An ancestral transmembrane transcription factor couples cell envelope regulation and the

SOS response in *Caulobacter crescentus*

Kamilla Ankær Brejndal[1], Nikolaj Vestergaard Hansen[1], Koyel Ghosh[1], Sebastian Nielsen[1], Lykke

Haastrup Hansen[1], Lene A. Jakobsen[1], Martin R. Larsen[1] and Clare L. Kirkpatrick[1]*

[1] Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Southern Denmark, Odense,

Denmark.

* Corresponding author. Email clarek@bmb.sdu.dk ORCiD 0000-0001-8564-8559.

Short title: HigX regulates cell envelope genes

Keywords: antibiotic resistance, cell envelope, transmembrane transcription factor, toxin-antitoxin

system, gene regulation, Caulobacter crescentus

Abstract

The DNA damage (SOS) response in bacteria involves derepression of a set of genes in order to

activate mechanisms to tolerate stress, repair DNA and slow down cell division. While some of

these genes are well characterized, many genes exist which are clearly induced by DNA damage

but for which the function is unclear. In *Caulobacter crescentus*, the toxin-antitoxin (TA) system

higBA and a closely associated downstream transcription factor (*higX*) are strongly induced as part

of the SOS response, but the role of *higX* is unknown. We show that, unexpectedly, HigX functions

independently of HigBA as a cell membrane-associated regulator and is toxic when overexpressed

in filamentous cells. ChIP-Seq indicated that it binds to several promoters associated with cell

envelope regulation. In cells with the SOS response constitutively activated, HigX was

overproduced, but at the same time was unable to bind the majority of its target promoters. *higX*

was highly conserved in genomic context among many alpha-proteobacteria, while *higBA* was only

found upstream of it in a small number of *Caulobacter* genomes, including the universal laboratory

strain *C. crescentus* NA1000. Compositional analysis suggested that *higBA* originated from a

foreign source, while *higX* is likely ancestral to the alpha-proteobacteria. Our data support a model

where dysregulation of HigX production and activity in filamentous Δ*lexA* cells contributes to cell

envelope instability and antibiotic sensitivity. Thus, the protective effect of inhibiting cell division

during the SOS response in order to repair the DNA, carries the hidden cost of interference with

HigX-mediated cell envelope maintenance.

Author summary

The DNA damage (SOS) response in bacteria is key for their survival in harsh conditions, but the

genes which are induced by this response and the molecular mechanisms involved are variable

between different bacteria. We investigated the function of an uncharacterized SOS-induced gene

in *Caulobacter crescentus* (*higX*) and found that it is a membrane-localized DNA binding protein,

but that it did not help survival in DNA damage. Instead, it negatively affected cell viability when

induced, unlike other SOS response genes. Genomic analysis showed that *higX* is highly

conserved among alphaproteobacteria, but it is only under SOS control in a small number of

genomes (including *Caulobacter crescentus*) where a toxin-antitoxin system and its SOS-

regulatory promoter have been inserted upstream. This work uncovers HigX as a novel factor in

cell envelope regulation, and shows that loss of cell shape regulation, eg. in filamentous Δ*lexA*

cells, can influence the ability of transmembrane transcription factors to bind to their target genes.

Introduction

Free-living bacteria require robust stress response systems in order to thrive in variable (and

sometimes stressful) natural environments. One of the most important is the SOS response

system, for response to and repair of DNA damage, especially double-strand breaks (1). When

DNA damage occurs, the SOS response allows cell division to be paused for the cell to carry out

DNA repair, in order to assure that intact chromosomes are passed on to the next generation.

LexA and RecA are the key regulators of the SOS response, and are widely conserved

among bacteria (2). In a noninduced state, LexA maintains its target genes under tight

repression by binding to specific recognition sites in their promoters. During DNA damage, RecA

recognizes single-stranded DNA and polymerises into a filament (3, 4). The polymer form of RecA

interacts with LexA causing it to cleave itself and leave the promoters, allowing transcription of the

target genes (5). While the consensus binding sequence for LexA varies between different

bacterial species, it is generally true that the closer a given LexA binding site matches the

consensus, the higher the affinity of LexA for the site and the tighter the repression of the

promoter(6). Hence, a high-affinity site can act as an on-off switch for its target genes, while a low-

affinity site would have a more subtle effect on transcription.

Toxin-antitoxin (TA) systems are widespread in bacterial genomes, with a tendency towards free-

living bacteria possessing multiple systems (frequently in multiple copies) and intracellular bacteria

having few or none (7). All systems consist of at least a toxin, which acts intracellularly to inhibit

central metabolism, and an antitoxin which inhibits toxin action (8-11). In some cases, described

further later, a third component is also present. The regulation of TA system activity is primarily

post-translational, because while the promoters of some TA systems are transcriptionally activated

by stress (12-15), transcriptional activation does not automatically result in a net increase of toxin

activity (16) and other systems are transcriptionally stress-insensitive (17, 18). In some bacteria,

TA system promoters are under the control of LexA (12-15)[OBJ]. One example is the *higBA* system

of *Caulobacter crescentus*. This TA system comprises the DNA-binding protein antitoxin HigA and

the ribosome-dependent RNase toxin HigB and is negatively regulated by binding of HigA and

LexA upstream of the *higB* start codon. LexA binding to the *higBA* promoter provides sufficiently

strong repression that it is possible to delete the HigA antitoxin without major phenotypic

effects(15)[OBJ]. Consistent with this, the LexA binding site in the *higBA* promoter is a perfect match

to the experimentally defined consensus sequence for *Caulobacter* LexA (19)[OBJ] (T/A)TGTTC

(N_6)TGTTC, and the HigA protein is almost undetectable in wild type (WT) *Caulobacter crescentus*

but strongly upregulated in the Δ*lexA* mutant (15)[OBJ]. Due to this strict repression, HigB-dependent

phenotypes are most clearly observable in the Δ*lexA* mutant. In this strain, improvements in growth

rate and in ciprofloxacin resistance are seen when the *higB* toxin gene is deleted, suggesting that

the *higBA* TA system is a functional component of the *Caulobacter crescentus* DNA damage

response and that HigB's toxic activity contributes to poor growth rate and ciprofloxacin sensitivity

in Δ*lexA* cells. Hence, *Caulobacter crescentus higBA* is an example of a TA system in which

transcriptional derepression of its promoter (during DNA damage) does lead to toxin-dependent

phenotypes(15)[OBJ].

One toxin-dependent phenotype of the HigBA system was an unexpected protective effect against

cell envelope stress. This came to light through a forward genetic screen for rescue of nalidixic

acid sensitivity in the Δ*tipN* mutant, which identified *higA* as a loss of function suppressor

candidate, during a transposon insertion screen for nalidixic acid resistance (15). The mechanism

of this protective effect proved to be through HigB-mediated cleavage of the *acrB2* efflux pump

transcript mRNA, which was strongly transcriptionally induced by nalidixic acid. Mutants lacking

TipN had destabilized cell envelopes which were disproportionally sensitive to cell envelope stress

induced by overload of the envelope with AcrAB2 efflux pump proteins (20), unless these were

post-transcriptionally downregulated by HigB.

While our previous work focused on the role of HigB in the DNA damage and cell envelope stress

responses, it also came to our attention that other factors may be involved. In particular, we noted

different antibiotic resistance phenotypes for the Δ*lexA* Δ*higB* and the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* mutants, even

though both of these are lacking the toxin gene *higB*. The Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* strain remained as

sensitive to DNA damaging antibiotics as the Δ*lexA* parent strain, and did not display the improved

resistance seen in the Δ*lexA* Δ*higB* mutant (15). To investigate sources of this HigB-independent

antibiotic sensitivity, we examined the genomic context of the *higBA* TA system and observed that

a third gene is encoded only 42 bp downstream of the *higA* antitoxin gene. The close proximity of

this gene (CCNA_03131) to *higBA* was suggestive of a function as a regulatory third component of

the TA system. However, it bore no similarity to the chaperone third components seen in other

higBA systems, in some cases designated *higC* (21, 22). Instead, it is annotated as a transcription

factor of the LytTR family. These factors are found in a wide variety of bacteria, including

pathogens, and regulate processes such as competence, extracellular toxin and bacteriocin

production, alginate production and quorum sensing (23). Here we show that this gene, for which

we propose the designation *higX*, (considering its close association with *higBA* but still enigmatic

function) is indeed a transcription factor and can regulate the TA system promoter, but its primary

function is independent from it. In evolutionary terms, *higBA* in *Caulobacter crescentus* is a recent

arrival upstream of *higX*. Insertion of *higBA* and its LexA-dependent promoter at this position is

unique to the *crescentus/vibrioides* lineage and is not conserved among other *Caulobacter* species

or other alpha-proteobacteria. Conversely, *higX* is widely conserved among the

alphaproteobacteria, generally found adjacent to a putative hydrolase gene and is not LexA-

dependent. Overproduction of *higX* upon LexA derepression in *Caulobacter crescentus* leads to

ciprofloxacin sensitivity, likely because the cell envelope is destabilized and the antibiotic has

easier access to its target inside the cell. However, we also observed that in the Δ*lexA* strain,

binding of HigX to its target promoters was globally decreased, suggesting a novel link between

cell filamentation and cell envelope gene regulation.

Results

Ciprofloxacin sensitivity of the ΔlexA ΔhigBA mutant is due to excessive production of a
transcription factor downstream of higBA

To investigate the source of the unexpected HigB-independent ciprofloxacin sensitivity in Δ*lexA*

Δ*higBA*, we focused on the CCNA_03131 (hereafter, *higX*) gene downstream of *higBA* (Fig. 1A).

We constructed in-frame deletions of *higX* in WT, Δ*lexA* or Δ*higBA* strains and investigated the

effect on ciprofloxacin sensitivity. Consistent with our previous observations (15), loss of *higA* in

the WT background sensitized cells to ciprofloxacin (through HigB activation), while deletion of

higB from the Δ*lexA* strain was protective against it. Deletion of *higX* in WT, with or without deletion

of *higBA*, had no effect. However, in the ciprofloxacin-sensitive Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* background, deletion

of *higX* improved ciprofloxacin resistance to a similar level to the Δ*lexA* Δ*higB* strain, showing that

higX is indeed responsible for the ciprofloxacin sensitivity in the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* strain in the

absence of the HigB toxin (Fig. 1B).

The Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* strain had been constructed by in frame deletion of *higBA* in the Δ*lexA* single

mutant background. However, we subsequently realized that this would exert polar regulatory

effects on *higX* expression, because (1) deletion of the *higBA* coding sequence brings *higX* directly

downstream of the strong promoter regulating *higBA*, and (2) both repressors of this promoter,

LexA and HigA, are absent. Indeed, we observed that *higX* was transcribed at very low levels in

WT, Δ*higA* and Δ*higBA* but much higher in Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* (Fig. 1C). Therefore, the ciprofloxacin

sensitivity phenotype of Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* is associated with elevated HigX RNA expression,

suggesting why *higX* deletion is protective.

