University of Dundee

Regulation of Protein Biosynthetic Activity During Growth Arrest

Bergkessel, Megan

Published in:
Current Opinion in Microbiology

DOI:
10.1016/j.mib.2020.07.010

Publication date:
2020

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal

Citation for published version (APA):
Bergkessel, M. (2020). Regulation of Protein Biosynthetic Activity During Growth Arrest. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*, *57*, 62-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2020.07.010

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 08. Dec. 2021

Title: Regulation of Protein Biosynthetic Activity During Growth Arrest

Megan Bergkessel

e-mail: mbergkessel001@dundee.ac.uk

postal address: University of Dundee, School of Life Sciences, Dow St., Dundee DD1 5EH, Scotland, UK

Division of Molecular Microbiology, School of Life Sciences, University of Dundee

Abstract: Heterotrophic bacteria grow and divide rapidly when resources are abundant. Yet resources are finite, and environments fluctuate, so bacteria need strategies to survive when nutrients become scarce. In fact, many bacteria spend most of their time in such conditions of nutrient limitation, and hence they need to optimise gene regulation and protein biosynthesis during growth arrest. An optimal strategy in these conditions must mitigate the challenges and risks of making new proteins, while the cell is severely limited for energy and substrates. Recently, ribosome abundance and activity were measured in these conditions, revealing very low amounts of new protein synthesis, which is nevertheless vital for survival. The underlying mechanisms are only now starting to be explored. Improving our understanding of the regulation of protein production during bacterial growth arrest could have important implications for a wide range of challenges, including the identification of new targets for antibiotic development.

What are the causes of growth arrest?

Many heterotrophic bacteria can grow and divide rapidly if their nutritional needs are met, but this condition is the exception, not the rule. Even in nutrient-rich environments, bacterial growth itself quickly depletes local resources and causes accumulation of waste products that inhibit further rapid growth. For example, many species form dense biofilm communities, which are held together by self-produced matrices, and which quickly become self-limiting. Experimental measurements and modelling in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilms suggest that at thicknesses greater than about 40-70 microns, metabolism of the biofilm cells completely depletes oxygen at the base of the biofilm, leading to near-zero growth rates[1,2]. Depending on the organism and environment, other macronutrients (e.g. carbon[3], nitrogen[4], or phosphorus[5]), or micronutrients (such as iron[6]) may become limiting first, but in all cases the lack of an essential substrate for new biosynthesis causes growth to stop. Outside of biofilms, heterotrophic bacteria often exist in low-nutrient environments that cause frequent growth arrest[7]. Other environmental stresses, such as reactive oxygen species, high osmolarity, and unfavourable temperature, can suppress growth by directly inhibiting ATP and/or protein synthesis[8-10]. Finally, bacteria (as well as fungi, plants, and animals) have evolved a wide array of weapons that specifically target the energy conservation or biosynthetic machinery of competing bacteria in order to inhibit their growth (for example, see [11]). All of these challenges would hinder growth whether there were an adaptive response from the challenged bacteria or not, but decades of work strongly suggest that complex regulation is in place to coordinate stopping replication, repressing expression of new biosynthetic machinery, and redirecting resources toward functions needed for survival (reviewed in [12,13]). Still, many questions remain about the mechanisms that allow ongoing adjustments to protein biosynthetic rates and priorities during protracted growth

© 2020. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

arrest – adjustments that, though small in magnitude, may make the difference between survival and death.

Risks and benefits of protein biosynthesis during growth arrest

Regulation operating during growth arrest must weigh the risks of consuming extremely limited resources against the benefits of making potentially useful new proteins. Many studies of multiple organisms in different growth-arrest contexts have found that growth-arrested bacteria continue to make new proteins at low rates[14-20]. However, protein biosynthesis requires networks of interconnected metabolic activities to supply the energy and substrates required, and, especially if flux through these networks is inconsistent, activity can increase the vulnerability of the bacteria to damage (Fig. 1A). For example, the redox reactions of the electron transport chain can release reactive oxygen species, resulting in damage that is difficult to repair with limited resources[3,21]. Stalled, transcribing RNA polymerases can increase the likelihood of some types of DNA damage by leaving DNA-RNA hybrids that can be recognised improperly by DNA synthesis machinery[22-24], and ongoing translation under starvation conditions can lead to protein aggregation[25], requiring the activity of heat-shock proteases to maintain viability[26]. The presence of antibiotic compounds exacerbates the risks associated with activity, as these compounds largely subvert biosynthetic processes. Mutants that tolerate antibiotics better often show slower growth or increased lag times[27]. Indeed, the bacterial form best suited to long-term survival of harsh, resource-depleted conditions is the spore, with metabolic activity very close to zero (reviewed in [28]).

Despite this, even in organisms that can form spores as a response to extreme resource limitation (such as *Bacillus subtilis*), a substantial subpopulation will instead maintain a vegetative state that is metabolically and biosynthetically active at low rates[29]. Furthermore, researchers have observed that despite the risks of protein synthesis during growth arrest, inhibiting it decreases survival[14,30,31]. What benefits outweigh the risks of biosynthesis during resource limitation? Essential proteins sustain damage over time and must be replaced[32]. Ongoing activity also allows defensive responses against specific environmental threats, e.g. by upregulation of efflux pumps or DNA repair enzymes[31,33]. And even in conditions of extreme resource limitation, cells encounter small amounts of useful nutrients (from lysis of other bacteria, for example); taking advantage of them requires uptake and incorporation via biosynthesis[17,34]. Finally, when favourable conditions return, bacteria must be prepared to rapidly resume growth or risk being overrun by competitors. Because growth-arrested bacteria are often exposed to fluctuating environments with opportunities and threats varying unpredictably over time, an ability to alter protein synthesis activity in response to the environment while still remaining in a growth-arrested state would likely be advantageous (Fig. 1B).

