Novel regulation from novel interactions: Identification of an RNA sponge that controls the levels, processing and efficacy of the RoxS riboregulator of central metabolism in *Bacillus subtilis*

Sylvain Durand^{*1}, Adam Callan-Sidat^{†2}, Josie McKeown^{†2}, Stephen Li^{†2}, Gergana Kostova¹, Juan R. Hernandez-Fernaund^{3,4}, Mohammad Tauqeer Alam², Andrew Millard^{2,5}, Chrystala Constantinidou², Ciarán Condon¹, Emma L. Denham^{*2,6}

1 - UMR8261, CNRS, Université de Paris, Institut de Biologie Physico-Chimique, 13 rue Pierre et Marie Curie, 75005 Paris, France

2 - Division of Biomedical Sciences, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry, UK

3 – School of Life Sciences, Proteomics Research Technology Platform, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry, UK

4 – Present address - Unidad de Investigacion del Hospital Universitario de Canarias. Calle Ofra, s/n. 38320. La Laguna. Canary Islands. Spain.

5 – Present address - Department of Genetics and Genome Biology, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

6 – Present address - Department of Biology and Biochemistry, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath, UK

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel +44 1225 383424; Email:

e.l.denham@bath.ac.uk Correspondence may also be addressed to Tel +33 1 58 41 50 31; Email: s.durand@ibpc.fr

† These authors contributed equally to this work.

ABSTRACT

Small RNAs (sRNAs) are a taxonomically-restricted but transcriptomically-abundant class of post-transcriptional regulators. While potentially of importance, we know the function of few. This is in no small part because we lack global-scale methodology enabling target identification, this being especially acute in species without known RNA meeting point proteins (e.g. Hfq). We apply a combination of psoralen RNA cross-linking and Illumina-sequencing to identify RNA-RNA interacting pairs *in vivo* in *Bacillus subtilis*, resolving previously well-described interactants. Although sRNA-sRNA pairings are rare (compared with sRNA/mRNA), we identify a robust example involving the unusually conserved sRNA (RoxS/RsaE) and an unstudied sRNA that we term Regulator of small RNA A (RosA). This interaction is found in independent samples across multiple conditions. Given the possibility of a novel associated regulatory mechanism, and the rarity of well-characterised bacterial sRNA-sRNA interactions, we mechanistically dissect RosA and its interactants. RosA we show to be a sponge RNA, the first to be described in a Gram-positive bacterium. RosA interacts with at least two sRNAs, RoxS and FsrA. Unexpectedly, it acts differently on each. As expected of a sponge RNA, FsrA is sequestered by RosA. The RosA/RoxS interaction is more complex affecting not only the level of RoxS but also its processing and efficacy. Importantly, RosA provides the condition-dependent intermediary between CcpA, the key regulator of carbon metabolism, and RoxS. This not only provides evidence for a novel, and functionally important, regulatory mechanism, but in addition, provides the missing link between transcriptional and post-transcriptional regulation of central metabolism.

INTRODUCTION

To adapt to changing environments and survive exposure to harsh conditions, organisms have evolved complicated metabolic and genetic regulatory networks to ensure that a homeostatic balance is maintained^{1,2}. At the RNA synthesis level, gene expression can be modulated through combinations of transcription factors controlling genes required for growth and survival under specific conditions³⁻⁵. At the post-transcriptional level, small regulatory RNAs (sRNAs) act to temper gene expression by short imperfect base pairing with their mRNA targets, altering the level of protein production by increasing or decreasing access to the ribosome-binding site, or by facilitating or blocking the access to the mRNA by ribonucleases (RNases)^{6,7}. Most regulatory RNAs are independently expressed under the control of specific transcription factors. However, more recently, it has been shown that sRNAs can also be produced by processing RNAs that have other functions in the cell, such as tRNAs⁸ and mRNAs⁹.

Regulation by RNA is an important mechanism for fine-tuning gene expression in the Gram-positive model bacterium *Bacillus subtilis*, recently reviewed in¹⁰. Over 150 potential sRNAs have been identified in *B. subtilis* and shown to be expressed in a condition-dependent fashion¹¹⁻¹³. To date the roles of very few of these putative sRNAs have been determined. However, where targets have been identified, they have been shown to play key roles in stress adaptation. *B. subtilis* notably expresses three sRNAs with C-rich regions (CRRs) with similar predicted secondary structure; RoxS/S415 (Related to oxidative stress)¹⁴, FsrA/S512 (Fur regulated small RNA)¹⁵ and CsfG/S547 (Controlled by sigma-F and sigma-G)¹⁶, (S numbers relate to transcriptionally active segments identified by Nicolas *et al.*¹²). The RoxS sRNA is one of the best characterised sRNAs in Gram-positive bacteria^{14,17,18} and is conserved among Bacilli and Staphylococci, where it is named RsaE^{19,20}. RoxS has been shown to be upregulated in response to nitric oxide (NO) in *B. subtilis* and *S. aureus*, by the two component system ResDE, and its homolog SsrAB, respectively¹⁴. RoxS expression is also activated when malate is supplied as a carbon source. This control is mediated by the transcription factor Rex, that is known to sense the NAD/NADH ratio of the cell. Indeed, this ratio is perturbed by the conversion of malate to pyruvate by the three malate dehydrogenases of *B. subtilis* that reduce NAD⁺ to NADH, and by its cycling through the TCA

pathway. It has been proposed that one role of RoxS is to re-equilibrate the NAD/NADH ratio of the cell by inhibiting the expression of enzymes leading to the production of NADH. FsrA is regulated by the transcription factor Fur and acts as part of the iron-sparing response¹⁵. Fur down-regulates mRNAs whose protein products contain iron as part of their structures, but are not essential for growth, therefore ensuring iron availability for essential iron-containing proteins^{15,21}. Interestingly, both RoxS and FsrA down-regulate several genes encoding enzymes of the TCA cycle that produce NADH. CsfG is highly expressed during sporulation, anaerobic growth and after glucose exhaustion¹². During sporulation, expression of this sRNA is controlled by the sigma factors F and G which are restricted to the forespore¹⁶. However, to date no mRNA target or physiological role for CsfG has been identified. Durand *et al.* have hypothesised that its similar sequence motifs and structure to RoxS and FsrA suggests these three sRNAs may have overlapping targets and play similar roles under different growth conditions¹⁴.

The lack of well resolved pathways through which sRNAs act in no small parts reflects the difficulty of global scale target identification, this being more acute in some bacteria than others. In many enterobacteria, such as *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella typhimurium*, the RNA chaperone Hfq plays a key role as a mediator of sRNA-mRNA interactions and has greatly enabled the identification of mRNA targets through pull-down studies^{22,23}. Although Hfq is conserved in Gram-positive bacteria, it does not appear to play a global role in RNA-mediated regulation of gene expression^{24,25}. Hfq-dependent regulation by only one sRNA in *Listeria* and a handful in *Clostridium* are the only known exceptions. It is therefore generally accepted that sRNA regulation in the Firmicutes either depends on different RNA chaperones or can occur in the absence of any protein factors. A number of groups have used *in vivo* RNA cross-linking with the psoralen AMT, followed by ligation to form chimeras and RNAseq to identify RNA-RNA interactions in eukaryotic cells²⁶⁻²⁸. Here then we employed LIGR-seq²⁶ to identify sRNA targets in *B. subtilis*. In addition to identifying many known members of the FsrA and RoxS regulons and several new targets, we also identified a new regulatory RNA, S345, that interacts with both FsrA and RoxS. These interactions are found in independent samples and across multiple conditions. Given the possibility of a novel associated regulatory mechanism, and the rarity of well-characterised bacterial

102 sRNA-sRNA interactions, we mechanistically dissect S345 and its interactants. We show that S345 not
 103 only functions as an RNA sponge for RoxS, but also affects its processing and degradation. We rename
 104 this sRNA RosA (for Regulator of sRNA A). We show that the transcription of RosA is under the control
 105 of the carbon catabolite control protein A (CcpA), linking the action of RoxS to the carbon source
 106 availability in *B. subtilis*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Media and growth conditions

Selection for transformations was performed on Lysogeny Broth (LB) at 37°C supplemented with required antibiotics. For *E. coli* these were ampicillin (100 µg ml⁻¹) or chloramphenicol (10 µg ml⁻¹) and for *B. subtilis* either phleomycin (4 µg ml⁻¹), kanamycin (20 µg ml⁻¹), tetracycline (5 µg ml⁻¹), chloramphenicol (5 µg ml⁻¹), erythromycin (2 µg ml⁻¹), spectinomycin (100 µg ml⁻¹) or combinations of the above. Growth experiments were performed in LB, M9 medium supplemented with glucose at a final concentration of 0.3%¹² or MD medium²⁹ supplemented with arabinose or malate at a final concentration of 1%.

Bacterial strain construction

All *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* strains and plasmids used in this study are listed in Supplementary Table I. Primer sequences can be found in Supplementary Table II. *E. coli* DH5α and TG1 were used for all cloning procedures. *B. subtilis* strains were derived from the *B. subtilis* 168 trp⁺. The isogenic deletion mutants were constructed according to the method described by Tanaka et al³⁰ without pop-out of the deletion cassette. Transfer of genetic mutations between strains was achieved by transformation of genomic DNA extracted from the relevant strain. Reintroduction of sRNAs under the control of their native promoters was achieved by Gibson Assembly into pRMC that integrates into the *amyE* locus³¹ of a PCR amplicon. Primer annealing sites were chosen to include the native promoter mapped in Nicolas et al¹². The sequence of cloned sRNAs was subsequently confirmed by sequencing and transformed into *B. subtilis* (plasmid pRMC+P_{native}-sRNA). Integration into the *amyE* locus was confirmed by an iodine halo assay by replica plating transformation plates onto starch plates. The RosA promoter fusion was constructed at the native genomic locus by integration of the pBSBII plasmid³². Combinatorial strains were constructed in the genetic background of the same promoter fusion strain by transformation of genomic DNA of the respective strain and selection on the appropriate antibiotics.

