RecA levels modulate biofilm development in *Acinetobacter baumannii*

Carly Ching^{1,2}, Paul Muller¹, Merlin Brychcy¹, Alicyn Reverdy¹, Brian Nguyen¹, Margaret Downs^{1,3},
Samuel Regan⁴, Breanna Isley¹, William Fowle¹, Yunrong Chai¹, and Veronica G. Godoy^{1*}

¹Northeastern University, Department of Biology, Boston, MA, 02115

²Current address: Department of Biomedical Engineering, Boston University, Boston, MA, 02215

³Current address: Department of Biochemistry, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA
02118.

⁴Current Address: Transitional Year Resident at St. Joseph Mercy Ann Arbor, 5301 McAuley Dr.,
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197.

* Corresponding Author: Veronica G. Godoy, v.godoycarter@northeastern.edu

Abstract

Infections caused by *Acinetobacter baumannii*, a Gram-negative opportunistic pathogen, are difficult to eradicate due to the bacterium's propensity to quickly gain antibiotic resistances and form protective bacterial multicellular communities known as biofilms. The *A. baumannii* DNA damage response (DDR) mediates antibiotic resistance acquisition and regulates RecA in an atypical fashion; both RecA^{Low} and RecA^{High} cell types are formed in response to DNA damage. In this study, we show that RecA levels modulate biofilm development, formation and dispersal, through *bfmR*, the global biofilm regulator. RecA loss results in surface attachment and prominent biofilms while elevated RecA leads to diminished attachment and dispersal. Recalcitrance to treatment may be explained by DDR induction, common during infection, and the balance between biofilm maintenance in low RecA cells, and increased mutagenesis and dispersal to reach new niches in high RecA cells. These data highlight the importance of understanding fundamental biology to better treat bacterial infections.

Impact

The mechanism of biofilm formation and dispersal in *A. baumannii*, shown here to depend on RecA levels, contributes to the understanding of recalcitrant infections caused by this important pathogen.

Introduction

Acinetobacter baumannii is an emerging Gram-negative opportunistic pathogen and one of the ESKAPE pathogens, a group of bacteria responsible for most hospital-acquired infections (Rice, 2008). *A. baumannii* outbreaks in hospitals are difficult to eradicate, due to increased multi-drug resistance (MDR) (Peleg et al., 2008) and its ability to form biofilms (Eze et al., 2018). *A. baumannii* infections are very dangerous to immunocompromised individuals, causing various illnesses, including pneumonia, septicemia, and wound infections (Smith et al., 2007).

When gene products involved in antibiotic binding or processing on the chromosome are mutated, resistance is acquired (Blair et al., 2014). One response pathway underlying multidrug resistance (MDR) is the DNA damage response (DDR). Mutagenesis results from induction of error-prone DNA polymerase genes which are part of the DDR regulon (Cirz et al., 2007; Fuchs and Fujii, 2013). We have shown that in *A. baumannii*, RecA-dependent induction of multiple error-prone polymerases in response to DNA damage leads to clinically relevant antibiotic resistance (Norton et al., 2013). In *Escherichia coli* and many other bacteria, the cells' main recombinase, RecA, and the global transcriptional repressor, LexA, manage the DDR, also known as the SOS response (Little and Mount, 1982). In contrast, there is no known LexA homologue in *A. baumannii*, indicating the *A. baumannii* DDR circuitry is regulated differently (Ching et al., 2017; Hare et al., 2014; MacGuire et al., 2014; Norton et al., 2013). We also showed that in response to DNA damage there are two RecA cell types, low *recA* expression (RecA^{Low}) and high *recA* expression (RecA^{High}), regulated by a 5'untranslated region in the *recA* transcript (Ching et al., 2017; MacGuire et al., 2014).

Bacterial cells within biofilms are often less sensitive to chemical and physical challenges, including antibiotics (Anderl and Franklin, 2000; Singh et al., 2016). Like many biological processes, the biofilm cycle in *A. baumannii* is not fully understood, though key biofilm genes have been described, including the biofilm master regulator gene *bfmR* that controls adhesive *csu* pili and genes important for virulence and desiccation tolerance (Farrow et al., 2018; Tomaras et al., 2008, 2003). It is also known that genes encoding Bap protein and efflux pumps are important for biofilms (Brossard and Campagnari, 2012; He et al., 2015; Loehfelm et al., 2008; Tomaras et al., 2008, 2003). The BfmR response regulator is part of a two-component system (BfmRS) (Farrow et al., 2018; Geisinger and Isberg, 2015; Russo et al., 2016; Tomaras et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2014) that results in BfmR phosphorylation. It is unknown if *bfmR* expression is induced by another factor or whether de-repression by phosphorylated BfmR, with lower affinity for its operator site (Draughn et al., 2018), is enough for induction. The *A. baumannii* biofilm extracellular matrix has been reported to contain poly- β -(1-6)-*N*-acetylglucosamine, mannose and extracellular DNA (Bales et al., 2013; Choi et al., 2009; Hardouin et al., 2014; Sahu et al., 2012).

In summary, the DDR and the biofilm cycle are two developmental pathways in bacteria to assure genomic stability and survival. In some bacteria, antibiotics and DNA damaging agents have been observed to induce biofilm formation, suggesting a link between these two pathways (Linares et al., 2006; Takajashi et al., 1995). However, the mechanisms linking the DDR and biofilms varies between bacterial species. For example, in *Streptococcus mutans*, *Escherichia coli* (Costa et al., 2014; Inagaki et al., 2009), and *Clostridium difficile* (Walter et al., 2015) there is a direct correlation between DDR and biofilms in which both pathways are induced in response to environmental signals. However, we showed that during *Bacillus subtilis* biofilm development, induction of the DDR shuts off biofilm matrix genes in a subpopulation of cells (Gozzi et al., 2017), indicating an inverse correlation between

DDR and biofilm formation. In this case, DDR signaling complements the biofilm cycle, and cells that are DDR-induced could potentially leave the biofilm to search for new niches. Altogether, the varied relationships between DDR and the biofilm cycle are intriguing and show that cells have evolved different ways to balance these strategies, which could have downstream effects in treatment and clinical practices.

Here, we demonstrate that the DDR and the biofilm cycle intersect in *A. baumannii*. We show that loss of RecA in *A. baumannii* results in increased cell-to-surface adherence, in part due to elevated expression of *bfmR* with a concomitant increase in Csu pili. We further identify novel regulation of *bfmR* through the RecA-dependent UmuDAb gene product. We observed that DNA damaged biofilm pellicles shut off *csuAB* gene expression, turn on *recA*, and cells disperse. The observed inverse relationship between DDR and biofilm formation may lead to a heterogeneous population combining physical (biofilm) and genetic (elevated mutagenesis) protection to environmental challenges.

Results

Figure 1. RecA negatively influences surface attachment and biofilm formation. (A) Saturated $\Delta recA$ cell cultures show growth on the side surface of glass test tubes (red arrow) compared to WT cells. **(B)** $\Delta recA$ forms visible pellicles biofilms at the air-liquid interface earlier than its isogenic WT counterpart. Biofilm pellicles of WT (with empty PNLAC1 plasmid), $\Delta recA$ (with empty PNLAC1 plasmid), and the complemented strain ($\Delta recA$ (pNLAC1-*recA*)) at 24 hrs. Representative images are shown. **(C)** $\Delta recA$ cells adhere to the abiotic surface better than WT and the $\Delta recA$ complemented strain ($\Delta recA$ (pNLAC1-*recA*)). Left panel displays wells after Crystal Violet staining. Right panel shows absorbance at 595 nm for Crystal Violet staining of polystyrene surface-adhered cells at 24 hrs. Experiments were performed in triplicate and error bars shown represent standard deviation of the mean. An unpaired two-tailed T-test was performed for statistical analysis, * = $P < 0.05$. Brackets above the columns show the comparisons made. NS=not significant **(D)** RecA influences colony biofilm architecture and coloration. Differences in Congo Red coloration is an indication of biofilm matrix alterations. Colony biofilms of WT, $\Delta recA$ and complemented $\Delta recA$ strains on plates at 48 hrs. Numbers shown underneath the images represent the average diameter of 3 colonies from images taken at the same magnification and settings in 3 independent experiments relative to the WT colony diameter set as 1. The error shown is the standard deviation of the mean. **(E)** $\Delta recA$ biofilms have increased observable matrix compared to WT biofilms. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) of WT and $\Delta recA$ biofilms collected on coverslips at 24 hrs. Scale bar is 3 μ m.

