LuxU connects quorum sensing to biofilm formation in *Vibrio fischeri*

Valerie A. Ray and Karen L. Visick*

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Loyola University Medical Center, Maywood, IL 60153, USA.

Summary

Biofilm formation by *Vibrio fischeri* is a complex process involving multiple regulators, including the sensor kinase (SK) RscS and the response regulator (RR) SypG, which control the s̲y̲mbiosis p̲olysaccharide (*syp*) locus. To identify other regulators of biofilm formation in *V. fischeri*, we screened a transposon library for mutants defective in wrinkled colony formation. We identified LuxQ as a positive regulator of *syp*-dependent biofilm formation. LuxQ is a member of the Lux phosphorelay and is predicted to control bioluminescence in concert with the SK AinR, the phosphotransferase LuxU and the RR LuxO. Of these, LuxU was the only other regulator that exerted a substantial impact on biofilm formation. We propose a model in which the Lux pathway branches at LuxU to control both bioluminescence and biofilm formation. Furthermore, our evidence suggests that LuxU functions to regulate *syp* transcription, likely by controlling SypG activity. Finally, we found that, in contrast to its predicted function, the SK AinR has little impact on bioluminescence under our conditions. Thus, this study reveals a novel connection between the Lux and Syp pathways in *V. fischeri*, and furthers our understanding of how the Lux pathway regulates bioluminescence in this organism.

Introduction

Bacteria readily adapt to changing environmental conditions by sensing and integrating different cues present in their surroundings to produce a response appropriate for survival or growth. One mechanism by which bacteria co-ordinate such responses is through the use of two-component systems, with the sensor kinase (SK) component involved in detecting and relaying an environmental cue, and the response regulator (RR) component promoting the response, often a change in gene expression

(Stock *et al.*, 2000; West and Stock, 2001). A classic example of signal integration via two-component regulators is the Lux pathway in the marine bioluminescent bacterium *Vibrio harveyi* (Ng and Bassler, 2009). This organism integrates distinct signals (small molecules termed autoinducers or AIs) using specific SKs that funnel their activities into a common phosphorelay pathway to control the production of cellular bioluminescence.

In *V. harveyi*, the Lux pathway (Fig. 1A) is composed of the SKs LuxQ (in association with the periplasmic protein LuxP), LuxN and CqsS (not depicted), the histidine phosphotransferase LuxU and the RR LuxO (reviewed in Ng and Bassler, 2009). Under low cell densities (low AI concentrations), the SKs exhibit net kinase activity and serve as phosphoryl-donors to LuxU, which serves as a phosphoryl-donor to the RR LuxO. Phosphorylated LuxO (LuxO~P) then promotes the transcription of five sRNAs (*qrr1-5*), which bind to and destabilize (in conjunction with Hfq) the transcript for the master transcriptional regulator LuxR$_{VH}$. This regulator promotes the transcription of the *lux* operon, which encodes the proteins necessary for light production. Without LuxR$_{VH}$, light is not produced. However, as the cell density increases, the AI concentrations also increase, causing a shift in the equilibrium of SK activity (i.e. from net kinase to net phosphatase activity). This switch to net phosphatase activity promotes the removal of phosphoryl groups from LuxO through LuxU. Without LuxO~P, LuxR$_{VH}$ is produced and promotes the expression of the *lux* operon, ultimately leading to light production.

Similar pathways exist in a variety of other *Vibrio* species, including *V. parahaemolyticus*, *V. cholerae*, *V. anguillarum*, *V. vulnificus* and *V. fischeri* (Milton, 2006; Zhang *et al.*, 2012). Like *V. harveyi*, the *V. fischeri* Lux pathway also controls bioluminescence (reviewed in Stabb *et al.*, 2008; Miyashiro and Ruby, 2012). The *V. fischeri* Lux components appear similar to those in *V. harveyi* (Fig. 1). For example, *V. fischeri* encodes (or is predicted to encode) homologues of LuxP, LuxQ, LuxU and LuxO, which are proposed to function in a manner similar to their counterparts in *V. harveyi* (Miyamoto *et al.*, 2000; Visick, 2005; Stabb *et al.*, 2008; Miyashiro *et al.*, 2010); however, differences between the Lux pathways in *V. fischeri* and *V. harveyi* exist. For example, *V. fischeri* does not encode a homologue of CqsS or LuxN, but encodes another SK,

Fig. 1. Models for the regulation by the Lux and Syp pathways.
A. In *V. harveyi*, bioluminescence is regulated by the Lux phosphorelay, composed of the sensor kinases (SKs) LuxQ (which interacts with the periplasmic protein LuxP), LuxN and CqsS (not depicted), the phosphotransferase LuxU and the response regulator (RR) LuxO. Phosphoryl-transfer (dashed, double-sided arrows) occurs between the SKs, LuxU and LuxO. Under low cell density conditions, LuxO is phosphorylated by the kinase activity of the SKs and activates transcription of the *qrr* sRNAs, which bind to the transcript of *luxR*$_{VH}$ and prevent its translation. Without LuxR$_{VH}$, the *lux* operon (not depicted) is not expressed and light (bioluminescence) is not produced. At high cell densities, LuxO is dephosphorylated by the phosphatase activity of the SKs, leading to subsequent production of LuxR$_{VH}$ and bioluminescence. Autoinducers (AIs) or the AI synthases (LuxM, LuxS or CqsA) are not depicted for simplicity.
B. In *V. fischeri*, the Lux phosphorelay functions in largely the same manner to regulate bioluminescence, with homologues of LuxP, LuxQ, LuxU and LuxO, but not CqsS or LuxN; *V. fischeri* encodes another putative SK, AinR. Additionally, *V. fischeri* uses the LuxR$_{VH}$ homologue, LitR, to activate transcription of LuxR$_{VF}$ (not similar to LuxR$_{VH}$), which promotes transcription of the *lux* operon (when bound to the AI produced by LuxI) (not depicted), leading to subsequent light production (bioluminescence). Regulators shaded in grey indicate those found in this study to be involved in biofilm formation. RscS is a SK known to control biofilm formation. Phosphorylation of the RR SypG is predicted to activate transcription of the *syp* locus, which encodes proteins thought to regulate, produce and transport a polysaccharide necessary for biofilm formation. The specific activity of LuxU in activating biofilm formation is unknown, but it appears from the current study to work at or above the level of *syp* transcription, likely at the level of SypG activation (indicated by a question mark). This figure is adapted from Visick (2005).

AinR, predicted to function at the same level as LuxQ (Gilson *et al.*, 1995; Stabb *et al.*, 2008; Miyashiro and Ruby, 2012). Furthermore, LuxO–P controls the transcription of a single *qrr* sRNA, which likely binds to and destabilizes the transcript of the transcriptional regulator LitR (a LuxR$_{VH}$ homologue) (Miyamoto *et al.*, 2003; Miyashiro *et al.*, 2010). Finally, LitR controls the transcription of an additional downstream regulator, LuxR$_{VF}$ (not similar to LuxR$_{VH}$) (Fidopiastis *et al.*, 2002), which activates the *lux* operon when bound by its AI (Stevens *et al.*, 1994; Sitnikov *et al.*, 1995). Thus, *V. fischeri* integrates AI cues not only to regulate the phosphorylation state of the RR LuxO, but also to regulate the transcription of the *lux* operon, adding another level of control to the production of cellular bioluminescence in this organism.

In addition to controlling bioluminescence, the Lux pathway in *V. fischeri* impacts other processes such as acetate metabolism (Studer *et al.*, 2008) and motility (Lupp and Ruby, 2005; Hussa *et al.*, 2007; Cao *et al.*, 2012). Lux

regulates a variety of processes in other vibrios as well. For example, *V. cholerae*, *V. anguillarum*, *V. vulnificus* and *V. parahaemolyticus* utilize the Lux pathway to control biofilm formation via regulators downstream of LuxO (Croxatto *et al.*, 2002; Hammer and Bassler, 2003; Enos-Berlage *et al.*, 2005; Lee *et al.*, 2007; Zhang *et al.*, 2012). For *V. fischeri*, no clear connection between the Lux pathway and biofilm formation has been observed, with the exception that a *litR* mutant exhibits a change in colony morphology (from translucent to opaque) consistent with a possible alteration in biofilm formation (Fidopiastis *et al.*, 2002). Thus, it seems likely that *V. fischeri* could utilize the Lux pathway to regulate biofilm formation, but the exact role, if any, has yet to be determined.

Vibrio fischeri is known to promote biofilm formation through the symbiotic polysaccharide (*syp*) locus (Fig. 1B). The *syp* locus is set of 18 genes thought to be involved in the regulation, production and transport of a polysaccharide involved in biofilm formation (Yip *et al.*, 2005; 2006;

Shibata and Visick, 2012). This locus is transcriptionally controlled by the RR SypG, encoded within the *syp* locus, and σ[54] (Yip *et al.*, 2005). Another regulator of the *syp* locus is the SK RscS, which functions upstream of SypG to promote *syp* transcription (Yip *et al.*, 2006; Hussa *et al.*, 2008). Under standard laboratory conditions, *V. fischeri* does not form robust biofilms (i.e. wrinkled colony formation and pellicle production). However, robust biofilms that are dependent on the *syp* locus can be induced by overexpression of either *rscS* (Yip *et al.*, 2006) or *sypG*; for SypG to induce biofilm formation, the biofilm inhibitor protein SypE must be absent or inactivated (Hussa *et al.*, 2008; Morris *et al.*, 2011). This enhanced biofilm production correlates with a competitive advantage for colonization by *V. fischeri* of its symbiotic host, the squid *Euprymna scolopes* (Yip *et al.*, 2006; Morris *et al.*, 2011).

In the current study, we sought to identify other components involved in biofilm formation by *V. fischeri* and found that the Lux pathway plays a role in this phenotype. Regulation of biofilm formation by the Lux pathway in *V. fischeri* is novel, as LuxU plays an important role but LuxO involvement is minimal. Our data indicate that the Lux pathway in *V. fischeri* branches at LuxU to regulate both bioluminescence and *syp*-dependent biofilm formation. Additionally, we have evidence to suggest that the SK AinR plays a minimal role in regulating light production and no role in regulating biofilm formation, under our conditions. Thus, this work provides new insight into the mechanism by which the Lux pathway functions in *V. fischeri*, and also helps further our understanding of the complex regulatory network involved in controlling biofilm formation in this organism.

