Intracellular AIEC LF82 relies on SOS and stringent responses to survive, multiply and tolerate antibiotics.

Gaëlle Demarre [1,2], Victoria Prudent [1], Hanna Schenk [3], Emilie Rousseau [1], Marie-Agnes Bringer [5,6], Nicolas Barnich [6], Guy Tran Van Nhieu [1], Sylvie Rimsky [1], Silvia De Monte [3,6] and Olivier Espéli [1,*].

Affiliations

[1] CIRB – Collège de France, CNRS-UMR724, INSERM U1050, PSL Research University, 11 place Marcelin Berthelot 75005 Paris, France.
[2] Inovarion, Paris, France
[3] Department of Evolutionary Theory, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, Plön, Germany
[4] Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, 21000 Dijon
[5] Microbes, Intestin, Inflammation et Susceptibilité de l'Hôte. UMR Inserm/ Université d'Auvergne U1071, USC INRA 2018
[6] Institut de Biologie de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, Département de Biologie, Ecole Normale Supérieure, CNRS, INSERM, PSL Research University, Paris, France

* for correspondence: olivier.espeli@college-de-france.fr

Abstract

Adherent Invasive *Escherichia coli* (AIEC) strains recovered from Crohn's disease lesions survive and multiply within macrophages. A reference strain for this family, AIEC LF82, forms microcolonies within phagolysosomes, an environment that prevents commensal *E. coli* multiplication. Little is known about the LF82 intracellular growth status, and signals leading to macrophage intra-vacuolar multiplication. We used single-cell analysis, genetic dissection and mathematical models to monitor the growth status and cell cycle regulation of intracellular LF82. We found that within macrophages, bacteria may replicate or undergo non-growing phenotypic switches. This switch results from stringent response firing immediately after uptake by macrophages or at later stages, following genotoxic damage and SOS induction during intracellular replication. Importantly, non-growers resist treatment with various antibiotics. Thus, intracellular challenges induce AIEC LF82 phenotypic heterogeneity and non-growing bacteria that could provide a reservoir for antibiotic-tolerant bacteria responsible for relapsing infections.

Introduction

Adherent Invasive *Escherichia coli* (AIEC) strains recovered from Crohn's disease (CD) lesions are able to adhere to and invade cultured intestinal epithelial cells and to survive and multiply within macrophages (Glasser et al 2001). Attention around the potential role of AIEC in the pathophysiology of CD is growing (Elhenawy *et al*, 2018); however much remains to be learned about the host-pathogen interactions that govern AIEC infection biology. The diversity of virulence factors displayed by multiple AIEC strains suggests that members of this pathovar have evolved different strategies to colonize their hosts. AIEC ability to persist, and in some cases replicate within macrophages is particularly intriguing. Previous work performed with murine macrophage cell lines has revealed that LF82, the first AIEC to have been characterized, multiplies in a vacuole presenting the characteristics of a mature phagolysosome (Bringer *et al.,* 2006). In such an environment, AIEC should encounter acidic, oxidative, genotoxic and proteic stresses. Screening of genes involved in LF82 fitness within macrophage has revealed that HtrA, DsbA, or Fis proteins are required for optimum fitness, (Bringer *et al.,* 2005; Bringer *et al.,* 2007; Miquel *et al.,* 2010). These observations confirmed that LF82 encounter stresses in the phagolysosomes. The impact of these stresses on the survival and growth of LF82 inside phagolysomes has not yet been investigated.

Studies on the bacterial cell cycle of few model organisms under well-controlled laboratory conditions have revealed that to achieve accurate transmission of the genetic information and optimal growth of the population, molecular processes must be coordinated. (for reviews see Hajduk *et al.,* 2016; Haeusser & Levin, 2008; Margolin & Bernander, 2004). When growth conditions deteriorate, the cell cycle can be modified slightly, as in the case of cell filamentation when genotoxic stress induces the SOS response, or more drastically when sporulation is induced by nutrient deprivation (Jonas, 2014). Such cell cycle alterations affect the entire population. However, under unperturbed conditions, a subset of the population also appears to present a significantly reduced growth rate that allows tolerance to antibiotic treatments. This small portion of the population, typically 1/10000 bacteria, is known as persisters (Wood *et al.,* 2013; Lewis, 2010; Bigger, 1944). Persisters have been detected for a number of bacteria. They can be found spontaneously in normally growing or stationary phase populations, or they are induced by exogeneous stresses or mutations. Recently, significant increase of the proportion of *S. typhimurium* persisters has been observed

when these bacteria invade macrophages (Helaine *et al.,* 2014). Using a fluorescent reporter, it has been demonstrated that these persisters were not multiplying prior to antibiotic addition. The same tool also revealed the presence of non-growing mycobacteria inside macrophages (Mouton *et al.,* 2016). Several mediators of persistence have been identified, with toxin-antitoxin modules emerging as key players and the reduction of metabolic activities as the main driver of persistence (Rycroft *et al.,* 2018; Dörr *et al.,* 2009; Shan *et al.,* 2017; Balaban *et al.,* 2004; Harms *et al.,* 2017; Amato *et al.,* 2014). Persisters are increasingly viewed as a major cause of the recurrence of chronic infectious disease and could be an important factor in the emergence of antibiotic resistance (Verstraeten *et al.,* 2016). In addition to persisters, bacterial tolerance to antibiotic treatments has been observed. In contrast to persisters, tolerance concerns the entire population. Tolerance corresponds to a weaker ability of antibiotics to kill slow growing compared to fast growing bacteria. Tolerant bacteria emerge, for example, in the presence of a nutritional limitation. The viability of tolerant bacteria is impacted by the concentration and length of the antibiotic challenge (Kim & Wood, 2017). Tolerant cells have some aspect of active metabolism, and their frequency in the population changes when bacterial environmental sensing is altered (Amato & Brynildsen, 2015; Bernier *et al.,* 2013; Radzikowski *et al.,* 2016). Persistence is often viewed as the result of a phenotypic switch ensuring long-term adaptation to variable environments, however the origin of persistence and tolerance *in vivo* remain unclear, and their distinction in the context of a host- pathogen interaction is difficult (Kim & Wood, 2017).

In the present work, we analyzed growth characteristics of LF82 in THP1 monocytes differentiated into macrophages. We observed that stresses within macrophages induce a profound bacterial response that leads to the formation of non-growing and antibiotic-tolerant LF82 at a high rate through the successive induction of stringent and SOS responses. A portion of non-growing LF82 formed within macrophages is tolerant to antibiotics and present a survival advantage. Our work revealed that internalization within phagolysosomes curbs bacterial multiplication, and frequent escape from the replicative cycle toward non-growing state(s) is a way to improve long-term survival in the host.

Results

Inside macrophages, LF82 population size increases despite extensive death.

We used THP1 monocyte-derived into macrophages to monitor the population size of AIEC LF82 bacteria over a 24 h period post infection (P.I.) (Figure 1A). CFU measurements revealed that the LF82 population exponentially increased for 10-14 hours (τ= 0.15 h^{-1}, 0.21 doubling / h) after a long lag. The population reached a maximum at 18-20 h of approximately 5-fold the value at 1 h; the number of LF82 then slightly decreased (reaching 3 -fold) at 24 h. In this environment LF82 might simultaneously encounter acidic pH, oxidative and genotoxic stresses, toxic molecules such as cathepsins and a lack of important nutrients. Surprisingly, the tolerance level of LF82 to any individual stress did not differ from a commensal K12 *E. coli* in *in vitro* conditions (Supplementary Figure S1A). Using direct ex vivo Live and Dead labeling, it has been previously proposed that LF82 are not killed or only rarely killed by macrophages (Lapaquette *et al.,* 2012). We observed that this method underestimates dead bacteria inside macrophages compared to the labeling dead bacteria with propidium iodide (PI) immediately after macrophage lysis (Supplementary Figure S2A). We observed 20 - 30% PI-positive bacteria at 1 h, 12 h, 18h and 24 h post-infection (Figure 1A). To estimate the speed of dead bacteria disappearing in macrophages, we observed the elimination of heat-killed bacteria by THP1 macrophages. Dead LF82 disappeared exponentially with a decay rate of 0.6 h^{-1} and a half-life of 1.4 h (Supplementary Figure S2B); therefore dead LF82 observed at 12h, 18h or 24 h did not correspond to the accumulation over infection period but rather to the bacteria killed in the last 3 hours before observations. This finding led to consider that LF82 must be under stress attack by macrophages at all times during infection.

LF82 is under attack by macrophages.

