Inter-membrane association of the Sec and BAM translocons for bacterial outer-membrane biogenesis

Sara Alvira[1*], Daniel W. Watkins[1*], Lucy Troman[1], William J. Allen[1], James Lorriman[1], Gianluca Degliesposti[2], Eli J. Cohen[3], Morgan Beeby[3], Bertram Daum[4], Vicki A.M. Gold[4], J. Mark Skehel[2] and Ian Collinson[1†]

[1], *School of Biochemistry, University of Bristol, BS8 1TD, United Kingdom*

[2], *Biological Mass Spectrometry and Proteomics, MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Francis Crick Avenue, Cambridge, CB2 0QH, United Kingdom*

[3], *Faculty of Natural Sciences, Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

[4], *Living Systems Institute, University of Exeter, EX4 4QD, United Kingdom*

[*], these authors contributed equally to this work

[†], corresponding author: ian.collinson@bristol.ac.uk

SUMMARY (150/ 150)

The outer-membrane of Gram-negative bacteria is critical for surface adhesion, pathogenicity, antibiotic resistance and survival. The major constituent – hydrophobic β-barrel Outer-Membrane Proteins (OMPs) – are secreted across the inner-membrane through the Sec-translocon for delivery to periplasmic chaperones *e.g.* SurA, which prevent aggregation. OMPs are then offloaded to the β-Barrel Assembly Machinery (BAM) in the outer-membrane for insertion and folding. We show the Holo-TransLocon (HTL: an assembly of the protein-channel core-complex SecYEG, the ancillary sub-complex SecDF, and the membrane 'insertase' YidC) contacts SurA and BAM through periplasmic domains of SecDF and YidC, ensuring efficient OMP maturation. Our results show the trans-membrane proton-motive-force (PMF) acts at distinct stages of protein secretion: for SecA-driven translocation across the inner-membrane through SecYEG; and to communicate conformational changes *via* SecDF to the BAM machinery. The latter presumably ensures efficient passage of OMPs. These interactions provide insights of inter-membrane organisation, the importance of which is becoming increasingly apparent.

INTRODUCTION

Outer-membrane biogenesis in Gram-negative bacteria (reviewed in (Konovalova et al., 2017)) requires substantial quantities of protein to be exported; a process which begins by transport across the inner plasma membrane. Precursors of β-barrel Outer-Membrane Proteins (OMPs) with cleavable N-terminal signal-sequences are targeted to the ubiquitous Sec-machinery and driven into the periplasm by the ATPase SecA and the trans-membrane proton-motive-force (PMF) (Brundage et al., 1990; Collinson, 2019; Cranford-Smith and Huber, 2018; Lill et al., 1989). Upon completion, the pre-protein signal-sequence is proteolytically cleaved (Chang et al., 1978; Josefsson and Randall, 1981), releasing the mature unfolded protein into the periplasm. The emergent protein is then picked up by periplasmic chaperones, such as SurA and Skp, which prevent aggregation (McMorran et al., 2013; Sklar et al., 2007), and somehow facilitate delivery to the β-Barrel Assembly Machinery (BAM) for outer-membrane insertion and folding (Voulhoux et al., 2003; Wu et al., 2005).

In *E. coli,* BAM consists of a membrane protein complex of subunits BamA-E, of known structure (Bakelar et al., 2016; Gu et al., 2016; Iadanza et al., 2016). The core component, BamA, is a 16 stranded β-barrel integral membrane protein, which projects a large periplasmic stretch of 5 POlypeptide TRanslocation-Associated (POTRA) domains into the periplasm. BamB-E are peripheral membrane lipoproteins anchored to the inner leaflet of the OM. Despite structural insights, the mechanism for BAM-facilitated OMP insertion is unknown (Ricci and Silhavy, 2019).

The bacterial periplasm is a challenging environment for unfolded proteins, so complexes spanning both membranes are critical for efficient delivery through many specialised secretion systems (Green and Mecsas, 2016). So, how do enormous quantities of proteins entering the periplasm *via* the general secretory pathway (Sec) efficiently find their way through the cell envelope to the outer-membrane? From where is the energy derived to facilitate these trafficking processes some distance from the energy transducing inner-membrane and in an environment lacking ATP? Could it be achieved by a direct interaction between chaperones, and the translocons of the inner (Sec) and outer (BAM) membranes?

The core-translocon, SecYEG, does not possess periplasmic domains of sufficient size to mediate such an interaction (Van den Berg et al., 2004). However, the Holo-TransLocon (HTL)

contains the ancillary sub-complex SecDF and the membrane protein 'insertase' YidC (Duong

and Wickner, 1997; Schulze et al., 2014); both of which contain periplasmic extensions

potentially large enough to reach the POTRA domains of BamA.

SecDF is a member of the so called Root Nodulation Division (RND) superfamily of proton-

motive-force (PMF) driven transporters (reviewed in (Tseng et al., 1999)). It is a highly

conserved component of the bacterial Sec translocon, where it has long been known to facilitate

protein secretion (Duong and Wickner, 1997; Economou et al., 1995; Pogliano and Beckwith,

1994). While fellow component of the HTL – YidC – is essential for membrane protein

insertion, and thus indispensable (Samuelson et al., 2000; Scotti et al., 2000), knock out mutants

of *secD* and *secF* are not fatal but severely compromised and cold-sensitive (Gardel et al.,

1987), presumably due to deficiencies in envelope biogenesis. The cause of this has been

ascribed to a defect in protein transport across the inner membrane.

In keeping with other members of the RND family, like AcrB (Eicher et al., 2014), SecDF

confers PMF stimulation of protein secretion (Arkowitz and Wickner, 1994). Different

structures of SecDF show the large periplasmic domains in different conformational states

(Furukawa et al., 2018; Kumazaki et al., 2014; Mio et al., 2014), also affected by altering a key

residue of the proton transport pathway (SecD$_{D519N}$ – *E. coli* numbering) (Furukawa et al.,

2017). On this basis, an elaborate mechanism has been proposed whereby PMF driven

conformational changes at the outer surface pick up and pull polypeptides as they emerge from

the protein channel exit site of SecY. Yet, ATP- and PMF-driven translocation across the inner

membrane does not require SecDF or YidC (Gardel et al., 1987; Schulze et al., 2014); SecYEG

and SecA will suffice (Brundage et al., 1990). Evidently then, there must be two PMF-

dependent components of protein secretion: one early stage dependent on SecYEG/ SecA, and

another later event on AcrB-like SecDF activity. This distinction has not been fully considered.

This study explores the role of the ancillary components of the Sec machinery for protein

secretion and downstream trafficking through the periplasm for outer-membrane delivery and

maturation. In particular, we examine the possibility of a direct interaction between the HTL

and BAM machineries to facilitate protein transport through the envelope. The basic properties

and structure of the inter-membrane super-complex are investigated, as well as its importance

for OMP folding and insertion. The implications of this interaction and its modulation caused

by proton transport through SecDF are profound. Thus, we consider their consequences for the

mechanism of protein transport through the Sec and BAM machineries, and for outer-
membrane biogenesis.
96
97
98 **RESULTS**
99
Co-fractionation and immunoprecipitation highlight an interaction between the Sec and
BAM machineries
Total *E. coli* membranes of cells over-producing either SecYEG or HTL were prepared and
fractionated by sucrose gradient centrifugation to separate the inner- and outer-membranes (Fig.
1a). We first sought to determine the precise locations of IM and OM proteins in the fractions;
SDS-PAGE analysis of the fractions stained for total protein revealed the presence of SecY in
the lighter inner-membrane fractions (Fig. S1a, asterisk – left panel). Heating the fractions
(required to unfold outer membrane proteins) prior to SDS-PAGE helped reveal the location of
the most highly expressed outer membrane residents (OmpC and OmpF; Fig. S1a, asterisk –
right panel). Thus, in these gradients fraction 1-3 mostly contain outer-membranes, and
fractions 4-6 are composed mainly of inner-membranes.
Immunoblotting confirmed the presence of the BAM components (BamA, BamB and
BamD), as expected, in OM fractions (OM; Fig. 1b). Likewise, the over-produced SecY and
SecE subunits mark the fractions containing the core-complex (SecYEG) in the IM fractions
(IM; Fig. 1b, YEG↑). However, when over-produced as part of HTL there is a marked shift of
their migration towards the outer-membrane containing fractions (Fig. 1b, HTL↑).
Interestingly, the over-production of SecDF alone results in a similar effect (Fig. 1c); a
measurable increase of SecY and SecG in the outer-membrane containing fractions. This effect
was lost in comparable experiments where the periplasmic domain of SecD (P1) had been
removed (Fig. 1c). Our interpretation of these experiments is that the interaction between the
Sec and Bam complexes, requiring at least the periplasmic domains of SecD (and most likely
SecF and YidC), causes an association of inner and outer membrane vesicles reflected in the
shift we observe.
To further examine this interaction, we extracted native membranes with a mild detergent
for Immuno-Precipitation (IP) using a monoclonal antibody raised against SecG. The pull-

downs were then probed for native interacting partners by western blotting (Fig. 1d,e, Fig. S1b). As expected, SecG (positive control) and SecD of HTL co-immuno-precipitated. Crucially, BamA could also be detected. The specificity of the association was demonstrated by controls omitting the SecG antibody or the SecG protein (produced from membranes extracts of a *ΔsecG* strain (Nishiyama et al., 1994)), wherein non-specific binding was either undetectable, or considerably lower than the specific co-immuno-precipitant (Fig. 1d). When BAM was over-produced, the yield of BamA recovered in the IPs increased accordingly (Fig. 1d, e, Fig. S1b).

In a similar experiment, a hexa-histidine tagged BamA was used to isolate BAM from cells over-producing the complex. Western blots showed that BamA co-purified, as expected, with additional components of the BAM complex (BamB and BamD), and crucially also with SecD and SecG of the HTL (Fig. 1f, Fig. S1c). Again, controls (omitting Ni^{2+}, or recombinant his_6-BamA) were reassuringly negative.

Interaction between HTL and BAM is cardiolipin dependent

The phospholipid C̲ardioL̲ipin (CL) is known to be intimately associated with energy transducing systems, including the Sec-machinery, for both complex stabilisation and efficient transport (Corey et al., 2018; Gold et al., 2010; Schulze et al., 2014). For this reason, the IP experiments above were augmented with CL. On omission of CL the interactions of SecG with SecD and BamA were reduced ~ 3- and 5-fold, respectively (Fig. 1d, e; Fig. S1b). This lipid-mediated enhancement of the SecG-SecD interaction is consistent with our previous finding that CL stabilises HTL (Schulze et al., 2014), and shows it also holds true for the HTL-BAM interaction. *Apropos*, CL has been shown to be associated with the BAM complex (Chorev et al., 2018).

HTL and BAM interact to form an assembly large enough to bridge the inner and outer membranes

To confirm the interaction between the Sec and BAM machineries, the purified complexes were subjected to glycerol gradient centrifugation. When mixed together, HTL and BAM co-migrated towards higher glycerol concentrations, beyond those attained by the individual complexes (Fig. 2a); consistent with the formation of a larger complex due to an interaction between the two. The interaction is clear, but not very strong, likely due to the required transient

nature of the association between the two translocons *in vivo*, and also because of the complete breakdown of the inner and outer membranes by detergent – required for this experiment. When the experiment was repeated with the individual constituents of HTL: SecDF and YidC, but not SecYEG, were also shown to interact with BAM (Fig. S2a-c).

Visualisation of the heavy fractions containing interacting HTL and BAM by Negative Stain (NS)-Electron Microscopy (EM) revealed a heterogeneous mixture of small and very large complexes (Fig. S3a, large complexes marked with white arrows). As noted above, this mixed population is probably due to the expected transient nature of the interaction between the two complexes, and/ or due to super-complex instability caused by loss of the bilayer and specifically bound phospholipids, *e.g.* CL, during purification (see above and below). Even though we augment the material with CL it is unlikely the full complement of native lipids found in the membrane bound state are restored.

To overcome this heterogeneity we stabilised the complex by cross-linking, using GraFix (Kastner et al., 2008) (Fig. S4a, middle). Note that this interaction was also demonstrated by size exclusion chromatography, performed for sample preparation for mass spectrometry and cryo-EM (see below). Visualisation by NS-EM revealed a marked reduction in the number of dissociated complexes (Fig. S3b). As expected, omitting CL from the preparation resulted in dissociation of the majority of the large complexes, even with GraFix (Fig. S3c), supporting the findings above of the CL dependence of the interaction (Fig. 1e).

Mass spectrometry confirmed the presence of BAM and HTL constituents in a high molecular weight GraFix fraction (Fig. S4a, right; Table S1), which was selected for analysis by NS-EM. The subsequent single particle analysis of this material (Table S2) revealed a remarkable structure large enough (~ 300 x 250 x 150 Å) to contain both Sec and BAM machineries (Botte et al., 2016; Iadanza et al., 2016), and with a height sufficient to straddle the space between the two membranes (Fig. 2b, Fig. S4b), especially when considering the plasticity of the periplasm (Zuber et al., 2008). Moreover, the periplasmic domains of the HTL and BAM complexes are potentially large enough reach out across the space between the inner and outer-membranes to contact one another. Indeed, regions of SecDF and the POTRA domains of BamA have been show to extend ~ 60 Å (Furukawa et al., 2017) and ~ 110 Å (Ma et al., 2019) respectively, sufficient to bridge this gap.