134

135 ***In vivo* RNA interactome**

136 **AMT *in vivo* cross linking**

137 Bacteria were grown to the required O.D before 10 O.D_{600 nm} units were harvested by centrifugation
 138 (4000 g, 5 minutes, 4°C). Bacteria were resuspended in 2 ml PBS either containing no AMT (to
 139 identify background and levels of spurious interactions) or 0.7 mM AMT. Bacteria were incubated for
 140 10 minutes at 37°C for 10 minutes before being transferred to a 6 well plate. The bacteria were
 141 exposed to UV 365 nm at 0.120 Jcm⁻² for 10 minutes before being added to 1 ml of ice cold killing
 142 buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl [pH 7.5], 5 mM MgCl₂, 20 mM Na-azide). The bacteria were harvested by
 143 centrifugation at (4000 g, 5 minutes, 4°C). the supernatant was discarded and the pellet flash frozen in
 144 liquid nitrogen. We determined the *in vivo* RNA interactome of *B. subtilis* grown in M9 minimal media
 145 supplemented with 0.3% glucose at three points in the growth curve (exponential phase O.D._{600nm} 0.5,
 146 stationary phase O.D._{600nm} 1.4 and just after lysis had started to occur, and in LB at mid-exponential
 147 phase (O.D._{600nm} of 1.0). A Δfur mutant³³ was prepared in LB at mid-exponential phase to increase
 148 expression of the Fur regulated sRNA FsrA. Samples were prepared in duplicate.

149

150 **RNA extraction and formation of chimeras between interacting RNAs**

151 The RNA was extracted by resuspending the cell pellet in 800 μ l LETS buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.0],
 152 50 mM LiCl, 10 mM EDTA, 1% sodium dodecyl sulfate [SDS]) and bead beating in a FastPrep using 0.1
 153 μ m glass beads for three rounds of 40 seconds. The tubes were transferred to ice in between cycles.
 154 The tubes were briefly spun to remove the bubbles created during bead beating. Two rounds of phenol
 155 chloroform isoamyl alcohol extraction and one round of chloroform isoamyl alcohol extraction were
 156 carried out. Before the addition of 10 % v/v NaAcetate and 1 ml isopropanyl and precipitation of RNA
 157 overnight at -20°C. The RNA was pelleted by centrifugation at maximum speed at 4°C and the pellet
 158 was washed with 70% Ethanol before being air dried and resuspended in water. The RNA was quantified
 159 using the Qubit kit (Fisher Life Science). 10 μ g of RNA was treated with Turbo DNase (Fisher Scientific)
 160 to remove contaminating DNA. Ribosomal RNA was removed using Ribozero (Illumina) according to

the manufacturer's instructions. To form the chimeric RNAs between RNAs crosslinked with AMT the protocol described by Sharma *et al.* was followed as described in the supplementary data ²⁶. The only modification was the use of CircDNAligase (Epicentre) instead of CircRNAligase as this has been discontinued.

RNAseq

Following uncrosslinking at UV 254 nm, RNA was purified and resuspended in 10 µl H₂O and processed through the TruSeq stranded total RNA library kit (150 bp) (Illumina) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The resulting libraries were sequenced on the MiSeq (Illumina).

Analysis

STAR aligner was used to map reads (Version STAR_2.6.0c_08-11) (34). This mapping tool is designed to analyse splicing of introns and exons, which is similar to what is created through the formation of chimeric reads where two different RNA fragments have been joined together. By identification of reads that map to different features (protein coding sequences, sRNAs, UTRs, transcripts for ncRNAs such as rRNA and tRNA, or transcribed intergenic regions) it is possible to identify RNA interactions. STAR aligner was set to single end read mode to map read 1 and read 2 separately, the chimeric detection mode activated, as this has been reported to be more sensitive to chimeric junctions. The allowed mismatches in mapping was set to default for STARaligner. The output from STAR was merged in to one Sam file, before being annotated using featureCounts within the package subread-1.6.3 in R, with all further statistical analysis also carried out in R (35). In our initial analysis we found many reads mapped to the genome, but to unannotated features. To overcome this problem, we created new features for the unannotated regions of the genome and these are termed UA-start – stop in the data files.

Chimeric reads will map to two different genomic features, whereas non-chimeric reads should only map to one feature. The exception is of those reads with repetitive mapping or those that map to two

neighbouring features such as genes in an operon. An interaction count table was generated of reads that mapped to more than one feature and thus are considered as interacting pairs. The interaction count matrix then allowed statistical analysis of each interacting pair using a hypergeometric test. This compares the number of interaction read counts for each specific interaction with the number of other interaction read counts formed by each member of that pair, but with other RNAs. All interaction pairs with a P-value below 0.05 were extracted as significant interactions. To increase confidence in the identified interactions a second analysis was carried out where the pairs of sequenced samples were analysed together and untranslated regions were combined with coding sequences. The hypergeometric test was repeated and a P-adjusted value was calculated using Benjamini and Hochberg to control for the false discovery rate which was set at 0.05³⁴.

To add further confidence to which interacting pairs form the most likely interactions, the interacting pairs were further assessed by *in silico* prediction with IntaRNA2.0, which predicts the stability and binding position between two interacting RNA pairs (36,37). The gene and any untranslated region that has been identified associated with the gene of interest (12) were included in the prediction to take into account the transcriptional start and stop sites. If no UTR had been identified for an mRNA the 50 bp up and downstream of the start and stop site were employed.

Proteomics analysis

Strains were grown to O.D._{600 nm} 1.0 in LB. 20 O.D. units were harvested and washed 3 X with PBS to remove media components. Cells were resuspended in 200 µl urea buffer (8 M Urea, 50 mM Tris and 75 mM NaCl). 200 µl of urea buffer washed 0.1 µM beads were added to the cells before being disrupted using three rounds of bead beating for 40 seconds using a FastPrep. Cells were placed on ice between the three rounds of bead beating. The disrupted cells were then sonicated in a water bath for 15 minutes. Cell extracts were centrifuged at 15,000 x g, 5 min and supernatants used for protein quantification (Qubit protein assay kit). Protein reduction and alkylation was conducted by mixing 150 µg of total protein with 10 mM TCEP and 40 mM CAA, at 600 rpm, for 20 min at room temperature. After, proteins

were predigested with 1.5 µg of rLysC (Promega) for 3 h at room temperature and samples diluted with 50 mM ammonium bicarbonate, 2 M urea final concentration. Protein digestion was performed with 1.5 µg of Trypsin (Promega) overnight at room temperature. The reaction was stopped by adding 1% TFA and 10 µg of peptides were desalted using StageTip³⁵.

Reversed phase chromatography was used to separate 1 µg of tryptic peptides prior to mass spectrometric analysis. The cell proteomes were analysed with two columns, an Acclaim PepMap µ-precolumn cartridge 300 µm i.d. x 5 mm, 5 µm, 100 Å and an Acclaim PepMap RSLC 75 µm i.d. x 50 cm, 2 µm, 100 Å (Thermo Scientific). The columns were installed on an Ultimate 3000 RSLCnano system (Dionex) at 40°C. Mobile phase buffer A was composed of 0.1% formic acid and mobile phase B was composed of acetonitrile containing 0.1% formic acid. Samples were loaded onto the µ-precolumn equilibrated in 2% aqueous acetonitrile containing 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid for 8 min at 10 µL min⁻¹ after which peptides were eluted onto the analytical column at 250 nL min⁻¹ by increasing the mobile phase B concentration from 8% B to 25% over 90 min, then to 35% B over 12 min, followed by a 3 min wash at 90% B and a 15 min re-equilibration at 4% B.

Eluting peptides were converted to gas-phase ions by means of electrospray ionization and analysed on a Thermo Orbitrap Fusion (Thermo Scientific). Survey scans of peptide precursors from 375 to 1500 m/z were performed at 120K resolution (at 200 m/z) with a 2x10⁵ ion count target. The maximum injection time was set to 150 ms. Tandem MS was performed by isolation at 1.2 Th using the quadrupole, HCD fragmentation with normalized collision energy of 33, and rapid scan MS analysis in the ion trap. The MS2 ion count target was set to 3x10³ and maximum injection time was 200 ms. Precursors with charge state 2–6 were selected and sampled for MS2. The dynamic exclusion duration was set to 60 s with a 10 ppm tolerance around the selected precursor and its isotopes. Monoisotopic precursor selection was turned on and instrument was run in top speed mode.

Thermo-Scientific raw files were analysed using MaxQuant software v1.6.0.16³⁵ against the UniProtKB *B. subtilis* database (UP000001570, 4,260 entries). Peptide sequences were assigned to MS/MS spectra using the following parameters: cysteine carbamidomethylation as a fixed modification and protein N-terminal acetylation and methionine oxidations as variable modifications. The FDR was set to 0.01 for both proteins and peptides with a minimum length of 7 amino acids and was determined by searching a reversed database. Enzyme specificity was trypsin with a maximum of two missed cleavages. Peptide identification was performed with an initial precursor mass deviation of 7 ppm and a fragment mass deviation of 20 ppm. The MaxQuant feature 'match between runs' was enabled. Label-free protein quantification (LFQ) was done with a minimum ratio count of 2. Data processing was performed using the Perseus module of MaxQuant v1.6.0.16³⁶. Proteins identified by the reverse, contaminant and only by site hits were discarded. Only protein groups identified with at least two assigned peptides were accepted and LFQ intensities were log2 transformed. Significantly regulated proteins were identified in two rounds of analysis. First, a Student's T-test (FDR 0.05) and a minimum difference of S0=0.1 was applied on all biological replicates. Second, a finest statistical analysis was applied using the same parameters as before but removing the outliers identified by principal component analysis and Pearson correlation test. The significantly regulated proteins were selected from both analyses.