HigX regulates the expression of higBA alongside LexA and HigA

In other three-component TA systems with a transcription factor as their third component, the

transcription factor regulates of the promoter upstream of the TA system (18, 24). To investigate

whether HigX also has this activity, we examined activity of a transcriptional P_{higBA}-*lacZ* reporter

construct (Fig. 2A, B) in WT or strains lacking combinations of *lexA*, *higBA* or *higX*. Promoter

activity was unaffected by *higX* deletion in the WT or in Δ*higBA* backgrounds, but decreased in

Δ*lexA* Δ*higBAX* compared to Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA*, suggesting that HigX can activate the promoter

upstream of *higBA* when LexA and HigA are absent (Fig. 2B). We attempted to confirm this finding

by complementation with an overexpression construct containing *higX* under the control of the

vanillate-inducible promoter (pMT335-*higX*). However, we could not transform the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA*

strain with this plasmid, suggesting that its increased level of *higX* expression is sufficiently toxic to

make the cells intolerant of transformation with a multi-copy plasmid containing *higX*, even in the

absence of inducer. Expression of *higX* from this plasmid in WT, Δ*lexA* or Δ*higBA* strains

containing the P_{higBA}-*lacZ* transcriptional reporter had a weak inhibitory effect on promoter activity,

which was only statistically significant in the Δ*higBA* background (Fig. 2C). Therefore, *higX* can

activate or repress the promoter upstream of *higBA*, dependent on which other regulators are

present, but its regulatory activity is weaker at this locus than that of LexA or HigA.

The different levels of mRNA expression for *higB* and *higX* observed by qRT-PCR (Fig. 1C) were

suggestive of regulation of the two transcripts by separate promoters, consistent with previous

genome-wide transcriptional profiling which identified independent primary transcriptional start

sites for *higBA* and *higX* (25), at genome positions 3281528 and 3280865 respectively. We

therefore constructed translational beta-galactosidase fusions of the regions immediately upstream

of *higB* and *higX* (including the first few codons of each of the genes) to *lacZ*, such that the *higB*

and *higX* reporter fusions should employ the native transcription start sites,. Surprisingly, the

translational fusion P_{higB}-*higB::lacZ* did not exhibit the same pattern of activity as the transcriptional

reporter (Fig. 2D, compare to 2B). For the translational reporter, the basal activity in WT, Δ*higBA*,

Δ*higBAX* or Δ*higX* strains was almost undetectable and high promoter activity was only observed

in the three strains lacking *lexA*, in contrast to the transcriptional reporter where basal expression

appeared high and the fold increase in the Δ*lexA* mutant strains was much less pronounced.

Conversely, the activity of the translational reporter for *higX* expression was much weaker (Fig 2E).

It was slightly LexA-dependent, but much less so than the promoter of *higB.* We conclude that *higX*

is primarily regulated by the strictly LexA-dependent promoter upstream of *higB*, despite having an

independent transcription start site, and that the different mRNA levels observed for *higB* vs. *higX*

(Fig. 1C) are due to other factors, for example processing or different stability. Moreover, the

strikingly low basal level of P$_{higB}$-*higB::lacZ* activity, relative to the transcriptional *lacZ* fusion of the

same region, is suggestive of an unknown post-transcriptional negative regulator of *higBA*.

HigX is a membrane-associated transcription factor

It was previously noted in a bioinformatic study of LytTR-family transcription factors (23) that all

members of this family in the *Caulobacter crescentus* genome, including *higX*, are likely to encode

transmembrane proteins. Bioinformatic prediction suggested that HigX contains four

transmembrane helices N-terminal to the LytTR DNA binding domain, with the transmembrane and

DNA-binding domains separated by a short low-complexity region (LCR) (Fig. 3A, S1A). The four

helices are predicted to form a tightly packed bundle with no apparent periplasmic domain (Fig.

S1B). To investigate whether the transmembrane domain was required for DNA binding activity,

we constructed another overexpression plasmid where the *higX* gene was truncated to convert

amino acid 133 (Val) to a new start codon, creating the *higX*-noTM variant containing only the LCR

and the LytTR domain. We expressed this alongside the full-length *higX* overexpression plasmid

and compared HigX abundance by western blotting using a custom polyclonal antibody to HigX

alongside cell extracts containing pMT335 empty vector and NA1000 without any plasmid as

control. It was only possible to detect HigX protein in the pMT335-*higX* overexpression strain,

showing that while the antibody can detect HigX, the native level of this protein is very low (Fig. 3B,

left). We could not detect the truncated HigX protein from the pMT335-*higX*-noTM overexpression

strain, suggesting that it may be unstable. Comparing the *Caulobacter* western blot results to cell

extracts of *E. coli* Rosetta cells containing pET28a-*higX* or pET28a-*higX*-noTM constructs intended

for protein purification, we observed that both the full-length and truncated proteins could be

detected in *E. coli* with our HigX polyclonal antibody (Fig. 3B, right). Therefore, although the

truncated version of HigX is not intrinsically unstable, it cannot be maintained in *Caulobacter* in the

absence of the TM domain.

To investigate whether HigX is localized to the membrane in living cells, we constructed C-terminal

GFP fusions to full length HigX and to the truncated HigX-noTM allele lacking the transmembrane

helices. Since the native level of HigX expression was so low, these were created as plasmid-

borne constructs under control of the vanillate-inducible promoter in order to have sufficient

expression to detect GFP fluorescence. Fluorescence microscopy showed that full length HigX

localizes uniformly around the cell periphery in both WT and filamentous cells (Fig. 3C), indicating

that normal cell division is not required for HigX subcellular localisation. No fluorescence was

observed in cells carrying the truncated HigX-noTM-GFP fusion protein, and overexpression of the

truncated HigX-noTM protein (without GFP fusion) had no effect on activity of the P$_{higBA}$-*lacZ*

transcriptional reporter (Fig. 3D), confirming that the transmembrane domain is essential for

stability and/or activity of HigX in the cell.

In order to detect the HigX native expression levels in WT and mutant strains, we employed

quantitative mass spectrometry. Protein extracts were prepared from WT, Δ*higBA*, Δ*higX*, Δ*lexA*,

and Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* strains, with separation of the soluble (cytoplasmic) proteins from the insoluble

(membrane-associated) proteins before trypsinization and isotope labeling. A total of 1332

membrane-associated proteins were detected with two or more peptides, including HigX. No HigX

peptides were detected in the soluble fraction, indicating that the fluorescence observed at the cell

periphery in Fig 3C is due to membrane localisation. The abundance of HigX peptides was not

significantly changed between WT and Δ*higBA*, strongly depleted in Δ*higX* and enriched in both

Δ*lexA* and Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* strains by 30-40% (Fig. 3E, Supplementary Table S1), consistent with the

trend observed in the translational reporter experiments (Fig. 2).

HigX acts independently of the toxin-antitoxin system HigBA

To test our hypothesis that overproduction of HigX was responsible for ciprofloxacin sensitivity in

Δ*lexA*, we expressed it *in trans* from the vanillate-inducible promoter using pMT335-*higX* in WT,

Δ*lexA* and Δ*lexA* Δ*higB*. We found that *higX* overexpression had no effect on cell viability

compared to the empty vector control on normal media. However, on ciprofloxacin, *higX*

overexpression reduced viability of the Δ*lexA* strain compared to the empty vector. Strikingly, the

higX overexpression plasmid also reversed the improvement in ciprofloxacin resistance seen in the

Δ*lexA* Δ*higB* strain relative to empty vector (Fig. 4A). In addition to confirming that *higX*

overexpression was responsible for the ciprofloxacin sensitivity phenotype, this result also

indicated that HigX does not act solely through regulation of the TA system promoter, since the

phenotype was clearly visible in the absence of the HigB toxin. In support of the independence of

HigX from HigBA, we also observed an improvement of ciprofloxacin resistance in a Δ*lexA* Δ*higX*

double mutant relative to Δ*lexA*, where both of these strains have the *higBA* TA system genes

intact (Fig. 4B). This result demonstrates that the increased abundance of HigX seen in the Δ*lexA*

single mutant strain (Fig. 3D) contributes to its ciprofloxacin sensitivity in addition to (and

independently of) the overexpression of HigB.

HigX preferentially binds cell envelope, transport, and metabolism-associated genes

To assess the DNA binding capability of HigX, we performed chromatin immunoprecipitation

sequencing (ChIP-Seq) on wild type and Δ*lexA* strains using our polyclonal antibody to HigX.

Using the "MACS2 callpeak" program, we identified 596 significantly enriched peaks in the wild-

type strain (Supplementary Dataset S1). In contrast, peak calling for the Δ*lexA* strain revealed

genome-wide depletion of the enriched peaks, with 413 peaks identified with significant

enrichment, but with enrichment signal values uniformly lower than in WT (Fig 5A). Therefore, the

DNA-binding and thus regulatory function of HigX is strongly reduced upon deletion of *lexA*,

despite the 40% upregulation of HigX peptide abundance (Fig 3E). Significant peaks in the WT

strain were further filtered through a 95% threshold based on their signal value (≥ 3.22), resulting in

30 significant peaks that corresponded to the top 5% of the dataset. The highest of these peaks

was located between CCNA_03217 (a TetR-family transcriptional regulator) and CCNA_03218

(periplasmic multidrug efflux lipoprotein precursor), with the summit being closest to CCNA_03218

(Fig 5B).

To determine the overall function of HigX target genes and provide a holistic view of its potential

regulatory role, we extracted the summit locations of all 596 peaks and mapped them to the

nearest genes, followed by COG (Clusters of Orthologous Groups) annotation and functional

classification. From this, we observed that most peaks were associated with the following COG

categories, listed from most to least abundant: M, C, T, P, K, and J (Fig. 5C). However, when we

focused on the top 30 significant peaks (signal value ≥ 3.22), genes associated with carbohydrate

transport and metabolism (G) became the most prominent, while most of the previously dominant

categories (M, C, T, P, and K) remained to a lesser extent. In contrast, genes associated with

translation, ribosomal structure, and biogenesis (J) were no longer represented. This COG

distribution suggests that, for the 5% highest confidence ChIP peaks, HigX preferentially targets

genes associated with membrane, transport, and metabolism-related functions.