Ribosome dynamics during growth and growth arrest

Ribosomes are the engines of protein synthesis, so their abundance and activity are important points of control of biosynthetic capacity, and accordingly, their regulation changes dramatically as nutrient availability drops (Fig. 2). Elegant work over several decades has shown how *Escherichia coli* tunes resource allocation to maximise ribosome biogenesis when nutrients are plentiful, and diverts resources toward acquiring nutrients when those

89 nutrients become limiting ([35-37] and references therein). Earlier work compared ribosome
90 production and protein synthesis at fast (doubling time (τ) = 20 minutes) and slow
91 (τ = 100 minutes) growth rates, but recently these quantitative analyses have been extended
92 to conditions that impose extremely slow (τ = 1440 minutes, in chemostats) or no growth
93 (e.g. stationary phase or carbon starvation)[18,19,38].

94 Several interesting observations emerge from these studies. First, quantitative comparisons
95 across this expanded range of growth conditions highlight the striking magnitude of the
96 changes as cells enter growth arrest. The rate of new protein synthesis in growth arrest is
97 estimated to be approximately 1500-fold lower than during optimal growth (Fig. 2A), and the
98 average number of active ribosomes per cell approximately 100, compared to 62,000 at the
99 fastest growth rates (Fig. 2B). Changes of this magnitude have enormous impacts on the
100 biochemical and biophysical context in which the gene expression machinery operates, but
101 the mechanisms by which the machinery adjusts to these changes are not well understood.

102 Second, careful investigation of the translational responses to extreme limitation with
103 different limiting nutrients has revealed that ribosome dynamics are distinct, suggesting that
104 finely tuned regulation is important even though new protein synthesis is so strikingly
105 reduced. In carbon starvation, a large fraction (80%) of the ribosomes are sequestered in an
106 inactive state, while nitrogen limitation more dramatically represses the translation
107 elongation rate, and phosphorus limitation strongly reduces cells' ribosome content, at least
108 in part by degradation of ribosomes[18,38,39]. Growth-limiting osmotic and oxidative
109 stresses also strongly repress translation elongation rates, requiring adjustments to
110 ribosome activities or amounts[8,9]. Maximising survival of growth arrest in a dynamic
111 environment likely requires complex regulation to identify and recycle damaged ribosomes,
112 safely sequester excess functional ribosomes, and occasionally produce new ribosomes as
113 conditions require. Consistent with this notion, multiple studies have shown that genes
114 involved in ribosome biogenesis are expressed during carbon- or energy-limited growth
115 arrest, and that they are important for survival[14,15,40].

116 Ribosome dynamics have mostly been observed at the population level, so the distribution
117 of active and inactive ribosomes across individual cells is not well studied. Multiple
118 mechanisms exist for sequestering ribosomes upon growth arrest, which could be used by
119 each cell to inactivate a consistent fraction of its ribosomes (reviewed in [41]). However, it is
120 also possible that translational activity is unequally distributed across the bacterial
121 population. Toxin-antitoxin systems have in fact been proposed to drive heterogeneity, when
122 stochastically arising imbalances allow the toxin to escape antitoxin control and target
123 biosynthetic machinery, including ribosomes, tRNAs, EF-Tu, and mRNAs (reviewed in [42]).
124 Two studies have investigated protein synthesis rates (in *E. coli*) and ribosome levels (in *P.*
125 *aeruginosa*) in single cells during starvation-induced growth arrest, to directly assess their
126 distributions[16,43]. In both cases, after initial large drops in ribosome abundance[43] or
127 protein synthesis rates[16] at the entry to growth arrest, the new levels were maintained by
128 most cells for several days. However, both studies also found outliers of high and low
129 ribosome abundance and activity, suggesting that heterogeneity does arise and may play an
130 important role. Within dense communities of sibling bacteria, selective pressure could
131 conceivably favour the uneven distribution of protein biosynthetic activity across individual
132 cells to maximise survival of the population. Examples of metabolic coordination in biofilms
133 mediated by gated ion channels[4] and redox-active secondary metabolites[2] have been

described, but further explorations of mechanisms contributing to such coordination and their impacts on protein biosynthesis are still needed.

Mechanisms for regulating protein biosynthesis during growth arrest

Mechanisms to dynamically adjust protein biosynthesis during growth arrest have been studied relatively little, in part because of the difficulty of measuring low activity levels. Most research has focused on the transition from rapid growth to growth arrest as nutrients are depleted. The dominant pattern in this context is strong suppression of ribosome biogenesis and upregulation of genes involved in nutrient acquisition and general stress responses. Key regulators of this transition (which have been recently comprehensively reviewed) include general stress sigma factors, which bias RNA polymerase (RNAP) activity toward stress-adaptive functions[44], and the modified nucleotides cAMP and (p)ppGpp, which bias RNAP activity away from ribosomal RNA and protein genes[45,46]. The regulators playing important roles *after* cells have entered into a protracted growth arrest are much less clear, but (p)ppGpp likely plays an ongoing role even though its levels peak at the entry to growth arrest[47]. Homologs of RelA, which is activated by binding uncharged tRNAs and the ribosome during translation[48], are major sources of (p)ppGpp in many organisms. Thus, low levels of ongoing translation during growth arrest may contribute to ongoing adjustment of (p)ppGpp levels. Indeed, a Tn-Seq screen in *Rhodopseudomonas palustris* found that both the ability to synthesise (p)ppGpp *and* genes for ribosome biosynthesis were important for fitness throughout 20 days of carbon-limited growth arrest[14].