Plate reader experiments

Experiments to monitor promoter activity were carried out in a 96-well format in a BioTek Synergy Plate reader and analysed as described previously³¹.

RNA isolation and Northern Blotting

RNA was isolated from mid-log phase *B. subtilis* cells growing in the indicated medium by the RNAsnap method described in Stead *et al.*, 2012. Northern blots were performed as described previously (Durand *et al.*, 2012). The S345/RosA riboprobe was transcribed *in vitro* using T7 RNA polymerase (Promega) and labelled with [α -³²P]-UTP using a PCR fragment amplified with oligo pair CC2440/CC2441 as

template. The oligos CC089, CC964 and CC875 were 5' end-labelled with T4 polynucleotide kinase (PNK) and [g-³²P]-ATP and used to probe *sucC*, *ppnkB* and RoxS RNA respectively.

Quantitation of sRNAs

S345/RosA and RoxS RNAs were transcribed *in vitro* from PCR fragments amplified with the oligo pairs CC2406/CC2407 and CC1832/CC1833 respectively. Known quantities (in fmol) of *in vitro* transcribed S345/RosA and RoxS RNAs, and 5 µg total RNA isolated from wild-type cells were loaded on a denaturing 6% acrylamide gel. The oligos CC2347 and CC875 were 5' end-labelled with T4 polynucleotide kinase (PNK) and [g-³²P]-ATP and used to probe on Northern blot S345/RosA and RoxS respectively.

Electrophoretic mobility shift assays (EMSA)

For EMSA assays, S345/RosA, RoxS and FsrA sRNAs were transcribed with T7 RNA polymerase *in vitro* from PCR fragments amplified with the oligo pairs CC2406/CC2407, CC1832/CC1833 and CC2492/CC2493 respectively. A 15 µl reaction was prepared by mixing 2 pmol of S345/RosA RNA with an increased concentration of RoxS or FsrA RNA (1, 2, 3 and 4 pmol) in 1X the RNA binding Buffer (10 mM Tris pH8; 50 mM NaCl; 50 mM KCl, 10 mM MgCl₂). The Mix was heated for 3 min and cool down at room temperature for 10 min. After cooling, 10 µl of glycerol (Stock solution 80%) was added and the RNA were loaded on a 6% non-denaturing polyacrylamide gel (Acry:bisacry – 37.5:1). RNA was transferred on to a Hybond N+ membrane and hybridized with the S345/RosA radiolabelled probe (CC2347).

Strain Competition experiment

Strains marked with appropriate antibiotics were combined at a 1:1 ratio, inoculated at a starting O.D.₆₀₀ nm and grown for 24 hours in LB. To confirm starting ratios at a 1:1 ratio colony counts were performed on the initial inoculum. At 24 hours cultures were serially diluted and plated on LB plates containing the relevant antibiotics to enable counting of each strain. Ratios of strains were calculated and Welch's T

test was used to determine significance. An average of three technical replicates each containing three biological replicates was carried for each combination of strains.

RESULTS

in vivo RNA crosslinking identifies known and unknown sRNA-RNA interactions

To identify new sRNA-mRNA interactions in *B. subtilis* we applied the LIGR-seq protocol²⁶ to *B. subtilis* cells growing in M9 minimal media supplemented with 0.3 % glucose (exponential and transition phase) or in LB (WT and Δfur mutant at exponential phase). The Δfur mutant was included to increase the expression levels of the sRNA FsrA, the transcription of which is repressed by Fur. Cells were irradiated at 365 nm with the chemical crosslinker AMT (4'-aminomethyltrioxsalen). Biological replicates of each sample were prepared. RNAs were extracted, ligated, and non-crosslinked RNA was digested with RNase R. Crosslinks were reversed with 254 nm irradiation and RNA samples were subjected to high-throughput sequencing to detect chimeras formed by ligation.

We designed and analysed the resulting RNA-seq data for chimeras using a customized pipeline. This included using STAR aligner which is designed for mapping RNAseq data containing splicing of introns and exons in data sets produced from eukaryotes³⁷. We discovered that carrying out the alignment using single-end read mode and activating the chimeric detection increased the sensitivity of the chimeric read detection. This also enabled us to map chimeric reads where the ligation of the two fragments occurred close to the read ends.

In each of the eight individual samples analysed, many potential RNA-RNA interactions were identified through using the customized pipeline (see Methods). However, to validate the data, we focused on chimeras identified for the well-characterized sRNAs of *B. subtilis*, FsrA and RoxS (Supplementary Table 3 A (FsrA) and B (RoxS)). Many known interactions of FsrA such as *citB*, *gltAB*, *lutA* and *leuC*^{15,21} and for RoxS, *citZ*¹⁴ were identified in our screen. However, many other interactions were also

present in the data set. To improve our confidence in identifying new targets of FsrA and RoxS we combined the data from the sample pairs and reanalysed the data. Statistically significant interactions and the P-adjusted value for each sample pair are shown in Supplementary Table S4 A (FsrA) and B (RoxS). The IntaRNA prediction of each interaction is also shown. Several potential new targets that have a possible link with iron metabolism were identified for FsrA. For example, we identified many chimeras between FsrA and the *yedF* mRNA, encoding a secreted peptide that controls LiaRS activity³⁸. The gene downstream of *yedF* in this operon, *yedG*, encodes a protein that contains an Fe-S cluster and is part of a protein complex required to process YedF into a functional peptide. RoxS regulates the expression of many RNAs encoding proteins involved in central metabolism, such as citrate synthase (CitZ)¹⁴. Our data showed a statistically significant interaction between RoxS and the *citZ* mRNA and also for *odhA* which encodes 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase (E1 subunit).

The above data confirm the validity of the LIGR-seq technique to identify new potential sRNA-mRNA interactions in bacteria. We suggest therefore that as a method AMT crosslinking may be considered as being complementary to studies focusing on individual RNAs such as MAPS³⁹ and those focusing on finding RNA interactions that occur on proteins such as RILseq²³ or CLASH⁴⁰, where different interacting RNAs have been found depending on the technique used.

Identification of a novel robust sRNA-sRNA interaction

Analysis of the RNA interactome also allowed us to map sRNA-sRNA interactions. Indeed, the most statistically significant interaction for both FsrA and RoxS was with the predicted sRNA S345 and S346 (annotated as 3' UTR of S345) (Figure 1). The interaction between S345 and both RoxS and FsrA was the most represented chimera pair in the interactions that we detected between RoxS and FsrA. The interaction is not only of strong statistical significance but was found in multiple growth conditions (Supplementary tables 3,4). As robustly described sRNA-sRNA interactions are unusual (for other examples see^{41,42}) we sought to characterize this further.

The sequence of S345 has three G rich regions (GRRs) (Figure 1 and 2A) with potential complementarity to the C-rich regions (CRRs) of FsrA and RoxS that have been shown to be involved in the interactions with their mRNA targets. We used RNAfold to predict how FsrA and RoxS might interact with S345 (Figure 2B and supplementary Figure 1)⁴³. The interaction with FsrA is predicted to incorporate GRR2 of S345 and CRR2 of FsrA (Supplementary Figure 1). Intriguingly, the interaction with RoxS is predicted to incorporate both GRR1 and GRR2 of S345, and CRR1, CRR2 and CRR3 of RoxS (Figure 2B). Both predictions include two long stretches of interacting nucleotides, suggesting these two RNA pairs can form stable duplexes.

RoxS interacts directly with S345 *in vitro*.

To confirm the potential interaction between S345 and RoxS or FsrA, we performed an Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay (EMSA; Figure 3). S345 was mixed with increasing concentrations of RoxS or FsrA and loaded on a non-denaturing acrylamide gel. The results show that RoxS can bind very efficiently to S345, producing a sharp band of higher molecular weight and a full-shift of S345 even at the lowest molar ratio of RoxS to S345 tested (0.5). Complex formation between FsrA and S345 was less efficient and the complex was less well defined, but nonetheless visible. A full shift of S345 was not apparent even at a 2-fold excess of FsrA (Figure 3). When both RoxS and FsrA were incubated together with S345, the interaction was clearly in favour of RoxS, with only trace quantities of the FsrA-S345 complex visible. These results suggest that RoxS has a higher affinity for S345 than FsrA and are in agreement with the longer predicted duplex between these two sRNAs.

S345 is a highly processed sRNA

To begin to characterize S345, we first assayed its expression pattern and stability in the same conditions as those used in the crosslinking experiment (LB and in M9 minimal medium + glucose). Northern blot analysis of total RNA isolated at different times after the addition of rifampicin to block new transcription showed that the level of the S345 RNA is higher in LB than in M9 at mid-exponential phase (Figure 4). Moreover, three major forms of S345 were detected. The approximate sizes for species 1, 2

and 3 are 230 nts, 185 nts and 120 nts, respectively (Supplementary Figure 2A). The half-life of the largest species (1) was less than 1 minute, while the dominant species (2) had a slightly greater stability, with a half-life of 1.9 minutes in LB. The shortest species (3) had the longest half-life: 7.1 minutes in LB (Figure 4). Since the half-lives of the three forms of S345 are similar in M9 + glucose, the lower levels of S345 in this medium are most likely due to transcriptional regulation (see below).