To further characterize the DNA-binding specificity of HigX, we performed a motif discovery

analysis by utilizing the summits of the 30 significant (top 5%) ChIP-seq peaks in conjunction with

MEME-ChIP. This analysis identified a significantly enriched 19-bp motif (E-value = 1.4×10^{-23})

present in 13 of the 30 submitted sequences, with a strong central enrichment, which indicates that

this motif likely represents the direct binding site of HigX (Fig. 5D). The motif is characterized by an

8-bp imperfect inverted repeat, with the left half spanning positions 4–11 (ATGTTASC) and the

right half spanning positions 12–19 (GSTACCAT), with no intervening spacer and a single

mismatch between the repeat halves.

Thus far, we had only investigated ciprofloxacin sensitivity of the ΔlexA strain and derivatives.

However, the ChIP-Seq analysis suggested that the dysregulation of HigX in the ΔlexA strain,

either at the level of overproduction of the protein or failure to bind the target genes, may also lead

to cell envelope irregularity that could lead to sensitivity to cell envelope-targeting antibiotics. We

therefore tested the ability of the ΔlexA and ΔlexA ΔhigX strains to grow on cephalexin, which

targets septal peptidoglycan synthesis. The ΔlexA strain was sensitized to cephalexin relative to

WT, and cephalexin resistance was restored in the ΔlexA ΔhigX double mutant (Fig. 5E).

Therefore, even though HigX production is under SOS control, its downstream effects in the cell

are more likely to be involved with cell envelope maintenance than with the SOS response.

Suppressor mutations in cell envelope-related genes improve ΔlexA ΔhigBA ciprofloxacin
resistance
To identify possible downstream effectors of HigX responsible for the overexpression phenotype,

we designed parallel forward genetic screening strategies to take advantage of (1) the ΔlexA

ΔhigBA strain's sensitivity to ciprofloxacin and (2) its intolerance of transformation with the

pMT335-higX plasmid (Fig 6A). We constructed a pooled library of random himar1 transposon (Tn)

mutants in the ΔlexA ΔhigBA background in order to select for (1) ciprofloxacin-resistant Tn

mutants and (2) Tn mutants which can be stably transformed with pMT335-higX, using the ΔlexA

ΔhigBA strain in preference to the ΔlexA strain in order to avoid selection of phenotypes due to the

HigB toxin. The first screen was performed by passage of the mutant pool through medium

containing 1 µg/ml ciprofloxacin, followed by selection of ciprofloxacin-resistant single colonies.

The second was performed by preparation of electrocompetent cells from a culture of the pooled

library, electroporation with pMT335-higX and plating on medium containing gentamicin and

vanillate (to select for the plasmid antibiotic resistance marker and to induce higX overexpression,

respectively). Such mutants should have Tn insertions in loci which suppress the HigX-mediated

phenotypes.

From our Tn mutant library of approximately 25'000 clones, we were able to obtain four stable Tn

mutants where we could confirm the desired phenotypes by re-plating on selective media

(ciprofloxacin, or gentamicin + vanillate) followed by backcrossing of the transposon mutations into

Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* cells which had not been through the mutagenesis or selection procedure. All four

suppressor mutations were in or near genes associated with cell envelope-related functions (Fig.

6B). The two Tn mutants obtained from the ciprofloxacin resistance screen both had a Tn insertion

in or near CCNA_03248, encoding an uncharacterized TonB-dependent receptor. One insertion

was found within the coding sequence of CCNA_03248, while the other was in an intergenic region

218 bp upstream of the CCNA_03248 start codon. Notably, the Tn insertion site in the intergenic

region, at 3415650, is only 188 bp away from the peak summit of one of the significant (although

not top 5%) HigX binding sites, at 3415838, suggesting that this gene is a direct HigX target (Fig

6C). The two Tn mutants obtained from the pMT335-*higX* tolerance screen had Tn mutations in

CCNA_00669, encoding a lipopolysaccharide biosynthesis protein, and approximately 100 bp

upstream of the peptidoglycan amidase gene *amiC*. However, the two mutants obtained from the

pMT335-*higX* tolerance screen were also ciprofloxacin-resistant (Fig. 6D), and the mutants

obtained from the ciprofloxacin resistance screen could be transformed with pMT335-*higX*,

demonstrating that even if the genetic screens were not saturated, the selection strategies have

succeeded in isolating suppressor mutants with convergent phenotypes.

Taken together, these data support a model where overproduction of HigX in a Δ*lexA* background,

either from endogenous overproduction in Δ*lexA* strains or *in trans* from pMT335-*higX*, leads to

destabilization of the cell envelope. Since *higX* deletion protected the Δ*lexA* strain against Cipro

and cephalexin sensitivity even though HigX did not bind its target genes properly in the Δ*lexA*

mutant, the phenotype cannot be due to changes in HigX-dependent gene regulation but could be

a property of simply having too much HigX protein in the cell membrane, or having the protein

present but nonfunctional. We infer that our suppressor Tn mutants counteract the destabilizing

effect of HigX on the cell envelope, either directly or indirectly.

higX is widespread among alpha-proteobacteria but synteny with *higBA* is not conserved

To investigate whether this unusual combination of TA system with adjacent but independent

transcription factor was conserved among other bacteria, we evaluated the genomic conservation

of this locus using the FlaGs software (26) with the *Caulobacter crescentus* NA1000 HigX protein

sequence as query and the limit of aligned genomes set to 99, of which 68 were successfully

aligned. We observed that *higX* is not unique to *Caulobacter* species but found in many other

alpha-proteobacteria as well. Within the *Caulobacter* genus, the flanking gene context of *higX* was

well conserved, immediately upstream of the master cell cycle regulator *ctrA*. Moreover, it was co-

conserved with a conserved uncharacterized gene, annotated as a putative hydrolase of the

COG4188 family in all except five of the more distantly related genomes, including in the non-

Caulobacter species which did not have their *higX* orthologue adjacent to *ctrA* (Fig. S2). However,

in the 68 aligned *higX*-proximal regions, only four of the genomes contained probable *higBA*

orthologues upstream of *higX*. Hence, *higX* is much more conserved in its genomic context in

alpha-proteobacteria than *higBA* is (although we do not exclude that the other bacteria may

encode *higBA* at a different site in the genome, since at least in the *Caulobacter* genus it is

conserved between species (27)) and *higX* is almost universally found adjacent to the

uncharacterized hydrolase gene.

While examining the alignments of Fig S2 we noted that the intergenic region between the putative

hydrolase and the *higB* gene appeared consistently larger than the intergenic region between the

putative hydrolase and the *higX* gene (in the majority of genomes which lacked *higBA*), suggesting

that some of the intergenic sequence may be associated exclusively with the *higBA* genes. We

therefore aligned the intergenic regions between the putative hydrolase gene and *hig(BA)X* from a

subset of 15 *Caulobacter* genomes, including NA1000 and the four others which contained *higBA*

upstream of *higX*, and observed a consistent breakpoint in the intergenic region where the

intergenic sequence stopped in the genomes lacking *higBA*, but continued in the genomes which

had *higBA* upstream of *higX*. (Fig. 7A). This breakpoint was at base 3281622 of the *Caulobacter*

crescentus NA1000 genome, relative to the start codons of the putative hydrolase at base 3281744

and *higB* at base 3281524. From this, we inferred that of this intergenic region, the 122 bp adjacent

to the putative hydrolase gene is universal to all the genomes, while the additional 98 bp of

intergenic sequence found only in the genomes of the strains possessing *higBA* is likely to be a

higBA-specific regulatory element. Notably, this additional sequence contained the high-affinity

LexA binding site that is responsible for the LexA-mediated repression of the *higBA* promoter.

Therefore, the LexA-mediated repression of *higX* under normal conditions and the overproduction

of HigX when this repression is released is likely unique to NA1000 and the other *Caulobacter*

crescentus/vibrioides strains which contain *higBA* and its LexA-dependent promoter immediately

upstream of *higX*. In all other *higX*-encoding alphaproteobacteria, we would instead anticipate *higX*

to be expressed in a LexA-independent manner.

In order to investigate whether *higBA* is a recent arrival in a minority of the *Caulobacter* genomes,

or whether it is an ancestral factor that has been lost from the majority of them, we employed

compositional analysis of relative synonymous codon usage (RSCU) and tetranucleotide

frequency. Using multivariate compositional analysis of these two parameters (Supplementary

Dataset S2), we detected a minor atypicality of *higX* in its codon usage (q = 0.0211), but no

significant difference in tetranucleotide composition (q = 0.805) relative to other coding sequences

of the genome. In contrast, *higB* and *higA* displayed significant compositional atypicality in their

RSCU (*higB*: q = 3.83 x 10^{-37}, *higA*: q = 5.25 x 10^{-7}) and tetranucleotide composition (*higB*: q = 9.46

x 10^{-187}, *higA:* q = 4.39 x 10^{-144}), compared to all CDS within the genome. This degree of deviation

from the rest of the genome is potentially indicative of horizontal gene transfer or, at the least,

evidence for a recent arrival (Fig. 7B+C). The small deviation in codon usage for *higX* is likely

biologically negligible, with an effect size of 1.08 (i.e., 8% above the 95% cutoff; Figure S3A). By

comparison, *higB* and *higA* exhibited larger effect sizes (RSCU: 2.34 and 1.39; tetranucleotide:

2.66 and 2.43; Figure S3A). Thus, *higBA* appear to be compositionally highly atypical, whereas

higX is compositionally typical relative to the rest of the genome. We conclude from this that the

presence of *higBA* at this locus is most likely due to an insertion event into a recent ancestor of the

NA1000 lab strain of *Caulobacter* and a few closely related species, while the presence of *higX*

alone at this locus is the "ancestral" state.

higX is ancestral but *higBA* is of likely foreign origin

To support the compositional bias analysis, we investigated if the compositional typicality of *higX*

and atypicality of *higBA* was reflected in their encoded proteins' phylogeny, as an indication of their

most likely origin. The 16S rRNA phylogenetic tree showed that all genera cluster into separate

clades, with the only exception being *Asticcacaulis excentricus* CB 48, whose placement is within

the *Brevundimonas* clade (Fig. S3B). Regarding the presence/absence heatmap, as expected,

HigX was found to be the most prevalent protein across the order, with 13 organisms containing it

in different combinations and 9 containing it as the sole protein. Interestingly, the prevalence of all

3 proteins was not limited to members of the *Caulobacter* genus. In fact, one member of

Brevundimonas contained all three proteins. However, it is important to note that this heatmap

does not account for the synteny of the genes encoding the proteins. Thus, it is possible that even

if an organism contains all three proteins, they are not within the same gene cluster or operon.

higBA could likely be positioned away from *higX* somewhere else on the genome.