Using RT-qPCR, we measured the expression of genes induced by the acid response (*asr*, *ydeO* and *frc*), the oxidative response (*soxS*, *ykgB*), the SOS response (*sulA*), the response to membrane alteration (*pspB*), the lack of Mg2+ (*mgrB*), the lack of phosphate (*phoB*), general efflux pump (*emrK*) and the *gltT* tRNA gene that is repressed by the stringent response (Figure 1B). Every response pathway was induced inside the macrophage. The induction of acid and the oxidative response were already high at 1 h post-infection,

while the SOS response, the response to membrane alterations and to the lack of Mg2+,

were peaking at 6 h post-infection. The expression of the *gltT* tRNA is strongly repressed

at time point 1h indicating that stringent response is on early in the infection. The

induction of most pathways decreased at 24 h.

Environmental stresses influence LF82 survival.

To test the impact of stress responses on the ability of LF82 to colonize macrophage, we

constructed deletion mutants of several key regulators of *E. coli* stress pathways and

analyzed their survival. Deletion of the acid stress regulators *evgA-evgS*, *phoP* and *ydeO*

significantly impacted the ability of LF82 to survive and multiply within macrophages to

a level comparable to or even below that of a commensal K12 *E. coli* (Figure 1C). Similar

observations were obtained with the *rpoS* deletion (general stress response), *recA*

deletion (SOS response), *soxS* deletion (oxidative stress) and *pspA* and *htrA* deletions

(envelope damages). The ppGpp0 strain (*relA spoT* deletions) is the most impacted

strain; less than 5% of the initial population survived a 24 h period within macrophages.

SOS and stringent responses severely impacted LF82 survival

We explored the stringent and SOS responses in more details. RecA is the main inducer

of the SOS response, which activates nearly 100 genes involved in DNA repair and many

others with unrelated or unknown functions, but it is also a crucial to correct DNA

lesions by homologous recombination and translesion synthesis (Kreuzer, 2013). In

addition to *recA* deletion, we constructed deletions of *sulA* (division inhibitor) and a

mutation in *lexA* (*lexAind-),* which blocks SOS induction in K12 *E. coli* and reduces

viability in the presence of mitomycin C for LF82 and K12 (Supplementary Figure S3A).

We observed that the deletion of each SOS gene significantly decreased the survival of

LF82 within macrophages (Figure 1C). Inside the macrophage, survival of the ppGpp0

strain was dramatically impacted. However, this mutant also presented a strong growth

defect in liquid culture that complicates interpretation of the macrophage results. To

study the impact of the stringent response on LF82 survival and induced antibiotic

tolerance, we constructed deletion mutants that might have partial stringent response

phenotypes; deletion of *dksA,* encoding a protein linking the stringent response to

transcription (Sharma & Chatterji, 2010); and deletion of the polyphosphate kinase and

exopolyphosphatase *ppk* and *ppx* (Rao & Kornberg, 1999). As expected, the *dksA and*

ppk-ppx deletions had a much less dramatic effect on LF82 growth and survival within
macrophages than the *relA-spoT* mutant; nevertheless, the *dksA* mutation significantly
impacted the number of live bacteria recovered at 24 h P.I. (Figure 1C). We probed the
ability of LF82 to survive within macrophages when both stringent and SOS responses
were altered. We chose to combine *dksA* deletion with *recA* deletion or *lexAind-*
mutation. These strains presented a survival defect (CFU 24 h / CFU 1 h) comparable to
that of the single *dksA* mutant (Figure 1C). These observations demonstrate that
surviving LF82 simultaneously or successively require SOS and stringent responses.
181

Inside phagolysosomes individual LF82 were not homogenously responding to
stresses.
Imaging revealed great heterogeneity in the number of LF82 bacteria within individual
macrophages. At 18 h or 24 h P.I., many macrophages presented fewer than 5 bacteria,
which was comparable to the amount observed at 1 h P.I. (Figure 2A); however, a
number of macrophages also presented foci containing up to 50 bacteria (Figure 2B).
These observations led us to consider that LF82 were not homogeneously stressed by
macrophages. We used GFP fusion with selected stress response promoters to monitor
variability of these responses among bacteria and among macrophages (Figure 2B). For
all stress responses, heterogeneity in GFP fluorescence was far larger than for LB
cultures (Figure 2 F - G). At 24 h P.I., we found that approximately 30% of the bacteria
had poorly respond to oxidative or acid responses (Figure 2E and 2F). Owing the high
stability of the GFP protein that we used in this assay, it is unlikely that this
heterogeneity resulted from short pulses of induction separated by long repression
periods. Such a sizeable phenotypic heterogeneity was moreover observed for bacteria
contained in a single macrophage as well as similar Lamp 1 positive vacuolar
environments (Figure 2C). We therefore questioned whether heterogeneity in stress
response might reflect the coexistence of multiple cell cycle regulation phenotypes.
200

201 **Macrophages induce the formation of non-growing LF82**
202 We essayed heterogeneity in LF82 cell cycle within macrophages by using two
203 complementary fluorescence assays. First, Fluorescent Dilution (FD) highlights bacteria
204 that have not divided since the time of infection (Figure 3A and Supplementary Figure
205 S4A-C).

FD shows that at 24 h P.I. LF82 underwent up to 6 divisions, which is still below the maximum dilution detectable by the assay in our conditions (8 generations in LB, Supplementary Figure S4B). In good agreement with the CFU measurement FD shown that only 20% of the population has performed more than 1 division at 6 h P.I. From these observations, we can estimate that the highest generation rate of LF82 within macrophages is ≈ 0.5 doubling /h between 6 and 20 h P.I.. Interestingly, FD also revealed that approximately 4% of the population did not divide or divided fewer than 2 times in 24 h P.I. (Figure 3A and Supplementary Figure S4B). By contrast among the small amount of K12 bacteria that survived for 24 h in the macrophage, 60% of K12 bacteria underwent fewer than 2 divisions and less than 10% underwent 5 divisions (Supplementary Figure S3D). Second, we used TIMER to refine these observations; it provides an instantaneous evaluation of the generation time during the infection kinetics (Figure 3B and S4A and S4B). Timer indicated that 18 h post-infection, 18% of the LF82 population was not actively dividing, supporting the existence of a non-growing or slow-growing subpopulation. Since they require dilution of fluorescent proteins both Timer and FD are poorly informative about the first hours of the infection. Therefore, we used a GFP fusion with the septal ring protein FtsZ to monitor division in the individual bacterium (Figure 3C). In LB, exponentially growing LF82 frequently presented the FtsZ ring (70% of the population), but stationary phase LF82 rarely presented the FtsZ ring (<2% of the population, Figure 3D). Following infection of macrophages with the stationary phase culture of LF82 *ftsZ-gfp*, we observed that 5% (+/-2) and 40% (+/- 12) of the population, respectively, presented a FtsZ ring at 1 h and 24 h P.I. (Figure 3C and 3D). Following infection with exponentially growing LF82 we observed a sudden reduction in the number of LF82 presenting a FtsZ ring at 1 h and 4h P.I. (Figure 3D). The three reporters (FD, Timer and FtsZ) provided complementary indications: i) within macrophages, LF82 strongly slow down their cell cycle for several hours; ii) starting at 6 h P.I. LF82 multiply; in this phase the generation time may vary among bacteria but can be as short as 2h; iii) a part of the population, completely halted their cell cycle and become non-grower. The difference between the number of non-growing LF82 revealed by Timer and FD shows that non-growing LF82 are formed late in the infection kinetics and not only upon phagocytosis.

Macrophages induce the formation of antibiotic-tolerant LF82.

Non-growing Salmonella phenotypes have been observed inside macrophages and during mouse infection (Helaine *et al.,* 2014; Claudi *et al.,* 2014). Being tolerant to subsequent antibiotic challenge they were recognized as persisters. We inquired whether also for LF82 the non-growing component of the population had enhanced antibiotic tolerance. In exponentially growing liquid cultures, approximately 1/10000 LF82 tolerated a 3 h ciprofloxacin challenge, and can therefore be considered persisters. Following a brief passage through the macrophage, the frequency of LF82 bacteria tolerant to ciprofloxacin increased to 0.5 % (nearly 50 fold compared to exponentially growing LF82). Interestingly the number of tolerant LF82 increased to 5% (500 fold compared exponentially growing LF82) after 24 h in the macrophage (Figure 4A). This near to 10-fold increase at 24 h compared with 1 h indicates that, like non-growers, tolerant phenotypes are not exclusively formed upon infection, but also as bacteria multiply inside the macrophage. In this respect, the behavior of LF82 differs significantly from *S. typhimurium*, which forms a large number of persisters upon macrophage entry , but this number remains stable during the infection (Helaine *et al.,* 2014). To test if non-growing LF82 revealed by the FD assay indeed corresponded to the antibiotic-tolerant population, we used the macrophage-permeable antibiotic ofloxacin. We added ofloxacin (10x MIC) for 4 h after 20 h of intracellular growth, and we observed significant increases in the proportion of green LF82 (non-growing) inside macrophages (Figure 4B). These observations suggest that the sub-population of non-growing bacteria largely overlaps with that of persisters, where protection from antibiotics may also confer enhanced tolerance to intracellular stresses.