The 5'-end of S345 was suggested from the sequencing product of the LIGR-seq data and was confirmed by primer extension using an oligo close to the putative S345 transcriptional terminator (supplementary Figure 2B). We were able to predict a putative sigma-A promoter that fits perfectly with this mapped 5' end (Figure 1). Moreover, the distance between the mapped 5' end and the putative transcriptional terminator is 229 nts, which corresponds well with the size of the largest band detected by Northern blot and suggests that species 1 corresponds to the primary S345 transcript.

The Northern blot in Figure 4 was performed with an oligonucleotide probe starting 30 nts from the 5' end of S345. A second probe starting only 10 nts from the 5' end gave a similar pattern (data not shown). We thus deduced that the three major forms of S345 have the same 5' end and that species 2 and 3 are processed from the primary transcript at 3' proximal sites. In agreement with this hypothesis, when S345 was first identified by tiling array, an extended 3' region was identified that was annotated as S346¹². The size of our proposed primary transcript corresponds to the sum of the annotated segments S345 + S346. Our LIGR-seq data showed numerous truncations of S345 at its 3' end and allowed us to determine an approximate position for the cleavage site generating species 2 (Figure 2B). The processing of the 3' end of S345 was further confirmed as we were also able to map the 5' end of a 3' degradation product (*) stabilized in a Δmja mutant strain by primer extension. This corresponds to an endonucleolytic cleavage event occurring at the end of the duplex between RoxS and S345 (Supplementary Figure 2 and Figure 2B). The upstream cleavage product, protected from degradation due to its hybridisation with RoxS corresponds to the smallest (120 nts) S345 species (species 3). These observations suggest that S345 is quickly processed near its 3' end to form species 2 and 3, in

agreement with the shorter half-life of the full length S345 RNA compared to its two derivatives (Figure 4).

S345 destabilises RoxS

To determine whether S345 had an effect on RoxS levels or stability *in vivo*, we measured the rate of RoxS RNA degradation before and after the addition of rifampicin to WT and Δ S345 mutant strains. The experiment was done in LB, since S345 is expressed at higher levels in this medium. Samples were taken over a time course of 0 to 60 minutes and the RNA analysed by Northern blot. RoxS expression was significantly higher in the absence of S345 (Figure 5A). The half-life of RoxS in the presence of S345 was 13.2 minutes, whereas in the absence of S345 the half-life increased to 46.3 minutes. This result shows that expression of S345 leads to destabilization of the RoxS sRNA. In contrast, deletion of S345 has no impact on the stability of FsrA in LB media (Supplementary Figure 3).

We also calculated the relative amount of S345 and RoxS present in the cells grown in LB. In 5 μ g of total RNA, S345 and RoxS were present at approximately equimolar amounts (10 fmol each; supplementary Figure 4). This result shows that there is sufficient S345 in the cell to completely titrate all RoxS present in the cell under equilibrium conditions and suggests that it could act as an RNA sponge to counteract RoxS activity by titrating it away from its targets.

Deletion of S345 leads to destabilisation of FsrA and RoxS targets

RoxS has been previously shown to negatively impact the stability of the *ppnKB* and *sucCD* mRNAs encoding an NAD(H) kinase and succinate dehydrogenase, respectively¹⁴. If S345 indeed modulates the availability of RoxS to interact with its targets, we would predict that the half-life of these transcripts would decrease in the Δ S345 strain due to the additional free RoxS in the cell (Figure 5A). In Northern blot experiments performed on cells growing in LB medium, the half-life of the *ppnKB* mRNA was indeed decreased 4.7-fold in Δ S345 cells compared to WT (Figure 5B), consistent with the increased amounts of RoxS in the Δ S345 strain. To confirm that the effect on the half-life of the *ppnKB* mRNA in this strain

430 was due to the increase in RoxS levels, we constructed a strain lacking both sRNAs (S345 and RoxS).
 431 As expected, the *ppnKB* mRNA became stable again in the $\Delta roxS \Delta S345$ double mutant with a half-life
 432 similar to a strain lacking RoxS alone (Figure 5B). This result confirms that the destabilization of the
 433 *ppnKB* mRNA in the $\Delta S345$ strain is RoxS-dependent. We thus propose that S345 be renamed RosA,
 434 for regulator of sRNA A.

435

436 Intriguingly, unlike *ppnKB*, the rate of degradation of the *sucCD* mRNA was not affected in $\Delta rosA$ cells,
 437 with its half-life remaining at around 19 minutes in both the WT and the $\Delta rosA$ strain in LB medium
 438 (Figure 5B). We previously showed that RoxS is processed by RNase Y to remove the first 20 nts of the
 439 transcript producing a shorter, functional version of the sRNA called RoxS (D)¹⁴. RoxS (D) is far more
 440 efficient at competing with the ribosome for binding to the *sucCD* transcript than the full-length RoxS
 441 sRNA *in vitro*¹⁴. Removal of the first 20 nts of RoxS removes a significant portion of a 5' stem loop,
 442 freeing up nucleotides to base-pair with the *sucCD* Shine-Dalgarno (SD) region. We therefore asked
 443 whether RosA had an effect on RNase Y processing of RoxS. RoxS (D) can be readily detected in a
 444 strain lacking the 5'-3' exoribonuclease RNase J1 (encoded by *mjA*), since this RNase is involved in the
 445 rapid degradation of the processed species. We therefore performed Northern blots on cells treated with
 446 rifampicin to compare the relative amounts and half-lives of RoxS and RoxS (D) in ΔmjA versus ΔmjA
 447 $\Delta rosA$ cells. Figure 6 shows that RoxS is efficiently processed to produce RoxS (D) in the ΔmjA strain
 448 and is the most dominant form of RoxS in this strain. In contrast, in the double $\Delta mjA \Delta rosA$ mutant, full
 449 length RoxS was the dominant version of RoxS. Thus, RosA increases the efficiency of processing of
 450 RoxS to its truncated form. This is likely because base pairing with RosA is predicted to free up the
 451 RNase Y cleavage site in RoxS that is normally hidden within the duplex structure of the 5' stem-loop
 452 (Figure 2A).

453

454 To determine the global effect of RosA on RoxS and FsrA targets, and potentially identify other roles for
 455 this non-coding RNA, we performed a global proteomics analysis comparing the WT and $\Delta rosA$ deletion
 456 strains grown to mid-exponential phase in LB. The proteomes were analysed by label free quantitative

proteomics. We detected 1463 proteins in the LC MS/MS analysis and identified 19 proteins that showed statistically significant (P value <0.05) reduced levels in the Δ *rosA* strain compared to WT (Table 1). Interestingly, seven of these proteins have already been assigned to the FsrA and RoxS regulons^{14,15,21}: CitB and SdhA have been assigned to the FsrA regulon, and PpnKB, CitZ, EtfA, SucC and SucD are members of the RoxS regulon. Most of the other proteins showing reduced levels in the Δ *rosA* mutant are predicted by CopraRNA or IntaRNA^{44,45} to be direct targets of FsrA and/or RoxS, and have been shown to bind similar metal ions and other cofactors to the proteins encoded by other RoxS/FsrA mRNA targets. This fits with the general agreement that members of the FsrA and RoxS regulons are involved in regulating genes involved in iron homeostasis and oxidoreduction^{14,21}. The reduced levels of the FsrA and RoxS targets in the Δ *rosA* strain supports the idea that RosA counteracts regulation by both RoxS and FsrA and suggests that its primary role is as a sponge for these two sRNAs.

Production of the short form of RosA requires RoxS

We showed above that RosA is important for the processing of RoxS to RoxS (D); we therefore wondered whether the converse was also true, *i.e.* whether RoxS had an effect on the processing of RosA. In Figure 6B we analysed the expression pattern and degradation rates of the three RosA species in the presence and absence of RoxS. In the presence of RoxS, all three forms of RosA were detected as seen above (Figure 4). However, in the absence of RoxS, the RosA species 3 was completely absent. We conclude that the interaction with RoxS plays a role in the processing of RosA to its smallest form. The size of species 3 (~120 nts) is consistent with an RNA that extends from the mapped 5' of all three RosA species to the end of the duplex with RoxS around nt 116 (Figure 2B). The duplex would protect the 3' end of species 3 from 3' exoribonucleases, consistent with its relatively long half-life compared to species 1 and 2. No effect on RosA processing could be seen upon deletion of FsrA under these growth conditions (Supplementary Figure 2).

RosA provides a fitness benefit for *B. subtilis* under conditions of oxidative respiration

483 We asked whether RosA had an impact on cell doubling time by comparing the growth rate of the Δ rosA
 484 strain to that of the WT. No major difference in growth rate was seen in either LB or in M9. To ask
 485 whether there was a more subtle fitness cost to the cells lacking RosA, we performed competition assays
 486 between WT and Δ rosA cells in LB medium. We mixed the WT strain marked with a spectinomycin
 487 antibiotic resistance cassette and the phleomycin resistant Δ rosA mutant at a 1:1 ratio, which was
 488 confirmed by colony counts carried out on the starting culture. We then counted the number of Δ rosA
 489 and WT bacteria after 24 hours. The Δ rosA strain was recovered at significantly lower levels than the
 490 WT suggesting that it is at a competitive disadvantage (Figure 7). In a control experiment, we also
 491 competed a phleomycin resistant strain deleted for *yqbR*, a gene located on the Skin prophage region,
 492 that was shown to be transcriptionally inactive in LB by Nicolas et al ¹². This strain retained a 1:1 ratio
 493 with the WT strain after 24 hours. We were also able to restore the fitness deficit of the Δ rosA strain with
 494 ectopic expression of RosA at the *amyE* locus. We propose that the reduction in the levels of enzymes
 495 of the TCA cycle, targeted by increased expression of FsrA and RoxS in the Δ rosA strain, gives these
 496 bacteria a fitness disadvantage as they are unable to generate ATP as quickly the WT strain.