The protein phylogenetic trees to be compared against the 16S rRNA phylogenetic tree were

generated by utilizing BLASTx with *higB, higA* or *higX* as queries. Hits (n =100) were filtered and

used for creating a presence/absence heatmap of each gene per organism and in different

combination classes (Fig S4). Occurrence of all three proteins was limited to members of the

Caulobacter genus (n = 5), closely matching results of the heatmap from the 16S rRNA

phylogenetic tree (Figure S3B). HigB and HigA co-occurring in the absence of HigX were only

found in one species out of the 100 used and the co-occurrence of HigA and HigX was limited to

the *Caulobacter* genus (n = 7). Interestingly, in the remaining combination classes, a stark contrast

was observed. The class for HigB as the sole protein (n = 41) contained no organisms within the

Caulobacterales order (Fig S4, S5). In fact, twelve of these were members of the *Enterobacter*

genus, which is part of Gammaproteobacteria, showing a significant discrepancy with the 16S

rRNA phylogenetic tree. A similar pattern was observed for the HigA-only class (n = 59), whose

members consisted of organisms outside Caulobacterales (Figure S4, S6). By comparison, the

HigX-only class (n = 56) displayed a phylogeny similar to the 16S rRNA phylogenetic tree, with

only two organisms coming from outside the Caulobacterales order (Figure S4, S7). Overall, the

results from the phylogenetic analysis strongly indicate that *higX* is both ancestral to and

phylogenetically consistent with the Caulobacterales lineage, whereas the phylogenies of *higB* and

higA are indicative of a foreign genetic origin, possibly enterobacterial in the case of *higB*.

Discussion
In this study, we identify HigX as the factor responsible for the unexpected and HigB-independent

ciprofloxacin sensitivity of the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* mutant. Although HigX appeared at first to be a third

component of the HigBA TA system, due to its close genetic proximity, annotation as transcription

factor and ability to weakly regulate the *higBAX* promoter, we found that it does not exert its effect

through the TA system. Instead, it acts independently at the level of the cell envelope where it is

physically located and for which it regulates some of the genes. Δ*lexA* mutant strains produce

higher levels of HigX due to the placement of the *higX* gene directly downstream of the strong

LexA-dependent promoter of *higBA* and the lack of LexA to repress it, but this is not reflected in

increased binding of HigX to its target promoters. HigX is incorporated into the cell membrane

through its N-terminal domain, and high levels of HigX sensitize Δ*lexA* cells, but not WT cells, to

ciprofloxacin and cephalexin. Forward genetic screening showed that toxicity of excessive HigX

production can be suppressed by cell envelope-related mutations, including of at least one HigX

target gene.

Our compositional bias and phylogenetic analysis of *higBAX* revealed that higX appears to be

ancestral and phylogenetically conserved with a strong match to the 16S rRNA phylogeny of

Caulobacter. In contrast, *higB* and *higA* were found to be atypical in both the compositional

parameters (RSCU and tetranucleotide) and their phylogeny, suggesting a foreign nature.

Unexpectedly, the phylogeny of HigB was very different compared to HigA. The genus

Enterobacter was prevalent in the HigB tree (n=13), thus indicating this genus as the most likely

origin of *higB.* However, the potential origin of *higA* is less clear, as its prevalence is less clustered

to a single genus like *higB* and it did not display the same bias towards enterobacterial

orthologues. Instead, its occurrence is highest among *Stenotrophomonas* (n=10), *Bradyrhizobium*

(n=7), and *Xanthomonas* (n=5). Therefore, the potential source of *higA* acquisition can be reduced

to these three genera, with *Stenotrophomonas* being the most likely candidate. Taken together,

these results reveal that the toxin and antitoxin are of different evolutionary lineages and were

most likely acquired separately, rather than together, as previously documented (reviewed in (9,

28)).

Our initial observation that led us to investigate *higX* was the ciprofloxacin sensitivity phenotype of

the Δ*lexA* mutant. This had initially seemed counter-intuitive, given that this strain has the SOS

response constitutively activated in defence against DNA damaging drugs. However, part of the

SOS response in *Caulobacter* is to inhibit cell division through the divisome inhibitor protein SidA

(29) leading to the production of highly filamentous cells. *Caulobacter crescentus* is very sensitive

to cell envelope stress relative to other Gram-negative bacteria (30) and it could be that extreme

cell elongation weakens the integrity of the cell envelope, providing easier access to the cytoplasm

for antibiotics and accounting for the ciprofloxacin sensitivity. Excessive incorporation of cell

envelope proteins into the membrane and periplasm has been shown to cause cell envelope stress

in elongated cells where the filamentation was caused by different factors than the SOS response

(20), showing that LexA is not required for this effect. We propose that cell elongation-dependent

weakening of the envelope could be the reason why HigX overexpression is toxic to Δ*lexA* cells,

while WT cells are unaffected.

It was striking that global DNA binding of HigX was decreased in the Δ*lexA* cells even though they

produced more HigX protein than WT cells did. We find it unlikely that the reduced DNA binding of

HigX in the ΔlexA mutant is due to a global dependence on LexA for HigX binding, because in

comparing our regulon of HigX to the previously established ChIP-Seq regulon of LexA (15) we

found only 13 shared peaks, none of which were in our top 5% 30 HigX peaks. This suggests that

access of HigX to its target promoters is the major limiting factor in the ΔlexA strain. Restriction of

the protein to the inner face of the membrane would not limit nucleoid access in WT cells, because

the chromosomal DNA in Caulobacter does not condense but fills the whole cell during the normal

replication cycle (31). However, in filamentous cells, the DNA content is variable and depends on

whether chromosome replication has arrested or continued (32). If replication continues, the DNA

can continue to fill the cell volume, at least up to a point (33), but if it is inhibited then the

filamentous cell will have one or two nucleoids surrounded by DNA-free regions (34, 35). The

nucleoid arrangement in Caulobacter cells lacking LexA has not been imaged directly. However,

the DNA content of ΔlexA cells as measured by FACS is characteristic of replication arrest with

one or two chromosomes without over-replication (15), similar to cells with the SOS response

induced by mitomycin C (32). This would be insufficient, in most cases, to fill up the entire

cytoplasm of the highly filamentous ΔlexA cells. Therefore, even if more HigX is produced in ΔlexA

cells, some of the available membrane surface into which it can be inserted could be away from

the nucleoid, sequestering the protein away from the DNA and explaining the globally reduced

binding that we observe. Removal of HigX from its membrane localization does not improve DNA

access, since in our experiments with the truncated HigX lacking the four TM helices, we saw

neither gene regulation activity nor GFP fluorescence suggesting that the TM helix bundle is

required for the protein's stability. Together, these data support a model where correct HigX

regulatory activity can only happen with membrane-localised WT protein in normal shaped cells,

while activity is lost in elongated cells or if the HigX TM domain is missing (Fig 8). It will be

interesting to investigate whether HigX-dependent gene regulation is affected in cells that are

filamentous for other reasons (independent of LexA) in order to test this hypothesis, as this would

be more representative of HigX-dependent gene regulation in species that do not have the higBA

TA system genes and their LexA box immediately upstream.

Analysis of the regulon of HigX suggests that its cell membrane localisation may be linked to its

regulation of processes that happen there. Indeed, the highest peak that we observed was

associated with a periplasmic multidrug efflux lipoprotein precursor gene (CCNA_03218) (Fig 5B),

similar to the AcrA component of AcrAB-NodT family multidrug efflux pumps. The COG analysis of

the 5% top peaks had a noticeable representation of genes associated with transport of

carbohydrates, transport of inorganic ions, energy production/conversion and cell envelope or

membrane biogenesis (Fig 5C). We have not yet observed any phenotype linked to loss of HigX in

WT cells grown under lab conditions. However, its role may be more important for envelope

maintenance under stress conditions. The high level of evolutionary conservation of HigX across

the Caulobacterales order suggests that its presence is generally beneficial, even if currently

mysterious.

HigX's transmembrane conformation is unusual for a LytTR family protein. The majority of these

transcription factors are cytoplasmic and regulate extracellular processes such as competence,

alginate production, expression of virulence factors and bacteriocins (23). However, little is known

about how they are regulated themselves. In the original bioinformatic study which characterized

the LytTR transcription factors, it was noted that all of the instances of this domain discovered in

alpha-proteobacteria were probable membrane proteins (23), but without apparent periplasmic

domains that could allow them to function as extracellular sensors in the same way as the

membrane-bound transcription factors of *Vibrio cholerae* (36). Instead, their domain structure is

more similar to the enterococcal bacitracin-sensing response regulator BcrR, which is permanently

anchored to the inner membrane by a 4 helix transmembrane domain that senses bacitracin

directly and stimulates transcription of target genes by the DNA-binding domain (37). More recent

studies have identified a LytTR sub-family where the transcription factor is negatively regulated by

a separate membrane protein, designated "LytTR regulatory systems" (LRS). First identified in

Streptococcus mutans (38, 39), LRS are particularly abundant in the Firmicutes but also found in

some actinobacteria and a few gamma-, beta- and epsilon-proteobacteria (40). In LRS the LytTR

protein is consistently encoded upstream of the membrane protein, which usually consists of three

or four transmembrane alpha-helices and no apparent periplasmic domain, and the membrane

protein negatively regulates the transcription factor through membrane sequestration preventing it

from activating its target genes (41). The similarity of the topology of LRS membrane proteins to

the N-terminus of HigX (and the other Caulobacter LytTR proteins) is suggestive of the alpha-

proteobacteria having developed a new family of "fused LRS" where the transmembrane domain

and the DNA binding domain are in the same protein. However, the regulatory influence of the

transmembrane domain on the DNA binding domain would have to be positive rather than

negative, since we observe that full length HigX can carry out promoter regulation while the HigX

DNA binding domain without the transmembrane domain cannot (Fig. 3D), similarly to BcrR where

the DNA binding domain has no affinity for DNA without the transmembrane domain (37). A recent

computational study has revealed that transmembrane transcription factors are widely prevalent

throughout bacterial and archaeal taxonomic groups and may use the biophysical state of the

membrane as a signaling input to regulate gene expression (42), which could explain the

dependence that we see on the presence of the transmembrane domain for HigX.

In summary, we have uncovered a role for the first of this class of transmembrane transcription

factors from the alpha-proteobacteria to be characterized, and shown that cell filamentation

through loss of *lexA* negatively affects the ability of HigX to bind its target genes. In addition to

identifying a new type of cell envelope regulatory factor in *Caulobacter*, our findings also indicate

that TA system incorporation into a bacterial genome can cause alternative downstream

phenotypes that do not depend on the function of the TA system itself, but on the regulatory

element(s) that it brings along and the genomic context into which it arrives.