Results

Transposon mutagenesis reveals a regulatory connection between syp and lux

To better understand the requirements for biofilm formation in *V. fischeri*, we performed a random transposon mutagenesis of KV3299, a strain that lacks the *syp* biofilm inhibitor protein SypE. We then induced biofilm formation by introducing the *sypG* overexpression plasmid pEAH73; under these biofilm-inducing conditions, *V. fischeri* forms wrinkled colonies instead of smooth colonies (Hussa *et al.*, 2008). We screened approximately 5000 mutants for those exhibiting a defect in wrinkled colony formation and found 27 that appeared to form smooth colonies. To verify the phenotypes of these mutants, we cured them of their *sypG* overexpression plasmid and then reintroduced it. All of the mutants remained defective in wrinkled colony formation and fell into two classes. Class 1 mutants (24 total) exhibited smooth colony morphology (compare Fig. 2A and B), while class 2 mutants (three total) exhib-


Fig. 2. Transposon mutagenesis reveals other regulators of biofilm formation in *V. fischeri*.
A–C. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 45.5 h post spotting for the following strains: ΔsypE control (pEAH73/KV3299) (A), a representative class 1 mutant (pEAH73/KV5872; *syp*::Tn5 ΔsypE) (B) and a representative class 2 mutant (pEAH73/KV4431; *luxQ*::Tn5 ΔsypE) (C). An asterisk indicates the time at which wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.
D. A graphical depiction of the predicted *luxPQ* genes (block arrows) and Tn insertion sites (black triangles). There are 2 bp between the predicted translational stop site of *luxP* and the predicted translational start site of *luxQ*.

ited a substantial delay (approximately 6 h) in the start of wrinkled colony formation, but appeared similar to that of the parent strain at later times (compare Fig. 2A and C; asterisks indicate the time at which wrinkled colony formation is apparent, typically identified by ridge formation around the outer edge of the spot). To further evaluate these mutants, we performed Southern blot analysis on each mutant to determine whether the transposon had inserted within the *syp* locus, a location predicted to disrupt wrinkling. We found that the class 1 (smooth) mutants mapped within this locus, while the class 2 (delayed) mutants were unaltered in their *syp* regions (data not shown). These results confirm the assumption that wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression depends on the *syp* locus. Because our goal was to identify novel (non-*syp*) factors involved in biofilm formation, we pursued characterization of the class 2 mutants. Upon cloning and sequencing the DNA flanking the site of the Tn insertion in each class 2 mutant, we found that one insertion mapped near the end of

VF_0707, while the other two were within *VF_0708* (Fig. 2D). These genes are predicted to encode LuxP and LuxQ, respectively, two proteins proposed to be involved in controlling bioluminescence in *V. fischeri* (Fig. 1B).

Loss of LuxQ affects bioluminescence and biofilm formation

In *V. fischeri*, LuxP and LuxQ are predicted to regulate bioluminescence due to their sequence similarity to the well-characterized proteins of *V. harveyi* (58% and 44% identical, 72% and 67% similar respectively) and to the functional conservation of other members of the *lux* regulatory pathway between *V. harveyi* and *V. fischeri* (reviewed in Stabb *et al.*, 2008); however, the functions (bioluminescence or otherwise) of these two proteins in *V. fischeri* have not yet been assessed through mutagenesis studies. Thus, to understand the functions of these putative regulators, we asked whether these genes were involved in controlling bioluminescence, in addition to probing their role in controlling biofilm formation. As the Tn insertions were in a Δ*sypE* background, it was first necessary to ask whether loss of SypE impacted luminescence; we found that it did not substantially impact luminescence (Fig. S1A), regardless of whether we used OD_{600} to estimate cell number (Fig. S1B) or determined the number of colony-forming units (Fig. S1C) to calculate the specific luminescence. Next, we assessed the impact of the Tn mutations on luminescence. The model (Fig. 1B), generated from work in *V. harveyi* (Bassler *et al.*, 1994; Neiditch *et al.*, 2005), predicts that a *luxP* mutant should fail to transmit the AI signal to LuxQ, causing LuxQ to remain a kinase; as a result, the levels of LuxO~P should be higher and luminescence should be lower. The model also predicts that the *luxQ* mutant should exhibit a decrease in LuxO~P levels, leading to increased luminescence. We found that all three mutants exhibited an increase in luminescence relative to their parent (Δ*sypE*) (Fig. 3A).

Since the *luxP* Tn mutant did not exhibit the predicted luminescence phenotype, we hypothesized that the Tn insertion, which was located at the end of *luxP*, was polar on *luxQ*. To test this prediction, we constructed in-frame deletions of both *luxP* (Δ*luxP*) and *luxQ* (Δ*luxQ*) in both the Δ*sypE* and wild-type backgrounds. Neither mutation impacted growth of *V. fischeri* (data not shown). Regardless of the background, loss of LuxP decreased bioluminescence, while loss of LuxQ increased bioluminescence as predicted (Fig. 3B and data not shown). The luminescence of the Δ*luxQ* mutant could be restored to the level of the *luxQ*⁺ control by expression of an epitope-tagged version of *luxQ* (*luxQ-FLAG*) in single copy from the chromosome (Fig. 3C). Together, these data indicate that: (i) LuxP and LuxQ are involved in controlling bioluminescence, as predicted, (ii) the Tn insertion within *luxP* was

polar on *luxQ*, and (iii) *luxP* and *luxQ* likely comprise an operon (Fig. 2D).

As the Tn insertion in *luxP* was polar on *luxQ*, we predicted that the 6 h delay in biofilm formation initially observed from the Tn mutants was likely due to loss or disruption of *luxQ*. To test this prediction, we examined wrinkled colony formation by the Δ*luxQ* (Δ*sypE*) mutant that overexpressed *sypG*. Like the Tn mutants, this mutant also exhibited a delay in wrinkled colony formation relative to the control (compare Fig. 4A and B). This delay in biofilm formation could be complemented by expression of *luxQ-FLAG* in single copy from the chromosome of the Δ*luxQ* mutant (Fig. 4A–C). Thus, LuxQ appears to control both bioluminescence and biofilm formation in *V. fischeri*. In contrast, the *luxP* mutation exerted relatively little effect on biofilm formation (Fig. S2); thus, we focused our subsequent studies on LuxQ and other Lux regulators.

LuxU exerts a more substantial impact on biofilm formation than LuxO

In *V. harveyi*, LuxQ functions through the phosphotransferase LuxU, to control the phosphorylation state of the RR LuxO (Fig. 1A) (Freeman and Bassler, 1999a,b). As LuxQ is involved in controlling biofilm formation in *V. fischeri*, we asked whether LuxU and LuxO were also involved. Thus, we generated deletions of both *luxU* (Δ*luxU*) and *luxO* (Δ*luxO*) in the Δ*sypE* background. However, it was necessary to first confirm that our mutants exhibited the predicted pattern of luminescence [i.e. increased bioluminescence; for *luxO* mutants, this has been previously reported (Lupp *et al.*, 2003; Hussa *et al.*, 2007)] (Fig. 1B). As expected, both mutants exhibited an increase in bioluminescence relative to their parent (Figs 3D and S1). Neither mutant exhibited a growth defect (data not shown). Finally, a Δ*luxU* Δ*luxO* (Δ*sypE*) mutant exhibited a luminescence phenotype similar to that of the individual mutants (Fig. 3D). Overall, these data confirm that LuxU functions to control bioluminescence in *V. fischeri*, as predicted.

Next, we introduced the *sypG* plasmid into the Δ*luxU* and Δ*luxO* mutants and assessed wrinkled colony formation. Similar to the loss of LuxQ, loss of LuxU resulted in a delay (about 7 h) in wrinkled colony formation (compare Fig. 5A and B). However, loss of LuxO resulted in only a slight, but reproducible delay (1.5 h) in wrinkled colony formation (compare Fig. 5A and C); we also observed the same slight delay for a *luxO*::*kan* mutant (data not shown), confirming the results of the Δ*luxO* mutant. These data suggest that, under our conditions, LuxU plays a more critical role than LuxO in controlling biofilm formation. These results also suggest that LuxU may function independently of LuxO to control biofilm formation. To investigate this possibility further, we evaluated biofilm formation

Fig. 3. Luminescence of *lux* mutants in culture. Cultures were grown in SWTO and incubated at 24°C with vigorous shaking. Luminescence and OD_{600} were measured over time until maximum luminescence was achieved (between OD_{600} 1.5 and 2). All data are plotted as specific luminescence (Sp. lum.; relative luminescence divided by OD_{600}) versus OD_{600} and are representative of at least three independent experiments.

A. $\Delta sypE$ control (black squares; KV3299), *luxP*::Tn*5* $\Delta sypE$ (white circles; KV4430), *luxU*::Tn*5* $\Delta sypE$ (grey diamonds; KV4431), *luxQ*::Tn*5* $\Delta sypE$ (black triangles; KV4432).

B. $\Delta sypE$ control (black squares; KV3299), $\Delta luxP$ $\Delta sypE$ (white circles; KV5347), $\Delta luxQ$ $\Delta sypE$ (black circles; KV5394), $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ (grey triangles; KV4830), $\Delta luxQ$ $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ (black diamonds; KV6008).

C. $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*erm* control (black squares; KV4390), $\Delta luxQ$ $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*erm* (black circles; KV5973), $\Delta luxQ$ $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-FLAG* (white circles; KV5902), $\Delta luxQ$ $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG* (grey triangles; KV5904), $\Delta luxQ$ $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-H378A-FLAG* (black diamonds; KV5903).

D. $\Delta sypE$ control (black squares; KV3299), $\Delta luxO$ $\Delta sypE$ (white circles; KV5468), $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ (black triangles; KV4830), $\Delta luxO$ $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ (grey diamonds; KV5472).

E. $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*erm* control (black squares; KV4390), $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*erm* (black triangles; KV5974), $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*luxU-FLAG* (white triangles; KV5905), $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ *att*Tn*7*::*luxU-H61A-FLAG* (white circles; KV5906).

F. $\Delta sypE$ control (black squares; KV3299), $\Delta ainR$ $\Delta sypE$ (grey circles; KV6196), $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ (black triangles; KV4830), $\Delta ainR$ $\Delta luxU$ $\Delta sypE$ (black diamonds; KV6259).

