CRISPR/Cas9-mediated gene deletion of the *ompA gene* in an *Enterobacter* gut

symbiont impairs biofilm formation and reduces gut colonization of *Aedes*

***aegypti* mosquitoes**

Shivanand Hegde[1], Pornjarim Nilyanimit[2], Elena Kozlova[1], Hema P. Narra[1], Sanjeev K.

Sahni[1], Grant L. Hughes[3,4,#]

[1] Department of Pathology, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA.

[2] Center of Excellence in Clinical Virology, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok,

Thailand.

[3] Department of Pathology, Institute for Human Infections and Immunity, Center for

Tropical Diseases, Center for Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Disease. University

of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA.

[4] Current address: Department of Vector Biology and Department of Parasitology,

Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Pembroke Place, Liverpool, UK.

[#]Corresponding author. Email: grant.hughes@lstmed.ac.uk

Running head: CRISPR/Cas9 engineering of a gut bacterium.

Abstract

CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing is a powerful tool to modify bacterial genomes but it has yet

to be applied to insect symbionts. To demonstrate that the CRISPR/Cas9 system can

be used to genetically alter host-associated bacteria, we deleted the outer membrane

protein A (*ompA*) of an *Enterobacter* symbiont of *Aedes* mosquitoes. The Δ*ompA*

mutant had an impaired ability to form biofilms and poorly infected *Ae. aegypti*. In

adults, the mutant had a significantly reduced infection prevalence compared to the wild

type or complement, while no differences in prevalence were seen in larvae, suggesting

bacterial genetic factors are important for adult gut colonization. Integration of genes

into the symbiont genome demonstrated this technology can be exploited to develop

novel symbiotic control strategies. Our results provide insight into the role of the *ompA*

gene in host-microbe interactions and confirms CRISPR/Cas9 technology can be

employed for genetic manipulation of non-model gut microbes.

Introduction.

Mosquitoes harbor a community of microbes within their guts. In general, the gut-associated microbiome of mosquitoes tends to have low species richness but can differ greatly between individuals and habitats[1-8]. Importantly, these microbes can modulate many host phenotypes, several of which can influence vectorial capacity[9-11]. As such, it is imperative that we understand how the microbiome is acquired and maintained within mosquito vectors. While environmental factors unquestionably influences mosquito microbiome composition and abundance[2-4,8], and studies are elucidating the role of microbial interactions[5,7,12,13] and host genetic factors[14-18] in shaping the microbiome, we have a poor understanding regarding bacterial factors that influence colonization of the mosquito gut.

In other invertebrates, several bacterial genes have been implicated in gut colonization. For example, a genome wide screen exploiting transposon-sequencing found a suite of genes from the bacterium *Snodgrasselia* involved in colonization of the honey bee gut[19]. These bacterial genes were classified into the broad categories of extracellular interactions, metabolism and stress response[19]. Knock out of a purine biosynthesis gene in *Burkholderia* impaired biofilm formation and reduced bacterial colonization rates in a bean bug. Biofilm formation was also shown to play a role in virulence of pathogenic *Pseudomonas* in artificial infections of *Drosophila,* with strains that lacked the capacity to form biofilms being more virulence to the host, while a hyperbiofilm strain was less virulent than the WT strain[20]. In other blood feeding invertebrates, bacterial genetics also appears critical for host colonization. Knockout of the type II secretion

system in *Aeromonas veronii* reduced infection in *Hirudo verbena* leeches[21]. In Tsetse

flies, the outer-membrane protein A (*ompA*) gene of *Sodalis glossinidius* is essential for

symbiotic interactions[22]. *Sodalis* mutants lacking the *ompA* gene poorly colonized the fly

gut compared to the wild type (WT) *Sodalis*[22] and the mutant strain also had a reduced

capacity to form biofilms[23]. Heterologous expression of the *ompA* gene from pathogenic

Escherichia coli in *Sodalis* mutants induced mortality in the fly implicating this gene as a

virulence factor in pathogenic bacteria[22]. Taken together, these studies suggest that

bacterial genetic factors are critical for host colonization of invertebrates and that biofilm

formation facilitates symbiotic associations in insects.

In mosquitoes, few studies have investigated how bacterial genetics affect gut

colonization. However, evidence from experimental evolution studies suggests bacterial

genetics plays a critical role. In two separate studies, *Enterobacter* was selected for

increased persistence in the gut of *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes, the major malaria

vector in sub-Saharan Africa, by repeatedly infecting mosquitoes with strains that

persisted in the gut for longer periods of time[24,25]. Transcriptomics comparisons of

effective and ineffective colonizers in liquid media identified 41 genes that were

differentially expressed between these two strains[25], further implicating the importance

of bacterial genetics in mosquito infection, however the role of these genes in

colonization of the mosquito gut has not been resolved. In a separate study, *in vitro*

screening of a transposon mutant library of *Enterobacter* identified a *waaL* gene mutant

that was insensitive to oxidative stress[26]. The *waaL* gene encodes an O antigen ligase

which is needed for attachment of the O antigen to lipopolysaccharide and the mutant

was found to have lower rates of colonization of the midguts of *Anopheles*

mosquitoes[26].

Gene knockouts approaches in bacteria provide compelling evidence of the role of

bacterial genes in host-microbe interactions[21-23,26-28]. In general, most studies use

transposon mutagenesis for gene knockout, which requires screening of the mutant

library. As *in vivo* screening is burdensome and in some cases not feasible, a targeted

gene knockout approach is highly desirable to investigate the functionality of bacterial

genes in host-microbe interactions. In the past few years, the CRISPR/Cas9 gene

editing system has been employed to modify bacterial genomes[29-31]. While much of the

work has been done in model bacterial species[32-36], editing approaches have expanded

into non-model bacterial systems[37-42]. Despite this expansion, few studies have used

this technology in host-associated microbes[43]. In the vector biology field, gene knockout

approaches can be used to interrogate the role of bacterial genes responsible for host-

microbe interactions, while the ability to integrate genes into the bacterial symbiont

genome has great potential for applied paratransgenic control strategies[11,44-46].

Previously, manipulation of non-model symbionts that associate with insect vectors

have has been accomplished by plasmid transformation[47-55] or stable transformation of

the genome using transposons or integrative plasmids[56-61], but the use of CRISPR/Cas9

gene editing in symbionts has yet to be accomplished. For paratransgenic strategies,

stable site-specific integration of transgenes into the symbiont genome is critical, and as

such, the application of CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing technology to non-model bacteria

that associate with insect vectors will stimulate research in this field.

