Molecular basis for inhibition of adhesin-mediated bacterial-host interactions through a novel peptide-binding domain

Shuaiqi Guo^{1-3,5}, Hossein Zahiri¹, Corey Stevens^{1#}, Daniel C. Spaanderman³⁻⁵, Lech-Gustav Milroy^{3,5}, Christian Ottmann^{3,5}, Luc Brunsveld^{3,5}, Ilja K. Voets^{2,4,5}, Peter L. Davies¹

*Corresponding author: Peter L. Davies, peter.davies@queensu.ca

¹Department of Biomedical and Molecular Sciences, Queen's University, Kingston, ON Canada K7L 3N6

²Laboratory of Self-Organizing Soft Matter,

³Laboratory of Chemical Biology,

⁴Laboratory of Macromolecular and Organic Chemistry,

⁵Institute for Complex Molecular Systems,

²⁻⁵Address: Eindhoven University of Technology P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, Netherlands Tel: +31 (0)40 247 5303

#Author present address: Laboratoire des Polymères, Institut des Matériaux and Institut des Sciences et Ingénierie Chimiques, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Batiment MXD, Station 12, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Abstract:

Modulation of protein-protein interactions (PPIs) with small-molecules is a promising conceptual approach in drug discovery. In the area of bacterial colonization, PPIs contribute to adhesin-mediated biofilm formation that cause most infections. However, the molecular basis underlying these adhesin-ligand interactions is largely unknown. The 1.5-MDa adhesion protein, *MpIBP*, uses a peptide-binding domain (*MpPBD*) to help its Antarctic bacterium form symbiotic biofilms on sea ice with microalgae such as diatoms. X-ray crystallography revealed *MpPBD* uses Ca^{2+} -dependent interactions to self-associate with a crystal symmetry mate via the C-terminal threonine-proline-aspartate sequence. Structure-guided optimization derived penta-peptide ligands that bound *MpPBD* 1,000-fold more tightly, with affinities in the nano-molar range. These ligands act as potent antagonists to block *MpPBD* from binding to the diatom cells. Since adhesins of some human pathogens contain peptide-binding module homologs of *MpPBD*, this same conceptual approach could help develop ligand-based PPI modulators to disrupt harmful bacteria-host interactions.

Introduction:

Protein-protein interactions (PPIs) are central to most biochemical processes such as actin and tubulin polymerization, ATP production through the electron transport chain, and signal transduction via G protein-coupled receptors(1-3). Given PPIs' vital role in the well-being of cells, their modulation by drug-like molecules is an attractive approach that holds great promise for the development of new strategies to treat various diseases. Over the past two decades, significant advances in structural biology and medicinal chemistry have enabled some fruitful developments in drug discovery to target PPIs that govern mammalian cellular processes(4-6). For example, the structure of B-cell lymphoma extra-large (Bcl-xL) protein in complex with a peptide derived from the Bcl-2 Antagonist/Killer (Bak) protein inspired the fragment-based identification of the first Bcl-2 family inhibitors(7). This ultimately led to the FDA approval of Venetoclax in 2016 to treat lymphocytic leukemia and lymphoma(8). In addition to such small-molecule inhibitors, peptide antagonists have been developed to target their partner proteins' ligand-binding sites to disrupt PPIs of Bcl-2 proteins(9) and those involved in other diseases(10-13). Although the use of small-molecule and peptide therapeutics to target PPIs is an active and highly promising field(12-14), most of the studies published to date have been focused on cancer-related, human PPIs. Investigations of PPIs that mediate bacterial infections have taken second place to antibiotic development. It is only now when antibiotics are losing some of their potency that other strategies for inhibiting bacteria are being intensively studied(15-18).

Bacterial adhesins are a key class of virulence factors that bind bacteria to host cells(19-22), and subsequently help develop multi-cellular communities called

biofilms responsible for over 80% of chronic infections in humans(23). There is currently a shortage of effective treatments against biofilm-related infections(23-25). With the increasing spread of antibiotic-resistant pathogenic bacteria, there is an urgent need for the development of PPI disruptors to block the adhesins of bacteria, which might prevent the colonization and persistent infections caused by biofilms. Adhesins are typically long, modular proteins with one terminus anchored to the bacterial surface, while the other end is extended out to interact with substrates like the carbohydrates and proteins on host cell surfaces(19, 26-31). With structures of adhesin-ligand complexes starting to emerge(32-34), researchers are beginning to elucidate the molecular basis of the interactions required to build a biofilm. To date, most of these studies have focused on the characterization of lectin-glycan interactions(32, 33, 35), and have resulted in some effective treatments against bacterial infections(17, 36). For example, the FimH adhesin of uropathogenic *Escherichia coli* has been successfully targeted by mannose analogs to help treat urinary tract infections(35, 37-41). These studies validate the efficacy of the anti-adhesion strategy, which can be used as an alternative approach to treat bacterial infections without the excessive use of antibiotics. While PPIs are heavily involved in bacteria-host interactions, examples that detail the molecular basis of these interactions are scarce. Given that PPIs are typically many fold stronger than those of lectin-glycan interactions(42), the development of PPI inhibitors to disrupt bacteria-host interactions will be of great interest and potential utility.

Marinomonas primoryensis ice-binding protein (*MplBP*) is an exceptionally large (~ 1.5 MDa) Repeats-In-Toxin (RTX) adhesin found on the surface of its Antarctic bacterium(27, 43). While its N-terminal Region I (RI) is responsible for anchoring the adhesin to the outer-membrane, its C-terminal ligand-binding Regions III and IV (RIII

and RIV) help the bacterium form symbiotic biofilms with diatoms on the underside of lake ice(27, 28). *MpIBP_RIII* contains five β -sheet-rich domains, including a carbohydrate-binding lectin module (RIII_5, also referred as *MpPA14*) and a Peptide-Binding Domain (RIII_3, *MpPBD*), both responsible for binding diatoms by interacting with the cell-surface glycans and proteins, respectively. We reported the X-ray crystal structure of *MpIBP_RIII1-4*, which revealed that *MpPBD* folds as an oblong β -sandwich with a shallow, solvent-exposed ligand-binding cavity on the periphery of the structure(27). Importantly, it was observed in the crystal unit cell that the three C-terminal amino-acid residues (threonine-proline-aspartate, TPD) of *MpIBP_RIII1-4* were stably anchored in the ligand-binding cavity of a symmetry-related molecule within the crystal unit cell. The observed crystal contacts led us to postulate that *MpPBD* binds its bacterium to diatoms by interacting with surface proteins via short tripeptide sequences at the C-termini.

Here, we show that the TPD peptide sequence binds *MpPBD* in solution with an affinity of 26 μ M. Using a structure-guided approach, we optimized the peptidyl sequence by iteratively screening a library of pentapeptides and obtained ligands that bound *MpPBD* ~ 1000-fold more strongly with affinities of ~ 30 nM. X-ray crystal structures of *MpPBD*-ligand complexes revealed that the strong protein-peptide interactions originate from a combination of Ca^{2+} -dependent polar interactions and hydrophobic contacts. We further demonstrate that these short peptidyl ligands are effective at inhibiting the binding of *MpPBD* to diatoms, which gives insight into how microbial adhesion can be disrupted through ligand-based antagonists.