The data for KV3299 in (B) are the same as that shown in (D). The data for KV4390 in (C) are the same as that shown in (E).

by the $\Delta luxO$ $\Delta luxU$ ($\Delta sypE$) mutant. We predicted that if LuxU functions through LuxO to regulate biofilm formation, then loss of both LuxU and LuxO would result in a phenotype similar to loss of LuxO alone (i.e. a 1.5 h delay). This was not the case: loss of both regulators resulted in an 8 h delay in wrinkled colony formation (compare Fig. 5A and D). This delay supports the hypothesis that the two regulators function independently to impact biofilm formation. Furthermore, this result contrasts with the luminescence

results, in which the phenotypes of the *luxU*, *luxO* and *luxU luxO* mutants were similar (Fig. 3D), and which suggest that LuxU likely functions through LuxO to control bioluminescence. Together, these data suggest that the Lux pathway branches at LuxU to control both bioluminescence and biofilm formation (Fig. 1B). Since loss of LuxU resulted in a more severe biofilm phenotype than loss of LuxO, we chose to pursue the role of LuxU (and its inputs) in the current study.

Fig. 4. The effect of *luxQ* point mutations on biofilm formation. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 45 h post spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*erm* control (pEAH73/KV4390) (A), Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*erm* (pEAH73/KV5973) (B), Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-FLAG* (pEAH73/KV5902) (C), Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG* (pEAH73/KV5904) (D) and Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-H378A-FLAG* (pEAH73/KV5903) (E). An asterisk indicates the time at which wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

LuxQ kinase activity promotes biofilm formation

Our current data suggest that LuxQ functions as a positive regulator of biofilm formation under our conditions. Because this SK is predicted to function as both a kinase and a phosphatase (Freeman and Bassler, 1999a; Neiditch *et al.*, 2006), we asked whether the ability of LuxQ to positively regulate biofilm formation depended upon its kinase and/or phosphatase activity. Previous work from *V. harveyi* had demonstrated that certain point mutations cause the loss of one activity but not the other (i.e. kinase activity is lost, while phosphatase activity is retained and vice versa) (Neiditch *et al.*, 2006). Thus, we generated point mutations in the *V. fischeri luxQ* gene that are predicted to cause either loss of phosphatase activity (*luxQ-A216P*; kin+/phos-) or loss of kinase activity (*luxQ-H378A*; kin-/phos+), while retaining the other activity respectively. We then expressed these *luxQ* alleles in single copy from the chromosome of the Δ*luxQ* mutant. To confirm that these LuxQ derivatives were functional, we examined their ability to control light production. According to the model (Fig. 1B) and work from *V. harveyi* (Neiditch *et al.*, 2006), a phosphatase mutant (LuxQ-A216P, kin+/phos-) should exhibit a decrease in bioluminescence (due to an increase in LuxO~P), while a kinase mutant (LuxQ-H378A, kin-/phos+) should exhibit an increase in biolumi-

nescence (due to a decrease in LuxO~P). Indeed, each mutant exhibited the expected pattern of luminescence (Fig. 3C), indicating that the proteins produced were functional and behaved as predicted.

We next assessed the ability of these alleles to complement the Δ*luxQ* mutant with respect to the timing of wrinkled colony formation. We found that the phosphatase mutant, LuxQ-A216P (kin+/phos-), could complement the *luxQ* mutant, restoring the timing of wrinkled colony formation to approximately that of the control strain (*luxQ*+) and the wild-type-complemented Δ*luxQ* mutant (compare Fig. 4A, C and D). In contrast, the kinase mutant, LuxQ-H378A (kin-/phos+), failed to complement the *luxQ* mutant; this strain exhibited wrinkled colony formation that was indistinguishable from the Δ*luxQ* parent (compare Fig. 4A, B and E). These data suggest that the kinase activity of LuxQ, but not its phosphatase activity, is necessary to regulate biofilm formation.

The impact of LuxQ on biofilm formation depends on LuxU

Our data indicate that LuxQ (specifically its kinase activity) and LuxU are necessary to regulate biofilm formation. According to the model (Fig. 1B), LuxQ is predicted to function through LuxU. To test this hypothesis, we first

Fig. 5. Wrinkled colony formation by *luxU* and *luxO* mutants. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 45 h post spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE* control (pEAH73/KV3299) (A), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV4830) (B), Δ*luxO* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV5468) (C) and Δ*luxO* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV5472) (D). An asterisk indicates the time at which wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

asked whether LuxQ functioned through LuxU to regulate bioluminescence. If this were the case, we would expect that a *luxQ luxU* mutant would phenocopy a *luxU* mutant, and indeed it did (Fig. 3B). To further evaluate this regulatory connection, we expressed the *luxQ-A216P* (kin+/phos-) allele in the *luxQ luxU* mutant. Whereas, in the context of the *luxQ* (*luxU*⁺) background this allele decreased luminescence, it failed to do so when *luxU* was also disrupted: the levels of luminescence produced by the *luxQ luxU* mutant expressing *luxQ-A216P* (kin+/phos-) were indistinguishable from that of the *luxU* mutant (Fig. 6A). These data suggest that LuxQ functions through LuxU to regulate bioluminescence.

Next, we asked whether LuxQ functioned through LuxU to control biofilm formation. We first evaluated biofilm formation by the *luxQ luxU* (*sypE*) mutant. We found that the double mutant exhibited a delay in wrinkled colony formation similar to that seen with the individual *luxQ* and *luxU* mutants (Fig. S3), rather than an additive delay. Thus, these results suggest that LuxQ and LuxU function in the

same pathway to regulate biofilm formation. To probe this relationship further, we utilized the *luxQ-A216P* allele, which permits complementation of the *luxQ* mutation (Fig. 4). We hypothesized that if LuxU were necessary for LuxQ to regulate biofilm formation, then disruption of *luxU* in the *luxQ* mutant expressing *luxQ-A216P* should delay biofilm formation relative to the *luxU*⁺ strain. Indeed, this was the case (Fig. 6B). These data suggest that the ability of LuxQ to positively regulate biofilm formation depends upon LuxU.

Biofilm formation depends on the conserved site of phosphorylation in LuxU

In *V. harveyi*, LuxU serves as a phosphotransferase, shuttling phosphoryl groups between the SKs and the RR LuxO (Fig. 1A). This role depends upon the conserved site of phosphorylation, His58 (Freeman and Bassler, 1999b). To determine whether the *V. fischeri* homologue functions in a similar manner, we first constructed an epitope-tagged version of *luxU* (*luxU-FLAG*). Expression of this allele in

Fig. 6. Luminescence and wrinkled colony formation by *luxQ* and *luxU* mutants.

A. Luminescence of *lux* mutants in culture. Cultures were grown in SWTO and incubated at 24°C with vigorous shaking. Luminescence and OD_{600} were measured over time until maximum luminescence was achieved (between OD_{600} 1.5 and 2) for the following strains: Δ*luxQ att*Tn7::*erm* control (black triangles; KV5973), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn7::*erm* (black diamonds; KV5974), Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn7::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG* (white circles; KV5904) and Δ*luxQ* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn7::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG* (black circles; KV6054). All data are plotted as specific luminescence (Sp. lum.; relative luminescence divided by OD_{600}) versus OD_{600} and are representative of at least three independent experiments.

B. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 42 h post spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE att*Tn7::*erm* control (pEAH73/KV4390), Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn7::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG* (pEAH73/KV5904) and Δ*luxQ* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn7::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG* (pEAH73/KV6054). An asterisk indicates the time at which wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

single copy from the chromosome of the Δ*luxU* mutant restored luminescence to that of the control (Fig. 3E), as well as the normal timing of wrinkled colony formation (compare Fig. 7A–C). Next, we substituted the predicted, conserved histidine for an alanine (H61A) in the *luxU-FLAG* construct and introduced this allele into the chromosome of the Δ*luxU* mutant. The Δ*luxU* mutant expressing the *luxU-H61A* allele failed to restore luminescence to the level of the parent (Fig. 3E) and exhibited the same 6 h delay in wrinkled colony formation as the uncomplemented Δ*luxU* mutant (compare Fig. 7B and D). To ensure that the lack of complementation was not due to a reduction or loss of the protein, we performed Western blot analysis and found that protein was expressed from both alleles (Fig. S4). Together, these data suggest that the conserved site of phosphorylation in LuxU is necessary to regulate biofilm formation. Thus, it appears that key residues predicted to be involved in phosphotransfer are required for regulation of biofilm formation.

AinR does not function as predicted to regulate bioluminescence and exerts no impact on biofilm formation

It has been predicted that, like the *V. harveyi* Lux pathway, multiple SKs feed into LuxU to control bioluminescence in *V. fischeri* (Visick, 2005; Stabb *et al.*, 2008; Miyashiro and Ruby, 2012). In particular, the SK AinR is proposed to function at the same level as LuxQ to control bioluminescence in *V. fischeri* (Fig. 1B) (Gilson *et al.*, 1995; Stabb *et al.*, 2008). To determine whether AinR is involved in controlling bioluminescence and biofilm formation, we generated a Δ*ainR* (Δ*sypE*) mutant and first assessed its luminescence phenotype; no study of AinR has assessed its role in controlling bioluminescence in liquid culture. The model (Fig. 1B) predicts that, similar to loss of LuxQ, loss of AinR would result in an increase in luminescence. However, this was not the case: loss of AinR resulted in a consistent but very slight decrease in luminescence as

Fig. 7. Wrinkled colony formation by complemented Δ*luxU* mutants. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 45 h post spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE att*Tn*7::erm* control (pEAH73/KV4390) (A), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7::erm* (pEAH73/KV5974) (B), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7::luxU-FLAG* (pEAH73/KV5905) (C) and Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7::luxU-H61A-FLAG* (pEAH73/KV5906) (D). An asterisk indicates the time at which wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

compared to the control (Figs 3F and S5). To determine whether AinR functioned through the known phosphorelay pathway (i.e. through LuxU), we generated a Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* (Δ*sypE*) mutant and assessed its luminescence phenotype. We expected that the double mutant would exhibit the luminescence phenotype of the *luxU* single mutant. Surprisingly, this mutant consistently exhibited in an intermediate luminescence phenotype: the Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* mutant was brighter than the Δ*ainR* mutant, but not as bright as the Δ*luxU* mutant (Fig. 3F). These data suggested that AinR may play only a minor role in controlling bioluminescence under these conditions.