Tolerance to antibiotics is enhanced for LF82 compared with commensal *E. coli.*

We compared the number of LF82 and a commensal K12 laboratory strain with tolerance to ciprofloxacin following brief (1 h) or long (24 h) passages in macrophages. After a brief passage in macrophages, the proportion of LF82 that were tolerant to ciprofloxacin was significantly higher for LF82 than K12 (Figure 4C). Interestingly, even if the absolute number of ciprofloxacin-tolerant K12 was largely reduced compared with LF82, their proportions among bacteria that survived 24 h inside macrophages were comparable (Figure 4C). These findings demonstrate that the number of antibiotic-tolerant bacteria formed in response to macrophage attack is reinforced for LF82 compared with a commensal strain.

Tolerance to antibiotics is a transient state.

We next evaluated whether the antibiotic tolerance was a stable or transient phenotype. We used the macrophage lysis procedure to recover LF82 with induced persistence for 1 h in the macrophage; then, we either challenged them immediately with ciprofloxacin or allowed them to recover in LB for 1 h or 2 h before antibiotic challenge. When bacteria were cultured for 1 hour in LB, the frequency of tolerant bacteria was decreased in comparison to bacteria that were immediately treated with the antibiotic; however, this number was still higher than that of bacteria that had not infected macrophages. Two hours in LB was sufficient to cause a comparable frequency of ciprofloxacin-tolerant LF82 to that of bacteria that had not encountered macrophages (Figure 4D). These observations show that when the environment is no longer stressful, antibiotic-tolerant, non-growing LF82 rapidly switch back to a replicative mode.

Characterization of non-growing LF82.

Both FD and TIMER revealed slightly more non growing LF82 (4% and 18% respectively, figure 3A) than antibiotic-tolerant LF82 after macrophage lysis (0.5% at 1 h P.I. or 5% at 24 h P.I. , Figure 4A). This finding raised the possibility that persisters only form a portion of the non-growing population. To quantify this proportion, we infected macrophages with TIMER-tagged LF82, lysed the macrophages and allowed bacterial growth on a LB-agarose pad under the microscope at 37°C. Seventy percent of the LF82 recovered quickly from the challenge and formed microcolonies, but approximately 30% of them never divided (Figure 4E). These non-cultivable LF82 presented either non-growing and growing TIMER fluorescence (Figure 4F). The presence of non-cultivable LF82 among the bacteria with non-growing TIMER fluorescence explains the difference between fluorescence and antibiotics assays.

SOS and stringent responses influence antibiotic tolerance.

Among mutants that affected LF82 survival (Figure 1C), only the *recA*, *relA spot* and *dksA* deletions negatively impacted the number of LF82 that were tolerant to a 3-h ciprofloxacin treatment (Figure 5A). The impact of the *recA* deletion might be misinterpreted because ciprofloxacin alters DNA and limits resuscitation of *recA*

persisters. Therefore, we repeated the tolerance assay with cefotaxime for the following

SOS mutants: *recA* (impaired for DNA lesion repair and SOS induction), *lexAind-* (unable

to induce SOS) and *sulA* (unable to block cell division). When they were tested *in vitro*,

SOS mutants did not present defect for cefotaxime tolerance (Supplementary Figure

S3B). However, these mutants exhibited decreased tolerance when persisters were

induced by a pretreatment with subinhibitory concentrations of ciprofloxacin

(Supplementary Figure S3C). This finding is in good agreement with previous reports

(Dörr *et al.,* 2009), it confirms that SOS induction favors the production of persisters.

We analyzed cefotaxime tolerance of these SOS mutants following 1 h and 20 h passages

within macrophages (Figure 5B and 5C). We observed for *recA and sulA* mutants a

significant reduction of the proportion of cells that were tolerant to cefotaxime

treatment after a 20 h passage in the macrophage (Figure 5C) but no immediate effect

for the 1 h time point (Figure 5B). The *lexAind-* mutant did not change the number of

tolerant LF82 in these conditions. We also analyzed the *dksA* mutant in these assays;

surprisingly, it behaved differently than the *recA* and *sulA* mutants: we observed a

significant reduction of the proportion of cefotaxime tolerant LF82 following a 1 h

passage within macrophages (Figure 5B) but not when the bacteria were grown for 20 h

in macrophages (Figure 5C). To test an eventual epistatic relation between SOS and

stringent response we combined *recA* and *dksA* deletions. They had an additive impact

on the ability of LF82 to become tolerant to cefotaxime after a brief infection (Figure 5B)

and a 20-hour infection (Figure 5C). Our observations suggest that production of

persister/tolerant LF82 is under the control of the stringent response in the first hours

of infection and controlled by genotoxic stress, the SOS response and DNA lesion

processing later in the infection. When one of these to responses is deficient the

production of persister /tolerant LF82 requires the other.

The role of SOS response and stringent response for the control of LF82 cell cycle

in the macrophages.

Knowing that SOS and stringent responses influence the production of antibiotic

tolerant LF82 after a passage within macrophage we examined whether SOS and

stringent responses also contributed to LF82 cell cycle control , i.e. production of non-

growing, replicative or dead LF82. We used the FD assay to measure the number of non-

growing LF82 in *the relA-spoT* and *recA* mutants. FD revealed that the non-grower

number was dramatically reduced in the *relA-spoT* mutant (<1%) (Figure 5D). This suggests that in the absence of stringent response LF82 cannot immediately curb its cell cycle upon phagocytosis. By contrast the number of non-growers remained unchanged in the *recA* mutant (Figure 5E). This is in agreement with the absence of effect of the *recA* deletion on the production of cefotaxime tolerant LF82 early in the infections. TIMER revealed that at 20 h P.I. the proportion of slow, mid and fast growing LF82 was affected by the alteration of *recA, lexAind-, sulA* and *dksA.* The *recA* and *dksA* deletions reduced the number of non-growing LF82; by contrast, the *lexAind-* and *sulA* mutations only increased the number of fast growing LF82 in the population (Figure 5F). Finally, the live and dead assay showed a strong increase in lethality of the *recA, sulA*, *lexAind- ,relA spoT* and *dksA* mutants at both time points (Figure 5G) suggesting that in the macrophage environment a failing cell cycle control will almost certainly lead to LF82 death. Altogether our results shown that stringent response is the main controller of the early intracellular survival of LF82; it limits LF82 growth and induces the formation of non-growers and among them persisters. Later on when replication is resumed SOS response grows in importance. DNA lesions that have been accumulated in the lag phase must be repaired to allow replication and formation of new non-growers and new persisters.

Kinetics of macrophage infection

LF82 tolerates macrophage induced stresses, thus it survives and multiplies in the phagolysosome. The population expansion is accompanied by a rise in the number of bacteria that do not grow and tolerate an antibiotic challenge (called henceforth persisters). The change in time, during macrophage infection, of LF82 population size and fraction of persisters are relevant to future fundamental studies, but also to devising therapeutic strategies involving AIEC or other intracellular pathogens. In order to explore the mechanistic bases of the infection kinetics, we have used a mathematical model (Figure 6A) to fit the observed changes in CFUs and persister counts during 24 hours for LF82, K12 and the stringent response mutant LF82*dksA* (Figure 6B). The model is based on the following biologically-informed hypotheses (illustrated in Figure 6A and detailed in the Supplementary text 1). i) Reproduction: the population of replicating bacteria B has a constant net growth rate (birth minus death rate) δ_1, which is either 0 or negative during a lag phase of duration λ, and $\beta>0$ otherwise. ii) A stress-

induced death rate, $\delta_2(S)$ that increases with stress (S). We assume that stress S, possibly

due to lesions (DNA lesions, membranes alterations, oxidative damages among others)

that accumulate over time or due to a macrophage response to the infection, builds up in

time proportionally to the total number of bacteria in the population. iii) Switch to

persistence: bacteria have a constant probability k_p of generating non-growing, stress-

tolerant phenotypes P. The dynamics of a population of bacteria can be described by a

set of three ordinary differential equations for the number B of non-persister bacteria,

the number P of persisters, and the stress variable S (Methods). The number of dead

bacteria D can be derived from these under the assumption that dead LF82 decay

exponentially with rate 0.56 (computed from the assay in Supplementary Figure 2C).