Results and discussion

Initial ligand identification

Close inspection of the *MpIBP_RIII1-4* structure (PDB code: 5K8G) revealed the detailed PPIs involved in its self-association within the crystal by binding the C-terminal Thr-Pro-Asp (TPD) of a symmetry-related molecule (Figure 1A). The C-terminal aspartate residue is buried inside the ligand-binding pocket of the other molecule, with its terminal α -carboxyl oxygens binding Ca1 and Ca2 via three ionic bonds (Figure 1B). The protein-protein interaction is further enhanced by hydrogen bonding between carbonyl and amide groups of the TPD sequence and V293 and N333 from the Calcium- and Peptide-Binding Loops 1 and 2 (CPBL1 and 2) of *MpPBD*. The threonine residue at the pre-penultimate position (position 3) is the most solvent exposed residue of the peptide, and the ambiguous electron density of its side chain was indicative of a high degree of flexibility. The fortuitous crystallisation of the self-interacting *MpPBD_RIII1-4* indicated that peptidyl sequences are the likely ligands of *MpPBD*. To prevent the self-association through the extended C-terminal “TPD” sequence, and facilitate the binding of free peptide to *MpPBD*, we designed a new *MpIBP_RIII1-4* construct by truncating the carboxyl end of the original protein from D519 to N507 (Figure 1A, Supplementary file 1-Figure S1; green and blue arrows). This new *MpIBP_RIII1-4* construct was used for the subsequent binding and structural studies described below.

Figure 1: Self-association of *MplBP_RIII1-4* within the crystal unit cell. A) *MplBP_RIII1-4* molecule (grey) interacts with a neighboring symmetry mate (yellow) in the crystal via its C-terminal "TPD" sequence. The C-terminal D519 residue of the original *MplBP_RIII1-4* construct is marked by a green arrow, while the C-terminal N507 residue of the truncated construct used in this study is marked by a blue arrow. The ligand-binding site is indicated by a red box of dashed lines. B) Zoomed-in view of the ligand-binding site of *MplBP_RIII1-4* within the crystal showing the atomic details at the protein-protein interaction interface. The right panel shows the interface from a view that is rotated approximately 180° around a vertical axis from the left. Polar interactions are indicated by black dashed lines. Carbon atoms of the bound "TPD" sequence are colored in yellow while those for its symmetry-related protein are colored in grey. Oxygen atoms are red, nitrogen atoms are blue and Ca^{2+} ions are shown as green spheres. Amino acid residues involved in protein-protein interactions are labelled and shown in stick representation.

Given that a C-terminal carboxylic acid group appears to be key for the protein-protein interaction, we used fluorescence polarisation (FP) to screen a small collection of 15 N-terminally FITC-labelled peptides that end in various C-terminal amino acid residues with a free α -carboxyl group (selected on the basis of availability within the laboratory). In the presence of $\sim 80 \mu\text{M}$ of *MpIBP_RIII1-4*, two FITC-labelled and phosphorylated peptides with sequences of IKARAS(_pS)SPVILVGTHLD (pep 14) and RHKKLMFK(_pT)EGPDSD (pep 15) produced significant delta fluorescence polarisation values, indicating binding of these peptides to *MpPBD* (Figure 2A). None of the other 13 peptides appeared to bind *MpPBD* as they produced negligible delta polarisation values. FP with protein titrations further showed that in the presence of 2 mM Ca^{2+} , peptides 14 and 15 bound *MpPBD* with EC_{50} values of $2.7 \mu\text{M}$ and $0.69 \mu\text{M}$, respectively. Moreover, the presence of excess EDTA abolished the interaction between peptide and protein (Figure 2B), which validated the Ca^{2+} -dependency of the protein-peptide interaction as demonstrated by the structural data.

Interestingly, the three binding sequences “TPD”, pep 14 and pep 15 all ended in a C-terminal aspartate residue with a free α -carboxylic acid group. This was consistent with the structural data, which showed that the terminal carboxylic acid group of “TPD” directly bonded to the two calcium ions in the *MpPBD* ligand-binding site. However, since the C-terminal aspartate side chain of *MpIBP_RIII1-4* had no direct interactions with its neighbouring symmetry mate in the crystal, it was not clear how the aspartate residues in these three peptidyl sequences contributed to their binding to *MpPBD*. To further validate the hypothesis that *MpPBD* binds specifically to certain C-terminal amino-acid sequences, peptides encompassing only the last five

amino acids of the original *MpIBP_RIII1-4* construct (FITC-A β DSTPD) and pep 15 (FITC-A β GPDS) were synthesized and studied. The affinity of *MpPBD* for these two short peptide ligands, together with two analogs (FITC-A β DSTD and FITC-A β GPDD) was measured by FP (Figure 2C).

Unexpectedly, FITC-A β DSTPD, which contains the C-terminal “TPD” binding sequence originally identified in the crystal structure of *MpIBP_RIII1-4*, showed the weakest interaction to *MpPBD* out of this series, with an EC₅₀ of ~ 27 μ M. In contrast, the peptide, FITC-A β DSTD, bound at least 200-fold stronger with an EC₅₀ of 0.11 μ M (Figure 2C). Similarly, FITC-A β GPDS bound with an EC₅₀ of 0.16 μ M, which is roughly 4-fold stronger than its longer, phosphorylated counterpart (FITC-RHKLMFK_pTEGPDS, EC₅₀ = 0.69 μ M), validating the importance of the C-terminal residues for binding *MpPBD*. Furthermore, FITC-A β GPDS bound the protein 20-fold stronger than its analog FITC-A β GPDD.

To further ascertain the chemical constituents of the peptide C-terminus responsible for binding *MpPBD*, two additional analogs of the peptide FITC-A β GPDS were synthesized. When the C-terminal aspartate was replaced by an asparagine, a residue with similar length side chain but different chemistry, the affinity of the peptide FITC-A β GPDSN for *MpPBD* fell by 40% to an EC₅₀ of 0.27 μ M (Figure 2C). However, the substitution of the terminal α -carboxylic acid group of FITC-A β GPDS by a C-terminal carboxamide group (FITC-A β GPDS-NH₂) abolished the protein-peptide interaction all together (Figure 2C). These results demonstrated the crucial importance of the ionic interaction between the terminal carboxylic acid group and the two Ca²⁺ ions in the ligand-binding site of *MpPBD*. The side-chain carboxylic acid

group of the peptide C-terminal aspartic acid residue gave more favourable binding to *MpPBD* compared to that of the side-chain amide of the peptide bearing an asparagine at the same position. Moreover, the FP results indicate that the peptide amino acids at the penultimate position (position 2) have a significant impact on the peptide-protein interactions. The strong binders, FITC-A β GPDS and FITC-A β DSTD, contain the small polar residues of either threonine or serine at this position. The intermediate binder FITC-A β GPDS has an aspartate while the weakest binder FITC-A β DSTPD has a proline at the same position. Although the proline is involved in main-chain hydrogen bonding with V293 and N333 of the CPBL1 and CPBL2, respectively, its rigid five-membered imine ring is unable to interact with the protein (Figure 1B). As for FITC-A β GPDD, the negative charge of the aspartate side chain at position 2 may be disruptive for the peptide-protein interaction. We therefore sought to acquire detailed structural information to explain the high affinities of FITC-A β GPDS and FITC-A β DSTD for *MpPBD*.