Even though (p)ppGpp has been studied extensively, the fact that its functions are carried out differently in different organisms[49], and that it impacts many core cellular processes simultaneously (reviewed in [50], Fig. 3), has prevented a full understanding of its direct effects. Recent work has shown that these effects are even more widespread than previously appreciated: a careful transcriptomic study showed that (p)ppGpp binding to RNA polymerase in *E. coli* directly impacts expression levels for 757 genes[51], and a crosslinking approach identified 56 direct binding targets of (p)ppGpp, many of which are involved in translation and nucleotide biosynthesis and were previously unknown[52]. The new insights into the direct effects of (p)ppGpp on regulation of nucleotide biosynthesis are particularly interesting and highlight the centrality of the nucleotide pools in cellular metabolic networks (Fig. 3). Levels are tightly controlled, but a notable shift in purine nucleotides toward (p)ppGpp occurs at the entry to growth arrest[47,53], and complex crosstalk and feedback extends these effects to numerous biosynthetic pathways. How cells might adjust gene expression activities in response to the nucleotide pools present in growth arrest, and how they might restore the pools to resume active growth are not known. Within growth-arrested states, perturbations to nucleotide pools appear to impact survival. For example, among antibiotic-exposed persisters in *P. aeruginosa*, mutations inhibiting *de novo* pyrimidine biosynthesis decreased survival, but depleting ATP in those mutants restored survival[54]. New tools to sensitively measure levels of specific nucleotides in single cells and in real time will be extremely useful in dissecting these complex networks.

While mechanisms to downregulate protein biosynthesis during growth arrest are still not fully understood, mechanisms for transiently upregulating biosynthesis in this state are even less explored. In this context, “upregulation” is relative – mechanisms operating during growth arrest (potentially acting with only 100 active ribosomes available per cell) cannot drive high levels of expression of anything, in absolute terms, but instead help cells

180 overcome challenges to gene expression imposed by nutrient limitation or by the activities of
181 regulators like (p)ppGpp. One such challenge is that the substrates needed may not all be
182 present in the environment at once. To take advantage of transient availability, many
183 organisms have storage mechanisms for phosphorus (polyphosphate granules) and carbon
184 (polyhydroxyalkanoate granules and glycogen). Production of these storage compounds is
185 induced at the onset of growth arrest[55,56], and genes for phosphorus and carbon storage
186 are under positive selection in an extremely low-nutrient environment[7]. Nitrogen is
187 abundant in proteins, and proteolysis and reuse of amino acids is important during growth
188 arrest, including both recycling material from dying cells in a starving population[17,20] and
189 degrading aggregated proteins within the cell[26].

190 Assuming that the substrates for biosynthesis can be scavenged from the environment or
191 intracellular storage, the gene expression machinery must adapt to the repressive regulatory
192 context that occurs with growth arrest. A recent study of the stationary-phase nucleoid-
193 associated protein Dps, which appears to bind the chromosome in a crystalline-like
194 lattice[57], revealed that this growth-arrest adaptation may be less of a barrier to gene
195 expression than previously assumed – it has essentially no impact on RNAP's ability to
196 access and transcribe DNA[58]. Other work showed that a growth-arrest-specific
197 transcriptional regulator in *P. aeruginosa* (SutA) can directly enhance transcription initiation
198 of the rRNA genes; the effects were greatest in conjunction with the general stress sigma
199 factor[59]. This observation suggests that the stress-specific holoenzyme might be used for
200 some transcription of housekeeping genes during growth arrest, which could be important if
201 the housekeeping holoenzyme is largely sequestered by binding to the 6S small RNA[60].

202

203 **Implications for antibiotic tolerance and persistence**

204 One motivation for studying growth-arrested states has been the long-recognised correlation
205 between susceptibility to most commonly-used antibiotics and growth[3,61,62]. It is now
206 appreciated that non-growing cells that persist during antibiotic treatment maintain some
207 metabolic activity but strongly repress protein biosynthesis[63], and that multiple
208 mechanisms affecting biosynthetic activity give rise to complex population dynamics of
209 antibiotic killing[64]. A non-growing persister state also appears to protect *Salmonella* from
210 the host immune system, and requires some ongoing protein synthesis[65]. Recent efforts to
211 standardise methods for investigating and describing non-growing states and their
212 susceptibilities[66] are helpful, and highlight the importance of developing a deeper
213 understanding of biosynthesis regulation under growth-arrested conditions. Some
214 distribution of biosynthetic activity levels will always exist for any population of bacteria, and
215 below a threshold, they are more likely to tolerate antibiotic exposure. The mean and shape
216 of the distribution, as well as the timescales over which an individual bacterium might
217 sample different regions of the distribution, are characteristics that likely have direct impacts
218 on antibiotic susceptibility patterns. These characteristics are defined by the regulatory
219 networks that govern biosynthetic activity during growth arrest.

220 A billion years of evolution have shaped these networks to balance the risks of ongoing
221 protein synthesis against the benefits of renewing and adapting the proteome under severe
222 resource limitation. Much still remains to be learned about the mechanisms responsible for
223 this regulation in diverse organisms. By focusing research efforts on mechanisms that favour
224 biosynthesis in addition to those that repress it during growth arrest, and seeking to
225 understand how these mechanisms are coordinated over time and across bacterial

226 populations, we stand to improve our basic knowledge of bacterial life in natural
227 environments, and also gain useful insights toward addressing the pressing challenges of
228 rising antibiotic resistance.

229

230 **Acknowledgments**

231 I would like to thank Dianne Newman, Phil Esra, and colleagues in the University of Dundee
232 Molecular Microbiology Division for helpful feedback on this manuscript. Financial support
233 has been provided by the University of Dundee Institutional Strategic Support Funds.