The model has a total of 12 parameters for the three strains, which are fitted to data as

explained in Methods and SI. Although LF82 displays a considerable overshoot in

population size (as also observed in (Glasser *et al*, 2001)), the dynamics can be

reproduced by choosing the same β for every strain. We estimated such net growth rate

to 0.15 ± 0.003 h^{-1}, corresponding to 0.21 divisions per hour (Figure 6B), consistent with

independent cell-level measures by FD (Supplementary Figure 4). The most notable

quantitative difference between strains is that K12 displayed a lag phase of more than

13 hours, twice as long as LF82 and LF82*dksA*. A consequence of this difference is that

when K12 bacteria start actively duplicating, stress has already built up. Together with

K12's enhanced sensitivity to stress, this curbs the population expansion, resulting in a

lower overall growth within macrophages. In the LF82*dksA* mutant, growth is instead

impaired by increased initial mortality (whose rate δ_1 has been estimated by PI

measures, Supplementary Figure S2C), presumably related to stringent response failure.

With respect to the other strains, moreover, LF82 is advantaged at later times – when

the SOS response becomes important – thanks to reduced stress-induced death rate.

Rate of persistence production for LF82 and LF82 *dksA* (0.08 and 0.002 h^{-1}, respectively)

is estimated to be higher than for K12 (0.001 h^{-1}) , supporting the notion that AIEC

strains within macrophages turn to persisters at an enhanced rate, but less so if their

stringent response is impaired. The model allows testing changes in infection dynamics

for 'virtual mutants' LF82*, obtained by varying k_p, λ and d_{max} – the parameters that

quantitatively differ between LF82 and *E. coli* K12 (Figure 6C). The total population

overshoot is enhanced when lag phase is shorter and the effect of stress less acute, but

damped when persisters production is more frequent. Interestingly, the phenotypes of

the single stress response mutants (acid, oxidative, lack of Mg^{2+}), i.e. reduced CFU at 24 h

without perturbation of the persister proportion in the population (Figure 1C and 3A)

were nicely reproduced by a change in the single d_{max} parameter. This suggests that the

model can be used to plan future works on the effect of mutants or drugs on macrophage

colonization by LF82.

Discussion

We analyzed the growth and survival strategies used by LF82 to colonize the THP1

macrophage cell line. Our analysis revealed that intracellular LF82 were constantly

under stress while colonizing macrophages. The consequences of these stresses were

important: increase in the death rate of LF82, slow multiplication of replicating LF82

and formation of a large number of non-growing LF82. LF82 adapts to this environment

thanks to successive phenotypic switches that require the two main stress responses:

the SOS response and the stringent response (Figure 7).

Macrophages place LF82 under lethal stress.

Using fluorescent reporters, we measured that half of the LF82 population present at 24

h P.I. had given rise to 6 or more generations. Under normal condition, this should

produce a 30 to 60-fold increase in the population size at 20 h compared with the 1 h

time point PI. However, we only observed a 3 to 6-fold increase in viable bacteria at 20-

24 h compared with 1 h. We demonstrated that this modest colonization of

macrophages by LF82 is explained by a big death rate (Figure 1A) and switch from

replicative to non-growing cell cycle (Figure 3). At the single-macrophage and single-

bacterium level, FD and TIMER fluorescent reporters revealed non-growing LF82. We

observed macrophages containing few (less than 4) LF82 with red fluorescent dilution

staining. These bacteria had therefore divided several times (>4) before observation and

thus should be accompanied by their siblings (>16). This observation is in good

agreement with our Live and Dead assay indicating that LF82 progeny has a significant

chance to be killed and destroyed by the macrophage. By contrast, some macrophages

contained growing LF82 and ultimately acquired more than 50 bacteria in one or

several compartments. The live and dead assay confirmed that LF82 was frequently

killed by macrophages. Because alterations of bacterial stress responses significantly

reduced the bacterial yield, we propose that LF82 death is the consequence of oxidative, acid, genotoxic and proteic stresses imposed by the macrophage. We compounded these experimental observations in a mathematical model describing the dynamics of bacterial infection within macrophages. A first phase of stalled growth, a likely combined effect of a prolonged lag phase and of compensation between death and division, is followed by an exponential increase in bacterial concentration. This second phase might correlate with a transient increased permissiveness of phagolysosomes or more likely the adaptation of LF82 to growth in this stressful environment. This expansion is successively curbed by the building-up of stressors. Many persisters are formed in the first phase. However, in the second phase a phenotypic switch to non-growing LF82 will eventually result in a sizeable increase of the persister population. We thus understand the survival of LF82 as a consequence of its ability to adapt to harsh phagolysosome environment both at the entry of the macrophage, by induction of stress responses and particularly the stringent response, and during exponential expansion by SOS response. LF82 advantage over commensal K12 would reside in its ability to exit from the lag phase to perform a few rounds of replication/division before stress becomes too strong (Figure 6). Strategically, early onset of growth is compensated by production of persistent bacteria, which endows the pathogenic strain with long-term survival in spite of rapid exploitation of the macrophage environment. We have not yet identified LF82 specific regulons, genes or mutations that allow this transition to take place.

Replicative LF82.

Fluorescent dilution revealed that after the exit of lag phase LF82 replicated moderately within macrophages, with generation time longer than 2 h. *In vitro*, this would be comparable with generation times observed in minimal medium with poor carbon sources such as acetate. Our observations revealed that within macrophages, 40% of the LF82 population presented an FtsZ ring, which is significantly above the number expected from a mixed population of *E. coli* growing with a 2h generation time (28% of cells with FtsZ ring (den Blaauwen *et al*, 2001)) and non-growing cells. Interestingly, in spite of SulA induction, we did not observe filamentation of LF82 within macrophage. These finding demonstrates that some of the cell cycle rules that were established under defined *in vitro* conditions do not apply to intracellular growth conditions, opening

470   avenues for future investigations of bacterial cell cycle regulation in the context of host
471   infection or the microbiota.
472
Non-replicative LF82.
FD and Timer revealed that a significant number of intracellular LF82 were not growing.
FD revealed that approximately 4% of the phagocytosed LF82 immediately halted their
cell cycle. TIMER revealed that at 20 h P.I., approximately 20% of the LF82 population
was not growing. We also demonstrated that once the macrophages were lysed, a large
portion of the LF82 population (from 0.3 to 10%) was tolerant to several hours of
antibiotic challenge, and the proportion of non-growers in the population increased in
macrophages in the presence of antibiotics. Altogether, these observations suggest that
the phagolysosome environment induces frequent cell cycle arrests among the
population and that a part of this arrested population is tolerant or persisters to
antibiotics. Such a phenomenon has been previously described during *S. typhimurium*
infection of macrophages (Helaine *et al.,* 2014) or mice (Helaine *et al.,* 2014; Claudi *et al.,*
2014) and is reminiscent of VBNR mycobacteria (Manina *et al.,* 2015). Interestingly, we
observed an increase in the proportion of macrophage-induced antibiotic-tolerant LF82
at later time points, suggesting adaptive responses to the intracellular
microenvironment.
489
Stress responses are important for LF82 survival within macrophages.
As expected for bacteria residing in a toxic environment, stress responses are important
for LF82 survival within macrophages. Acidic, oxidative, genotoxic, and envelope
alterations, lack of Mg2+ and lack of nutrient stress responses significantly decreased
the fitness of LF82 (50 to 10% of WT). In a few cases, we demonstrated an additive
effect of simultaneously altering two pathways. However, LF82 demonstrated
surprisingly good tolerance to these alterations compared with the *in vitro* findings for
individual stresses. For example, *recA* deletion mutant was extremely sensitive (<1%
survival) to prolonged treatment with genotoxic drugs (Supplementary Figure S3A); by
comparison, in macrophages, despite clear SOS induction, the viability of the *recA*
mutant was only reduced by half compared with WT. Set aside the possibility that
stress-less niches exist due a possible heterogeneity in the macrophage population, the

fitness decline of LF82 stress mutants may be limited by a combination of slow growth,

formation of non-growers and/or yet uncharacterized adaptation pathways.

SOS and stringent responses successively control LF82 fate.