Loss of RecA promotes biofilms in *A. baumannii*

A. baumannii ATCC 17978 $\Delta recA$ cells (*recA::km*, Table S1 (Aranda et al., 2011)) grown in standard LB medium and shaking conditions consistently displayed observable surface attachment on the sides of glass tubes (Fig. 1A, red arrow). In comparison, the parental wild-type strain had little to no surface attachment (Fig. 1A). This observation suggested that *A. baumannii* $\Delta recA$ cells form more biofilm than WT cells. Since lack of RecA can presumably affect bacterial growth (Cox et al., 2008), we performed growth measurements of free-living planktonic WT and $\Delta recA$ cells. We also measured growth in $\Delta recA$ cells complemented with a low-copy plasmid, pNLAC1 (Luke et al., 2010), containing *recA* under its own promoter (Ching et al., 2017) ($\Delta recA$ (pNLAC1-*recA*), Table S1), which we will refer to as the complemented $\Delta recA$ mutant. We observed a slight growth disadvantage in $\Delta recA$ cells whenever the starting inoculum size was $<10^7$ cells that was rescued by the extrachromosomal copy of *recA* (Fig S1A & B). Our result is largely consistent with a previous report that the $\Delta recA$ strain showed no noticeable growth defects compared to the parental WT strain (Aranda et al., 2011).

To further assay biofilm formation, we prepared pellicle biofilms (formed at the air-liquid interface) with $\Delta recA$ and WT cells as indicated in materials and methods. WT cells did not form a visible pellicle (Fig. 1B, left) at 24 hrs while $\Delta recA$ cells (Fig. 1B, middle) formed a visible and opaque pellicle as early as 24 hrs, consistent with previous observations (Fig. 1A). At 48 and 72 hrs the WT cells formed a pellicle that was smooth and with striations while the $\Delta recA$ pellicle was thicker and granular on the surface (Fig. S2). Cell adherence to the sides/bottom of the wells were measured by Crystal Violet staining. We observed a significant increase in surface-attached cells in $\Delta recA$ biofilms at 24 hrs compared to WT cells (Fig. 1C). These data suggest that $\Delta recA$ makes prominent biofilms compared to the WT strain. To confirm that the observed $\Delta recA$ biofilms are indeed due to loss of RecA, we tested the $\Delta recA$ complemented strain for biofilm formation. At 24 hrs, there was less observable

pellicle formation in the complemented strain (Fig 1B, right), and surface architecture was similar to WT (Fig. S2).

Biofilm formation is also studied at the colony level (growth at the air-surface interface) (Vlamakis et al., 2013). Typically, robust colony biofilms have more wrinkling surface architecture due to differential cell death and mechanical forces as a result of increased extracellular matrix (Asally et al., 2012). Thus, we grew colony biofilms on solid medium plates containing Congo red and Coomassie brilliant blue, dyes that detect changes in biofilm matrix components (Ghodke et al., 2019; Surgalla and Beesley, 1969). At 48 hrs, the $\Delta recA$ colony biofilm had differential coloring to the WT and complemented strain indicative of increased biofilm matrix production (Fig 1D). We noticed that the $\Delta recA$ colony biofilms also had decreased diameter size throughout the length of the experiment. Notably, the complemented $\Delta recA$ colony is similar in size to WT but with an intermediate coloration (Fig. 1D). We have previously observed partial complementation of colony biofilms phenotypes with plasmid borne ectopic gene copies, possibly due to the sensitivity of the process to gene dosage (Ching et al., 2018). The data obtained from these experiments suggest that the $\Delta recA$ strain forms robust biofilms.

Inverse relationship between RecA and biofilm is not exclusive to *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978

To assess whether this finding was exclusive to *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978, we used a transposon derivative of *A. baumannii* AB5075 in which the transposon is inserted approximately in the middle of the RecA ORF (Gallagher et al., 2015) (Table S1). *A. baumannii* AB5075 is a highly virulent clinical isolate (Jacobs et al., 2014). For pellicle biofilms at 48 hrs, the AB5075 insertional $recA::Tn$ mutant had significantly increased cell adherence compared to the parental strain (Fig. S3A). Furthermore, the

AB5075 *recA::Tn* mutant colony biofilm is also smaller than the parental strain and displays differences in colony morphology, including changes in opacity and striations on the edge (Fig. S3B). These data suggest that the observation that RecA negatively impacts biofilm development is not exclusive to the ATCC 17978 strain.

RecA modulates the biofilm matrix in *A. baumannii*

Since $\Delta recA$ forms prominent biofilms, we were curious to observe closely the differences between $\Delta recA$ and WT biofilms, especially regarding the extracellular matrix. Thus, we analyzed $\Delta recA$ and WT pellicle biofilms by scanning electron microscopy (SEM). To observe pellicle biofilms from the WT and $\Delta recA$ strains we used a fixing procedure that takes advantage of cationic dyes binding to negatively charged polysaccharides and preserve these for imaging (Erlandsen et al., 2004). We found that there were noticeable differences between the matrix and biofilm structures of the WT and $\Delta recA$ strains (Fig. 1E). At 24 hrs WT cells have some matrix and connection between cells, while $\Delta recA$ cells were embedded in an observable thick matrix (Fig. 1E). This finding suggests that $\Delta recA$ cells produce extracellular matrix earlier in their biofilm development.

Surface-attached cells withstand antibiotic treatment

Biofilms have been noted to protect bacteria from antibiotic exposure (Anderl and Franklin, 2000; Singh et al., 2016). To determine if there were any differences in antibiotic susceptibility of the WT and $\Delta recA$ biofilms compared to free-living cells, surface-attached WT and $\Delta recA$ biofilms were treated with the bactericidal aminoglycoside gentamicin. First, we determined the MIC of gentamicin for exponentially growing free living planktonic cells and found it to be the same for both WT and $\Delta recA$ cells (1.88 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, error within 2-fold). Aranda *et al.* determined the MIC in free living

planktonic cells to Amikacin and Tobramycin, both aminoglycosides, and reported that these were also the same for the WT and $\Delta recA$ strains (1.5 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ and 0.38 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, respectively) (Aranda et al., 2011).

To assess whether biofilms withstand gentamicin treatment differently to planktonic cells, the spent growth medium from 72 hr pellicle biofilms was removed, the wells were washed to eliminate non-attached cells and gentamicin was added in fresh growth medium at different concentrations, and wells were incubated for 24 hrs. After exposure to gentamicin, the growth medium and non-attached cells were removed, and Crystal Violet staining was performed as before. Strikingly, there were more surface-attached $\Delta recA$ cells suggesting that they withstood treatment better than WT cells (Fig. 2A). For the $\Delta recA$ strain, the percentage of surface-attached cells remaining after antibiotic treatment plateaus above 50% relative to no treatment after exposure to 0.47–15 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ of gentamicin (Fig. 2B), representing over 3-fold excess of $\Delta recA$ surface-attached cells compared to WT (at 15 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ the percentage of WT surface-attached cells decreases to ~16% relative to no treatment).

Figure 2. Biofilm formation influences antibiotic challenge (A) The $\Delta recA$ strain forms stronger biofilms and withstands gentamicin treatment better than the WT. Images of Crystal Violet staining representing cell attachment of 72 hr mature biofilms formed by $\Delta recA$ and WT after 24 hrs of gentamicin treatment. The concentrations shown are those below and above the MIC measured for free-living planktonic cells. (B) Percentage eradication of biofilms (A595 of exposed biofilm/A595 of untreated parental biofilm) treated with a range of gentamicin concentrations for WT and $\Delta recA$ cells. Experiments were performed in triplicate. Error bars represent standard deviation. An unpaired two-tailed T-test was performed to compare percentage of eradication between WT and $\Delta recA$ cells for each antibiotic concentration, * = $P < 0.05$.

To determine if the remaining surface-attached cells were viable, we directly measured the viability of surface-attached cells before and after gentamicin treatment, by LIVE/DEAD staining and quantified the number of cells within 5 independent fields of view. We find that without gentamicin and compared to the WT, the $\Delta recA$ strain had ~ 2-fold more viable surface-attached cells (Table 1). The gentamicin treated biofilms (Table 1) shows that $\Delta recA$ cells in a biofilm survive approximately 4-fold better than WT cells upon antibiotic exposure (Table 1). Taken together, the evidence indicates that biofilms made by $\Delta recA$ protect cells from antibiotic treatment.

Increasing RecA diminishes biofilm formation

Together, our data suggest that there is an inverse relationship between RecA and biofilms in *A. baumannii*. To further test this relationship, we artificially increased RecA levels in the WT cells and expected that a RecA overproducing strain would form poor biofilms with fewer surface-attached cells than WT or $\Delta recA$ biofilms. Thus, we introduced the plasmid borne copy of *recA* under its own promoter (pNLAC1-*recA*, Table S1) into the WT strain, which we refer to as *recA*⁺⁺ (Table S1). We first measured the intracellular RecA concentration of *recA*⁺⁺ relative to the WT strain. To do this, we purified *A. baumannii* RecA and *Escherichia coli* RecA to test whether an antibody raised against *E. coli* RecA recognizes *A. baumannii* RecA equally well. There is no difference between the detection of the *E. coli* RecA or *A. baumannii* RecA for the antibody (Fig. S4A&B). Using semi-quantitative western blot analysis, we found that the relative level of RecA in *recA*⁺⁺ cells were between 3- to 5-fold higher than WT in both basal and DNA-damage inducing conditions than the parental strain (Fig. S4C). We calculated that after DNA damage, RecA relative levels in the WT strain increased by ~3-fold relative to basal. Thus, *recA*⁺⁺ at basal conditions has similar levels of RecA as the WT strain treated with 10X MIC of ciprofloxacin (Fig. S4C).