234

235 **References**

236

237 1. Stewart PS, White B, Boegli L, Hamerly T, Williamson KS, Franklin MJ, Bothner B, James
238 GA, Fisher S, Vital-Lopez FG, et al.: **Conceptual Model of Biofilm Antibiotic
239 Tolerance That Integrates Phenomena of Diffusion, Metabolism, Gene Expression,
240 and Physiology**. *J Bacteriol* 2019, **201**.
241 2. Schiessl KT, Hu F, Jo J, Nazia SZ, Wang B, Price-Whelan A, Min W, Dietrich LEP: **Phenazine
242 production promotes antibiotic tolerance and metabolic heterogeneity in
243 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilms**. *Nat Commun* 2019, **10**:762.
244 3. Meylan S, Porter CBM, Yang JH, Belenky P, Gutierrez A, Lobritz MA, Park J, Kim SH,
245 Moskowitz SM, Collins JJ: **Carbon Sources Tune Antibiotic Susceptibility in
246 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* via Tricarboxylic Acid Cycle Control**. *Cell Chem Biol* 2017,
247 **24**:195-206.
248 4. Martinez-Corral R, Liu J, Suel GM, Garcia-Ojalvo J: **Bistable emergence of oscillations in
249 growing *Bacillus subtilis* biofilms**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018, **115**:E8333-E8340.
250
251 * This work provides a deeper investigation into mathematical models to describe
252 oscillatory growth and activity that emerges in *Bacillus subtilis* biofilms, dependent
253 on their size and environmental conditions. It is likely that many bacterial
254 communities under nutrient limitation develop activity dynamics, and this system
255 provides an elegant model for investigating parameters that can impact such
256 dynamics.
257
258 5. Tee HS, Waite D, Payne L, Middleditch M, Wood S, Handley KM: **Tools for successful
259 proliferation: diverse strategies of nutrient acquisition by a benthic
260 cyanobacterium**. *ISME J* 2020.
261 6. Arnaouteli S, Matoz-Fernandez DA, Porter M, Kalamara M, Abbott J, MacPhee CE,
262 Davidson FA, Stanley-Wall NR: **Pulcherrimin formation controls growth arrest of the
263 *Bacillus subtilis* biofilm**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2019, **116**:13553-13562.
264 7. Props R, Monsieurs P, Vandamme P, Leys N, Denef VJ, Boon N: **Gene Expansion and
265 Positive Selection as Bacterial Adaptations to Oligotrophic Conditions**. *mSphere*
266 2019, **4**.
267 8. Dai X, Zhu M, Warren M, Balakrishnan R, Okano H, Williamson JR, Fredrick K, Hwa T:
268 **Slowdown of Translational Elongation in *Escherichia coli* under Hyperosmotic
269 Stress**. *mBio* 2018, **9**:9.
270 9. Zhu M, Dai X: **Maintenance of translational elongation rate underlies the survival of
271 *Escherichia coli* during oxidative stress**. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2019, **47**:7592-7604.

272 10. Zhang Y, Burkhardt DH, Rouskin S, Li GW, Weissman JS, Gross CA: **A Stress Response**
273 **that Monitors and Regulates mRNA Structure Is Central to Cold Shock Adaptation**.
274 *Mol Cell* 2018, **70**:274-286 e277.
275 11. Coulthurst S: **The Type VI secretion system: a versatile bacterial weapon**. *Microbiology*
276 2019, **165**:503-515.
277 12. Kolter R, Siegele DA, Tormo A: **The Stationary Phase of the Bacterial Life Cycle**. *Annu*
278 *Rev Microbiol* 1993, **47**:855-874.
279 13. Bergkessel M, Basta DW, Newman DK: **The physiology of growth arrest: uniting**
280 **molecular and environmental microbiology**. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2016, **14**:549-562.
281 14. Yin L, Ma H, Nakayasu ES, Payne SH, Morris DR, Harwood CS: **Bacterial Longevity**
282 **Requires Protein Synthesis and a Stringent Response**. *MBio* 2019, **10**.
283 15. Babin BM, Bergkessel M, Sweredoski MJ, Moradian A, Hess S, Newman DK, Tirrell DA:
284 **SutA is a bacterial transcription factor expressed during slow growth in**
285 ***Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2016, **113**:E597-605.
286 16. Gefen O, Fridman O, Ronin I, Balaban NQ: **Direct observation of single stationary-phase**
287 **bacteria reveals a surprisingly long period of constant protein production activity**.
288 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2014, **111**:556-561.
289 17. Schink SJ, Biselli E, Ammar C, Gerland U: **Death Rate of *E. coli* during Starvation Is Set by**
290 **Maintenance Cost and Biomass Recycling**. *Cell Syst* 2019, **9**:64-73 e63.
291 18. Iyer S, Le D, Park BR, Kim M: **Distinct mechanisms coordinate transcription and**
292 **translation under carbon and nitrogen starvation in *Escherichia coli***. *Nat Microbiol*
293 2018, **3**:741-748.
294

295 *This work, along with references 17, 19 and 38, provides quantitative information about
296 the rates of protein synthesis under nutrient-limited conditions. Additionally, it uses
297 a fluorescence *in-situ* hybridisation (FISH) technique to assess transcriptional rates,
298 and finds interesting differences in transcription-translation coupling depending on
299 which nutrient is limiting. While it was not a focus of this manuscript, the method
300 described could also be used to investigate population heterogeneity in transcription
301 kinetics under growth arrest.
302