Figure 2: Identification of initial peptidyl ligands of *Mp*PBD. (A) Screening of a collection of 15 FITC-labelled peptides by fluorescence polarisation (FP) with *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 at a concentration of ~ 80 μM. Background polarization was subtracted from all values to result in Δ polarisation values on the y-axis. Peptide sequences are displayed. Data bars for peptides 14 (blue) and 15 (red) are indicated within boxes of dashed lines. (B) FP assay of Peptides 14 (blue closed circles) and 15 (red open triangles) from (A) with titration of *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 in the presence of 2 mM CaCl₂ and in the presence of excess 2 mM EDTA (red open squares). (C) FP assay to assess the binding of six different FITC-labelled peptides to *Mp*PBD. The mean of three experiments were plotted. Some of the SD error bars are smaller than the data point symbols in B) and C). The calculated EC₅₀ values for each experiment are shown in B) and C).

Structural basis for peptide-MpPBD interactions

To elucidate the atomic details of the peptide-protein interactions, we solved the X-ray crystal structures of *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 in complex with the peptides FITC-A β DSTD and FITC-A β GPDS to 2-Å resolution (Supplementary file 1-Table S1). Clear electron densities were observed for the peptide amino acids in the last three positions (Figure 3), while those at the position immediately beforehand at the N-terminal end appeared to be ambiguous. No electron density could be observed beyond position 3 suggesting these residues are highly flexible because they are fully exposed to the solvent and are thus unlikely to interact with the protein.

At position 2 of FITC-A β GPDS, serine has its side-chain hydroxyl group hydrogen bonded with the side-chain amide of N333 on CPBL2, while the main chains of these two residues hydrogen bond via their carbonyl and amide groups (Figure 3A). The observed hydrogen bonding interactions help to explain why FITC-A β GPDS has a 20-fold higher affinity for *Mp*PBD than that of FITC-A β GPDD, with the only difference between the two peptides being the presence or absence of serine at position 2. Indeed, X-ray crystallography indicates that the larger aspartate residue at position 2 would clash with N333 and destabilize the protein-peptide interactions. In comparison, FITC-A β DSTD has a similar binding mode to FITC-A β GPDS, with the threonine side-chain hydroxyl hydrogen bonded with the amide of N333 side chain at the edge of the peptide-binding cavity. In addition, the threonine side-chain methyl group is involved in hydrophobic contact with residue A255 of the protein (Figure 3B). This helps restrain the free rotation of the threonine side-chain hydroxyl, locking it into a favourable conformation for polar interactions. The observed additional

hydrophobic interactions might help explain why FITC-A β DSTD bound *MpPBD* with slightly higher affinity than did FITC-A β GPDS.

Interestingly, the gain of hydrogen bonding interactions at the peptide 2nd position had an impact on how the C-terminal aspartate of the peptides bound *MpPBD*. The aspartate of the TPD sequence observed in the ligand-binding cavity showed no interaction between its side chain γ carboxylic acid group and the protein. In contrast, when FITC-A β DSTD and FITC-A β GPDS were complexed with *MpPBD*, the side-chain hydroxyl of S295 within CPBL1 pointed downward to hydrogen bond with the γ carbonyl of the peptide aspartate, which helped G296 to interact with the γ hydroxyl of the same peptide aspartate via its main-chain amide (Figure 3A, B, left panels). Taken together with the gained interactions from the peptide position 2, the structural data gave the molecular explanation of why FITC-A β DSTD and FITC-A β GPDS bound *MpPBD* with substantially higher affinity than their analogs, FITC-A β DSTD and FITC-A β GPDD, respectively.

Figure 3: Protein-peptide binding interfaces revealed by X-ray crystallography. Zoomed-in views of the *MpPBD* ligand-binding site interacting with peptides that end with sequences of DSD (A) and DSTD (B), respectively. The $2F_o - F_c$ electron density maps around the peptide residues and Ca1 and 2 are shown as blue mesh (contoured at 1σ). The right panels in A) and B) are views that are rotated around approximately 180° from the left panels. Polar interactions are indicated by black dashed lines. Carbon atoms of the peptides are colored in yellow while those for the protein are colored in grey. Oxygen atoms are red, nitrogen atoms are blue, while Ca^{2+} ions are shown as green spheres. Amino acids involved in protein-peptide interactions are shown in stick representation. Peptide amino-acid residues are indicated in red 3-letter code, while those for the protein are labelled in black one-letter code. CIF files can be found in Figure 3 – source data 1 and has been deposited in the Protein Data Bank (PDB: “Code”)

Structure-guided screening identified ligands with low-nano-molar affinity

Guided by the structural insight that the C-terminal residues are crucial for the peptide-protein interactions, we next sequentially screened libraries of pentapeptides by FP to identify stronger ligands for *MpPBD*.

The first round of screening involved 20 pentapeptides with a consensus sequence of FITC-AGAGX where the first four amino acids of the peptides were alternating alanine and glycine residues. The ultimate (C-terminal) residue “X” represented one of the 20 naturally occurring amino acids (Figure 4A). Consistent with the results shown above, the peptide with an aspartate at the C-terminal position (FITC-AGAGD) bound *MpPBD* the tightest, with a moderate EC_{50} of 3.2 μ M. This was followed by those peptides with large hydrophobic side-chains at position 1, such as FITC-AGAGI, FITC-AGAGY and FITC-AGAGF, which produced EC_{50} values of 4.4 μ M, 4.6 μ M, and 7.2 μ M, respectively, when bound to *MpPBD* (Supplementary file 1- Table S2, Figure S2). Most of the other peptides bound *MpPBD* with an affinity in the 10 μ M range, while those with basic side chains (FITC-AGAGK and FITC-AGAGR) had negligible interaction with *MpPBD*.

Having identified FITC-AGAGD as the strongest ligand for *MpPBD* in the first round of screening, we proceeded with a second set of 20 pentapeptides that had a consensus sequence of FITC-AGAXD. All peptides except for AGAPD (EC_{50} = 4.6 μ M) bound more strongly than FITC-AGAGD (EC_{50} = 1.5 μ M). Consistent with the structural studies reported earlier (Figure 1B), neither proline nor glycine at position 2 can have side-chain interactions with *MpPBD*, explaining their lower affinity for the protein. Furthermore, the peptide with threonine in the second position (FITC-AGATD) has the highest affinity for *MpPBD* with an EC_{50} of 89 nM (Figure 4A, green;

Supplementary file 1-Table S2; Figure S3), which is up to 35-fold tighter than those of FITC-AGAGD. Peptides with aromatic residues at the same position, including FITC-AGAFD and FITC-AGAYD bound slightly weaker than did AGATD, with EC₅₀ values of 180 nM and 170 nM, respectively. Consistent with the characterisation of FITC-A β GPDS and FITC-A β DSTD, FITC-AGATD bound *MpPBD* more than 3-fold stronger than did FITC-AGASD (EC₅₀ = 310 nM), validating the importance of the threonine methyl group in restraining the hydroxyl group to a favourable conformation for interacting with N333.