Figure 3. RecA levels modulate *A. baumannii* cell attachment. (A) Cells with high levels of RecA form significantly weaker biofilms than $\Delta recA$ and WT. To change the levels of RecA, we introduced into WT cells a plasmid encoding *recA* driven by its own promoter. We refer to this strain as $recA^{++}$. These cells produce RecA at levels similar of fully induced WT cells (Fig. S4). Both WT and $\Delta recA$ adhere significantly better to surfaces than $recA^{++}$. Graph displays absorbance at 595 nm for Crystal Violet staining of polystyrene surface-adhered cells from 48 hr pellicles. The error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean. An unpaired two-tailed T-test was performed for statistical analysis in which $\Delta recA$ was compared pairwise to each WT and $recA^{++}$, and WT was compared to $recA^{++}$. * = $P < 0.05$. (B) $\Delta recA$ cells attach to surfaces faster than either WT or $recA^{++}$. Surface attachment of WT (with empty PNLAC1 plasmid), $\Delta recA$ (with empty PNLAC1 plasmid) and $recA^{++}$. $\Delta recA$ cells attach to polysterene surfaces between 3-6 hours after inoculation. Error bars, for the most part not visible (very small), represent the standard deviation of the mean. (C) There is no large difference in growth between strains during the first 13 hrs of biofilm formation. Colony Forming Units (CFUs)/mL of the respective strains at the same time points as in (B). The error bars represent standard deviation of the mean. Experiment was performed in technical triplicate and biological duplicate. (D) The $\Delta recA$ strain has high density of pili. Transmission electron microscopy images of the pili on the surface of the WT, $\Delta recA$, and $recA^{++}$ strains. The scale bar for the WT and $\Delta recA$ strains images is 100 nm and 500 nm for $recA^{++}$. (E) Immunoblot for Csui pili isolated from the indicated strains. The total protein ratio of each cell extract from which the pili were isolated compared to WT is shown at the bottom of the image. The >40kD band is non-specific but clearly shows that same amounts of proteins were loaded per lane. (F) Immunoblot for Csui pili from whole cell extracts also show that $\Delta recA$ cells have more Csui pili. There is no difference in Csui pili between $\Delta recA$ cells with or without the empty vector (pNLAC1). The cell free extracts were loaded at similar concentrations (20 μ g of total protein per lane) as also shown by the >40kD band. An anti-Csui polyclonal primary antibody, and an anti-rabbit secondary antibody were used at the dilutions indicated in Materials and Methods. Lanes are appropriately labelled, and the MW size markers are shown. The CsuiAB protein band is highlighted by the arrows.

210 We observed that $recA^{++}$ biofilms had significantly less surface-attached cells compared to the WT and

ΔrecA biofilms, but still above the limit of detection (Fig 3A, dashed line shows limit of detection).

The *recA⁺⁺* strain grown in planktonic conditions had a slight growth defect which was like *ΔrecA* cells in shaking conditions. These strains doubling time was 0.15X slower than WT based on these growth curves (Fig. S1 C&D).

RecA levels influence surface attachment

Since there were minor growth defects in planktonic shaking conditions for *ΔrecA* and *recA⁺⁺* cells (Fig. S1) in the conditions tested, we decided to concurrently measure biofilm attachment and bacterial growth in the first 13 hours of static growth conditions. We inferred that difference in biofilms due to growth would be apparent at the early stages of biofilm formation where there may still be active cell division. To do this, we set up biofilms as indicated in materials and methods and measured surface attachment while also determining colony forming units (CFUs) from 0-13 hrs at regular intervals. Strikingly, at 6 hrs we detected an increase in surface-attached cells for *ΔrecA* compared to WT and *recA⁺⁺*, both of which showed little attachment (Fig. 3B). The colony forming unit counts were comparable for all the strains (Fig. 3C). These data show that *ΔrecA* cells attach to surfaces earlier than the WT or the *recA⁺⁺* strains, as our previous assays suggested (Fig. 1B). This also demonstrates that our findings for biofilm formation are directly comparable and not, in part, due to growth differences. In this experiment, as well as in the one shown previously (Fig. 1B), strains contained the empty plasmid (pNLAC1; Table S1) for direct comparison to the complemented strain. We observed that regardless of pNLAC1 (Fig. 3B, C) *ΔrecA* forms robust biofilms, while WT and *recA⁺⁺* do not. Overall our data indicates an inverse relationship between RecA and biofilm development.

RecA levels influence density of attachment pili

Since $\Delta recA$ cells attaches to surfaces faster than WT or $recA^{++}$ (Fig. 3A, B), we wanted to investigate whether $\Delta recA$ had more surface pili to permit attachment. Csu pili are involved in cell adherence in *A. baumannii* biofilms (Gaddy and Actis, 2009; Pakharukova et al., 2018; Rumbo-Feal et al., 2013; Tomaras et al., 2003). To investigate this, we imaged the $\Delta recA$, WT and $recA^{++}$ strains from saturated cultures using transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Remarkably, $\Delta recA$ cells displayed a higher density of surface pili than WT or $recA^{++}$ cells (Fig. 3D). To determine whether we were observing, in part, Csu pili, we performed a Western blot to detect CsuAB protein from both purified pili (Fig. 3E) and total cell extracts (Fig. 3F). We detected a strong signal for CsuAB pili in $\Delta recA$ cells.

We next constructed a plasmid containing the promoter of the *csuAB* operon fused to *gfp* (P_{csuAB} -*gfp*) which was introduced into $\Delta recA$, WT, and $recA^{++}$ strains. Fluorescence measurements of statically grown cells in YT medium showed a fluorescence signal in $\Delta recA$ cells at ~6 hours, and the signal further accumulated to orders of magnitude more than WT or $recA^{++}$ (Fig. 4A). Indeed, GFP fluorescence of the WT strain with the same *csu* reporter plasmid was detected after 36 hours and gradually increased with time. Expression in the $recA^{++}$ strain was even lower, while growth is comparable (Fig. 4A). Single cell imaging of these cells at 20 hrs showed that fluorescence was easily detectable in $\Delta recA$, but largely absent in WT or $recA^{++}$ (Fig. 4B). Quantification of fluorescence of single cells (Fig. 4C) shows significantly elevated average fluorescence in $\Delta recA$ cells compared to $recA^{++}$ or WT. Notably, $recA^{++}$ fluorescence is significantly lower than the WT (Fig. 4C). We next measured expression levels of *csu* pili genes in biofilm pellicle cells using qPCR. *csuAB* expression is ~80-fold higher in *A. baumannii* $\Delta recA$ and lower in $recA^{++}$ compared to WT cells (Fig. 4D). In

Figure 4. Csui pili expression depends on RecA levels. (A) $\Delta recA$ cells with a Csui fluorescent reporter show elevated and earlier fluorescence compared to WT or recA⁺⁺. Fluorescence, a measure of Csui pili expression, was measured every 15 mins for a 1000 mins at 25°C in static conditions in a plate reader. (B) Single cell detection of the csu-gfp reporter shows high csu in $\Delta recA$ cells. Representative fluorescent images of the *A. baumannii* strains with a Csui fluorescent reporter after 24 hrs in shaking conditions. Scale bar represents 10 μ m. (C) Quantification of fluorescence in single cells demonstrate csu-gfp fluorescence dependence on RecA levels; high in $\Delta recA$, and low in recA⁺⁺. At least 300 single cells were counted, and their fluorescence measured with MicrobeJ (Ducret et al., 2016) from microscope images taken with the same settings. Mean single cell fluorescence with standard deviation is plotted. An unpaired two-tailed T-test was performed for statistical analysis; *p<0.05 (D) csu transcript is higher in $\Delta recA$ cells compared to WT and recA⁺⁺. qPCR was performed in triplicate with three biological repeats to measure csu gene expression from the WT, $\Delta recA$ and recA⁺⁺ strains. Expression was standardized to 16S rRNA expression, and the value for the WT strain was set to 1 (dotted line). Error bars represent standard deviation of the mean. An unpaired two-tailed T-Test was used for statistical analysis, compared to gene expression of the WT strain. * = P< 0.05, NS = not significant.

260

265

increase in RecA. To test this and monitor both RecA and *csuAB* expression we constructed a plasmid borne transcriptional reporter of *Csu* genes as the one we used previously (Fig. 4), but used instead

mCherry, P_{csuAB} -mCherry, and we introduced it into the *A. baumannii* strain already containing a chromosomal P_{recA} -gfp reporter (Ching et al., 2018). 48 hr pellicle biofilms of the double reporter strain were treated with 0.5X MIC of ciprofloxacin (Cip), which is known to induce the DDR but does not kill cells (MacGuire et al., 2014), for an additional 48 hrs. The biofilm pellicles were examined by confocal microscopy to observe differences in gene expression, and in biofilm thickness.