303 19. Dai X, Zhu M, Warren M, Balakrishnan R, Patsalo V, Okano H, Williamson JR, Fredrick K,
304 Wang YP, Hwa T: **Reduction of translating ribosomes enables *Escherichia coli* to**
305 **maintain elongation rates during slow growth**. *Nat Microbiol* 2016, **2**:16231.
306 20. Takano S, Pawlowska BJ, Gudelj I, Yomo T, Tsuru S: **Density-Dependent Recycling**
307 **Promotes the Long-Term Survival of Bacterial Populations during Periods of**
308 **Starvation**. *MBio* 2017, **8**.
309 21. Meirelles LA, Newman DK: **Both toxic and beneficial effects of pyocyanin contribute to**
310 **the lifecycle of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa***. *Mol Microbiol* 2018, **110**:995-1010.
311 22. Ragheb MN, Thomason MK, Hsu C, Nugent P, Gage J, Samadpour AN, Kariisa A, Merrikh
312 CN, Miller SI, Sherman DR, et al.: **Inhibiting the Evolution of Antibiotic Resistance**.
313 *Mol Cell* 2019, **73**:157-165 e155.
314 23. Wimberly H, Shee C, Thornton PC, Sivaramakrishnan P, Rosenberg SM, Hastings PJ: **R-**
315 **loops and nicks initiate DNA breakage and genome instability in non-growing**
316 **Escherichia coli**. *Nat Commun* 2013, **4**:2115.

317 24. Sivaramakrishnan P, Sepulveda LA, Halliday JA, Liu J, Nunez MAB, Golding I, Rosenberg
318 SM, Herman C: **The transcription fidelity factor GreA impedes DNA break repair**.
319 *Nature* 2017, **550**:214-218.
320 25. Pu Y, Li Y, Jin X, Tian T, Ma Q, Zhao Z, Lin SY, Chen Z, Li B, Yao G, et al.: **ATP-Dependent**
321 **Dynamic Protein Aggregation Regulates Bacterial Dormancy Depth Critical for**
322 **Antibiotic Tolerance**. *Mol Cell* 2019, **73**:143-156 e144.
323 26. Basta DW, Angeles-Albores D, Spero MA, Ciemniecki JA, Newman DK: **Heat-shock**
324 **proteases promote survival of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* during growth arrest**. *Proc*
325 *Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2020, **117**:4358-4367.
326 27. Levin-Reisman I, Ronin I, Gefen O, Braniss I, Shoresh N, Balaban NQ: **Antibiotic tolerance**
327 **facilitates the evolution of resistance**. *Science* 2017, **355**:5.
328 28. Setlow P: **Spore Resistance Properties**. *Microbiol Spectr* 2014, **2**:TBS-0003-2012.
329 29. Gray DA, Dugar G, Gamba P, Strahl H, Jonker MJ, Hamoen LW: **Extreme slow growth as**
330 **alternative strategy to survive deep starvation in bacteria**. *Nat Commun* 2019,
331 **10**:890.
332 30. Reeve CA, Amy PS, Matin A: **Role of Protein Synthesis in the Survival of Carbon-Starved**
333 ***Escherichia coli* K-12**. *J Bacteriol* 1984, **160**:1041-1046.
334 31. Mok WWK, Brynildsen MP: **Timing of DNA damage responses impacts persistence to**
335 **fluoroquinolones**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018, **115**:E6301-E6309.
336
337 **This work clearly demonstrates that dynamic responses during growth arrest are key to
338 survival outcomes in the case of exposure to DNA-damaging fluoroquinolone
339 antibiotics. New synthesis of DNA damage repair machinery must occur prior to
340 resumption of growth in order for growth-arrested cells to maximise survival after
341 exposure to the antibiotic.
342
343 32. Willi J, Kupfer P, Evequoz D, Fernandez G, Katz A, Leumann C, Polacek N: **Oxidative**
344 **stress damages rRNA inside the ribosome and differentially affects the catalytic**
345 **center**. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2018, **46**:1945-1957.
346 33. Pu Y, Zhao Z, Li Y, Zou J, Ma Q, Zhao Y, Ke Y, Zhu Y, Chen H, Baker MAB, et al.: **Enhanced**
347 **Efflux Activity Facilitates Drug Tolerance in Dormant Bacterial Cells**. *Mol Cell* 2016,
348 **62**:284-294.
349 34. Robador A, Amend JP, Finkel SE: **Nanocalorimetry Reveals the Growth Dynamics of**
350 ***Escherichia coli* Cells Undergoing Adaptive Evolution during Long-Term Stationary**
351 **Phase**. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2019, **85**.
352 35. You C, Okano H, Hui S, Zhang Z, Kim M, Gunderson CW, Wang YP, Lenz P, Yan D, Hwa T:
353 **Coordination of bacterial proteome with metabolism by cyclic AMP signalling**.
354 *Nature* 2013, **500**:301-306.
355 36. Dennis PP, Ehrenberg M, Bremer H: **Control of rRNA synthesis in *Escherichia coli*: a**
356 **systems biology approach**. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 2004, **68**:639-668.
357 37. Li GW, Burkhardt D, Gross C, Weissman JS: **Quantifying absolute protein synthesis rates**
358 **reveals principles underlying allocation of cellular resources**. *Cell* 2014, **157**:624-
359 635.
360 38. Li SH, Li Z, Park JO, King CG, Rabinowitz JD, Wingreen NS, Gitai Z: ***Escherichia coli***
361 **translation strategies differ across carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus limitation**
362 **conditions**. *Nat Microbiol* 2018, **3**:939-947.
363

