 051, 053, 056, 057, 064, 070, 081, 084, 087, 106 and 118
362E	2	4	0,25-4		
Clade 2					
HPUra	16	32	2-32	24	016, 019, 027, 075 and 208.
362E	2	4	0,5-4		
Clade 3					
HPUra	16	32	4-32	7	023
362E	4	4	1-4		
Clade 4					
HPUra	8	16	2-16	9	017
362E	2	4	1-4		
Clade 5					
HPUra	16	32	4-32	43	033, 045, 078 and 126
362E	1	2	0,5-4		
Clade 6					
HPUra	4	4	4	1	131
362E	4	4	4		
Clade unknown					
HPUra	16	32	4-32	49	013, 024, 039, 046, 063, 090, 093, 097, 099, 101, 107, 110, 137, 139, 150, 154, 159, 161, 176, 202, 205, 207, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, and 234
362E	2	4	0,5-4		

Table 2.

Top 10 significantly changed genes HPUra UP

RefSeq locus tag[1]	logFC	logCPM	LR	pvalue	adj_pvalue	Fold	minFDR	Old locus tag[2]	Gene name[3]	Product	Protein ID
CD630DERM_RS12480	11.16	3.84	9.8	1.8e-03	2.4e-02	2291.8	5.37	CD630DERM_23052	CD2305B	Hypothetical protein	WP_004454601.1
CD630DERM_RS15730	6.02	12.24	39.2	3.9e-10	1.9e-07	64.9	22.30	-	-	Hypothetical protein	WP_032506906.1
CD630DERM_RS17185	5.12	8.69	48.8	2.9e-12	3.8e-09	34.8	27.97	CD630DERM_32060	CD3206	Hypothetical protein	WP_003434302.1
CD630DERM_RS17015	4.64	8.61	45.7	1.3e-11	1.0e-08	25.0	26.55	CD630DERM_31740	CD3174	Type I glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase	WP_003421962.1
CD630DERM_RS17020	4.62	8.68	54.7	1.4e-13	2.7e-10	24.6	31.77	CD630DERM_31750	CD3175	Transcriptional regulator	WP_003429564.1
CD630DERM_RS00700	4.37	10.08	33.9	5.8e-09	2.1e-06	20.7	18.85	CD630DERM_00801	CD0080A	50S ribosomal protein L29	WP_003421158.1
CD630DERM_RS00655	4.26	8.55	22.7	1.9e-06	1.4e-04	19.1	12.77	CD630DERM_00720	CD0072	30S ribosomal protein S10	WP_011860633.1
CD630DERM_RS16270	3.96	8.16	34.9	3.5e-09	1.4e-06	15.6	19.44	CD630DERM_30310	CD3031	Transcriptional antiterminator	WP_003432034.1
CD630DERM_RS19860	3.93	10.72	31.8	1.7e-08	4.1e-06	15.2	17.89	CD630DERM_36630	CD3663	30S ribosomal protein S6	WP_003420522.1
CD630DERM_RS00775	3.83	6.09	15.1	1.0e-04	2.7e-03	14.2	8.53	CD630DERM_00930	CD0093	50S ribosomal protein L14	WP_009895197.1