We therefore undertook studies to develop CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing approaches

in an *Enterobacter* species isolated from *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes, the major vector of

arboviruses such as dengue, Zika and Yellow fever viruses. We used the Scarless Cas9

Assisted Recombineering (no-SCAR) method to disrupt the *ompA* gene of the non-

model *Enterobacter* species[35]. The no-SCAR approach is a single step genome editing

system that does not require a selectable marker[35]. After characterization of the mutant

in vitro, we examined the role of the *ompA* gene in host-microbe interactions by re-

infecting bacteria into mosquito in a mono-association. To demonstrate that the

CRISPR/Cas9 gene-editing system could be useful for applied symbiotic control

approaches we inserted genes conferring antibiotic resistance or a fluorescent protein

into the bacterial genome and re-infected the altered strains back into mosquitoes. Our

result sheds insights into the role of the *ompA* gene in host-microbe interactions in *Ae.*

aegypti and confirm that CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing can be a powerful tool for genetic

manipulation of native gut-associated microbes of mosquitoes.

Results

Enterobacter biofilm formation in *Ae. aegypti* guts

Over the course of conducting mono-axenic infections in *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes with an *Enterobacter* symbiont, we repeatedly observed a conglomeration of bacterial cells in the gut that was indicative of a biofilm (Figure 1). This formation of bacteria has a similar appearance to biofilms observed in the guts of other insects[20,23]. No bacteria were observed in *Ae. aegypti* when infections were conducted with *E. coli* that was not adapted to the mosquito gut environment (Figure 1), although as seen previously, infection with *E. coli* enabled mosquito development[62-64]. We therefore sort out to examine the role of bacterial genetics in biofilm formation and host colonization of this gut-associated bacterium of *Aedes* mosquitoes. While several genes have been implicated in biofilm formation[20,23,65], we chose to knockout the *ompA* gene of *Enterobacter* given that this gene has been demonstrated to influence biofilm formation and gut colonization of *Sodalis*[22,23], an *Enterobacteriaceae* symbiont of Tsetse flies, which is phylogenetically related to *Enterobacter*. The CRISRP/Cas9 genome editing system was employed to edit the symbionts genome.

Genome editing in non-model *Enterobacter* bacteria isolated from mosquitoes.

To edit the *Enterobacter* isolate that resides within the gut of *Aedes* mosquitoes, we employed the no-SCAR gene editing approach that had been developed in *E. coli*[35]. To optimize the approach in our hands, we performed initial experiments in *E. coli* to delete a ~1 kb region of the *ompA* gene (Figure 2A). As the no-SCAR approach exploits the λ-Red recombineering system to repair double stranded breaks, we supplied cells with a

double stranded DNA template that had regions of homology flanking the gRNA site

(250 bp for each arm). Using this approach, we successfully deleted a 1001 bp

fragment of the *ompA* gene. Of the colonies we screened, we saw an editing at a

frequency of 6.25% (N = 48) (Figure 2A). Given our successful editing in *E. coli*, we

employed this technique in the non-model *Enterobacter*. However, we altered our

editing procedure to delete a 598 bp fragment from the *Enterobacter ompA* gene. This

was done to attain a higher frequency of mutants[66] and accommodate a different PAM

site in the *ompA* gene of *Enterobacter*. Using a donor template designed for the

Enterobacter ompA gene that had similar length flanking homology arms as the

previous experiment done in *E. coli*, we obtained mutant knockouts at a rate of 32% (N

= 50) (Figure 2B). For both bacterial species, Sanger sequencing across the integration

site indicated the deletion occurred at the expected loci in the bacterial genome (Figure

2C; Supplementary text 1 and 2).

Characterization of the *Enterobacter ompA* mutant.

We quantified the growth rates of the Δ*ompA* mutant in comparison to the WT

Enterobacter and the Δ*ompA/ompA* complement in liquid LB media. We saw no

significant difference between the WT, the Δ*ompA* mutant or the Δ*ompA/ompA*

complement (Figure 3A). To examine the stability of the deletion, we subcultured the

Δ*ompA* mutant on LB media for 10 generations and performed PCR to amplify across

the deletion. At alternative generations PCR analysis indicated the deletion was present

indicating genomic stability at this site (Figure 3B).

Previously, *ompA* has been shown to be important in biofilm formation as *Sodalis*

deletion mutants were unable to form biofilms[23]. As such we characterized *in vitro*

biofilm formation using the crystal violet (CV) biofilm assay. After visual inspection, it

was clear the Δ*ompA* mutant had distinctly less biofilm deposition compared to either

the WT or the Δ*ompA/ompA* complement (Figure 3C), and after quantification and

normalization to account for any difference in growth between the strains, biofilm

formation was confirmed to be significantly different between the Δ*ompA* mutant and the

WT (Figure 3D; Tukey's multiple comparisons test, $P < 0.0001$) or Δ*ompA/ompA*

complement (Tukey's multiple comparisons test, $P < 0.0001$), while the was no

significant differences between the WT and the Δ*ompA/ompA* complement (Tukey's

multiple comparisons test $P = 0.2$).

The role of *ompA* gene in mosquito infection.

To examine the importance of the *ompA* gene on bacterial colonization of mosquitoes,

we infected *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes in a mono-association under gnotobiotic

conditions[6]. This infection method was used to avoid other gut-associated microbes

influencing host colonization rates[7] and it also assisted in quantification of introduced

bacteria by measuring colony forming units (CFUs). In larvae we saw a significant

reduction in bacterial titer in the mutant compared to both the WT (Kruskal-Wallis test; P

< 0.01) and the Δ*ompA/ompA* complement (Kruskal-Wallis test; $P < 0.05$) (Figure 4A).

Similarly, in adults, there was a significant reduction in bacterial infection in the Δ*ompA*

mutant compare to either the WT or Δ*ompA/ompA* complement (Kruskal-Wallis test; P <

0.001) (Figure 4B). While no significant changes were seen in the prevalence of

infection (number of mosquitoes infected) in the larval stage (Figure 4C, Fisher's exact

test; WT compared to Δ*ompA* P = 0.24 and Δ*ompA* compared to Δ*ompA/ompA* P =

0.24), in adults, the prevalence of infection was significantly different (Figure 4D,

Fisher's exact test; WT compared to Δ*ompA* P < 0.0001 and Δ*ompA* compared to

Δ*ompA/ompA* P < 0.0001), with only 45% of adults infected by the Δ*ompA* mutant

compared to 95% and 88% by the WT and Δ*ompA/ompA* complement, respectively. We

also examined the growth rates of mosquitoes administered with the WT, Δ*ompA*

mutant and Δ*ompA/ompA* complement. No significant differences were seen in the time

to pupation (Figure 5A) or percentage of first instar larvae that reached adulthood

(Figure 5B) between any of the strains.

Integration of genes into the *Enterobacter* chromosome.