To assign the locations and orientations of the individual constituents of HTL and BAM, we
compared the 3D reconstructions of different sub-complexes: BAM bound to SecYEG-DF
(without YidC) (Fig. S4c) or SecDF alone (Fig. S4d). The difference analysis revealed the
locations of YidC (Fig. 2b, pink; Fig. S4c, pink arrow), SecDF (Fig. 2b, green; Fig. S4d, green
arrow) and SecYEG (Fig. 2b, blue; Fig. S4d, blue arrow) at the bottom of the assembly
(assigned as the inner-membrane region). The orientation of BAM relative to SecDF is different
in SecDF-BAM compared to HTL-BAM (Fig. S4d, red arrows), possibly due to its known
ability to move (see below), and/ or the absence of stabilising interactions with the rest of HTL
components.
Removing BamB from the complex results in the loss of significant mass in the area
designated as the OM region with respect to the holo-structure (Fig. 2b, orange; Fig. S4e, orange
arrow). This confirmed the orientation of the inner and outer-membranes, and the assignment
of the BAM complex as shown in Fig. 2b. Interestingly, the complex lacking BamB shows a
diminishment of the density assigned as YidC (Fig. S4e, pink arrow), suggestive of a mutual
interaction between the two.
201
Periplasmic domains of the Sec and BAM translocons associate to form a large cavity
between the bacterial inner and outer membranes
Despite heterogeneity in the sample we were able to isolate a cross-linked HTL-BAM
complex by size exclusion chromatography and produce a low-resolution cryo-EM structure
(Fig. 2c, Fig. S5 and Table S2) with an overall resolution of 18.23 Å.Taken together with the
difference map generated by NS-EM (Fig. 2b; Fig. S4) the structure reveals the basic
architecture of the assembly and the arrangement of constituent subunits.
The extreme complexity of the image processing resulted in an insuffient number of particles
to attain high resolution. Many factors contribute to this problem: the dynamism of the complex,
due to the limited contact surface between the HTL and BAM; its inherent mobility necessary
for function; the presence of detergent surrounding the trans-membrane regions of the HTL and
BAM components, accounting for most of the surface of the assembly; and finally, the absence
of inner- and outer-membranes scaffolds. The loss of the fixed double membrane architecture
was particularly problematic; during image processing we found different sub-populations

where the BAM pivots away from its raised position towards where the inner membrane would
otherwise have been. Obviously, this would not happen if restrained by the outer-membrane.

In spite of all this, the attainable structure proved to be very illuminating. Due to the limited
resolution, we deployed cross-linking mass spectroscopy (XL-MS) to verify the contacts
between HTL and BAM responsible for inter-membrane contact points. The HTL and BAM
complexes were mixed together in equimolar quantities and cross-linked with the lysine-
specific reagent DSBU. The reaction mixture was then fractionated by gel filtration and
analysed by SDS-PAGE. A single band corresponding to the cross-linked HTL-BAM complex
was detected (Fig. S6a); note that the isolation of the intact HTL-BAM complex by size
exclusion chromatography provides further evidence of a genuine interaction. The fractions
containing the cross-linked complex were combined and digested before LC-MS/ MS analysis.

The analysis of mass spectrometry data enabled the detection and mapping of the inter- and
intra-molecular protein cross-links within the assembly. The results show an intricate network
of interactions most of which are consistent with the cryo-EM structure, particularly at one side
of the assembly between SecD and BamBCD, and on the other side between YidC and
BamABCD (Fig. S6b,c). All the constituent proteins of HTL were cross-linked to BAM
subunits with exception of SecG and YajC. Thus, the resulting co-immunoprecipitation and
affinity pull down of SecG with the Bam components (described above; Fig. 1d-f) must have
been the result of an indirect interaction, presumably *via* SecDF-YidC. This is consistent with
the lack of an interaction of SecYEG alone and the BAM complex (Fig. S2b), and the
assignment of the electron microscopy structures (Fig. 2b,c) – showing no connection between
SecYEG and BAM. In this respect, it is interesting to note in the structure that the periplasmic
domains of SecD, YidC and to a lesser degree SecF, extend to establish multiple interactions
with the BAM lipoproteins suggesting a pivotal role for these subunits in the formation of the
HTL:BAM complex (Fig. 2c,e). This bridge between the two complexes also helps to define a
very large cavity between the IM and OM (Fig. 2d).

The BAM complex is recognisable in the cryo-EM structure at the outer membrane with the
expected extensive periplasmic protrusions (Bakelar et al., 2016; Gu et al., 2016). Some
components of the BAM complex, such as BamB, can be unambiguoulsy docked at the cryo-
EM structure, due to the direct determination by NS and its easily recognisable ß-propeller

shape (Fig. 2e). We suggest also the locations of BamA, BamC and BamD according to the
cryo-EM density and the constraints of the XL-MS data (Fig. 2e; Fig. S6c).

The inner-membrane region the HTL is much more open than the previous structure, when
visualised alone (Botte et al., 2016). In the new open structure, the locations of the core-
complex SecYEG, SecDF and YidC can be easily distinguished, connected by two bridges from
the former (Fig. 2f, left, asterisks). These bridging sites could be the binding sites of CL and
the central lipid pool identified previously, required for structural stability and translocon
activity (Corey et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2019; Schulze et al., 2014). Within SecYEG the
protein channel can be visualised though the centre, along with the lateral gate (required for
signal sequence binding and inner membrane protein insertion) facing towards SecDF, YidC
and the putative central lipid pool (Martin et al., 2019; Fig. 2f, right).

Cardiolipin, required for super-complex formation, stabilises an 'open' form of the HTL
The HTL bound to BAM in our EM structure (Fig. 3a, structure ii) seems to be more open
when compared to the previously published low-resolution cryo-EM structure (Botte et al.,
2016) (emd3056; Fig. 3a, structure i), and also displays a more prominent periplasmic region.
Preparations of HTL alone, made in this study, contain both a 'compact' state (Fig. 3a, structure
iii) similar to that of the previously published structure (Fig. 3a, structure i), as well as a
proportion of an 'open' state, with proud periplasmic domains, not previously described (Fig.
3a, structure iv), and apparently more similar to that seen in the HTL-BAM structure (Fig. 3a,
structure ii).
The HTL sample used here is extremely pure, of known subunit composition and not prone
to oligomerisation (Schulze et al., 2014). So, we can rule out that this larger form, assigned as
an 'open' state, of HTL is not due to the presence of contaminants, unknown additional partner
proteins, or dimerisation. Instead, the reason for the presence of these different populations –
'compact' and 'open' states – is likely due to varying interactions with lipids, including CL.
Lipid content within the HTL is critical for proper structure and function, and CL is particularly
important for protein translocation through the Sec machinery (Corey et al., 2018; Gold et al.,
2010; Hendrick and Wickner, 1991; Schulze et al., 2014). Depletion of these core lipids, for
instance by detergent extraction, might be expected to cause a collapse of the complex.
Augmenting the HTL with CL during purification increased the proportion of the 'open' state

(from 8% to 17%), which could be enriched by glycerol gradient fractionation (to 32%), and
further stabilised by cross-linking (to 40%) (Fig. S7).

Evidently then, it seems likely that the open conformation (Fig. 3a, structure iv) is the state
capable of interacting with the BAM complex (Fig. 3a, structure ii). The 'open' structure, and
the 'compact' structure seen before (Botte et al., 2016), may reflect different functional states
of the translocon. Presumably, the HTL would be closed when idle in the membrane, and would
open to various degrees depending on the associated cytosolic partners (*e.g.* ribosomes or
SecA), periplasmic factors (chaperones, BAM, *etc*.) and various substrates. Thus, it is not
suprising that when free of the constraints of the membrane, and in the harsh environment of a
detergent micelle, that these various states can be adopted.

Increasing the distance between inner and outer membranes weakens the HTL-BAM
interaction
The dimensions of the HTL-BAM structure roughly corresponds to the distance between the
inner and outer membranes. Increasing the thickness of the periplasm might therefore be
expected to reduce formation of HTL-BAM complexes, as previously observed for other trans-
periplasmic complexes (Asmar et al., 2017; Cohen et al., 2017). To test this prediction, we
increased the thickness of the periplasm by manipulating the width-determining lipoprotein
Lpp, which separates the outer membrane from the peptidoglycan layer. Increasing the length
of *lpp* thus increases the width of the periplasm, from ~ 250 Å for wild-type *lpp* to ~ 290 Å
when an additional 21 residues are added to the resultant protein (Lpp$_{+21}$) (Asmar et al., 2017)
(Fig. 4a).

The experiments described above (Fig. 1d,e) were repeated: extracting total membranes in
the presence of CL for IP by antibodies raised against SecG. Blotting for SecD and BamA then
provided a measure respectively for interactions between HTL and BAM (Fig. 4b,c, Fig. S8) in
the *lpp$_{+21}$* background. Consistent with our model, the integrity of the HTL in the inner
membrane was unaffected, but the recovery of HTL-BAM was reduced more than 3-fold.

PMF stimulation of protein translocation through the inner membrane by SecA and
SecYEG is not conferred by proton passage through SecD

It has been known for many years that SecDF plays a critical role in protein secretion. The
results above show that the periplasmic domains of HTL, and in particular those of SecDF,
mediate the recruitment of the BAM complex, likely to facilitate the onward journey of proteins
to the outer membrane. Therefore, we decided to re-evaluate the precise role and activity of this
ancillary sub-complex. Experiments were established to investigate: (1) the role of SecDF in
SecA dependent protein transport through the inner membrane *via* SecYEG, and (2) the
consequences of its interaction with the BAM machinery for outer membrane protein
maturation. In particular, we set out to explore the possibility of an active role in these events
for the proton translocating activity of the SecDF sub-complex.

secDF null mutants exhibit a severe export defect, and are only just viable (Pogliano and
Beckwith, 1994). To explore this phenotype further we utilised *E. coli* strain JP325, wherein
the production of SecDF is under the control of an *ara* promoter: the presence of arabinose or
glucose, respectively results in production or depletion of SecDF-YajC (Economou et al., 1995)
(Fig. 5a, Fig. S9a). When plated, depletion of SecDF-YajC results in a strong growth defect
(Fig. 5b, panels 1 and 2), which can be rescued by recombinant expression of wild type *secDF*
(Nouwen and Driessen, 2002) (Fig. 5b, panels 3 and 4). In contrast, expression of *secD$_{D519N}$F*,
which results in the production of a complex defective in proton transport (Furukawa et al.,
2017), did not complement the defect (Fig. 5b, panels 5 and 6).

In light of these findings, we set up a classical *in vitro* transport assay investigating SecA-
driven proOmpA transport into inner membrane vesicles (IMVs) containing either over-
produced native HTL, or the defective version of HTL (containing SecD$_{D519N}$F). Both sets of
vesicles contained similar concentrations of SecY (Fig. S9b), yet despite the blocked proton
pathway through SecDF, there was no difference in the efficiencies of transport (Fig. 5c). The
lower quantities of transported pre-protein compared to the core-complex (SecYEG) most
likely reflects the reduced quantities of SecYEG in the HTL experiments, measured by blotting
for SecY (Fig. S9b).

Most importantly, the results demonstrate that HTL does not require a functional proton wire
through SecDF for SecA mediated ATP and PMF driven protein translocation (Fig. 5c). In this
respect, SecYEG and SecA are sufficient (Brundage et al., 1990). Therefore, the proton
translocating activity of SecD, crucial for cell survival, must be required for something else
other than secretion through the SecYEG core complex.

Interaction between the Sec and BAM complexes is required for efficient OmpA folding

The most obvious function of an interaction between the Sec and BAM machineries would be to facilitate efficient delivery and insertion of OMPs to the OM. We therefore reasoned that disrupting this interaction might compromise OMP delivery to BAM, leading to the accumulation of unfolded OMPs in the periplasm – particularly where high levels of OM biogenesis are required, such as in rapidly dividing cells. Elevated levels of unfolded OmpA (ufOmpA) in the periplasm are a classical signature of OMP maturation deficiencies (Bulieris et al., 2003; Sklar et al., 2007), and can be easily monitored by SDS-PAGE and western blotting: folded OmpA (fOmpA) does not denature fully in SDS unless boiled, it therefore runs at a lower apparent molecular mass on a SDS-PAGE compared to ufOmpA (Fig. 5d, left) (Bulieris et al., 2003; Sklar et al., 2007).

Based on the above results, SecDF looks like the most important mediator of the Sec-BAM interaction. We therefore used the SecDF depletion strain (JP325) as a basis for functional assays. To overcome the growth defect (Fig. 5b, panels 1 and 2) and produce sufficient cells to analyse, overnight cultures of the strains used above were grown in permissive media (arabinose), and then transferred to new media containing glucose. At $OD_{600nm} = 1.0$, the cultures were harvested and membranes were prepared and solubilised for analysis by co-IP as described above. As expected, depletion of SecD (Fig. S9c-d) reduced pull down of BamA (approximately 3-fold) compared to the complemented cells (Fig. 5e-f; Fig. S9c-d).