497

498 **RosA is subject to carbon catabolite repression**

499 To begin to understand under which physiological conditions RosA might act as a sponge of FsrA and
 500 RoxS, we investigated how transcription of RosA is controlled. We used the DBTBS server to determine
 501 which transcription factors are predicted to bind to the RosA promoter region and regulate its
 502 transcription ⁴⁶. DBTBS predicted a binding site for the transcriptional regulator CcpA between -1 to +
 503 12 relative to the mapped 5' end of RosA (Figure 1). CcpA mediates carbon catabolite repression in *B.*
 504 *subtilis*, repressing catabolic genes and activating genes involved in excretion of excess carbon ⁴⁷. The
 505 prediction of a CcpA binding site in the promoter region of RosA was corroborated by Marciniak *et al.*
 506 who identified the coordinates of the CcpA binding site in front of RosA ⁴⁸. The expression profile of
 507 RosA in the 104-condition tiling array data for *B. subtilis* was very similar to known members of the CcpA
 508 regulon, such as MalA, AcoA and AbnA, consistent with the idea that RosA is a CcpA regulated sRNA
 509 ¹².

510

511 To confirm the regulation of *rosA* by CcpA we fused the promoter of *rosA* to GFP using the BaSysBioII
512 vector³². We monitored expression of this fusion in WT *B. subtilis* and in an isogenic mutant lacking the
513 *ccpA* gene. No difference in *ProsA*-GFP expression could be seen between the WT and the Δ *ccpA*
514 strain in LB medium (Figure 8A). Addition of 0.3 % (w/v) glucose to the medium resulted in repression
515 of *rosA* promoter activity in the WT strain (Figure 8B), whereas in the absence of *ccpA* the *rosA* promoter
516 remained active, as predicted (Figure 8B).

517

518 We performed a similar experiment where we measured the levels of RosA RNA in a defined medium
519 with 1% malate or arabinose by Northern blot (Figure 8C). RosA levels were similar in WT and Δ *ccpA*
520 mutant strains grown in arabinose where CcpA is inactive on its targets. In contrast, as observed with
521 the promoter fusion, RosA expression was repressed in the WT strain and this repression was alleviated
522 in the Δ *ccpA* mutant strain grown in a medium supplemented with malate.

523

524 We also measured RosA expression during a switch in carbon source. *B. subtilis* WT and Δ *ccpA* strains
525 were first grown to late exponential phase in a defined medium with arabinose as the sole carbon source,
526 before adding 1% malate to promote carbon catabolite repression. Cells were harvested during
527 exponential phase and 30 and 60 min after addition of malate and RosA RNA levels were measured by
528 Northern blot (Figure 8D). Expression of RosA decreased after addition of malate in both the WT and
529 Δ *ccpA* strain. However, the level of RosA was higher in Δ *ccpA* strain than in the WT demonstrating that
530 RosA is subject to the catabolite repression, and that this regulation is partially CcpA dependent. In
531 contrast, when the same membrane was re-probed for RoxS, we observed expression of RoxS was
532 induced upon addition of malate as previously observed¹⁷. These experiments confirm that RosA is a
533 carbon catabolite responsive sRNA controlled by CcpA and that RoxS and RosA are important to
534 manage the reprogramming of gene expression during a switch in carbon sources.

535

536

DISCUSSION

In this study we report the use of *in vivo* RNA cross-linking using the psoralen AMT to globally identify RNA-RNA interactions occurring in the Gram-positive model organism *B. subtilis*. Our results identified hundreds of potential interactions, including previously well described sRNA-mRNA interactions. Two of three known sRNAs containing C-rich regions in *B. subtilis*, FsrA and RoxS, have been shown to target transcripts encoding essential components of central metabolism using their C-rich regions^{14,15,20}. In addition to the identification of known and new mRNA targets for RoxS and FsrA, we also showed that these two sRNAs interact with a new sRNA, S345, that we renamed RosA in this study. Deletion of RosA from the genome of *B. subtilis* leads to a 3.5-fold increase of the half-life of RoxS showing that RosA controls RoxS turnover. In parallel, a proteomic analyses in the Δ rosA strain show a reduced levels of the known RoxS and FsrA targets like the TCA cycle enzymes, SucCD, OdhAB, CitZ, SdhA and CitB^{14,15,21}. Many of the other proteins with reduced levels, identified by the proteomic experiment, were also predicted to be targets of either RoxS or FsrA using CopraRNA^{44,45}. A predicted target of RoxS is *acsA*, which encodes a key enzyme in central metabolism since it catalyses the conversion of ATP, acetate and CoA to AMP, diphosphate and acetyl-CoA, thus acting as a balancing point for the levels of CoA and acetyl-CoA in the cell⁴⁹. Furthermore, the SrtN protein is used by the cell to deacetylate AcsA and this reaction depends on NAD⁺⁵⁰. The goal of RoxS-mediated reduction in AcsA levels may be to reduce non-essential NAD⁺ consumption. Moreover, we showed that the level of RosA and RoxS is comparable in LB and that one-to-one mixtures of RosA and RoxS *in vitro* result in full-duplex formation. Thus, these results show that RosA has the potential to be a highly efficient sponge of RoxS and FsrA activity in *B. subtilis* cells. Our data show that RosA acts differently on the two target RNAs. FsrA is sequestered in classic sponge RNA activity as the levels of the FrsA RNA remain unchanged, but its proteins targets are reduced in the absence of RosA. Whereas for RoxS we have shown that the levels, processing and its target efficacy are being affected.

563 In the field of eukaryotic RNA regulation, sponge RNAs are well-accepted as part of the regulatory
564 landscape ⁵¹ and this idea has recently been getting increased traction in bacteria. Indeed, several
565 sponge RNAs have been described in Gram-negative organisms and, intriguingly, many are derived
566 from other transcripts (reviewed by Figueroa-Bossi and Bossi ⁴² and Azam and Vanderpool ⁴¹). In
567 contrast, RosA is a stand-alone sRNA. Interestingly, another stand-alone sRNA in *S. aureus*, namely
568 RsaI (RsaOG), was also shown to be CcpA-regulated and to interact with the sRNAs RsaG, RsaD and
569 RsaE, the RoxS homologue in *S. aureus*, ⁵². RsaI, like RosA, contains two G-rich regions to bind to
570 RsaG, RsaD and RsaE. These results suggest that RsaI and RosA could fulfil the same functions in *S.*
571 *aureus* and *B. subtilis* and that similar sponge RNA-mediated regulatory pathways exist in Firmicutes to
572 balance the metabolic requirements of the cell. Indeed, RsaI is conserved in the genus *Staphylococcus*
573 but not in Bacilli, while RosA is conserved in some Bacilli but not in the Staphylococci. The role of RsaI
574 as a sponge RNA remains to be definitively proven since the impact of RsaI on RsaE, RsaD and RsaG
575 mRNA targets has not yet been investigated. In contrast to RosA, RsaI has also been shown to
576 additionally have a C-rich region used to bind mRNA targets. It could thus act as both a direct regulator
577 and as an sRNA sponge. The absence of equivalent C-rich regions in RosA may limit its function to that
578 of a sponge RNA. However, we plan to study whether RosA can directly regulate its own mRNA targets.
579

580 In this study, we identified three forms of RosA, with different half-lives. Full length RosA (229 nts) is
581 very short-lived and is quickly processed to the 185 nts form that appears to be the main functional form
582 of RosA. The shortest form of RosA (species 3) has a half-life of 7.1 minutes and its generation is RoxS
583 dependent. We believe that this form of RosA corresponds to a stable degradation product protected
584 from 3' degradation by duplex formation with RoxS. None of the three most commonly used RNases in
585 *B. subtilis*, RNase J1, RNase III or RNase Y could account for the processing of RosA to its different
586 forms (data not shown). The role of RosA in facilitating the processing of RoxS and the possible
587 persistence of a RoxS-RosA duplex in cells (RosA species 3) raises the interesting question of whether
588 RoxS can be recycled from RosA to regulate mRNAs such as *sucCD* that prefer the shorter form of
589 RoxS? One could imagine that this duplex might be a reservoir of mostly processed RoxS, that could

590 switch to new partners for which it had a greater affinity. Further experiments are required to explore
591 this possibility.

592

593 Expression of RoxS is tightly controlled by two transcription factors, ResDE and Rex^{14,17}. Why then is
594 this additional level of post-transcriptional regulation of RoxS by RosA required? Our previous data
595 suggests that RoxS is involved in readjusting the transitory imbalances in NAD/NADH ratio that occur
596 upon encountering carbon sources such as malate. Through its role in reducing NADH levels, RoxS
597 eventually increases the DNA binding capacity of the transcriptional activator Rex, turning down its own
598 expression. However, RoxS is a relatively stable sRNA, with a half-life of 13 min in a WT strain that
599 increases to >45 min in the absence of RosA. The use of this non-coding sponge RNA is thus likely be
600 a way to dial down RoxS activity more efficiently than by simply turning off transcription, first by
601 neutralizing the C-rich regions involved in the regulation of all known targets so far and then by
602 stimulating its degradation. We propose that RosA accelerates the degradation of RoxS by stimulating
603 the opening of the 5' stem loop of RoxS, where RNase Y is known to cleave to produce the truncated
604 form of RoxS, named RoxS (D), *i.e.* the processing pathway that leads to the functional form of RoxS
605 required for *sucCD* regulation is also the first step in RoxS turn-over. In agreement with this hypothesis,
606 the 45 min half-life of RoxS observed in the $\Delta rosA$ strain is similar to that measured previously in a strain
607 deleted for RNase Y¹⁴.