We undertook experiments to demonstrate the CRISPR/Cas9 gene-editing approaches

can be used to integrate genes into the chromosome of non-model bacteria that

associate with mosquitoes. We created two independent transgenic strains that had

either, a gene encoding mCherry fluorescence or a gene encoding resistance to the

antibiotic gentamicin, inserted into the bacterial chromosome. These genes were

integrated into the genome using the same gRNA that was used for deletional

mutagenesis, and as such, these insertions also disrupted the *ompA* gene. Sequencing

across the integration site indicated the insertion of these genes occurred within the

ompA gene and thereby disrupted its function (Figure 6A and 6D). Continual

subculturing was undertaken for both strains and molecular analysis indicated the

stability of these lines for ten generations (Figure 6B and 6E). To demonstrate the

integrated genes were functional, we observed expression of mCherry fluorescence and

successfully cultured the strain containing gentamicin resistance on plates containing

the antibiotic (Figure 6C and 6F). Finally, we infected these transgenic strains into

mosquitoes to demonstrate that these strains were able to colonize the mosquito gut

and functionality of the integrated gene was confirmed by observing fluorescence or by

rearing the *Enterobacter ompA*::gentamicin strain in mosquitoes administered sugar

supplemented with gentamicin. Fluorescent bacteria were observed in the gut of

mosquitoes while no signal was seen in controls (WT *Enterobacter* infected mosquitoes)

(Figure 5G). The *Enterobacter ompA*::gentamicin was successfully rescued from

mosquitoes reared on gentamicin and was seen to stably infect mosquitoes over time at

a density of 1×10^4 CFUs/mosquito. Consistent with our previous finding (Figure 4B), the

WT bacteria initially infected mosquitoes at higher titers (T test; day 0 $P < 0.001$).

However, at 4 days post infection (dpi), the total bacterial load of culturable microbes in

mosquitoes supplemented with WT *Enterobacter* was significantly reduced when reared

on sugar supplemented with antibiotic (T test; day 4 $P < 0.05$), and no CFUs were

recovered after at 6 dpi (T test; day 6 $P < 0.001$) (Figure 6H).

Discussion.

We harnessed the CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing system to create knockout mutants in an *Enterobacter* gut symbiont of *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes enabling us to examine the role of bacterial genetics, specifically the *ompA* gene, in biofilm formation and gut colonization. A deletion of the *ompA* gene of *Enterobacter* decreased bacterial colonization of the mosquito host at both the larval and adult stages after infection in a mono-association. Strikingly, we found this effect was most pronounced in adult mosquitoes with more than half of the mosquitoes not possessing any culturable mutants, while there was no difference in prevalence of infection between the mutant and WT bacteria in larvae. The reduced prevalence of mutant bacteria in adults likely reflects differences in microbial colonization of each mosquito life stage. Larvae are continually subjected to bacteria in the larval water habitat while adults only have a short time frame to acquire bacteria immediately after eclosion, when they are thought to imbibe a small amount of larval water which seeds the gut with microbiota[67]. Our data shows greater variation in colonization of the adult stage between the mutant and WT strains, indicating that the *ompA* gene, and potentially bacterial factors in general, may be critical for colonization of the adult gut. These findings are also consistent with other sequence-based studies, that indicate adult stages have greater variability in species composition of their microbiota, while the microbiome of immature stages reflects the larval water habitat[1-8].

Overall, our findings are similar to studies done in Tsetse flies whereby an *ompA* mutant of *Sodalis*, an *Enterobacteriaceae* symbiont, has impaired biofilm formation and reduced colonization rates[22,23]. These studies, in conjunction with our work, suggests

that the *ompA* gene is imperative for symbiotic associations within dipterans. It also

suggests that biofilm formation may be a strategy employed by bacteria to colonize the

gut of insects. In pathogenic infections in mammals, biofilms enable bacteria to colonize

new niches, promote infection and are associated with virulence[68,69]. Although less is

known regarding the importance of biofilm formation in insects, in an artificial

Pseudomonas-Drosophila infection model, biofilm formation was associated with

virulence and host survival[20]. In a natural symbiotic association between bean bugs and

Burkholderia, disruption of a purine biosynthesis gene in the bacterium also reduce

biofilm formation and colonization of the insect[65]. In mosquitoes, gut biofilm formation

could also have implications for vector competence as *Chromobacterium*, which was

isolated from *Aedes* mosquitoes, produced molecules that inhibited dengue virus only

when grown *in vitro* as a biofilm and not when grown in a planktonic state[70]. However, it

is unknown if biofilm formation occurred *in vivo*[70]. Our data provide evidence that

biofilms occur within the gut of mosquitoes and facilitate host colonization.

While we have shown that the *ompA* gene of *Enterobacter* is important for host

colonization, we see no evidence that deletion of this gene alters mosquito development

or growth rates. This is in contrast to the *Riptortus-Burkholderia* symbiosis whereby

mutation of the *purT* gene in *Burkholderia* resulted in reduced growth rates and

reduction in body weight of the host compared to insects that were infected with the WT

bacterium[65]. The difference in our study to the findings in the *Riptortus-Burkholderia*

symbiosis could be related to different requirements of the bean bug compared to the

mosquito host as well as the different genes mutated in the symbionts. Our findings are

consistent with another study in mosquitoes whereby an *ompA* mutant of *E. coli* was

reported to not influence growth when a genomic mutant library was screened in *Ae.*

aegypti in a mono-association[71]. Using a similar gnotobiotic system that exploits the

ability to sterilize mosquito eggs and rescue development of the insect by

supplementation, several recent reports describe approaches to create bacteria-free

mosquitoes[62,63]. Here, we reared mosquitoes in a mono-association where they were

only subjected to *Enterobacter.* However*,* more than half the adult mosquitoes

inoculated with the Δ*ompA* mutant were not infected by bacteria, but nevertheless, had

similar development and growth rates compared to mosquito possessing WT bacteria. It

would be intriguing to determine if these uninfected mosquitoes were bacteria-free. If

so, the use of mutant bacteria that rescue development but cannot colonize mosquitoes

may provide a simple means to create sterile bacteria-free mosquitoes.

CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing has revolutionized genetic approaches in model bacteria[32-

35], and while the use of this approach is expanding to other non-model bacteria[37-42], to

our knowledge, there are no examples of editing undertaken in symbiotic microbes.

Here we demonstrate that editing approaches functional in *E. coli* can be applied to

phylogenetically related symbiotic bacteria that associate within the guts of mosquitoes.