Overnight cultures were next prepared as described above, and then transferred to new media containing either arabinose or glucose, marked as t = 0 in Fig. 5a, d, g-i. Samples were then taken at regular intervals and the ratio of unfolded to folded OmpA determined (Fig. 5d, i), along with cell density (Fig. 5h) and SecD levels (Fig. 5g). Under SecDF depletion conditions (red squares), high levels of unfolded OmpA accumulate in the periplasm, particularly during the exponential phase where the demand for OM biogenesis is very high (Fig. 5d, asterisk; Fig. 5h,i; Fig. S9e). Meanwhile, under permissive conditions (Fig. 5g-i, arabinose, yellow circles), an increase in ufOmpA is observable after 1.5 h, but it recovers fully by 3 h. Notably, this change is accompanied by a transient decrease in SecDF levels.

Clearly, the expression of *secDF* and levels of ufOmpA in the cell envelope are anti-correlated, exacerbated during fast cell growth. These effects were not an indirect consequence

of BamA loss, which was unperturbed (Fig. S9f). Taken together, the data show that depletion of SecDF reduces the interaction between HTL and BAM, and thereby hampering transport of β-barrel proteins to the outer-membrane – resulting in a build-up of ufOmpA in the periplasm. This would compromise the integrity of the outer-membrane and explain the cold-sensitivity of *secDF* mutants (Gardel et al., 1987).

Proton transport through SecD is required for efficient outer membrane protein maturation

Proton translocation through SecD is crucial for cell growth (Fig. 5b, panels 5 and 6), but evidently not for PMF-stimulated transport through the inner membrane *via* SecYEG (Fig. 5c). To determine if this activity is required for downstream events, we once again deployed the SecDF depletion strain, complemented with wild-type or mutant *secDF* (as above, Fig. 5b, panels 3 - 6). Comparable quantities of the respective SecD variants could be produced (Fig. 5g, green and purple; Fig. S9a). The defective HTL(SecD$_{D519N}$F) protein retained its ability to interact with the BAM complex (Fig. 5f; Fig. S9c,d). The analysis showed the wild type, but not the mutant, reduced unfolded OmpA in the periplasm to levels much closer to that of the strain grown in permissive conditions (Fig. 5i; green and purple, respectively; Fig. S9e). Therefore, proton transport through SecDF is apparently required for efficient outer membrane protein folding.

HTL(SecD$_{D519N}$F) adopts a different conformation to the native version

The PMF-dependent mobility of the periplasmic domain of SecD (Furukawa et al., 2017) may be critical for its activity as part of the BAM-HTL complex. To test this, the variant of HTL containing SecD$_{D519N}$ was produced for comparison with the native form. Electron microscopy was used to assess the extent of the 'compact' and 'open' forms of the HTL complex (Fig. 5j, respectively structures i and ii). The 2D classification of HTL-SecD$_{D519N}$ shows the open state is populated to a similar extent compared to the unmodified HTL (Fig. S10).

The 3D analysis shows the compact states in both cases, similar to those seen before (Botte et al., 2016) (Fig. 3, structure i; Fig. 5j, structures i and iv). However, the 'open' states are significantly different: blocking the proton pathway in SecD results in a shorter extension of

the periplasmic domains of the HTL, compared to the unmodified form (Fig. 5j, structures ii *versus* v). This is consistent with the conformational change observed at atomic resolution in SecDF alone (Fig. 5j, structures iii *versus* vi) (Furukawa et al., 2017). Even at the current low-resolution description of the HTL-BAM complex (Fig. 2), it is clear that these observed PMF-dependent conformational changes of SecD would be communicated to the outer membrane.

HTL interacts with the periplasmic chaperone SurA in complex with OmpA

The results above lead us to address outstanding questions regarding chaperone interaction with the Sec complex. When proteins emerge from the channel into the periplasm they are presumably quickly engaged by chaperones, prime examples being Skp and SurA (McMorran et al., 2013; Sklar et al., 2007). So far, no evidence has been presented of a direct interaction of these chaperones with the Sec-machinery. As noted above, the core SecYEG complex does not contain periplasmic domains large enough to do so. We explored the possibility of such an interaction with the HTL, using the same approach described above for HTL variants and BAM (Fig. 2a, Fig. S4a).

Addition of SurA to the HTL (without cross-linking) followed by glycerol gradient centrifugation yielded heavy fractions containing HTL and SurA (Fig. S11a), indicative of them being in complex. As in the case for the HTL-BAM binding experiment, only low yields of the HTL-SurA complex were generated. Again, this is understandable because of the likely transient nature of the translocon-chaperone interaction. To overcome this the experiment was repeated in the presence of cross-linker (Grafix) and fractions were prepared for NS-EM (Fig. S11b).

The subsequent analysis revealed a structure with dimensions of roughly 300 x 250 x 150 Å, large enough to contain both HTL and SurA (Fig. 6a). To overcome the uncertainty, due to the low yield of HTL-SurA recovery, we decided to verify the presence and location of SurA on the isolated complex. To do so, the complex was immuno-decorated with a polyclonal antibody raised against SurA (Fig. 6b. Fig. S11c-d) or, as a control, a monoclonal antibody specific to a cytosolic loop of SecY (Corey et al., 2016) (Fig. 6c, Fig. S11e-f). The results mark the location of the cytosolic face of SecY (Fig. 6c), and SurA as a prominent extention on the other periplasmic side of the inner-membrane closest to SecDF-YidC.

The experiment was repeated using SurA purified in complex with a classical OMP
substrate, OmpA (Fig. 6d,e; Fig. S12a-b). The NS-EM structure of HTL-SurA-OmpA shows
additional density compared to HTL-SurA, roughly adjacent to the channel exit site of SecYEG
and in contact with SurA, possibly representing a late inner-membrane translocation
intermediate (Fig. 7).

DISCUSSION
The *in vivo* and *in vitro* analyses described here demonstrate a direct, functional interaction
between the Sec and BAM translocons, mediated by the extended periplasmic domains
possessed by BAM (Ma et al., 2019), SecDF (Furukawa et al., 2017) and YidC (Kumazaki et
al., 2014), but not SecYEG. Evidently, direct contact between HTL and BAM is required for
efficient OMP biogenesis in rapidly growing cells. The interaction could enable large protein
fluxes to stream through the periplasm, while minimising aggregation and proteolysis (Fig. 7).
The presence of a super-complex that bridges both membranes appears to be a fundamental
feature of the Gram negative bacterial cell envelope, the importance of which is only just
coming to the fore (Rassam et al., 2015; 2018).
It has already been shown that the HTL contains a lipid-containing cavity within the
membrane, presumably to facilitate membrane protein insertion (Botte et al., 2016; Martin et
al., 2019). Remarkably, in the super-complex between HTL and BAM there is a much larger
extension of this cavity opening into the periplasm (Fig. 2). This would seem an obvious place
for OMP passage and for the interaction with chaperones, and is of sufficient size to do so (Fig.
7). The cavity is situated such that secretory protein could enter *via* the protein-channel through
SecYEG, and then exit accordingly into the periplasm or into the mouth of the BAM complex.
It remains to be seen how the Sec-BAM complex and the periplasmic chaperones coordinate.
Perhaps these chaperones recognise emerging protein at the Sec-machinery and shuttle them
into the periplasm, with or without the need for the BAM complex. Otherwise, they could
facilitate the passage through the inter-membrane assembly for OM folding and insertion (Fig.
7). We show the interaction of SurA, as well as an OMP-SurA complex, with HTL;
incriminating at least this chaperone with the early stages of transport through the cell wall, *i.e.*
immediately after precursor cleavage. Furthermore, SurA is known to interact with BamA

(Sklar et al., 2007), suggesting its involvement throughout OMP passage from the Sec to BAM

(Fig. 7).

Other ancillary factors of the Sec machinery have also been implicated: YfgM and PpiD are

thought to mediate interactions with periplasmic chaperones (Götzke et al., 2014), the latter of

which has also been shown to interact with SecYEG and YidC (Jauß et al., 2019). Interestingly,

yfgL and *yfgM* are in the same operon (Blattner et al., 1997); the former encoding a subunit of

the BAM complex (BamB) (Wu et al., 2005). Indeed, a recent proteomic analysis of the *E. coli*

'membrane protein interactome' identifies cross-membrane interactions involving SecYEG,

BAM and the chaperones YfgM and PpiD (Carlson et al., 2019). Understanding the interplay

of various periplasmic chaperones during OMP passage through the Sec-BAM assembly to the

outer membrane will require further attention.

From our data it is clear that the periplasmic domain of SecD is central to the physical BAM-

HTL interaction. Even more intriguing though is the requirement for a functioning proton wire

through the SecDF trans-membrane domain. This raises the intriguing prospect of a TonB-style

energy-coupling from the inner membrane (Celia et al., 2016): *i.e.* the transmission of free

energy available from ATP turnover and the PMF from the Sec-machinery (Arkowitz and

Wickner, 1994; Brundage et al., 1990; Schiebel et al., 1991), for OMP folding and insertion at

the outer-membrane. We therefore propose that one of the primary roles of SecDF is in inter-

membrane trafficking and chemiosmotic energy transduction. Indeed, we and others have

shown that ATP- and PMF-driven transport of proteins through the inner membrane is

dependent only on SecYEG and SecA (Brundage et al., 1990; Schulze et al., 2014); while we

show here proton translocation through SecD is crucial for efficient OMP folding and growth.

Thus, there appears to be two distinct requirements of the PMF in protein secretion: one for

the early stage – SecA driven translocation through SecYEG at the inner membrane, and

another for late stages of OMP maturation. The latter could be facilitated by conformational

changes in SecDF, for transduction of energy from the inner to the outer membrane. When a

key proton carrying residue of the inner membrane segment of the translocon is neutralised –

$SecD_{D519N}$ – the conformation of the periplasmic domain is perturbed (Furukawa et al., 2017).

Presumably then, successive protonation (approximated by $SecD_{D519N}$) and deprotonation result

in large, long-range, cyclical conformational changes during PMF driven proton transport from

the periplasm to the cytosol. Interestingly, the phospholipid cardiolipin (CL) is also important

for the association of the Sec and BAM machineries; it is probably not a coincidence that this

lipid has already been shown to be critical for PMF driven protein translocation through

SecYEG (Corey et al., 2018).

Taking all together, this builds a compelling case for SecD mediated inter-membrane energy

transduction for outer membrane protein folding and insertion – in keeping with other members

of the RND transporter family, such as the assembly of AcrAB (inner membrane) and TolC

(outer membrane) (Du et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2017). Direct association between inner and

outer membrane components appears to be the rule rather than the exception for transporters

embedded in double membrane systems: parallels with the translocation assembly module

(TAM) for auto-transporter secretion (Selkrig et al., 2012) and the TIC-TOC import machinery

of chloroplasts (Chen et al., 2018) are particularly striking, given the respective outer-

membrane components (TamA and TOC75) are homologous of BamA. Particularly intriguing

is the possibility of the mitochondrial homologue of BAM (Sorting and Assembly Machinery;

SAM) participating in analogous inter-membrane interactions between respective inner and

outer membranes. Indeed, subunits of the MItochondrial contact site and Cristae Organizing

System (MICOS) connect the energy-transducing ATP synthase of the inner membrane and

SAM at the outer-membrane (Ott et al., 2015; Rampelt et al., 2017).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strains and plasmids

E. coli C43 (DE3) was a gift from Sir John Walker (MRC Mitochondrial Biology Unit,

Cambridge, UK) (Miroux and Walker, 1996). *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) were purchased as competent

cells (New England Biolabs). *E. coli* Δ*secG* (KN425 (W3110 M25 Δ*secG*::kan)) (Nishiyama et

al., 1994), which lacks a genomic copy of *secG*, was obtained from Prof. Frank Duong (University

of British Colombia, Vancouver, Canada). *E. coli* strain JP352 (Kan[r]), which contains an

arabinose-regulated *secDF-yajC* operon (Economou et al., 1995), was given to us by Prof. Ross

Dalbey.

The plasmids for over-expression of *secEYG* and *yidC* were from our laboratory collection
(Collinson et al., 2001; Lotz et al., 2008), the former and also that of *secDF* were acquired from
Prof. Frank Duong (Duong and Wickner, 1997). Vectors designed for over-production of HTL,
HTL(ΔYidC) and HTL(SecD$_{D519N}$) were created using the ACEMBL expression system
(Bieniossek et al., 2009; Botte et al., 2016). The vector for *bamABCDE* over-expression pJH114
(Amp^r) was a gift from Prof. Harris Bernstein (Roman-Hernandez et al., 2014); from which
pJH114-*bamACDE* (ΔBamB) was produced by linear PCR with primers designed to flank the
BamB gene and amplify DNA around it. FseI restriction sites were included in the primers to ligate
the amplified DNA. pBAD-SecDF(ΔP1) was generated by amplifying SecDF(ΔP1) from pBAD-
SecDF and cloning it between the pBAD NcoI and HindIII sites. pET28b-*surA* and pET11a-*ompA*
(Schiffrin et al., 2017) were gifts from Prof. Sheena Radford (The Astbury Centre for Structural
Molecular Biology, University of Leeds, UK).

For SecDF depletion experiments, SecDF was cloned into pTrc99a (Amp^r, IPTG-inducible),
and the *secD$_{D519N}$* mutation was subsequently made by changing the WT carrying plasmid using a
site-directed ligase-independent PCR method.

