1	LeuO is a global regulator of gene expression in Salmonella
2	enterica serovar Typhimurium
3	
4	Shane C. Dillon ¹ , Elena Espinosa ² , Karsten Hokamp ³ , David W. Ussery ⁴ , Josep
5	Casadesús ² , and Charles J. Dorman ¹ *
6	
7	¹ Department of Microbiology, School of Genetics and Microbiology, Moyne Institute of
8	Preventive Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland
9	² Departamento de Genética, Facultad de Biología, Universidad de Sevilla, Apartado
10	1095, Seville 41080, Spain
11	³ Department of Genetics, School of Genetics and Microbiology, Smurfit Institute, Trinity
12	College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.
13	⁴ Center for Biological Sequence Analysis, Department of Systems Biology, Technical
14	University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark
15	
16	
17	*Corresponding author, Email: cjdorman@tcd.ie
18	
19	Running title: Salmonella Typhimurium LeuO regulon
20	
21	Key words: LeuO, LysR-type transcription regulator, H-NS, gene regulation, RNA
22	polymerase, Salmonella enterica
23	
24	

25 Summary

26 We report the first investigation of the binding of the Salmonella enterica LeuO LysR-27 type transcription regulator to its genomic targets in vivo. Chromatin-28 immunoprecipitation-on-chip identified 178 LeuO binding sites on the chromosome of S. 29 enterica serovar Typhimurium strain SL1344. These sites were distributed across both 30 the core and the horizontally acquired genome, and included housekeeping genes and 31 genes known to contribute to virulence. Sixty-eight LeuO targets were co-bound by the 32 global repressor protein, H-NS. Thus, while LeuO may function as an H-NS antagonist, 33 these functions are unlikely to involve displacement of H-NS. RNA polymerase bound 34 173 of the 178 LeuO targets, consistent with LeuO being a transcription regulator. Thus, 35 LeuO targets two classes of genes, those that are bound by H-NS and those that are 36 unbound by H-NS. LeuO binding site analysis revealed a logo conforming to the TN₁₁A 37 motif common to LysR-type transcription factors. It differed in some details from a motif 38 that we composed for *Escherichia coli* LeuO binding sites. 1263 and 1094 LeuO binding 39 site locations were predicted in the S. Typhimurium SL1344 and E. coli MG1655 40 genomes, respectively. Despite differences in motif composition, many LeuO target 41 genes were common to both species. Thus, LeuO is likely to be a more important global 42 regulator than previously suspected.

44 Introduction

45 The LeuO protein belongs to the family of LysR-type transcriptional regulators (LTTRs), 46 the largest family of prokaryotic DNA binding proteins (Momany and Neidle, 2012; Pareja 47 et al., 2006) with over 55,000 potential members in the Pfam database (PF00126 48 HTH 1, LysR substrate) (Punta et al., 2012). The number of different LTTRs in a given 49 species is often very large; for example, Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium (S. 50 Typhimurium) encodes 44 distinct LTTRs (Lahiri et al., 2009). LTTRs are typically 300 to 51 350 amino acids in length and activate the transcription of operons and regulons 52 involved in diverse cellular functions such as nitrogen fixation, the response to oxidative 53 stress and aspects of bacterial virulence (Van Rhijn and Vanderleyden, 1995; Hernandez-Lucas et al., 2008; Lahiri et al., 2008; 2009; Maddocks and Oyston, 2008; 54 55 O'Byrne and Dorman, 1994; Sheehan and Dorman, 1998). A typical LysR family 56 member consists of an N-terminal DNA binding domain and a C-terminal sensing 57 domain and it activates or represses the transcription of target genes; some, but not all, 58 are known to bind ligands that influence their DNA binding activity (Schell, 1993; Zaim 59 and Kierzek, 2003).

60 LeuO is a member of the LTTR family and is found in members of the 61 Enterobacteriaceae, including Escherichia coli, Salmonella, Shigella and Yersinia spp. 62 (Maddocks and Oyston, 2008). The designation *leuO* was originally used to describe an 63 open reading frame of unknown function located beside the leucine biosynthesis operon 64 (leuABCD) (Henikoff et al. 1988). The leuO gene was later found to be part of a complex 65 cis-acting promoter relay system that connects the leuABCD and ilvIH operons (Chen et 66 al., 1992; Wu et al., 1995; Wu and Fang, 2003). More recently it has been shown that 67 the leuO gene is activated by the transcriptional regulators RcsB and BgIJ and is 68 negatively autoregulated (Stratmann et al., 2012).

69 Further work, performed mostly in *E. coli* and *Salmonella* Typhi, has shown that 70 LeuO plays a positive role in the regulation of a number of genes including the bgl 71 operon involved in β -glucoside utilization (Ueguchi *et al.*, 1998), the *yjjQ-bglJ* operon 72 encoding LuxR-type transcriptional regulators (Stratmann et al., 2008), and the vicRQP 73 operon involved in Sulfa drug efflux (Shimada et al., 2009). LeuO also activates the 74 casABCDE operon (Hernandez-Lucas et al. 2008; Westra et al., 2010; Medina-Aparicio 75 et al., 2011) that is part of the CRISPR/Cas defence system that provides 'immunity' 76 against mobile genetic elements (Karginov and Hannon, 2010). Furthermore LeuO has 77 been implicated in the bacterial response to stress (Majumder et al., 2001; Fang et al., 78 2000) and genetic screens have identified LeuO as a Salmonella virulence factor (Tenor 79 et al., 2004; Lawley et al., 2006). LeuO may in part contribute to Salmonella virulence by 80 positively regulating the outer membrane porins OmpS1 and OmpS2 (Fernandez-Mora 81 et al., 2004; De la Cruz et al., 2007; Hernandez-Lucas et al., 2008), which are known 82 virulence factors in the mouse model infection system (Rodriguez-Morales et al., 2006). 83 LeuO has also been reported to regulate positively rovA, a key regulator of virulence in 84 Yersinia spp. (Lawrenz and Miller, 2007).

85 It is clear that LeuO regulates a diverse set of genes and this has been expanded 86 by a recent SELEX analysis in *E. coli* (Shimada *et al.*, 2011). However, we do not have a 87 detailed understanding of the genes that are regulated by LeuO in the important 88 pathogen S. Typhimurium. On these grounds, we used a global ChIP-chip approach to 89 identify LeuO-regulated genes to obtain comprehensive information about LeuO binding 90 to its genomic targets in living bacterial cells. This approach allowed us to investigate 91 LeuO binding in the context of other DNA binding proteins that are likely to target the 92 same genes, such as RNA polymerase and the H-NS protein. It also allowed us to study 93 LeuO binding to DNA adopting conformations that are natural to the *in vivo* situation, a 94 factor that is known to influence the binding of several DNA binding proteins (Cameron

Λ

95 and Dorman, 2012). In our strategy, we exploited knowledge of LeuO protein 96 expression: the *leuO* gene is expressed maximally in bacteria growing in phosphate-97 limited minimal medium on entry into stationary phase (Fang *et al.*, 2000, VanBogelen *et 98 al.*, 1996). We present the first *in vivo* DNA analysis of LeuO binding to the *S*. 99 Typhimurium chromosome using the ChIP-chip technique, and provide evidence that 100 LeuO is a global regulator in *S*. Typhimurium.

102 Results and Discussion

103 Identification of LeuO target genes in Salmonella enterica using a ChIP-chip approach 104 In order to understand the function of LeuO in *S*. Typhimurium, we identified the network 105 of LeuO gene targets using a chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) assay. The LeuO 106 protein, tagged with the FLAG epitope, was cross-linked to its DNA targets, and then 107 immunoprecipitated using an anti-FLAG antibody. The DNA targets bound by LeuO were 108 then identified by hybridization to a DNA microarray (Experimental procedures).

109 Bacterial cultures to be used in the ChIP assay were grown under conditions 110 known to promote maximal LeuO protein expression: growth in a minimal low-phosphate 111 medium (LPM) to stationary phase (equivalent to an OD₆₀₀ value of 1.4) (Fig. 1A) (Fang 112 et al., 2000, VanBoegelen et al., 1996). The LeuO-bound ChIP DNA fragments were 113 fluorescently labelled with Cy3 dCTP while the genomic DNA control was labelled with 114 Cy5 dCTP. The DNA samples were co-hybridized to a DNA tiling microarray and the 115 intensity of fluorescence of each of the DNA probes was calculated (Fig. 1B). The 116 ChIPOTIe peak finding programme (Buck et al., 2005) was used to identify LeuO binding 117 sites using a 2-fold cut-off. This procedure identified 261 binding regions common to two 118 biological replicate experiments. However as the ChIP-chip procedure often results in 119 the identification of false positive binding events (Waldminghaus and Skarstad, 2010), a 120 control 'mock' ChIP-chip experiment was also performed, in which normal mouse IgG 121 antibodies were used during a ChIP reaction, to identify any DNA sequences that were 122 non-specifically immunoprecipitated. The ChIPOTle programme identified 83 peaks in 123 the control dataset that were also present in the LeuO dataset; consequently these 124 targets were eliminated from the final analysis. Altogether, 178 LeuO binding sites were 125 identified (Fig.1 and Table S1). Previously characterized LeuO target genes from other 126 bacterial species that were found in our dataset include the CRISPR/Cas operon (Fig. 1),

sdiA, ompN/ompS2, dnaE, cyoABCDE, tesB, fimD, sdhA, add, cpsG, nuoH, tdcD, treF
and phoU (Table S1) (Westra et al., 2010; Turnbull et al., 2012; Shimada et al., 2011).
The presence of these targets validated our approach. A large number of new LeuO
target genes were also identified in this study, some of which are discussed below (see *Extension of the LeuO regulon*).

132 The majority of the bacterial transcription factors that have been studied by 133 genome-wide location analysis have been found to bind predominantly to non-coding 134 DNA sequences (Grainger et al., 2004; 2005; 2006; 2007; Cho et al., 2008; Shimada et 135 al., 2011; Wei et al., 2012). This is not surprising because most transcription factors 136 regulate transcription by binding to DNA sites that are located upstream of open reading 137 frames (ORFs). In general, LTTRs bind to several intergenic sites located upstream of 138 their regulated gene(s) (Maddocks and Oyston, 2008). While they often bind close to 139 promoter regions (-55 bp to +20 bp), sites located more than 200 bp upstream of the 140 promoter have been detected, as have binding sites internal to the ORF (+350 bp) 141 (Wilson et al., 1995, Viswanathan et al., 2007). The evidence that LTTRs can exert their 142 regulatory influence through binding to a wide variety of locations prompted us to 143 examine the location of S. Typhimurium LeuO binding sites in detail.