As a putative SK, AinR is predicted to recognize and respond to the AI N-octanoyl-homoserine lactone (C8-HSL) (Gilson *et al.*, 1995). Thus, the diminished luminescence phenotypes of the Δ*ainR* and Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* mutants could result from a failure of this mutant to respond to C8-HSL. Alternatively, deletion of *ainR* could impact expression of the upstream gene *ainS*, which encodes the C8-HSL synthase protein. An impact on AinS synthesis could lead to decreased amounts of C8-HSL and decreased light production, potentially via direct control of the *lux* operon, as previously demonstrated (Kuo *et al.*, 1996; Egland and Greenberg, 2000). To distinguish between these possibilities, we added exogenous C8-HSL to the *ainR* mutants and controls. We reasoned that, if the *ainR* mutants were defective in their response to C8-HSL, then they would still exhibit diminished luminescence relative to their controls. This appeared not to be the case, however, as addition of C8-HSL to the Δ*ainR* and Δ*ainR*

Δ*luxU* mutants increased their luminescence levels to those of the control strain and the Δ*luxU* mutant respectively (Fig. S5B). These data suggest that the decrease in luminescence by both the Δ*ainR* and Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* mutants is likely due to decreased levels of C8-HSL, whose activity in promoting luminescence is largely or fully independent of the function of AinR, at least under our conditions. Thus, the role of AinR in controlling luminescence remains unclear.

Although AinR did not function as predicted in controlling bioluminescence, we wondered whether loss of AinR would impact biofilm formation. This was not the case: the Δ*ainR* mutant exhibited no defect in biofilm formation, while the Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* mutant exhibited the defect of the *luxU* mutant (Fig. S6) and could be complemented when the wild-type allele of *luxU-FLAG* was expressed in single copy from the chromosome (data not shown). Thus, AinR has no impact on biofilm formation, and its role in controlling bioluminescence remains unclear. Further work will be necessary to determine what role AinR plays, if any, in controlling luminescence in *V. fischeri*.

LuxU, but not RscS, is necessary to regulate *syp*-dependent biofilm formation under SypG-inducing conditions

Since the only known role of LuxU is to serve as a phosphoryl-donor (Freeman and Bassler, 1999b; Shikuma *et al.*, 2009) and LuxU impacts *syp*-dependent biofilm formation, we hypothesized that it could function

Fig. 8. Wrinkled colony formation by *luxU* and *rscS* mutants. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 43 h post spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE* control (pEAH73/KV3299) (A), Δ*rscS* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV6268) (B), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV4830) (C) and Δ*rscS* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV6269) (D). An asterisk indicates the time at which initiation of wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

upstream of SypG, a RR known to be required for transcription of the *syp* locus (Yip *et al.*, 2005). As previous studies had demonstrated that the SK RscS functions upstream of the RR SypG to control *syp*-dependent biofilm formation (Fig. 1B) (Yip *et al.*, 2006; Hussa *et al.*, 2008), we questioned the relative importance of these two potential inputs, RscS and LuxU, on SypG-induced biofilm formation. We thus generated *sypE* mutants with deletions in *luxU*, *rscS* or both and evaluated SypG-induced biofilm formation. Surprisingly, only loss of LuxU exerted an impact: whereas the *luxU* mutant exhibited a delay in wrinkled colony formation (compare Fig. 8A and C), the *rscS* mutant showed no significant defect in biofilm formation under these conditions (compare Fig. 8A and B). Even when the *rscS* and *luxU* mutations were combined, this mutant exhibited the same delay as the *luxU* mutant alone and could be complemented when the wild-type allele of *luxU-FLAG* was expressed in single copy from the chromosome (compare Fig. 8C and D and data not shown). Overall, these data indicate that LuxU plays a more important role than RscS in controlling biofilm formation when *sypG* is overexpressed.

LuxU functions at or above SypG to impact *syp* transcription

As LuxU is necessary to promote *syp*-dependent biofilm formation, we sought to determine whether LuxU functioned upstream of SypG to control its activation

(phosphorylation). If so, then we would expect that a phosphorylation-independent allele of SypG would be 'blind' to the presence or absence of LuxU. We thus overexpressed a version of SypG in which the conserved site of phosphorylation, D53, was substituted for a glutamate (D53E). This substitution in RRs has previously been shown to promote the active state of the RR (Sanders *et al.*, 1989; 1992; Freeman and Bassler, 1999a). Indeed, this substitution in SypG caused an increase in SypG activity, as measured by *syp* transcription (Hussa *et al.*, 2008). Consistent with this increased activity, when overexpressed in the Δ*sypE* mutant, *sypG-D53E* induced wrinkling sooner than when the wild-type allele of *sypG* was overexpressed (9–10 h vs. 13–15 h respectively). When *sypG-D53E* was overexpressed in the Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* mutant, the timing of wrinkled colony formation was not delayed, but rather was similar to that of the *luxU*[+] control (Fig. 9A). These data are consistent with a model in which LuxU functions at or above the level of SypG.

It remains formally possible that the accelerated wrinkling effects of the *sypG-D53E* allele, combined with the delayed wrinkling caused by the loss of LuxU, result in a strain with a net timing of biofilm formation similar to the wild-type strain. Thus, to further probe the level at which LuxU exerts its impact on biofilm formation, we asked whether loss of LuxU affected transcription of the SypG-controlled *sypA* gene using a *lacZ* reporter fusion. We assayed β-galactosidase activity from the reporter expressed from the chromosomes of the Δ*luxU* and the

Fig. 9. The role of LuxU in *syp* activation.
A. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG-D53E* overexpression using plasmid pKV276. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 24 h post spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE* control (pKV276/KV3299) and Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pKV276/KV4830). Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.
B. SypG-induced *syp* transcription from P*sypA*-*lacZ* reporter strains. Cultures of *sypG* overexpressing strains Δ*sypE* *att*Tn*7*::P*sypA*-*lacZ* (white bars; pEAH73/KV4926) and Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* *att*Tn*7*::P*sypA*-*lacZ* (grey bars; pEAH73/KV5516) were inoculated in LBS containing Tet and grown at 28°C with shaking. Samples were collected at 12 and 24 h and assessed for β-galactosidase activity (in Miller units) as a measure of promoter activity. All experiments were performed in triplicate. Data are a combination of two independent experiments with error bars representing the standard error. The *P*-value refers to the variation between the two samples as indicated by the brackets.

luxU⁺ strains that overexpressed the wild-type allele of *sypG*. Loss of LuxU resulted in a decrease in *syp* transcription at two time points tested (12 and 24 h) (Fig. 9B). Thus, these data suggest that LuxU functions at or above the level of *syp* transcription, potentially due to an impact on SypG activation (Fig. 1B).

Discussion

In this study, we identified a novel connection between the Lux pathway and biofilm formation in *V. fischeri*. Specifically, we found that disruption of either the gene encoding the SK LuxQ or the gene encoding the phosphotransferase

LuxU caused a delay in SypG-induced biofilm formation. Surprisingly, this effect was independent of LuxO, which exerted only a minor impact on biofilm formation. However, LuxU does seem to function through LuxO to regulate bioluminescence. Thus, the Lux pathway appears to branch at LuxU to regulate bioluminescence through LuxO and biofilm formation via a SypG-dependent pathway.

From the data presented in this work, we propose a model in which LuxQ functions through LuxU to regulate *syp*-dependent biofilm formation through activation of the RR SypG (Fig. 1B). Support for the idea that LuxQ and LuxU serve as phosphoryl-donors to a downstream regulator of biofilm formation is as follows: (i) the kinase activity of LuxQ is necessary to promote biofilm formation, (ii) the predicted, conserved site of phosphorylation in LuxU is necessary to regulate biofilm formation, (iii) the only known role of LuxU in the literature is as a histidine phosphotransferase (HPt) (Freeman and Bassler, 1999b; Shikuma *et al.*, 2009), (iv) LuxQ depends on LuxU to regulate biofilm formation, and (v) the downstream RR of the Lux pathway, LuxO, is not required for the effect of LuxU on biofilm formation. Together, these data suggest that phospho-transfer is necessary for LuxQ and LuxU to regulate biofilm formation via a regulator distinct from LuxO. In support of the idea that LuxU serves as an input to regulate the activity of the RR SypG, we found that: (i) a 'constitutively active' allele of SypG overcomes the requirement for LuxU, and (ii) LuxU functions at or above the level of *syp* transcription. Overall, these data suggest that LuxU functions at or above the level of SypG, potentially at the level of SypG phosphorylation. This possibility is further supported by the fact that SypG and LuxO have similar domain structures (both are σ⁵⁴-dependent RRs) and exhibit 50% identity to each other. However, proof of such a possibility awaits additional biochemical experimentation; to date, attempts to examine the phosphorylation state of SypG have been unsuccessful. Thus, while our data support the hypothesis that LuxU could serve as a phosphoryl-donor to SypG, the regulation is clearly complex and may include currently unknown regulators.

It has been previously proposed, in two other *Vibrio* species, that LuxU can function independently of LuxO to control the activity of downstream targets of the Lux pathway. The first example is from the fish pathogen *V. anguillarum*. In this organism, VanU functions through VanO to regulate the expression of the LuxR_VH homologue, VanT, by activating expression of *qrr1-4* (Croxatto *et al.*, 2004). VanU also appears to act through a VanO-independent mechanism to inhibit the expression of *qrr1-4* (Croxatto *et al.*, 2004; Weber *et al.*, 2011). Weber *et al.* (2011) thus hypothesize that VanU functions through another RR to repress expression of *qrr1-4*. Similarly, in *Vibrio alginolyticus*, Liu *et al.* (2011) propose that LuxU functions, at least in part, independently of LuxO to control expression of a

downstream regulator, LuxT, likely through another RR. However, in neither case has a downstream RR been identified.

There are at least a couple of examples in the literature in which a single domain HPt protein interacts with more than one target RR. *Caulobacter crescentus* ChpT is one such example. ChpT phosphorylates the RRs CtrA and CpdR with equal affinity *in vitro* (Biondi *et al.*, 2006); these phosphorylation events are critical during cell cycle progression. Phosphorylation of CtrA activates this protein, permitting it to bind DNA and control, among other things, DNA replication (Domian *et al.*, 1997; Quon *et al.*, 1998; Jacobs *et al.*, 2003). In contrast, it is the unphosphorylated form of CpdR that is active; in this state, CpdR indirectly promotes degradation of (unphosphorylated) CtrA (Iniesta *et al.*, 2006), permitting the cell to replicate its DNA. Thus, the same phosphorelay controls two separate RRs to exert opposite effects on protein activity.