We investigated the trigger that could allow some LF82 to halt their cell cycle inside

macrophages. It appeared to be unrelated to the ability to sense acidic or oxidative

stress (Figure 5A). At an early time point (1 h P.I.), stringent response mutants

significantly altered the survival and production of antibiotic-tolerant LF82 (Figure 1

and Figure 5A). This finding suggests that abrupt nutrient starvation is one of the first

signals received by LF82 upon phagocytosis. The early stringent response should result

in a slowdown of transcription, translation and DNA replication, and therefore, it might

provoke the formation of non-growers and a lag phase that last for 7 h (Figure 6). We

assessed whether the stringent response impaired the declines in viability in this first

period (Figure 5), and we observed a decrease in the number of bacteria with undiluted

GFP using the FD assay (Figure 5D), as well as a reduction in antibiotic-tolerant LF82

induction (Figure 5B). This suggests that the slowing down induced by the stringent

response confers a temporary protection than can be extended to antibiotic tolerance

when bacteria become persister. Accordingly the impact of stringent response alteration

was less apparent after the lag phase when replication is re-established in a portion of

the population of LF82 (Figure 5). SOS induction was moderate at 1 h but important at 6

h and 24 h P.I.; this is in good agreement with the lack of an effect of *recA* deletion on the

accumulation of LF82 with undiluted FD GFP (Figure 5D) and the lack of an influence of

SOS mutants on the number of LF82 that were tolerant to cefotaxim at 1 h after infection

(Figure 5B). DNA lesions could, however, form during this period, but they were mostly

observed when DNA replication restarted after 6 h. In this second phase of infection, SOS

induction in replicative bacteria might play several roles: i) sustaining DNA repair and

therefore DNA replication, cell division and increases in population size; ii) decelerating

the division progression, this is the role of SulA, and thus contributing to the formation

of new non-growers (Figure 5C and 5D and Figure 7); iii) intervening for resuscitation of

non-growers presenting DNA lesions, both within macrophages and after macrophage

lysis.

Macrophages as a niche for LF82 survival

The purpose of macrophage colonization by LF82 in Crohn's disease patients is not yet understood. *In vitro*, LF82 colonization did not provoke extensive death of macrophages, which are thus unlikely to serve as a transient replicative niche for ileal infection. Alternatively, we can imagine that dormant LF82 within macrophages can serve as a long-term storage. In this environment, bacteria might be protected from competition with other species of the microbiota and coincidentally from antibiotics. Upon macrophage lysis or inactivation, dormant LF82 would be released and would start to multiply under adequate conditions.

Methods

Strains and plasmids

Deletion mutants (Supplementary Table S1) were constructed using the recombineering method as described in (Demarre *et al.,* 2017). Plasmids are described in Supplementary Table S2.

Infection and microscopy

THP1 monocytes (5×10^5 cells/ml) differentiated into macrophages for 18 h in phorbol 12-myristate 13-acetate (PMA, 20 ng/ml) were infected and imaged as previously described (Demarre *et al.,* 2017). Infections were performed using an MOI of 30 (measured by CFU), resulting in the observation of 3 LF82 bacteria per macrophage on average at 1 h post-infection. Imaging was performed on an inverted Zeiss Axio Imager with a spinning disk CSU W1 (Yokogawa).

Antibiotic challenge and viable bacterial count using the gentamycin protection assay

To determine the number of intracellular bacteria after 20 min of infection, infected macrophages were washed twice with PBS, and fresh cell culture medium containing 20 µg ml^{-1} of gentamicin (Gm) was added for the indicated time (1 h to 30 h). Cell monolayers were washed once with PBS, and 0.5 ml of 1% Triton X-100 in 1x PBS was added to each well for 5 min to lyse eukaryotic cells (Bringer *et al.,* 2006). Samples were mixed, diluted and plated on LB agar plates to determine the number of colony-forming units (CFU) recovered from the lysed monolayers. For the antibiotic tolerance assays,

macrophage lysates were transferred to 5-ml tubes and centrifuged for 10 min at 4100

g. The pellet was either resuspended in 1x PBS (t0) and ciprofloxacin (1 μg/ml) for 1 h

and 3 h, or in LB and cefotaxim (100 μg/ml) for 1 h and 3 h. CFU were measured by

serial dilution. Tolerance was estimated for the 1-h and 3-h time points as a function of

the CFU at t0.

Live and dead assay

At the indicated time points, macrophages were lysed with vigorous resuspension in 1x

PBS 1% Triton. The cell lysate was pelleted at 300 g for 10 min to eliminate large cell

remnants. The supernatant was centrifuged at 4000 g for 10 min. The bacterial pellet

was suspended in 1x PBS and processed with the Live and Dead BacLight Viability kit

(Thermo Fisher). The bacteria were pelleted for 3 min at 5000 g, resuspended in 50 μl of

1x PBS and spread on a 1% agarose 1x PBS pad for immediate observation.

Measurement of gene expression by RT-qPCR

Total RNA was extracted with TRIzol reagent from 10^6 macrophages, as described in the

Molecular Cloning, a laboratory Manual (Green and Sambrook, CSH Press). First-strand

CDNA synthesis was performed with the Maxima First Strand cDNA Synthesis Kit for RT-

qPCR (Thermo Fisher), and real-time qPCR was performed with SYBR Green Master Mix

(Bio-Rad) on a MyiQ real-time qPCR machine (Bio-Rad).

Fluorescence quantification

Custom-made FIJI macros were developed for the analyses of fluorescence. For the

Biosensors and FD, constitutive expression of mCherry from p-mCherry was used to

construct bacterial masks, which were subsequently used to measure GFP intensity. For

TIMER analyses, green fluorescence was used to construct the mask. Fluorescence

distributions were analyzed with the distribution fitting tool in MATLAB.

Mathematical model for the infection kinetics

A set of three ODEs recapitulates the main features of the observed growth within

macrophages, as explained in the main text and in the SI:

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = [1 - I(t < \lambda)]\beta B - k_p B - I(t < \lambda)\delta_1 B - \delta_2(S)B$$

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = k_p B \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = B + P$$

Here, $I(t < \lambda)$ is the indicator function, which is unitary during lag phase. At the
beginning of the infection, thus, the net growth rate $-\delta_1$ is either zero (K12 and LF82) or
negative (stringent response mutant LF82dskA). At later times, net growth rate β is
instead positive. The stress-induced death rate has been chosen to be a sigmoidal
function of the stress level:

$\delta_2(S) = \frac{d_{max}}{1 + e^{a(S - S_{1/2})}}$

where the half-saturation stress value $S_{1/2}$ and the sensitivity parameter a are assumed
to be identical for all strains. Here stress is an effective variable quantifying the effect of
crowding on growth within macrophages, and could correspond both to density-
dependent reduction of bacterial growth rate (e.g. due to resource depletion), and to the
progressive buildup of macrophage-induced killing.

Fit of the infection kinetics data

Parameters providing the best fit of eqs. (1) to the times series of CFUs and persisters
have been obtained by a weighted least-square distance minimization using the python
differential evolution algorithm. We used a two-step approach to the fit which allowed us to
establish first a subset of 7 parameters (λ and k_p for each strain and β) that shape the lag
and exponential phases of growth. Subsequently, we fixed β and the λs, and fitted the
remaining parameters. Details of the fitting procedure are found in the SI, and the
results of the fit in Table 1 of the SI.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge Laurent Aussel, Dirk Bumann, Sophie Helaine, Jakob Moller
Jensen and Fabai Wu for providing the biosensors and fluorescent cell cycle reporters.
We thank Parul Singh and Xavier de Bolle for careful reading of the manuscript and
fruitful discussions. We are very grateful to the members of the CIRB imaging facility.
This work has received support from the program «Investissements d'Avenir» launched

633   Table S1

Name	genotype	description	reference
AIEC LF82			(Glasser *et al.,* 2001)
AIEC LF82 Δbla	*ampC*		Gift from Nicolas Barnich
AIEC LF82 Δ*htrA*	*htrA*		(Bringer *et al.,* 2005)
AIEC LFGD1	AIEC LF82 *Δbla relA::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD4	AIEC LF82 *Δbla ydeO::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD6	AIEC LF82 *Δbla lon::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD9	AIEC LF82 *Δbla recA::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD11	AIEC LF82LF82 *Δbla HupA-mcherry-FRT-kan-FRT*		This work
AIEC LFGD13	AIEC LF82 *Δbla pspA::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD15	AIEC LF82 *Δbla soxS::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD27	AIEC LF82 *Δbla phoP::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD30	AIEC LF82 *Δbla evgA evgS::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD40	AIEC LF82 *Δbla evgAS-FRT phoP::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD41	AIEC LF82 *Δbla evgAevgS-FRT ydeO::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD56	AIEC LF82 *Δbla relA-FRT*		This work
AIEC LFGD57	AIEC LF82 *Δbla relA-FRT spoT::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD69	AIEC LF82 *Δbla lexAind-::kan*	Mutation X-> Y in *lexA* constructed by recombineering	This work
AIEC LFGD79	AIEC LF82 *Δbla dksA::kan*		This work