In untreated biofilms (Fig. 5A), most cells had moderate to high expression of the P_{csuAB} -mCherry pili reporter with few expressing the P_{recA} -gfp (Fig. 5A). In comparison, cells isolated from Cip-treated biofilms showed dramatic changes (Fig. 5B). Most of the DNA damaged biofilm cells were fluorescing GFP, an indication of RecA induction, with few cells expressing mCherry. There appeared to be little to no overlap in gene expression between the two reporters, suggestive of mutually exclusive cell types. Most treated cells were also elongated, as cell division inhibition is a common feature of DDR induction (Kreuzer, 2013). Notably, the untreated pellicles showed high cell density and had a greater thickness (28 μ m) than the treated pellicles (22 μ m), suggesting that biofilm dispersal occurred in response to DNA damage treatment. It is unlikely that thinning is due to cell death by the Cip treatment since we used sub-MIC levels of Cip. Our data suggest that RecA negatively influences expression of *Csu* pili genes, necessary for expression of the *Csu* pili machinery and biofilm formation.

RecA levels modulate *bfmR* expression

287 Csu pili regulation is dependent on BfmR, a key regulator of biofilm formation in *A. baumannii*
 288 (Tomaras et al., 2008). Increased Csu pili in $\Delta recA$ suggests either higher *bfmR* expression or perhaps
 289 a more active BfmR. To test whether *bfmR* was differentially expressed we measured expression levels
 290 of *bfmR* in biofilm pellicles using qPCR. We found that *bfmR* expression is significantly higher in
 291 $\Delta recA$, but not in $recA^{++}$, compared to WT (~4 folds, Fig. 6A). These results suggest that RecA levels
 292 manage *bfmR* expression that in turn controls Csu pili.

Figure 6. RecA levels modulate biofilm development through *bfmR* and UmuDAb. (A) $\Delta recA$ have significantly higher *bfmR* expression, the global biofilm regulator. *bfmR* transcript is higher in $\Delta recA$ compared to WT or *umuDAb*. qPCR was performed twice each with three biological repeats. Dotted line represents WT expression. An unpaired two-tailed T-test was performed for statistical analysis, compared to gene expression of the WT strain; * $p < 0.05$, NS=not significant. (B) UmuDAb is the RecA-controlled transcription factor regulating biofilms. A strain lacking *umuDAb* form poor biofilms compared to other strains. The $\Delta recA$ strain forms biofilm significantly better than any of the other strains tested in pairwise statistical analysis shown by the straight line on top of the columns. The WT strain is significantly different to $\Delta umuDAb$ and $recA^{++}$, while $\Delta umuDAb$ is significantly different to $recA^{++}$. An unpaired two-tailed T-test was performed for statistical analysis; * $p < 0.05$. (C) Transmission electron micrograph of the $\Delta umuDAb$ strain shows no surface pili. Representative image shown. Scale bar is 100nm. (D) Model based on the presented data. Arrows represent positive effect while the red blunted line represents a negative effect, which in the UmuDAb case we believe is post-translational.

UmuDAb, a RecA-dependent transcription factor, regulates BfmR

While *A. baumannii* lacks LexA, UmuDAb, is a known repressor of some, but not all, DDR genes (Hare et al., 2014). Notably, UmuDAb has a typical helix-turn-helix DNA binding motif at the amino-terminal end that is cleaved by activated RecA nucleoprotein filament, RecA*, in a way believed to be like that of LexA and other proteins within the same family (Draughn et al., 2018; Hare et al., 2013). Cleavage of UmuDAb by RecA* provides a plausible mechanistic explanation for the observations that high RecA levels (i.e. low UmuDAb) lead to biofilm dispersal. Thus, we hypothesized that UmuDAb may serve as a RecA-dependent regulator of biofilms.

We constructed a $\Delta umuDAb$ strain as we have previously done (Norton et al., 2013) and tested biofilm formation. We found that the $\Delta umuDAb$ strain formed significantly weaker biofilms than any of the other strains previously studied in pairwise comparisons (Fig 6B). In fact, $\Delta umuDAb$ formed significantly worse biofilms than *recA*⁺⁺ (Fig. 6B). Consistent with this observation, TEM showed no visible pili on the surface of $\Delta umuDAb$ cells (Fig 6C). Furthermore, we detected almost no *bfmR* transcript in $\Delta umuDAb$ cells compared to WT (Fig 6A). Contrary to the known UmuDAb repressor function (Hare et al., 2014; Witkowski et al., 2016), our findings suggest that UmuDAb has a positive effect on *bfmR* and consequently on *csu*. Taken together, our data suggest that UmuDAb is an inducer of *bfmR*. Our group is currently investigating the mechanism by which UmuDAb performs this function.

Discussion

Bacteria largely exist in the environment as biofilms (Costerton et al., 1995). Generally, cells in biofilms have different characteristics and gene expression profiles from their free-living planktonic counterparts. Here, we find that in *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978, RecA levels, a key DDR gene product,

influences biofilm development in either the ATCC 17978 (Figs. 1-6) or AB5075 (Fig. S3) strains. Our data also show that cells lacking *recA* produce robust biofilms (Fig. 1). Importantly, $\Delta recA$ biofilms on an abiotic surface are more resilient (Fig. 2) and are viable after antibiotic treatment (Table 1) providing additional evidence to the concept that biofilms protect cells from antibiotic exposure (Anderl and Franklin, 2000; Singh et al., 2016). Thus, recurring *A. baumannii* infections may be the product of cells remaining adhered to equipment surfaces or implanted devices.

We found that RecA levels influence biofilm formation through Csu pili density. $\Delta recA$ cell adherence is dependent on higher *csuAB* and increased Csu pili compared to either the WT or the *recA*⁺⁺ strains (Figs. 3, 4). Our results further suggest that *csuAB* expression is due to induction of *bfmR* (Fig. 6). It has been previously shown that *bfmR* and *csuAB* expression is higher in biofilm cells (Rumbo-Feal et al., 2013) consistent with our findings.

Aranda *et al.* phenotypically characterized the $\Delta recA$ insertional mutant used in this study. Free-living $\Delta recA$ cells had decreased survival during heat shock, desiccation, UV, and certain antibiotic treatment (Aranda et al., 2011). Importantly, the $\Delta recA$ strain had much lower pathogenicity in a mouse model, indicating its importance in this process (Aranda et al., 2011). These results demonstrate the significance of RecA in survival and virulence in free-living planktonic cells. However, our findings demonstrate the importance of investigating both biofilm and free-living states. For example, it has been shown that strong *A. baumannii* biofilm formers are less frequently antibiotic-resistant, consistent with having lower levels of RecA and subsequently mutagenesis (Wang et al., 2018). Moreover, biofilm cells were more resistant to eradication (Wang et al., 2018), again consistent with the observation that $\Delta recA$ surface-attached cells are more difficult to eradicate with antibiotics (Fig. 2,

and Table 1). For example, certain antibiotics have lowered penetration of biofilms (Anderl and Franklin, 2000; Singh et al., 2016) and there is a nutrient gradient within the biofilm which leads to different metabolic states of biofilm cells (Werner et al., 2004). Additionally, planktonic free-living cells have been shown to more readily gain higher level antibiotic resistances compared to biofilm cells during exposure to ciprofloxacin (Santos-Lopez et al., 2019).

Our findings have significant implications on understanding *A. baumannii* survival to antibiotic treatment and possibly antibiotic resistance. We show that upon DNA damage, the DNA damage response is induced, leading to induction of *recA* with simultaneous shutoff of biofilm genes, leading to thinner biofilms (Fig. 5). We have observed that this occurs through lowered *bfmR* and *csuAB* expression upon elevated RecA levels. Quantification of RecA upon DNA damage, and in *recA*⁺⁺ cells, demonstrates how sensitive biofilm gene expression is to a change in RecA levels (Figs. S4, 1-3). This may be due to the UmuDAb sensitivity to cleavage by RecA* (Hare et al., 2013).

Our evidence suggests that UmuDAb is an inducer of *bfmR* and of biofilm formation (Fig. 6). A summary and model of genes is shown in Fig. 6D. Based on previous findings, we have observed bimodality of *recA* expression in planktonic cells (Ching et al., 2017; MacGuire et al., 2014), and there may also be heterogeneity in RecA levels between cells in biofilms. Thus, within the biofilm there may be two cell types: RecA^{Low} cells maintain biofilms and low mutagenic potential while RecA^{High} cells with high mutagenic potential (Norton et al., 2013) can disperse and search for new niches. This observed inverse relationship can allow the population to combine physical (biofilm) and genetic (elevated mutagenesis) protection to environmental challenges, including antibiotic exposure in a host.