Our overall goal was to delete the *ompA* gene in *Enterobacter* and therefore we altered

our editing strategy when carrying out experiments in the non-model *Enterobacter*

compared to our initial attempts in *E. coli*, and as such it is difficult to compare rates of

editing between bacterial species. Nevertheless, the number of mutant colonies was

considerably greater in *Enterobacter* compared to *E. coli* indicating the editing approach

is applicable to this symbiotic *Enterobacteriaceae* bacterium. Similar to our findings, a

two-plasmid CRISPR/Cas9 system, exploiting the use of λ-Red recombineering,

developed in *E. coli* was also functional in the *Enterobacteriaceae, Taumella citrea*,

without the need for modification[36]. Taken together, these findings suggest that

CRISPR/Cas9-based approaches may be applicable to a wide range of

Enterobacteriaceae. Similar to the original study in *E. coli*[35], we observed

counterselection escapees in our editing experiments. The no-SCAR approach uses a

counterselectoin method to edit bacteria and cells that possess both the Cas9 and the

gRNA should not be viable as a result of double stranded breaks in their genome. As

the genetic basis of counterselection escape remains unclear and our primary objective

was to create a mutant strain, we did not pursue the mechanism behind these escapees

further.

Previous integration attempts in *E. coli* using the no-SCAR approach inserted a small

fragment (80 bp) into the bacterial genome[35]. It was hypothesized however, that this

approach could be used to integrate larger sized fragments over 1 kb into the genome

based on the efficiency of integration and counterselection escape rates, although

screening would be required[35]. Here we demonstrate this is indeed feasible as we

inserted 1.3 kb and 1.5 kb fragments into the *Enterobacter* genome, and importantly,

these genes, driven by the AmTr promoter[72], were functional both *in vitro* and *in vivo*.

Our work expands the list of bacteria amenable to CRISPR/Cas9 based genome editing

approaches and provides an elegant tool to investigate specific bacterial genes that

influence host-microbe interactions in mosquito vectors.

The application of CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing to gut-associated bacteria of mosquitoes has significant applied potential. Paratransgenesis strategies are being evaluated in a range of medical and agricultural systems to mitigate pathogen transmission from insect vectors, however, most approaches engineer symbionts by plasmid transformation[47-55] and where genome integration has been accomplished in symbionts[56-61], it has been done with technologies that did not allow for site specific integration. Here, we demonstrate site-specific integration of transgenes into the bacterial symbiont genome. Paratransgenic approaches suitable for use in the field will need to stably integrate genes into the bacterial genome in a manner that does not compromise bacterial fitness. As such, the use of CRISPR/Cas9 to engineer specific sites in the bacterial genome, such as intergenic regions within the genome, will undoubtedly be beneficial for these applied approaches.

In summary, we have demonstrated that the CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing system can be applied to non-model symbiotic bacteria that associate with eukaryotic hosts to interrogate the role of bacterial genes in host-microbe associations. We created knockout and knockin mutants by deleting and disrupting the *ompA* gene of *Enterobacter*. The knockout mutant displayed a reduced ability to form biofilms and colonize the gut of *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes in a mono-association, demonstrating bacterial genetic factors are important determinants that influence colonization of mosquito guts. *Aedes* mosquitoes are becoming powerful systems to investigate the genetics of host-microbe interactions given the scientific community has simple and

344 efficient approaches to alter both the microbes (this study) and mosquito host

345 genome[73,74] at their disposal, as well as methods to create mono-associated bacterial

346 lines[64]. Finally, rapid, efficient, and site specific gene editing approaches for gut bacteria

347 that associate with mosquitoes will facilitate the development of novel paratransgenic

348 approaches to control arthropod-borne disease.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial and mosquito strains. *E. coli* BL21(DE3) (NEB) and an *Enterobacter* strain previous isolated from a lab-reared colony of *Ae. albopictus* (Galveston) mosquitoes[7] were used in this study. Cultures were grown in liquid LB media at 37°C with the appropriate antibiotic unless stated otherwise. Mosquitoes were reared in the UTMB insectary under conventional conditions or in mono-associations (described below).

CRISPR gene editing. Editing the *ompA* gene of *E. coli* and *Enterobacter* (Supplementary Table 1) was complete as described in Reisch and Prather[35]. The photospacer sequence for the *ompA* gene was designed using the CHOPCHOP[75], and cloned into pKDsgRNA-ack plasmid[35] directly upstream of gRNA scaffold using REPLACR mutagenesis protocol[76] (Supplementary Table 2). The plasmids were acquired from Addgene (Supplementary Table 1; Addgene plasmid 62655 and 62654). The resulting plasmids pKDsgRNA-Ec-*ompA* and pKDsgRNA-Ent-*ompA* were Sanger sequenced to confirm insertion of photospacer sequence. These plasmids were then transformed into either *E. coli* or *Enterobacter* containing the pCas9-CR4 plasmid. Transformants were selected at 30°C on LB agar plate containing spectinomycin (50 µg/mL), chloramphenicol (34 µg/mL), and with or without anhydrotetracycline (aTC) at 100ng/mL. Colonies from the –aTC plate were grown overnight in LB broth with the appropriate antibiotic at 30°C. A 1:100 diluted overnight culture was (grown until 0.4 OD_{600}) supplemented with 1.2% arabinose to induce the expression of λ-Red recombinase. Cells were then transformed with 1-1.5 µg of double stranded donor DNA that flanked the PAM site for homologous recombination. Donor DNA was created by

either PCR amplification or by gene synthesis (Genewiz). Regardless of the method of

construction, each donor had flanking regions of 250 bp homologous to the target DNA.

The resulting colonies were screened for mutations by colony PCR with primers flanking

the integration site and positive clones were Sanger sequenced. Positive colonies were

grown in LB broth and genomic DNA was isolated. For further validation, the flanking

regions of deletion or insertions were amplified and the PCR product Sanger

sequenced.

Stability of insertion. The stability of the knockout Δ*ompA* mutant and the knockin

ompA::gentamicin and *ompA*::mCherry strains was assessed in LB medium. The

*omp*A::mCherry and knockout Δ*ompA* mutant cultures were grown for 10 passages in

LB broth. At each passage 40 µl of culture was transferred into 4ml fresh LB medium.

The *ompA*::gentamicin strain was grown with or without gentamicin (50 µg/mL).

Genomic DNA was isolated from the 0, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10th subculture and PCR that

amplified across the integration site was performed.

Complementation of *ompA* mutant. Functional rescue of the *omp*A mutation was

achieved by complementing the mutant with the WT gene. The WT *omp*A gene was

amplified from *Enterobacter* genomic DNA and cloned into the pRAM-mCherry vector[7]

and thereby creating pRAM-mCherry-*Ent-OmpA.* The Sanger sequence-verified

plasmid was transformed into the Δ*ompA* mutant, thereby generating the Δ*ompA/ompA*

complement strain. Colonies that acquired the plasmid were selected on LB plates

containing kanamycin (50 µg/mL).