608

609 We determined that RosA is transcriptionally repressed by the main carbon catabolite repressor in *B.*
610 *subtilis*, CcpA, and that the expression of RoxS and RosA is anticorrelated during a switch of carbon
611 source. When *B. subtilis* is grown on one of its preferred carbon sources such as malate⁵³, a large
612 proportion of the carbon is metabolized only as far as pyruvate and acetyl CoA by malate
613 dehydrogenase (Figure 9). These enzymes use NAD as a co-factor, leading to an increase of NADH
614 concentration in the cell known to inhibit the DNA binding abilities of the transcriptional regulator Rex.
615 This inhibition allows the transcriptional derepression of RoxS and, instead of directing malate into the
616 TCA cycle, malate is converted to lactate and acetate *via* fermentation pathways normally repressed by

617 Rex. Fermentation allows the regeneration of NAD⁺ from NADH. Concomitantly, RosA is repressed by
 618 CcpA allowing RoxS to bind its targets including mRNAs encoding enzymes of the TCA cycle which use
 619 NAD as co-factor. CcpA enables *B. subtilis* to quickly adapt to the presence of these preferred carbon
 620 sources. Indeed, CcpA represses genes involved in the metabolism of secondary carbon sources and
 621 turns down expression many of the enzymes of the TCA cycle and transporters of TCA cycle-
 622 intermediates, to ensure resources are not wasted ^{47,54} (Figure 9). CcpA also activates the transcription
 623 of genes whose products are responsible for overflow metabolism when the bacteria are grown on a
 624 preferred carbon source. The targeting of these metabolic pathways is strikingly similar to what was
 625 observed previously by Durand *et al.* for RoxS, *i.e.* CcpA and RoxS have many overlapping targets ¹⁷
 626 (Figure 10). In contrast, when *B. subtilis* is grown on a non-preferred carbon sources like arabinose, the
 627 inactivation of the carbon catabolite protein CcpA will allow the transcriptional derepression of the RosA
 628 sRNA and other CcpA regulated genes, including those encoding enzymes of the TCA cycle. RosA in
 629 turn sponges RoxS and impairs the post-transcriptional repression of RoxS targets, also including
 630 mRNAs implicated in the TCA cycle. Rex, for its part, represses the fermentation pathways (Figure 10).
 631
 632 The discovery here of the RosA RNA sponge under the control of the transcription factor CcpA, provides
 633 the missing link between RoxS and CcpA. In other words, RoxS is connected to the CcpA regulon *via*
 634 the RosA non-coding RNA, and RoxS ensures an additional, potentially more rapid control at the post-
 635 transcriptional level for more than 30 % of genes that are regulated by CcpA. The effect of RosA on
 636 RoxS also significantly expands CcpA regulon.

637

638 CONCLUSIONS

639 We have shown that *in vivo* AMT crosslinking of RNA is a suitable method to identify novel RNA-RNA
 640 interactions including sRNA interactions. We have focused here on a novel interaction between the two
 641 sRNAs FsrA and RoxS with the RNA sponge S345 that we have renamed RosA (Regulator of sRNA A)
 642 and have highlighted its role in balancing the metabolic state of the cell. However, there remains many

643 newly identified interactions in the interaction data set to be investigated that likely represent many novel
644 regulatory mechanisms.

645

646

647 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

648 Conceptualization, ELD; Methodology, ELD, ACS, JRHF, CC¹, SD, AM and TA; Investigation, ELD,
649 SD JM, ACS, SL, GK and JRHF Writing – Original Draft, ELD, SD and CC²; Funding Acquisition, ELD,
650 CC¹ and SD; Supervision, ELD, CC¹, TA, SD and AM.

651 **SUPPLEMENTARY DATA**

652 Supplementary Data are available.

653

654 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

655 The authors would like to thank Jan Maarten van Dijl and Ruben Mars for providing strains. Thomas
656 Guest for constructing the RosA promoter fusion, and Justin Merritt and Holly Hall for useful
657 discussion.

658

659 **FUNDING**

660 This work was supported by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC)
661 Research grant BB/L020173/1 (to ED), University of Warwick, Noreen Murray Award to University of
662 Warwick (ED and CC¹), Medical Research Council Doctoral Training Programme MR/J003964/1 and
663 the University of Bath (ED). SD and CC were supported by funds from the Centre National de la
664 Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and the Université de Paris to UMR8261, the Agence Nationale de la
665 Recherche (BaRR) and the Labex Dynamo program.

666

667 **CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS**

668 The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

669 REFERENCES

- 670 1 Buescher, J. M. *et al.* Global network reorganization during dynamic adaptations of *Bacillus*
671 *subtilis* metabolism. *Science* **335**, 1099-1103, doi:10.1126/science.1206871 (2012).
- 672 2 Lewis, N. E., Nagarajan, H. & Palsson, B. O. Constraining the metabolic genotype-phenotype
673 relationship using a phylogeny of in silico methods. *Nature reviews. Microbiology* **10**, 291-305,
674 doi:10.1038/nrmicro2737 (2012).
- 675 3 Arrieta-Ortiz, M. L. *et al.* An experimentally supported model of the *Bacillus subtilis* global
676 transcriptional regulatory network. *Molecular systems biology* **11**, 839,
677 doi:10.15252/msb.20156236 (2015).
- 678 4 Grainger, D. C., Lee, D. J. & Busby, S. J. Direct methods for studying transcription regulatory
679 proteins and RNA polymerase in bacteria. *Current opinion in microbiology* **12**, 531-535,
680 doi:10.1016/j.mib.2009.08.006 (2009).
- 681 5 Ishihama, A. Prokaryotic genome regulation: multifactor promoters, multitarget regulators and
682 hierarchic networks. *FEMS microbiology reviews* **34**, 628-645, doi:10.1111/j.1574-
683 6976.2010.00227.x (2010).
- 684 6 Storz, G., Vogel, J. & Wassarman, K. M. Regulation by small RNAs in bacteria: expanding
685 frontiers. *Molecular cell* **43**, 880-891, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2011.08.022 (2011).
- 686 7 Dutta, T. & Srivastava, S. Small RNA-mediated regulation in bacteria: A growing palette of
687 diverse mechanisms. *Gene* **656**, 60-72, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gene.2018.02.068> (2018).
- 688 8 Lalaouna, D. *et al.* A 3' external transcribed spacer in a tRNA transcript acts as a sponge for
689 small RNAs to prevent transcriptional noise. *Molecular cell* **58**, 393-405,
690 doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2015.03.013 (2015).
- 691 9 Chao, Y. *et al.* In Vivo Cleavage Map Illuminates the Central Role of RNase E in Coding and
692 Non-coding RNA Pathways. *Molecular cell* **65**, 39-51, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2016.11.002 (2017).
- 693 10 Mars, R. A., Nicolas, P., Denham, E. L. & van Dijl, J. M. Regulatory RNAs in *Bacillus subtilis*: a
694 Gram-Positive Perspective on Bacterial RNA-Mediated Regulation of Gene Expression.
695 *Microbiology and molecular biology reviews : MMBR* **80**, 1029-1057, doi:10.1128/mmb.00026-
696 16 (2016).
- 697 11 Irnov, I., Sharma, C. M., Vogel, J. & Winkler, W. C. Identification of regulatory RNAs in *Bacillus*
698 *subtilis*. *Nucleic acids research* **38**, 6637-6651, doi:10.1093/nar/gkq454 (2010).
- 699 12 Nicolas, P. *et al.* Condition-dependent transcriptome reveals high-level regulatory architecture
700 in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Science* **335**, 1103-1106, doi:10.1126/science.1206848 (2012).
- 701 13 Rasmussen, S., Nielsen, H. B. & Jarmer, H. The transcriptionally active regions in the genome
702 of *Bacillus subtilis*. *Molecular microbiology* **73**, 1043-1057, doi:10.1111/j.1365-
703 2958.2009.06830.x (2009).
- 704 14 Durand, S. *et al.* A nitric oxide regulated small RNA controls expression of genes involved in
705 redox homeostasis in *Bacillus subtilis*. *PLoS genetics* **11**, e1004957,
706 doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004957 (2015).
- 707 15 Gaballa, A. *et al.* The *Bacillus subtilis* iron-sparing response is mediated by a Fur-regulated
708 small RNA and three small, basic proteins. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
709 *of the United States of America* **105**, 11927-11932, doi:10.1073/pnas.0711752105 (2008).
- 710 16 Marchais, A., Duperrier, S., Durand, S., Gautheret, D. & Stragier, P. CsfG, a sporulation-
711 specific, small non-coding RNA highly conserved in endospore formers. *RNA biology* **8**, 358-
712 364 (2011).
- 713 17 Durand, S., Braun, F., Helfer, A. C., Romby, P. & Condon, C. sRNA-mediated activation of
714 gene expression by inhibition of 5'-3' exonucleolytic mRNA degradation. *eLife* **6**,
715 doi:10.7554/eLife.23602 (2017).
- 716 18 Marincola, G., Wencker, F. D. R. & Ziebuhr, W. The Many Facets of the Small Non-coding
717 RNA RsaE (RoxS) in Metabolic Niche Adaptation of Gram-Positive Bacteria. *Journal of*
718 *molecular biology*, doi:10.1016/j.jmb.2019.03.016 (2019).

719 19 Bohn, C. *et al.* Experimental discovery of small RNAs in *Staphylococcus aureus* reveals a
720 riboregulator of central metabolism. *Nucleic acids research* **38**, 6620-6636,
721 doi:10.1093/nar/gkq462 (2010).

722 20 Geissmann, T. *et al.* A search for small noncoding RNAs in *Staphylococcus aureus* reveals a
723 conserved sequence motif for regulation. *Nucleic acids research* **37**, 7239-7257,
724 doi:10.1093/nar/gkp668 (2009).