AIEC LFER1	AIEC LF82 *Δbla lexAind-FRT dksA::kan*		This work
AIEC LFER2	AIEC LF82 *Δbla dksA-FRT recA::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD86	AIEC LF82 *Δbla sulA::kan*		This work
AIEC LFGD83	AIEC LF82 *Δbla ppk-ppX::kan*		This work
AIEC LF82 ΔrpoS	*rpoS::kan*		Gift from Jakob Moller Jensen (Simonsen *et al.,* 2011)

636 Table S2

name	description	Antibiotic resistance	reference
pKOBEGA		ampR specR	(Derbise *et al.,* 2003)
pAD37	Matrix vector for recombineering	kanR	(David *et al.,* 2014)
pFWZ5	Para-fts-sfGFP-T::aph	kanR	Gift from Fabai Wu (Wu *et al.,* 2015)
pFCcGi	pFP25 P*rpsM-mCherry*, ParaBAD-GFP	ampR	Gift from Sophie Helaine (Helaine *et al.,* 2014)
pP*rpsm-mcherry*	pGBM2-P*rpsM-mCherry*	specR	This work
pSC101-timer bac			Gift from Dirk Bumann (Claudi *et al.,* 2014)
pom1-GFP	pGBM2-Pro3-GFP		(Espéli *et al.,* 2001)

pLA42	pFPV25 PkatG-gfpmut3	ampR	Gift from Laurent Aussel (Viala *et al.,* 2011; Hébrard *et al.,* 2009)
pP1485	pFPV25 P*asr-gfp*	ampR	Gift from Laurent Aussel (Viala *et al.,* 2011; Hébrard *et al.,* 2009)
pmgtC	pFPV25 P*mgtC-gfp*	ampR	Gift from Laurent Aussel (Viala *et al.,* 2011; Hébrard *et al.,* 2009)
pSulA-GFP	pZA31MCS-delta Xho P*sulA-GFP*		(Esnault *et al.,* 2007)

References

Amato SM & Brynildsen MP (2015) Persister Heterogeneity Arising from a Single Metabolic Stress. *Curr. Biol. CB* **25:** 2090–2098

Amato SM, Fazen CH, Henry TC, Mok WWK, Orman MA, Sandvik EL, Volzing KG & Brynildsen MP (2014) The role of metabolism in bacterial persistence. *Front. Microbiol.* **5:** 70

Balaban NQ, Merrin J, Chait R, Kowalik L & Leibler S (2004) Bacterial persistence as a phenotypic switch. *Science* **305:** 1622–1625

Barnich N, Bringer M-A, Claret L & Darfeuille-Michaud A (2004) Involvement of lipoprotein NlpI in the virulence of adherent invasive Escherichia coli strain LF82 isolated from a patient with Crohn's disease. *Infect. Immun.* **72:** 2484–2493

Bernier SP, Lebeaux D, DeFrancesco AS, Valomon A, Soubigou G, Coppée J-Y, Ghigo J-M & Beloin C (2013) Starvation, together with the SOS response, mediates high biofilm-specific tolerance to the fluoroquinolone ofloxacin. *PLoS Genet.* **9:** e1003144

Bigger J (1944) TREATMENT OF STAPHYLOCOCCAL INFECTIONS WITH PENICILLIN BY INTERMITTENT STERILISATION. *The Lancet* **244:** 497–500

den Blaauwen T, Lindqvist A, Löwe J & Nanninga N (2001) Distribution of the Escherichia coli structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC)-like protein MukB in the cell. *Mol. Microbiol.* **42:** 1179–1188

Bringer M-A, Barnich N, Glasser A-L, Bardot O & Darfeuille-Michaud A (2005) HtrA stress protein is involved in intramacrophagic replication of adherent and invasive Escherichia coli strain LF82 isolated from a patient with Crohn's disease. *Infect. Immun.* **73:** 712–721

Bringer M-A, Billard E, Glasser A-L, Colombel J-F & Darfeuille-Michaud A (2012) Replication of Crohn's disease-associated AIEC within macrophages is dependent on TNF-α secretion. *Lab. Investig. J. Tech. Methods Pathol.* **92:** 411–419

Bringer M-A, Glasser A-L, Tung C-H, Méresse S & Darfeuille-Michaud A (2006) The Crohn's disease-associated adherent-invasive Escherichia coli strain LF82 replicates in mature phagolysosomes within J774 macrophages. *Cell. Microbiol.* **8:** 471–484

Bringer M-A, Rolhion N, Glasser A-L & Darfeuille-Michaud A (2007) The oxidoreductase DsbA plays a key role in the ability of the Crohn's disease-associated adherent-invasive Escherichia coli strain LF82 to resist macrophage killing. *J. Bacteriol.* **189:** 4860–4871

Cieza RJ, Hu J, Ross BN, Sbrana E & Torres AG (2015) The IbeA invasin of adherent-invasive Escherichia coli mediates interaction with intestinal epithelia and macrophages. *Infect. Immun.* **83:** 1904–1918

Claudi B, Spröte P, Chirkova A, Personnic N, Zankl J, Schürmann N, Schmidt A & Bumann
D (2014) Phenotypic variation of Salmonella in host tissues delays eradication by
antimicrobial chemotherapy. *Cell* **158:** 722–733

David A, Demarre G, Muresan L, Paly E, Barre F-X & Possoz C (2014) The two Cis-acting
sites, parS1 and oriC1, contribute to the longitudinal organisation of Vibrio
cholerae chromosome I. *PLoS Genet.* **10:** e1004448

Demarre G, Prudent V & Espéli O (2017) Imaging the Cell Cycle of Pathogen E. coli
During Growth in Macrophage. *Methods Mol. Biol. Clifton NJ* **1624:** 227–236

Derbise A, Lesic B, Dacheux D, Ghigo JM & Carniel E (2003) A rapid and simple method
for inactivating chromosomal genes in Yersinia. *FEMS Immunol. Med. Microbiol.*
38: 113–116

Dörr T, Lewis K & Vulić M (2009) SOS response induces persistence to fluoroquinolones
in Escherichia coli. *PLoS Genet.* **5:** e1000760

Elhenawy W, Oberc A & Coombes BK (2018) A polymicrobial view of disease potential in
Crohn's-associated adherent-invasive E. coli. *Gut Microbes* **9:** 166–174

Esnault E, Valens M, Espéli O & Boccard F (2007) Chromosome structuring limits
genome plasticity in Escherichia coli. *PLoS Genet.* **3:** e226

Espéli O, Moulin L & Boccard F (2001) Transcription attenuation associated with
bacterial repetitive extragenic BIME elements. *J. Mol. Biol.* **314:** 375–386

Glasser AL, Boudeau J, Barnich N, Perruchot MH, Colombel JF & Darfeuille-Michaud A
(2001) Adherent invasive Escherichia coli strains from patients with Crohn's
disease survive and replicate within macrophages without inducing host cell
death. *Infect. Immun.* **69:** 5529–5537

Haeusser DP & Levin PA (2008) The great divide: coordinating cell cycle events during
bacterial growth and division. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* **11:** 94–99

Hajduk IV, Rodrigues CDA & Harry EJ (2016) Connecting the dots of the bacterial cell
cycle: Coordinating chromosome replication and segregation with cell division.
Semin. Cell Dev. Biol. **53:** 2–9

Harms A, Fino C, Sørensen MA, Semsey S & Gerdes K (2017) Prophages and Growth
Dynamics Confound Experimental Results with Antibiotic-Tolerant Persister
Cells. *mBio* **8:**

Hébrard M, Viala JPM, Méresse S, Barras F & Aussel L (2009) Redundant hydrogen
peroxide scavengers contribute to Salmonella virulence and oxidative stress
resistance. *J. Bacteriol.* **191:** 4605–4614

Helaine S, Cheverton AM, Watson KG, Faure LM, Matthews SA & Holden DW (2014)
Internalization of Salmonella by macrophages induces formation of
nonreplicating persisters. *Science* **343:** 204–208

Jonas K (2014) To divide or not to divide: control of the bacterial cell cycle by
environmental cues. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* **18:** 54–60

Kim J-S & Wood TK (2017) Tolerant, Growing Cells from Nutrient Shifts Are Not
Persister Cells. *mBio* **8:**