144 LeuO binding sites were classified based on their location, i.e. intergenic or within 145 an ORF. Intergenic and intra-ORF sites were further sub-categorized into Intergenic (I, 146 located upstream of an individual gene), Intergenic Convergent (IC, located between two 147 convergently-transcribed genes), Intergenic Divergent (ID, located between two 148 divergently-transcribed genes), ORF 3' (located within the 3' promoter-distal half of an 149 ORF) and ORF 5' (located within the 5' promoter-proximal half of the ORF) (Fig. 1D). 150 Surprisingly we found that only about 33% of binding sites were located in intergenic 151 regions with the remaining ~66% of binding sites being located within ORFs (Fig. 1D). 152 Thirty six of the 60 intergenic binding events were located upstream of an individual

153 gene, 18 were located between divergently-transcribed genes and 6 binding events were 154 located between convergently-transcribed genes, making target gene predictions based 155 on binding site location difficult. The same number (59) of ORF binding events were 156 distributed equally between the 5' and 3' regions of ORFs. It is possible that a proportion 157 of these intra-ORF binding events have been incorrectly classified in the case of 158 adjacent genes that share short intergenic regions. This is because the resolution 159 capacity of the ChIP-chip method is limited by the average size of the sonicated DNA 160 fragments (~500 bp). However most represent intra-ORF LeuO binding sites of the type 161 that have been documented previously for LeuO and other LysR-like regulators 162 (Shimada et al., 2011; Wilson et al., 1995; Viswanathan et al., 2007). The significance of 163 intra-ORF binding is not clear but because of their location they may have a repressive 164 effect on transcription as in some instances LeuO has been shown to act as a negative 165 regulator (Hernandez-Lucas et al., 2008; Shimada et al., 2009). Alternatively, as H-NS 166 can bind within coding regions to form transcriptionally repressive nucleoprotein 167 complexes (Nagarajavel et al., 2007), these intra-ORF binding events could simply 168 reflect LeuO-mediated antagonism of H-NS binding to internal gene regions. It is also 169 possible that they may reflect an architectural role for the LeuO protein in determining 170 the structure of the nucleoid (Chen and Wu, 2005).

171

172 Extension of the LeuO regulon

Our ChIP-chip analysis greatly extended the number of known LeuO target genes in *S*. Typhimurium. Prior knowledge of LeuO targets in *Salmonella* extended only to relatively few loci, including genes in *S*. Typhi rather than *S*. Typhimurium (De la Cruz *et al.*, 2007; Hernandez-Lucas *et al.*, 2008; Medina-Aparicio *et al.*, 2011; Turnbull *et al.*, 2012). The 164 new *S*. Typhimurium regulon members identified here are involved in a variety of cellular processes and include, for example, inner/outer membrane proteins, transport

Q

proteins, motility factors, cell division proteins, oxidative stress response proteins andalso other LTTRs (Table S1).

LeuO binding has been mapped previously to the CRISPR-associated *casA* and *cas3* promoters in *S*. Typhi (Medina-Aparicio *et al.*, 2011); here, we observed high levels of LeuO binding at the promoter for the CRISPR repeats with little or no binding at the *casA* and *cas3* promoters in *S*. Typhimurium (Fig. 1C). However, while P_{casA} and P_{cas3} were not classified as LeuO targets in LPM growth conditions, subsequent LeuObinding-site motif analysis predicted LeuO binding in the 5' regulatory region of these genes (see *Genome-wide prediction and validation of LeuO binding sites*).

Other notable LeuO target genes are *sopA*, encoding an effector protein that is translocated by the *Salmonella* pathogenicity island (SPI) 1 type III secretion system, and *sifA*, the SPI-2 translocated effector gene. These are important virulence determinants of *S*. Typhimurium and their detection is consistent with the previous characterization of LeuO as a *Salmonella* virulence factor required for host-pathogen interactions (Tenor *et al.*, 2004).

The *rcsA* gene was also identified as a LeuO target. Its product, RcsA, is an auxiliary regulator for the Rcs (regulation of capsular polysaccharide biosynthesis) twocomponent phosphophorelay system that senses alterations in the outer membrane and the peptidoglycan layer of the cell envelope (Majdalani and Gottesman, 2005). Interestingly, RcsA can form heterodimers with the response regulator RcsB, which activates *leuO* transcription in conjunction with BgIJ, counteracting H-NS repression of *leuO* transcription (Stratmann *et al.*, 2012).

The *rssB* gene, which encodes a response-regulator-like adaptor protein (RssB) for ClpXP proteolytic degradation of the RpoS stress and stationary phase sigma factor (Klauck *et al.*, 2001), was found to be a LeuO target. This LeuO-RssB link is significant in the context of an earlier discovery that a Tn*10* insertion that activated *leuO* expression

205 led to a reduction in RpoS levels (Klauck *et al.*, 1997). It is possible that in addition to the 206 established effect of LeuO on DsrA regulatory RNA expression, and hence DsrA-207 sensitive RpoS mRNA translation, LeuO may also influence RpoS protein levels by 208 modulating the expression of the RssB adaptor protein.

209 We also identified the genes coding for three other LysR-like regulators as LeuO 210 targets: metR, yeeY and stm2180. While the functions of YeeY and STM2180 are 211 uncharacterized, MetR is known to be involved in the regulation of methionine 212 biosynthesis (Maxon et al., 1989). The possibility that bacteria may link their amino acid 213 biosynthetic pathways through gene regulation is intuitively appealing, since mounting 214 appropriate responses to metabolic challenges is essential for survival. It may be also 215 significant during infection: the Salmonella containing vacuole in an infected host cell is a 216 nutrient limiting environment (simulated by growth in LPM), and control of amino acid 217 biosynthesis by LeuO may facilitate survival during the infection process.

218 The observed binding of LeuO to its known target ompS2/ompN but not to 219 ompS1/ompS provided an important insight. LeuO is known to induce ompS2 expression 220 at a lower concentration than required for the induction of ompS1 (De la Cruz, 2007), 221 consistent with LeuO having a higher affinity for the regulatory region of ompS2. The 222 low intracellular concentration of LeuO when cultured in LPM may not allow LeuO to 223 occupy lower affinity sites such as the regulatory region of ompS1. To investigate if the 224 genome-wide binding pattern of LeuO was altered upon an increase in the intracellular 225 concentration of LeuO, we used the inducible pBAD system to over-express 3 x FLAG 226 tagged LeuO and monitored its binding pattern using the ChIP-chip technique. This 227 analysis revealed that LeuO bound to 331 chromosomal locations (after removal of any 228 false positives also present in a mouse IgG control ChIP-chip) (Table S1). We observed 229 LeuO binding to other known targets including ompS1 and cas3, which we did not detect 230 previously. This is consistent with LeuO having a lower affinity for these sites so that a

1∩

231 higher intracellular concentration of LeuO is required before full binding is achieved. 232 LeuO concentration is very low in exponentially growing cells (~200 molecules/cell) but 233 is believed to reach up to 2000-4000 molecules per cell in stationary phase E. coli 234 cultures (Shimada et al. 2011). If LeuO binds as a dimer, there may be as many as 235 1000-2000 LeuO binding sites (see Genome-wide prediction and validation of LeuO 236 binding sites). It is not inconceivable that under appropriate growth conditions 237 Salmonella synthesizes large amounts of LeuO to occupy even more binding sites than 238 documented here as we are only beginning to understand the growth conditions under 239 which LeuO plays a regulatory role (Gallego-Hernandez et al. 2012).

240

241 LeuO binding in close proximity to H-NS

242 Enteric bacteria encode the abundant DNA binding H-NS protein which acts as a global 243 repressor of ~20% of genes in S. Typhimurium (Dillon and Dorman, 2010; Dorman, 244 2004). H-NS represses transcription of these genes by binding to curved AT-rich DNA 245 sequences and mediates its repressive function by preventing RNA polymerase binding 246 or by trapping RNA polymerase at promoters (Dame et al., 2006; Navarre et al., 2006; 247 Lucchini et al., 2006; Walthers et al., 2011). Counteracting the repressive function of H-248 NS is important if cells are to express H-NS regulated genes; not surprisingly, a number 249 of H-NS antagonism mechanisms have been described (Stoebel et al., 2008). LeuO has 250 recently emerged as an important antagonist of H-NS (Hernandez-Lucas et al., 2008; 251 Shimada et al., 2009; 2011) and it may exert this function by simply competing with H-252 NS for binding to DNA (Shimada et al., 2011) or acting as a barrier to H-NS 253 polymerization (Chen et al., 2003; Chen and Wu, 2005). While LeuO is known to 254 antagonize H-NS, its own gene is repressed by H-NS (Klauck et al., 1997; Chen et al., 255 2001; Stratmann et al., 2012). Deletion of hns in Salmonella Typhimurium strain SL1344 256 resulted in a dramatic increase in LeuO protein levels (Fig. 2A), confirming the

repressive action of H-NS at the *leuO* gene in SL1344. LeuO binding was observed in close proximity to a previously mapped H-NS binding site at *leuO* (Dillon *et al.*, 2010), consistent with LeuO functioning as an H-NS antagonist in *S*. Typhimurium.

260 It was important to determine which of the 178 S. Typhimurium LeuO binding 261 events were associated with H-NS and to ascertain whether LeuO mediated its function 262 by displacing H-NS or by another mechanism. To address these questions, H-NS 263 binding to the SL1344 chromosome was examined by ChIP-chip analysis under the 264 same growth conditions that are known to promote *leuO* expression (i.e. grown to 265 stationary phase in LPM) (Fig. 2B). In addition, previously published data (Dillon et al., 266 2010) on H-NS binding under standard laboratory growth conditions in which LeuO is 267 undetectable (i.e. grown to exponential phase in LB) were analysed and the findings 268 were integrated with those from the present investigation.

269 The ChIPOTle algorithm identified 496 H-NS binding regions in SL1344 grown in 270 LPM (Table S2) (456 binding regions were identified in LB, Dillon et al., 2010). The 271 locations of these H-NS binding regions were compared with the LeuO binding sites and 272 those LeuO binding sites that overlapped with, or were located within 200 bp of, an H-273 NS binding region were classified as LeuO+H-NS sites; the remaining sites were 274 classified as LeuO sites (Fig. 2C) (Table S1). We identified 68 LeuO sites that met our 275 criteria for classification as LeuO+H-NS sites; the remaining 110 LeuO sites were not 276 associated with H-NS co-localization and so were designated as LeuO sites.