Overall, we have identified an inverse relationship between the DDR and biofilm development in *A. baumannii*. These results demonstrate the complexity of treating pathogens with a DDR that does not follow the paradigm, such as *A. baumannii* (Ching et al., 2017; MacGuire et al., 2014). Recent work has highlighted the potential for clinical RecA inhibitors to potentiate the effect of antibiotics while hindering antibiotic resistance acquisition by reducing mutagenic capacity in bacteria (Alam et al., 2016). This indeed may be promising in the treatment of certain bacteria, as demonstrated in *E. coli* (Alam et al., 2016). However, our results show that for *A. baumannii*, inhibiting RecA may lead to robust biofilm formation. It is thus important to understand the relationships between survival strategies in bacteria, and that different bacteria may have different responses to treatment, based on their fundamental biology. Overall, our results show the complex ways that *A. baumannii* robustly survives stress by balancing alternative survival strategies.

Methods

Strains and Growth Conditions

Strains and plasmids used are listed in Table S1. *A. baumannii* strains harboring the PNLAC1-*recA* plasmid were constructed as before (Ching et al., 2017). The Δ *umuDAb* strain was constructed using SOE PCR to insert a kanamycin gene cassette in the *umuDAb* gene as before (Norton et al., 2013). The oligonucleotides used are in Table S1. All bacterial cultures were routinely grown in LB medium, unless otherwise noted, and incubated at 37°C with shaking at 225 rpm for liquid cultures. YT medium used is composed of 2.5g NaCl, 10g Tryptone and 1g Yeast extract per liter. Solid medium contains 1.5% agar (Fisher Bio-Reagents). Antibiotics were used at the following concentrations: Kanamycin (Kan; 35 µg/mL), Gentamicin (Gm; 10 µg/mL), Tetracycline (Tet; 12 µg/mL) and Carbenicillin (Carb; 100 µg/mL).

Growth curve measurements

Strains were diluted in the growth medium as indicated in the respective figure legends and grown in YT medium in 96-well dishes. All strains were grown at least in triplicate. They were incubated in a plate reader (Biotek Synergy H1) at 37°C with shaking for 24 hrs. with measurements of OD₆₀₀ every 15 mins.

Pellicle & Colony Biofilm Formation

To form pellicle biofilms, cells from a saturated culture were inoculated at a 1:1000 dilution into YT liquid medium in either 6, 12 or 24-well non-tissue culture treated (lacking coating which change surface properties) polystyrene plates. The same number of cells, adjusted based on optical density, were added to each well. Plates were then incubated statically at 25°C. A standard Crystal violet staining procedure was used to quantify adherence to the polystyrene surface (Chen et al., 2015). Early biofilms are formed after 24 hrs of static growth and between 48-72 hrs. the biofilm has matured. After 72 hrs. the biofilms start to deteriorate. In the time course experiment, to correlate viable cells and biofilm formation, samples were taken for CFU counting from 3 wells per experiment. The well content was thoroughly mixed before taking the samples, diluted with PBS, and plated on LB agar. After CFU sampling, the well content was aspirated, washed 3 times with PBS, and stained with Crystal Violet as before (Ching et al., 2018). For colony biofilms, 3 µL of a saturated bacterial culture were spotted on to YT agar plates containing 200µg/mL Congo red and 100µg/mL Coomassie brilliant blue (Congo red plates) (Ching et al., 2018) and incubated for 48 hrs., early colony biofilms, to 96 hrs. at 25°C. Images of biofilms were taken with a Leica MSV269 dissecting scope and a Leica DMC2900 camera, using the same settings. The radius of the biofilm colonies was measured in triplicate from the dissecting microscope images at the same magnification.

Scanning Electron (SEM) and Transmission Electron (TEM) microscopy

Biofilms for SEM were prepared by collecting pellicle biofilms on a glass coverslip treated with a solution of 0.1 mg/mL of polylysine (Fisher Scientific). The coverslips with the biofilms were deposited for at least 24 hrs at 4°C in wells with fixative 1 composed of 25% Glutaraldehyde, 0.1 M Na-Cacodylate buffer (pH 7.2), 0.15% Alcian Blue and 0.15% Safranin. Additional treatment of the coverslips and observation of the biofilms was performed at the Northeastern University Electron Microscopy Core Facility.

For TEM, cultures were grown to saturation in YT liquid medium and streaked for single colonies on YT plates incubated at 37°C. A colony was picked and gently resuspended in 100 µL of phosphate buffered saline (PBS). 10 µL of the resuspended colony was pipetted onto a copper grid, excess liquid wicked away with filter paper, and the grid was dried at room temperature. To negatively stain the samples and observe pili, 10 µL of a solution of 1.5% phosphotungstic acid (PTA) was pipetted onto the cell-containing grids. Liquid excess was wicked away with filter paper, and grids were left to air dry at room temperature. Microscopy was performed with a JEOL JEM-1010 (JEOL USA, Peabody, MA) microscope equipped with a 2k x 2k AMT CCD camera (Advanced Microscopy Techniques, Woburn, MA) at the Northeastern University Electron Microscopy Core Facility.

Quantitative measurement of gene expression

To measure *bfmR* and *csu* transcripts in WT, $\Delta recA$, and *recA*⁺⁺, we took 500µL of 48 h statically grown pellicle cells. These were harvested by centrifugation and resuspended in 1 mL of RNA Protect Bacteria Reagent (Qiagen) with 30µL of 20 mg/mL lysozyme, incubated at room temperature for 15 min, spun down at 15,000g for 5 min, and cell pellets were stored at -20 °C. Total RNA extraction was

carried out by using the Zymo Direct-zol RNA Kit (Zymo) according to manufacturer's instructions. A NanoDrop One (ThermoFisher) was used to measure RNA concentration and purity. RNA was converted to cDNA using a high capacity cDNA reverse transcription kit according to the manufacturer's protocol (Applied Biosystems). Expression of *bfmR* and *csuAB* pili gene expression by RT-qPCR was performed with cDNA using the qPCR primer pairs listed in Table S1 and following the protocol for Fast SYBR Green Master Mix (Applied Biosystems) using a StepOnePlus real-time PCR instrument (Applied Biosystems). Relative gene expression was standardized using endogenous 16S ribosomal RNA expression and the comparative threshold cycle ($\Delta\Delta CT$) was calculated for each sample and compared relative to WT expression. Experiments were repeated twice, and each sample was run in biological triplicate. An unpaired two tail T test was used for statistical analysis relative to the parental strain (*= $P < 0.05$).

Pilus purification.

Pilus shear preparations were performed as previously published (Moon et al., 2017). Briefly, similar number of cells grown on a YT agar plate ($OD_{600} \sim 20$) were collected in 1.5 mL of 1X PBS, placed on ice for 10 min, and vortexed for 1 min. After centrifugation at 13,000 x g at 4°C, cells supernatants (containing the pili) and the respective pellets (containing pili-less cells) were collected. The pili within supernatants were precipitated for 20 hrs with trichloroacetic acid (TCA) (final concentration, 25%), at -20°C. The precipitated pili were collected by centrifugation at 16,000 x g for 10 min at 4°C and resuspended in 50 μ L 1X PBS. Total protein was extracted from pili-free cell pellets and whole cell lysates using Bugbuster reagent (Novagen) following the manufacturer's instructions and quantified using a Bradford assay.

Purification of His-tagged *A. baumannii* RecA and Immunoblots

The *recA* gene from *A. baumannii* was amplified using primers RecALICF and RecALICR (Table S1) and cloned into the pET-His6-TEV-LIC vector (plasmid 29653; Addgene, Cambridge, MA, USA) using Ligation Independent Cloning Protocol (Gradia et al., 2017) and introduced by transformation into DH5α *Escherichia coli* cells for plasmid maintenance. The induction of expression and purification methods are as previously described for RecA purification from *Escherichia coli* (Tashjian et al., 2017). RecA purification was confirmed by SDS-PAGE.

For the semi-quantitative western blots, saturated cultures were diluted 1:100 and grown to exponential phase. Cells were then treated with ciprofloxacin (Cip) at 10X the MIC for 3 hrs (Ching et al., 2017). A parallel culture for each strain was left untreated. Cells were collected by centrifugation and whole-protein lysate was extracted using Bugbuster reagent (Novagen) and Pierce Universal Nuclease according to manufacturer's instructions. Cell free lysates were quantified with a Bradford assay following manufacturer's instructions (BioRad). Lysate was diluted to 1X with Laemmli buffer and heated for 10 minutes at 95°C. The samples were separated on a 12% Bis-Tris gel (Invitrogen) in MOPS buffer and transferred to a nitrocellulose membrane (Cafarelli et al., 2013). The blot was developed as before (Cafarelli et al., 2013) using a primary anti-RecA antibody (Abcam) at a 1:10,000 dilution (Norton et al., 2013) and an HRP-labelled secondary goat anti-rabbit antibody (Abcam) diluted at 1:40,000. The density of the RecA bands was quantified by ImageJ (Norton et al., 2013). The RecA signal from all samples were compared to a standard of purified RecA protein from *A. baumannii*. Similar loading of lanes was measured by Commassie Blue staining of a parallel gel. The procedure was done in 4 biological replicates. RecA determinations were similar every time.