With the last two C-terminal residues defined as Thr and Asp, we proceeded to screen for the optimal amino acid in the 3rd position from the C terminus (FITC-AGXTD). While the majority of the 20 peptides of FITC-AGXTD bound *MpPBD* more strongly than did FITC-AGATD (72 nM in this round of screening), with affinity in the nanomolar range, the three with aromatic side chains and cysteine stood out. In particular, FITC-AGYTD, FITC-AGWTD and FITC-AGCTD produced EC₅₀ values of 29 nM, 23 nM, and 23 nM (Figure 4A, magenta; Supplementary file 1-Table S3; Figure S4), respectively. We reason that these amino acids with hydrophobic side chains at the 3rd position likely help the solvent-exposed residue interact with the protein via hydrophobic interactions, contributing to their higher affinity for *MpPBD*.

Having demonstrated that residues at the 2nd and 3rd positions of the peptides have an impact on how the C-terminal amino-acid interacted with *MpPBD*, we performed a final round of screening, with a consensus sequence of FITC-AGYTX (Figure 4A, red). The reasons for selecting the tyrosine-containing peptide sequence over the tryptophan- or the cysteine-containing peptide include: FITC-AGYTD is more soluble than FITC-AGWTD; FITC-AGYTD is not subject to dimerization the way FITC-

361 AGCTD can be linked by cysteine-dependent disulphide formation, which might
 362 confound the results of the binding studies. The results of the screening revealed
 363 that all but one of the FITC-AGYTX peptides bound *MpPBD* weaker than did FITC-
 364 AGYTD, with their EC₅₀ values ranging from high nano- to micro-molar
 365 concentrations. This validated the importance of the C-terminal aspartate residue for
 366 the protein-peptide interaction. The only peptide with a comparable affinity to FITC-
 367 AGYTD is FITC-AGYTS, which produced a calculated EC₅₀ of 30 nM (Figure 4A,
 368 red; Supplementary file 1-Table S3, Figure S5). Given their similar affinities for
 369 *MpPBD*, AGYTD and AGYTS were considered two of the optimal peptidyl ligands,
 370 which bound *MpPBD* roughly 1,000-fold tighter than the “TPD” binding sequence
 371 initially identified (Figure 4B).

Figure 4: Structure-guided optimization of peptidyl ligands of MpPBD. (A) Overview of the binding of the 80 FITC-labelled pentapeptides to MpPBD in four rounds of screening. Data are plotted as average $1/EC_{50}$ values calculated from FP assays of each individual FITC-labelled peptide (in three replicates). All EC_{50} values are listed in Tables S2, S3, and the corresponding FP titration plots are shown in Figures S2-S5. Data bars for peptides in the first round of screening (FITC-AGAGX) are colored black, while those for second (FITC-AGAXD), third (FITC-AGXTD) and fourth (FITC-AGYTX) rounds are colored green, magenta and red, respectively (only some amino-acid sequences are labelled in the graph for short). The strongest MpPBD binders from each round of screening are marked by arrows and their calculated EC_{50} values are indicated. (B) FP titration plots of representative peptides showing the progressive enhancement of ligands' affinity for MpPBD.

Isothermal titration calorimetry validated the nano-molar affinity of MpPBD ligands

To further validate the peptidyl ligands identified by FP, we used isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) to directly measure the interactions between unlabelled peptides (i.e. lacking FITC labels) and MpPBD. ITC measurements of *MplBP_RIII1-4* (~ 20 μM) titrated with the four different ligands (~ 200 μM) of AGAGD, AGATD, AGYTD,

and AGYTS all yielded sigmoidal-shaped curves with calculated stoichiometry values (N) close to 1 (Figure 5A-D). This was consistent with the X-ray crystallography data that demonstrated *MpPBD* has only one ligand-binding site. The interaction of the moderate binder, AGAGD, with *MpPBD* showed a gradually transitioning sigmoidal curve, indicating a relatively slow saturation rate of the *MpPBD* ligand-binding sites. This resulted in a calculated K_d of 1.9 μM , which is comparable to the EC_{50} values of FITC-AGAGD obtained from the FP experiments (1.5 μM or 3.2 μM). The result suggested that the FITC label did not have a significant impact on the peptide-protein interactions. The three strong binders, AGATD, ATYTD and ATYTS, all resulted in sigmoidal-shaped ITC curves with much steeper transitions. The three peptides had calculated K_d values of 86 nM, 67 nM and 59 nM, respectively. Thus, the ITC results of the representative peptides showed the same trend in binding *MpPBD* as did FP, with comparable K_d and EC_{50} values. Taken together, binding studies by FP and ITC have identified short peptidyl ligands with nano-molar affinities to *MpPBD* (Figure 5E).

ITC indicated that significantly larger negative enthalpic (ΔH) contributions were involved in the binding of the potent ligands, AGATD, AGYTD, and AGYTS, to *MpPBD* than for the moderate binder AGAGD (Figure 5E). In contrast, the positive entropic contributions (ΔS) were smaller for AGYTD and AGYTS when compared to AGAGD. The calculated thermodynamic profiles suggested that the enhancement of the peptide-protein interaction is primarily a result of a gain in polar interactions compared to a hydrophobic effect. This was supported by the structural comparison between the protein-peptide complex structures, which showed threonine or serine at peptide position 2 gained side-chain hydrogen bonding interactions with the

415 protein compared to that of proline or glycine at the same position (Figure 3 vs
416 Figure 1). However, additional high-resolution structural information was required to
417 elucidate the basis for the stronger interactions between *Mp*PBD and its peptidyl
418 ligands AGYTD and AGYTS.
419

420

Figure 5: Isothermal titration calorimetry results of the binding of four unlabelled peptidyl ligands AGAGD (A), AGATD (B), AGYTD (C), and AGYTS (D) to *MplBP_RIII1-4*. (E) Table showing the thermodynamic parameters of the binding of the four unlabeled peptidyl ligands to *MpPBD* calculated from ITC. K_d by ITC and EC_{50} by FP for the five representative peptidyl ligands of *MpPBD* are shown. Red arrow compares the binding of the initially identified ligand that ends with “TPD” with the optimal sequences that end with “YTS” and “YTD” obtained from the structure-guided ligand optimization.

Molecular basis for potent binding by *MpPBD* ligands

To further reveal the molecular basis for the potent *MpPBD* ligands, we solved X-ray crystal structures of *MplBP_RIII1-4* in complex with the peptides AGYTS and AGYTD to a resolution of 1.8 Å (Supplementary file 1-Table S1, Figure 6, Supplementary file 1-Figure S6). Consistent with the other *MpPBD*-peptide complexes, AGYTD and AGYTS had their terminal α -carboxyl group in contact with Ca1 and Ca2 via three ionic bonds with average lengths of approximately 2.5 Å (Figure 6, Figure 7A; Supplementary file 1-Table S4). The threonine residues in position 2 had their hydroxyl group bond with the side-chain amide of N333, as seen with FITC- A_{β} DSTD and FITC- A_{β} GPDS (Figure 6). However, the YTD and YTS-containing peptides bound *MpPBD* with more hydrogen bonds of shorter lengths on average compared to the weaker binders (Figure 7B; Supplementary file 1-Table S4), which is consistent with the large negative enthalpic contributions for the binding indicated by ITC. For example, the side chain of the terminal aspartate of AGYTD interacted with *MplBP_RIII1-4* S295 and G296 with bond lengths of 2.5 Å and 2.8 Å, respectively (Figure 6A; Supplementary file 1-Table S4), while those at the same position for FITC- A_{β} GPDS and FITC- A_{β} DSTD were at 3.2 Å and 3.5 Å, respectively (Figure 3). In contrast, the initially identified binding sequence that ends with TPD lacked these two bonds when bound by *MpPBD* (Figure 1B).