LeuO co-localization with H-NS at 68 locations is consistent with a global H-NS antagonism function. However it is important to consider that LeuO may also repress some of its target genes, perhaps in conjunction with H-NS. This possibility is supported by the observation that LeuO and H-NS are both known to repress the *fimAICDFGH* operon in *E. coli* (Shimada *et al.* 2011). The 68 LeuO+H-NS sites represent only 38% of the total number of LeuO binding events; in contrast, Shimada *et al.* (2011) found that

283 95% of LeuO sites in E. coli overlapped with H-NS sites. We then examined average 284 LeuO and H-NS occupancy at the two classes of LeuO binding sites. Average H-NS and 285 LeuO ChIP occupancies were calculated +/- 500 bp with respect to the centre of the 286 LeuO binding sites. These surveys showed that the peak of LeuO binding was offset by 287 100 bp from the ChIPOTIe peak centre (Fig. 2D). However an interesting pattern 288 emerged: close analysis of regions of LeuO and H-NS co-occupancy revealed that the 289 LeuO binding peak coincided consistently with a trough in the H-NS binding landscape 290 (Fig. 2D). The significance of this is not clear but may indicate that LeuO functions as an 291 H-NS barrier or antagonist, taking up a position interposed between two consecutive H-292 NS binding peaks. It is also possible that the intracellular concentrations of LeuO might 293 not be high enough to displace H-NS completely.

294 We wished to know if LeuO could antagonize H-NS binding by competing with 295 and displacing this protein from DNA. We examined H-NS binding at the 110 LeuO-only 296 sites in LB-grown SL1344 and found that none of these 110 locations was occupied by 297 H-NS (Table S1). Therefore the presence of LeuO had not simply resulted in the 298 complete displacement of H-NS in LPM since these locations lacked H-NS binding in the 299 absence of detectable levels of LeuO. Next we examined H-NS occupancy at the 68 300 LeuO+H-NS sites in LB-grown cultures and found that fewer LeuO target genes were 301 bound by H-NS in LB when compared with LPM (41 of the 68 genes were bound by H-302 NS in LB) (Fig. 3A). Therefore the presence of LeuO appeared to correlate with H-NS 303 binding to more LeuO target genes, which would not be expected if LeuO simply 304 displaced H-NS from its cognate binding sites. However these results did not rule out the 305 possibility that LeuO influenced the pattern of H-NS occupancy without completely 306 displacing H-NS. Therefore we calculated the average H-NS binding levels at LeuO 307 binding sites in both LPM and LB (Fig. 3B). This analysis revealed much higher levels of 308 H-NS binding at LeuO target genes in LeuO-inducing (i.e. LPM) conditions compared to

309 repressive (LB) conditions. Our data are inconsistent with a simplistic model in which 310 LeuO overcomes H-NS transcriptional repression activity simply by displacing H-NS. 311 They are more suggestive of a subtle remodeling of the nucleoprotein complex that 312 overcomes H-NS-mediated repression without stripping H-NS from the DNA. A 313 mechanism of this kind has been proposed for other H-NS antagonists in S. 314 Typhimurium, such as the SlyA protein and OmpR (Perez et al., 2008; Cameron and 315 Dorman, 2012). The ability of LeuO to form DNA-protein-DNA bridges, analogous to 316 those created by Lacl, might also allow LeuO to interfere with H-NS activity without 317 removing the protein from the DNA. Significantly, the LacI protein can replace LeuO as 318 an H-NS antagonist at *leuO* (Chen and Wu, 2005), a finding that is consistent with the 319 two proteins operating through a common mechanism. Here, the LeuO/Lacl proteins 320 erect a DNA-protein-DNA bridge between two binding sites that contains H-NS behind a 321 LeuO/Lacl barrier. This barrier protects a nearby promoter from encroachment by H-NS 322 polymerization without the need to displace H-NS from the DNA.

323

324 RNA polymerase recruitment to LeuO target genes

325 LTTRs are known to bind sites overlapping or adjacent to the target promoter to 326 repress or activate transcription (Maddocks and Oyston, 2008). It has been suggested 327 that LTTRs activate transcription by interacting with the C-terminal domain of the α 328 subunit of RNA polymerase (α CTD). For example, the LTTR family member OxyR 329 increases RNA polymerase binding to OxyR-dependent promoters, suggesting that 330 OxyR activates transcription partly by recruiting RNA polymerase (Kullik et al., 1995). To 331 determine whether LeuO might recruit RNA polymerase, we examined RNA polymerase 332 binding at LeuO target genes under LeuO-inducing growth conditions (LPM) and non-333 inducing growth conditions (LB). ChIPOTIe analysis of both datasets and comparison 334 with the location of LeuO binding sites revealed that 173 of the 178 LeuO binding sites

1 /

were also associated with RNA polymerase binding in LPM (co-occupancy was defined
as a LeuO binding region located within 200 bp of an RNA polymerase binding region),
whereas only 61 of the LeuO binding sites were occupied by RNA polymerase upon
growth in LB (Fig. 3A) (Table S1).

339 This analysis provided three striking observations. First, LeuO appears to be 340 associated with active transcription, as the vast majority of LeuO target genes are 341 associated with RNA polymerase binding in LPM. However it cannot be excluded that 342 some of these co-localization events represent transcriptionally repressive events as 343 LeuO may prevent promoter clearance by trapping RNA polymerase at promoters, a 344 property already described for H-NS (Dame et al. 2002). Secondly, the presence of 345 RNAP at 105 LeuO target genes in inducing conditions (and its absence in non-inducing 346 conditions) suggests that LeuO recruits RNA polymerase. Lastly the observation that 63 347 of the 68 LeuO+H-NS co-occupancy sites are also associated with RNA polymerase 348 binding is intriguing as binding of H-NS and RNA polymerase are believed to be mutually 349 exclusive in Salmonella (Lucchini et al. 2006). As discussed above this may represent 350 trapping of RNA polymerase by LeuO and H-NS. Alternatively, LeuO may remodel H-NS 351 oligomers and allow RNA polymerase to bind to promoters without the need to displace 352 H-NS. We cannot discount the other possibility that all three factors do not in fact co-353 localize in individual cells as ChIP quantifies protein occupancy across a population of 354 cells.

Next we plotted the mean RNA polymerase occupancy in both growth conditions with respect to the location of the LeuO binding sites (Fig. 3C). RNA polymerase occupancy was plotted for a distance of +/- 500 bp from the centre of the LeuO binding sites and was found to peak with respect to the centre of LeuO binding sites in both growth media. However, the average RNA polymerase occupancy in LeuO-inducing conditions (LPM) was much higher than in non-inducing conditions (LB) and the peak of

binding was also broader. This is consistent with LeuO promoting the recruitment of RNA
 polymerase to target genes, and the broader peaks of binding are consistent with the
 detection of elongating RNA polymerase.

364

365 Identification of an AT-rich LeuO DNA binding motif

366 The ability of proteins to recognize specific DNA sequences is a key feature of many 367 biological processes. Recognition of a specific DNA sequence by a protein often 368 involves the formation of amino acid and nucleotide-specific hydrogen bonds (Garvie 369 and Wolberger, 2001). For LysR-like proteins, a DNA sequence known as the LTTR box. 370 has been identified (Maddocks and Oyston, 2008). The consensus sequence of the 371 LTTR box is T-N₁₁-A and often displays imperfect dyad symmetry (Parsek *et al.*, 1994). 372 However this motif is highly degenerate and does not give an accurate understanding of 373 the DNA sequences with which LeuO interacts. Therefore we wanted to determine if 374 LeuO binding was associated with a specific DNA motif in our ChIP-chip binding sites. 375 The recent SELEX study of LeuO binding in *E. coli* (Shimada *et al.*, 2011) also gave us 376 information on the location of LeuO binding sites in a related species and we were able 377 to incorporate this information into our analysis.

378 First, the S. Typhimurium LeuO+H-NS binding regions described above in which 379 LeuO binding overlapped with or was close to an H-NS binding location were selected 380 for DNA sequence motif analysis. We also created a list of DNA sequences bound by 381 LeuO in E. coli by extracting 500-bp DNA sequences that centered on the genomic 382 coordinate provided for each LeuO binding site by Shimada et al. (2011). Recall that 383 almost all of the *E. coli* sites were of the LeuO+H-NS type. The details of these datasets 384 are provided in Fig. 4A and in the Experimental procedures. Next we used the unbiased 385 motif-finding algorithm Meme to search the two datasets for significantly over-386 represented sequence motifs (Bailey et al., 2009). Meme identified a 28-bp motif in both

387 datasets (Fig. 4B). Two striking features of the LeuO motifs are their imperfect dyad 388 symmetry and their A+T richness. While some dyad symmetry is discernable in the E. 389 *coli* logo, it is much harder to detect in its *S*. Typhimurium counterpart. Furthermore both 390 motifs contain a central region matching the T-N₁₁-A LTTR box motif and alignment of 391 the central T-N₁₁-A motifs of the sequence logos shows significant overlap between the 392 two motifs (Fig. 4B). However, the *E. coli* LTTR box displays a much stronger nucleotide 393 preference at most positions, a sequence divergence that may explain why only 15 of 394 the E. coli LeuO target genes were common to S. Typhimurium (Table S1). Regulon 395 divergence is not uncommon even in closely related species and this is reflected in 396 differences in the presence and nature of regulatory protein binding sites (Perez and 397 Groisman, 2009). While the *E. coli* and *S.* Typhimurium LeuO proteins are highly related 398 (87% amino acid identity) there are a number of amino acid differences in the N-terminal 399 DNA binding domain which may have altered DNA binding site specificity. Furthermore 400 selective pressure associated with the acquisition and regulatory integration of 401 horizontally-acquired Salmonella pathogenicity islands that contain a large number of 402 predicted LeuO binding sites (see following section), may have also altered DNA binding 403 site preference.