Methods

General growth conditions

Caulobacter crescentus strains were routinely grown in peptone-yeast extract (PYE) medium at

30°C and *E. coli* strains in LB at 37°C. Antibiotics were used at the following concentrations;

tetracycline at 1 µg/ml for *Caulobacter* and 10 µg/ml for *E. coli*, gentamicin at 1 µg/ml

for *Caulobacter* and 10 µg/ml for *E. coli*, nalidixic acid at 20 µg/ml for *Caulobacter* and kanamycin

at 20 µg/ml (solid media) or 5 µg/ml (liquid media) for *Caulobacter* and 20 µg/ml for *E.*

coli. Ciprofloxacin was prepared as 20 mg/ml stock solution in 0.1 M HCl and in all experiments

involving ciprofloxacin, an equivalent volume of 0.1 M HCl was added to the control cultures or

plates. Vanillate stock solution was prepared at 50 mM stock solution (adjusted to pH 8.0 with

NaOH) and used at 50 or 100 µM as indicated in the figure legends.

Strain and plasmid construction

DNA fragments for cloning were PCR-amplified with Phusion DNA polymerase (Thermo Fisher

Scientific) from stationary phase cultures of wild type (WT) *Caulobacter crescentus*, using PCR

primers listed in Supplementary Table S2. Products were purified by agarose gel electrophoresis.

Cloning of the correct region was confirmed by sequencing and plasmid stocks were maintained

in *E. coli* EC100 or TOP10. Plasmids used in this work are listed in Supplementary Table

S3. Replicating plasmids (pMT335 (43), pJC327 (44) and plac290 derivatives) were transferred

into *Caulobacter* strains by electroporation while suicide plasmids for generation of deletion

mutants (pNPTS138 derivatives) and transposon mutants (pHPV414 (45)) were transferred by

conjugation from *E. coli* S17-1 *λpir* (46). After integration of suicide vectors by recombination

through one of the homologous flanking regions, secondary recombination events were induced by

counterselection on PYE agar containing 3% sucrose and mutants carrying resulting in-frame

deletions were screened for by PCR. Double mutants were made by introducing

the Δ*higX* or Δ*higBAX* alleles into the Δ*lexA* mutant strain. Generalised transductions with

bacteriophage ΦCr30 were performed as previously described (47). *C. crescentus* strain numbers

and genotypes are listed in Supplementary Table S4. pET28a derivatives containing WT or truncated HigX fused to an N-terminal His-tag were expressed in *E. coli* Rosetta(DE3) (Novagen).

Efficiency of plating assays

Resistance to cephalexin and ciprofloxacin was assessed by dilution spot plating. Cultures of strains to be tested were grown overnight to stationary phase, then inoculated into new medium to grow to mid-exponential phase. Culture density was measured, normalised to the OD600 of the least dense culture (OD600=0.5 or less), serially diluted in PYE to 10^{-6} and 5 µl spotted onto plates containing PYE medium with sub-inhibitory concentrations of cephalexin (5 µg/ml) or ciprofloxacin (1 µg/ml). For *higX* overexpression experiments, the plates additionally contained gentamicin in order to maintain selection on the plasmid, and all plates contained vanillate (50 µM) to induce overexpression of *higX*. Plates were imaged after 3 days growth at 30°C. Images are representative of at least three independent biological replicates.

Beta-galactosidase assays

β-galactosidase assays were performed on strains carrying low copy plasmid-borne transcriptional or translational fusions of the promoters of interest to l*acZ*. Cultures were grown to early exponential phase (OD_{600} = 0.1 – 0.4) with exposure to ciprofloxacin or vanillate as described in the main text or figure legends, followed by β-galactosidase assays using the method of Miller (35) on three independent biological replicates.

RNA extraction and quantitative RT-PCR

RNA was extracted from 4 ml mid-exponential phase cultures which were treated with 2500 U Ready-Lyse (Bionordika) and homogenized using QiaShredder columns, prior to RNA extraction with the RNEasy Mini Kit (Qiagen) according to the manufacturers' instructions, including on-column DNase digestion. RNA quality was assessed by agarose gel electrophoresis and concentration was measured in a Nanodrop spectrophotometer. cDNA was prepared using the SuperScript IV Reverse Transcriptase Kit (Thermo Fisher) according to the manufacturers' instructions, on 400 ng RNA template using random hexamer primers. Quantitative RT-PCR was performed in technical and biological triplicates on a 96-well LightCycler real-time PCR system

587   (Roche) using SYBR Green (Roche). The *higB* transcript was amplified with

588   primers higB_qrt_fwd and higB_qrt_rev, the *higX* transcript was amplified with primers

589   CC_3036_qrt_fwd and CC_3036_qrt_rev, and the reference gene *rpoD* was amplified with

590   primers rpoDfow and rpoDrev. Quantification was by the standard curve method

591   and *higB* and *higX* transcript levels were normalized to *rpoD*.

Western blot and anti-HigX antibody

Custom polyclonal antibody to HigX for western blotting and ChIP-Seq was developed by Nordic

Biosite. Rabbits were immunized with the synthetic peptide (C-)LRMEDHYVRIRTEHGSRLE

corresponding to amino acids 178 to 196 of the HigX protein with cysteine conjugated at the N-

terminus. Antiserum was extracted from the rabbits and affinity purified on a Sepharose column

containing the immobilized synthetic peptide to obtain purified polyclonal antibody. Cell extracts for

western blotting were prepared by growing *Caulobacter* cultures in PYE (containing 50 µM

vanillate for strains containing pMT335 derivatives), or *E. coli* Rosetta(DE3) cultures in LB with 0.1

mM IPTG, to mid-exponential phase, normalizing to OD600 = 0.5, centrifuging and resuspending in

100 µl SDS-PAGE loading buffer. Extracts were run on a 16% SDS-PAGE gel alongside

PageRuler prestained markers (Thermo Fisher). Proteins were transferred to PVDF membranes

and blocked by incubation in TBS containing 5% dried skim milk. HigX protein was detected by

incubation with primary antibody diluted 1/5000 in TBS with 2% skim milk at 4°C overnight,

secondary antibody diluted 1/4000 in TBS with 2% skim milk at 4°C for one hour, and HRP

substrate at room temperature for one minute. Between incubations, membranes were washed 2 x

5 minutes then 1 x 15 minutes in TBS.

Microscopy

Cultures for imaging were grown to mid-exponential phase with 50 µM vanillate to induce HigX-

GFP expression and immobilized on 1% agarose (in water) microscope slides. Phase-contrast and

GFP fluorescence images were obtained with an inverted Olympus IX83 microscope equipped with

a 100x/1.46 oil objective and a Photometrics Prime scientific complementary metal-oxide-

semiconductor (sCOMS) camera. GFP images were taken before phase-contrast images to

minimize bleaching. Images are representative of three independent biological replicates.

Quantitative mass spectrometry

Cultures for mass spectrometry were grown to mid-exponential phase, harvested by centrifugation

and cell pellets were immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen. Cells were sonicated in ice-cold 100 mM

Na_2CO_3 containing cOmplete protease inhibitor and PhosSTOP phosphatase inhibitor (Sigma) for

2x20 sec at 60% amplitude on ice using a probe sonicator. After sonication the samples were

incubated at 4 °C for 1h with rotation. After incubation, the samples were ultracentrifuged at

100.000g for 90 min using a Hitachi Micro ultracentrifuge (CS 150 NX). After ultracentrifugation,

the supernatants (soluble protein fraction) were transferred to another tube and the membrane

pellets were gently washed with 100μL 50 mM TEAB, pH 8.5. The membrane pellets were

resolubilized in 5% sodium deoxycholate (SDC) in 50 mM HEPES buffer, pH 8.5, by probe

sonication (1x20 sec at 20% amplitude). After sonication, the samples were centrifuged at 20.000g

for 10 min, the supernatants were transferred to new tubes and the protein concentrations were

measured by Nanodrop (Implen Nanophotometer N60). The membrane protein samples were

reduced and alkylated using 5 mM DTT for 30 min and 10 mM iodoacetamide for 30 min,

respectively. After alkylation, trypsin was added (5%) and the samples were incubated at 37 °C

over-night. After incubation, additional trypsin (1%) was added and incubated at 37 °C for 1 hour.

A total of 25 μg of peptides from all conditions were labeled with Tandem Mass Tag (TMT) pro 18

plex (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to the manufacturer's protocol. The TMT labeling was

performed as following: NA1000 (TMT 126, 127N and 127C); Δ*higBA* (TMT 128N, 128C and

129N); Δ*higX* (TMT 129C, 130N and 130C); Δ*lexA* (TMT 131N, 131C and 132N); Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA*

(TMT 132C, 133N and 133C). After labeling, all samples were combined into one sample and the

SDC was precipitated by adding formic acid to 2% followed by centrifugation at 20.000g for 20 min.

The supernatant was transferred to a new Eppendorf tube and dried by vacuum centrifugation. The

dried TMT labeled peptides were desalted using Poros Oligo R3 Reversed Phase (RP) material

and subsequently fractionated using high pH RP fractionation into 12 concatenated fractions as

described previously (PMID: 35240313). Each fraction was dried and resolubilized in 10 μL 0.1%

formic acid prior to liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS).

An aliquot of each peptide fraction was loaded onto a 20 cm analytical column (100 μm inner

diameter) packed with ReproSil – Pur C18 AQ 1.9 μm RP material using an EASY nanoLC system

coupled to an Orbitrap Eclipse Tribrid (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The peptides were eluted with an

organic solvent gradient from 100% phase A (0.1% FA) to 22% phase B (95% ACN, 0.1% FA) for

100 min, then from 22% B to 40% B for 20 min before the column was washed with 95% B. The

flow rate was set to 300 nL/min during elution. The automatic gain control target value was 1.5×10^6

ions in MS and a maximum fill time of 50 ms was used. Each MS scan was acquired at high-

resolution (120,000 full width half maximum (FWHM) at m/z 200) in the Orbitrap with a mass range

of 350-1500 Da. The instrument was set to select as many precursor ions as possible in 3 sec

between the MS scans. Peptide ions were selected from the MS for higher energy collision-

induced dissociation (HCD) fragmentation (collision energy: 34%). Fragment ions were detected in

the orbitrap at high resolution (50,000 FWHM) for a target value of $1,5 \times 10^5$ ions and a maximum

injection time of 150 ms using an isolation window of 0.7 Da and a dynamic exclusion of 20 sec. All

raw data were viewed in Xcalibur v3.0 (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

All LC-MS/MS raw data files were searched in Proteome Discoverer (PD) version 2.5.0.400

(Thermo Fisher Scientific) using the SEQUEST HT search algorithm against the *Caulobacter*

crescentus (strain NA1000 / CB15N) OX=565050 protein FASTA database. The searches had the

following criteria: enzyme, trypsin; maximum missed cleavages, 2; fixed modifications, TMTpro (N-

terminal), TMTpro (K) and Carbamidomethyl (C).