364 *This work, along with references 18 and 19, quantitatively describes adjustments to the
365 translational machinery at very slow growth rates. Chemostat growth was used to
366 set a very slow growth rate, with either carbon, nitrogen, or phosphorus limiting,
367 and different characteristics of the translation machinery were affected by each
368 condition. The quantitative insights allow for a deeper interrogation of the
369 biosynthesis regulation under very limiting conditions than was previously possible.
370
371 39. Fessler M, Gummesson B, Charbon G, Lo Svenningsen S, Sorensen MA: **Short-term**
372 **kinetics of rRNA degradation in *Escherichia coli* upon starvation for carbon, amino**
373 **acid, or phosphate**. *Mol Microbiol* 2020.
374 40. Basta DW, Bergkessel M, Newman DK: **Identification of Fitness Determinants during**
375 **Energy-Limited Growth Arrest in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa***. *MBio* 2017, **8**.
376 41. Prossliner T, Skovbo Winther K, Sorensen MA, Gerdes K: **Ribosome Hibernation**. *Annu*
377 *Rev Genet* 2018, **52**:321-348.
378 42. Harms A, Brodersen DE, Mitarai N, Gerdes K: **Toxins, Targets, and Triggers: An Overview**
379 **of Toxin-Antitoxin Biology**. *Mol Cell* 2018, **70**:768-784.
380 43. Akiyama T, Williamson KS, Schaefer R, Pratt S, Chang CB, Franklin MJ: **Resuscitation of**
381 ***Pseudomonas aeruginosa* from dormancy requires hibernation promoting factor**
382 **(PA4463) for ribosome preservation**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2017, **114**:3204-3209.
383 44. Gottesman S: **Trouble is coming: Signaling pathways that regulate general stress**
384 **responses in bacteria**. *J Biol Chem* 2019, **294**:11685-11700.
385 45. Hengge R: **Linking bacterial growth, survival, and multicellularity - small signaling**
386 **molecules as triggers and drivers**. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 2020, **55**:57-66.
387 46. Gourse RL, Chen AY, Gopalkrishnan S, Sanchez-Vazquez P, Myers A, Ross W:
388 **Transcriptional Responses to ppGpp and DksA**. *Ann Rev Microbiol* 2018, **72**:163-184.
389 47. Murray HD, Schneider DA, Gourse RL: **Control of rRNA Expression by Small Molecules Is**
390 **Dynamic and Nonredundant**. *Molecular Cell* 2003, **12**:125-134.
391 48. Winther KS, Roghanian M, Gerdes K: **Activation of the Stringent Response by Loading of**
392 **RelA-tRNA Complexes at the Ribosomal A-Site**. *Mol Cell* 2018, **70**:95-105 e104.
393 49. Anderson BW, Liu K, Wolak C, Dubiel K, She F, Satyshur KA, Keck JL, Wang JD: **Evolution**
394 **of (p)ppGpp-HPRT regulation through diversification of an allosteric oligomeric**
395 **interaction**. *Elife* 2019, **8**.
396
397 ** This work shows how evolutionary divergence of protein-protein interfaces away from
398 the active sites of purine biosynthetic enzymes can differentially affect the ability of
399 (p)ppGpp to inhibit their activities. Furthermore, it gives detailed insight into the
400 complex mechanisms by which (p)ppGpp can carry out its effects. Understanding this
401 complexity begins to give a sense of how this small molecule might be able to
402 coordinate the behaviors of numerous interrelated bisynthetic pathways in the cell.
403
404 50. Hauryliuk V, Atkinson GC, Murakami KS, Tenson T, Gerdes K: **Recent functional insights**
405 **into the role of (p)ppGpp in bacterial physiology**. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2015, **13**:298-
406 309.
407 51. Sanchez-Vazquez P, Dewey CN, Kitten N, Ross W, Gourse RL: **Genome-wide effects on**
408 ***Escherichia coli* transcription from ppGpp binding to its two sites on RNA**
409 **polymerase**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2019, **116**:8310-8319.