404 We know that the LTTR box motif is often associated with dyad symmetry 405 (Schell, 1993; Grob et al., 1997; Sheehan and Dorman, 1998) and this property appears 406 to be a general feature of the extended 28 bp motifs identified here, albeit weakly in the 407 case of the S. Typhimurium example. The presence of dyad symmetry is consistent with 408 individual LeuO subunits binding to half-sites to form a dimer. However, LTTRs are 409 known to be functionally active as tetramers that protect large regions of DNA (50-60 bp) 410 (Maddocks and Oyston, 2008). Tetramer formation by LeuO would lend itself to DNA-411 protein-DNA bridging, as it is the case with tetrameric Lacl (Chen and Wu, 2005). This 412 would allow LeuO to participate in both short-range and long-range protein-DNA

413 interactions, facilitated by DNA looping. Supporting this hypothesis are data from our 414 genome-wide prediction of LeuO binding sites that identified many examples of clustered 415 binding sites (see the *Genome-wide prediction and validation of LeuO binding sites* 416 section below).

417 The extremely high A+T content of both logos (Fig. 4B) is consistent with the 418 proposed role of LeuO as an H-NS antagonist as H-NS binds to A+T rich sequences 419 (Navarre et al., 2006, Lucchini et al., 2006, Dillon et al., 2010). Furthermore both logos 420 contain a central A-tract at nucleotide positions 15-17. These A-tracts are intriguing 421 because DNA structural studies have determined that A-tracts are associated with 422 narrowing of the DNA minor groove (Beveridge et al., 2004; Rohs et al., 2009). Variation 423 in DNA shape, in particular DNA minor groove width and DNA twist, is emerging as an 424 important 'indirect' mechanism used by proteins to achieve DNA-binding specificity in the 425 absence of base-specific contacts (Cameron and Dorman, 2012; Rohs et al., 2009). In 426 this mechanism the bases are not necessarily involved in contacting the protein but in 427 allowing the DNA to assume a conformation that facilitates protein binding (Rohs et al., 428 2009). These flexible bases are often located in linker sequences that connect two half-429 sites that are directly bound by protein subunits (Hizver et al., 2001; Rohs et al., 2009). 430 The guasi-palindromic nature and presence of A-tracts in the LeuO motifs suggests that 431 a combination of direct amino-acid-base-pair interactions and DNA shape may be 432 important features in determining LeuO binding specificity.

433

434 Genome-wide prediction and validation of LeuO binding sites

The identification of the 28-bp LeuO DNA binding motifs suggested that accurate prediction of LeuO binding sites in *E. coli* and *S.* Typhimurium genome sequences would be possible. We used the Motif Alignment and Search Tool (MAST), which is part of the MEME suite of tools used for motif discovery and searching (Bailey *et al.*, 2009), to

1 Q

439 generate a position-specific scoring matrix (PSSM) from the LeuO sequence logos. This 440 PSSM was used to search for sequence matches in the S. Typhimurium SL1344 and E. 441 coli K-12 MG1655 genome sequences as described in the Experimental procedures 442 section. This analysis resulted in the identification of 1263 and 1094 matches in the S. 443 Typhimurium and *E. coli* genome sequences, respectively (Fig. 5A, B and Table S3). 444 These predicted sites were often located in intrinsically curved A+T rich regions and are 445 also associated with H-NS binding (Fig. 5A, Table S4). Eight-hundred-and-eighty-nine of 446 the 1263 predicted LeuO binding sites in S. Typhimurium were associated with H-NS 447 binding in vivo, suggesting that LeuO may function as a more global antagonist of H-NS 448 than previously thought. While the PSSMs used to search for binding sites differed 449 between the species, there were many instances of homologous genes being associated 450 with a predicted binding site(s) in both species. For example, predicted LeuO binding 451 sites were identified for the *viiAXY* operon and in the nearby *viiQ-bqIJ* operon in both 452 species (Fig. 5C, D). LeuO is known to activate bglJ in E. coli (Stratmann et al., 2008) 453 while RcsB-BgIJ heterodimers activate leuO transcription (Stratmann et al., 2012). 454 Furthermore rcsB is also associated with a predicted LeuO site in both species, 455 illustrating the complexity of the LeuO regulatory network.

456 In order to validate our genome-wide prediction of LeuO binding sites we 457 searched for sites in other known LeuO-regulated genes that were not identified in our 458 ChIP-chip study. We correctly predicted sites in the 5' regulatory region of leuO itself 459 (Chen and Wu, 2005), in the yjjQ-bglJ operon (Stratmann et al., 2008), in ompS1, assT 460 (stm3192), and in the CRISPR-associated casA and cas3 genes (Westra et al., 2010; 461 Medina-Aparicio et al., 2011). Furthermore LeuO binding sites have been precisely 462 mapped in the regulatory regions of Salmonella Typhi casA (Medina-Aparicio et al., 463 2011) and *ompS1* (De la Cruz *et al.*, 2007) and our predicted binding sites map to these 464 locations.

465 To further validate our genome-wide prediction of LeuO binding sites, three S. 466 Typhimurium regions were tested for in vitro binding of purified LeuO protein by 467 electrophoretic mobility shift assays. The *pipA* and *envR* genes each contain one and 468 two predicted LeuO sites respectively, while SL3361, which is located beside envR and 469 does not contain a predicted LeuO binding site motif, was used as a negative control 470 (Fig. 6A). Both *pipA* and *envR* DNA probes showed a clear pattern of retarded migration 471 after incubation with increasing concentrations of purified LeuO while LeuO did not bind 472 to the SL3361 DNA probe (Fig. 6A). The envR 5' regulatory region (P_{envR}) contains two 473 predicted LeuO binding sites located in close proximity to each other (81-bp spacing) 474 and displayed a higher affinity for LeuO binding than the pipA region. The presence of 475 two LeuO binding sites in close proximity and in helical register along the DNA may lead 476 to LeuO oligomerization and DNA bending (Hryniewicz and Kredich, 1994), which may 477 account for the apparently higher affinity observed for this DNA probe.

478 Next we used primer extension to resolve DNase I footprints on PCR amplified 479 DNA templates (Cameron and Dorman, 2012). This approach can be used to more 480 accurately map LeuO binding sites and validate the location of predicted LeuO binding 481 sites. A 400 bp DNA probe encompassing two predicted sites in P_{envR} was used as the 482 target in our experiments. We identified five regions that were protected from DNase I 483 digestion by LeuO, two of which overlapped with the location of the predicted binding 484 sites (Fig. 6B). Three other protected sites were identified further upstream of the leuO 485 ORF which did not contain a predicted site but were located in a 60 bp region of high 486 A+T content (66%), consistent with LeuO binding to A+T rich sequences.

Finally we used quantitative RT-PCR to examine the effect of deleting *leuO* on the transcript levels of four predicted LeuO target genes which are also bound by H-NS (Table S4) - *envR*, *pipA*, *sifA* and *sopA*. We examined transcript levels for these genes in (i) a strain that harbours a T-POP transposon (Lee *et al.* 2007) upstream of *leuO* in its

าก

491 native chromosomal location, so that *leuO* is over-expressed when tetracycline is added 492 to the culture (SL1344 Tpop-leuO) and (ii) a strain that harbours a T-POP transposon 493 upstream of *leuO* but the *leuO* gene is deleted (SL1344 Tpop- $\Delta leuO$). Deletion of *leuO* 494 dramatically decreased the level of envR transcript (Fig. 6C) and increased the levels of 495 sifA, sopA and pipA transcripts (Fig. 6C). The results of this analysis suggest that LeuO 496 activates transcription of envR, perhaps by antagonizing H-NS, but appears to function 497 as a repressor at the other target genes. It is possible that LeuO and H-NS function 498 together to repress transcription of these genes. The location of the LeuO binding sites 499 may be important as the predicted binding sites near envR are located upstream of the 500 envR start codon, consistent with LeuO functioning as a transcriptional activator of this 501 promoter. Conversely the predicted LeuO binding sites for sifA, sopA and pipA are all 502 located downstream of the start codons, where LeuO binding is likely to have a 503 repressive effect on transcription. Thus it appears that LeuO has a dual role as activator 504 and repressor of transcription. Transcriptional activation by LeuO is well documented but 505 LeuO has also been shown to repress the acid stress regulator cadC, the small RNA 506 dsrA and the fimAICDFGH operon in E. coli (Shi and Bennett, 1995; Repoila and 507 Gottesman, 2001; Shimada et al. 2011). Furthermore, LeuO has a complex relationship 508 with its own gene, antagonizing H-NS-mediated *leuO* repression and antagonizing RcsB-509 BgIJ-mediated leuO activation (Stratmann et al., 2012; Chen and Wu, 2005).

510 Many of the genes on the A+T-rich *Salmonella* pathogenicity islands (SPI) 1 and 511 2 are repressed by H-NS (Dillon *et al.*, 2010) and our analysis identified 25 predicted 512 LeuO sites in SPI1 and 11 in SPI2. Notably, sites were predicted in the promoter 513 regions of key regulators *hilA*, *hilC*, *hilD*, and *ssrAB* (Table S3). This may explain why 514 LeuO was identified as a virulence factor in a *S*. Typhimurium host-pathogen model 515 system (Tenor *et al.*, 2004) and in a long-term systemic infection mouse model system 516 (Lawley *et al.*, 2006).

517 It is also important to point out that 24 of 44 genes encoding S. Typhimurium 518 LTTRs (Lahiri et al., 2009) contain one or more predicted LeuO binding site(s) in their 519 regulatory region. These include the genes encoding TdcA, which is involved in the 520 metabolism of L-serine and L-threonine (Kim et al., 2009), and NhaR, which regulates a 521 sodium proton antiporter (Rahav-Manor et al., 1992). These LTTRs and their 522 neighbouring regulatory targets are also repressed by H-NS (Table S2), suggesting a 523 complex regulatory interplay between LeuO, other LTTRs and H-NS. As LTTRs often 524 auto-regulate their own expression (Maddock and Oyston, 2008), it is possible that LeuO 525 establishes a heterotypic interaction with the corresponding LTTR family member to 526 facilitate this auto-regulation (Knapp and Hu, 2010). The presence of LeuO binding sites 527 at so many LTTR genes shows that LeuO also has the potential to coordinate their 528 expression within a LeuO-dependent regulatory network.

529 Many genes that contain a predicted LeuO binding site were not detected by our 530 ChIP-chip approach. The tetrameric structure of LTTRs permits simultaneous binding to 531 two sites. The nucleoprotein complex upstream of a given target gene can include a 532 variety of distal sites, bridged by the LTTR to a common target-gene-proximal site. Distal 533 site availability may be determined stochastically or may reflect changes in nucleoid 534 structure, dictating which distal sites are likely to be brought into a position adjacent to 535 the target-gene-proximal site such that LeuO-mediated bridging becomes possible. 536 These considerations are not only relevant to a consideration of LeuO as a regulator of 537 transcription, but also apply to its potential role as a nucleoid-structuring element.