Another well-studied example of an HPt protein interacting with two RRs occurs in the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. In this organism, the HPt protein YPD1 serves as a phosphoryl-donor to the RRs SSK1 and SKN7 under hypo-osmotic conditions (Li *et al.*, 1998). However, YPD1 interacts differently with each RR. For example, YPD1 stabilizes the phosphorylated state of the RR SSK1 via protein–protein interactions, but does not form stable complexes with the RR SNK1 (Janiak-Spens *et al.*, 2000). Phosphorylation of SSK1 inactivates this regulator until the cell experiences hyperosmotic conditions, in which case SSK1 is rapidly dephosphorylated and activates a downstream pathway involved in controlling osmotic stress genes (Posas *et al.*, 1996; Posas and Saito, 1998). In contrast, phosphorylation of SNK1 promotes activation of a downstream pathway involved in controlling genes for the cell wall and cell cycle (Morgan *et al.*, 1995; Li *et al.*, 1998; Bouquin *et al.*, 1999). These activities of YPD1 allow for the co-ordinated regulation of multiple pathways in *S. cerevisiae*. It is possible that LuxU similarly provides a mechanism for co-ordination of two distinct pathways in *V. fischeri*.

One question that remains is why only the kinase activity of LuxQ, but not its phosphatase activity, is important for biofilm formation. Furthermore, making LuxQ a 'constitutive' kinase through three predicted routes (LuxQ-A216P mutation, deletion of *luxP* or deletion of *luxS*) did not (reproducibly, in the case of LuxQ-A216P) promote accelerated biofilm formation by *V. fischeri* (Figs 4D and S2, and V. A. Ray and K. L. Visick, unpubl. data). Potentially, similar to the yeast system described above, LuxU could interact differently with LuxO and SypG, serving as a phosphoryl-donor to both, but only removing the phosphoryl groups from LuxO. Additional work is necessary to better understand the role of the Lux pathway in influencing biofilm formation.

Our work provides insight into the control of biofilm formation by *V. fischeri*, but also challenges the current model of how the Lux pathway regulates bioluminescence in *V. fischeri*. While LuxP, LuxQ, LuxU and LuxO appeared to function to regulate bioluminescence as predicted [or as previously shown for LuxO (Miyamoto *et al.*, 2000)] (Figs 1B and 3B and D), the SK AinR did not. Loss of AinR led to a slight decrease in luminescence compared to the control strain (Figs 3F and S5), while loss of both AinR and LuxU resulted in an intermediate level of luminescence (Fig. 3F). However, the decreased luminescence of the *ainR* and *ainR luxU* mutants could be overcome by the addition of exogenous C8-HSL, which is normally produced by the AI synthase AinS. From these data, we conclude that deletion of *ainR* impacts expression of the gene encoding *ainS* (located directly upstream of *ainR*), and that loss of AinR itself has little impact on bioluminescence. Furthermore, it seems possible that AinR may not function through the known phosphorelay, or at least not through LuxU, to control bioluminescence. These data are not inconsistent with those reported by Lyell *et al.*, who showed that, on solid media, loss of AinS resulted in an increased luminescence phenotype that did not depend on AinR function (Lyell *et al.*, 2010). Thus, additional work is necessary to understand what role AinR may have in controlling this process in *V. fischeri*.

If AinR does not function through the known phosphorelay to regulate bioluminescence, does LuxQ serve as the only input? Our data suggest that this is not the case: loss of LuxU resulted in a greater increase in luminescence than did the loss of LuxQ (Fig. 3B). In both *V. cholerae* and *V. harveyi*, three SKs feed into LuxU (LuxQ, CqsS and VpsS, and LuxQ, LuxN and CqsS respectively) (Ng and Bassler, 2009). In *V. fischeri*, no gene for CqsS exists, but one for VpsS is present (Shikuma *et al.*, 2009). Thus, it is possible that VpsS may also feed into LuxU and serve as another input to regulate light production and possibly biofilm formation. Identifying a missing SK(s) would be an interesting future direction.

This is the first study to examine the role of RscS in biofilm formation under SypG-inducing conditions (overexpression of *sypG* in a Δ*sypE* background). Previous studies have already demonstrated that RscS functions upstream of SypG to induce *syp* transcription in a manner that depends on *sypG* (Hussa *et al.*, 2008) and that RscS is critical in symbiotic biofilm (aggregate) formation and colonization (Visick and Skoufos, 2001; Yip *et al.*, 2006); however, these previous studies have only explored how overexpression of *rscS* impacts biofilm formation or how its loss impacts colonization. Our findings indicate that LuxU is more important than RscS for biofilm formation under the conditions we used here. In contrast to these results, our preliminary data for the impact of a *luxU* mutation on the ability of *V. fischeri* to colonize squid

Table 1. *V. fischeri* strains used in this study.

Strains	Relevant genotype	Reference
CL42	*luxO*::*kan*	Lupp *et al.* (2003)
ES114	Wild-type	Boettcher and Ruby (1990)
KV3299	Δ*sypE*	Hussa *et al.* (2008)
KV4390	Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*erm*	Morris *et al.* (2011)
KV4430	*luxP*::Tn*5* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV4431	*luxQ*::Tn*5* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV4432	*luxQ*::Tn*5* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV4828	*luxO*::*kan* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV4830	Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV4926	Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::P$_{sypA}$-*lacZ* (Erm^r)	This study
KV5347	Δ*luxP* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV5394	Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV5468	Δ*luxO* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV5472	Δ*luxO* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV5516	Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::P$_{sypA}$-*lacZ* (Erm^r)	This study
KV5872	*syp*::Tn*5* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV5902	Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-FLAG*	This study
KV5903	Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-H378A-FLAG*	This study
KV5904	Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG*	This study
KV5905	Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxU-FLAG*	This study
KV5906	Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxU-H61A-FLAG*	This study
KV5973	Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*erm*	This study
KV5974	Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*erm*	This study
KV6008	Δ*luxQ* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV6054	Δ*luxQ* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE att*Tn*7*::*luxQ-A216P-FLAG*	This study
KV6196	Δ*ainR* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV6259	Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV6268	Δ*rscS* Δ*sypE*	This study
KV6269	Δ*rscS* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE*	This study

revealed, at most, a mild defect due to loss of LuxU (V. A. Ray and K. L. Visick, unpubl. data). These data suggest, perhaps not surprisingly, that our biofilm-inducing (*sypG* overexpression) conditions do not fully reflect the dynamics in nature (during colonization). It is of interest to note, however, that not all symbiosis-competent strains of *V. fischeri* encode a functional RscS protein (Mandel *et al.*, 2009; Gyllborg *et al.*, 2012). Therefore, it is not unreasonable to imagine that another pathway such as Lux could contribute to *syp* induction and biofilm formation during colonization. This work thus provides an important framework for deepening our understanding of the complex regulatory control over processes critical to colonization by *V. fischeri*.

Experimental procedures

Bacterial strains and media

Vibrio fischeri strains utilized in this study are shown in Table 1. Strains used in this study were derived from strain ES114, a bacterial isolate from *E. scolopes* (Boettcher and Ruby, 1990). For routine culturing, *V. fischeri* strains were grown in LBS (Luria–Bertani salt) medium (Graf *et al.*, 1994). For luminescence studies, *V. fischeri* strains were grown in Sea Water Tryptone (SWT) (Yip *et al.*, 2005) and SWTO (Bose *et al.*, 2007). All derivatives of *V. fischeri* were gener-

ated via conjugation, as previously described (DeLoney *et al.*, 2002). *Escherichia coli* strains GT115 (InvivoGen, San Diego, CA, USA), Tam1 λ pir (Active Motif, Carlsbad, CA, USA), β3914 (Le Roux *et al.*, 2007), π3813 (Le Roux *et al.*, 2007) and CC118 (Herrero *et al.*, 1990) were used for cloning and conjugation. All *E. coli* strains were grown in Luria–Bertani medium (Davis *et al.*, 1980). Solid media were made using agar to a final concentration of 1.5%. Antibiotics were added to cultures when appropriate to the following final concentrations: ampicillin (Ap) at 100 μg ml^{-1} (*E. coli*), tetracycline (Tet) at 15 μg ml^{-1} (*E. coli*) or 5 μg ml^{-1} (*V. fischeri*), chloramphenicol (Cm) at 20 or 25 μg ml^{-1} (*E. coli*) or 5 μg ml^{-1} (*V. fischeri*), kanamycin (Kan) at 50 μg ml^{-1} (*E. coli*) or 100 μg ml^{-1} (*V. fischeri*) and erythromycin (Erm) at 5 μg ml^{-1} (*V. fischeri*). Along with any necessary antibiotics, diaminopimelate (DAP) was added to a final concentration of 0.3 mM for *E. coli* strain β3914 and thymidine was added to a final concentration of 0.3 mM for *E. coli* strain π3813.

Transposon mutagenesis and identification of mutants with wrinkling defects

Transposon mutants were generated as described previously (Lyell *et al.*, 2008). Briefly, plasmid pEVS170, containing the mini-Tn*5* transposon, was introduced into *V. fischeri* strain KV3299 via conjugation. Ex-conjugates were then pooled and the *sypG* overexpression plasmid pEAH73 was introduced via conjugation. The resultant ex-conjugates were then screened for their ability to form wrinkled colonies. Any mutants found to

Table 2. Plasmids used in this study.