SDS-PAGE, western blotting and antibodies
All SDS-PAGE was performed with either *Invitrogen* Bolt 4-12% Bis-Tris gels or *Invitrogen*
midi 4-12% Bis-Tris gels. For western blotting, proteins were transferred onto nitrocellulose
membrane. Mouse monoclonal antibodies against SecY, SecE and SecG were from our laboratory
collection (used at 1:10000 dilution). Polyclonal antibodies against SecD and BamA were
generated commercially in rabbits, and SecA in sheep from purified proteins (All used at 1:5000
dilution). BamB and BamD antibodies were gifts from Dr Harris Bertstein (1:5000 dilution). The
SurA antibody was purchased from 2BScientific (1:10000 dilution). A secondary antibody
conjugated to DyLight800 was used for SecG and SecY (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 1:10000
dilution), whereas a HRP-conjugated secondary antibody was used for SecD and BamA (1:10000
dilution).

Protein production and purification
HTL, HTL(ΔYidC), HTL(SecD$_{D519N}$), SecYEG, YidC, SecDF and SurA were purified as
described previously (Burmann et al., 2013; Collinson et al., 2001; Lotz et al., 2008; Schulze et

al., 2014). BAM and BAM(ΔBamB) was over-produced in *E. coli* C43 according to established
protocols (Iadanza et al., 2016; Roman-Hernandez et al., 2014). For preparation of SurA and SurA-
OmpA complexes, both proteins were over-produced separately in 1 L of cultures as described
previously (Humes et al., 2019). Both were harvested by centrifugation, lysed in a cell disruptor
(Constant Systems Ltd.) and resuspended in 20 mL 20 mM Tris pH 8.0, 130 mM NaCl, 10% (v/v)
glycerol ($TS_{130}G$) in the presence of cOmplete protein inhibitor cocktail (Roche). The resulting
samples were clarified by centrifugation in an SS34 rotor (27,000 x*g*, 4°C, 20 minutes, Sorvall).
For OmpA, the supernatant was discarded and the pellet resuspended in 20 mL $TS_{130}G$ + 6 M urea.
The OmpA pellet was diluted to 80 mL with 6 M urea and mixed with the SurA supernatant to give
a final urea concentration of 4.8 M. The urea was removed by dialysing in 2 L $TS_{130}G$ for 6 hours
at room temperature, then dialysing overnight at 4°C in 5 L fresh $TS_{130}G$. The sample was
centrifuged under the same conditions as above and the supernatant loaded onto a 5 mL HisTrap
HP column equilibrated with $TS_{50}G$. The column was washed with $TS_{50}G$ + 20 mM imidazole,
and bound proteins eluted with $TS_{50}G$ + 300 mM imidazole. The eluents were loaded onto a HiTrap
Q HP column equilibrated in $TS_{50}G$ and free SurA was found in the unbound fraction. A linear
gradient of 0.05 - 1 M NaCl was applied over 60 mL and the fractions containing SurA-OmpA
were taken for further analyses.
569

Isolation of inner and outer membranes

1 L of *E. coli* cultures over-producing SecYEG, HTL, SecDF or SecDF(ΔP1) were produced as
described previously (Collinson et al., 2001; Komar et al., 2016; Schulze et al., 2014). The
harvested cell pellets were resuspended in 20 mL $TS_{130}G$, homogenised with a potter, passed twice
through a cell disruptor (Constant Systems Ltd.) for lysis and centrifuged to remove debris (SS34
rotor, Sorvall, 12,000 x*g*, 20 minutes, 4°C). The supernatant was taken and layered upon 20 mL
$TS_{130}G$ + 20% (w/v) sucrose in a Ti45 tube and centrifuged (Ti45 rotor, Beckmann-Coulter,
167,000 x*g*, 120 minutes, 4°C). The pellet was taken, resuspended in 4 mL $TS_{130}G$, homogenised
with a potter and layered upon a sucrose gradient prepared in an SW32 centrifuge tube composed
of 5 mL layers of $TS_{130}G$ + 55% (w/v), 48%, 41%, 34% and 28% sucrose. The sample was then
fractionated by centrifugation (SW32 rotor, Beckmann-Coulter, 130,000 x*g*, 15 hours, 4°C). Upon
completion, the light to heavy fractions were analysed by SDS PAGE and western blotting.
582

Co-immunoprecipitations (co-IPs) with *E. coli* total membrane extracts

Membrane pellets of *E. coli* strains C43 (WT), C43 pJH114-*bamABCDE* (Amp^r), *ΔsecG* (Kan^r), WT *lpp*, mutant *lpp$_{+21}$* and JP325 (containing variants of pTrc as specified in text, cultures grown in glucose for depletion of endogenous SecDFyajC), were prepared as described previously (Collinson et al., 2001), with *bamABCDE* over-expression achieved as before (Roman-Hernandez et al., 2014). The pellets were resuspended in TS$_{130}$G to 120 mg/mL, homogenised and solubilised with 0.5% DDM for 1 hour at 4°C. The solubilised material was clarified by ultra-centrifugation (160,000 x*g* for 45 mins) and the membrane extracts were analysed.

For co-IPs pulling on SecG antibody, 250 uL of protein G resin was washed in a spin column with 200 mM NaCl, 20 mM HEPES pH 8.0 (HS buffer), and blocked overnight in HS buffer + 2% (w/v) BSA at 4°C. Meanwhile, 7.5 μL of purified SecG monoclonal antibody was added to 500 μL of the membrane extracts and incubated overnight at 4°C. The following morning, the resin was washed thoroughly in HS buffer containing either 0.02% (w/v) DDM or 0.02% (w/v) DDM with 0.002% (w/v) CL, resuspended back to 250 μL and added to the 500 μL of membrane extract for three hours rotating gently at room temperature. The resin was separated from the extracts by centrifugation in a spin column at 2,000 x*g* for 1 minute, washed 7 times with 350 μL HS buffer, followed by one final wash with 150 μL HS buffer, which was collected in a fresh tube for analysis (to which 50 uL of 4x LDS sample buffer was added once collected). The bound material was then eluted by addition of 150 uL 1 x LDS sample buffer (to which an additional 50 uL of 1x LDS sample buffer was added once collected). Samples were analysed by SDS PAGE and western blotting.

For co-affinity adsorption by pulling on the hexa-histidine tag of recombinant BamA, 100 μL of nickel-charged chelating resin was added to 500 μL of membrane extracts and incubated for 5 minutes at room temperature. The resin was then separated from the extract and treated in the same way as described above but with TS$_{130}$G + 0.02% (w/v) DDM/ 0.002% (w/v) CL + 30 mM imidazole (washing) or 300 mM imidazole (elution).

Statistical analyses were conducted using GraphPad Prism. An unpaired T-test was used to compare pull down samples (p value = 0.05, * = < 0.05, ** = < 0.01, *** = < 0.001, specific p values are stated in figure legends).

***In vitro* assembly and purification of complexes for EM and XL-MS**

All protein complexes visualized by negative stain EM were formed by incubating 5 µM of the

respective proteins in binding buffer (20 mM HEPES pH 8.0, 250 mM NaCl, 0.03% (w/v) DDM/

0.003% (w/v) CL) at 30ºC for 30 minutes with shaking in a total volume of 150 µl. The protein

complexes were purified in a glycerol/ glutaraldehyde gradient (20 - 40% (w/v) and 0 - 0.15%

(w/v), respectively) by centrifugation at 34,000 RPM in a SW60 Ti rotor (Beckmann-Coulter) for

16 hours at 4ºC. Mobility controls of individual and partial complexes (BAM, and HTL) or

individual proteins (SecYEG, YidC, SecDF, SurA) without the glutaraldehyde gradient were

performed under the same conditions. Gradients were fractionated in 150 µl aliquots and those

with glutaraldehyde were inactivated with 50 mM of Tris pH 8.0. Aliquots were analysed by SDS-

PAGE and silver staining. For HTL:SurA:Ab$_{SurA}$ and Ab$_{SecY}$:HTL:SurA complexes, 5 µM of HTL

and SurA were incubated in binding buffer at 30ºC for 30 minutes with shaking in a total volume

of 150 µl. Antibodies were added at concentrations of 1 in 7.5 or 1 in 15 for the SecY or SurA

antibodies respectively, these were incubated at 30ºC for 15 minutes before complex purification

as described above.

The HTL:BAM complex for cryoEM was formed by incubating 8 µM of the HTL and BAM

complexes in binding buffer (50 mM HEPES pH 8.0, 200 mM NaCl, 0.01% (w/v) DDM / 0.001%

(w/v) CL at 30ºC for 20 minutes with shaking in a total volume of 250 µl. After 20 min, 0.05% of

glutaraldehyde was added to the sample and incubated for 10 minutes at 21ºC. The crosslinker was

inactivated with 30 mM Tris pH 8.0 and the sample was loaded onto a Superose 6 Increase 10/300

GL (GE healthcare) column equilibrated in GF buffer (30 mM Tris pH 8.0, 200 mM NaCl, 0.01%

(w/v) DDM). Fractions were analysed by SDS-PAGE and silver staining.

The HTL:BAM complex for cross-linked mass spectroscopy (XL-MS) analysis was prepared

following the same procedure described for the cryo-EM preparation, but the sample was

crosslinked with 1.5 mM DSBU and inactivated with 20 mM of ammonium carbonate pH 8.0

before loaded onto the gel filtration column.

XL-MS analysis

The DSBU cross-linked HTL:BAM complex was precipitated by methanol and chloroform

(Wessel and Flügge, 1984) and the pellet dissolved in 8 M urea. After reduction with 10 mM DTT

(one hour at 37ºC) and alkylation with 50 mM iodoacetamide (30 minutes in the dark at RT), the

sample was diluted 1:5 with 62.5 mM ammonium hydrogen carbonate and digested with trypsin

(1:20 w/w) overnight at 37ºC. Digestion was stopped by the addition of formic acid to a final

concentration of 2% (v/v) and the sample split in two equal amounts for fractionation by size

exclusion (SEC) and reverse phase C18 at high pH chromatography. A Superdex Peptide 3.2/300

column (GE Healthcare) was used for SEC fractionation by isocratic elution with 30% (v/v)

acetonitrile/ 0.1% (v/v) TFA at a flow rate of 50 μL/ min. Fractions were collected every minute

from 1.0 mL to 1.7 mL of elution volume. Reverse phase C18 high pH fractionation was carried

out on an Acquity UPLC CSH C18 1.7 μm, 1.0 x 100 mm column (Waters) over a gradient of

acetonitrile 2-40% (v/v) and ammonium hydrogen bicarbonate 100 mM.

All the fractions were lyophilized and resuspended in 2% (v/v) acetonitrile and 2% (v/v) formic

acid for LC–MS/MS analysis. An Ultimate U3000 HPLC (ThermoScientific Dionex, USA) was

used to deliver a flow of approximately 300 nL/ min. A C18 Acclaim PepMap100 5 μm,

100 μm × 20 mm nanoViper (ThermoScientific Dionex, USA), trapped the peptides before

separation on a C18 Acclaim PepMap100 3 μm, 75 μm × 250 mm nanoViper (ThermoScientific

Dionex, USA). Peptides were eluted with a gradient of acetonitrile. The analytical column was

directly interfaced *via* a nano-flow electrospray ionisation source, with a hybrid quadrupole

orbitrap mass spectrometer (Q-Exactive HF-X, ThermoScientific, USA). MS data were acquired

in data-dependent mode. High-resolution full scans (R=120,000, m/z 350-2000) were recorded in

the Orbitrap and after CID activation (stepped collision energy 30 ± 3) of the 10 most intense MS

peaks, MS/ MS scans (R=45,000) were acquired.

For data analysis, Xcalibur raw files were converted into the MGF format through MSConvert

(Proteowizard (Kessner et al., 2008)) and used directly as input files for MeroX (Götze et al.,

2015). Searches were performed against an ad-hoc protein database containing the sequences of

the complexes and a set of randomised decoy sequences generated by the software. The following

parameters were set for the searches: maximum number of missed cleavages 3; targeted residues

K; minimum peptide length 5 amino acids; variable modifications: carbamidomethyl-Cys (mass

shift 57.02146 Da), Met-oxidation (mass shift 15.99491 Da); DSBU modification fragments:

85.05276 Da and 111.03203 (precision: 5 ppm MS (Kessner et al., 2008) and 10 ppm MS (Götze

et al., 2015)); False Discovery Rate cut-off: 5%. Finally, each fragmentation spectra were manually

inspected and validated.

EM and image processing

For negative stain, aliquots of sucrose gradient fractions containing the different complexes were applied to glow-discharged (15 s) carbon grids with Cu 300 mesh, washed and stained with 2% (w/ v) uranyl acetate (1 min). Digital images were acquired with two different microscopes; a Tecnai 12 with a Ceta 16M camera (ThermoFisher Scientific) at a digital magnification of 49,000 x and a sampling resolution of 2.04 Å per pixel, and in a Tecnai 12 with a Gatan Camera One View at a digital magnification of 59,400 and a sampling resolution of 2.1 Å per pixel. Image processing was performed using the EM software framework Scipion v1.2 (la Rosa-Trevín et al., 2016). Several thousand particles were manually and semi-automatic supervised selected as input for automatic particle picking through the XMIPP3 package (Abrishami et al., 2013; la Rosa-Trevín et al., 2013). Particles were then extracted with the Relion v2.1 package (Kimanius et al., 2016; Scheres, 2012a) and classified with a free-pattern maximum-likelihood method (Relion 2D-classification). After manually removing low quality 2D classes, a second round of 2D classification was performed with Relion and XMIPP-CL2D in parallel (Sorzano et al., 2010). Representative 2D averages were used to generate several initial 3D models with the EMAN v2.12 software (Scheres, 2012b; Tang et al., 2007). Extensive rounds of 3D classification were then carried out using Relion 3D-classification due to the heterogeneity of the sample. The most consistent models were used for subsequent 3D classifications. For the final 3D volume refinement, Relion auto-refine or XMIPP3-Projection Matching were used. Resolution was estimated with Fourier shell correlation using 0.143 correlation coefficient criteria (Rosenthal and Henderson, 2003; Scheres and Chen, 2012). See Table S2 for image processing details.