538

າາ

539 **Experimental procedures**

540 Bacterial strains and culture conditions

541 The bacterial strains used in this study were S. Typhimurium strain SL1344 (his, a 542 histidine auxotroph) (Hoiseth and Stocker, 1981); CJD1034scd (SL1344 leuO::3xFLAG); 543 CJD1028scd (SL1344 hns::3xFLAG); SL1344 hns::kan; SL1344 hns::kan leuO::cat, 544 SL1344 pBAD/euO::3xFLAG; SV7424 (SL1344 Tpop-leuO), SV7425 (SL1344 Tpop-545 $\Delta leuO$. E. coli K-12 strain BL21 (plZ1871) was used to overexpress and purify the LeuO 546 protein. S. Typhimurium strain SL1344 and its derivatives were grown in 250 ml flasks in 547 low phosphate medium (LPM) (5 mM KCl, 7.5 mM (NH₄)₂SO₄, 0.5 mM K₂SO₄, 0.1% 548 casamino acids, 0.34% glycerol, 80 mM MES, after autoclaving 337.5 µM 549 K₂HPO₄/KH₂PO₄ and 10mM MgCl₂ were added, pH 7) or Luria Broth at 37°C and at 200 550 rpm in a C76 water bath shaker (New Brunswick Scientific). Where necessary, 551 antibiotics were used at the following final concentrations: carbenicillin (100 μ g ml⁻¹), 552 kanamycin (50 μ g ml⁻¹), streptomycin (50 μ g ml⁻¹) and chloramphenicol (25 μ g ml⁻¹).

553

554 Construction of SL1344 derivatives expressing 3xFLAG tagged LeuO and H-NS

555 The *leuO*::3xFLAG and *hns*::3xFLAG derivatives of S. Typhimurium SL1344 were 556 generated using a modified version of the λ Red recombination method (Uzzau *et al.*, 557 2001). The primers used for these constructions are listed in Table S5. The 558 leuO::3xFLAG and hns::3xFLAG strains were marked with the kanamycin antibiotic 559 resistance cassette, which was transduced into a clean background using phage P22 HT 560 int105. Green agar plates were used to screen for colonies free from phage (Sternberg 561 and Maurer, 1991). The kanamycin resistance cassette was flanked by FRT sites (FLP 562 recombinase recognition targets), which allowed its removal by site-specific 563 recombination using the pCP20 plasmid (Cherepanov and Wackernagel, 1995).

າາ

564 Chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) assay

565 Cultures of S. Typhimurium SL1344, SL1344 leuO::3xFLAG, SL1344 hns::3xFLAG were 566 inoculated 1:100 into fresh Luria broth or Low phosphate medium (LPM) and grown at 567 37°C until stationary phase. SL1344 pBAD/euO::3xFLAG was inoculated 1:100 into fresh 568 Luria broth and grown to exponential phase ($OD_{600} \sim 0.2$) and then arabinose was added 569 to a final concentration of 0.2% for 1 hour before harvesting cells. For all experiments 25 570 ml of culture was harvested and re-suspended in 50 ml of PBS. DNA-protein 571 interactions were cross-linked for 30 min by adding formaldehyde (Sigma-Aldrich, 572 catalogue number F8775) to a final concentration of 1%. Glycine was then added to a 573 final concentration of 0.125M to stop the crosslinking. The ChIP assay was then 574 performed as detailed in Dillon et al., (2010). The following antibodies were used in this 575 study: mouse monoclonal to the RNA polymerase β' subunit (Neoclone catalogue 576 number W0001), mouse monoclonal to the FLAG epitope (Sigma-Aldrich, catalogue 577 number F3165) and normal mouse IgG (Millipore, catalogue number 12-371).

578

579 Fluorescent labelling of DNA and microarray hybridization

Fluorescent labelling of ChIP DNA samples for microarray experiments were carried out as described in Dillon *et al.* (2010). The microarrays used in this study were designed and produced by Oxford Gene Technology. The microarrays consisted of 43,453 60-mer oligonucleotides tiled throughout the S. Typhimurium SL1344 chromosome and pSLT plasmid. Microarrays were hybridized for 24 h in a hybridization oven (Agilent Technologies) and washed according to instructions provided by Oxford Gene Technology.

587

588 Microarray data acquisition, analysis and data access

 γ_A

589 The microarray slides were scanned using an Agilent G2505C scanner. Cy3 and Cy5 590 images were acquired at 3-micron resolution. Scanned images were analysed using 591 Agilent Feature extraction software. This software packages was used to quantify the 592 fluorescent intensities of each spot representing an array element. Background 593 subtracted fluorescence values were reported for each spot in the Cy3 and Cy5 594 channels and used to calculate a background subtracted Cv3/Cv5 ratios. The baseline 595 levels of each dataset were normalized to a value of one, allowing all experiments to be 596 directly compared from this baseline value. The data centering was performed by 597 calculating the median ratio for each experiment and dividing all the Cy3/Cy5 ratios 598 (obtained in that experiment) by this number. The ChIPOTle algorithm (Buck et al., 2005) 599 was used to define regions of enrichment in ChIP-on-chip datasets by using a sliding 600 window approach. ChIPOTIe calculates the average log₂ ratio within each window and 601 the fold cut-off chosen was log₂₁. A window size of 500 bp and a step size of 125 bp 602 were used for analyzing the datasets, the rationale being that the ChIP procedure 603 produces DNA fragments of approximately 500 bp in size. The raw ChIP-on-chip 604 datasets have been submitted to the GEO database (Accession number GSE35826).

605

606 *Quantitative reverse transcriptase PCR (qRT-PCR)*

607 RNA was extracted from S. Typhimurium strain SL1344 stationary phase cultures 608 (O.D.600 ~2) using the SV total RNA isolation system (Promega Co., Madison, WI) as 609 described at http://www.ifr.ac.uk/safety/microarrays/protocols.html. The quantity and 610 quality of the extracted RNA were determined using a ND-1000 spectrophotometer 611 (NanoDrop Technologies, Wilmington, DE). To diminish genomic DNA contamination, 612 the preparation was treated with DNase I (Turbo DNA free, Applied Biosystems/Ambion, 613 Austin, TX). An aliguot of 0.6 µg of DNase-I-treated RNA was used for cDNA synthesis 614 using the High-Capacity cDNA Archive Kit (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA).

615 Quantitative RT-PCR reactions were performed in LightCycler 480 II (Roche). Each 616 reaction was carried out in a total volume of 10 µl on a 480 well optical reaction plate 617 (Roche) containing 5 µl SYBR, 0.5 µl DYE II (Takara), 4.6 µl cDNA (1/10 dilution) and 618 two gene-specific primers at a final concentration of 0.2 mM each. Real-time cycling 619 conditions were as follows: (i) 95°C for 10 min, (ii) 40 cycles at 95°C for 15 s, 60°C for 1 620 min. A non-template control was included for each primer set. Melting curve analysis 621 verified that each reaction contained a single PCR product. Gene expression levels were 622 normalized to transcripts of *rfaH* that served as an internal control. Gene-specific primers 623 were designed with PRIMER3 software (http://primer3.sourceforge.net) and are listed in 624 Table S5.

625

626 Purification of LeuO protein

627 The leuO gene was PCR-amplified using oligonucleotide primers pET21-leuO-BamHI 628 and pET21-leuO-Sall (Table S5). The amplification product was digested with BamHI 629 and Sall, and cloned in plasmid pET21a to yield pIZ1871. For LeuO protein purification, 630 E. coli BL21 (pIZ1871) was grown in YT broth, and adding 1 mM IPTG induced LeuO 631 expression. After 4 h of induction, cells were centrifuged and resuspended in lysis buffer 632 (20 mM Tris, 300 mM NaCl, 10 mM imidazole, 1 mM PMSF, 5 µl/ml protein inhibitor 633 cocktail [Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO], 10% glycerol) and lysed by sonication. 634 The suspension was centrifuged and the supernatant was mixed with Ni-agarose beads 635 (QIA express Type ATG Kit, Qiagen) and incubated overnight with gentle mixing on a 636 rotating wheel at 4°C. Agarose beads were washed with washing buffer (20 mM Tris, 637 300 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, 10% glycerol). Protein elution was performed with 500 638 ul of elution buffer (20 mM Tris, 300 mM NaCl, 200 mM imidazole, 10% glycerol). 639 Imidazole was removed by washing with storage buffer (20 mM Tris, 300 mM NaCl, 10%

٦L

640 glycerol) and centrifuged using Amicon® Ultra centrifugal filters. LeuO-6xHis protein was
641 stored at -80°C.

642

643 Gel mobility shift assays

644 DNA probes labelled with 6-caroxyfluorescein (6-FAM) were prepared by PCR 645 amplification and primer pairs used are listed in Table S5. PCR products were purified 646 with the Wizard® SV Clean-Up-System (Promega, Madison, WI). For gel shift assays, 647 50 ng of each FAM-labelled probe was incubated at room temperature for 30 minutes 648 with increasing concentrations of LeuO-6xHis in a final volume of 20 µl. The binding 649 buffer L10x contained 20 mM HEPES, 100 mM KCl, 2 mM MgCl₂, 0,1 mM EDTA and 650 20% glycerol (De la Cruz et al., 2007). Protein-DNA complexes were subjected to 651 electrophoresis at 4°C in a 6% nondenaturing acrylamide:bisacrylamide (29:1) gel in 0.5 652 Tris-borate-EDTA buffer. DNA fragments were visualized with a FLA-5100 Imaging 653 system (Fujifilm, Tokyo, Japan).

654

655 DNase I footprinting of LeuO binding to PCR-amplified DNA

656 The PenvR DNA probe labelled with 6-caroxyfluorescein (6-FAM) was prepared by PCR 657 amplification and the primers used are listed in Table S5. DNase I footprinting was 658 performed as described in Cameron and Dorman (2012) with some small changes. The 659 DNase I footprinting reactions were conducted in 15 µl reaction volumes containing 1x 660 DNase I buffer (Roche)(40 mM Tris-HCl, 10 mM NaCl, 6 mM MgCl₂, 1 mM CaCl₂, pH 661 7.9) 0.01 mM DTT, 100 ng/ µl BSA, 50 nM bait DNA, and 50 nM LeuO-6xHis. LeuO-DNA 662 binding was allowed to equilibrate at 37°C for 20 minutes, then 1 µl (0.04 units) of pre-663 warmed DNase I was added and mixed gently, then incubated at 37°C for 5 minutes. 664 Reactions were stopped by addition of 2 µl EDTA (100 mM) followed by vigorous vortex mixing and heat denaturation at 95°C for 10 minutes. Digestion products were desalted
using MicroSpin G-25 columns (GE Healthcare) and were analyzed on an ABI 3730
DNA Analyzer along with GeneScan 500-LIZ size standards (Applied Biosystems).