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

Lapaquette P, Bringer M-A & Darfeuille-Michaud A (2012) Defects in autophagy favour
adherent-invasive Escherichia coli persistence within macrophages leading to
increased pro-inflammatory response. *Cell. Microbiol.* **14:** 791–807

Lewis K (2010) Persister cells. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* **64:** 357–372

Manina G, Dhar N & McKinney JD (2015) Stress and host immunity amplify
Mycobacterium tuberculosis phenotypic heterogeneity and induce nongrowing
metabolically active forms. *Cell Host Microbe* **17:** 32–46

Margolin W & Bernander R (2004) How do prokaryotic cells cycle? *Curr. Biol. CB* **14:**
R768-770

Miquel S, Claret L, Bonnet R, Dorboz I, Barnich N & Darfeuille-Michaud A (2010) Role of
decreased levels of Fis histone-like protein in Crohn's disease-associated
adherent invasive Escherichia coli LF82 bacteria interacting with intestinal
epithelial cells. *J. Bacteriol.* **192:** 1832–1843

Mouton JM, Helaine S, Holden DW & Sampson SL (2016) Elucidating population-wide
mycobacterial replication dynamics at the single-cell level. *Microbiol. Read. Engl.*
162: 966–978

Radzikowski JL, Vedelaar S, Siegel D, Ortega ÁD, Schmidt A & Heinemann M (2016)
Bacterial persistence is an active σS stress response to metabolic flux limitation.
Mol. Syst. Biol. **12:** 882

Rao NN & Kornberg A (1999) Inorganic polyphosphate regulates responses of
Escherichia coli to nutritional stringencies, environmental stresses and survival
in the stationary phase. *Prog. Mol. Subcell. Biol.* **23:** 183–195

Rycroft JA, Gollan B, Grabe GJ, Hall A, Cheverton AM, Larrouy-Maumus G, Hare SA &
Helaine S (2018) Activity of acetyltransferase toxins involved in
Salmonella persister formation during macrophage infection. *Nat. Commun.* **9:**
1993

Shan Y, Brown Gandt A, Rowe SE, Deisinger JP, Conlon BP & Lewis K (2017) ATP-
Dependent Persister Formation in Escherichia coli. *mBio* **8:**

Sharma UK & Chatterji D (2010) Transcriptional switching in Escherichia coli during
stress and starvation by modulation of sigma activity. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* **34:**
646–657

Simonsen KT, Nielsen G, Bjerrum JV, Kruse T, Kallipolitis BH & Møller-Jensen J (2011) A
role for the RNA chaperone Hfq in controlling adherent-invasive Escherichia coli
colonization and virulence. *PloS One* **6:** e16387

Verstraeten N, Knapen W, Fauvart M & Michiels J (2016) A Historical Perspective on
Bacterial Persistence. *Methods Mol. Biol. Clifton NJ* **1333:** 3–13

Viala JPM, Méresse S, Pocachard B, Guilhon A-A, Aussel L & Barras F (2011) Sensing and
adaptation to low pH mediated by inducible amino acid decarboxylases in
Salmonella. *PloS One* **6:** e22397

Wood TK, Knabel SJ & Kwan BW (2013) Bacterial persister cell formation and
dormancy. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **79:** 7116–7121

Wu F, Van Rijn E, Van Schie BGC, Keymer JE & Dekker C (2015) Multi-color imaging of
the bacterial nucleoid and division proteins with blue, orange, and near-infrared
fluorescent proteins. *Front. Microbiol.* **6:** 607

Legend of the figures

Figure 1. A) Measure of viable and dead AIEC LF82 for 24 h post-infection of THP1 differentiated macrophages. Circles represent average CFU (blue) and Propidium iodide (PI) positive bacteria (black) ± Standard deviation (SD) (dotted lines). B) Analysis by qRT-PCR of the induction of LF82 stress responses at 1 h, 6 h and 24 h P.I. of THP1 macrophages. Values represent the average of two experiments. C) Proportion of viable bacteria at 24 h P.I. of THP1 macrophages in comparison to 1 h. LF82, K12 and LF82 deletion mutants were infected at a MOI of 30 which corresponds to 0 - 5 visible bacteria per macrophage at time point 1h (Figure 2A). Values represent the average of 3 to 7 experiments ± SD. Horizontal lines indicate viability decrease by 2, 5 and 10 fold compared to WT LF82.

Figure 2. A) Imaging of THP1 macrophages infection by LF82-GFP at a MOI of 30. Representative images at 1 h and 24 h. Scale bar is 5 μm B) Imaging of LF82-mCherry stress responses at the single cell level with biosensors. Imaging was performed at 24 h P.I.. LF82-mCherry was transformed with plasmids containing either the *katG* promoter fused to GFP (P*katG*-GFP), the *mgtC* promoter (P*mgt*C-GFP), the *asr* promoter (P*asr*-GFP) or the *sulA* promoter (P*sulA*-GFP). C) Imaging of LF82-mCherry P*asr*GFP and Lamp1 phagolysosome marker E) Measure of the fluorescence intensity of individual LF82-mCherry containing the *katG* promoter fused to GFP at 1 h and 24 h P.I. F) Measure of the fluorescence intensity of individual LF82-mCherry containing the *asr* promoter fused to GFP at 1 h and 24 h P.I. G) LF82 P*sulA*-GFP, LF82 P*katG*GFP, LF82 P*asr*-GFP in LB respectively supplemented with MMC (5μM), with H2O2 (5μM) or switched to pH4.7 1h before imaging. Distribution of the fluorescence of LF82 P*asr*-GFP after 24h post infection in macrophage (from panel B) and after 1 hours of growth in LB buffered at pH4.7. Fluorescence values were expressed as their log2ratio with the average value of the maximum decile (maximum expression). Distributions were compared with a Two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test.

Figure 3. A) Representative image of LF82 containing the fluorescent dilution plasmid (pFC6Gi) at 1 h and 24 h post-infection. The frequency of replicative and non-growing LF82 (undiluted GFP) is indicated (N =300). B) Representative image of LF82 containing the TIMER plasmid (pBR-TIMER) at 18 h post-infection. The red arrows points toward

the reddest LF82. The frequency of replicative and non-growing LF82 is indicated (N

=300). C) Representative images of LF82-mCherry FtsZ-GFP at 1 h and 24 h post-

infection. Infections presented in panels A to C were performed with a stationary phase

culture of LF82 (O.D. 2). Scale bars are 5 μm. D) Measure of the frequency of LF82

presenting a FtsZ ring in populations growing in LB or within macrophages (N =300).

Figure 4. A) Measure of the proportion of LF82 that were tolerant to ciprofloxacin (10x

MIC) at 1 h or 3 h. LF82 were cultivated up to OD 0.3 in LB medium (*in vitro*) or

harvested after 1 h or 24 h post infection within macrophages. The challenges exerted

on bacteria passaged through macrophages started immediately after macrophage lysis

(see experimental procedures). B) Proportion of non-growing LF82 (labeled using the

Fluorescent Dilution assay) observed within macrophages (24 h P.I.) following a 6 h

ofloxacin treatment. C) Ratio of ciprofloxacin-tolerant versus viable LF82 and K12

bacteria after macrophage infection. Values are averages of 5 experiments. Data were

analyzed using a Student's *t* test to determine differences with the proportion of

ciprofloxacin-tolerant LF82 at 1 h post-infection, *P < 0.05.   D) Measure of the

proportion of LF82 that were tolerant to ciprofloxacin at 1 h or 3 h with increasing times

after macrophage lysis. E) Imaging of the regrowth properties of individual LF82-TIMER

bacteria after macrophages lysis. Infections were performed for 20 h and then

macrophages were lysed, LF82 spread on to LB agarose pads and immediately imaged at

37°C. Timer red fluorescence was progressively lost as microcolonies formed. The lysis

procedure requires 20 minutes before the first field can be observed (t20 min). F)

Measure of the ability of LF82 to form microcolonies as a function of red TIMER

fluorescence at t20 min of the experiment are presented in E; areas of microcolonies are

expressed in pixels^2 ;

Figure 5. A) Proportions of LF82, K12 and LF82 deletion mutants that were tolerant to a

3-h ciprofloxacin challenge following a 1 h or 24 h intracellular growth period within

THP1 macrophages. Values represent the average of 3 to 7 experiments. Data were

analyzed using a Student's *t* test to determine differences compared with WT LF82. *P <