Top 10 significantly changed genes HPUra DOWN

RefSeq locus tag[1]	logFC	logCPM	LR	pvalue	adj_pvalue	Fold	minFDR	Old locus tag[2]	Gene name[3]	Product	Protein ID
CD630DERM_RS09945	-14.85	4.52	17.0	3.7e-05	1.2e-03	-29514.0	9.72	CD630DERM_17940	CD1794	Hypothetical protein	WP_003430297.1
CD630DERM_RS12730	-14.52	4.33	17.3	3.1e-05	1.1e-03	-23428.2	9.87	CD630DERM_23550	CD2355	Thiol reductase thioredoxin	WP_003416870.1
CD630DERM_RS00870	-14.39	4.91	21.8	3.0e-06	1.9e-04	-21483.7	12.35	-	-	tRNA-Asn	-
CD630DERM_RS00255	-14.35	5.48	45.8	1.3e-11	1.0e-08	-20874.2	26.55	-	-	tRNA-His	-
CD630DERM_RS00925	-14.18	4.91	23.1	1.5e-06	1.3e-04	-18514.8	12.89	-	-	tRNA-Ser	-
CD630DERM_RS17905	-14.02	5.11	26.3	3.0e-07	4.1e-05	-16646.0	14.57	-		Hypothetical protein	WP_042741280.1
CD630DERM_RS05300	-14.01	4.27	12.7	3.7e-04	7.3e-03	-16475.8	7.11	CD630DERM_09230	CD0923	Hypothetical protein, putative phage protein	WP_021362052.1
CD630DERM_RS00170	-13.98	4.82	13.8	2.0e-04	4.5e-03	-16156.5	7.78	-		tRNA-Asn	-
CD630DERM_RS03115	-13.96	5.24	56.8	4.8e-14	1.9e-10	-15908.4	32.28	CD630DERM_04981	CD0498A	Hypothetical protein	WP_011860839.1
CD630DERM_RS05160	-13.92	3.89	15.3	9.1e-05	2.5e-03	-15523.8	8.65	CD630DERM_08960	CD0896	Hypothetical protein	WP_003418667.1

[1] At time of analysis https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/NZ_LN614756.1

[2] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/LN614756,1

[3] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/AM180355.1

Table 3.

362E			**top 10 significant changed genes up**								
RefSeq locus tag[1]	logFC	logCPM	LR	pvalue	adj_pvalue	Fold	minFDR	Old locus tag[2]	Gene name[3]	Product	Protein ID
CD630DERM_RS12480	11.31	3.84	9.9	1.6e-03	1.3e-02	2544.2	6.25	CD630DERM_23052	CD2305B	Hypothetical protein	WP_004454601.1
CD630DERM_RS17185	7.73	8.69	87.6	8.1e-21	3.3e-17	211.9	54.77	CD630DERM_32060	CD3206	Hypothetical protein	WP_003434302.1
CD630DERM_RS17955	6.88	7.78	28.5	9.5e-08	5.0e-06	117.8	17.62	CD630DERM_33520	CD3352	AraC family transcriptional regulator	WP_009891821.1
CD630DERM_RS17950	6.87	9.82	31.9	1.6e-08	1.0e-06	117.3	19.88	CD630DERM_33510	CD3351	ATP-dependent Clp protease proteolytic subunit	WP_003436212.1
CD630DERM_RS15730	6.67	12.24	45.3	1.7e-11	4.0e-09	101.9	27.89	-	-	Hypothetical protein	WP_032506906.1
CD630DERM_RS00990	5.92	8.75	50.1	1.4e-12	5.7e-10	60.4	30.70	CD630DERM_01090	CD0109	Anaerobic ribonucleoside-triphosphate reductase activating protein	WP_003432598.1
CD630DERM_RS00655	5.65	8.55	35.0	3.2e-09	2.7e-07	50.3	21.80	CD630DERM_00720	CD0072	30S ribosomal protein S10	WP_011860633.1
CD630DERM_RS00985	5.50	8.94	66.3	3.8e-16	7.6e-13	45.2	40.27	CD630DERM_01080	CD0108	Anaerobic ribonucleoside triphosphate reductase	WP_003436320.1
CD630DERM_RS05405	5.49	10.12	43.5	4.2e-11	8.0e-09	45.0	26.89	CD630DERM_09410	CD0941	Hypothetical protein	WP_009894743.1
CD630DERM_RS15695	5.24	10.08	41.5	1.2e-10	2.0e-08	37.9	25.61	CD630DERM_29250	CD2925	Hypothetical protein	WP_009894743.1