668 Western immunoblotting

669 Total proteins extracts were prepared from bacterial cultures grown at 37°C in LPM or 670 LB medium until stationary phase was reached (O.D.600 ~1.4 and O.D.600 ~2 671 respectively). Bacterial cells contained in 1 ml of culture were collected by centrifugation 672 (16,000 g, 2 min, 4°C) and suspended in 50 µl of Laemmli sample buffer [1.3% SDS, 673 10% (v/v) glycerol, 50 mM Tris-HCl, 1.8% β -mercaptoethanol, 0.02% bromophenol blue, 674 pH 6.8]. Proteins were resolved by Tris-Tricine-PAGE, using 12% gels. Conditions for 675 protein transfer have been described elsewhere (Balbontin et al., 2006). Primary 676 antibodies were anti-FLAG M2 monoclonal antibody (1:5.000, Sigma Chemical Co, St. 677 Louis, MO), anti-DnaK monoclonal antibody (1:5,000, MBL International, MA), and anti-678 GroEL polyclonal antibody (1:10,000, Sigma Chemical Co, St. Louis, MO). Goat anti-679 mouse horseradish peroxidase-conjugated antibody (1:5,000, BioRad, Hercules, CA) 680 was used as secondary antibody. Proteins recognized by the antibodies were visualized 681 by chemiluminiscence using luciferin-luminol.

682

683 DNA sequence analysis

To test for the presence of over-represented motifs in DNA sequences bound by LeuO in *E. coli* and *S.* Typhimurium, the SELEX screening (Shimada *et al.*, 2011) and ChIPOTIe datasets were manually curated to define short binding regions that could be analyzed by the Meme motif-finding program. For the SELEX data this involved extracting 500 bp of DNA sequence centred on the genomic coordinate presented for each LeuO binding site in Shimada *et al.* (2011). For *S.* Typhimurium this involved selecting the highest-

690 scoring probes from the broader binding regions identified by ChIPOTIe and the 691 corresponding DNA sequences were extracted using the Artemis genome viewer 692 (Rutherford et al., 2000). The unbiased motif-finding program Meme (Bailey et al., 2009) 693 was used to search the curated datasets. Meme parameters were set as follows: motifs 694 could range in size from 10 to 50 bp, each DNA sequence could contain multiple or no 695 motif sites, and both palindromic and non-palindromic motifs could be found. The MAST 696 program (Bailey et al., 2009) was used to generate position specific scoring matrix 697 (PSSM) from the E. coli LeuO and S. Typhimurium motifs. The PSSMs were used to 698 scan the E. coli K-12 MG1655 and S. Typhimurium SL1344 genome sequences for 699 matches with an E-value < 0.1 and a position p-value < 0.0001. The matching 700 sequences are listed in Table S3.

701

702 Acknowledgments

703 This work was supported by Science Foundation Ireland grant 07/IN.1/B918 (Dorman 704 Laboratory) and by grants BIO2010-15023 and CSD2008-00013 from the Ministerio de 705 Ciencia e Innovación of Spain (MICINN) and the European Regional Fund (Casadesús 706 Laboratory). Elena Espinosa holds a FPI Ph.D. fellowship from the MICINN. We thank 707 Andrew Cameron for advice on DNase I footprinting and the Trinity Centre for High-708 Performance computing for providing computational resources and Saccha Lucchini and 709 Jay Hinton for strain SL1344 *hns::kan*, and for scientific discussions. We also thank 710 Modesto Carballo, Laura Navarro, and Cristina Reves of the Servicio de Biología 711 (CITIUS, Universidad de Sevilla) for help in experiments performed at the facility. The 712 authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

713

714

715 **References**

- Bailey, T. L., Boden, M., Buske, F.A., Frith, M., Grant, C.E., Clementi, L., *et al.* (2009)
 MEME SUITE: tools for motif discovery and searching. *Nucleic Acids Res* 37:
 W202-208.
- Balbontin, R., Rowley, G., Pucciarelli, M.G., Lopez-Garrido, J., Wormstone, Y., Lucchini,
 S., *et al.* (2006) DNA adenine methylation regulates virulence gene expression in
 Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium. *J Bacteriol* **188**: 8160-8168.
- Beveridge, D.L., Dixit, S.B., Barreiro G., and Thayer, K.M. (2004) Molecular dynamics
 simulations of DNA curvature and flexibility: helix phasing and premelting. *Biopolymers* 73: 380-403.
- Buck, M.J., Nobel A.B., and Lieb, J.D. (2005) ChIPOTle: a user-friendly tool for the
 analysis of ChIP-chip data. *Genome Biol* 6: R97.
- Cameron, A.D.S., and Dorman, C.J. (2012) A fundamental regulatory mechanism
 operating through OmpR and DNA topology controls gene expression in
 Salmonella pathogenicity islands SPI-1 and SPI-2. *PLoS Genetics* 8: e1002615.
- Chen, C.C., Chou, M.Y., Huang, C.H., Majumder, A., and Wu, H.Y. (2005) A *cis*spreading nucleoprotein filament is responsible for the gene silencing activity
 found in the promoter relay mechanism. *J Biol Chem* 280: 5101-5112.
- Chen, C.C., Fang, M., Majumder A., and Wu, H.Y. (2001) A 72-base pair AT-rich DNA
 sequence element functions as a bacterial gene silencer. *J Biol Chem* 276: 94789485.
- 736 Chen, C.C., Ghole, M., Majumder, A., Wang, Z., Chandana S., and Wu, H.Y. (2003)
- 737 LeuO-mediated transcriptional derepression. *J Biol Chem* **278**: 38094-38103.

- Chen, C.C., and Wu, H.Y. (2005) LeuO protein delimits the transcriptionally active and
 repressive domains on the bacterial chromosome. *J Biol Chem* 280: 1511115121.
- Chen, D., Bowater, R., Dorman, C.J., and Lilley, D.M.J. (1992) Activity of a plasmidborne *leu500* promoter depends on the transcription and translation of an
 adjacent gene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 89: 8784-8788.
- Cherepanov P.P., and Wackernagel, W. (1995) Gene disruption in *Escherichia coli*: Tc^r
 and Km^r cassettes with the option of Flp-catalyzed excision of the antibiotic resistance determinant. *Gene* **158**: 9-14.
- Cho, B.K., Knight, E.M., Barrett, C.L., and Palsson, B.O. (2008) Genome-wide analysis
 of Fis binding in *Escherichia coli* indicates a causative role for A-/AT-tracts. *Genome Res* 18: 900-910.
- Dame, R.T., Wyman, C., Wurm, R., Wagner, R., and Goosen, N. (2002) Structural basis
 for H-NS-mediated trapping of RNA polymerase in the open initiation complex at
 the *rrnB* P1. *J Biol Chem* 277: 2146-2150.
- Dame, R.T., Noom, M.C., and Wuite, G.J. (2006) Bacterial chromatin organization by H NS protein unraveled using dual DNA manipulation. *Nature* 444: 387-390.
- De la Cruz, M.A., Fernandez-Mora, M., Guadarrama, C., Flores-Valdez, M.A.,
 Bustamante, V.H., Vazquez A., *et al.* (2007) LeuO antagonizes H-NS and StpAdependent repression in *Salmonella enterica ompS1. Mol Microbiol* **66**: 727-743.
- Dillon, S.C., Cameron, A.D., Hokamp, K., Lucchini, S., Hinton, J.C., and Dorman, C.J.
 (2010) Genome-wide analysis of the H-NS and Sfh regulatory networks in *Salmonella* Typhimurium identifies a plasmid-encoded transcription silencing
 mechanism. *Mol Microbiol* **76**: 1250-1265.
- Dillon, S.C., and Dorman, C.J. (2010) Bacterial nucleoid-associated proteins, nucleoid
 structure and gene expression. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 8: 185-195.

- Dorman, C.J. (2004) H-NS, a universal regulator for a dynamic genome. *Nature Rev Microbiol* 2: 391-400.
- Fang, M., Majumder, A., Tsai K.J., and Wu, H.Y. (2000) ppGpp-dependent *leuO*expression in bacteria under stress. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 276: 64-70.
- Fernandez-Mora, M., Puente, J.L., and Calva, E. (2004) OmpR and LeuO positively
 regulate the *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhi *ompS2* porin gene. *J Bacteriol* **186**: 2909-2920.
- Gallego-Hernandez, A. L., Hernandez-Lucas, I., De la Cruz, M. A., Olvera, L., Morett, E.,
 Medina-Aparicio, L., *et al.* (2012) Transcriptional regulation of the *assT-dsbL- dsbl* gene cluster in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhi IMSS-1 depends on
 LeuO, H-NS, and specific growth conditions. *J Bacteriol* 194: 2254-2264.
- Garvie, C.W., and Wolberger, C. (2001) Recognition of specific DNA sequences. *Mol Cell* 8: 937-946.
- Grainger, D.C., Aiba, H., Hurd, D., Browning, D.F., and Busby, S.J.W. (2007)
 Transcription factor distribution in *Escherichia coli*: studies with FNR protein.
 Nucleic Acids Res 35: 269-278.
- Grainger, D.C., Hurd, D., Goldberg, M.D., and Busby, S.J.W. (2006) Association of
 nucleoid proteins with coding and non-coding segments of the *Escherichia coli*genome. *Nucleic Acids Res* 34: 4642-4652.
- Grainger, D.C., Hurd, D., Harrison, M., Holdstock, J., and Busby, S.J.W. (2005) Studies
 of the distribution of *Escherichia coli* cAMP-receptor protein and RNA polymerase
 along the *E. coli* chromosome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **102**: 17693-17698.
- 786 Grainger, D.C., Overton, T.W., Reppas, N., Wade, J.T., Tamai, E., Hobman, J.L., et al.
- (2004) Genomic studies with *Escherichia coli* MelR protein: applications of
 chromatin immunoprecipitation and microarrays. *J Bacteriol* **186**: 6938-6943.