To measure the relative amount of Csu pili in the different strains, we performed immunoblots with an anti-Csu antibody (gracious gift from Luis Actis). The pili content of each strain was standardized to the total protein measured in the cell-free extracts from which the pili were isolated. To detect Csu pili from whole cell lysates, similar number of cells were lysed with Bugbuster and Pierce Universal Nuclease as indicated above. The samples were separated in a 12% polyacrylamide gel in MES buffer at 150V for 1 hour. Immunoblot procedures were followed as above using a 1:1000 dilution of the anti-Csu primary antiserum and a 1:40,000 dilution of the HRP labeled secondary anti-rabbit antibody (Abcam). A ChemiDoc MP imaging system (BioRad) was used for chemiluminescence signal detection from RecA and Csu blots.

Construction of the P_{csu} -gfp and P_{csu} -mCherry expression reporter plasmids and expression assays

A. baumannii ATCC 17978 containing a *csu* operon (P_{csu} -gfp) transcriptional reporter on the Carbenicillin (Carb) resistant plasmid pTU1-A-AB (Moore et al., 2016) was used to assess the expression of Csu in the WT, *recA*⁺⁺ and Δ *recA* strains. The P_{csu} -gfp reporter plasmid was made utilizing a modified version of the EcoFlex Kit (Moore et al., 2016). The EcoFlex kit was a gift from Paul Freemont (Addgene kit #1000000080). All level 1-3 plasmids (Addgene accession numbers 72935-72946) were digested with PstI and dephosphorylated using Quick CIP (both New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA.). PstI restriction sites were attached to the *A. calcoaceticus* 'native pWH1266 backbone by PCR amplification with primers ori_ab_pstI_r and ori_ab_pstI_f (Table S1). The amplicon was further digested with PstI and ligated using T4 DNA ligase (Thermo Fisher Scientific) into the linearized level 1-3 plasmids. 5 μ L of the ligation mix was introduced by transformation into chemically competent *E. coli* DH5 α . Positive clones were confirmed by a digest with PstI and BsaI

(New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA.). Afterwards, the promoter region of the *csu* operon was amplified using primers *csu_f* and *csu_r*. The pBP_lacZ (Table S1; Addgene accession number 72948) and the purified PCR fragment were digested using SphI and NdeI and the pBP-lacZ plasmid dephosphorylated. The ligation was carried out with T4 DNA ligase (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Colonies were screened using blue-white color in plates with X-Gal and verified by colony PCR and sequencing using Primers pBP_pTU_f and pBP_r.

Plasmids with the expected inserts were then used in a combined cloning and ligation reaction, by using 20 fmol of each entry vector (pBP_csu, pBP_B0012, pBP_egfp, pBP_pET-RBS and pTU1-A-RFP-AB) combined with 2 µL of Cutsmart, 0.5 µL of BsaI-HFv2, 0.5 µL of T4 DNA Ligase and 1 µL of 10 mM ATP (all reagents from New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA., except T4 DNA Ligase from Thermo Fisher Scientific). The reaction was cycled 50 times in a thermocycler with a 37 °C digestion step for 2 minutes and a 16 °C ligation step for 5 minutes. Any plasmid with no insert is eliminated from the mix by digestion with BsaI at 37 °C for 1 h. The enzymes were heat-inactivated at 80°C for 10 min. 5 µL of the ligation mix was introduced by transformation into chemically competent *E. coli* DH5α. Colonies with the expected fragment were screened by red-white color in which white colonies contain the desired insert due to the exchange of the mCherry gene originally in the pTU1-A-AB cloning site and confirmed by colony PCR and sequencing the insert using pBP_pTU_f and pTU_r. Plasmids with the desired constructs were introduced by transformation into *A. baumannii* utilizing standard electroporation protocols (MacGuire et al., 2014). To construct the mCherry *csuAB* reporter, (*P_{csu}-mCherry*) same primers and approach were used except that the plasmid pBP_ORF-mCherry was used instead.

Microscopy and GFP reporter measurements

To perform confocal microscopy experiments we used a Zeiss Axio Observer.Z1/7. The excitation/emission used were 280/618 nm for the red channel, and 488/509 nm for the green channel. We formed biofilms in wells, and after 48 hrs, 0.5xMIC Cip was added underneath pellicles and dishes were incubated statically for an additional 48 hrs. Pellicles were collected from mock treated and Cip-treated wells on a glass coverslip treated with 0.1 mg/mL of polylysine to facilitate attachment. The side of the pellicle in direct contact with the liquid medium was in contact with the glass, and the side of the biofilm in contact with air remained as such. Z-stacks were of 1 μ m.

For the GFP reporter measurements, GFP fluorescence was measured in a plate reader (Biotek synergy H1) for at least 24 hrs. at 25°C without shaking. To start the experiment, cultures were diluted 1:100 in YT medium in a 96 multi-well dish. Green fluorescence (Excitation 479 nm and emission 520 nm) and OD₆₀₀ were measured every 15 mins. Growth and fluorescence data were gathered at least in triplicate for each strain.

MIC and Biofilm Eradication Assays, and Live/Dead determination.

Standard assays were used to test for MIC (Andrews, 2001) in planktonic shaking cultures. Pellicles were set up as described above and incubated statically at 25°C for the number of hours indicated in the respective figure legends, at which time cells that were not stuck to the wells 'surface were removed, and wells washed three times with 1X PBS. YT medium containing Gm, at a range of concentrations shown in the respective figures was added to each washed well. The plate was then incubated statically for 24 hrs. at 25°C, after which the spent medium was removed, and wells were washed three times with PBS. Crystal Violet staining was then carried out as before (Chen et al., 2015).

LIVE/DEAD staining was performed on resuspended surface-attached cells, and microscopy performed as before (Ching et al., 2018). The LIVE/DEAD stained surface attached cells of the WT, *ΔrecA*, and *recA⁺⁺* after Gm treatment (10X MIC) were mechanically dislodged. This methodology did not affect cells' integrity. The number of total cells obtained from the surface-attached fraction varied from strain to strain due to their difference in ability to attach to surfaces. The total number of cells and their viability was determined by counting 5 independent microscope fields from each of the strains.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author Contributions

V.G.G., and C.C. initiated research in discussions with YC. B. I. performed preliminary experiments. C.C., P.M., A.R., M. B., B. N., S. R., M.D., W. F., and V.G.G. performed experiments and analyzed data. C.C. and V.G.G. wrote the manuscript.

Funding

M.D. and S.R. were funded by the Undergraduate Research and Fellowships office at Northeastern University. V.G.G. is funded by a stipend from NUSci, an Inclusive Excellence award from HHMI and the NSF REU site award #1757443, Y.C. is funded by an NSF grant (MCB1651732), and A.R. by Northeastern University Provost Dissertation Completion Fellowship.

565 Acknowledgments

566 We would like to acknowledge members of the Godoy, Chai, and Geisinger labs at Northeastern
 567 University for helpful comments and discussion. We would like to thank G. Bou from Servicio de
 568 Microbiologia, Complejo Hospitalario Universitario, La Coruña, Spain for the $\Delta recA$ strain, Luis Actis
 569 from the Department of Microbiology, Miami University, for the anti-Csu antibody, and Stephen Lory
 570 from Harvard Medical School for access to the AB7505 transposon collection.

571 Table 1. Viability of surface attached cells

Strain/Treatment	Total number attached live cells*	Ratio to WT
WT/No Gm	1046	1
$\Delta recA$ /No Gm	2366	2.3
$recA^{++}$ /No Gm	627	0.6
WT/Gm ^a	293	1
$\Delta recA$ /Gm ^a	1046	3.6
$recA^{++}$ /Gm ^a	NF	—

572

573 * in 5 fields; ^a15μg/mL; NF, None found

References:

- Alam K, Alhhazmi A, Decoteau JF, Luo Y, Geyer CR, Alam K, Alhhazmi A, Decoteau JF, Luo Y, Geyer CR. 2016. RecA Inhibitors Potentiate Antibiotic Activity and Block Evolution of Antibiotic Resistance Article RecA Inhibitors Potentiate Antibiotic Activity and Block Evolution of Antibiotic Resistance. *Cell Chem Biol* **23**:381–391. doi:10.1016/j.chembiol.2016.02.010
- Anderl JN, Franklin MJ. 2000. Role of Antibiotic Penetration Limitation in *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Biofilm Resistance to Ampicillin and Ciprofloxacin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **44**:1818–1824.
- Andrews JM. 2001. Determination of minimum inhibitory concentrations. *J Antimicrob Chemother* **5**–16.
- Aranda J, Bardina C, Beceiro A, Rumbo S, Cabral MP, Barbé J, Bou G. 2011. *Acinetobacter baumannii* RecA protein in repair of DNA damage, antimicrobial resistance, general stress response, and virulence. *J Bacteriol* **193**:3740–7. doi:10.1128/JB.00389-11
- Asally M, Kittisopikul M, Rue P, Du Y, Hu Z, Cagatay T, Robinson AB, Lu H, Garcia-Ojalvo J, Suel GM. 2012. Localized cell death focuses mechanical forces during 3D patterning in a biofilm. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* **109**:18891–18896. doi:10.1073/pnas.1212429109
- Bales PM, Renke EM, May SL, Shen Y, Nelson DC. 2013. Purification and Characterization of Biofilm-Associated EPS Exopolysaccharides from ESKAPE Organisms and Other Pathogens. *PLoS One* **8**. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0067950
- Blair JMA, Webber MA, Baylay AJ, Ogbolu DO, Piddock LJ V. 2014. Molecular mechanisms of antibiotic resistance. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **13**:42–51. doi:10.1038/nrmicro3380