In vitro characterization of Enterobacter strains. To assess the impact of the gene deletion on bacterial growth the WT, ΔompA mutant and ΔompA/ompA complement were grown in LB broth and the density of bacteria (OD_{600}) was quantified by spectrophotometer. A 1:100 dilution of an overnight culture was inoculated into a 5 ml LB broth in 50 ml tube and incubated at 37°C for 24 hrs. At 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 24 hours growth was recorded at OD_{600}. The biofilm assay was performed as described previously[77,78]. Briefly, biofilm formation by Enterobacter strains was quantified on polystyrene microtiter plates after 72 h of incubation at 37°C by CV staining. Three independent experiments were performed, and the data were represented as CV OD_{570} after normalizing by CFUs.

Mosquito infections. Mono-association in Ae. aegypti mosquitoes were done using gnotobiotic infection procedure[64], with slight modifications[7]. Briefly, mosquito eggs were sterilized for 5 min in 70% ethanol, 3 min 3% bleach+0.01% Coverage Plus NPD (Steris Corp.), 5 min in 70% ethanol then rinsed three times in sterile water. Eggs were vacuumed hatched for 30-45 min and left overnight at room temperature to hatch any remaining eggs. Exactly twenty L1 larvae were transferred to T175 flask containing 60 ml of sterile water and fed on alternative days with 60 μl of fish food (1 μg/μl). Larvae were inoculated with 1×10^7/ml of either the WT Enterobacter, the ΔompA mutant or the ΔompA/ompA complement. The WT and ΔompA strains were transformed with the pRAM-mCherry plasmid that conferred resistance to kanamycin (but did not possess a functional ompA gene). L4 larvae were collected, washed three times with 1X PBS, and

then homogenized in 500 µl of 1X PBS and 50 µl of homogenate was plated on LB agar

containing 50 µg/mL kanamycin. Similarly, adult mosquitoes were collected 3-4 days

post emergence and bacterial infection was quantified in the same manner as larvae. In

order to assess the growth of the mosquitoes, time to pupation and growth rate were

observed. Time to pupation was determined by quantifying the number of pupae each

day post hatching, while survival to adulthood was calculated by quantifying the number

of L1 larvae that reached adulthood. The experiment was repeated three times.

Knock-in mutants were administered to adult *Ae. aegypti* in a sugar meal. Three to four

day old mosquitoes were fed with 1×10^7 of WT or the $\Delta ompA$::gentamicin strain for

three days in 10% sucrose solution. After three days, mosquitoes were either

administered sugar supplemented with gentamicin (50 µg/mL) or sugar without

antibiotic. CFUs were determined at days 0, 2, 4, and 6 dpi by plating homogenized

mosquitoes (N=10) on LB agar. Similarly, the $\Delta ompA$::mCherry and WT *Enterobacter*

were fed to mosquitoes and midguts were dissected to assess the colonization of

bacteria in the tissue. For visualization of bacteria, midguts were fixed in 1%

paraformaldehyde (PFA) in 1X PBS for 30 minutes and permeabilized with 0.01% Triton

X-100 in 1X PBS for 20 min. The tissues were stained with 1:250 diluted Phalloidin

(Sigma) for 20 minutes and samples were washed twice with 1X PBS for 10 minutes.

Finally, midguts were then stained with 1:500 diluted DAPI (Invitrogen) for 10 min.

Samples were transferred to slides and mounted with ProLong™ Gold Antifade

(Invitrogen). The slides were observed under Revolve FL (ECHOLAB).

Acknowledgements.

We would like to thank the UTMB insectary core for providing mosquitoes. GLH was

supported by NIH grants (R21AI138074, R21AI124452 and R21AI129507), a University

of Texas Rising Star award, the Western Gulf Center of Excellence for Vector-borne

Diseases (CDC grant CK17-005), the Robert J. and Helen Kleberg Foundation and the

Gulf Coast Consortia. This work was also supported by a James W. McLaughlin

postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Texas Medical Branch to SH and a Dutsadi

Piphat Scholarship and Thailand Research Chair Grant from NSTDA (p-15-50004) to

PN. We also wish to thank Dr Ulrike Munderloh (University of Minnesota) for the kind

gift of the pRAM plasmid.

Competing interests.

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure legends.

Figure 1. Midgut infection of *Enterobacter* and *E. coli* in mono-associations of *Aedes* mosquitoes. *Enterobacter* forms a biofilm in the gut of *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes (left) while no bacteria were observed in the gut of mosquitoes reared with *E. coli* under gnotobiotic conditions (right). Bacteria possessed a plasmid expressing mCherry. Blue – host nuclei. Green – host actin cytoskeleton stained with phalloidin. The scale bar is 70 μm.

Figure 2. CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing in bacteria. A schematic of the editing approach and screening of putative mutants in *E. coli* (A) and *Enterobacter* (B). A ~1kb fragment of *E. coli* BL21(DE3) was deleted using no-SCAR protocol. The 250 bp of left arm (LA) and right arm (RA) was assembled to generate 500 bp donor DNA. The transformants were screened via colony PCR with primers binding in regions flanking the deletion. Similar to strategy employed in *E. coli*, knockout of the *ompA* gene from *Enterobacter* isolated from the mosquito gut was created by deleting the 598 bp fragment. The green star indicates the PAM site in the *ompA* gene. (C) The sequence of the *ompA* mutation in *E. coli* and *Enterobacter* was confirmed by Sanger sequencing. The sequence above the gene within the dotted line has been deleted. The chromatogram shows the 10 bp flanking the deletion.

Figure 3. In vitro characterization of the *ompA* mutation. The *Enterobacter* Δ*ompA* mutant had a similar growth rate compared to both the WT and the Δ*ompA/ompA*

complement in liquid LB media (A). The stability of mutant was evaluated *in vitro* by

continuous subculturing in LB medium (B). Genomic DNA of alternative subcultures was

used as template for PCR using gene specific primers that amplified across the

deletion. Two separate gel images were merged to create the figure 2B. Passage 8 was

run on a separate gel to passages 0 – 6. Biofilm formation was assessed using the CV

biofilm assay for the WT, Δ*ompA* mutant and the Δ*ompA/ompA* complement (C).

Quantification of the relative biofilm formation normalized by the number of bacteria per

well (D).

Figure 4. The Δ*ompA* mutant poorly infected mosquitoes. Infection of *Enterobacter*

strains (WT, Δ*ompA* mutant and Δ*ompA/ompA* complement) reared in a mono-

association using a gnotobiotic rearing approach for larvae (A) and adults (B). L4 and 3-

4 days post emergence adults were screened for bacterial load by plating on LB media

to quantify the bacteria. The prevalence of infection (number of mosquitoes infected)

between the treatments was calculated comparing number of infected to uninfected

larvae (C) or adults (D).

Figure 5. The Δ*ompA* mutant does not affect growth rates or development of

mosquitoes. The growth rate (time to pupation) (A) and development (percentage of L1

larvae to reach adulthood) (B) was observed in mosquitoes infected with *Enterobacter*

strains (WT, Δ*ompA* mutant and Δ*ompA/ompA* complement) reared in a mono-

association.