- Grob, P., Kahn, D., and Guiney, D.G. (1997) Mutational characterization of promoter
 regions recognized by the *Salmonella dublin* virulence plasmid regulatory protein
 SpvR. *J Bacteriol* **179**: 5398-5406.
- Henikoff, S., Haughn, G.W., Calvo, J.M., and Wallace, J.C. (1988) A large family of
 bacterial activator proteins. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 85: 6602-6606.
- Hernandez-Lucas, I., Gallego-Hernandez, A.L., Encarnacion, S., Fernandez-Mora, M.,
 Martinez-Batallar, A.G., Salgado, H., *et al.* (2008) The LysR-type transcriptional
 regulator LeuO controls expression of several genes in *Salmonella enterica*serovar Typhi. *J Bacteriol* **190**: 1658-1670.
- Hizver, J., Rozenberg, H., Frolow, F., Rabinovich, D., and Shakked, Z. (2001) DNA
 bending by an adenine-thymine tract and its role in gene regulation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 98: 8490-8495.
- Hoiseth, S.K., and Stocker, B.A. (1981) Aromatic-dependent *Salmonella typhimurium*are non-virulent and effective as live vaccines. *Nature* 291: 238-239.
- Hryniewicz M.M., and Kredich, N.M. (1994) Stoichiometry of binding of CysB to the *cysJIH, cysK*, and *cysP* promoter regions of *Salmonella typhimurium*. *J Bacteriol*176: 3673-82.
- Karginov, F.V., and Hannon, G.J. (2010) The CRISPR system: small RNA-guided
 defense in bacteria and archaea. *Mol Cell* 37: 7-19.
- Kim, M., Lim, S., Kim, D., Choy, H.E., and Ryu, S. (2009) A *tdcA* mutation reduces the
 invasive ability of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium. *Mol Cell* 28: 389395.
- Klauck, E., Bohringer, J., and Hengge-Aronis, R. (1997) The LysR-like regulator LeuO in
 Escherichia coli is involved in the translational regulation of *rpoS* by affecting the
 expression of the small regulatory DsrA-RNA. *Mol Microbiol* 25: 559-569.

- Klauck, E., Lingnau, M., and Hengge-Aronis, R. (2001) Role of the response regulator
 RssB in sigma recognition and initiation of sigma proteolysis in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* **40**: 1381-1390.
- Knapp, G.S., and Hu, J.C. (2010) Specificity of the *E. coli* LysR-type transcriptional
 regulators. *PLoS One* 5: e15189.
- Kröger, C., Dillon, S.C., Cameron, A.D.S., Papenfort, K., Sivasankaran, S.K., Hokamp,
 K., *et al.* (2012) The transcriptional landscape and small RNAs of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **109**: e1277-1286.
- Kullik, I., Stevens, J., Toledano, M.B., and Storz, G. (1995) Mutational analysis of the
 redox-sensitive transcriptional regulator OxyR: regions important for DNA binding
 and multimerization. *J Bacteriol* **177**: 1285-1291.
- Lahiri, A., Das, P., and Chakravortty, D., (2008) The LysR-type transcriptional regulator Hrg counteracts phagocyte oxidative oxidative burst and imparts survival advantage to *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium. *Microbiol* **154**: 2837-2846.
- Lahiri, A., Das, P., and Chakravortty, D. (2009) *Salmonella* Typhimurium: insight into the
 multi-faceted role of the LysR-type transcriptional regulators in *Salmonella*. *Int J Biochem Cell Biol* **41**: 2129-2133.
- Lawley, T.D., Chan, K., Thompson, L.J., Kim, C.C., Govoni, G.R., and Monack, D.M.
 (2006) Genome-wide screen for *Salmonella* genes required for long-term
 systemic infection of the mouse. *PLoS Pathog* 2: e11.
- Lawrenz, M.B., and Miller, V.L. (2007) Comparative analysis of the regulation of *rovA*from the pathogenic yersiniae. *J Bacteriol* **189**: 5963-5975.
- Lee, C.C., Wozniak, C., Karlinsey, J.E., and Hughes, K.T. (2007) Genomic screening for regulatory genes using the T-POP transposon. *Methods Enzymol* **421**: 159-167.

- Lucchini, S., Rowley, G., Goldberg, M.D., Hurd, D., Harrison, M., and Hinton, J.C. (2006)
 H-NS mediates the silencing of laterally acquired genes in bacteria. *PLoS Pathog*2: e81.
- 842 Maddocks, S.E., and Oyston, P.C. (2008) Structure and function of the LysR-type 843 transcriptional regulator (LTTR) family proteins. *Microbiology* **154**: 3609-3623.
- Majdalani, N., and Gottesman, S. (2005) The Rcs phosphorelay: a complex signal
 transduction system. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 59: 379-405.
- Majumder, A., Fang, M., Tsai, K.J., Ueguchi, C., Mizuno, T., and Wu, H.Y. (2001) LeuO
 expression in response to starvation for branched-chain amino acids. *J Biol Chem* 276: 19046-19051.
- Maxon, M.E., Redfield, B., Cai, X.Y., Shoeman, R., Fujita, K., Fisher, W., *et al.* (1989)
 Regulation of methionine synthesis in *Escherichia coli*: effect of the MetR protein
 on the expression of the *metE* and *metR* genes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 86: 8589.
- Medina-Aparicio, L., Rebollar-Flores, J.E., Gallego-Hernandez, A.L., Vazquez, A.,
 Olvera, L., Gutierrez-Rios, R.M., *et al.* (2011) The CRISPR/Cas immune system
 is an operon regulated by LeuO, H-NS, and leucine-responsive regulatory protein
 in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhi. *J Bacteriol* **193**: 2396-2407.
- Momany, C., and Neidle, E.L. (2012) Defying stereotypes: the elusive search for a universal model of LysR-type regulation. *Mol Microbiol* **83:** 453-456.

Nagarajavel, V., Madhusudan, S., Dole, S., Rahmouni, A.R., and Schnetz, K. (2007)

Repression by binding of H-NS within the transcription unit. *J Biol Chem* 282:
23622-30.

- Navarre, W.W., Porwollik, S., Wang, Y., McClelland, M., Rosen, H., Libby, S.J., *et al.*(2006) Selective silencing of foreign DNA with low GC content by the H-NS
 protein in *Salmonella*. *Science* **313**: 236-238.
- 865 O'Byrne, C.P., and Dorman, C.J. (1994) The *spv* virulence operon of *Salmonella*866 *typhimurium* LT-2 is regulated negatively by the cAMP-CRP system. *J Bacteriol*867 **176:** 905-912.
- Pareja, E., Pareja-Tobes, P., Manrique, M., Pareja-Tobes, E., Bonal, J., and Tobes, R.
 (2006) ExtraTrain: a database of Extragenic regions and Transcriptional
 information in prokaryotic organisms. *BMC Microbiol* 6: 29.
- Parsek, M.R., Ye, R.W., Pun, P., and Chakrabarty, A.M. (1994) Critical nucleotides in the
 interaction of a LysR-type regulator with its target promoter region: *catBC*promoter activation by CatR. *J Biol Chem* 269: 11279-11284.
- Perez, J.C., Latifi, T., and Groisman, E.A. (2008) Overcoming H-NS-mediated
 transcriptional silencing of horizontally acquired genes by the PhoP and SlyA
 proteins in *Salmonella enterica. J Biol Chem* 283: 10773-10783.
- Perez, J.C., and Groisman, E.A. (2009) Evolution of transcriptional regulatory circuits in
 bacteria. *Cell* 138: 233-244.
- Punta, M., Coggill, P.C., Eberhardt, R.Y., Mistry, J., Tate, J., Boursnell, C., *et al.* (2012)
 The Pfam protein families database. *Nucleic Acids Res* 40: D290-301.
- Rahav-Manor, O., Carmel, O., Karpel, R., Taglicht, D., Glaser, G., Schuldiner, S., *et al.*(1992) NhaR, a protein homologous to a family of bacterial regulatory proteins
 (LysR), regulates *nhaA*, the sodium proton antiporter gene in *Escherichia coli*. *J Biol Chem* 267: 10433-10438.
- Repoila, F., and Gottesman, S. (2001) Signal transduction cascade for regulation of
 RpoS: temperature regulation of DsrA. *J Bacteriol* 183: 4012-23.

- Rodriguez-Morales, O., Fernandez-Mora, M., Hernandez-Lucas, I., Vazquez, A., Puente,
 J.L., and Calva, E. (2006) *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium *ompS1* and *ompS2* mutants are attenuated for virulence in mice. *Infect Immun* **74**: 13981402.
- Rohs, R., West, S.M., Sosinsky, A., Liu, P., Mann, R.S., and Honig, B. (2009) The role of
 DNA shape in protein-DNA recognition. *Nature* 461: 1248-1253.
- Rutherford, K., Parkhill, J., Crook, J., Horsnell, T., Rice, P., Rajandream, M.A., and
 Barrell, B. (2000) Artemis: sequence visualization and annotation. *Bioinformatics*16: 944-945.
- Schell, M.A. (1993) Molecular biology of the LysR family of transcriptional regulators.
 Annu Rev Microbiol 47: 597-626.
- Sheehan, B.J., and Dorman, C.J. (1998) *In vivo* analysis of the interactions of the LysRlike regulator SpvR with the operator sequences of the *spvA* and *spvR* virulence
 genes of *Salmonella typhimurium*. *Mol Microbiol* **30**: 91-105.
- Shi, X., and Bennett, G.N. (1995) Effects of multicopy LeuO on the expression of the
 acid-inducible lysine decarboxylase gene in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* 177:
 810-814.
- Shimada, T., Bridier, A., Briandet R., and Ishihama, A. (2011) Novel roles of LeuO in
 transcription regulation of *E. coli* genome: antagonistic interplay with the
 universal silencer H-NS. *Mol Microbiol* 82: 378-397.
- Shimada, T., Yamamoto, K., and Ishihama, A. (2009) Involvement of the leucine
 response transcription factor LeuO in regulation of the genes for sulfa drug efflux. *J Bacteriol* 191: 4562-4571.
- Sternberg, N.L., and Maurer, R. (1991) Bacteriophage-mediated transduction. *Methods Enzymol* 204: 18-43.