For CryoEM, appropriate fractions of the glutaraldehyde-crosslinked HTL:BAM complex purified by gel filtration were applied to glow-discharged (20 s) Quantifoil grids (R1.2/R1.3, Cu 300 mesh) with an ultrathin carbon layer (2 nm), blotted and plunged into a liquid ethane chamber in a Leica EM. Two data sets from the same grid were acquired in a FEI Talos Arctica cryo-electron microscope operated at 200 kV and equipped with a K2 detector at calibrated magnification of 79000 x. The first data set with 2056 images recorded, had a 1.75 Å/px sample resolution, dose rate of 2.26 electrons/$Å^2$ and 20 s exposure time fractionated in 40 frames. Defocus values oscillated between -1.5 nm and -3.0 nm. The second data set with 3703 images recorded, had a 0.875 Å/px sample resolution, dose rate of 2.47 electrons/$Å^2$ and 18 s exposure time fractionated in 40 frames. Defocus values oscillated between – 1.0 nm and -2.2 nm. Particles were

picked in the same way as for negative stain, and were binned to a 1.75 Å/px sample resolution

before merging to the first data set. Image processing was performed using the EM software

framework Scipion v1.2 (la Rosa-Trevín et al., 2016) with a similar strategy of the NS-EM samples

but also using extensive masking procedures (Fig. S6).

All 3D reconstructions were calculated using a home-built workstation (CPU Intel Core i7

7820X, 2x Asus Turbo GTX 1080Ti, 16Gb RAM DDR4) and partial usage of HPC clusters

(Bluecrystal 4 and Bluecryo) at the University of Bristol.

Depletion of SecDF-YajC

E. coli strain JP352 was transformed with an empty pTrc99a, or the same plasmid, but cloned

with either WT *secDF* or s*ecD$_{D519N}$F*. Precultures of the strains were prepared in 100 mL 2xYT

media supplemented with 0.2% (w/v) arabinose, ampicillin (for pTrc selectivity) and kanamycin

(for JP352 selectivity). The following morning, the cells were harvested by centrifugation and

resuspended with 50 mL fresh 2xYT (no arabinose). This washing procedure was repeated two

more times to remove excess arabinose. Prewarmed (37ºC) 1 L 2xYT cultures containing either

0.2% (w/v) arabinose or 0.5% (w/v) glucose were then inoculated with the preculture such that a

final OD$_{600\ nm}$ of 0.05 was achieved. An aliquot was taken every 1.5 hours for 6 hours. Induction

of pTrc with IPTG was not necessary as background expression was sufficient to achieve levels of

SecD similar to that of JP325 cultured in the presence of arabinose. Periplasmic and outer

membrane fractions were produced by preparing spheroplasts (Birdsell and Cota-Robles, 1967),

centrifuging the samples at 12000 x*g* for 5 minutes, taking the supernatant (a mixture of

periplasmic and OM fractions) and removing the OM fraction by ultracentrifugation at 160000 x*g*

for 20 minutes. The fractions were then subjected to SDS-PAGE and western blotting.

Measurement of protein transport

733   Inner membrane vesicles (IMVs) were produced from BL21(DE3) cells overproducing HTL,

734   HTL(SecD$_{D519N}$), SecYEG or with empty pBAD as described previously (Corey et al., 2018).

735   Transport experiments with and without PMF were performed in triplicate using established

736   methods (Corey et al., 2018).

Acknowledgments

We are particularly grateful for the generosity of Dr Harris Bernstein for the kind gifts of the *bamABCDE* expression construct (pJH114) and antibodies, and Prof. Sheena Radford for *surA* and *ompA* expression plasmids. Thanks to Prof. Daniel Daley for telling us about YfgL and YfgM. We thank Dr Remy Martin for brewing, and for making the HTL *secD$_{D519N}$F* mutant. We acknowledge access and support of the Wolfson Bioimaging Facility and the GW4 Facility for High-Resolution Electron Cryo-Microscopy, with particular thanks to Dr Ufuk Borucu. We are grateful to Mr Tom Batstone for the support at the computer cluster BlueCryo.

Funding: This work was funded by the BBSRC (BB/S008349/1 to IC, DWW and SA; BB/N015126/1 to IC and DWW; BB/M003604/1 to IC and SA; SWBioDTP – BB/J014400/1 and BB/J014400/1 to LT), EMBO (Long Term Fellowship – ALTF 710-2015, LTFCOFUND2013 and GA-2013-609409 – to SA) and the Elizabeth Blackwell Institute for Health Research, University of Bristol (Elizabeth Blackwell Bridging fellowship to SA). The GW4 Facility for High-Resolution Electron Cryo-Microscopy was funded by the Wellcome Trust (electron microscope with direct electron detector; 202904/Z/16/Z and 206181/Z/17/Z) and BBSRC (computer cluster; BB/R000484/1).

Author contribution: SA, DWW, LT, WA and IC designed and conducted experiments, assisted by JL; SA, DWW, LT and IC wrote the manuscript; VAMG and BD provided facilities and expertise, and edited the manuscript; EJC and MB, helped with the Lpp experiments – conception, strain provision and text editing; GD and JMS, conducted the XL-MS experiments, processed the data, helped in their description and interpretation; IC, VAMG, BD and MB secured funding; IC led the project.

Declaration: the authors declare no competing interests.

Data and materials availability: All data are available in the main text or the supplementary

materials. The HTL-BAM cryo-EM structure has been deposited at the EMDB under the

accession number 11240.

REFERENCES

Abrishami, V., Zaldívar-Peraza, A., la Rosa-Trevín, de, J.M., Vargas, J., Otón, J., Marabini, R.,
Shkolnisky, Y., Carazo, J.M., and Sorzano, C.O.S. (2013). A pattern matching approach to the
automatic selection of particles from low-contrast electron micrographs. Bioinformatics *29*,
2460–2468.

Arkowitz, R.A., and Wickner, W. (1994). SecD and SecF are required for the proton
electrochemical gradient stimulation of preprotein translocation. Embo J. *13*, 954–963.

Asmar, A.T., Ferreira, J.L., Cohen, E.J., Cho, S.-H., Beeby, M., Hughes, K.T., and Collet, J.-F.
(2017). Communication across the bacterial cell envelope depends on the size of the periplasm.
PLoS Biol. *15*, e2004303.

Bakelar, J., Buchanan, S.K., and Noinaj, N. (2016). The structure of the β-barrel assembly
machinery complex. Science *351*, 180–186.

Bieniossek, C., Nie, Y., Frey, D., Olieric, N., Schaffitzel, C., Collinson, I., Romier, C., Berger,
P., Richmond, T.J., Steinmetz, M.O., et al. (2009). Automated unrestricted multigene
recombineering for multiprotein complex production. Nat. Methods *6*, 447–450.

Birdsell, D.C., and Cota-Robles, E.H. (1967). Production and ultrastructure of lysozyme and
ethylenediaminetetraacetate-lysozyme spheroplasts of Escherichia coli. J. Bacteriol. *93*, 427–
437.

Blattner, F.R., Plunkett, G., Bloch, C.A., Perna, N.T., Burland, V., Riley, M., Collado-Vides, J.,
Glasner, J.D., Rode, C.K., Mayhew, G.F., et al. (1997). The complete genome sequence of
Escherichia coli K-12. Science *277*, 1453–1462.

Botte, M., Zaccai, N.R., Nijeholt, J.L.À., Martin, R., Knoops, K., Papai, G., Zou, J., Deniaud, A.,
Karuppasamy, M., Jiang, Q., et al. (2016). A central cavity within the holo-translocon suggests a
mechanism for membrane protein insertion. Sci Rep *6*, 38399.

Brundage, L., Hendrick, J.P., Schiebel, E., Driessen, A.J., and Wickner, W. (1990). The purified
E. coli integral membrane protein SecY/E is sufficient for reconstitution of SecA-dependent
precursor protein translocation. Cell *62*, 649–657.

Bulieris, P.V., Behrens, S., Holst, O., and Kleinschmidt, J.H. (2003). Folding and insertion of the
outer membrane protein OmpA is assisted by the chaperone Skp and by lipopolysaccharide. J.
Biol. Chem. *278*, 9092–9099.

Burmann, B.M., Wang, C., and Hiller, S. (2013). Conformation and dynamics of the periplasmic
membrane-protein-chaperone complexes OmpX-Skp and tOmpA-Skp. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.
20, 1265–1272.

Carlson, M.L., Stacey, R.G., Young, J.W., Wason, I.S., Zhao, Z., Rattray, D.G., Scott, N., Kerr,
C.H., Babu, M., Foster, L.J., et al. (2019). Profiling the Escherichia coli membrane protein
interactome captured in Peptidisc libraries. eLife *8*.

Celia, H., Noinaj, N., Zakharov, S.D., Bordignon, E., Botos, I., Santamaria, M., Barnard, T.J.,
Cramer, W.A., Lloubes, R., and Buchanan, S.K. (2016). Structural insight into the role of the
Ton complex in energy transduction. Nature *538*, 60–65.

Chang, C.N., Blobel, G., and Model, P. (1978). Detection of prokaryotic signal peptidase in an
Escherichia coli membrane fraction: endoproteolytic cleavage of nascent f1 pre-coat protein.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.a. *75*, 361–365.

Chen, Y.-L., Chen, L.-J., Chu, C.-C., Huang, P.-K., Wen, J.-R., and Li, H.-M. (2018). TIC236
links the outer and inner membrane translocons of the chloroplast. Nature.

Chorev, D.S., Baker, L.A., Wu, D., Beilsten-Edmands, V., Rouse, S.L., Zeev-Ben-Mordehai, T.,
Jiko, C., Samsudin, F., Gerle, C., Khalid, S., et al. (2018). Protein assemblies ejected directly
from native membranes yield complexes for mass spectrometry. Science *362*, 829–834.

Cohen, E.J., Ferreira, J.L., Ladinsky, M.S., Beeby, M., and Hughes, K.T. (2017). Nanoscale-
length control of the flagellar driveshaft requires hitting the tethered outer membrane. Science
356, 197–200.

Collinson, I., Breyton, C., Duong, F., Tziatzios, C., Schubert, D., Or, E., Rapoport, T., and
Kühlbrandt, W. (2001). Projection structure and oligomeric properties of a bacterial core protein
translocase. Embo J. *20*, 2462–2471.

Collinson, I. (2019). The Dynamic ATP-Driven Mechanism of Bacterial Protein Translocation
and the Critical Role of Phospholipids. Front Microbiol *10*, 1217.

Corey, R.A., Allen, W.J., Komar, J., Masiulis, S., Menzies, S., Robson, A., and Collinson, I.
(2016). Unlocking the Bacterial SecY Translocon. Structure *24*, 518–527.

Corey, R.A., Pyle, E., Allen, W.J., Watkins, D.W., Casiraghi, M., Miroux, B., Arechaga, I.,
Politis, A., and Collinson, I. (2018). Specific cardiolipin-SecY interactions are required for
proton-motive force stimulation of protein secretion. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.a. *115*, 7967–
7972.

Cranford-Smith, T., and Huber, D. (2018). The way is the goal: how SecA transports proteins
across the cytoplasmic membrane in bacteria. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. *365*.

Du, D., Wang, Z., James, N.R., Voss, J.E., Klimont, E., Ohene-Agyei, T., Venter, H., Chiu, W.,
and Luisi, B.F. (2014). Structure of the AcrAB-TolC multidrug efflux pump. Nature *509*, 512–
515.

Duong, F., and Wickner, W. (1997). Distinct catalytic roles of the SecYE, SecG and SecDFyajC
subunits of preprotein translocase holoenzyme. Embo J. *16*, 2756–2768.

Economou, A., Pogliano, J.A., Beckwith, J., Oliver, D.B., and Wickner, W. (1995). SecA
membrane cycling at SecYEG is driven by distinct ATP binding and hydrolysis events and is
regulated by SecD and SecF. Cell *83*, 1171–1181.

Eicher, T., Seeger, M.A., Anselmi, C., Zhou, W., Brandstätter, L., Verrey, F., Diederichs, K.,
Faraldo-Gómez, J.D., and Pos, K.M. (2014). Coupling of remote alternating-access transport
mechanisms for protons and substrates in the multidrug efflux pump AcrB. eLife *3*.

Furukawa, A., Nakayama, S., Yoshikaie, K., Tanaka, Y., and Tsukazaki, T. (2018). Remote
Coupled Drastic β-Barrel to β-Sheet Transition of the Protein Translocation Motor. Structure *26*,
485–489.e2.