Figure 6. Integration of mCherry and gentamicin into the *Enterobacter* genome.

Sanger sequence across the integration site, stability of the inserted gene and *in vitro*

expression of the inserted gene for the Δ*ompA*::mCherry (A-C) and the Δ*ompA*::

gentamicin (D-F) strains. The chromatogram shows the sequence spanning the inserted

sites. Strains were continually subcultured for 10 passages and PCR was done to

examine the stability of the insert (B; Δ*ompA*::mCherry plus WT; E Δ*ompA*::gentamicin

passaged with (ab+) or without (ab-) gentamicin plus WT). mCherry fluorescence or

ability to grow on selective media containing gentamicin confirmed the expression of the

transgene *in vitro*. Mosquitoes were inoculated with the *Enterobacter* strains to confirm

expression of the transgene *in vivo*. Dissected midgut infected with Δ*ompA*::mCherry

(left) or negative control (right; WT bacteria without expression plasmid) (G). Midguts

were stained with phalloidin (green) and DAPI (blue). The scale bar is 30 μM. The WT

and Δ*ompA*::gentamicin *Enterobacter* strains were fed to adult mosquitoes for 3 days in

a sugar meal before gentamicin was administered to mosquitoes in a sugar meal (H).

Mosquitoes were collected every second day and CFUs assessed. Pairwise

comparisons were conducted at each time point using a T test (* - $P < 0.05$, *** $P <$

0.001, **** $P < 0.0001$).

References.

1. Osei-Poku, J., Mbogo, C. M., Palmer, W. J. & Jiggins, F. M. Deep sequencing reveals extensive variation in the gut microbiota of wild mosquitoes from Kenya. *Mol Ecol* **21,** 5138–5150 (2012).
2. Boissière, A. *et al. Midgut microbiota of the malaria Mosquito vector Anopheles gambiae and interactions with Plasmodium falciparum Infection. PLoS Pathog* **8,** e1002742 (2012).
3. David, M. R., Santos, L. M. B. D., Vicente, A. C. P. & Maciel-de-Freitas, R. Effects of environment, dietary regime and ageing on the dengue vector microbiota: evidence of a core microbiota throughout *Aedes aegypti* lifespan. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz* **111,** 577–587 (2016).
4. Muturi, E. J., Kim, C.-H., Bara, J., Bach, E. M. & Siddappaji, M. H. *Culex pipiens* and *Culex restuans* mosquitoes harbor distinct microbiota dominated by few bacterial taxa. *Parasit Vectors* **9,** 18 (2016).
5. Hughes, G. L. *et al.* Native microbiome impedes vertical transmission of *Wolbachia* in *Anopheles* mosquitoes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **111,** 12498–12503 (2014).
6. Coon, K. L., Brown, M. R. & Strand, M. R. Mosquitoes host communities of bacteria that are essential for development but vary greatly between local habitats. *Mol Ecol* **25,** 5806–5826 (2016).
7. Hegde, S. *et al.* Microbiome interaction networks and community structure from lab-reared and field-collected *Aedes aegypti*, *Aedes albopictus*, and *Culex quinquefasciatus* mosquito vectors. *bioRxiv* 1–56 (2018). doi:10.1101/337311
8. Wang, Y., Gilbreath, T. M., Kukutla, P., Yan, G. & Xu, J. Dynamic gut microbiome across life history of the malaria mosquito *Anopheles gambiae* in Kenya. *PLoS ONE* **6,** e24767–9 (2011).
9. Weiss, B. L. & Aksoy, S. Microbiome influences on insect host vector competence. *Trends Parasitol* **27,** 514–522 (2011).
10. Hegde, S., Rasgon, J. L. & Hughes, G. L. The microbiome modulates arbovirus transmissionin mosquitoes. *Current Opinion in Virology* **15,** 97–102 (2015).
11. Saldaña, M. A., Hegde, S. & Hughes, G. L. Microbial control of arthropod-borne disease. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz* **112,** 81–93 (2017).
12. Audsley, M. D., Ye, Y. H. & McGraw, E. A. The microbiome composition of *Aedes aegypti* is not critical for *Wolbachia*-mediated inhibition of dengue virus. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **11,** e0005426 (2017).
13. Muturi, E. J., Bara, J. J., Rooney, A. P. & Hansen, A. K. Midgut fungal and bacterial microbiota of *Aedes triseriatus* and *Aedes japonicus* shift in response to La Crosse virus infection. *Mol Ecol* **25,** 4075–4090 (2016).
14. Stathopoulos, S., Neafsey, D. E., Lawniczak, M. K. N., Muskavitch, M. A. T. & Christophides, G. K. Genetic dissection of *Anopheles gambiae* gut epithelial responses to *Serratia marcescens*. *PLoS Pathog* **10,** e1003897 (2014).
15. Xiao, X. *et al.* A mesh-duox pathway regulates homeostasis in the insect gut. *Nat. Microbiol* **2,** 17020 (2017).

16.   Pang, X. *et al.* Mosquito C-type lectins maintain gut microbiome homeostasis.
Nat. Microbiol **1,** 16023 (2016).

17.   Short, S. M., Mongodin, E. F., MacLeod, H. J., Talyuli, O. A. C. & Dimopoulos, G.
Amino acid metabolic signaling influences *Aedes aegypti* midgut microbiome
variability. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **11,** e0005677–29 (2017).

18.   Kumar, S., Molina-Cruz, A., Gupta, L., Rodrigues, J. & Barillas-Mury, C. A
peroxidase/dual oxidase system modulates midgut epithelial immunity in
Anopheles gambiae. Science **327,** 1644–1648 (2010).

19.   Powell, J. E., Leonard, S. P., Kwong, W. K., Engel, P. & Moran, N. A. Genome-
wide screen identifies host colonization determinants in a bacterial gut symbiont.
Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **113,** 13887-13893 (2016).

20.   Mulcahy, H., Sibley, C. D., Surette, M. G. & Lewenza, S. *Drosophila melanogaster*
as an animal model for the study of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilm infections *in*
vivo. PLoS Pathog **7,** e1002299–14 (2011).

21.   Maltz, M. & Graf, J. The type II secretion system is essential for erythrocyte lysis
and gut colonization by the leech digestive tract symbiont *Aeromonas veronii.*
Appl Environ Microbiol **77,** 597–603 (2011).

22.   Weiss, B. L., Wu, Y., Schwank, J. J., Tolwinski, N. S. & Aksoy, S. An insect
symbiosis is influenced by bacterium-specific polymorphisms in outer-membrane
protein A. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **105,** 15088–15093 (2008).