725 21 Smaldone, G. T. *et al.* A global investigation of the *Bacillus subtilis* iron-sparing response
726 identifies major changes in metabolism. *Journal of bacteriology* **194**, 2594-2605,
727 doi:10.1128/jb.05990-11 (2012).

728 22 Vogel, J. & Luisi, B. F. Hfq and its constellation of RNA. *Nature reviews. Microbiology* **9**, 578-
729 589, doi:10.1038/nrmicro2615 (2011).

730 23 Melamed, S. *et al.* Global Mapping of Small RNA-Target Interactions in Bacteria. *Molecular cell*
731 **63**, 884-897, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2016.07.026 (2016).

732 24 Hammerle, H. *et al.* Impact of Hfq on the *Bacillus subtilis* transcriptome. *PloS one* **9**, e98661,
733 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0098661 (2014).

734 25 Rochat, T. *et al.* Tracking the Elusive Function of *Bacillus subtilis* Hfq. *PloS one* **10**, e0124977,
735 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0124977 (2015).

736 26 Sharma, E., Sterne-Weiler, T., O'Hanlon, D. & Blencowe, B. J. Global Mapping of Human
737 RNA-RNA Interactions. *Molecular cell* **62**, 618-626, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2016.04.030 (2016).

738 27 Lu, Z. *et al.* RNA Duplex Map in Living Cells Reveals Higher-Order Transcriptome Structure.
739 *Cell* **165**, 1267-1279, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.04.028 (2016).

740 28 Aw, J. G. *et al.* In Vivo Mapping of Eukaryotic RNA Interactomes Reveals Principles of Higher-
741 Order Organization and Regulation. *Molecular cell* **62**, 603-617,
742 doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2016.04.028 (2016).

743 29 Anagnostopoulos, C. & Spizizen, J. REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSFORMATION IN
744 *BACILLUS SUBTILIS*. *Journal of bacteriology* **81**, 741-746 (1961).

745 30 Tanaka, K. *et al.* Building the repertoire of dispensable chromosome regions in *Bacillus subtilis*
746 entails major refinement of cognate large-scale metabolic model. *Nucleic acids research* **41**,
747 687-699, doi:10.1093/nar/gks963 (2013).

748 31 Mars, R. A. *et al.* Small regulatory RNA-induced growth rate heterogeneity of *Bacillus subtilis*.
749 *PLoS genetics* **11**, e1005046, doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005046 (2015).

750 32 Botella, E. *et al.* pBaSysBioII: an integrative plasmid generating gfp transcriptional fusions for
751 high-throughput analysis of gene expression in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Microbiology* **156**, 1600-1608,
752 doi:10.1099/mic.0.035758-0 (2010).

753 33 Bsat, N., Herbig, A., Casillas-Martinez, L., Setlow, P. & Helmann, J. D. *Bacillus subtilis*
754 contains multiple Fur homologues: identification of the iron uptake (Fur) and peroxide regulon
755 (PerR) repressors. *Molecular microbiology* **29**, 189-198, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2958.1998.00921.x
756 (1998).

757 34 Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful
758 Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*
759 *(Methodological)* **57**, 289-300, doi:10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x (1995).

760 35 Rappsilber, J., Mann, M. & Ishihama, Y. Protocol for micro-purification, enrichment, pre-
761 fractionation and storage of peptides for proteomics using StageTips. *Nature protocols* **2**,
762 1896-1906, doi:10.1038/nprot.2007.261 (2007).

763 36 Tyanova, S. *et al.* The Perseus computational platform for comprehensive analysis of
764 (prote)omics data. *Nature methods* **13**, 731-740, doi:10.1038/nmeth.3901 (2016).

765 37 Dobin, A. *et al.* STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*
766 **29**, 15-21, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts635 (2013).

767 38 Butcher, B. G., Lin, Y. P. & Helmann, J. D. The yydFGHIJ operon of *Bacillus subtilis* encodes a
768 peptide that induces the LiaRS two-component system. *Journal of bacteriology* **189**, 8616-
769 8625, doi:10.1128/jb.01181-07 (2007).

- Carrier, M. C., Lalaouna, D. & Masse, E. A game of tag: MAPS catches up on RNA interactomes. *RNA biology* **13**, 473-476, doi:10.1080/15476286.2016.1156830 (2016).
- Iosub, I. A. *et al.* Hfq CLASH uncovers sRNA-target interaction networks involved in adaptation to nutrient availability. *bioRxiv*, 481986, doi:10.1101/481986 (2019).
- Azam, M. S. & Vanderpool, C. K. Talk among yourselves: RNA sponges mediate cross talk between functionally related messenger RNAs. *The EMBO journal* **34**, 1436-1438, doi:10.15252/embj.201591492 (2015).
- Figueroa-Bossi, N. & Bossi, L. Sponges and Predators in the Small RNA World. *Microbiology spectrum* **6**, doi:10.1128/microbiolspec.RWR-0021-2018 (2018).
- Gruber, A. R., Lorenz, R., Bernhart, S. H., Neubock, R. & Hofacker, I. L. The Vienna RNA websuite. *Nucleic acids research* **36**, W70-74, doi:10.1093/nar/gkn188 (2008).
- Wright, P. R. *et al.* Comparative genomics boosts target prediction for bacterial small RNAs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **110**, E3487-3496, doi:10.1073/pnas.1303248110 (2013).
- Wright, P. R. *et al.* CopraRNA and IntaRNA: predicting small RNA targets, networks and interaction domains. *Nucleic acids research* **42**, W119-123, doi:10.1093/nar/gku359 (2014).
- Sierro, N., Makita, Y., de Hoon, M. & Nakai, K. DBTBS: a database of transcriptional regulation in *Bacillus subtilis* containing upstream intergenic conservation information. *Nucleic acids research* **36**, D93-96, doi:10.1093/nar/gkm910 (2008).
- Fujita, Y. Carbon catabolite control of the metabolic network in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Bioscience, biotechnology, and biochemistry* **73**, 245-259, doi:10.1271/bbb.80479 (2009).
- Marciniak, B. C. *et al.* High- and low-affinity cre boxes for CcpA binding in *Bacillus subtilis* revealed by genome-wide analysis. *BMC Genomics* **13**, 401, doi:10.1186/1471-2164-13-401 (2012).
- Gardner, J. G., Grundy, F. J., Henkin, T. M. & Escalante-Semerena, J. C. Control of acetyl-coenzyme A synthetase (AcsA) activity by acetylation/deacetylation without NAD(+) involvement in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Journal of bacteriology* **188**, 5460-5468, doi:10.1128/jb.00215-06 (2006).
- Gardner, J. G. & Escalante-Semerena, J. C. In *Bacillus subtilis*, the sirtuin protein deacetylase, encoded by the *srtN* gene (formerly *yhdZ*), and functions encoded by the *acuABC* genes control the activity of acetyl coenzyme A synthetase. *Journal of bacteriology* **191**, 1749-1755, doi:10.1128/jb.01674-08 (2009).
- Bak, R. O. & Mikkelsen, J. G. miRNA sponges: soaking up miRNAs for regulation of gene expression. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews. RNA* **5**, 317-333, doi:10.1002/wrna.1213 (2014).
- Bronesky, D. *et al.* A multifaceted small RNA modulates gene expression upon glucose limitation in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *The EMBO journal*, doi:10.15252/embj.201899363 (2019).
- Kleijn, R. J. *et al.* Metabolic fluxes during strong carbon catabolite repression by malate in *Bacillus subtilis*. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **285**, 1587-1596, doi:10.1074/jbc.M109.061747 (2010).
- Tobisch, S., Zuhlke, D., Bernhardt, J., Stulke, J. & Hecker, M. Role of CcpA in regulation of the central pathways of carbon catabolism in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Journal of bacteriology* **181**, 6996-7004 (1999).
- Vizcaino, J. A. *et al.* ProteomeXchange provides globally coordinated proteomics data submission and dissemination. *Nature biotechnology* **32**, 223-226, doi:10.1038/nbt.2839 (2014).

817 TABLES AND FIGURE LEGENDS

818

819 **Table 1** Proteomics analysis for Δ rosA/WT shows reduced levels of RoxS and FsrA targets

Protein	BSU Number	log2(Δ S345/WT)	Copra/IntaRNA predicted target	Dysregulated in Δ FsrA or Δ RoxS	Protein description and Biological Process
AcsA	BSU29680	-2.27	RoxS		acetyl-CoA synthetase utilization of acetate, fatty acids
SpoVS	BSU16980	-1.57	FsrA		Unknown spore coat assembly, spore core dehydration
CitB	BSU18000	-1.40	FsrA	Δ FsrA	aconitase, trigger enzyme TCA cycle
NadK2/ PpnKB /YtdI	BSU29540	-1.14	RoxS	Δ RoxS	ATP-NAD kinase NADP biosynthesis
YrhF	BSU27210	-1.07	RoxS		Unknown
EtfA	BSU28520	-0.95	RoxS and FsrA	Δ RoxS	electron transfer flavoprotein (alpha subunit) fatty acid degradation,
CitZ	BSU29140	-0.95	RoxS and FsrA	Δ RoxS	Citrate synthase 2 TCA Cycle
OdhB	BSU19360	-0.87			TCA Cycle 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase complex
OdhA	BSU19370	-0.85	RoxS		TCA Cycle 2-oxoglutarate dehydrogenase (E1 subunit)
SucC	BSU16090	-0.84	RoxS	Δ RoxS	succinyl-CoA synthetase (beta subunit) TCA Cycle
YvyI/Pm _i	BSU35790	-0.78	FsrA and RoxS		mannose-6-phosphate isomerase mannose utilization
GudB	BSU22960	-0.78			glutamate dehydrogenase, trigger enzyme glutamate utilization, control of GlcC activity
CitA	BSU09440	-0.78	FsrA and RoxS		minor citrate synthase Unknown
SucD	BSU16100	-0.76		Δ RoxS	succinyl-CoA synthetase (alpha subunit) TCA Cycle
YpbR/ DynA	BSU22030	-0.73	RoxS		dynammin-like protein fusion of membranes
YkrA	BSU14550	-0.62	RoxS		Unknown
YcsA	BSU04000	-0.62	RoxS		putative tartrate dehydrogenase Unknown
SdhA	BSU28440	-0.61	FsrA	Δ FsrA	succinate dehydrogenase (flavoprotein subunit) TCA cycle
YpiB	BSU22580	-0.48	FsrA		Unknown