The tyrosine residues at position 3 of the YTD or YTS-containing peptides played a key role in their tight interactions with *MpPBD*. Given the hydrophobic nature of its aryl side chain, the solvent-exposed peptide tyrosine appears to pack against Y294 of *MpPBD*, which helps CPBLs to clench the peptide more tightly in the ligand-binding cavity (Figure 6A, B). Indeed, the hydrogen bond lengths between the peptide tyrosine main-chain oxygen (Tyr3-O) and protein S295 main-chain nitrogen (S295-N) is 2.9 Å for AGYTD and 3 Å for AGYTS, which are shorter than those at the same position for FITC-A β DSTD (3.2 Å) and FITC-A β GPDS (3.3 Å) (Supplementary file 1-Table S4). These subtle structural differences underlined the molecular basis for the potent binding to *MpPBD* by the peptides that end with YTD or YTS compared to the weaker ligands (Figure 6C, D).

Taken together, the presence of a tyrosine residue at position 3 of AGYTS and AGYTD stabilized the peptide-protein complexes via hydrophobic interactions. This corroborated with the results that other FITC-AGXTD peptides with aromatic residues at the 3rd position were also strong ligands for *MpPBD* (Supplementary file 1-Table S3; Figure 4A). These atomic details explain why our structure-guided screening approach was extremely effective in obtaining potent ligands with nanomolar affinities for *MpPBD*.

Figure 6: Atomic details of the interactions between *MpPBD* and its nano-molar-affinity peptidyl ligands AGYTD (A) and AGYTS (B) revealed by X-ray crystallography. Color scheme is the same as in Figure 3. Thick green-dashed lines indicate hydrophobic contact between the protein and peptide tyrosine residues. The plasticity of the *MpPBD* ligand-binding site is illustrated by their differences in complexing peptides that end with “TPD” (C) and “YTS” (D). Residue S295 that pointed to the side in C) and downward in D) is indicated by black arrows. The protein is shown in surface representation while the peptide is shown in stick representation. CIF files can be found in Figure 6 – source data 2

Figure 7: Length of the polar bonds between *MpPBD* and its peptidyl ligands revealed by X-ray crystal structures of protein-peptide complexes. Data bars are the average lengths for ionic (A) and hydrogen (B) bonds. Black data points indicate the length of individual bonds between the protein and peptide. Numbers above the data bars indicate the number of bonds at the protein-peptide interfaces. Details of the bonds are listed in Supplementary file 1-Table S4.

AGYTD blocks *MpPBD* binding to diatoms

Having identified optimal peptidyl ligands for *MpPBD*, we next tested their potential as antagonists to disrupt the PPI-mediated bacteria-diatom interactions that led to the discovery and characterization of this protein(27). Here we tested if *AGYTD* can block fluorescently labelled *MpIBP_RIII1-4* from binding to the Antarctic marine diatom *C. neogracile*(44). The porous silica cell wall (frustule) of *C. neogracile* is rectangular in shape with a length of roughly 10 μm and a width of 3-4 μm , with 1-4 projections protruding from the corners (Figure 8A, Supplementary file 1-Figure S7). The binding of TRITC-labelled *MpIBP_RIII1-4* to *C. neogracile* resulted in red fluorescence evenly distributed around the cell centrally located inside of the diatom frustule (Figure 8B). At concentrations of 37.5 μM or above, *AGYTD* was extremely effective at blocking accumulation of the protein on the diatom, as the peptide outcompeted the cell surface proteins for binding *MpPBD* and displaced $\sim 95\%$ of the fluorescent signal (Figure 8C, D, black bars). The inhibitory effect of *AGYTD* fell off by $\sim 30\%$ at 3.75 μM but was still more potent compared to the weaker *MpPBD*

ligand, AGAGD, even at a 100-fold higher concentration of 375 μ M (Figure 8D, black and blue bars). While 37.5 μ M AGAGD had a minimal effect on the binding of *MpPBD* to diatoms, the potency of AGYTD diminished in the nano-molar concentrations. These results indicated that the effective inhibitory concentrations of the *MpPBD* peptide ligands are significantly higher than the K_d values calculated for the protein-peptide interactions. This is likely due to the multi-valent effect originating from the presence of many nearby protein binding sites on the diatom cell membrane.

Remarkably, AGYTD proved to be a potent antagonist that can displace *MpPBD* pre-bound to the diatoms. The addition of 37.5 μ M of AGYTD resulted in the dissociation of roughly 70% of the TRITC-labelled *MpIBP_RIII1-4* from the diatoms (Figure 8D, grey bars). Although the peptide was more effective at the same concentration when used as a prophylactic (Figure 8D, black bar), this important result demonstrated the potential of the peptide antagonists in disrupting pre-existing bacteria-host interactions, like those involved in biofilms.

Figure 8: Inhibition of binding of *Mp*PBD to diatoms by competing peptides. Representative images showing: (A) an untreated *C. neogracile*; (B) a *C. neogracile* cell treated with 0.2 mg/mL TRITC-labelled *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4; (C) a *C. neogracile* cell treated with 0.2 mg/mL TRITC-labelled *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 in the presence of 375 μ M AGYTD. All three images (A) – (C) are at the same magnification with the black scale bar in (C) indicating 10 μ m. (D) Fluorescence levels shown by the *C. neogracile* cells alone and those treated with TRITC-labelled *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 and various concentrations of a strong or weak ligand, AGYTD and AGAGD, respectively. Each bar represents the quantification of average fluorescence from 30 individual diatoms. The white bar represents the control experiment where diatoms were treated with TRITC-labelled *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 in the absence of peptide. Black bars represent experiments where diatoms were treated with 0.2 mg/mL TRITC-labelled *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 and indicated concentrations of AGYTD. Grey bars with an asterisk underneath represent experiments where diatoms were incubated with 0.2 mg/mL TRITC-labelled *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 before AGYTD was added. Blue bars represent experiments where diatoms were treated with 0.2 mg/mL TRITC-labelled *Mp*IBP_RIII1-4 and indicated concentrations of AGAGD. Additional representative images are shown in Fig.S7.

Conclusion and outlook:

One major challenge in the field of PPI modulator discovery is a lack of starting points for the initial ligand identification. Here, a serendipitously discovered peptidyl ligand TPD has served as a lead for the development of a class of short peptides that bound *MpPBD* with 1,000-fold higher affinity. This was largely achieved by systematically screening small libraries totaling 80 peptides that informed on the optimal residue in each of three terminal positions. Remarkably, these high-affinity ligands can serve as antagonists to disrupt *MpPBD* from binding to the diatom cells that form symbiotic associations with the Antarctic bacterium.