Plasmids	Description	Source or reference
pEAH73	pKV69 carrying wild-type *sypG*; Cm^r Tet^r	Hussa *et al.* (2008)
pEAH90	pEVS107 the P$_{sypA}$ promoter region (generated with primers 714 and 782) upstream of promoterless *lacZ*	This study
pEVS104	Conjugal helper plasmid (*tra trb*); Kan^r	Stabb and Ruby (2002)
pEVS107	Mini-Tn7 delivery plasmid; *oriR6K*, *mob*; Kan^r, Erm^r	McCann *et al.* (2003)
pJET1.2	Commercial cloning vector; Ap^r	Fermentas
pKV69	Mobilizable vector; Cm^r Tet^r	Visick and Skoufos (2001)
pKV276	pEAH73 with D53E mutation in *sypG*; Cm^r Tet^r	Hussa *et al.* (2008)
pKV363	Mobilizable suicide vector; Cm^r	Shibata and Visick (2012)
pKV456	pKV363 containing 1.1 kb sequence flanking *rscS* using primers 1494-97	This study
pSW7848	Mobilizable suicide vector; Cm^r	Marie-Eve Val
pVAR17	pSW7848 containing 2 kb sequence flanking *sypE* derived from pCLD19 (Hussa *et al.*, 2008)	This study
pVAR18	pSW7848 containing 3.3 kb sequence flanking *luxU* using primers 995, 996, 1017 and 1018	This study
pVAR29	pKV363 containing 850 bp sequencing flanking *luxQ* using primers 1286, 1287, 1288 and 1304	This study
pVAR30	pKV363 containing 1.1 kb sequence flanking *luxP* using primers 1282, 1283, 1284 and 1303	This study
pVAR36	pKV363 containing 1.1 kb sequence flanking *luxO* using primers 1319, 1320, 1344 and 1345	This study
pVAR37	pKV363 containing 1.1 kb sequence flanking *luxO* and *luxU* using primers 1319, 1321, 1344 and 1346	This study
pVAR52	pEVS107 with P$_{lacZ}$ containing 2.3 kb *luxQ*-FLAG allele using primers 1314 and 1437	This study
pVAR53	pEVS107 with P$_{lacZ}$ containing 2.3 kb *luxQ-A216P*-FLAG allele using primers 849 and 1425	This study
pVAR54	pEVS107 with P$_{lacZ}$ containing 2.3 kb *luxQ-H378A*-FLAG allele using primers 849 and 1426	This study
pVAR55	pEVS107 with P$_{lacZ}$ containing 400 bp *luxU*-FLAG allele using primers 1312 and 1422	This study
pVAR56	pEVS107 with P$_{lacZ}$ containing 400 bp *luxU-H61A*-FLAG allele using primers 849 and 1427	This study
pVAR62	pKV363 containing 1.1 kb sequence flanking *ainR* using primers 1323 and pr_NL35 (Lyell *et al.*, 2010)	This study

be defective for wrinkled colony formation after 2 days were then cured of their *sypG* overexpression plasmid and the plasmid was reintroduced. Any mutant that still exhibited a defect was subject to further analysis as described below.

Southern blot analysis

Southern blot analysis was performed as described previously (Visick and Skoufos, 2001; Yip *et al.*, 2005), except that chromosomal DNA was digested with KpnI and probed for the *syp* locus or with PstI and probed for Tn sequences. All Tn mutants exhibited a pattern consistent with only one Tn insertion.

Molecular techniques

All plasmids were constructed using standard molecular biological techniques, with restriction and modification enzymes obtained from New England Biolabs (Beverly, MA, USA) or Fermentas (Glen Burnie, MD, USA). Plasmids utilized in this study are shown in Table 2. To identify the site of insertion of the three non-*syp* Tn mutants, we cloned the Tn, with flanking DNA, as previously described (Lyell *et al.*, 2008). Unmarked deletions in *V. fischeri* were generated as previously described (Le Roux *et al.*, 2007; Shibata and Visick, 2012). *V. fischeri* ES114 was used as the template in PCR amplifications to obtain the DNA containing or flanking the genes of interest using primers listed in Table S1. PCR products were cloned into the pJET1.2 cloning vector (Fermentas, Glen Burnie, MD, USA) or pCR1.2-TOPO (Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY, USA), then subcloned into appropriate final vectors using standard molecular techniques. Site-directed

mutagenesis was performed using the QuikChange Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene, La Jolla, CA, USA). For complementation in single copy from the chromosome, *luxQ* and *luxU* alleles were cloned downstream of a P$_{lacZ}$ promoter in the mini-Tn7 delivery vector pEVS107. Insertion at the Tn7 site of the chromosome was performed via tetraparental mating, as previously described (McCann *et al.*, 2003). All plasmids constructed in this study were sequenced at the Genomics Core Facility at the Center for Genetic Medicine at Northwestern University (Chicago, IL, USA) or ACGT (Wheeling, IL, USA) to ensure that the insertion contained the desired sequence or mutation.

Luminescence assays

Vibrio fischeri cultures were grown in SWT overnight at 24°C with shaking, then diluted to an optical density at 600 nm (OD$_{600}$) of ~0.01 in 30 ml of SWTO and incubated at 24°C with vigorous shaking. Samples were taken every 30–60 min. At each time point, bioluminescence (using a Turner Designs TD-20/20 luminometer at the factory settings and a large, clear scintillation vial) and OD$_{600}$ (using a cuvette) were measured for each sample. Maximum luminescence was observed at OD$_{600}$ measurements between 1.5 and 2 for all strains. Specific luminescence was calculated as relative luminescence (the relative light units of 1 ml of culture integrated over a 6 s count) divided by the OD$_{600}$.

Wrinkled colony assays

Vibrio fischeri strains were cultured overnight at 28°C with shaking in LBS containing Tet, then subcultured 1:100 into

fresh LBS containing Tet and grown under the same conditions for 3 to 4 h the next day. Subcultures were standardized to an OD_{600} of 0.2 and 10 μl aliquots were spotted onto LBS agar plates containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Spotted cultures were then monitored from the time the start of wrinkled colony formation became apparent to the point at which wrinkled colony development ceased or the appropriate data set was collected. Each set of strains for a particular experiment was spotted onto the same plate to account for any minor plate-to-plate variations. Each assay was performed at least two to three times, and most were done much more than three times. To ensure that cultures spotted at an OD_{600} of 0.2 resulted in the same number of cells inoculated per spot, we evaluated the correlation between cell number and OD. Specifically, we determined the cell number of the pEAH73-containing strains $\Delta sypE$, $\Delta sypE$ $\Delta luxU$, $\Delta sypE$ $\Delta luxQ$ and $\Delta sypE$ $\Delta ainR$ using cultures normalized to an OD_{600} of 0.2, and found no significant difference in the number of colony-forming units obtained from dilutions of the normalized cultures of these strains.

β-Galactosidase assay

Cultures of the reporter strains KV4926 and KV5516 carrying the *sypG* overexpression plasmid pEAH73 were grown in LBS containing Tet at 28°C with shaking. Samples (50 μl) were collected at 12 and 24 h and 50 μl of Pierce β-galactosidase Assay Reagent (Pierce Biotechnology, Rockford, IL, USA) were added to each sample. Measurements were taken in a microtitre dish using an ELx800 Absorbance Microplate Reader (BioTek, Winooski, VT, USA) with the appropriate settings. β-Galactosidase activity was determined as previously described (Miller, 1972). *P*-values were calculated using the student's *t*-test.

Acknowledgements

References

Bassler, B.L., Wright, M., and Silverman, M.R. (1994) Multiple signalling systems controlling expression of luminescence in *Vibrio harveyi*: sequence and function of genes encoding a second sensory pathway. *Mol Microbiol* **13:** 273–286.

Biondi, E.G., Skerker, J.M., Arif, M., Prasol, M.S., Perchuk, B.S., and Laub, M.T. (2006) A phosphorelay system controls stalk biogenesis during cell cycle progression in *Caulobacter crescentus*. *Mol Microbiol* **59:** 386–401.

Boettcher, K.J., and Ruby, E.G. (1990) Depressed light emission by symbiotic *Vibrio fischeri* of the sepiolid squid *Euprymna scolopes*. *J Bacteriol* **172:** 3701–3706.

Bose, J.L., Kim, U., Bartkowski, W., Gunsalus, R.P., Overley, A.M., Lyell, N.L., *et al.* (2007) Bioluminescence in *Vibrio fischeri* is controlled by the redox-responsive regulator ArcA. *Mol Microbiol* **65:** 538–553.

Bouquin, N., Johnson, A.L., Morgan, B.A., and Johnston, L.H. (1999) Association of the cell cycle transcription factor Mbp1 with the Skn7 response regulator in budding yeast. *Mol Biol Cell* **10:** 3389–3400.

Cao, X., Studer, S.V., Wassarman, K., Zhang, Y., Ruby, E.G., and Miyashiro, T. (2012) The novel sigma factor-like regulator RpoQ controls luminescence, chitinase activity, and motility in *Vibrio fischeri*. *MBio* **3:** e00285-00211.

Croxatto, A., Chalker, V.J., Lauritz, J., Jass, J., Hardman, A., Williams, P., *et al.* (2002) VanT, a homologue of *Vibrio harveyi* LuxR, regulates serine, metalloprotease, pigment, and biofilm production in *Vibrio anguillarum*. *J Bacteriol* **184:** 1617–1629.

Croxatto, A., Pride, J., Hardman, A., Williams, P., Camara, M., and Milton, D.L. (2004) A distinctive dual-channel quorum-sensing system operates in *Vibrio anguillarum*. *Mol Microbiol* **52:** 1677–1689.

Davis, R.W., Botstein, D., and Roth, J.R. (1980) *Advanced Bacterial Genetics*. Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.

DeLoney, C.R., Bartley, T.M., and Visick, K.L. (2002) Role for phosphoglucomutase in *Vibrio fischeri–Euprymna scolopes* symbiosis. *J Bacteriol* **184:** 5121–5129.

Domian, I.J., Quon, K.C., and Shapiro, L. (1997) Cell type-specific phosphorylation and proteolysis of a transcriptional regulator controls the G1-to-S transition in a bacterial cell cycle. *Cell* **90:** 415–424.

Egland, K.A., and Greenberg, E.P. (2000) Conversion of the *Vibrio fischeri* transcriptional activator, LuxR, to a repressor. *J Bacteriol* **182:** 805–811.

Enos-Berlage, J.L., Guvener, Z.T., Keenan, C.E., and McCarter, L.L. (2005) Genetic determinants of biofilm development of opaque and translucent *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*. *Mol Microbiol* **55:** 1160–1182.

Fidopiastis, P.M., Miyamoto, C.M., Jobling, M.G., Meighen, E.A., and Ruby, E.G. (2002) LitR, a new transcriptional activator in *Vibrio fischeri*, regulates luminescence and symbiotic light organ colonization. *Mol Microbiol* **45:** 131–143.

Freeman, J.A., and Bassler, B.L. (1999a) A genetic analysis of the function of LuxO, a two-component response regulator involved in quorum sensing in *Vibrio harveyi*. *Mol Microbiol* **31:** 665–677.

Freeman, J.A., and Bassler, B.L. (1999b) Sequence and function of LuxU: a two-component phosphorelay protein that regulates quorum sensing in *Vibrio harveyi*. *J Bacteriol* **181:** 899–906.

Gilson, L., Kuo, A., and Dunlap, P.V. (1995) AinS and a new family of autoinducer synthesis proteins. *J Bacteriol* **177:** 6946–6951.

Graf, J., Dunlap, P.V., and Ruby, E.G. (1994) Effect of transposon-induced motility mutations on colonization of the host light organ by *Vibrio fischeri*. *J Bacteriol* **176:** 6986–6991.