410 52. Wang B, Dai P, Ding D, Del Rosario A, Grant RA, Pentelute BL, Laub MT: **Affinity-based**
411 **capture and identification of protein effectors of the growth regulator ppGpp**. *Nat*
412 *Chem Biol* 2019, **15**:141-150.
413
414 **This manuscript identifies and convincingly verifies several new direct targets of (p)ppGpp
415 in *E. coli.* This is of key importance for understanding the regulatory networks
416 operating during growth arrest, because (p)ppGpp is a major regulator of this state
417 in a majority of bacterial species, and its pleiotropic effects had made elucidation of
418 direct targets difficult. Although the direct targets in other species could be
419 different, the method developed could in theory be deployed in other species as
420 well.
421
422 53. Zbornikova E, Knejzlik Z, Hauryliuk V, Krasny L, Rejman D: **Analysis of nucleotide pools in**
423 **bacteria using HPLC-MS in HILIC mode**. *Talanta* 2019, **205**:120161.
424 54. Cameron DR, Shan Y, Zalis EA, Isabella V, Lewis K: **A Genetic Determinant of Persister**
425 **Cell Formation in Bacterial Pathogens**. *J Bacteriol* 2018, **200**:11.
426 55. Brigham CJ, Speth DR, Rha C, Sinskey AJ: **Whole-genome microarray and gene deletion**
427 **studies reveal regulation of the polyhydroxyalkanoate production cycle by the**
428 **stringent response in *Ralstonia eutropha* H16**. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2012,
429 **78**:8033-8044.
430 56. Racki LR, Tocheva EI, Dieterle MG, Sullivan MC, Jensen GJ, Newman DK: **Polyphosphate**
431 **granule biogenesis is temporally and functionally tied to cell cycle exit during**
432 **starvation in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa***. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2017, **114**:E2440-
433 E2449.
434 57. Wolf SG, Frenkiel D, Arad T, Finkel SE, Kolter R, Minsky A: **DNA protection by stress-**
435 **induced biocrystallization**. *Nature* 1999, **400**:83-85.
436 58. Janissen R, Arens MMA, Vtyurina NN, Rivai Z, Sunday ND, Eslami-Mossallam B, Gritsenko
437 AA, Laan L, de Ridder D, Artsimovitch I, et al.: **Global DNA Compaction in Stationary-**
438 **Phase Bacteria Does Not Affect Transcription**. *Cell* 2018, **174**:1188-1199 e1114.
439 59. Bergkessel M, Babin BM, VanderVelde D, Sweredoski MJ, Moradian A, Eggleston-Rangel
440 R, Hess S, Tirrell DA, Artsimovitch I, Newman DK: **The dormancy-specific regulator,**
441 **SutA, is intrinsically disordered and modulates transcription initiation in**
442 ***Pseudomonas aeruginosa***. *Mol Microbiol* 2019, **112**:992-1009.
443 60. Chen J, Wassarman KM, Feng S, Leon K, Feklistov A, Winkelman JT, Li Z, Walz T, Campbell
444 EA, Darst SA: **6S RNA Mimics B-Form DNA to Regulate *Escherichia coli* RNA**
445 **Polymerase**. *Mol Cell* 2017, **68**:388-397 e386.
446 61. Hobby GL, Meyer K, Chaffee E: **Observations on the Mechanism of Action of Penicillin**.
447 *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine* 1942, **50**:281-285.
448 62. Pamp SJ, Gjermansen M, Johansen HK, Tolker-Nielsen T: **Tolerance to the antimicrobial**
449 **peptide colistin in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilms is linked to metabolically**
450 **active cells, and depends on the pmr and mexAB-oprM genes**. *Mol Microbiol* 2008,
451 **68**:223-240.
452 63. Radzikowski JL, Vedelaar S, Siegel D, Ortega AD, Schmidt A, Heinemann M: **Bacterial**
453 **persistence is an active sigmaS stress response to metabolic flux limitation**. *Mol*
454 *Syst Biol* 2016, **12**:882.
455 64. Ronneau S, Helaine S: **Clarifying the Link between Toxin-Antitoxin Modules and**
456 **Bacterial Persistence**. *J Mol Biol* 2019, **431**:3462-3471.

457 65. Stapels DC, Hill PWS, Westerman AJ, Fisher RA, Thurston TL, Saliba AE, Blommestein I,
458 Vogel J, Helaine S: ***Salmonella* persisters undermine host immune defenses during**
459 **antibiotic treatment**. *Science* 2018, **362**:1156-1160.
460
461 **This work shows that antibiotic-tolerant, non-growing persisters found within
462 macrophages in a mouse model of *Salmonella* infection still maintain sufficient
463 protein synthesis capacity to produce important T3SS effectors needed to
464 manipulate the host cell response. This could be viewed as an example of bacterial
465 cells finding the "sweet spot" of biosynthetic activity in a challenging environment.
466
467 66. Balaban NQ, Helaine S, Lewis K, Ackermann M, Aldridge B, Andersson DI, Brynildsen MP,
468 Bumann D, Camilli A, Collins JJ, et al.: **Definitions and guidelines for research on**
469 **antibiotic persistence**. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2019, **17**:441-448.
470
471 *This consensus opinion piece is important reading for anyone interested in the
472 mechanisms by which bacterial cells escape killing by antibiotics. Several important
473 distinctions are made, and a key to understanding complex interactions is to ensure
474 that everyone is using consistent definitions to discuss their findings.
475
476 67. Ehrenberg M, Bremer H, Dennis PP: **Medium-dependent control of the bacterial growth**
477 **rate**. *Biochimie* 2013, **95**:643-658.
478 68. Stracy M, Lesterlin C, Garza de Leona F, Uphoff S, Zawadzki P, Kapanidis AN: **Live-cell**
479 **superresolution microscopy reveals the organization of RNA polymerase in the**
480 **bacterial nucleoid**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2015:E4390-E4399.
481 69. Jensen KF, Dandanell G, Hove-Jensen B, Willemoës M: **Nucleotides, Nucleosides, and**
482 **Nucleobases**. *EcoSal Plus* 2008, **3**.
483
484
485 **Figure Legends**
486
487 **Figure 1. Bacteria must balance the risks and benefits of engaging in protein**
488 **synthesis while growth arrested. A)** New protein synthesis can be beneficial for growth-
489 arrested bacteria as it allows for maintenance and repair of cellular machinery and utilisation
490 of transiently available substrates for catabolism. However, extreme resource limitation can
491 also mean that fluxes through the electron transport chain are interrupted, leading to
492 oxidative damage, or that transcription and translation cannot continue processively. Stalled/
493 aborted translation can leave misfolded proteins that aggregate and must be degraded.
494 Stalled transcription that is uncoupled from translation can leave RNA-DNA hybrids that can
495 be substrates for inappropriate DNA synthesis. Under these conditions, ongoing biosynthetic
496 activity can be damaging, and total dormancy might be a safer state. **B)** The risks and
497 benefits of adopting an arbitrary level of biosynthetic activity over different environmental
498 exposures during growth arrest. Each column of the table represents the hypothetical fate of
499 a bacterium at a specific activity level during growth arrest, with the lowest activity (a spore)
500 on the left and the highest activity on the right. Each row of the table represents a new set of
501 conditions experienced by the bacterium. The rightmost column depicts a population activity
502 distribution that might be ideal for fitness under the condition in that row. In general, the
503 lowest activity levels lead to the least damage under the stresses of acute starvation and