23.   Maltz, M. A., Weiss, B. L., O'Neill, M., Wu, Y. & Aksoy, S. OmpA-mediated biofilm
formation is essential for the commensal bacterium *Sodalis glossinidius* to
colonize the tsetse fly gut. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **78,** 7760–7768 (2012).

24.   Riehle, M. A., Moreira, C. K., Lampe, D., Lauzon, C. & Jacobs-Lorena, M. Using
bacteria to express and display anti-*Plasmodium* molecules in the mosquito
midgut. *Int J Parasitol* **37,** 595–603 (2007).

25.   Dennison, N. J. *et al.* Functional genomic analyses of *Enterobacter*, *Anopheles*
and *Plasmodium* reciprocal interactions that impact vector competence. *Malar J*
15, 425 (2016).

26.   Pei, D. *et al.* The *waaL* gene mutation compromised the inhabitation of
Enterobacter sp. Ag1 in the mosquito gut environment. *Parasit Vectors* **8,** 1–10
(2015).

27.   Enomoto, S., Chari, A., Clayton, A. L. & Dale, C. Quorum sensing attenuates
virulence in *Sodalis praecaptivus. Cell Host Microbe* **21,** 629–636.e5 (2017).

28.   Dale, C., Young, S. A., Haydon, D. T. & Welburn, S. C. The insect endosymbiont
Sodalis glossinidius utilizes a type III secretion system for cell invasion. *Proc Natl*
Acad Sci USA **98,** 1883–1888 (2001).

29.   Selle, K. & Barrangou, R. Harnessing CRISPR-Cas systems for bacterial genome
editing. *Trends Microbiol* **23,** 225–232 (2015).

30.   Barrangou, R. & van Pijkeren, J. P. Exploiting CRISPR-Cas immune systems for
genome editing in bacteria. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* **37,** 61–68 (2016).

31.   Sander, J. D. & Joung, J. K. CRISPR-Cas systems for editing, regulating and
targeting genomes. *Nat Biotechnol* **32,** 347–355 (2014).

32.   Jiang, W., Bikard, D., Cox, D., Zhang, F. & Marraffini, L. A. RNA-guided editing of
bacterial genomes using CRISPR-Cas systems. *Nat Biotechnol* **31,** 233–239
(2013).

33.   Ronda, C., Pedersen, L. E., Sommer, M. O. A. & Nielsen, A. T. CRMAGE:
CRISPR Optimized MAGE Recombineering. *Sci Rep* **6,** 19452 (2016).
34.   Li, Y. *et al.* Metabolic engineering of *Escherichia coli* using CRISPR–Cas9
meditated genome editing. *Metabolic Engineering* **31,** 13–21 (2015).
35.   Reisch, C. R. & Prather, K. L. J. The no-SCAR (Scarless Cas9 Assisted
Recombineering) system for genome editing in *Escherichia coli*. *Sci Rep* **5,** 15096
(2015).
36.   Jiang, Y. *et al.* Multigene Editing in the *Escherichia coli* Genome via the CRISPR-
Cas9 System. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **81,** 2506–2514 (2015).
37.   Tong, Y., Robertsen, H. L., Blin, K., Weber, T. & Lee, S. Y. CRISPR-Cas9 toolkit
for *Actinomycete* Genome Editing. *Methods Mol Biol* **1671,** 163–184 (2018).
38.   Li, K., Cai, D., Wang, Z., He, Z. & Chen, S. Development of an efficient genome
editing tool in *Bacillus licheniformis* using CRISPR-Cas9 nickase. *Appl Environ*
Microbiol AEM.02608–17 (2018). doi:10.1128/AEM.02608-17
39.   Mougiakos, I. *et al.* Efficient genome editing of a facultative thermophile using
mesophilic spCas9. *ACS Synth Biol* **6,** 849–861 (2017).
40.   Oh, J.-H. & van Pijkeren, J. P. CRISPR-Cas9-assisted recombineering in
Lactobacillus reuteri. *Nucleic Acids Res* **42,** e131–e131 (2014).
41.   Cobb, R. E., Wang, Y. & Zhao, H. High-efficiency multiplex genome editing of
Streptomyces species using an engineered CRISPR/Cas System. *ACS Synth Biol*
4, 723–728 (2014).
42.   Jiang, Y. *et al.* CRISPR-Cpf1 assisted genome editing of *Corynebacterium*
glutamicum. *Nat Commun* **8,** 15179 (2017).
43.   Waller, M. C., Bober, J. R., Nair, N. U. & Beisel, C. L. Toward a genetic tool
development pipeline for host-associated bacteria. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **38,** 156–
164 (2017).
44.   Wilke, A. B. B. & Marrelli, M. T. Paratransgenesis: a promising new strategy for
mosquito vector control. *Parasit Vectors* **8,** 391–19 (2015).
45.   Arora, A. K. & Douglas, A. E. Hype or opportunity? Using microbial symbionts in
novel strategies for insect pest control. *J Insect Physiol* **103,** 10–17 (2017).
46.   Ricci, I. *et al.* Mosquito/microbiota interactions: from complex relationships to
biotechnological perspectives. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **15,** 278–284 (2012).
47.   Bisi, D. C. & Lampe, D. J. Secretion of anti-*Plasmodium* effector proteins from a
natural Pantoea agglomerans isolate by using *PelB* and *HlyA* secretion signals.
Appl Environ Microbiol **77,** 4669–4675 (2011).
48.   Bextine, B., Lauzon, C., Potter, S., Lampe, D. & Miller, T. A. Delivery of a
genetically marked *Alcaligenes* sp. to the glassy-winged sharpshooter for use in a
paratransgenic control strategy. *Curr Microbiol* **48,** 327–331 (2004).
49.   Beard, C. B., Mason, P. W., Aksoy, S., Tesh, R. B. & Richards, F. F.
Transformation of an insect symbiont and expression of a foreign gene in the
Chagas' disease vector *Rhodnius prolixus*. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **46,**
195–200 (1992).
50.   Durvasula, R. V. *et al.* Expression of a functional antibody fragment in the gut of
Rhodnius prolixus via transgenic bacterial symbiont *Rhodococcus rhodnii*. *Med*
Vet Entomol **13,** 115–119 (1999).
51.   Wang, S. *et al.* Fighting malaria with engineered symbiotic bacteria from vector

mosquitoes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **109,** 12734–12739 (2012).

52.   Favia, G. *et al.* Bacteria of the genus *Asaia* stably associate with *Anopheles*
stephensi, an Asian malarial mosquito vector. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104,**
9047–9051 (2007).

53.   Hughes, G. L. *et al.* Identification of yeast associated with the planthopper,
Perkinsiella saccharicida: potential applications for Fiji leaf gall control. *Curr*
Microbiol **63,** 392–401 (2011).