362E			**top 10 significant changed genes down**								
RefSeq locus tag[1]	logFC	logCPM	LR	pvalue	adj_pvalue	Fold	minFDR	Old locus tag[2]	Gene name[3]	Product	Protein ID
CD630DERM_RS05350	-14.17	5.04	40.4	2.1e-10	3.1e-08	-18382.7	24.94	CD630DERM_09310	CD0931	Hypothetical protein	WP_011861014.1
CD630DERM_RS05160	-13.92	3.89	15.0	1.1e-04	1.6e-03	-15523.8	9.33	CD630DERM_08960	CD0896	Hypothetical protein	WP_003418667.1
CD630DERM_RS05375	-13.72	4.09	14.3	1.5e-04	2.0e-03	-13454.4	8.95	CD630DERM_09360	CD0936	Endonuclease	WP_011861020.1
CD630DERM_RS15535	-13.57	4.30	23.5	1.3e-06	4.4e-05	-12181.6	14.47	CD630DERM_28950	CD2895	Membrane protein	WP_011861046.1
CD630DERM_RS13040	-13.55	3.91	11.4	7.5e-04	7.1e-03	-11987.2	7.15	CD630DERM_24140	CD2414	PTS sorbose transporter subunit IIB	WP_003430855.1
CD630DERM_RS05345	-13.55	4.41	16.5	4.9e-05	8.2e-04	-11969.7	10.25	CD630DERM_09301	CD0930A	Hypothetical protein	WP_011861013.1
CD630DERM_RS11925	-13.53	4.10	14.0	1.9e-04	2.3e-03	-11799.9	8.76	CD630DERM_21991	CD2199A	4Fe-4S ferredoxin	WP_003423406.1
CD630DERM_RS01060	-13.52	4.51	14.9	1.1e-04	1.6e-03	-11718.7	9.33	-	-	tRNA-Glu	-
CD630DERM_RS15350	-13.44	3.89	15.3	9.1e-05	1.4e-03	-11076.8	9.53	-	-	Membrane protein	WP_003426729.1
CD630DERM_RS06360	-13.43	4.12	23.9	1.0e-06	3.7e-05	-11012.2	14.72	CD630DERM_11160	CD1116	Transposase	WP_011861118.1

[1] At time of analysis https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/NZ_LN614756.1

[2] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/LN614756,1

[3] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/AM180355.1

Table 4.

	Name	Relevant features	Source/reference
Plasmids	pAP24	*tetR* P*tet* -*sluc* *opt* *catP* ; derived from pRPF185	Oliveira-Paiva
	pIB27	P$_{CD3412}$-*sluc* *opt* *catP* ; derived from pAP24	This study
	pIB54	pMTL-SC7315 containing the up- and downstream area of the 630Δerm σB CDS (950 bp each)	This study
	pIB68	P$_{CD0350}$-*sluc* *opt* *catP* ; derived from pAP24	This study
	pIB69	P$_{CD2963}$-*sluc* *opt* *catP; derived from pAP24*	This study
	pIB74	P$_{CD3614}$-*sluc* *opt* *catP; derived from pAP24*	This study
	pMTL-SC7315	pMTL83151 with *codA catP*	Cartman
Strains	DH5α	*Escherichia coli* F− *endA1 glnV44 thi-1 recA1 relA1 gyrA96 deoR nupG purB20 φ80dlacZΔM15 Δ(lacZYA-argF)U169, hsdR17(rK–mK+), λ–*	Laboratory stock
	CA434	*Escherichia coli* HB101 [F- *mcrB mrr hsdS20(rB-mB-) recA14 leuB6 ara-14 proA2 lacY1 galK2 xyl-5 mtl-1 rspL20(SmR)glnV44λ-*] R702	Purdy
	C. difficile 630Δerm	MLS susceptible derivative of strain 630	Van Eijk, Hussain
	IB37	630Δ*erm* pIB27; thia^R	This study
	IB54	630Δ*erm* Δ*sigB*	This study
	IB95	630Δ*erm* pIB68; thia^R	This study
	IB96	630Δ*erm* pIB69; thia^R	This study
	IB98	IB54 pIB27; thia^R	This study
	IB99	IB54 pIB68; thia^R	This study
	IB100	IB54 pIB69; thia^R	This study
	IB108	630Δ*erm* pIB74; thia^R	This study
	IB111	IB54 pIB74; thia^R	This study

Table 5.

Restriction sites are underlined. Overlap with the vector backbone is indicated in lowercase letters.