Inhibition of pathogenic bacterial adhesion to human cells has yielded promising results in combating infections(17, 35, 38, 40, 45-47). The anti-adhesion strategy works by preventing and clearing the accumulation of bacteria at the sites of infections. In contrast to the conventional small-molecule antibiotics, the adhesin antagonists do not kill the bacteria, thus they are less likely to raise resistance. Furthermore, given that adhesins are localized to the cell surfaces, their antagonists are not required to penetrate or be taken into the cells, simplifying their applications. These key attributes justified the pursuit of novel adhesin modulators to disrupt PPI-mediated bacterial adhesion to hosts to treat bacterial infections. Homologs of *MpPBD* with a conserved ligand-binding site are found in human pathogens such as *Vibrio cholerae*(27, 28, 48), the causative agent of cholera and others such as *Aeromonas veronii* that cause infections ranging from diarrhoea to wound infections and sepsis(49, 50), and the flesh-eating bacterium *Vibrio vulnificus*(51) (Figure S8). Therefore, there is an opportunity to use this conceptual approach to devise antagonists to disrupt the PPIs involved in bacterial infections. With the emergence of antibiotic-resistant pathogens, this work gives insight into how microbes might be

controlled through the modulation of PPI-related adhesion to their hosts. In future research, it will be of interest to design adhesin modulators consisting of D-peptides, which are non-metabolizable and are thus resistant to proteolytic degradation, as well as cyclic peptides that might achieve higher affinity via favourable entropic contributions.

Materials and Methods:

Peptide synthesis

FITC-labelled peptides FITC-A β GPDS, FITC-A β DSTPD, FITC-A β DSTD and FITC-A β GPDD were synthesized by Fmoc solid-phase peptide synthesis, either manually or using an automated Intavis MultiPep RSi peptide synthesizer. The protected amino acids (linked to Wang resins) and FITC were purchased from Novabiochem and Sigma-Aldrich. Crude peptides were then analyzed and purified by high-pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC) using a preparative reversed-phase column with MS detection. The peptides were freeze-dried and stored at – 30 °C. All other FITC-labelled peptides used in the structure-guided ligand optimization procedures by fluorescence polarization (FP) and the four unlabeled peptides (AGAGD, AGYTD, ATYTS and AGATD) used in the ITC measurements and X-ray crystallography were purchased from GenicBio (Shanghai, China). HPLC and MS spectra for representative peptides are shown in Supplementary file 1-Figure S9-S21.

Fluorescence polarization

The FITC-labelled peptides were dissolved in FP buffer (10 mM HEPES, pH 7.4, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% Tween 20, 1 mg/mL BSA) to a final concentration of 10 nM. Dilution series of *MplBP_RIII1-4* were made on round-bottom 384-well plates (Corning,

Black). The protein-peptide mixture in the plate was incubated at room temperature for at least 30 min before the fluorescence polarization was measured using a Tecan Infinite F500 plate reader (excitation 485 nm, emission 535nm). All measurements were performed in triplicate, and the data were plotted with the GraphPad Prism 8 software using a non-linear regression analysis method (single-site binding model).

Co-crystallization, X-ray diffraction and structure solutions of *MpPA14* with peptide ligands

The original *MpIBP_RIII1-4* construct self-associated in the crystal by inserting its C-terminal “TPD” sequence into the ligand-binding site of a symmetry-related molecule. This crystal contact competed with free peptides for binding *MpPBD* and interfered with the crystallization of peptide-protein complexes. Thus, *MpIBP_RIII1-4* protein used for co-crystallography was truncated by 12 amino acids from the original construct, which ended at the residue N507 instead of D519. In all other respects *MpIBP_RIII1-4* was produced, purified, and crystallized as previously described(27, 52). Co-crystallization of *MpIBP_RIII1-4* with various peptides was performed using the “microbatch-under-oil” method by mixing equal volumes of ~ 5 mg/mL protein with a precipitant solution composed of approximately 0.1 M calcium chloride, 0.1 M sodium acetate (pH 4.6), 30% (w/v) PEG400 and 1-2 mM of different peptides, including FITC-A β GPDS, FITC-A β DSTD, and the unlabeled peptides AGYTD and AGYTS.

X-ray crystallographic data were collected either at the P11 beamline of the PETRA III facility at DESY (Hamburg, Germany) or at the 08ID-1 beamline of the Canadian Light Source synchrotron facility via remote access. Data were indexed and integrated with X-ray Detector Software (XDS)(53) and CCP4-Aimless(54) or the

DIALS/xia2(55, 56) in the CCP4i2 software suite. The structure solutions for all complexes were obtained by using molecular replacement using the *MplBP_RIII1-4* structure (PDB: 5K8G) as the search model(27). The structures were refined using CCP4-Refmac5(57).

Isothermal Titration Calorimetry

Isothermal calorimetric titration (ITC) measurements were performed at 30 °C using a MicroCal VP-ITC instrument (Malvern). *MplBP_RIII1-4* was dialyzed overnight in a buffer of 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 9, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM CaCl₂. Next, the protein was diluted to approximately 20 µM and was mixed with serial 5-µl aliquots of 200 µM of each of the four peptide solutions (AGAGD, AGATD, AGYTD and AGYTS). Peptide solutions were automatically added by a rotating syringe (400 RPM) at 5-min intervals into the *MplBP_RIII1-4* solution for a total of 50 injections. The data were analyzed by Origin software Version 5.0 (MicroCal).

Diatom binding experiments

The Antarctic diatom, *Chaetoceros neogracile*, was cultured as previously described(27, 44). TRITC-labelled *MplBP_RIII1-4* (TRITC-*MplBP_RIII1-4*, 0.2 mg/mL) in the presence or absence of peptides was incubated with diatoms in buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 9, 300 mM NaCl, 5 mM CaCl₂) with gentle mixing for 2 h. Next, diatoms were pelleted by centrifugation for 3 min at 4,500 x g, and the resulting supernatant was discarded. This procedure was repeated three times to wash out unbound TRITC-*MplBP_RIII1-4* before the diatom pellet was finally resuspended in 20 µL of buffer, which was then examined on slides by fluorescence microscopy. In parallel experiments to test if the strong ligand AGYTD could compete off the TRITC-*MplBP_RIII1-4* that was already bound to diatoms, TRITC-*MplBP_RIII1-4* was

incubated with diatom for 1.5 h before the peptide AGYTD was added. The remainder of the experiment followed the same procedure as described above.

Images were obtained using an Olympus IX83 inverted fluorescence microscope equipped with an Andor Zyla 4.2 Plus camera. Quantification of the fluorescence intensity was done using Fiji ImageJ. The corrected total cell fluorescence (CTCF) was calculated using the formula: $CTCF = \text{Integrated Density} - (\text{Area of selected cell} \times \text{Mean Fluorescence of the background})$ (58). Quantification of 30 individual diatom cells was done for each treatment. As diatom cell aggregates produce overexposed fluorescence while those cells lacking a silica frustule have damaged plasma membranes necessary for protein binding, they were excluded from the measurements. Graphs were made using Graphpad Prism.