- 596 Brossard KA, Campagnari AA. 2012. The *Acinetobacter baumannii* Biofilm-Associated Protein
597 Plays a Role in Adherence to Human Epithelial Cells. *Infect Immun* 228–233.
598 doi:10.1128/IAI.05913-11
- 599 Cafarelli TM, Rands TJ, Benson RW, Rudnicki PA, Lin I, Godoy VG. 2013. A single residue unique
600 to dinb-like proteins limits formation of the polymerase IV multiprotein complex in *Escherichia*
601 *coli*. *J Bacteriol* **195**:1179–1193. doi:10.1128/JB.01349-12
- 602 Chen Y, Gozzi K, Yan F, Chai Y. 2015. Acetic acid acts as a volatile signal to stimulate bacterial
603 biofilm formation. *MBio* **6**:1–13. doi:10.1128/mBio.00392-15
- 604 Ching C, Gozzi K, Heinemann B, Chai Y, Godoy VG. 2017. RNA-Mediated cis Regulation in
605 *Acinetobacter baumannii* Modulates Stress-Induced Phenotypic Variation. *J Bacteriol* **199**:1–15.
- 606 Ching C, Yang B, Onwubueke C, Lazinski D, Camilli A, Godoy VG. 2018. Lon protease has
607 multifaceted biological functions in *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *J Bacteriol* **201**:1–12.
608 doi:10.1128/JB.00536-18
- 609 Choi AH, Slamti L, Avci FY, Pier GB. 2009. The pgaABCD Locus of *Acinetobacter baumannii*
610 Encodes the Production of Poly- β -1-6-N-Acetylglucosamine, Which Is Critical for Biofilm
611 Formation. *J Bacteriol* **191**:5953–5963. doi:10.1128/JB.00647-09
- 612 Cirz RT, Jones MB, Gingles NA, Minogue TD, Jarrahi B, Peterson SN, Romesberg FE. 2007.
613 Complete and SOS-mediated response of *Staphylococcus aureus* to the Antibiotic
614 Ciprofloxacin. *J Bacteriol* **189**:531–539. doi:10.1128/JB.01464-06
- 615 Costa SB, Campos ACC, Pereira ACM, Mattos-guaraldi AL De, Ju RH, Rosa P, Asad MBO. 2014.
616 Adherence to abiotic surface induces SOS response in *Escherichia coli* K-12 strains under

617 aerobic and anaerobic conditions. *Microbiology* 1964–1973. doi:10.1099/mic.0.075317-0

618 Costerton JW, Lewandowski Z, Caldwell DE, Korber DR, Sn S, Lappin-scott HM. 1995. Microbial
619 biofilms. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 711–745.

620 Cox JM, Li H, Wood EA, Chitteni-Pattu S, Inman RB, Cox MM. 2008. Defective dissociation of a
621 “slow” RecA mutant protein imparts an Escherichia coli growth defect. *J Biol Chem* **283**:24909–
622 24921. doi:10.1074/jbc.M803934200

623 Draughn GL, Milton ME, Feldmann EA, Bobay BG, Roth BM, Olson AL, Thompson RJ, Actis LA,
624 Davies C, Cavanagh J. 2018. The Structure of the Biofilm-controlling Response Regulator
625 BfmR from *Acinetobacter baumannii* Reveals Details of Its DNA-binding Mechanism. *J Mol*
626 *Biol* **430**:806–821. doi:10.1016/j.jmb.2018.02.002

627 Ducret A, Quardokus E, Brun Y. 2016. MicrobeJ, a high throughput tool for quantitative bacterial
628 cell detection and analysis. *Nat Microbiol* **1**:1–7. doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.77

629 Erlandsen SL, Kristich CJ, Dunny GM, Wells CL. 2004. High-resolution Visualization of the
630 Microbial Glycocalyx with Low-voltage Scanning Electron Microscopy : Dependence on
631 Cationic Dyes The Journal of Histochemistry & Cytochemistry. *J Histochem Cytochem*
632 **52**:1427–1435. doi:10.1369/jhc.4A6428.2004

633 Eze EC, Chenia HY, El Zowalaty ME. 2018. *Acinetobacter baumannii* biofilms : effects of
634 physicochemical factors , virulence , antibiotic resistance determinants , gene regulation , and
635 future antimicrobial treatments. *Infect Drug Resist* **11**:2277–2299.

636 Farrow JM, Wells G, Pesci EC. 2018. Desiccation tolerance in *Acinetobacter baumannii* is mediated
637 by the two-component response regulator BfmR. *PLoS One* **13**:1–25.

638 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0205638

639 Fuchs RP, Fujii S. 2013. Translesion DNA Synthesis and Mutagenesis in Prokaryotes. *Cold Spring*

640 *Harb Perspect Biol* 1–22.

641 Gaddy JA, Actis LA. 2009. Regulation of *Acinetobacter baumannii* biofilm formation. *Futur*

642 *Microbiol* 4:273–278. doi:10.2217/fmb.09.5.Regulation

643 Gallagher LA, Ramage E, Weiss EJ, Radey M, Hayden HS, Held KG, Huse HK, Zurawski D V.,

644 Brittnacher MJ, Manoil C. 2015. Resources for Genetic and Genomic Analysis of Emerging

645 Pathogen *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *J Bacteriol* 197:2027–2035. doi:10.1128/jb.00131-15

646 Geisinger E, Isberg RR. 2015. Antibiotic Modulation of Capsular Exopolysaccharide and Virulence

647 in *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *PLoS Pathog* 11:1–27. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1004691

648 Ghodke H, Paudel BP, Lewis JS, Jergic S, Gopal K, Romero ZJ, Wood EA, Woodgate R, Cox MM,

649 Oijen AMV. 2019. Spatial and temporal organization of reca in the *Escherichia coli* dna-damage

650 response. *Elife* 8:1–37. doi:10.7554/eLife.42761

651 Gozzi K, Ching C, Paruthiyil S, Zhao Y, Godoy VG, Chai Y. 2017. *Bacillus subtilis* utilizes the DNA

652 damage response to manage multicellular development. *npj Biofilms Microbiomes* 3:8.

653 doi:10.1038/s41522-017-0016-3

654 Gradia S, Ishida JP, Tsai M, Jeans C, Tainer JA, States U, Bioimaging I, Berkeley L, States U,

655 Berkeley L, States U, States U, States U. 2017. MacroBac: New technologies for robust and

656 efficient large-scale production of recombinant multi-protein complexes. *Methods Enzym.*

657 doi:10.1016/bs.mie.2017.03.008.MacroBac

658 Hardouin J, Chabane YN, Marti S, Rihouey C. 2014. Characterisation of Pellicles Formed by

659 *Acinetobacter baumannii* at the Air-Liquid Interface. *PLoS One* **9**.

660 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111660

661 Hare JM, Adhikari S, Lambert K V, Hare AE, Alison N. 2013. The *Acinetobacter* regulatory

662 UmuDAb protein cleaves in response to DNA damage with chimeric LexA/UmuD

663 characteristics. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **334**:57–65. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.2012.02618.x.The

664 Hare JM, Ferrell JC, Witkowski T a, Grice AN. 2014. Prophage induction and differential RecA and

665 UmuDAb transcriptome regulation in the DNA damage responses of *Acinetobacter baumannii*

666 and *Acinetobacter baylyi*. *PLoS One* **9**:e93861. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093861

667 He X, Lu F, Yuan F, Jiang D, Zhao P, Zhu J, Cheng H, Cao J, Lu G. 2015. Biofilm formation caused

668 by clinical *acinetobacter baumannii* isolates is associated with overexpression of the AdeFGH

669 efflux pump. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **59**:4817–4825. doi:10.1128/AAC.00877-15

670 Inagaki S, Fujita K, Nagayama K, Funao J, Effects OT. 2009. Effects of recombinase A deficiency

671 on biofilm formation by *Streptococcus mutans*. *Oral Microbiol Immunol* 104–108.