54.   Medina, F., Li, H., Vinson, S. B. & Coates, C. J. Genetic transformation of midgut
bacteria from the Red Imported Fire Ant (*Solenopsis invicta*). *Curr Microbiol* **58,**
478–482 (2009).

55.   Hurwitz, I., Hillesland, H., Fieck, A., Das, P. & Durvasula, R. The paratransgenic
sand fly: a platform for control of *Leishmania* transmission. *Parasit Vectors* **4,** 82
(2011).

56.   Pittman, G. W., Brumbley, S. M., Allsopp, P. G. & O'Neill, S. L. Assessment of gut
bacteria for a paratransgenic approach to control *Dermolepida albohirtum* Larvae.
Appl Environ Microbiol **74,** 4036–4043 (2008).

57.   Tikhe, C. V., Martin, T. M., Howells, A., Delatte, J. & Husseneder, C. Assessment
of genetically engineered *Trabulsiella odontotermitis* as a 'Trojan Horse' for
paratransgenesis in termites. *BMC Microbiol* 1–11 (2016). doi:10.1186/s12866-
016-0822-4

58.   Bextine, B., Lampe, D., Lauzon, C., Jackson, B. & Miller, T. A. Establishment of a
genetically marked insect-derived symbiont in multiple host plants. *Curr Microbiol*
50, 1–7 (2005).

59.   Pontes, M. H. & Dale, C. Lambda red-mediated genetic modification of the insect
endosymbiont *Sodalis glossinidius*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **77,** 1918–1920 (2011).

60.   Wang, S. *et al.* Driving mosquito refractoriness to *Plasmodium falciparum* with
engineered symbiotic bacteria. *Science* **357,** 1399–1402 (2017).

61.   Dotson, E. M., Plikaytis, B., Shinnick, T. M., Durvasula, R. V. & Beard, C. B.
Transformation of *Rhodococcus rhodnii*, a symbiont of the Chagas disease vector
Rhodnius prolixus, with integrative elements of the L1 mycobacteriophage. *Infect*
Genet Evol **3,** 103–109 (2003).

62.   Correa, M. A., Brackney, D. E. & Steven, B. Axenic *Aedes aegypti* develop
without live bacteria, but exhibit delayed development and reduced oviposition.
bioRxiv 264978 (2018). doi:10.1101/264978

63.   Valzania, L. *et al.* Both living bacteria and eukaryotes in the mosquito gut promote
growth of larvae. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **12,** e0006638 (2018).

64.   Coon, K. L., Vogel, K. J., Brown, M. R. & Strand, M. R. Mosquitoes rely on their
gut microbiota for development. *Mol Ecol* **23,** 2727–2739 (2014).

65.   Kim, J. K. *et al.* Purine biosynthesis, biofilm formation, and persistence of an
insect-microbe gut symbiosis. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **80,** 4374–4382 (2014).

66.   Wang, H. H. *et al.* Programming cells by multiplex genome engineering and
accelerated evolution. *Nature* **460,** 894–898 (2009).

67.   Lindh, J. M., Borg-Karlson, A.-K. & Faye, I. Transstadial and horizontal transfer of
bacteria within a colony of Anopheles gambiae (Diptera: Culicidae) and
oviposition response to bacteria-containing water. *Acta Trop* **107,** 242–250
(2008).

68.   Ribet, D. & Cossart, P. How bacterial pathogens colonize their hosts and invade
702   deeper tissues. *Microbes Infect* **17,** 173–183 (2015).
703   69.   Hall-Stoodley, L., Costerton, J. W. & Stoodley, P. Bacterial biofilms: from the
704   natural environment to infectious diseases. *Nat Rev Micro* **2,** 95–108 (2004).
705   70.   Ramirez, J. L. *et al. Chromobacterium* Csp_P reduces malaria and dengue
706   infection in vector mosquitoes and has entomopathogenic and in vitro anti-
707   pathogen activities. *PLoS Pathog* **10,** e1004398 (2014).
708   71.   Valzania, L., Coon, K. L., Vogel, K. J., Brown, M. R. & Strand, M. R. Hypoxia-
709   induced transcription factor signaling is essential for larval growth of the mosquito
710   *Aedes aegypti*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **115,** 457–465 (2018).
711   72.   Burkhardt, N. Y. *et al.* Development of Shuttle Vectors for Transformation of
712   Diverse Rickettsia Species. *PLoS ONE* **6,** e29511 (2011).
713   73.   Chaverra-Rodriguez, D. *et al.* Targeted delivery of CRISPR-Cas9
714   ribonucleoprotein into arthropod ovaries for heritable germline gene editing. *Nat*
715   *Commun* 1–11 (2018). doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05425-9
716   74.   Li, M. *et al.* Germline Cas9 expression yields highly efficient genome engineering
717   in a major worldwide disease vector,Aedes aegypti. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **114,**
718   E10540–E10549 (2017).
719   75.   Labun, K., Montague, T. G., Gagnon, J. A., Thyme, S. B. & Valen, E.
720   CHOPCHOP v2: a web tool for the next generation of CRISPR genome
721   engineering. *Nucleic Acids Res* **44,** W272–6 (2016).
722   76.   Trehan, A. *et al.* REPLACR-mutagenesis, a one-step method for site-directed
723   mutagenesis by recombineering. *Sci Rep* **6,** 51–9 (2016).
724   77.   O'Toole, G. A. & Kolter, R. Flagellar and twitching motility are necessary for
725   *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilm development. *Mol Microbiol* **30,** 295–304
726   (1998).
727   78.   Kozlova, E. V., Khajanchi, B. K., Popov, V. L., Wen, J. & Chopra, A. K. Impact of
728   QseBC system in c-di-GMP-dependent quorum sensing regulatory network in a
729   clinical isolate SSU of *Aeromonas hydrophila*. *Microb. Pathog.* **53,** 115–124
730   (2012).
731

A

Chr ompA AmTr prom mCherry ompA

CGTGACATCGGGCTCCTCCT   TGTTAACCCACTATTTGTAT

B

	P0		P2		P4		P6		P8		P10		NTC	M
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b		

2 kb →
1kb →

a- WT, b-ΔompA::mCherry

C

WT   ΔompA::mcherry

D

Chr ompA AmTr prom gentamicin ompA

CGTGACATCGGGCTCCTCCT   CGCCACCTAATGGGGTTAACA

E

	P0			P2			P4			P6			P8			P10			NTC	M
	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c		

1.8 kb →
1 kb →

a- WT, b-ΔompA::gentamicin(ab-), c-ΔompA::gentamicin(ab+)

F

WT   ΔompA::gentamicin

G

H

CFU/mosquito

10^6
10^5 ****   ns   *   ***
10^4
10^3
10^2
10^1
10^0

0   2   4   6

Days post antibiotic treatment

— WT
— ΔompA::gentamicin