The TMTpro reporter ion signals were quantified using S/N and they were normalized to the total

peptide S/N in the PD program. The in-built ANOVA test in PD was used to generate p-values for all

the proteins identified in the database searches with 1% FDR.

ChIP-Seq sample preparation and sequencing

Chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) was performed essentially as described in Fumeaux et al (48) with the following modifications. Cultures were grown to mid-exponential phase in 80 ml PYE before formaldehyde crosslinking. Sonication was carried out in a Covaris ultrasonicator with the following settings: temperature 6°C, duration 3600 seconds, peak power 75.0, duty % factor 10.0, cycles per burst 200, average power 7.5, delay 60 seconds. All of the cleared sonicated lysate was used for ChIP without taking an input sample out first. HigX-bound DNA was recovered by immunoprecipitating with 20 µg purified anti-HigX antibody per sample, divided between two Eppendorf tubes. After immune complex recovery, reversal of crosslinks and protease treatment, DNA was recovered in 50 µl MilliQ water per Eppendorf and pooled into 100 µl, of which 40 µl was used for sequencing. DNA was prepared for Illumina sequencing using the NEBNext UltraExpress DNA library preparation kit (New England Biolabs) according to the manufacturer's instructions and 50 bp paired-end sequencing was carried out on a NovaSeq 6000 (Illumina). Details of the sequence processing, alignment, quantification and data analysis are in the Supplementary methods.

Transposon mutagenesis, forward genetic screening and insertion mapping

A pooled library of transposon mutants was constructed in the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* background by performing five independent conjugations of the transposon carrier plasmid pHPV414 from *E. coli* S17-1 *λpir* into the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* recipient strain. Transconjugant colonies were selected on PYE plates with nalidixic acid and kanamycin after three days incubation at 30°C. Colony counting indicated that the library consisted of > 25'000 independent clones. Colonies were pooled in PYE and stored in aliquots at -80°C in 10% DMSO.

The ciprofloxacin resistance screen was performed by growing the pooled library to stationary phase and diluting it into medium containing 1 µg/ml ciprofloxacin and 20 ug/ml kanamycin, followed by plating on PYE plates containing 1ug/ml ciprofloxacin and 20 ug/ml kanamycin, and incubation at 30°C for five days. 40 colonies were re-streaked on PYE plates containing 1 µg/ml ciprofloxacin and 20 ug/ml kanamycin followed by incubation for 4 days to confirm growth.

The HigX overexpression tolerance screen was performed by growing the pooled library to

stationary phase, preparing electrocompetent cells and electroporating with pMT335-*higX*.

Plasmid-tolerating colonies were selected by plating electroporated cells on PYE plates containing

gentamicin and 50 μM vanillate. Colonies were re-streaked to new gentamicin/vanillate plates to

confirm stability of the phenotype.

Transposon insertion sites were mapped by plasmid rescue. Genomic DNA was extracted from the

ciprofloxacin-resistant or HigX-tolerant transposon mutants, partially digested with *Sau*IIIA and

ligated. Ligations were used to transform *E. coli* EC100D, in which the transposon can be

maintained as a replicating plasmid, and selected for kanamycin resistance. Plasmids were

extracted and sequenced with the transposon-specific himup2 primer across the junction between

the transposon insertion site and the flanking genomic DNA. To confirm specificity of the

transposon insertions for the observed phenotypes, the transposon insertions were back-crossed

into the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* strain by bacteriophage ΦCr30-mediated generalized transduction. The

resulting strains were tested for both ciprofloxacin resistance and tolerance of electroporation with

pMT335-*higX*.

Sequence alignment and analysis
The genomic context conservation of HigX orthologues was investigated with FlaGs (26).

Transmembrane segment prediction was performed with the DAS TM prediction program (49) and

the structure was modelled in Alphafold using default parameters (50). Multiple sequence

alignment of the region spanning *CCNA_03134* to *ctrA* was performed with MAFFT (51) (default

parameters) and visualized with Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis version 11 (52) (MEGA

version 11.0.13). Details of compositional bias analysis, comparative genomics and phylogenetic

analysis of proteins and 16S RNA sequences are in the Supplementary Methods.

Statistical analysis
All numerical data are reported as mean of all biological replicates performed and error bars

indicate the standard deviation. Statistical significance was analysed by non-paired equal

variance 2-tailed Student's T test for simple pairwise comparisons between strains or treatment

conditions and by a Dunnett's test in R (version 4.2.2) for multiple comparisons. Dunnett's test in R

was carried out by setting the wild-type strain (NA1000) as a reference and comparing all other

strains against it. * signifies $p < 0.05$, ** signifies $p < 0.01$ and *** signifies $p < 0.001$ throughout.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a grant from Independent Research Fund Denmark and start-up

funding from the University of Southern Denmark, both to CLK. We are grateful to Asmus Cosmos

Skovgaard for technical assistance. We thank Bert Ely, Gemma Atkinson, Nathan Fraikin and

Ditlev Brodersen for helpful discussions and Vishnu Narayanan Madhavan for critical reading of

the manuscript. Sequencing of DNA for ChIP-Seq was carried out at the Center for Functional

Genomics and Tissue Plasticity, Functional Genomics & Metabolism Research Unit, University of

Southern Denmark. The authors thank Ronni Nielsen for sequencing assistance.

Author contributions

732   CLK conceptualized and designed the study. KAB, NVH, KG, SN, LHH, LAJ, MRL and CLK

733   performed experiments. MRL analysed the quantitative proteomics data. NVH and CLK analysed

734   ChIP-Seq data and performed statistical analysis. KAB, KG, NVH, MRL and CLK wrote the paper.

Competing interests

737   The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

Data availability

The Fastq files containing the raw data from the ChIP-Seq experiments in WT and Δ*lexA* for HigX

genome binding have been deposited in GEO under the accession number GSE310922. All other

data is available within the paper or in its Supporting Information.

Figure legends

Figure 1. The higBA toxin-antitoxin system has a transcription factor closely associated
with it.

(A) Operon structure of *higBA* and location of the downstream gene *CCNA_03131* (*higX*). The

promoter upstream of *higBA* is negatively regulated by LexA and HigA. The *higB* and *higA* genes

are translationally coupled, with 7 bp overlap between the stop codon of *higB* and the start codon

of *higA*, while the *higX* start codon is 42 bp downstream of the *higA* stop codon. (B) Efficiency of

plating assay of WT *Caulobacter* (NA1000) and mutant strains lacking combinations of *lexA*, *higB*,

higA and/or *higX*, on 0.5 μg/ml ciprofloxacin or vehicle control. Images are representative of three

independent biological replicates. (C) Quantitative RT-PCR of mRNA levels of *higB* and *higX*,

normalized to the control transcript *rpoD*. Data was obtained from three independent biological

replicates.

Figure 2. Translational reporter constructs show that higB, higA and higX are
independently regulated.

(A) Construction of the transcriptional (red) or translational (green) reporter fusions to lacZ from

regions of the *higBAX* genomic locus. The transcription start sites in this region previously detected

by global mapping (25) are shown as red arrows. (B-C) Transcriptional beta-galactosidase reporter

assays in WT and mutant strains lacking combinations of *lexA*, *higB*, *higA* and/or *higX* (B) and WT,

Δ*lexA* and Δ*higBA* strains containing the empty vector pMT335 or the *higX* overexpression plasmid

pMT335-*higX*. Overexpression of *higX* was induced by 50 μM vanillate (C). (D-E) Translational

beta-galactosidase reporter assays in WT and mutant strains lacking combinations of *lexA*, *higB*,

higA and/or *higX* for a *lacZ* in-frame fusion to the *higB* upstream region and first ten codons of

HigB (D), and a *lacZ* in-frame fusion to the *higX* upstream region and first four codons of HigX (E).

A promoterless negative control of the translational fusion construct was tested in WT and had

undetectable beta-galactosidase activity (zero to two Miller units).

Figure 3. The N-terminal region of HigX localizes it to the cell periphery and is required for higBA promoter regulatory activity.

(A) Predicted domain structure (from Uniprot) of HigX with transmembrane helices (TM1-4) indicated in blue, low-complexity region (LCR) in green and the LytTR DNA-binding domain in orange. The black pin indicates where in the *higX*-noTM construct, amino acid Val133 was converted to a new Met start codon to create a truncated version consisting of the DNA binding domain without any transmembrane helices. (B) Western blots of cell extracts of *Caulobacter* cells expressing *higX* or *higX*-noTM in pMT335 with 50 µM vanillate induction (left) or E. coli Rosetta expressing His6-HigX in pET28a with 0.1 mM IPTG induction (right), with the anti-HigX polyclonal antibody. Solid arrows indicate the size of full-length HigX (28.2 kDa) and the dotted arrow indicates the size of HigX-noTM (14.6 kDa). (C) Phase-contrast and fluorescence microscopy of WT and Δ*lexA* Δ*higX* expressing a HigX-GFP translational fusion from the vanillate-inducible promoter. Scale bars indicate 2 µm. No GFP fluorescence was observed for cells carrying the pMT335 empty vector. (D) Beta-galactosidase assay of the transcriptional P$_{higBAX}$-lacZ reporter in WT and Δ*higBA* strains containing the empty vector pMT335, the full length *higX* overexpression plasmid pMT335-*higX* or the truncated *higX* overexpression plasmid pMT335-*higX*-noTM. No statistically significant difference was observed between the empty vector control and the *higX*-noTM overexpression plasmid. (E) Relative abundances of HigX peptides in Δ*higBA*, Δ*higX*, Δ*lexA* and Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* membrane-enriched cell extracts detected by mass spectrometry and normalized to WT. Values are the averages of three independent biological replicates. Peptide abundance values (averages), CV% values (% coefficient of variation) and p values are in Supplementary Table S1. Note that non-zero values for HigX peptides in the Δ*higX* strain are likely derived from the vestiges of the start and end of the *higX* coding region that remain in place after the in-frame deletion, and/or low-frequency detection of peptides derived from other proteins that coincidentally have the same mass/charge ratio as HigX-derived peptides.

Figure 4. Overexpression of higX in trans causes ciprofloxacin sensitivity independently of
the higBA toxin-antitoxin system.
(A) Efficiency of plating assay of WT, ΔlexA and ΔlexA ΔhigB containing empty vector pMT335 or

the *higX* overexpression plasmid pMT335-*higX*. All plates contained gentamicin and 50 μM

vanillate in addition to ciprofloxacin (0.5 μg/ml) or vehicle control. (B) Efficiency of plating assay of

WT, ΔlexA and ΔlexA ΔhigX on ciprofloxacin (0.5 μg/ml) or vehicle control. Images are

representative of three independent biological replicates.