Name	Sequence (5' –> 3')	Description
CD-0001- F	GAGACAAGAATTGCTATACTTA	Forward primer CD0001 MFA (*ori* C)
CD-0001- R	CAACCACTCTAGTTAATGC	Reverse primer CD0001 MFA (*ori* C)
CD-0001-probe-FAM	CTCAACTAGAACGTATAGATGTGCCAA	Probe CD0001 MFA (*ori* C)
CD-1931- F	GCAGGAATTTTAGATGAAGA	Forward primer CD1931 MFA (*ter* C)
CD-1931- R	GGCTGAAGTCTTATTAAATTTC	Reverse primer CD1931 MFA (*ter* C)
CD-1931-probe-TXR	CCTCTTAACTGTAGCAGATTCACCAT	Probe CD1931 MFA (*ter* C)
oIB-26	GGAA<u>GGTACC</u>GTTGAATAAAGTATTTATTTTCCATG	Forward primer for pCD3412 containing a kpnI restriction site
oIB-27	GGTA<u>GAGCTC</u>AGTATCACTCCTTTTTTCGAAC	Reverse primer for pCD3412 containing a SacI restriction site
oIB-44	CGTAGAAATACGGTGTTTTTTGTTACCCTACTTATAGTAGCAATTTATTTAGCTAAAAC	Forward primer for region 950 bp upstream of *sigB* CDS
oIB-45	TACTTTTTTTATATTTTTTTAAATATCAACTCCTAAATATTTAGTC	Reverse primer for region 950 bp upstream of *sigB* CDS
oIB-46	GGAGTTGATATTTAAAAAAATATAAAAAAAGTATTGACCTACTG	Forward primer for region 950 bp downstream of *sigB* CDS
oIB-47	GGGATTTTGGTCATGAGATTATCAAAAAGGGGACTACCAGGGTATCTAATC	Reverse primer for region 950 bp downstream of *sigB* CDS
oIB-53	CTTTAAAACAGTAGGTCAATACTTTTTTTATAT	Reverse primer to verify *sigB* CDS deletion
oIB-76	AAAATATAAAAAAAGTATTGACCTACTGTTTTAAAGATGGTATAGTATTAC	Forward primer to verify *sigB* deletion
oIB-78	GGAGATGTTAACTAATGAATGCATGG	Forward primer to verify *sigB* CDS deletion
oIB-79	CTAATGCACAGCGCCAGCAAACAAAC	Reverse primer to verify *sigB* CDS deletion
oIB-80	ctagcataaaaataagaagcctgcatttgcAAATTTACGAAAAGCTTGC	Forward primer for P_{CD0350}
oIB-82	ctagcataaaaataagaagcctgcatttgcTTGTGTTTAAGGGATTTTGAAAG	Forward primer for P_{CD2963}
oIB-92	ctagcataaaaataagaagcctgcatttgcGAATAAAAAAGGTGGTGTC	Forward primer for P_{CD3614}
oIB-94	agctattaataattttttacttggtctcatTTTTACCTCCATGTAACATTTATTG	Reverse primer for P_{CD0350}
oIB-95	agctattaataattttttacttggtctcatAATTAAATCCTTCCTTACATTGTAATTAC	Reverse primer for P_{CD2963}
oIB-100	agctattaataattttttacttggtctcatATAAACACCCTCCTATTCTTTG	Reverse primer for P_{CD3614}
oWKS-1240	CACCTCCTTTTTGACTTTAAGCCTACGAATACC	Forward primer on pAP24 backbone to amplify insert
oWKS-1241	CACCGACGAGCAAGGCAAGACCG	Reverse primer on pAP24 backbone to amplify insert
oWKS-1537	TAGGGTAACAAAAAACACCG	Reverse primer to amplify pMTL-SC7315 backbone
oWKS-1538	CCTTTTTGATAATCTCATGACC	Forward primer to amplify pMTL-SC7315 backbone
oWKS-1580	ATGAGACCAAGTAAAAAATTATTAATAGC	Forward primer to amplify pAP24 backbone
oWKS-1582	GCAAATGCAGGCTTCTTATTTTTATG	Reverse primer to amplify pAP24 backbone