Furukawa, A., Yoshikaie, K., Mori, T., Mori, H., Morimoto, Y.V., Sugano, Y., Iwaki, S.,
Minamino, T., Sugita, Y., Tanaka, Y., et al. (2017). Tunnel Formation Inferred from the I-Form
Structures of the Proton-Driven Protein Secretion Motor SecDF. Cell Rep *19*, 895–901.

Gardel, C., Benson, S., Hunt, J., Michaelis, S., and Beckwith, J. (1987). secD, a new gene
involved in protein export in Escherichia coli. J. Bacteriol. *169*, 1286–1290.

Gold, V.A.M., Robson, A., Bao, H., Romantsov, T., Duong, F., and Collinson, I. (2010). The
action of cardiolipin on the bacterial translocon. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.a. *107*, 10044–10049.

Götze, M., Pettelkau, J., Fritzsche, R., Ihling, C.H., Schäfer, M., and Sinz, A. (2015). Automated
assignment of MS/MS cleavable cross-links in protein 3D-structure analysis. J. Am. Soc. Mass
Spectrom. *26*, 83–97.

Götzke, H., Palombo, I., Muheim, C., Perrody, E., Genevaux, P., Kudva, R., Muller, M., and
Daley, D.O. (2014). YfgM is an ancillary subunit of the SecYEG translocon in Escherichia coli.
J. Biol. Chem. *289*, 19089–19097.

Green, E.R., and Mecsas, J. (2016). Bacterial Secretion Systems: An Overview. Microbiol Spectr
4.

Gu, Y., Li, H., Dong, H., Zeng, Y., Zhang, Z., Paterson, N.G., Stansfeld, P.J., Wang, Z., Zhang,
Y., Wang, W., et al. (2016). Structural basis of outer membrane protein insertion by the BAM
complex. Nature *531*, 64–69.

Hendrick, J.P., and Wickner, W. (1991). SecA protein needs both acidic phospholipids and
SecY/E protein for functional high-affinity binding to the Escherichia coli plasma membrane. J.
Biol. Chem. *266*, 24596–24600.

Humes, J.R., Schiffrin, B., Calabrese, A.N., Higgins, A.J., Westhead, D.R., Brockwell, D.J., and
Radford, S.E. (2019). The Role of SurA PPIase Domains in Preventing Aggregation of the
Outer-Membrane Proteins tOmpA and OmpT. J. Mol. Biol.

Iadanza, M.G., Higgins, A.J., Schiffrin, B., Calabrese, A.N., Brockwell, D.J., Ashcroft, A.E.,
Radford, S.E., and Ranson, N.A. (2016). Lateral opening in the intact β-barrel assembly
machinery captured by cryo-EM. Nature Communications *7*, 12865.

Jauß, B., Petriman, N.A., Drepper, F., Franz, L., Sachelaru, I., Welte, T., Steinberg, R.,
Warscheid, B., and Koch, H.-G. (2019). Non-competitive binding of PpiD and YidC to the
SecYEG translocon expands the global view on the SecYEG interactome in E. coli. J. Biol.
Chem.

Josefsson, L.G., and Randall, L.L. (1981). Different exported proteins in E. coli show differences
in the temporal mode of processing in vivo. Cell *25*, 151–157.

Kastner, B., Fischer, N., Golas, M.M., Sander, B., Dube, P., Boehringer, D., Hartmuth, K.,
Deckert, J., Hauer, F., Wolf, E., et al. (2008). GraFix: sample preparation for single-particle
electron cryomicroscopy. Nat. Methods *5*, 53–55.

Kessner, D., Chambers, M., Burke, R., Agus, D., and Mallick, P. (2008). ProteoWizard: open
source software for rapid proteomics tools development. Bioinformatics *24*, 2534–2536.

Kimanius, D., Forsberg, B.O., Scheres, S.H., and Lindahl, E. (2016). Accelerated cryo-EM
structure determination with parallelisation using GPUs in RELION-2. eLife *5*.

Komar, J., Alvira, S., Schulze, R.J., Martin, R., Lycklama A Nijeholt, J.A., Lee, S.C., Dafforn,
T.R., Deckers-Hebestreit, G., Berger, I., Schaffitzel, C., et al. (2016). Membrane protein
insertion and assembly by the bacterial holo-translocon SecYEG-SecDF-YajC-YidC. Biochem.
J. *473*, 3341–3354.

Konovalova, A., Kahne, D.E., and Silhavy, T.J. (2017). Outer Membrane Biogenesis. Annu.
Rev. Microbiol. *71*, 539–556.

Kumazaki, K., Kumazaki, K., Kishimoto, T., Kishimoto, T., Furukawa, A., Furukawa, A., Mori,
H., Mori, H., Tanaka, Y., Tanaka, Y., et al. (2014). Crystal structure of Escherichia coli YidC, a
membrane protein chaperone and insertase. Sci Rep *4*, 7299.

la Rosa-Trevín, de, J.M., Otón, J., Marabini, R., Zaldívar, A., Vargas, J., Carazo, J.M., and
Sorzano, C.O.S. (2013). Xmipp 3.0: an improved software suite for image processing in electron
microscopy. J. Struct. Biol. *184*, 321–328.

la Rosa-Trevín, de, J.M., Quintana, A., Del Cano, L., Zaldívar, A., Foche, I., Gutiérrez, J.,
Gómez-Blanco, J., Burguet-Castell, J., Cuenca-Alba, J., Abrishami, V., et al. (2016). Scipion: A
software framework toward integration, reproducibility and validation in 3D electron
microscopy. J. Struct. Biol. *195*, 93–99.

Lill, R., Cunningham, K., Brundage, L.A., Ito, K., Oliver, D., and Wickner, W. (1989). SecA
protein hydrolyzes ATP and is an essential component of the protein translocation ATPase of
Escherichia coli. Embo J. *8*, 961–966.

Lotz, M., Haase, W., Kühlbrandt, W., and Collinson, I. (2008). Projection structure of yidC: a

conserved mediator of membrane protein assembly. J. Mol. Biol. *375*, 901–907.

Ma, X., Wang, Q., Li, Y., Tan, P., Wu, H., Wang, P., Dong, X., Hong, L., and Meng, G. (2019).
How BamA recruits OMP substrates via poly-POTRAs domain. Faseb J. fj201900681RR.

Martin, R., Larsen, A.H., Corey, R.A., Midtgaard, S.R., Frielinghaus, H., Schaffitzel, C., Arleth,
L., and Collinson, I. (2019). Structure and Dynamics of the Central Lipid Pool and Proteins of
the Bacterial Holo-Translocon. Biophys. J.

McMorran, L.M., Bartlett, A.I., Huysmans, G.H.M., Radford, S.E., and Brockwell, D.J. (2013).
Dissecting the effects of periplasmic chaperones on the in vitro folding of the outer membrane
protein PagP. J. Mol. Biol. *425*, 3178–3191.

Mio, K., Tsukazaki, T., Mori, H., Kawata, M., Moriya, T., Sasaki, Y., Ishitani, R., Ito, K.,
Nureki, O., and Sato, C. (2014). Conformational variation of the translocon enhancing chaperone
SecDF. J. Struct. Funct. Genomics *15*, 107–115.

Miroux, B., and Walker, J.E. (1996). Over-production of proteins in Escherichia coli: mutant
hosts that allow synthesis of some membrane proteins and globular proteins at high levels. J.
Mol. Biol. *260*, 289–298.

Nishiyama, K., Hanada, M., and Tokuda, H. (1994). Disruption of the gene encoding p12 (SecG)
reveals the direct involvement and important function of SecG in the protein translocation of
Escherichia coli at low temperature. Embo J. *13*, 3272–3277.

Nouwen, N., and Driessen, A.J.M. (2002). SecDFyajC forms a heterotetrameric complex with
YidC. Mol. Microbiol. *44*, 1397–1405.

Ott, C., Dorsch, E., Fraunholz, M., Straub, S., and Kozjak-Pavlovic, V. (2015). Detailed analysis
of the human mitochondrial contact site complex indicate a hierarchy of subunits. PLoS ONE *10*,
e0120213.

Pogliano, J.A., and Beckwith, J. (1994). SecD and SecF facilitate protein export in Escherichia
coli. Embo J. *13*, 554–561.

Rampelt, H., Bohnert, M., Zerbes, R.M., Horvath, S.E., Warscheid, B., Pfanner, N., and van der
Laan, M. (2017). Mic10, a Core Subunit of the Mitochondrial Contact Site and Cristae
Organizing System, Interacts with the Dimeric F1Fo-ATP Synthase. J. Mol. Biol. *429*, 1162–
1170.

Rassam, P., Copeland, N.A., Birkholz, O., Tóth, C., Chavent, M., Duncan, A.L., Cross, S.J.,
Housden, N.G., Kaminska, R., Seger, U., et al. (2015). Supramolecular assemblies underpin
turnover of outer membrane proteins in bacteria. Nature *523*, 333–336.

Rassam, P., Long, K.R., Kaminska, R., Williams, D.J., Papadakos, G., Baumann, C.G., and
Kleanthous, C. (2018). Intermembrane crosstalk drives inner-membrane protein organization in
Escherichia coli. Nature Communications *9*, 1082.

Ricci, D.P., and Silhavy, T.J. (2019). Outer Membrane Protein Insertion by the β-barrel
Assembly Machine. EcoSal Plus *8*.

Roman-Hernandez, G., Peterson, J.H., and Bernstein, H.D. (2014). Reconstitution of bacterial
autotransporter assembly using purified components. eLife *3*, e04234.

Rosenthal, P.B., and Henderson, R. (2003). Optimal determination of particle orientation,
absolute hand, and contrast loss in single-particle electron cryomicroscopy. J. Mol. Biol. *333*,
721–745.

Samuelson, J.C., Chen, M., Jiang, F., Möller, I., Wiedmann, M., Kuhn, A., Phillips, G.J., and
Dalbey, R.E. (2000). YidC mediates membrane protein insertion in bacteria. Nature *406*, 637–
641.

Scheres, S.H.W. (2012a). RELION: implementation of a Bayesian approach to cryo-EM
structure determination. J. Struct. Biol. *180*, 519–530.

Scheres, S.H.W. (2012b). A Bayesian view on cryo-EM structure determination. J. Mol. Biol.
415, 406–418.

Scheres, S.H.W., and Chen, S. (2012). Prevention of overfitting in cryo-EM structure
determination. Nat. Methods *9*, 853–854.

Schiebel, E., Driessen, A.J., Hartl, F.U., and Wickner, W. (1991). Delta mu H+ and ATP
function at different steps of the catalytic cycle of preprotein translocase. Cell *64*, 927–939.

Schiffrin, B., Calabrese, A.N., Higgins, A.J., Humes, J.R., Ashcroft, A.E., Kalli, A.C.,
Brockwell, D.J., and Radford, S.E. (2017). Effects of Periplasmic Chaperones and Membrane
Thickness on BamA-Catalyzed Outer-Membrane Protein Folding. J. Mol. Biol. *429*, 3776–3792.

Schulze, R.J., Komar, J., Botte, M., Allen, W.J., Whitehouse, S., Gold, V.A.M., Lycklama A
Nijeholt, J.A., Huard, K., Berger, I., Schaffitzel, C., et al. (2014). Membrane protein insertion
and proton-motive-force-dependent secretion through the bacterial holo-translocon SecYEG-
SecDF-YajC-YidC. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.a. *111*, 4844–4849.

Scotti, P.A., Urbanus, M.L., Brunner, J., de Gier, J.W., Heijne, von, G., van der Does, C.,
Driessen, A.J., Oudega, B., and Luirink, J. (2000). YidC, the Escherichia coli homologue of
mitochondrial Oxa1p, is a component of the Sec translocase. Embo J. *19*, 542–549.

Selkrig, J., Mosbahi, K., Webb, C.T., Belousoff, M.J., Perry, A.J., Wells, T.J., Morris, F.,
Leyton, D.L., Totsika, M., Phan, M.-D., et al. (2012). Discovery of an archetypal protein
transport system in bacterial outer membranes. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *19*, 506–10–S1.

Sklar, J.G., Wu, T., Kahne, D., and Silhavy, T.J. (2007). Defining the roles of the periplasmic
chaperones SurA, Skp, and DegP in Escherichia coli. Genes Dev. *21*, 2473–2484.

Sorzano, C.O.S., Bilbao-Castro, J.R., Shkolnisky, Y., Alcorlo, M., Melero, R., Caffarena-
Fernández, G., Li, M., Xu, G., Marabini, R., and Carazo, J.M. (2010). A clustering approach to

multireference alignment of single-particle projections in electron microscopy. J. Struct. Biol.
171, 197–206.

Tang, G., Peng, L., Baldwin, P.R., Mann, D.S., Jiang, W., Rees, I., and Ludtke, S.J. (2007).
EMAN2: an extensible image processing suite for electron microscopy. J. Struct. Biol. *157*, 38–
46.

Tseng, T.T., Gratwick, K.S., Kollman, J., Park, D., Nies, D.H., Goffeau, A., and Saier, M.H.
(1999). The RND permease superfamily: an ancient, ubiquitous and diverse family that includes
human disease and development proteins. J. Mol. Microbiol. Biotechnol. *1*, 107–125.