- Stoebel, D.M., Free, A., and Dorman, C.J. (2008) Anti-silencing: overcoming H-NSmediated repression of transcription in Gram-negative enteric bacteria. *Microbiology* 154: 2533-2545.
- 915 Stratmann, T., Madhusudan, S., and Schnetz, K. (2008) Regulation of the *yjjQ-bglJ*916 operon, encoding LuxR-type transcription factors, and the divergent *yjjP* gene by
 917 H-NS and LeuO. *J Bacteriol* **190**: 926-935.
- Stratmann, T., Pul, U., Wurm, R., Wagner R., and Schnetz, K. (2012) RcsB-BglJ
 activates the *Escherichia coli leuO* gene, encoding an H-NS antagonist and
 pleiotropic regulator of virulence determinants. *Mol Microbiol* 83: 1109-1123.
- Tenor, J.L., McCormick, B.A., Ausubel, F.M., and Aballay, A. (2004) *Caenorhabditis elegans*-based screen identifies *Salmonella* virulence factors required for
 conserved host-pathogen interactions. *Curr Biol* 14: 1018-1024.
- Turnbull, A. L., Kim W., and Surette, M.G. (2012) Transcriptional regulation of *sdiA* by
 cAMP-receptor protein, LeuO, and environmental signals in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium. *Can J Microbiol* 58: 10-22.
- 927 Ueguchi, C., Ohta, T., Seto, C., Suzuki, T., and Mizuno, T. (1998) The *leuO* gene
 928 product has a latent ability to relieve *bgl* silencing in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol*929 **180**: 190-193.
- VanBogelen, R.A., Olson, E.R., Wanner, B.L., and Neidhardt, F.C. (1996) Global
 analysis of proteins synthesized during phosphorus restriction in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* 178: 4344-4366.
- Van Rhijn, P., and Vanderleyden, J. (1995) The Rhizobium-plant symbiosis. *Microbiol Rev* 59: 124-142.
- Viswanathan, P., Ueki, T., Inouye, S., and Kroos, L. (2007) Combinatorial regulation of
 genes essential for *Myxococcus xanthus* development involves a response
 regulator and a LysR-type regulator. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**: 7969-7974.

- Waldminghaus, T., and Skarstad, K. (2010) ChIP on Chip: surprising results are often
 artifacts. *BMC Genomics* 11: 414.
- Walthers, D., Li, Y., Liu, Y., Anand, G., Yan, J., and Kenney, L.J. (2011) Salmonella *enterica* response regulator SsrB relieves H-NS silencing by displacing H-NS
 bound in polymerization mode and directly activates transcription. *J Biol Chem*286: 1895-1902.
- Wei, Q., Le Minh, P.N., Dotsch, A., Hildebrand, F., Panmanee, W., Elfarash, A., *et al.*(2012) Global regulation of gene expression by OxyR in an important human
 opportunistic pathogen. *Nucleic Acids Res* **40**: 4320-4333.
- Westra, E.R., Pul, U., Heidrich, N., Jore, M.M., Lundgren, M., Stratmann, T., *et al.* (2010)
 H-NS-mediated repression of CRISPR-based immunity in *Escherichia coli* K12
 can be relieved by the transcription activator LeuO. *Mol Microbiol* **77**: 1380-1393.
- 950 Wilson, R.L., Urbanowski, M.L., and Stauffer, G.V. (1995) DNA binding sites of the LysR-
- type regulator GcvA in the *gcv* and *gcvA* control regions of *Escherichia coli*. J *Bacteriol* 177: 4940-4946.
- Wu, H.Y., Tan, J., and Fang, M. (1995) Long-range interaction between two promoters:
 activation of the *leu500* promoter by a distant upstream promoter. *Cell* 82: 445451.
- Wu, H.Y., and Fang, M. (2003) DNA supercoiling and transcription control: a model from
 the study of suppression of the *leu-500* mutation in *Salmonella typhimurium topA*⁻
 strains. *Prog Nucleic Acid Res Mol Biol* **73**: 43-68.
- Zaim, J., and Kierzek, A.M. (2003) The structure of full-length LysR-type transcriptional
 regulators. Modeling of the full-length OxyR transcription factor dimer. *Nucleic Acids Res* 31: 1444-1454.
- 962



966 Fig. 1: Global identification and categorization of LeuO binding sites by ChIP-chip

967 (A) Western Immunoblot analysis of LeuO protein levels in SL1344 cells grown to
968 stationary phase in LB or LPM are shown in the top panel. GroEL loading controls are
969 indicated in the bottom panel.

(B) Visualization of LeuO ChIP-chip data using the Integrated Genome Browser (IGB) for
S. Typhimurium SL1344. The location of LeuO binding sites, as defined by the ChIPOTIe
algorithm, are indicated by horizontal bars in the LeuO ChIPOTIe track. The locations of
known coding sequences (CDS) on the plus (+) and minus (-) DNA strands and SL1344
chromosome coordinates are also shown.

975 (C) Detailed view of the *S*. Typhimurium CRISPR/Cas locus. LeuO ChIP-chip data are 976 presented quantitatively, with enrichment ratios shown on the y-axis. The binding site 977 identified by ChIPOTIe is depicted by the blue rectangle and known promoter locations
978 are indicated by bent arrows. The *cas3* transcription start site was determined by Kröger
979 *et al.* (2012).

(D) Schematic representation of LeuO binding site classification as outlined in the text.
The pie chart shows the relative distribution of LeuO binding sites among the location
classes summarized in the genetic diagram on the left, with horizontal open arrows used
to represent ORFs and their relative orientations. The colours of the vertical arrows
correspond to the colours used in the pie chart segments.



987 Fig. 2: Integration of H-NS and LeuO genome-wide binding data

988 (A) Western Immunoblot analysis of LeuO protein levels in wild type SL1344 and
989 SL1344 *hns* are shown in the top panel. DnaK loading controls are indicated in the
990 bottom panel.

(B) Visualization of H-NS (red) and LeuO (blue) ChIP-chip data in the Integrated
Genome Browser with ChIPOTIe identified binding sites depicted below each lane as
horizontal bars. The locations of known coding sequences (CDS) on the plus (+) and
minus (-) DNA strands and SL1344 chromosome coordinates are also shown.

995 (C) Schematic representation of LeuO and H-NS overlap analysis. The Venn diagram
996 illustrates the number of LeuO sites that did (LeuO+H-NS) and did not (LeuO) overlap
997 with an H-NS binding site. Quantitative LeuO (blue) and H-NS (red) ChIP-chip data are
998 shown for representative examples of LeuO and LeuO+H-NS binding sites.

- (D) Average plots of LeuO and H-NS occupancy (ChIP-chip enrichment ratios) at
 LeuO+H-NS and LeuO-only sites. Averaged LeuO and H-NS data were plotted in 100-bp
 windows with respect to the center of ChiPOTle-defined LeuO binding sites.



1004

1005 Fig. 3: LeuO does not simply displace H-NS from DNA and may be involved in the

1006 recruitment of RNA Polymerase to target genes

(A) The number of H-NS, RNA Polymerase (RNAP) and LeuO co-localization events in
LeuO-inducing conditions (LPM) is indicated in the first row of the table. The second row
indicates the number of H-NS and RNAP binding events at the LPM defined LeuO sites
in non-inducing conditions (LB). (B) An average plot of H-NS occupancy with respect to
LeuO binding site location in LeuO inducing conditions (LPM) and non-inducing
conditions (LB). (C) An average plot of RNAP occupancy with respect to LeuO binding
site location in LeuO inducing conditions (LPM) and non-inducing
site location in LeuO inducing conditions (LPM) and non-inducing

- 1015

L	Δ					
'	`					

Species	Dataset	Number of Sequences	Average Size (bp)	Total Size (bp)	% A+T	Source
Salmonella Typhimurium	LeuO+ HNS	64	653	41825	50.5	This study
Escherichia coli	E. coli LeuO	119	501	59619	59.9	Shimada <i>et al.</i> 2011





1018 **Typhimurium and E. coli**

- 1019 (A) Details of the manually curated S. Typhimurium and *E. coli* LeuO datasets used to
- 1020 derive the LeuO binding motifs. (B) Alignment of sequence logos illustrating the *E. coli*
- 1021 and S. Typhimurium motifs identified by Meme. The location of the LTTR T_{N11} -A box is
- 1022 indicated below each Logo.



10241025Fig. 5: Predicted LeuO binding sites in the context of genome atlases for the S.

1026 Typhimurium and *E. coli* chromosomes

1027 (A+B) The locations of predicted LeuO binding sites on both strands of the S. 1028 Typhimurium SL1344 (A) and E. coli MG1655 (B) chromosomes are shown using 1029 coloured concentric circles. In addition, we show published H-NS ChIP-chip data 1030 from SL1344 grown in LPM together with DNA intrinsic curvature measurements and 1031 percentage A+T content (http://www.cbs.dtu.dk/services/GenomeAtlas). The colour 1032 code used in each concentric circle is explained in the key at the right of each 1033 diagram. Numbers on the inside of the innermost circle are locations relative to 1034 position zero measured in millions of base-pairs (Mbp). (C+D) A detailed view of a 1035 predominantly syntenic region of the S. Typhimurium (C) and E. coli (D) chromosomes 1036 illustrating the similarities and differences of predicted LeuO binding sites in the two 1037 species. The locations of predicted LeuO binding sites on the plus and negative strands 1038 are indicated by purple and green bars in tracks D and E. The locations of CDS on the 1039 plus and negative strands are indicated by blue and red rectangles, respectively.



1042 Fig. 6: Validation of predicted LeuO binding sites

1043 (A) EMSA analysis was used to validate predicted LeuO binding sites. pipA and envR 1044 were associated with one and two predicted binding sites respectively (indicated by thin 1045 black arrows) while SL3361 was not associated with a predicted site. DNA probes were 1046 incubated with increasing amounts of LeuO and complex formation is indicated by thick 1047 black arrows. (B) DNase I footprinting of LeuO binding to PenvR using end labelled DNA 1048 fragments. The size and quantity of 6-FAM-labelled DNase I digestion products were 1049 measured by fluorescent DNA sequencing with capillary electrophoresis. The locations 1050 of predicted LeuO binding sites are indicated by arrows and protected regions are 1051 indicated by asterisks. SL1344 chromosome coordinates are indicated on the x-axis. (C) 1052 qRT-PCR was used to monitor transcript levels for envR, sifA, sopA and pipA following 1053 *leuO* over-expression (SL1344 *Tpop-leuO*) and deletion of *leuO* (SL1344 *Tpop-\DeltaleuO*).

- 1054 Fold changes in transcript levels are expressed relative to strain SL1344 Tpop-leuO,
- 1055 which is normalized to 1.