A

B

831 **Figure 2 Prediction of the interaction between S345 and RoxS**

832 **A.** Prediction of the secondary structure of S345 with RNAfold web server ([http://rna.tbi.univie.ac.at/cgi-](http://rna.tbi.univie.ac.at/cgi-bin/RNAWebSuite/RNAfold.cgi)
833 [bin/RNAWebSuite/RNAfold.cgi](http://rna.tbi.univie.ac.at/cgi-bin/RNAWebSuite/RNAfold.cgi)) **B.** The interaction between RoxS and S345 sRNAs was predicted with
834 IntaRNA web server (<http://rna.informatik.uni-freiburg.de/IntaRNA/Input.jsp>). The RoxS sRNA is
835 coloured in blue. The C-rich region of RoxS and the G-rich region of S345 are coloured in red and grey
836 respectively. The RNA processing site of RoxS and the two main processing site of S345 are indicated
837 with red and purple pairs of scissors respectively (see also Fig. 5).

838

839

840

841 **Figure 3 S345 interacts with RoxS and FsrA sRNAs**

842 Electrophoretic mobility shift assays (EMSA) of S345 with RoxS and FsrA. 1 pmol of S345 was incubated

843 with an increasing concentration of RoxS and/or FsrA. The ratio of sRNA/S345 is indicated.

Figure 4 S345 is a differentially expressed, highly processed sRNA

A representative Northern blot showing total RNA isolated at times after addition of rifampicin (Rif) to WT strain grown in LB or M9 with glucose (0,3%). The three different forms of S345 are indicated by arrows. For each form of S345, the half-life with their standard deviation calculated from two independent experiments (biological replicates) are given under each autoradiogram.

Figure 5 Deletion of S345 alters the turnover rate of RoxS and RoxS targets

(A) A representative Northern blot of total RNA isolated from wild-type (WT) and $\Delta S345$ strains probed for the RoxS sRNA at times after addition of rifampicin (Rif) at 150 $\mu\text{g/mL}$. The blot was re-probed for the 5S rRNA as a loading control **(B)** Northern blot of total RNA isolated from wild-type WT, $\Delta S345$, $\Delta roxS$ and $\Delta S345 \Delta roxS$ strains probed for the *sucCD* or *ppnKB* mRNA. The blot was re-probed for 16S

857 rRNA as a loading control. Calculated half-lives are shown beneath the autoradiographs and are the
858 average of 2 experiments, with standard errors as shown.
859
860

861

862 **Figure 6 RNA processing events of S345 and RoxS are interdependent on the presence of the**

863 **other**

864 **A.** A representative Northern blot of total RNA isolated from Δmja and $\Delta mja \Delta S345$ strains probed for
865 the RoxS sRNA at times after addition of rifampicin (Rif) at 150 $\mu\text{g/mL}$. The blot was re-probed for 5S
866 rRNA as loading control. RoxS: Full size transcript, RoxS(D): truncated form of RoxS. Half-lives are
867 given under each autoradiogram **B.** Northern blot of total RNA isolated from WT and $\Delta roxS$ strains
868 probed for the S345 sRNA at times after addition of rifampicin (Rif) at 150 $\mu\text{g/mL}$. The blot was re-
869 probed for 5S rRNA as loading control. The three forms of S345 are indicated by arrows. Calculated
870 half-lives are shown beneath the autoradiographs and are the average of 2 experiments, with standard
871 errors as shown.

872

873

Figure 7 Δ S345 is reduced in fitness

The fitness deficit of the Δ rosA strain in LB was shown by co-culturing Δ S345 with the wild type strain mixed in a 1:1 ratio. The fitness deficit of Δ rosA was complemented by cloning the RosA sRNA under the control of its native promoter into the pRMC plasmid. Strains were grown for 24 hours and plated on antibiotics to enable CFUs to be determined for each strain in the mixed culture. An antibiotic marked wild type strain was used as a control. Statistically significant differences in fitness between strains calculated using Welch's T test are shown by **. The experiment was repeated three times.

Figure 8 RosA is a CcpA regulated sRNA

A. Assay of the *RosA* promoter fused to GFP in wild type *B. subtilis* and $\Delta ccpA$ in LB with no glucose and **B.** with the addition of 0.3% glucose. Black line with triangles WT growth curve, grey line with triangles $\Delta ccpA$ growth curve. Black line with circles promoter activity of *RosA* in WT, grey line with circles promoter activity in $\Delta ccpA$. Experiments were done in triplicate. **C.** Northern blot of *RosA* in WT and $\Delta ccpA$ mutant strain grown in MD medium with arabinose (1%) or malate (1%) as carbon sources. RNA was extracted at several O.D.₆₀₀ during growth as indicated. **D.** Northern blot of *RosA* and *RoxS* in

892 WT and $\Delta ccpA$ mutant strain grown in MD medium with 1% arabinose. At mid exponential phase
 893 (O.D._{600=0,6}), malate has been added to the culture and samples taken before (-30 min) and after (0, 30
 894 and 60 min) the addition of malate. The blot was re-probed for 5S rRNA as loading control.
 895
 896
 897

A

B

ETC: electron transport chain
M.D.: malate dehydrogenase

898

899 **Figure 9 Model for the regulation of the fermentation and respiration pathways by the two sRNAs**
900 **RoxS and RosA**

901 **A.** In the presence of the preferred carbon source malate, malate dehydrogenases (M.D.) convert
902 malate into pyruvate using NAD as co-factor. The increase of the NADH pool in the cell leads to the
903 inhibition of Rex activity. RoxS is derepressed and regulates its targets (including TCA cycle and
904 respiration enzymes). CcpA is activated and represses numerous genes including those encoding
905 enzymes of the TCA cycle and RosA sRNA avoiding its sponging effect on RoxS. The goal of this
906 regulation is dual: 1) To avoid the hyperactivation of electron transport chain (ETC) due to the increase

907 of the NADH pool to limit oxidative stress 2) To activate fermentation pathways in response to the Rex
 908 inhibition to regenerate NAD. **B.** In the presence of a non-preferred carbon sources like arabinose, the
 909 high NAD/NADH ratio activates Rex which in turn represses fermentation pathways and RoxS sRNA.
 910 The carbon catabolite control by CcpA is also inhibited, allowing RosA expression. RosA sponges RoxS
 911 sRNA present in the cell and blocks its activity. This cascade of regulation allows the full activation of
 912 the TCA cycle and the aerobic respiration of the cell.

913 **Supplemental Data**

914

915 **Supplementary Figure 1 Prediction of the interaction between S345/RosA and FsrA**

916 The interaction between FsrA and S345/RosA sRNAs was predicted with IntaRNA web server
917 (<http://rna.informatik.uni-freiburg.de/IntaRNA/Input.jsp>). FsrA sRNA is coloured in orange. The C-rich
918 region of FsrA and the G-rich region of S345 are coloured in red and grey respectively.

919

920

A

B

921

922 **Supplementary Figure 2 Sizes of S345**

923 **A.** Northern blot analysis of S345/RosA in the WT, $\Delta roxS$ and $\Delta fsrA$ strains before and after the addition
 924 of rifampicin to inhibit transcription. The three forms of S345/RosA are indicated by arrows. A
 925 radiolabelled DNA marker was loaded on the left side. **B.** Primer extension to determine the 5'-end of
 926 S345. RNA was extracted from WT and Δmja strains grown in LB. The sequencing reaction and the
 927 primer extension was done with an oligonucleotide closed to the 3' end of S345/RosA. (1) indicates the
 928 5' end of S345. (*) The 5' end of a 3' degradation product.

929

Supplementary Figure 3 S345/RosA has no reciprocal impact on FsrA degradation or processing

Northern blot analysis of the FsrA sRNA in WT and $\Delta S345/RosA$ strains before and after the addition of rifampicin to inhibit transcription. Calculated half-lives are shown beneath the autoradiographs and are the average of 2 experiments, with standard errors as shown.

Supplementary Figure 4 Quantification of S345/RosA and RoxS

Northern blot with a defined amount of *in vitro* transcript of S345/RosA (left side) and RoxS (right side) and 5 µg of total RNA extracted from a WT strain grown in LB. The experiment was repeated 2 times.

946 **Supplementary Tables 1 and 2**

947 Strains and Oligos used in this study

948

949 **Supplementary Table 3**

950 All statistically significant interactions between FsrA (A) and RoxS (B). Columns - Sample (condition
951 and strain), Target (interacting feature name), Target id (BSU number, Nicolas et al locus id, UA id), P
952 value, sRNA_target_interaction (count of sRNA interactions with target), other_sRNA_interaction
953 (count of other sRNA interactions in individual sample), other_target_interaction (count of other target
954 interactions in individual sample), total_sRNA_reads (total read count for sRNA in sample, interacting
955 and non-interacting), total_target_read (total read count for target in sample, interacting and non-
956 interacting).

957

958 **Supplementary Table 4**

959 Most statistically significant interactions between FsrA (A) and RoxS (B) across the pairs of
960 sequenced samples.