Van den Berg, B., Clemons, W.M., Collinson, I., Modis, Y., Hartmann, E., Harrison, S.C., and
Rapoport, T.A. (2004). X-ray structure of a protein-conducting channel. Nature *427*, 36–44.

Voulhoux, R., Bos, M.P., Geurtsen, J., Mols, M., and Tommassen, J. (2003). Role of a highly
conserved bacterial protein in outer membrane protein assembly. Science *299*, 262–265.

Wang, Z., Fan, G., Hryc, C.F., Blaza, J.N., Serysheva, I.I., Schmid, M.F., Chiu, W., Luisi, B.F.,
and Du, D. (2017). An allosteric transport mechanism for the AcrAB-TolC multidrug efflux
pump. eLife *6*.

Wessel, D., and Flügge, U.I. (1984). A method for the quantitative recovery of protein in dilute
solution in the presence of detergents and lipids. Anal. Biochem. *138*, 141–143.

Wu, T., Malinverni, J., Ruiz, N., Kim, S., Silhavy, T.J., and Kahne, D. (2005). Identification of a
multicomponent complex required for outer membrane biogenesis in Escherichia coli. Cell *121*,
235–245.

Zuber, B., Chami, M., Houssin, C., Dubochet, J., Griffiths, G., and Daffé, M. (2008). Direct
visualization of the outer membrane of mycobacteria and corynebacteria in their native state. J.
Bacteriol. *190*, 5672–5680.

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

Figure. 1: Identification of interactions between HTL and BAM

a. Schematic representation of sucrose gradient centrifugation tube for fractionation of *E. coli* total membranes. Numbers 1-6 indicate the fractions taken for SDS PAGE and immunoblotting shown in **b, c** and **d**.

b, c. Immunoblots of fractions produced as shown in **a** for membranes of *E. coli* C43 overproducing either SecYEG or HTL (**b**) or for *E. coli* C43 with no over-expression, and those over-producing either SecDF or SecD$_{\Delta P1}$F (lacking the periplasmic domain 1 (P1) of SecD) (**c**). To help visualise migration shifts, blotting signal was used to quantify relative abundances of proteins of interest, shown above or below blots as normalised bar charts.

d. Co-immuno-precipitations (co-IP) of SecG, SecD and BamA – pulling with the SecG antibody. Pull-downs were conducted with solubilised crude membrane extracts from *E. coli* C43 (WT), a strain lacking SecG (Δ*secG*), and C43 over-producing BAM. Experiments were conducted in the presence (+CL) and absence (-CL) of cardiolipin. L = load (1% total material), W = final wash before elution (to demonstrate proper washing of affinity resin, 17% of total material) and E = elution (17% of total material).

e. Quantification of IPs shown in (**d**). Error bars represent SEM. An unpaired T-test was used to compare samples (p = 0.05, n = 3, * = < 0.05, ** = < 0.01, p values from left to right are 0.4874, 0.8083, 0.0041, 0.0249, 0.0241 and 0.0839).

f. Affinity pull-down of recombinant BamA-His$_6$, SecD and SecG by nickel chelation all in the presence of cardiolipin. L, W and E as described in (**d**).

1052

1053

1054

Figure. 2: 3D characterization of HTL-BAM by NS-EM and cryo-EM in detergent solution, and XL-MS analysis

a. Silver-stained SDS-PAGE gels of fractions from glycerol centrifugation gradients are shown, with increasingly large complexes appearing in fractions of higher percentage glycerol, (from left to right). The glycerol centrifugation gradients of BAM alone (top) HTL alone (middle) and HTL mixed with BAM (bottom) are shown. Dashed lines represent the fraction of furthest migration of the individual components, as determined in the top two gels.

b. Negative stain analysis of the HTL-BAM complex (37.2 Å resolution) in four representative orthogonal views, with the orientation with respect to the inner and outer membranes inferred. BAM (grey), BamB (orange), SecYEG (cyan), YidC (pink) and SecDF (green) are shown.

c. Three orthogonal views of the cryo-EM HTL-BAM complex 3D reconstruction (27 Å resolution). Colours are as in (**a**), but with BamA in blue.

d. Frontal and lateral sliced views of the cryo HTL-BAM complex showing the large cavity between the IM and OM complexes.

e. Close-up of the outer-membrane region of the HTL-BAM complex. The cryo-EM structure (transparent surface) with BamABCDE atomic structures docked (pdb_5d0q). BamB (orange) position was determined directly by NS-EM (Fig. S4e). BamA (blue), BamC (yellow), BamD (red) and BamE (pink) are docked according to the HTL-BAM cryo-EM density and XLMS data (Fig. S6c). Green sphere atoms in BamC and BamD show interacting points with SecD identified by mass apectrometry.

f. Lower threshold map of HTL-BAM overlaid with the correct level (transparent grey), with the main components coloured as in (**a**). The lateral gate (LG) into the membrane, protein-channel through SecY and the central lipid pool are highlighted. The asterisks denote interaction sites between SecYEG and SecDF/ YidC.

1085

1086

1087

CryoEM
HTL compact
(emd3506)
(i)

NS-EM
HTL:BAM

(ii)

NS-EM
HTL
compact
(iii)

NS-EM
HTL
open
(iv)

1088

1089

Figure 3: EM structures of HTL in 'compact' and 'open' states

Structure and docking of a previously published cryo-EM structure of HTL in the compact state **(i)** (Botte et al., 2016), the HTL-BAM complex **(ii)**, HTL in the 'compact' state **(iii)** and HTL in the 'open' state **(iv)**; structures **(ii - iv)** are from this study.

1094

1095

Figure 4: Effect of increasing the periplasmic distance on the HTL-BAM interaction

a. Negative-stain EM model of HTL-BAM (from Fig. 2a), annotated with membranes at the experimentally determined distances between the inner and outer membranes of *E. coli* strains containing wild type *lpp* and mutant *lpp+21* (Asmar et al., 2017).

b. Co-immunoprecipitation of SecG, SecD and BamA when pulling from an anti-SecG monoclonal antibody. Co-IPs were conducted in the presence of cardiolipin as in Fig. 1d, but with solubilised membranes of strains described in **(a).**

c. Quantification of IPs from **(b)**. Error bars represent SEM. An unpaired T-test was used to compare samples ($p = 0.05$, $n = 3$, * = < 0.05, *** = < 0.001, p values from left to right are 0.0170, 0.0990 and 0.0006).

Figure 5: Effects of SecD depletion upon cell growth, OmpA secretion and maturation

a. Western blot illustrating depletion of SecD in *E. coli* JP325 whole cells when grown in the presence of arabinose or glucose. t=0 represents the time at which an overnight culture (grown in arabinose) was used to inoculate a fresh culture containing either arabinose or glucose.

b. Growth of *E. coli* JP325 transformed with empty vector pTrc99a (1 + 2), pTrc99a-*secDF* (3 + 4) and pTrc99A-*secD$_{D519N}$F* (5 + 6). Samples in panels 1, 3 and 5 were grown on LB-arabinose (permissive), whereas 2, 4 and 6 were grown on LB-glucose (non-permissive).

c. Classical SecA-driven import assay with *E. coli* inner membrane vesicles (IMVs) and OmpA. IMVs contained over-produced protein as stated on the x-axis. Error bars represent SEM (n=3).

d. Periplasmic fractions of *E. coli* JP325 immunoblotted for OmpA. Two species of OmpA are visible: folded OmpA (bottom band; fOmpA) and unfolded OmpA (top band; ufOmpA). Also shown are control lanes containing *E. coli* whole cells with over-produced, mainly 'folded' OmpA (fOmpA, bottom band) and the same sample, but boiled, to produce 'unfolded' OmpA (ufOmpA, top band).

e. Representative western blots of co-immuno-precipitations conducted as in Fig. 1d in the presence of CL, but with solubilised membranes prepared from *E. coli JP325* grown in the presence of glucose and cloned with variants of pTrc99a, as stated in the figure.

f. Quantification of BamA pull down from co-IPs shown in **(e)**. Error bars represent SEM. An unpaired T-test was used to compare samples (p = 0.05, n = 3, * = < 0.05, p values from left to right are 0.0449 and 0.6412).

For **(g-i)**, samples were prepared from various cell cultures; see key (above) for strains used. Error bars represent SEM (n=3 for experimental samples grown in glucose).

1147   **g.** Quantification of SecD from western blots such as those shown in **(a)**. Values are normalised

1148   to JP325-pTrc99a at t = 0.

1149

1150   **h.** Culture growth curves.

1151

1152   **i.** Analysis of western blots such as those from **(d)** showing the quantity of ufOmpA as a fraction

1153   of the total OmpA in the periplasmic fraction.

1154

j. Comparison of NS-EM structures of 'compact' (structures i and iv) and 'open' (structures ii

and v) conformations of HTL *versus* the counterpart containing $SecD_{D519N}F$ (HTL519); both in

the presence of CL. Atomic structures of SecDF overlaid with filtered maps at 5 Å are shown

alongside for the *I*-form (structure iii, 3XAM) and *F*-form (structure vi, 3AQP), with the amino

acid substitution equivalent to the *E.coli* $SecD_{D519N}$, 3AQP). The grey arbitrary mass indicates

the approximate position and mass of SecYEG.

1161

1162

1163

1164

Figure. 6: Negative-stain analysis of HTL:SurA and HTL:SurA-OmpA complexes

For **a**, **b, c** and **d** top panel shows views of 3D reconstructions, and bottom shows reference-free (RF) class averages and projections (P) of the final model, shown in the same orientations as the top. Scale bars are 100 Å, unless stated otherwise. See Table S2 for image processing details.

a. Orthogonal views of the HTL-SurA complex 3D reconstruction (41.9 Å resolution).

b. Opposing side views of the HTL-SurA complex (yellow) superimposed on the immuno-complex HTL-SurA:Ab$_{SurA}$ complex (grey). The antibody (yellow arrows) is shown bound to the mass assigned to SurA.

c. Opposing side views of the HTL-SurA complex (yellow) superimposed on the immuno-complex Ab$_{SecY}$:HTL-SurA complex (grey). The antibody (blue arrows) is shown bound to the mass assigned to SecYEG.

d. Orthogonal side views of the HTL-SurA:OmpA complex 3D reconstruction (37.5 Å resolution).

e. Assigned map of the HTL-SurA-OmpA complex in the three representative orthogonal views, with components coloured accordingly.

Figure 7: Schematic representation of the HTL:BAM machinery

Schematic model of OMP transfer through the bacterial envelope, facilitated by HTL-BAM and periplasmic chaperones, such as SurA, Skp, PpiD and YfgM. From left to right: OMP precursors with an N-terminal signal sequence are driven across the membrane by the ATPase SecA through the Sec translocon – the process is stimulated by PMF (independent of SecDF). Late in this process the pre-protein emerges into the periplasm and the signal sequence is removed, releasing the mature protein. Presumably, globular proteins are then guided into the periplasm, where folding will occur assisted by periplasmic chaperones. Otherwise, OMP-chaperone-HTL complexes are recognised by the BAM complex, with interactions forming between BAM and both HTL (this study) and SurA (Sklar et al., 2007). The persistence and variety of chaperones involvement at this stage is unclear (?). This conjunction enables the smooth and efficient passage of OMPs to the outer-membrane, enabled by energy coupling from the inner-membrane – trans-membrane proton-motive-force (PMF)-driven conformational changes *via* SecDF (right).

Supplementary figure 1: Raw western blots of co-immuno-precipitations and affinity pull downs

a. SDS PAGE stained for total protein of sucrose gradient fractions of *E. coli* C43 total membranes from cells over-producing SecYEG or HTL. Left and right gels show untreated and heat denatured (+Δ) samples respectively. Purified controls of SecYEG and YidC are also shown.

For (**b**) and (**c**), L = load (1% total material), W = final wash before elution (to demonstrate complete washing of affinity resin, 17% of total material) and E = elution (17% of total material).

b. Co-immunoprecipitations from Fig. 1d-e. Experiments were conducted in the presence (+CL) or absence (-CL) of augmented cardiolipin. Experiments were also carried out in the presence (+AB) or absence (-AB) of anti-SecG primary antibody, as a control to assess non-specific binding. Solubilised membranes of 3 cell strains were used: *E. coli* C43, a strain lacking SecG (Δ*secG*), and C43 over-producing BAM.

c. Affinity pull-downs from Fig. 1f. Experiments were conducted in with nickel-chelated (Ni) or non-chelated (blank) resin as a control to rule out non-specific binding.

Supplementary figure 2: Glycerol centrifugation gradients of HTL and BAM components

a, b, c. Silver-stained SDS-PAGE gels of fractions from the glycerol centrifugation gradients are shown, with increasingly large complexes appearing in fractions of higher percentage glycerol, (from left to right). For each panel, the glycerol centrifugation gradient of BAM alone is shown (top). The middle gel represents a HTL component (labelled on the top left of the gel). The bottom gel represents the experiment where BAM was mixed with the corresponding HTL component. Dashed lines represent the fraction of furthest migration of the individual components, as determined in the top two gels.

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278 **Supplementary figure 3: Negative-stained EM micrographs of the HTL:BAM complex**

1279

1280 **a, b, c.** Electron micrographs of HTL-BAM complexes in different conditions. Bottom, reference-

1281 free (RF) class averages of the largest populations found in the micrographs (top). Micrograph

1282 scale bar, 1000 Å. RF scale bar, 100 Å. White arrows indicate representative HTL:BAM

1283 complexes used for image processing.