Gyllborg, M.C., Sahl, J.W., Cronin, D.C., 3rd, Rasko, D.A., and Mandel, M.J. (2012) Draft genome sequence of *Vibrio fischeri* SR5, a strain isolated from the light organ of the

Mediterranean squid *Sepiola robusta*. *J Bacteriol* **194:** 1639.

Hammer, B.K., and Bassler, B.L. (2003) Quorum sensing controls biofilm formation in *Vibrio cholerae*. *Mol Microbiol* **50:** 101–104.

Herrero, M., de Lorenzo, V., and Timmis, K.N. (1990) Transposon vectors containing non-antibiotic resistance selection markers for cloning and stable chromosomal insertion of foreign genes in gram-negative bacteria. *J Bacteriol* **172:** 6557–6567.

Hussa, E.A., O'Shea, T.M., Darnell, C.L., Ruby, E.G., and Visick, K.L. (2007) Two-component response regulators of *Vibrio fischeri*: identification, mutagenesis, and characterization. *J Bacteriol* **189:** 5825–5838.

Hussa, E.A., Darnell, C.L., and Visick, K.L. (2008) RscS functions upstream of SypG to control the *syp* locus and biofilm formation in *Vibrio fischeri*. *J Bacteriol* **190:** 4576–4583.

Iniesta, A.A., McGrath, P.T., Reisenauer, A., McAdams, H.H., and Shapiro, L. (2006) A phospho-signaling pathway controls the localization and activity of a protease complex critical for bacterial cell cycle progression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **103:** 10935–10940.

Jacobs, C., Ausmees, N., Cordwell, S.J., Shapiro, L., and Laub, M.T. (2003) Functions of the CckA histidine kinase in *Caulobacter* cell cycle control. *Mol Microbiol* **47:** 1279–1290.

Janiak-Spens, F., Sparling, D.P., and West, A.H. (2000) Novel role for an HPt domain in stabilizing the phosphorylated state of a response regulator domain. *J Bacteriol* **182:** 6673–6678.

Kuo, A., Callahan, S.M., and Dunlap, P.V. (1996) Modulation of luminescence operon expression by N-octanoyl-L-homoserine lactone in *ainS* mutants of *Vibrio fischeri*. *J Bacteriol* **178:** 971–976.

Le Roux, F., Binesse, J., Saulnier, D., and Mazel, D. (2007) Construction of a *Vibrio splendidus* mutant lacking the metalloprotease gene *vsm* by use of a novel counterselectable suicide vector. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **73:** 777–784.

Lee, J.H., Rhee, J.E., Park, U., Ju, H.M., Lee, B.C., Kim, T.S., *et al.* (2007) Identification and functional analysis of *Vibrio vulnificus* SmcR, a novel global regulator. *J Microbiol Biotechnol* **17:** 325–334.

Li, S., Ault, A., Malone, C.L., Raitt, D., Dean, S., Johnston, L.H., *et al.* (1998) The yeast histidine protein kinase, Sln1p, mediates phosphotransfer to two response regulators, Ssk1p and Skn7p. *EMBO J* **17:** 6952–6962.

Liu, H., Gu, D., Cao, X., Liu, Q., Wang, Q., and Zhang, Y. (2011) Characterization of a new quorum sensing regulator *luxT* and its roles in the extracellular protease production, motility, and virulence in fish pathogen *Vibrio alginolyticus*. *Arch Microbiol* **194:** 439–452.

Lupp, C., and Ruby, E.G. (2005) *Vibrio fischeri* uses two quorum-sensing systems for the regulation of early and late colonization factors. *J Bacteriol* **187:** 3620–3629.

Lupp, C., Urbanowski, M., Greenberg, E.P., and Ruby, E.G. (2003) The *Vibrio fischeri* quorum-sensing systems *ain* and *lux* sequentially induce luminescence gene expression and are important for persistence in the squid host. *Mol Microbiol* **50:** 319–331.

Lyell, N.L., Dunn, A.K., Bose, J.L., Vescovi, S.L., and Stabb, E.V. (2008) Effective mutagenesis of *Vibrio fischeri* by using hyperactive mini-Tn*5* derivatives. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **74:** 7059–7063.

Lyell, N.L., Dunn, A.K., Bose, J.L., and Stabb, E.V. (2010) Bright mutants of *Vibrio fischeri* ES114 reveal conditions and regulators that control bioluminescence and expression of the *lux* operon. *J Bacteriol* **192:** 5103–5114.

McCann, J., Stabb, E.V., Millikan, D.S., and Ruby, E.G. (2003) Population dynamics of *Vibrio fischeri* during infection of *Euprymna scolopes*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **69:** 5928–5934.

Mandel, M.J., Wollenberg, M.S., Stabb, E.V., Visick, K.L., and Ruby, E.G. (2009) A single regulatory gene is sufficient to alter bacterial host range. *Nature* **458:** 215–218.

Miller, J.H. (1972) *Experiments in Molecular Genetics*. Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.

Milton, D.L. (2006) Quorum sensing in vibrios: complexity for diversification. *Int J Med Microbiol* **296:** 61–71.

Miyamoto, C.M., Lin, Y.H., and Meighen, E.A. (2000) Control of bioluminescence in *Vibrio fischeri* by the LuxO signal response regulator. *Mol Microbiol* **36:** 594–607.

Miyamoto, C.M., Dunlap, P.V., Ruby, E.G., and Meighen, E.A. (2003) LuxO controls *luxR* expression in *Vibrio harveyi*: evidence for a common regulatory mechanism in *Vibrio*. *Mol Microbiol* **48:** 537–548.

Miyashiro, T., and Ruby, E.G. (2012) Shedding light on bioluminescence regulation in *Vibrio fischeri*. *Mol Microbiol* **84:** 795–806.

Miyashiro, T., Wollenberg, M.S., Cao, X., Oehlert, D., and Ruby, E.G. (2010) A single *qrr* gene is necessary and sufficient for LuxO-mediated regulation in *Vibrio fischeri*. *Mol Microbiol* **77:** 1556–1567.

Morgan, B.A., Bouquin, N., Merrill, G.F., and Johnston, L.H. (1995) A yeast transcription factor bypassing the requirement for SBF and DSC1/MBF in budding yeast has homology to bacterial signal transduction proteins. *EMBO J* **14:** 5679–5689.

Morris, A.R., Darnell, C.L., and Visick, K.L. (2011) Inactivation of a novel response regulator is necessary for biofilm formation and host colonization by *Vibrio fischeri*. *Mol Microbiol* **82:** 114–130.

Neiditch, M.B., Federle, M.J., Miller, S.T., Bassler, B.L., and Hughson, F.M. (2005) Regulation of LuxPQ receptor activity by the quorum-sensing signal autoinducer-2. *Mol Cell* **18:** 507–518.

Neiditch, M.B., Federle, M.J., Pompeani, A.J., Kelly, R.C., Swem, D.L., Jeffrey, P.D., *et al.* (2006) Ligand-induced asymmetry in histidine sensor kinase complex regulates quorum sensing. *Cell* **126:** 1095–1108.

Ng, W.L., and Bassler, B.L. (2009) Bacterial quorum-sensing network architectures. *Annu Rev Genet* **43:** 197–222.

Posas, F., and Saito, H. (1998) Activation of the yeast SSK2 MAP kinase kinase kinase by the SSK1 two-component response regulator. *EMBO J* **17:** 1385–1394.

Posas, F., Wurgler-Murphy, S.M., Maeda, T., Witten, E.A., Thai, T.C., and Saito, H. (1996) Yeast HOG1 MAP kinase cascade is regulated by a multistep phosphorelay mechanism in the SLN1-YPD1-SSK1 'two-component' osmosensor. *Cell* **86:** 865–875.

Quon, K.C., Yang, B., Domian, I.J., Shapiro, L., and Marc-

zynski, G.T. (1998) Negative control of bacterial DNA replication by a cell cycle regulatory protein that binds at the chromosome origin. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **95:** 120–125.

Sanders, D.A., Gillece-Castro, B.L., Stock, A.M., Burlingame, A.L., and Koshland, D.E., Jr (1989) Identification of the site of phosphorylation of the chemotaxis response regulator protein, CheY. *J Biol Chem* **264:** 21770–21778.

Sanders, D.A., Gillece-Castro, B.L., Burlingame, A.L., and Koshland, D.E., Jr (1992) Phosphorylation site of NtrC, a protein phosphatase whose covalent intermediate activates transcription. *J Bacteriol* **174:** 5117–5122.

Shibata, S., and Visick, K.L. (2012) Sensor kinase RscS induces the production of antigenically distinct outer membrane vesicles that depend on the symbiosis polysaccharide locus in *Vibrio fischeri. J Bacteriol* **194:** 185–194.

Shikuma, N.J., Fong, J.C., Odell, L.S., Perchuk, B.S., Laub, M.T., and Yildiz, F.H. (2009) Overexpression of VpsS, a hybrid sensor kinase, enhances biofilm formation in *Vibrio cholerae. J Bacteriol* **191:** 5147–5158.

Sitnikov, D.M., Schineller, J.B., and Baldwin, T.O. (1995) Transcriptional regulation of bioluminesence genes from *Vibrio fischeri. Mol Microbiol* **17:** 801–812.

Stabb, E., Schaefer, A., Bose, J.L., and Ruby, E.G. (2008) Quorum signalling and symbiosis in the marine luminous bacterium *Vibrio fischeri*. In *Chemical Communication among Bacteria*. Winans, S.C., and Bassler, B.L. (eds). Washington, D.C.: ASM Press, pp. 233–250.

Stabb, E.V., and Ruby, E.G. (2002) RP4-based plasmids for conjugation between *Escherichia coli* and members of the *Vibrionaceae. Methods Enzymol* **358:** 413–426.

Stevens, A.M., Dolan, K.M., and Greenberg, E.P. (1994) Synergistic binding of the *Vibrio fischeri* LuxR transcriptional activator domain and RNA polymerase to the *lux* promoter region. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **91:** 12619–12623.

Stock, A.M., Robinson, V.L., and Goudreau, P.N. (2000) Two-component signal transduction. *Annu Rev Biochem* **69:** 183–215.

Studer, S.V., Mandel, M.J., and Ruby, E.G. (2008) AinS quorum sensing regulates the *Vibrio fischeri* acetate switch. *J Bacteriol* **190:** 5915–5923.

Visick, K.L. (2005) Layers of signaling in a bacterium-host association. *J Bacteriol* **187:** 3603–3606.

Visick, K.L., and Skoufos, L.M. (2001) Two-component sensor required for normal symbiotic colonization of *Euprymna scolopes* by *Vibrio fischeri. J Bacteriol* **183:** 835–842.