Data availability

X-ray crystal structure coordinates solved in this study have been deposited in the Protein Data Bank with accession codes of 6X6Q (*MplBP_RIII1-4* - FITC- A_{β} GPDS), 6X6M (*MplBP_RIII1-4* - FITC- A_{β} DSTD), 6X5W (*MplBP_RIII1-4* - AGYTD), and 6X5V (*MplBP_RIII1-4* - AGYTS). The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author P.L.D upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. John Allingham for access to his home source X-ray diffractometer at Queen's University, and to staff members at the Canadian Light Source in Saskatoon, Canada and the PETRA III facility at DESY in Hamburg, Germany for

access to data collection at these synchrotrons. We are grateful to Dr. EonSeon Jin, Hanyang University, Seoul, for the gift of the diatom, *Chaetoceros neogracile* and Dr. Saeed Rismani Yazdi for assistance with the diatom cultures. We are indebted to Mr. Kim Munro at the Protein Function Discovery unit at Queen's University for his assistance with acquiring and interpreting ITC data. We thank Ms. Irene van Oekel for preliminary tests on the binding of peptidyl ligands to MpPBD and Mr. Joost van Dongen for analytical support. This project was funded by a Natural Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC, http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/index_eng.asp) Discovery Grant (RGPIN-2016-04810) to PLD who holds the Canadian Research Chair in Protein Engineering. IKV acknowledges financial support by the European Union (ERC-2014-StG Contract No.635928) and the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO ECHO Grant No. 712.016.002).

Author contributions: S.G. and P.L.D. conceived the study, designed the experiments, and wrote the manuscript. S.G. performed co-crystallization, data collection, and structure determination of the X-ray crystal structures. S.G. performed FP binding experiments and analyzed data with assistance of D.C.S.. L.G.M. and D.C.S. performed peptide synthesis and purification. H.Z. and C.S. performed the diatom binding experiments and analyzed data. C.O., L.B., and I.K.V. provided critical feedback to S.G. throughout the project and contributed to the critical editing of drafts of the manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References:

- 1.Winder SJ, Ayscough KR. Actin-binding proteins. J Cell Sci. 2005;118(Pt 4):651-4.
- 2.Cunha CA, Romao MJ, Sadeghi SJ, Valetti F, Gilardi G, Soares CM. Effects of protein-protein interactions on electron transfer: docking and electron transfer calculations for complexes between flavodoxin and c-type cytochromes. J Biol Inorg Chem. 1999;4(3):360-74.

- 694 3.Pawson T, Nash P. Protein-protein interactions define specificity in signal transduction.
695 Genes Dev. 2000;14(9):1027-47.
- 696 4.Arkin MR, Tang Y, Wells JA. Small-molecule inhibitors of protein-protein interactions:
697 progressing toward the reality. Chem Biol. 2014;21(9):1102-14.
- 698 5.Andrei SA, Sijbesma E, Hann M, Davis J, O'Mahony G, Perry MWD, et al. Stabilization of
699 protein-protein interactions in drug discovery. Expert Opin Drug Discov. 2017;12(9):925-40.
- 700 6.Milroy LG, Grossmann TN, Hennig S, Brunsfeld L, Ottmann C. Modulators of protein-
701 protein interactions. Chem Rev. 2014;114(9):4695-748.
- 702 7.Oltersdorf T, Elmore SW, Shoemaker AR, Armstrong RC, Augeri DJ, Belli BA, et al. An
703 inhibitor of Bcl-2 family proteins induces regression of solid tumours. Nature.
704 2005;435(7042):677-81.
- 705 8.Roberts AW, Davids MS, Pagel JM, Kahl BS, Puvvada SD, Gerecitano JF, et al. Targeting
706 BCL2 with Venetoclax in Relapsed Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia. N Engl J Med.
707 2016;374(4):311-22.
- 708 9.Dutta S, Ryan J, Chen TS, Kougentakis C, Letai A, Keating AE. Potent and specific peptide
709 inhibitors of human pro-survival protein Bcl-xL. J Mol Biol. 2015;427(6 Pt B):1241-53.
- 710 10.Chang YS, Graves B, Guerlavais V, Tovar C, Packman K, To KH, et al. Stapled alpha-helical
711 peptide drug development: a potent dual inhibitor of MDM2 and MDMX for p53-dependent
712 cancer therapy. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(36):E3445-54.
- 713 11.Brancaccio D, Di Maro S, Cerofolini L, Giuntini S, Fragai M, Luchinat C, et al. HOPPI-NMR:
714 Hot-Peptide-Based Screening Assay for Inhibitors of Protein-Protein Interactions by NMR.
715 ACS Med Chem Lett. 2020;11(5):1047-53.
- 716 12.Drucker DJ. Advances in oral peptide therapeutics. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2020;19(4):277-
717 89.
- 718 13.Fosgerau K, Hoffmann T. Peptide therapeutics: current status and future directions. Drug
719 Discov Today. 2015;20(1):122-8.
- 720 14.Wojcik P, Berlicki L. Peptide-based inhibitors of protein-protein interactions. Bioorg Med
721 Chem Lett. 2016;26(3):707-13.
- 722 15.Davies J, Davies D. Origins and evolution of antibiotic resistance. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev.
723 2010;74(3):417-33.
- 724 16.Frieri M, Kumar K, Boutin A. Antibiotic resistance. J Infect Public Health. 2017;10(4):369-
725 78.
- 726 17.Krachler AM, Orth K. Targeting the bacteria-host interface: Strategies in anti-adhesion
727 therapy. Virulence. 2013;4(4):284-94.
- 728 18.Ventola CL. The antibiotic resistance crisis: part 1: causes and threats. P T.
729 2015;40(4):277-83.
- 730 19.Klemm P, Schembri MA. Bacterial adhesins: function and structure. Int J Med Microbiol.
731 2000;290(1):27-35.
- 732 20.Kline KA, Falker S, Dahlberg S, Normark S, Henriques-Normark B. Bacterial adhesins in
733 host-microbe interactions. Cell Host Microbe. 2009;5(6):580-92.
- 734 21.Stones DH, Krachler AM. Fatal attraction: how bacterial adhesins affect host signaling
735 and what we can learn from them. Int J Mol Sci. 2015;16(2):2626-40.
- 736 22.Newell PD, Boyd CD, Sondermann H, O'Toole GA. A c-di-GMP effector system controls
737 cell adhesion by inside-out signaling and surface protein cleavage. PLoS Biol.
738 2011;9(2):e1000587.
- 739 23.Jamal M, Ahmad W, Andleeb S, Jalil F, Imran M, Nawaz MA, et al. Bacterial biofilm and
740 associated infections. J Chin Med Assoc. 2018;81(1):7-11.

741 24. Lebeaux D, Ghigo JM, Beloin C. Biofilm-related infections: bridging the gap between
742 clinical management and fundamental aspects of recalcitrance toward antibiotics. *Microbiol*
743 *Mol Biol Rev.* 2014;78(3):510-43.

744 25. Romling U, Balsalobre C. Biofilm infections, their resilience to therapy and innovative
745 treatment strategies. *J Intern Med.* 2012;272(6):541-61.

746 26. Guo S, Langelaan DN, Phippen SW, Smith SP, Voets IK, Davies PL. Conserved structural
747 features anchor biofilm-associated RTX-adhesins to the outer membrane of bacteria. *FEBS J.*
748 2018;285(10):1812-26.

749 27. Guo S, Stevens CA, Vance TDR, Olijve LLC, Graham LA, Campbell RL, et al. Structure of a
750 1.5-MDa adhesin that binds its Antarctic bacterium to diatoms and ice. *Sci Adv.*
751 2017;3(8):e1701440.

752 28. Guo S, Vance TDR, Stevens CA, Voets IK, Davies PL. RTX Adhesins are Key Bacterial
753 Surface Megaproteins in the Formation of Biofilms. *Trends Microbiol.* 2019;27(5):470.