1284

1285

1295

1296

Supplementary figure 4: 3D characterization and subunit assignment of HTL-BAM by NS-EM in detergent solution

a. Silver stained SDS-PAGE analysis of HTL-BAM fractionated by glycerol density gradient centrifugation (left), and the same but with GraFix treatment (middle). Lines show the limit to which BAM (dashed white line) and HTL (solid black line) migrate when ran alone (Fig. 2a). Asterisk (middle panel) shows the fraction chosen for MS (Table S1), EM and image processing. Right panel, silver stain SDS-PAGE gel showing fractions and bands used for analysis by mass spectrometry.

b. Top left, four orthogonal views of the HTL-BAM complex 3D reconstruction (37.2 Å resolution). Bottom, reference-free (RF) class averages and projections (P) of the final model, shown in the same orientations as the top. Scale bar, 100 Å. See Table S2 for image processing details. Right, angular distribution and Fourier shell correlation of the HTL-BAM complex.

For **(c-e)**, top panel shows orthogonal views of different 3D reconstructions, labelled accordingly. Middle panel shows reconstructions superimposed with HTL-BAM (transparent grey) from **(b),** and bottom shows a comparison of the reference-free (RF) class averages of HTL-BAM with the corresponding structure. Scale bar, 100 Å. See Table S2 for image processing details.

c. SecYEG-SecDF-BAM (without YidC) complex 3D reconstruction (36.7 Å resolution, pink). Pink arrow indicates the mass in HTL-BAM (grey transparent) corresponding to YidC.

d. SecDF-BAM (without SecYEG and YidC) complex 3D reconstruction (39.4 Å resolution, green). Masses for SecDF trans-membrane domain (green arrow) and periplasmic region (red arrow), SecYEG (blue arrow) and YidC (pink arrow) are indicated.

1325   **e**. HTL-BAM(ΔBamB) complex 3D reconstruction (33.6 Å resolution, orange). Mass

1326   corresponding to BamB (orange arrow) and YidC (pink arrow) are indicated.

1327

1328

1329

1330

Supplementary figure 5: <u>Image processing and classification strategy for the cryo-EM data</u> <u>of the HTL-BAM</u> complex

1333

Relion 2D classification was used to clean the two preliminary datasets and classify the images.

Of Set I, 82% of the particles were used for extensive 3D classifications and auto-refinements. Of

Set II, 65% of the particles followed same procedure. High-quality particles from both data sets

were grouped and classified again masking the most variable regions. The final stable volume was

formed by 8,448 particles (1.3% of the particles): indicative of the number of different sub-

populations found in the sample. The final post-processing structure (Relion 2.0) has an overall

resolution of 18,23 Å.

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

1354

1357 **Supplementary figure 6: Sample preparation and XL-MS analysis of HTL-BAM**

1358

1359 **a.** Top, Gel filtration chromatography profile elution (Superose 6) of the HTL-BAM complex for

1360 cryo-EM and XL-MS analysis. Bottom, SDS-PAGE gel silver stained of the fractions eluted from

1361 the gel filtration at the top.

1362

1363 **b.** Representation of the interactome network between HTL and BAM resulted from XL-MS

1364 analysis. Internal green lines represent inter-connections between HTL-HTL, HTL-BAM and

1365 BAM-BAM components. Purple lines represent intra-connections between the HTL and BAM

1366 individual subunits.

1367

c. Representation of inter-protein interactions between HTL and BAM as determined by XL-MS.

The specific crosslinks residues are mapped onto the structures of the BAM complex (emd_4061

and pdb_5ayw) and the model of the HTL complex (emd_3506 and pdb_5mg3) (Botte et al., 2016).

Left, green dots and dashed lines represent positions and interactions, respectively, between SecD

residues and BAM components. Yellow, positions and interactions between SecF and BAM

components. Right, pink dots and dashed lines represent positions and interactions, respectively,

between YidC residues and BAM components. The HTL and BAM structures have been placed

artificially separate from one another to best illustrate the cross-linking contacts (rather than to

reflect their actual position in the super-complex).

1377

1378

1379

1380

Supplementary figure 7: EM field of wild-type HTL in different conditions

Bottom, reference-free (RF) class averages of the 'compact' (comp) and 'open' populations found in the micrographs; conditions as labelled. Percentages of the populations are indicated on the right RF images. Micrograph scale bar, 1000 Å. RF scale bar, 100 Å.

1388

1389

1390

1391 **Supplementary figure 8: Raw western blots of IPs investigating how periplasmic width**

1392 **effects the HTL-BAM interaction**

1393

1394 Legend is the same as described for Fig. S1a, but the cell strains used here were either *E. coli*

1395 containing WT *lpp* or the mutant *lpp+21*. All IPs were conducted in the presence of cardiolipin.

1396

Supplementary figure 9: Raw western blots accompanying SecD depletion experiments from Fig. 5

a. Western blots of whole cells visualised for SecD. Cell strains used were *E. coli* JP325 containing either empty pTrc99a, pTrc99a-SecDF or pTrc99a-SecD$_{D519N}$F. Samples were grown in either arabinose (permissive) or glucose (non-permissive), as indicated in the figure. R1/2/3 represent samples taken from replicate cultures. These blots were quantified to give Fig. 5f.

b. Immunoblotting of SecY in inverted membrane vesicles used in Fig. 5c. Samples were prepared at 4 dilutions: neat (1), ½ (2), ¼ (3) and 1/8 (4). SecY is indicated at the expected apparent Mw of 30 kDa. A higher band is also present at approximately 50 kDa, likely due to SecY dimers.

c. Raw western blots of co-IPs conducted in Fig. 5e-f. Legend is the same as for Fig. S1a, except the membranes used here were the same as those described in **(a)**, all grown in the presence of glucose for depletion of genome encoded SecDF-yajC. All IPs were conducted in the presence of cardiolipin.

d. Quantification of SecG and SecD from co-IPs shown in **(c)**. An unpaired t-test was used to compare samples ($p = 0.05$, n = 3, * = < 0.05, *** = < 0.001, p values from left to right are 0.0.1391, 0.0137, 0.0001 and 0.3618).

e. OmpA western blots of periplasmic fractions of cells from **(a).** Unfolded (ufOmpA) and folded OmpA (fOmpA) are indicated. These blots were quantified to give Fig. 5i.

f. BamA western blot of whole cells taken from cultures grown during depletion of SecDF-yajC.

1444

1445 **Supplementary figure 10: Negative-stain EM of HTL containing SecD$_{D519N}$ (HTL519)**

1446

1447 Electron micrographs of wild type (wt) HTL and HTL containing SecD$_{D519N}$F (HTL519) in the

1448 same conditions (with cardiolipin, and without GraFix). Bottom, reference-free (RF) class

1449 averages of the 'compact' (comp) and 'open' populations found in the micrographs (top).

1450 Percentages of the populations are indicated on the right of RF images. Micrograph scale bar, 1000

1451 Å. RF scale bar, 100 Å.

a HTL:SurA

HTL   20% ———————— [Glycerol] 40%
75 —
50 — SecD/YidC
37 —
25 — SecY
        SecF
15 — SecE/G

SurA   ← SurA migration limit
75 —
50 — SurA
37 —
25 —
15 —

HTL:SurA
75 — SecD/YidC
50 — SurA
37 — SecY
25 — SecF
15 — SecE/G
        HTL:SurA interaction →

b HTL:SurA GraFix

c HTL:SurA:Ab_SurA

20% ———————— [Glycerol] 40%
0% ———————— [Glutaraldehyde] 0.15%

250 —
150 —
75 —
50 —
37 —
25 —
20 —

d HTL:SurA:Ab_SurA GraFix

e Ab_SecY:HTL:SurA

20% ———————— [Glycerol] 40%
0% ———————— [Glutaraldehyde] 0.15%

250 —
150 —
75 —
50 —
37 —
25 —
20 —

f Ab_SecY:HTL:SurA GraFix

1452

Supplementary figure 11: Glycerol gradient centrifugation, electron micrographs and immunodecoration of HTL:SurA

For **(a), (c)** and **(e)**, the experiment was conducted as in Fig. S2. EM fields of HTL:SurA (**b,** top) and HTL:SuraA:Ab$_{SurA}$ (**d,** top) and Ab$_{SecY}$:HTL:SurA (**f**, top) prepared using GraFix are shown. Reference-free (RF) class averages of the biggest populations from corresponding micrographs are shown (bottom). Micrograph scale bar, 1000 Å. RF scale bar, 100 Å.

1474

1475 **Supplementary figure 12: Negative stain EM micrograph and glycerol gradient**

1476 **centrifugation of HTL-SurA-OmpA**

1477

1478 For **(a)**, the experiment was conducted as in Fig. S2. An EM field of HTL:SurA:OmpA prepared

1479 using GraFix is shown (**b**). Reference-free (RF) class averages of the biggest populations from the

1480 micrograph is shown (bottom). Micrograph scale bar, 1000 Å. RF scale bar, 100 Å.

1481

1482

Table 1: Mass spectrometry analysis of the GraFix fractions for image processing

Sample	Accession	Description	Score	Coverage	Prote	Peptid	# PSMs	Area
BAM:HTL detergent	B7UJN1	Protein translocase subunit SecD OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=secD PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UJN1_ECO27]	1166.56	53.01	1	35	403	4.609E+8
	B7UIM2	Outer membrane protein assembly factor BamA OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=bamA PE=3 SV=1 - [BAMA_ECO27]	683.99	60.74	1	46	257	7.500E+7
	B7UGM7	Outer membrane protein assembly factor BamC OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=nlpB PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UGM7_ECO27]	404.02	55.81	1	14	119	3.642E+7
	B7UJN2	Protein-export membrane protein SecF OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=secF PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UJN2_ECO27]	249.64	27.55	1	7	74	2.772E+7
	B7UMH2	Membrane protein insertase YidC OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=yidC PE=3 SV=1 - [YIDC_ECO27]	181.06	36.31	1	13	64	3.983E+7
	B7UH30	Outer membrane protein assembly factor BamD OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=yfiO PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UH30_ECO27]	173.40	66.12	1	15	76	3.235E+7
	B7UGV8	Outer membrane protein assembly factor BamB OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=yfgL PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UGV8_ECO27]	129.35	34.44	1	11	45	3.143E+7
	B7UK24	Protein translocase subunit SecY OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=secY PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UK24_ECO27]	36.43	15.58	1	5	14	3.454E+6
SurA:HTL detergent	B7UJN1	Protein translocase subunit SecD OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=secD PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UJN1_ECO27]	1098.08	50.57	1	33	393	6.386E+8
	B7UMH2	Membrane protein insertase YidC OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=yidC PE=3 SV=1 - [YIDC_ECO27]	266.32	32.66	1	13	98	1.235E+8
	B7UJN2	Protein-export membrane protein SecF OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=secF PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UJN2_ECO27]	236.81	18.27	1	5	70	4.934E+7
	B7UIA1	Chaperone SurA OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=surA PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UIA1_ECO27]	49.97	23.60	1	10	23	3.360E+6
	B7UK24	Protein translocase subunit SecY OS=Escherichia coli O127:H6 (strain E2348/69 / EPEC) OX=574521 GN=secY PE=3 SV=1 - [B7UK24_ECO27]	7.01	4.51	1	3	4	1.931E+6

Table 1: Mass spectrometry analysis of the GraFix fractions for image processing

Analysis of the protein composition of the HTL-BAM and HTL-SurA preparations in detergent solution by MS. Only proteins of interest are shown in this table. The SDS-PAGE bands corresponding to the GraFix fractions used for NS-EM processing (*e.g.* Fig. S4a, middle and right, asterisk) were cut from the gel and prepared for protein digestion, extraction and MS.

	Complex	Initial particles	High quality particles	Final 3D volume	Resolution
HTL structures	**HTL-DDM**	100754	74070	-	-
	HTL-DDM+CL	22869	18674	-	-
	HTLafter gradient+CL	21735	18434	-	-
	HTLafter gradient+gluta.+CL	101142	90432	9656 (compact conformation)	26,56 Å
				1569 (extended conformation)	39,54 Å
	HTL519$_{D519N}$	42098	38052	20699 (compact conformation)	18,7 Å
				4451 (extended conformation)	20,70 Å
HTL-BAM structures	**HTL:BAM Δgluta**	29336	12460	-	-
	HTL:BAM grafix	65381	28646	5122	37,2 Å
	HTL:BAM grafix ΔCL	14530	11406	-	-
	HTL:BAM CryoEM	839845	608493	12779	18,23 Å
	SecDF:BAM	22642	11987	5430	39,4 Å
	HTLΔYidC:BAM	16008	8612	4943	36,7 Å
	HTL:BAMΔB	31561	11484	3919	33,65 Å
HTL-SurA structures	**SurA:HTL**	24252	18696	2290	41,88 Å
	SurA:HTL:Ab$_{SecY}$	15819	9510	4431	47,06 Å
	Ab$_{SurA}$:SurA:HTL	14246	3882	730	56,67 Å
	SurA:HTL:OmpA	35546	33485	11699	37,50 Å

1495

1496 **Table 2: Parameters of EM analysis of HTL, HTL-BAM and HTL-SurA structures**

1497

1498

1499

1500