Weber, B., Lindell, K., El Qaidi, S., Hjerde, E., Willassen, N.P., and Milton, D.L. (2011) The phosphotransferase VanU represses expression of four *qrr* genes antagonizing VanO-mediated quorum-sensing regulation in *Vibrio anguillarum. Microbiology* **157:** 3324–3339.

West, A.H., and Stock, A.M. (2001) Histidine kinases and response regulator proteins in two-component signaling systems. *Trends Biochem Sci* **26:** 369–376.

Yip, E.S., Grublesky, B.T., Hussa, E.A., and Visick, K.L. (2005) A novel, conserved cluster of genes promotes symbiotic colonization and sigma(54)-dependent biofilm formation by *Vibrio fischeri. Mol Microbiol* **57:** 1485–1498.

Yip, E.S., Geszvain, K., DeLoney-Marino, C.R., and Visick, K.L. (2006) The symbiosis regulator *rscS* controls the *syp* gene locus, biofilm formation and symbiotic aggregation by *Vibrio fischeri. Mol Microbiol* **62:** 1586–1600.

Zhang, Y., Qiu, Y., Tan, Y., Guo, Z., Yang, R., and Zhou, D. (2012) Transcriptional regulation of *opaR*, *qrr2-4* and *aphA* by the master quorum-sensing regulator OpaR in *Vibrio parahaemolyticus. PLoS ONE* **7:** e34622.

Supporting information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article.

Supporting Information

LuxU Connects Quorum Sensing to Biofilm Formation in *Vibrio fischeri*

Valerie A. Ray and Karen L. Visick*

Department of Microbiology and Immunology

Loyola University Medical Center

Maywood, IL

*Corresponding author

Mailing address:

Karen L. Visick

2160 S. First Ave. Bldg. 105, Rm. 3933

Department of Microbiology and Immunology

Loyola University Medical Center

Maywood, IL 60153

(708) 216-0869

(708) 216-0869 (Fax)

kvisick@lumc.edu

Fig. S1

A

B

C

Fig. S1. Luminescence of ES114, Δ*sypE,* and Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* in culture. Cultures were grown in SWTO and incubated at 24˚C with vigorous shaking. Luminescence and OD_{600} were measured over time until maximum luminescence was achieved for the following strains: ES114 (black circles), Δ*sypE* (black squares; KV3299), and Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (black triangles; KV4830). (A) Data are plotted as specific luminescence (Sp. lum.; relative luminescence divided by OD_{600}) versus OD_{600}. The inset depicts a close-up of the luminescence levels of ES114 and Δ*sypE* to show the error bars. (B) Data are plotted as luminescence divided by OD at one time point around maximal luminescence (OD ~1.5). (C) Data are plotted as luminescence divided by CFU at one time point around maximal luminescence (OD ~1.5), in which samples were taken and the CFUs were calculated. Samples were taken in triplicate for each strain, with the average and standard deviation (error bars) represented. These data are representative of 2 independent experiments.

Fig. S2

Fig. S2. Wrinkled colony formation by Δ*luxP*. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28˚C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 40 h post-spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE* control (pEAH73/KV3299) and Δ*luxP* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV5347). An * indicates the time at which wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

Fig. S3

Fig. S3. Wrinkled colony formation of *luxQ* and *luxU* mutants. Time-course assays of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28˚C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 45.5 h post-spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE* control (pEAH73/KV3299) (A), Δ*luxQ* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV5394) (B), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV4830) (C), and Δ*luxQ* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV6008) (D). An * indicates the time at which wrinkled colony formation was apparent, typically identified by the presence of ridges around the outer edge of the spot. Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

Fig. S4

Fig. S4. Western blot analysis of LuxU-FLAG and LuxU-H61A-FLAG. Cells extracts from Δ*luxU* (KV4830) expressing either *luxU-FLAG* from pVAR44 (lane 1) or *luxU-H61A-FLAG* from pVAR49 (lane 2) were probed with an anti-FLAG antibody. LuxU is predicted to be 13 kD. This blot is representative of three independent experiments.

Fig. S5

A

B

Fig. S5. Luminescence of *ainR* mutants in the presence and absence of C8-HSL. Cultures were grown in SWTO and incubated at 24˚C with vigorous shaking. Luminescence and OD_{600} were measured over time until maximum luminescence was achieved for the following strains: Δ*sypE* control (squares; KV3299), Δ*ainR* Δ*sypE* (circles; KV6169), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (triangles; KV4830), Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (diamonds; KV6259). (A) Luminescence in the absence of C8-HSL (black symbols). (B) Luminescence in the

presence of 120 nM C8-HSL (white symbols). The inset for panel A depicts a close-up of the luminescence levels between the Δ*sypE* control and Δ*ainR* Δ*sypE* mutant. The data for Δ*sypE* in panel A (black squares) is the same as those in panel B (black squares). Data are plotted as specific luminescence (Sp. Lum.; relative luminescence divided by OD_{600}) versus OD_{600} and are representative of at least 3 independent experiments.

Fig. S6

Fig. S6. Wrinkled colony formation by *ainR* mutants. Time-course assay of wrinkled colony formation induced by *sypG* overexpression using plasmid pEAH73. Cultures were spotted onto LBS medium containing Tet and incubated at 28°C. Wrinkled colony formation was monitored up to 49 h post-spotting for the following strains: Δ*sypE* control (pEAH73/KV3299), Δ*ainR* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV6196), Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV4830), and Δ*ainR* Δ*luxU* Δ*sypE* (pEAH73/KV6259). Data are representative of at least three independent experiments.

Experimental Procedures

Western blot analysis

To evaluate the levels of protein produced by the *luxU*-H61A mutant, we expressed epitope (FLAG)-tagged versions of this allele and the wild-type control from plasmids (pVAR44 and pVAR49, respectively) in the Δ*luxU* mutant (KV4830). Strains were grown overnight at 28˚C with shaking in LBS containing Tet. Samples were collected (1 ml) and pelleted, then resuspended in 500μl 2X SDS loading buffer (4% SDS, 10% 2-mercaptoethanol, 0.005% bromophenol blue, 20% glycerol, 0.1M Tris pH 7), boiled for 5 min, and then loaded onto a 15% SDS polyacrylamide gel. After electrophoresis, proteins were transferred to a polyvinylidene fluoride membrane and probed with anti-FLAG antibody (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO). Protein bands were visualized using a horseradish peroxidase-conjugated secondary antibody and ECL reagents (SuperSignal West Pico Chemiluminescent Substrate, Pierce Biotechnology, Rockford, IL).

Luminescence assays supplemented with N-*octanoyl-homoserine lactone (C8-HSL)*

V. fischeri cultures were grown in SWT overnight at 24˚C with shaking, then diluted to an optical density at 600 nm (OD_{600}) of ~0.01 in 30 ml of SWTO and incubated at 24˚C with vigorous shaking. Samples were taken every 30-60 minutes. At each time point, bioluminescence (using a Turner Designs TD-20/20 luminometer at the factory settings and a large, clear scintillation vial) and OD_{600} (using a cuvette) were measured for each sample. Maximum luminescence was observed at OD_{600} measurements between 1.5 and 2 for all strains. Specific luminescence was calculated as relative luminescence (the relative light units of 1 ml of culture integrated over a 6-second count) divided by the OD_{600}. For cultures supplemented with exogenous C8-HSL, we used 120 nM purified C8-HSL (Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) dissolved in a carrier (ethyl acetate and 0.01% (v/v) glacial acetic acid), which was spotted onto the bottom of the flask and allowed to dry before SWTO and cells were added. Addition of the carrier alone had no effect on growth or luminescence.

Table S1. Primers used in this study [1]

#	Primer
460	GCCTTGATAGGAGCATTATAATG
714	AAACTAGTCATTAACCGATGGCGTCCATATCACCTTGAA
782	AAGGGCCCCTCTTAAGTCGATTAATATTCTGCAAACTGCA
849	CCTGTGTGAAATTGTTATCCG
995	AGACATGCCTGAGGTTTCAT
996	CACTAATACTGACTTGTCCTG
998	aaaggatccTGCCATTGTTGCAAGCTTATCT
1017	aaaggatccTACTGACTCACGATAGTCCC
1018	aaaggatccAGATAAGCTTGCAACAATGGC
1123	GATAGTAAGAGTGGTGTAAAT
1160	taggcggccgcacttagtatgGATGCACTGAATAATTGAGATACC
1282	taggcggccgcacttagtatgTAAAACAGGATCAGCTAAAACCAG
1283	catactaagtgcggccgcctaGAACACTAGTAATGAATAAAGGT
1284	ATGCAACAATTCTACCTGAATC
1286	taggcggccgcacttagtatgGTAGGTATGTATGGTTATACCTAC
1287	catactaagtgcggccgcctaGACTCGTAATTAGCTTCGCTTAAC
1288	GCAATAGGATAGCTATCACCTTC
1303	CGTGGCATTTATTAGCTACTGGG
1304	GATATTGCTTTAGGTGCTATTGATG
1312	GAAAACTACAGTCTTGGAATG
1314	CTGGTGTAGAACACTAGTAATG
1319	taggcggccgcacttagtatgGGAAGCAGTATCTTCTACCAT
1320	catactaagtgcggccgcctaTGGAATGAAAGATAAGGGGAC
1321	catactaagtgcggccgcctaTAAATCAATAATCGCGTCTTTTAAC
1323	GATCCGTCGCTTAGATGAC
1344	CGTAAAGTTGTTGCACCTAAG
1345	GCAGGTAAGATGGATCATAGG
1346	GGTGAGCTGCACGGGCAC
1422	aaaaaggtaccttatttatcatcatcatctttataatcCTTAAGTAAGAGTTCTCGATAAG[1]
1425	GATAATAAGATATTAcCATCAAGTGTAAGTTCC
1426	TTAGCAAGAATGAGTgcTGAAATAAGAACGCCT
1427	GTAAGAGAGATTAGCgcTTGTCTGAAGAGTAGT
1437	aaaaaggtaccttatttatcatcatcatctttataatcCGAGTCAAAAGGTGGCAACCCG
1494	TACTGACGTATCCGTGTTGC
1495	GGCCGATGCTAAAGATTCAG
1496	taggcggccgcacttagtatgAATGATTGTGATAAGGCTATAACG
1497	catactaagtgcggccgcctaAAGTATGAAACACAATAAACTTCG

[1]Non-native sequences are shown in lower case