0.05.   B) Measure of the proportions of LF82 *lexA ind*, *recA*, *sulA*, *dksA*, *dksA lexAind-*,

dksA recA mutants that were tolerant to 3 h of cefotaxim challenge after 1 hour of

macrophage infection. The 3 hour time point was below detection limit for the *dksA recA*

mutant because of the poor viability of the mutant in macrophages. Cefotaxime only kills growing bacteria; therefore we resuspended LF82 in LB after macrophage lysis. Under these conditions, we did not observe the plateau observed for persisters to ciprofloxacin, suggesting that tolerant rather than persister LF82 were measured. C) Same as in B but with 20 h of macrophage infection. Values represent the average of 3 to 7 experiments. Data were analyzed using a Student's *t* test to determine differences compared with WT LF82. *P < 0.05. D) Imaging of the FD for the *relA spoT* and *recA* mutants. Imaging at 24 h P.I. at an MOI 100x. Data represent the % of replicative and non-growing LF82; a total of 300 bacteria were counted. E) Percentage of the LF82 population presenting a high, mid or low level of red TIMER fluorescence at 18 h P.I. of macrophages. *recA*, *lexAind-*, *sulA* and *dksA* mutants were tested. F) Live and dead assay performed 1h and 18h post infection, in the LF82, LF82*recA*, LF82*lexAind-,* LF82*sulA*, LF82*relAspoT* and LF82*dksA* strains

Figure 6. A) Model of infection of THP1 macrophages by LF82, describing the processes of net growth, switch to persistence and stress-induced death as explained in the text. Part of the cells that enter the macrophage die at the onset of the infection (t=0). During lag phase (0<t<λ), death either exactly compensates birth or, in the mutant lacking the stringent response, results in a negative net growth rate -δ_1 . Later in the infection, the net growth rate β is positive. Death rate due to stress accumulation (yellow bar) is negligible in the early stages of infection and becomes particularly important at late time points. Bacteria switch to a persistent state at a rate k_p independent of the growth stage. B) Experimental measures of the infection kinetics (CFUs from 5 replicate experiments, circles; persister fractions, stars) collected over 24h for LF82, *E. coli* K12 and LF82 *dksA* and the best fitting parameters (Supplementary text Table 1) of model eq. (1) (Methods). Continuous lines represent total number of bacteria (B+P, continuous line) and persiters (P, dotted line). Vertical lines indicate the duration λ of lag phase. C) Projected changes in infection dynamics for 'virtual mutants' LF82*, obtained by varying k_p, λ and d_{max} – the parameters that quantitatively differ between LF82 and *E. coli* K12 – around the LF82 best fit solution (black line); coloured lines correspond to parameter values within the indicated interval.

Figure 7: Schematics of LF82 infection dynamics in macrophage phagolysosomes.

Upon phagocytosis both replicative (green FtsZ ring) or stationary phase (brown) LF82
detect a signal, perhaps nutrient depletion, that led to stringent response activation. This
activates a first phenotypic switch toward a non replicating state (orange) that protects
LF82 from dying because of initial stress burst. Among these non replicating LF82
persisters are formed. After this lag phase, a second switch is required to initiate few
rounds of replication. The timing and perhaps the frequency of switching from lag phase
to replicative phase differentiate LF82 from our control commensal strain. We have not
yet identified LF82 specific determinants that allow this switch. Subsequent replication
rounds are dependent on the DNA repair machinery. A third switch, linked to the
increasing stress or lesions, is turned on in a portion of the replicative population to
form new non growers and persisters.   The SOS response might also be playing a role at
this stage.
878
879
880
881

Legend of the supplementary figures

Supplementary Figure S1. A) Growth curves of LF82 and K12 (C600) in LB medium at pH 7.4 (blue) and in the presence of SHX (15 mg/ml), SHX (7 mg/ml), EDTA (70 mM) or in LB at pH 4.7 and LB at pH 4.7 in the presence of EDTA (70 mM). B) Chemicals or a pH shift were applied at 160 min. B) same as in A with addition of the antibiotics ciprofloxacin (24 ng/ml) or cefotaxim (800 ng/ml). Data are the mean of 3 technical replicates.

Supplementary Figure S2. A) Live and dead assay performed in situ on infected macrophages and after macrophage lysis. For in situ experiments a very weak propidium iodide (PI) labeling is observed on putative dead LF82. By contrast strong PI labeling is observed after macrophage lysis. B) Measure of the speed of disappearance after phagocytosis by macrophages of heat-killed LF82. LF82 were killed by 15 min incubation at 60°C and subsequently labeled with propidium iodide. Labeled dead LF82 were incubated with macrophage at an MOI of 100. Imaging was performed at 1h, 2h, 3h and 24h post infection. SYTO-9 was used to reveal macrophage and eventual live bacteria. The number of dead LF82 per macrophage was measured at each time points. Data are average of 3 experiments.

Supplementary Figure S3. A) Measure of the resistance to MMC of LF82, LF82 *recA*, LF82 *lexAind-,* MG1655, MG1655 *recA* and MG1655 *lexAind-*. B) Measure of the tolerance to cefotaxim of LF82 and LF82 *recA*, LF82 *lexAind-*, LF82 *sulA* grown in LB medium to an OD of 0.2. C) Induction of tolerance to cefotaxim by pretreatment with a subinhibitory dose of ciprofloxacin (24 ng/ml). The data represent the ratio of the number of bacteria that were tolerant to 3 h of cefotaxim in the presence or absence of ciprofloxacin.

Supplementary Figure S4. A) Growth curve of LF82 pFC6Gi in LB at 37°C. Colored diamonds represent the sampling times analyzed by fluorescence microscopy in the panel B. B) Distribution of GFP fluorescence in the growing population of LF82; GFP fluorescence is expressed as the number of generations (each generation corresponds to a 2-fold decrease in GFP fluorescence compared with the average fluorescence of the fully induced population at t0). C) Distribution of GFP fluorescence in the population of

915 LF82-infecting macrophages. Fluorescence was measured for individual bacteria or
916 small bacterial clusters after macrophage fixation at 1 h, 6 h, 24 h and 48 h post-
917 infection. D) Distribution of the GFP fluorescence in the population of K12 bacteria
918 infecting macrophages. Fluorescence was measured for individual bacteria or small
919 bacterial clusters after macrophage fixation at 1 h and 24 h post-infection.
920
Supplementary Figure S5. A) Scatter plot of green versus red TIMER fluorescence
measured for exponentially growing LF82 (green) and for a culture that had reached
stationary phase (red). B) Distribution of the red TIMER fluorescence measured for
exponentially growing LF82 (green) and stationary phase LF82 (red) at 4 h and 18 h
post-infection. Curves represent the normal fit of the data. The middle peak height for
exponential and stationary cultures was used to respectively define the fast-mid and
mid-slow borders of the boxes.
928
929
930
931

Figure 2

A

1 h P.I. | 24H P.I.

LF82-GFP
Macrophage (actin)

C

P_katG GFP | 24H P.I. | P_mgtC GFP

P_asr GFP | P_sulA GFP | LF82 mcherry Macrophage (actin)

D

LF82 mcherry   P_asr GFP | Lamp1

Macrophage (actin)

E

1H P.I. P_katG GFP LF82 mcherry | 24H P.I.

% of LF82

Fluorescence (AI)

F

1H P.I. P_asr GFP LF82 mcherry | 24H P.I.

% of LF82

Fluorescence (AI)

G

P_sulA GFP | P_katG GFP | P_asr GFP

MMC | H$_2$O$_2$ | pH4.5

KS test p= 3 e^{-225}

P_asr GFP
24h PI in Macrophage
1h in LB pH4.7

% of LF82

log2 fluorescence compared to maximum

A

Proportion of LF82 tolerant to antibiotics

— in vitro — 1h in macrophages — 24h in macrophages

time (h)

B

Replicatives: 71%
Non growing: 29% +/-10

C

Proportion of bacteria tolerant to 3h of ciprofloxacin

LF82
K12

Cipro tolerant 1h in Mθ / Viable after 1h in Mθ

Cipro tolerant 24h in Mθ / Viable after 24h in Mθ

Cipro tolerant 24h in Mθ / Viable after 1h in Mθ

D

Proportion of LF82 tolerant to ciprofloxacin

— no macrophage
— Cipro at t0
— Cipro at t60 min
— Cipro at t120 min
— no Cipro

time (h)

E

20 min 40 min 60 min 80 min

100 min 120 min 140 min 160 min

180 min 200 min 220 min 240 min

F

Area of the microcolony at t 240min

microcolonies

single cells

Red fluorescence intensity at t20 min

Figure 5

Phagocytosis

End of lag phase
λ =7.4h

Ab T/P

NR

replicative

stationary

Stringent response

DNA lesions

SOS ?

NR

Ab T/P

dead

dead

SOS response dependent replication

stationary

Switch 1   Switch 2   Switch 3

Mɸ stress