Figure 5. Genome-wide analysis of HigX DNA-binding and functional enrichment.
(A) ChIP-seq profiles of HigX in *Caulobacter* NA1000 wild-type (WT, blue) and ΔlexA (yellow)

strains, with the data plotted as reads per million (RPM) across the genome. (B) Zoom-in of the

highest peak in the dataset located between *CCNA_03217* and *CCNA_03218*, with a gene track

displaying the transcriptional orientation. The peak region is highlighted in red, and the summit

position is indicated by a red dashed line. (C) COG analysis of significant ChIP-seq peaks in the

WT strain. Blue bars represent all significant peaks identified by MACS2, while red bars indicate

peaks filtered by a signal value threshold (≥ 3.22). Two categories were omitted: "Function

unknown (S)" with 66 (blue) and 3 (red) counts, and "Unassigned (no COG)" with 177 (blue) and 9

(red) counts. (D) Sequence logo of the HigX binding motif identified through MEME-ChIP from the

peak summit regions of the filtered peaks from the WT (signal value ≥ 3.22). The motif consists of

an imperfect inverted repeat of 8-bp with no intervening spacer. The left half of repeat is located at

positions 4–11 (ATGTTASC) and the right half at positions 12–19 (GSTACCAT) with a single

mismatch between the repeat halves. (E) Efficiency of plating assay of WT, ΔlexA and ΔlexA

Δ*higX* on cephalexin (5 μg/ml) or vehicle control. Images are representative of three independent

biological replicates.

Figure 6. Forward genetic screening for suppressors of ΔlexA ΔhigBA ciprofloxacin
sensitivity reveals cell envelope-related genes.
(A) Schematic of the forward genetic screening protocol in the Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* strain for

ciprofloxacin resistance (left) and pMT335-*higX* transformation tolerance (right). (B) Location of the

transposon insertions in the four verified suppressor mutants. The insertion sites at the

CCNA_03248 locus are at 3415650 (upstream) and 3417411 (inside CDS), the insertion site in the

CCNA_00669 gene is at 727111 and the insertion site upstream of the *amiC* gene is at 2097088.

(C) Zoom-in of the ChIP-Seq profiles of WT (blue) and Δ*lexA* (yellow) at the CCNA_03248 locus.

(D) Efficiency of plating assay of WT, Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* and Δ*lexA* Δ*higBA* transduced with three of

the suppressor transposon mutations, on ciprofloxacin (0.5 μg/ml) or vehicle control. Images are

representative of three independent biological replicates.

Figure 7. HigX is broadly conserved in its genomic context while higBA is restricted to the
Caulobacter crescentus/vibrioides lineage.
(A) Alignment of the intergenic region upstream of *hig(BA)X* containing the breakpoint between

+*higBA* and -*higBA* strains. The DNA sequence shown corresponds to bases 3281574 to 3281632

of the NA1000 genome sequence. The LexA binding motif is shown in yellow. (B) Multivariate

compositional analysis of relative synonymous codon usage (RSCU) across all coding sequences

in *Caulobacter* NA1000 with individual CDSs represented as grey points and the 95 % confidence

intervals around the genomic centroid indicated as a dashed ellipse. The three genes of interest

are indicated as *higB* (orange), *higA* (blue) and *higX* (green). Below the PCA plot, density plots

display the genome-wide distributions of Mahalanobis distance (MD^2) under both standard two-

dimensional (PC1–PC2) and robust minimum covariance determinant (MCD) models (k = 35).

Empirical FDR < 0.05 cutoffs (Benjamini–Hochberg), are shown as black dotted lines and the MD^2

values for *higB*, *higA* and *higX* are indicated in their respective colors. (C) Multivariate

compositional analysis of tetranucleotide frequencies using the same approach as in (B). The

tetranucleotide frequency composition of each gene was normalized and projected into principal

component space, with the 95% confidence intervals around the genomic centroid indicated as a

dashed ellipse. Once again, *higB*, *higA*, and *higX* are shown in their respective colors, and the

density plots display the corresponding MD^2 distributions for both two-dimensional and robust MCD

models (*k* = 160) with FDR-based significance thresholds.

Figure 8. Model for the cell-shape dependent regulatory activity of HigX in Caulobacter.

HigX promoter binding is active in WT cells with native HigX protein, but not in filamentous Δ*lexA*

cells or WT shaped cells expressing HigX without its N-terminal transmembrane (TM) domain

which is likely unstable or inactive. The nucleoid is represented in blue and HigX in orange.

Resistance to ciprofloxacin and cephalexin is correlated with loss of HigX itself rather than loss of

HigX DNA-binding activity (? indicates that this has not been tested for HigX-noTM).

Supplementary Figure legends

Figure S1. Structure prediction of HigX as a transmembrane LytTR-family transcription
factor.

(A) Prediction of the transmembrane helix locations by DAS. (B) Model structure prediction of HigX

by Alphafold, showing the N-terminal domain as a tightly packed four-helix bundle and the C-

terminal domain with the typical LytTR DNA binding domain.

Figure S2. Extended FLaGs analysis of genomic context around HigX shows that it is
widely conserved with a divergent putative hydrolase enzyme across other alpha-
proteobacterial genera.

Output of FLaGs analysis using the results of a BLASTP search of HigX against known alpha-

proteobacterial genomes (the BLASTP query sequence of *Caulobacter crescentus* NA1000 HigX is

not included here, only the BLASTP output), with the limit of aligned genomic regions increased to

99, of which 68 were aligned. The number codes for selected proteins with annotated functions are

as follows: 1, uncharacterized putative hydrolase; 2, FliI; 3, CtrA; 4, FliJ; 5, LdpD; 22, HigA; 25,

HigB.

Figure S3. Effect size of the compositional bias and phylogenetic conservation of the
higBAX locus.

(A) Effect size analysis of *higB*, *higA*, and *higX* based on codon usage (RSCU) and tetranucleotide

frequency composition. Bars represent the square root of the Mahalanobis distance^2 ($\sqrt{MD^2}$)

relative to the 95% robust cutoff (MCD estimator), expressed as a fold over the threshold. The 95%

cutoff (effect size = 1) is indicated as a dashed horizontal line, meaning that values above this

indicate deviation from the genome-wide compositional background. (B) Phylogenetic tree of the

order Caulobacterales showing the distribution of the proteins HigB, HigA, and HigX. The

maximum-likelihood tree was constructed from 16S rRNA sequences of complete and reference

genomes (n = 24) retrieved from NCBI, serving as a phylogenetic standard for comparison. The

accompanying heatmap indicates the presence or absence of the three proteins across the same

genomes. Note that the heatmap does not account for gene synteny.

Figure S4. Distribution of HigB, HigA, and HigX homologs across bacteria
Presence–absence heatmap showing the occurrence of HigB, HigA, and HigX homologs across

bacterial genomes identified by BLASTX searches against the NCBI RefSeq protein database.

Each column indicates one of the three proteins, and each row corresponds to an organism with

both its scientific name and NCBI TaxID. Presence/absence (blue/grey) is indicated by the left

sidebar, and the right sidebar indicates protein combinations. Note that the heatmap does not

account for gene synteny.

Figure S5. Phylogeny of HigB homologs across bacteria
Phylogenetic tree of HigB homologs based on protein sequences retrieved from the top BLASTX

hits. Sequences were aligned with MAFFT (L-INS-i), followed by inference of the tree with IQ-

TREE using the maximum-likelihood method. The tree was midpoint-rooted for visualization, with

tip labels displaying organism names, which have been colored by genus. Bootstrap support

values (≥ 50) are displayed at internal nodes, and the scale bar indicates the number of amino-acid

substitutions per site. The phylogram in the upper left corner shows a condensed version of the

16S phylogenetic tree (Figure S4B), which acts as a phylogenetic standard for comparison.

Figure S6. Phylogeny of HigA homologs across bacteria
Phylogenetic tree of HigA homologs based on protein sequences retrieved from the top BLASTX

hits. Sequences were aligned with MAFFT (L-INS-i), followed by inference of the tree with IQ-

TREE using the maximum-likelihood method. The tree was midpoint-rooted for visualization, with

tip labels displaying organism names, which have been colored by genus. Bootstrap support

values (≥ 50) are displayed at internal nodes, and the scale bar indicates the number of amino-acid

substitutions per site. The phylogram in the upper left corner shows a condensed version of the

16S phylogenetic tree (Figure S4B), which acts as a phylogenetic standard for comparison.

Figure S7. Phylogeny of HigX homologs across bacteria

Phylogenetic tree of HigX homologs based on protein sequences retrieved from the top BLASTX

hits. Sequences were aligned with MAFFT (L-INS-i), followed by inference of the tree with IQ-

TREE using the maximum-likelihood method. The tree was midpoint-rooted for visualization, with

tip labels displaying organism names, which have been colored by genus. Bootstrap support

values (≥ 50) are displayed at internal nodes, and the scale bar indicates the number of amino-acid

substitutions per site. The phylogram in the upper left corner shows a condensed version of the

16S phylogenetic tree (full version in Figure S4B), which acts as a phylogenetic standard for

comparison.

References

1.   Baharoglu Z, Mazel D. SOS, the formidable strategy of bacteria against aggressions. FEMS Microbiology Reviews. 2014;38(6):1126-45.

2.   Erill I, Campoy S, Barbé J. Aeons of distress: an evolutionary perspective on the bacterial SOS response. FEMS Microbiology Reviews. 2007;31(6):637-56.

3.   Chen Z, Yang H, Pavletich NP. Mechanism of homologous recombination from the RecA–ssDNA/dsDNA structures. Nature. 2008;453(7194):489-94.

4.   Kovačič L, Paulič N, Leonardi A, Hodnik V, Anderluh G, Podlesek Z, et al. Structural insight into LexA–RecA* interaction. Nucleic Acids Research. 2013;41(21):9901-10.

5.   Fernández de Henestrosa AR, Ogi T, Aoyagi S, Chafin D, Hayes JJ, Ohmori H, Woodgate R. Identification of additional genes belonging to the LexA regulon in Escherichia coli. Molecular Microbiology. 2000;35(6):1560-72.

6.   Kamenšek S, Podlesek Z, Gillor O, Žgur-Bertok D. Genes regulated by the Escherichia coli SOS repressor LexA exhibit heterogenous expression. BMC Microbiology. 2010;10(1):283.

7.   Pandey DP, Gerdes K. Toxin-antitoxin loci are highly abundant in free-living but lost from host-associated prokaryotes. Nucleic Acids Res. 2005;33(3):966-76.

8.   Harms A, Brodersen DE, Mitarai N, Gerdes K. Toxins, Targets, and Triggers: An Overview of Toxin-Antitoxin Biology. Molecular Cell. 2018;70(5):768-84.