672 Jacobs AC, Thompson MG, Black CC. 2014. AB5075 , a Highly Virulent Isolate of *Acinetobacter*

673 *baumannii* , as a. *MBio* **5**:1–10. doi:10.1128/mBio.01076-14.Editor

674 Korch SB, Hill TM. 2006. Ectopic overexpression of wild-type and mutant *hipA* genes in

675 *Escherichia coli*: Effects on macromolecular synthesis and persister formation. *J Bacteriol*

676 **188**:3826–3836. doi:10.1128/JB.01740-05

677 Kreuzer KN. 2013. DNA Damage Responses in Prokaryotes: Regulating Gene Expression,

678 Modulating Growth Patterns, and Manipulating Replication Forks. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect*

679 *Biol* 1–23.

680 Kuhl SA, Zimmer JA, Rohatgi P. 2003. Complementation of bacteriophage induction and
681 recombination defects in *Escherichia coli* RecA- mutants by expression of the cloned T4
682 bacteriophage uvsX gene. *Curr Microbiol* **46**:88–93. doi:10.1007/s00284-002-3793-7

683 Linares JF, Gustafsson I, Baquero F, Martinez JL. 2006. Antibiotics as intermicrobial signaling
684 agents. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* **103**.

685 Little JW, Mount DW. 1982. The SOS Regulatory *Escherichia coli* System of Review **29**:1982.

686 Loehfelm TW, Luke NR, Campagnari AA. 2008. Identification and characterization of an
687 *Acinetobacter baumannii* biofilm-associated protein. *J Bacteriol* **190**:1036–1044.
688 doi:10.1128/JB.01416-07

689 Luke NR, Saubaran SL, Russo TA, Beanan JM, Olson R, Loehfelm TW, Cox AD, Michael FS,
690 Vinogradov E V, Campagnari AA. 2010. Identification and Characterization of a
691 Glycosyltransferase Involved in *Acinetobacter baumannii* Lipopolysaccharide Core
692 Biosynthesis . *Infect Immun* **78**:2017–2023. doi:10.1128/IAI.00016-10

693 MacGuire AE, Ching MC, Diamond BH, Kazakov A, Novichkov P, Godoy VG. 2014. Activation of
694 phenotypic subpopulations in response to ciprofloxacin treatment in *Acinetobacter baumannii*.
695 *Mol Microbiol* **92**:138–52. doi:10.1111/mmi.12541

696 Moon KH, Weber BS, Feldman F. 2017. Subinhibitory Concentrations of Trimethoprim and
697 Sulfamethoxazole *Acinetobacter baumannii* through Inhibition of Csu Pilus Expression.
698 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **61**:1–18.

699 Moore SJ, Lai HE, Kelwick RJR, Chee SM, Bell DJ, Polizzi KM, Freemont PS. 2016. EcoFlex: A
700 Multifunctional MoClo Kit for *E. coli* Synthetic Biology. *ACS Synth Biol* **5**:1059–1069.

701 doi:10.1021/acssynbio.6b00031

702 Norton MD, Spilkia AJ, Godoy VG. 2013. Antibiotic Resistance Acquired through a DNA Damage-
703 Inducible Response in *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *J Bacteriol* **195**:1335–45.
704 doi:10.1128/JB.02176-12

705 Pakharukova N, Tuittila M, Paavilainen S, Malmi H, Parilova O, Teneberg S, Knight SD, Zavialov A
706 V. 2018. Structural basis for *Acinetobacter baumannii* biofilm formation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U*
707 *S A* **115**:5558–5563. doi:10.1073/pnas.1800961115

708 Peleg AY, Seifert H, Paterson DL. 2008. *Acinetobacter baumannii*: Emergence of a successful
709 pathogen. *Clin Microbiol Rev* **21**:538–582. doi:10.1128/CMR.00058-07

710 Rice LB. 2008. Federal funding for the study of antimicrobial resistance in nosocomial pathogens: no
711 ESKAPE. *J Infect Dis* **197**:1079–81. doi:10.1086/533452

712 Rumbo-Feal S, Gómez MJ, Gayoso C, Álvarez-Fraga L, Cabral MP, Aransay AM, Rodríguez-
713 Ezpeleta N, Fullaondo A, Valle J, Tomás M, Bou G, Poza M. 2013. Whole Transcriptome
714 Analysis of *Acinetobacter baumannii* Assessed by RNA-Sequencing Reveals Different mRNA
715 Expression Profiles in Biofilm Compared to Planktonic Cells. *PLoS One* **8**:1–19.
716 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0072968

717 Russo TA, Manohar A, Beanan JM, Olson R, MacDonald U, Graham J, Umland TC. 2016. The
718 Response Regulator BfmR Is a Potential Drug Target for *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *mSphere*
719 **1**:1–19. doi:10.1128/msphere.00082-16

720 Sahu PK, Iyer PS, Oak AM, Pardesi KR, Chopade BA. 2012. Characterization of eDNA from the
721 Clinical Strain *Acinetobacter baumannii* AIIMS 7 and Its Role in Biofilm Formation. *Sci World*
722 *J* **2012**. doi:10.1100/2012/973436

- 723 Santos-Lopez A, Marshall CW, Scribner MR, Snyder DJ, Cooper VS. 2019. Evolutionary pathways
724 to antibiotic resistance are dependent upon environmental structure and bacterial lifestyle. *Elife*
725 **8**:1–23. doi:10.7554/elife.47612
- 726 Singh R, Sahore S, Kaur P, Rani A, Ray P. 2016. Penetration barrier contributes to bacterial biofilm-
727 associated resistance against only select antibiotics , and exhibits genus- , strain- and antibiotic-
728 specific differences. *Pathog Dis* 2–7. doi:10.1093/femspd/ftw056
- 729 Smith MG, Gianoulis T a, Pukatzki S, Mekalanos JJ, Ornston LN, Gerstein M, Snyder M. 2007. New
730 insights into *Acinetobacter baumannii* pathogenesis revealed by high-density pyrosequencing
731 and transposon mutagenesis. *Genes Dev* **21**:601–14. doi:10.1101/gad.1510307
- 732 Surgalla MJ, Beesley ED. 1969. Congo red-agar plating medium for detecting pigmentation in
733 *Pasteurella pestis*. *Appl Microbiol* **18**:834–837.
- 734 Takajashi A, Yomoda S, Ushijima I, Inoue M. 1995. Ofloxacin, norfloxacin and ceftazimide
735 increase the production of alginate and promote the formation of biofilm of *Pseudomonase*
736 *aeruginosa* in vitro. *J Antimicrob Chemother*.
- 737 Tashjian TF, Lin I, Belt V, Cafarelli TM, Godoy VG. 2017. RNA primer extension hinders DNA
738 synthesis by *Escherichia coli* mutagenic DNA polymerase IV. *Front Microbiol* **8**:1–9.
739 doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.00288
- 740 Tomaras AP, Dorsey CW, Edelmann RE, Actis LA. 2003. Attachment to and biofilm formation on
741 abiotic surfaces by *Acinetobacter baumannii*: Involvement of a novel chaperone-usheer pili
742 assembly system. *Microbiology* **149**:3473–3484. doi:10.1099/mic.0.26541-0
- 743 Tomaras AP, Flagler MJ, Dorsey CW, Gaddy JA, Actis LA. 2008. Characterization of a two-
744 component regulatory system from *Acinetobacter baumannii* that controls biofilm formation and

cellular morphology. *Microbiology* **154**:3398–3409. doi:10.1099/mic.0.2008/019471-0

Vlamakis H, Chai Y, Beauregard P, Losick R, Kolter R. 2013. Sticking together: Building a biofilm the *Bacillus subtilis* way. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **11**:157–168. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2960

Walter BM, Cartman ST, Minton NP, Butala M, Rupnik M. 2015. The SOS Response Master Regulator LexA Is Associated with Sporulation, Motility and Biofilm Formation in *Clostridium difficile*. *PLoS One* **10**:e0144763. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0144763

Wang N, Ozer EA, Mandel MJ, Hauser AR. 2014. Genome-wide identification of *Acinetobacter baumannii* genes necessary for persistence in the lung. *MBio* **5**:1–8. doi:10.1128/mBio.01163-14

Wang Y, Huang T, Yang Y, Kuo S, Chen C. 2018. Biofilm formation is not associated with worse outcome in *Acinetobacter baumannii* bacteraemic pneumonia. *Sci Rep* 1–10. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-25661-9

Werner E, Roe F, Bugnicourt A, Franklin MJ, Heydorn A, Molin S, Pitts B, Stewart PS. 2004. Stratified Growth in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Biofilms. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **70**:6188–6196. doi:10.1128/AEM.70.10.6188

Witkowski TA, Grice AN, Stinnett DB, Wells WK, Peterson MA, Hare JM. 2016. UmuDAb : An Error-Prone Polymerase Accessory Homolog Whose N-Terminal Domain Is Required for Repression of DNA Damage Inducible Gene Expression in *Acinetobacter baylyi*. *PLoS One* 1–19. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0152013