754 29. Smith TJ, Sondermann H, O'Toole GA. Type 1 Does the Two-Step: Type 1 Secretion
755 Substrates with a Functional Periplasmic Intermediate. *J Bacteriol.* 2018;200(18).

756 30. Berne C, Ducret A, Hardy GG, Brun YV. Adhesins Involved in Attachment to Abiotic
757 Surfaces by Gram-Negative Bacteria. *Microbiol Spectr.* 2015;3(4).

758 31. Kitts G, Giglio KM, Zamorano-Sanchez D, Park JH, Townsley L, Cooley RB, et al. A
759 Conserved Regulatory Circuit Controls Large Adhesins in *Vibrio cholerae*. *mBio.* 2019;10(6).

760 32. Vance TDR, Guo SQ, Assaie-Ardakany S, Conroy B, Davies PL. Structure and functional
761 analysis of a bacterial adhesin sugar-binding domain (vol 14, e0220045, 2019). *Plos One.*
762 2019;14(8).

763 33. Moonens K, Gideonsson P, Subedi S, Bugaytsova J, Romao E, Mendez M, et al. Structural
764 Insights into Polymorphic ABO Glycan Binding by *Helicobacter pylori*. *Cell Host Microbe.*
765 2016;19(1):55-66.

766 34. Moonens K, Hamway Y, Neddermann M, Reschke M, Tegtmeyer N, Kruse T, et al.
767 *Helicobacter pylori* adhesin HopQ disrupts trans dimerization in human CEACAMs. *EMBO J.*
768 2018;37(13).

769 35. Wellens A, Garofalo C, Nguyen H, Van Gerven N, Slattegard R, Hernalsteens JP, et al.
770 Intervening with urinary tract infections using anti-adhesives based on the crystal structure
771 of the FimH-oligomannose-3 complex. *Plos One.* 2008;3(4):e2040.

772 36. Ofek I, Hasty DL, Sharon N. Anti-adhesion therapy of bacterial diseases: prospects and
773 problems. *FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol.* 2003;38(3):181-91.

774 37. Han Z, Pinkner JS, Ford B, Obermann R, Nolan W, Wildman SA, et al. Structure-based
775 drug design and optimization of mannoside bacterial FimH antagonists. *J Med Chem.*
776 2010;53(12):4779-92.

777 38. Mydock-McGrane LK, Hannan TJ, Janetka JW. Rational design strategies for FimH
778 antagonists: new drugs on the horizon for urinary tract infection and Crohn's disease. *Expert*
779 *Opin Drug Discov.* 2017;12(7):711-31.

780 39. Sauer MM, Jakob RP, Lubert T, Canonica F, Navarra G, Ernst B, et al. Binding of the
781 Bacterial Adhesin FimH to Its Natural, Multivalent High-Mannose Type Glycan Targets. *J Am*
782 *Chem Soc.* 2019;141(2):936-44.

783 40. Totsika M, Kostakioti M, Hannan TJ, Upton M, Beatson SA, Janetka JW, et al. A FimH
784 inhibitor prevents acute bladder infection and treats chronic cystitis caused by multidrug-
785 resistant uropathogenic *Escherichia coli* ST131. *J Infect Dis.* 2013;208(6):921-8.

786 41.Spaulding CN, Klein RD, Ruer S, Kau AL, Schreiber HL, Cusumano ZT, et al. Selective
787 depletion of uropathogenic *E. coli* from the gut by a FimH antagonist. *Nature*.
788 2017;546(7659):528-32.

789 42.Kiessling LL. Chemistry-driven glycoscience. *Bioorg Med Chem*. 2018;26(19):5229-38.

790 43.Guo S, Garnham CP, Whitney JC, Graham LA, Davies PL. Re-evaluation of a bacterial
791 antifreeze protein as an adhesin with ice-binding activity. *Plos One*. 2012;7(11):e48805.

792 44.Gwak IG, Jung WS, Kim HJ, Kang SH, Jin E. Antifreeze Protein in Antarctic Marine Diatom,
793 *Chaetoceros neogracile*. *Mar Biotechnol*. 2010;12(6):630-9.

794 45.Huebinger RM, Do DH, Carlson DL, Yao X, Stones DH, De Souza Santos M, et al. Bacterial
795 adhesion inhibitor prevents infection in a rodent surgical incision model. *Virulence*.
796 2020;11(01):695-706.

797 46.Cusumano CK, Pinkner JS, Han Z, Greene SE, Ford BA, Crowley JR, et al. Treatment and
798 prevention of urinary tract infection with orally active FimH inhibitors. *Sci Transl Med*.
799 2011;3(109):109ra15.

800 47.Solanki V, Tiwari M, Tiwari V. Host-bacteria interaction and adhesin study for
801 development of therapeutics. *Int J Biol Macromol*. 2018;112:54-64.

802 48.Syed KA, Beyhan S, Correa N, Queen J, Liu J, Peng F, et al. The *Vibrio cholerae* flagellar
803 regulatory hierarchy controls expression of virulence factors. *J Bacteriol*.
804 2009;191(21):6555-70.

805 49.Hickman-Brenner FW, MacDonald KL, Steigerwalt AG, Fanning GR, Brenner DJ, Farmer JJ,
806 3rd. *Aeromonas veronii*, a new ornithine decarboxylase-positive species that may cause
807 diarrhea. *J Clin Microbiol*. 1987;25(5):900-6.

808 50.Whitaker IS, Kamya C, Azzopardi EA, Graf J, Kon M, Lineaweaver WC. Preventing infective
809 complications following leech therapy: is practice keeping pace with current research?
810 *Microsurgery*. 2009;29(8):619-25.

811 51.Hollis DG, Weaver RE, Baker CN, Thornsberry C. Halophilic *Vibrio* species isolated from
812 blood cultures. *J Clin Microbiol*. 1976;3(4):425-31.

813 52.Guo S, Campbell R, Davies PL, Allingham JS. Phasing with calcium at home. *Acta*
814 *Crystallogr F Struct Biol Commun*. 2019;75(Pt 5):377-84.

815 53.Kabsch W. Integration, scaling, space-group assignment and post-refinement. *Acta*
816 *Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*. 2010;66(Pt 2):133-44.

817 54.Evans P. Scaling and assessment of data quality. *Acta Crystallogr D*. 2006;62:72-82.

818 55.Beilsten-Edmands J, Winter G, Gildea R, Parkhurst J, Waterman D, Evans G. Scaling
819 diffraction data in the DIALS software package: algorithms and new approaches for multi-
820 crystal scaling. *Acta Crystallogr D Struct Biol*. 2020;76(Pt 4):385-99.

821 56.Winter G, Lobley CM, Prince SM. Decision making in xia2. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol*
822 *Crystallogr*. 2013;69(Pt 7):1260-73.

823 57.Vagin AA, Steiner RA, Lebedev AA, Potterton L, McNicholas S, Long F, et al. REFMAC5
824 dictionary: organization of prior chemical knowledge and guidelines for its use. *Acta*
825 *Crystallogr D*. 2004;60:2184-95.

826 58.Burgess A, Vigneron S, Brioudes E, Labbe JC, Lorca T, Castro A. Loss of human Greatwall
827 results in G2 arrest and multiple mitotic defects due to deregulation of the cyclin B-
828 Cdc2/PP2A balance. *P Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2010;107(28):12564-9.

829