9.   Jurėnas D, Fraikin N, Goormaghtigh F, Van Melderen L. Biology and evolution of bacterial toxin–antitoxin systems. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2022;20(6):335-50.

10.   Page R, Peti W. Toxin-antitoxin systems in bacterial growth arrest and persistence. Nature Chemical Biology. 2016;12(4):208-14.

11.   Ronneau S, Helaine S. Clarifying the Link between Toxin–Antitoxin Modules and Bacterial Persistence. Journal of Molecular Biology. 2019;431(18):3462-71.

12.   Christensen-Dalsgaard M, Jorgensen MG, Gerdes K. Three new RelE-homologous mRNA interferases of Escherichia coli differentially induced by environmental stresses. Mol Microbiol. 2010;75(2):333-48.

13.   Dorr T, Vulic M, Lewis K. Ciprofloxacin causes persister formation by inducing the TisB toxin in Escherichia coli. PLoS biology. 2010;8(2):e1000317.

14.   Kawano M, Aravind L, Storz G. An antisense RNA controls synthesis of an SOS-induced toxin evolved from an antitoxin. Mol Microbiol. 2007;64(3):738-54.

15.   Kirkpatrick CL, Martins D, Redder P, Frandi A, Mignolet J, Chapalay JB, et al. Growth control switch by a DNA-damage-inducible toxin–antitoxin system in Caulobacter crescentus. Nature Microbiology. 2016;1:16008.

16.   LeRoux M, Culviner PH, Liu YJ, Littlehale ML, Laub MT. Stress Can Induce
Transcription of Toxin-Antitoxin Systems without Activating Toxin. Molecular Cell. 2020.
17.   Fraikin N, Rousseau CJ, Goeders N, Van Melderen L. Reassessing the Role of the
Type II MqsRA Toxin-Antitoxin System in Stress Response and Biofilm Formation: mqsA Is
Transcriptionally Uncoupled from mqsR. mBio. 2019;10(6):e02678-19.
18.   Hallez R, Geeraerts D, Sterckx Y, Mine N, Loris R, Van Melderen L. New toxins
homologous to ParE belonging to three-component toxin–antitoxin systems in Escherichia coli
O157:H7. Molecular Microbiology. 2010;76(3):719-32.
19.   da Rocha RP, Paquola AC, Marques Mdo V, Menck CF, Galhardo RS.
Characterization of the SOS regulon of Caulobacter crescentus. J Bacteriol. 2008;190(4):1209-18.
20.   Vallet S-U, Hansen LH, Bistrup FC, Laursen SA, Chapalay JB, Chambon M, et al.
Loss of Bacterial Cell Pole Stabilization in Caulobacter crescentus Sensitizes to Outer Membrane
Stress and Peptidoglycan-Directed Antibiotics. mBio. 2020;11(3):e00538-20.
21.   Mets T, Kurata T, Ernits K, Johansson MJO, Craig SZ, Evora GM, et al. Mechanism
of phage sensing and restriction by toxin-antitoxin-chaperone systems. Cell host & microbe.
2024;32(7):1059-73.e8.
22.   Bordes P, Cirinesi A-M, Ummels R, Sala A, Sakr S, Bitter W, Genevaux P. SecB-like
chaperone controls a toxin–antitoxin stress-responsive system in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2011;108(20):8438-43.
23.   Nikolskaya AN, Galperin MY. A novel type of conserved DNA-binding domain in the
transcriptional regulators of the AlgR/AgrA/LytR family. Nucleic Acids Res. 2002;30(11):2453-9.
24.   de la Hoz AB, Ayora S, Sitkiewicz I, Fernández S, Pankiewicz R, Alonso JC,
Ceglowski P. Plasmid copy-number control and better-than-random segregation genes of
pSM19035 share a common regulator. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
2000;97(2):728-33.
25.   Zhou B, Schrader JM, Kalogeraki VS, Abeliuk E, Dinh CB, Pham JQ, et al. The global
regulatory architecture of transcription during the Caulobacter cell cycle. PLoS Genet.
2015;11(1):e1004831.
26.   Saha CK, Sanches Pires R, Brolin H, Delannoy M, Atkinson GC. FlaGs and
webFlaGs: discovering novel biology through the analysis of gene neighbourhood conservation.
Bioinformatics. 2021;37(9):1312-4.
27.   Ely B. Evolutionary history of Caulobacter toxin–antitoxin systems. Current
Microbiology. 2021;78(8):2899-904.
28.   Leplae R, Geeraerts D, Hallez R, Guglielmini J, Drèze P, Van Melderen L. Diversity
of bacterial type II toxin–antitoxin systems: a comprehensive search and functional analysis of
novel families. Nucleic Acids Research. 2011;39(13):5513-25.
29.   Modell JW, Hopkins AC, Laub MT. A DNA damage checkpoint in Caulobacter
crescentus inhibits cell division through a direct interaction with FtsW. Genes Dev.
2011;25(12):1328-43.
30.   Hocking J, Priyadarshini R, Takacs CN, Costa T, Dye NA, Shapiro L, et al.
Osmolality-dependent relocation of penicillin-binding protein PBP2 to the division site in
Caulobacter crescentus. J Bacteriol. 2012;194(12):3116-27.
31.   Jensen RB, Shapiro L. The Caulobacter crescentus smc gene is required for cell
cycle progression and chromosome segregation. Proceedings of the National Academy of
Sciences. 1999;96(19):10661-6.
32.   Heinrich K, Sobetzko P, Jonas K. A Kinase-Phosphatase Switch Transduces
Environmental Information into a Bacterial Cell Cycle Circuit. PLOS Genetics.
2016;12(12):e1006522.
33.   Gray WT, Govers SK, Xiang Y, Parry BR, Campos M, Kim S, Jacobs-Wagner C.
Nucleoid Size Scaling and Intracellular Organization of Translation across Bacteria. Cell.
2019;177(6):1632-48.e20.

34.   Arias-Cartin R, Dobihal GS, Campos M, Surovtsev IV, Parry B, Jacobs-Wagner C.
Replication fork passage drives asymmetric dynamics of a critical nucleoid‐associated
protein in <i>Caulobacter</i>. The EMBO Journal. 2017;36(3):301-18-18.
35.   Ward D, Newton A. Requirement of topoisomerase IV parC and parE genes for cell
cycle progression and developmental regulation in Caulobacter crescentus. Molecular
Microbiology. 1997;26(5):897-910.
36.   Calkins AL, Demey LM, Karslake JD, Donarski ED, Biteen JS, DiRita VJ.
Independent Promoter Recognition by TcpP Precedes Cooperative Promoter Activation by TcpP
and ToxR. mBio. 2021;12(5):e0221321.
37.   Gebhard S, Gaballa A, Helmann JD, Cook GM. Direct stimulus perception and
transcription activation by a membrane-bound DNA binding protein. Molecular Microbiology.
2009;73(3):482-91.
38.   Merritt J, Zheng L, Shi W, Qi F. Genetic characterization of the hdrRM operon: a
novel high-cell-density-responsive regulator in Streptococcus mutans. Microbiology (Reading).
2007;153(Pt 8):2765-73.
39.   Xie Z, Okinaga T, Niu G, Qi F, Merritt J. Identification of a novel bacteriocin regulatory
system in Streptococcus mutans. Molecular Microbiology. 2010;78(6):1431-47.
40.   Zou Z, Qin H, Brenner AE, Raghavan R, Millar JA, Gu Q, et al. LytTR Regulatory
Systems: A potential new class of prokaryotic sensory system. PLoS Genet.
2018;14(10):e1007709.
41.   Xie Z, Zou Z, Raz A, Qin H, Fischetti V, Zhang S, et al. Regulatory control of the
Streptococcus mutans HdrRM LytTR Regulatory System functions via a membrane sequestration
mechanism. Mol Microbiol. 2020;114(4):681-93.
42.   Demey LM, Gumerov VM, Xing J, Zhulin IB, DiRita VJ. Transmembrane Transcription
Regulators Are Widespread in Bacteria and Archaea. Microbiology Spectrum. 2023;11(3):e00266-
23.
43.   Thanbichler M, Iniesta AA, Shapiro L. A comprehensive set of plasmids for vanillate-
and xylose-inducible gene expression in Caulobacter crescentus. Nucleic Acids Res.
2007;35(20):e137.
44.   Ardissone S, Fumeaux C, Bergé M, Beaussart A, Théraulaz L, Radhakrishnan SK, et
al. Cell cycle constraints on capsulation and bacteriophage susceptibility. eLife. 2014;3:e03587.
45.   Viollier PH, Thanbichler M, McGrath PT, West L, Meewan M, McAdams HH, Shapiro
L. Rapid and sequential movement of individual chromosomal loci to specific subcellular locations
during bacterial DNA replication. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2004;101(25):9257-62.
46.   Simon R, Priefer U, Pühler A. A broad host range mobilization system for *in vivo*
genetic engineering: transposon mutagenesis in Gram negative bacteria. Bio/Technology.
1983;1:784-91.
47.   Ely B. Genetics of Caulobacter crescentus. Methods Enzymol. 1991;204:372-84.
48.   Fumeaux C, Radhakrishnan SK, Ardissone S, Theraulaz L, Frandi A, Martins D, et al.
Cell cycle transition from S-phase to G1 in Caulobacter is mediated by ancestral virulence
regulators. Nature communications. 2014;5:4081.
49.   Cserzo M, Wallin E, Simon I, von Heijne G, Elofsson A. Prediction of transmembrane
alpha-helices in prokaryotic membrane proteins: the dense alignment surface method. Protein Eng.
1997;10(6):673-6.
50.   Senior AW, Evans R, Jumper J, Kirkpatrick J, Sifre L, Green T, et al. Improved
protein structure prediction using potentials from deep learning. Nature. 2020;577(7792):706-10.
51.   Katoh K, Misawa K, Kuma Ki, Miyata T. MAFFT: a novel method for rapid multiple
sequence alignment based on fast Fourier transform. Nucleic Acids Research. 2002;30(14):3059-
66.
52.   Tamura K, Stecher G, Kumar S. MEGA11: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
Version 11. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2021;38(7):3022-7.

1048

Figure 3

Figure 6

A

B

PC2 (6% variance) vs PC1 (28.7% variance)

Centroid, higA, higB, higX — RSCU

2D (PC1–PC2) | k=35 (robust MCD)

Density vs Mahalanobis distance² (MD²)

C

PC2 (4.5% variance) vs PC1 (5.4% variance)

higX, higB, Centroid, higA — Tetranucleotide frequency

2D (PC1–PC2) | k = 160 (robust MCD)

Density vs Mahalanobis distance² (MD²)

Cell morphology
HigX-dependent gene regulation

Ciprofloxacin and cephalexin growth