504 antibiotic exposure but are associated with disadvantages in utilising transiently available
505 nutrients, repairing damage, and resuming growth. In this example, a bacterium with a
506 moderate level of activity represents a “sweet spot” that achieves the highest fitness across
507 the series of events occurring, but in theory fitness could be further optimised by changing
508 activity levels in response to changes in conditions throughout growth arrest.
509
510 **Figure 2. Ribosome dynamics during growth and growth arrest. A)** Box areas represent
511 total protein synthesis outputs per cell per unit time in *E. coli* at the maximum growth rate
512 (doubling time (τ)=20 minutes), a slower growth rate (τ=100 minutes) and stationary phase
513 induced by carbon starvation. Rates for fast and slow growth were estimated by multiplying
514 the number of actively translating ribosomes per cell by the average elongation speed, using
515 numbers summarised in [67], and also generally agree with measurements made in [19].
516 The rate estimate for stationary phase is based on measurements made in [19] and [17]. **B)**
517 Proteome composition for *E. coli* cells at τ=20 minutes, τ=100 minutes, and stationary
518 phase. The area of the large box for each growth rate represents all the proteins (by mass)
519 in a cell. Each blue square represents 100 actively translating ribosomes; orange
520 square=100 inactive ribosomes; red circle= 100 RNAPs actively transcribing rRNA; black
521 circle= 100 RNAPs actively transcribing something other than rRNA; grey circle= 100
522 inactive RNAPs. In this context, “inactive” includes ribosomes that are not yet mature, or are
523 in the process of terminating translation and being recycled to initiate a new protein, or are
524 sequestered, and RNAPs that are non-specifically associated with DNA, or bound at
525 promoters but not yet transcribing, or are sequestered. The area of each symbol is to scale.
526 Numbers for fast and slow growth are from [67]. The ribosome fractions for stationary phase
527 are from [19]. The RNAP number in stationary phase is a rough estimate, by extrapolation
528 from measurements in [68] to stationary phase. The number of active RNAP in stationary
529 phase is not known but is likely small. The reallocation of proteome resources during the
530 transition from fast to slow growth is driven in large part by cAMP [35], while (p)ppGpp is a
531 major regulator of the transition to growth arrest [18,46].
532
533 **Figure 3: Nucleotide pools are tightly regulated, impact many biosynthetic processes,**
534 **and change in growth arrest.** Sizes of boxes represent estimated sizes of nucleotide
535 pools, based on [53,69]. Direct synthesis reactions are represented by black arrows,
536 stimulatory effects are represented by green arrows, and inhibitory effects are represented
537 by red symbols (nucleotides play roles both as regulators and as direct substrates for DNA
538 and RNA synthesis). The amounts of cAMP and the nucleotide sugars were not directly
539 measured at the entry to growth arrest. The synthesis of high amounts of (p)ppGpp can
540 divert a measurable fraction of purine nucleotides away from other processes, and then
541 actively represses new purine synthesis. Pyrimidine biosynthetic enzymes bind (p)ppGpp
542 and may be directly repressed but are also indirectly downregulated by a decrease in purine
543 levels, as purines are positive allosteric effectors. At the same time, consumption of
544 nucleotides by growth-related processes is also reduced, such that pyrimidine pools actually
545 slightly increase. How the cell adapts to the growth-arrest status of nucleotide pools and
546 fluxes, and how it escapes this state to return to active growth, are largely unknown.
547



548
549

Figure 1. Bacteria must balance the risks and benefits of engaging in protein synthesis while growth arrested. A) New protein synthesis can be beneficial for growth-arrested bacteria as it allows for maintenance and repair of cellular machinery and utilisation of transiently available substrates for catabolism. However, extreme resource limitation can also mean that fluxes through the electron transport chain are interrupted, leading to oxidative damage, or that transcription and translation cannot continue processively. Stalled/ aborted translation can leave misfolded proteins that aggregate and must be degraded. Stalled transcription that is uncoupled from translation can leave RNA-DNA hybrids that can be substrates for inappropriate DNA synthesis. Under these conditions, ongoing biosynthetic activity can be damaging, and total dormancy might be a safer state. **B)** The risks and benefits of adopting an arbitrary level of biosynthetic activity over different environmental exposures during growth arrest. Each column of the table represents the hypothetical fate of a bacterium at a specific activity level during growth arrest, with the lowest activity (a spore) on the left and the highest activity on the right. Each row of the table represents a new set of conditions experienced by the bacterium. The rightmost column depicts a population activity distribution that might be ideal for fitness under the condition in that row. In general, the lowest activity levels lead to the least damage under the stresses of acute starvation and antibiotic exposure but are associated with disadvantages in utilising transiently available nutrients, repairing damage, and resuming growth. In this example, a bacterium with a moderate level of activity represents a "sweet spot" that achieves the highest fitness across the series of events occurring, but in theory fitness could be further optimised by changing activity levels in response to changes in conditions throughout growth arrest.



Figure 2. Ribosome dynamics during growth and growth arrest. A) Box areas represent total protein synthesis outputs per cell per unit time in *E. coli* at the maximum growth rate (doubling time (τ)=20 minutes), a slower growth rate (τ=100 minutes) and stationary phase induced by carbon starvation. Rates for fast and slow growth were estimated by multiplying the number of actively translating ribosomes per cell by the average elongation speed, using numbers summarised in [67], and also generally agree with measurements made in [19]. The rate estimate for stationary phase is based on measurements made in [19] and [17]. **B)** Proteome composition for *E. coli* cells at τ=20 minutes, τ =100 minutes, and stationary phase. The area of the large box for each growth rate represents all the proteins (by mass) in a cell. Each blue square represents 100 actively translating ribosomes; orange square=100 inactive ribosomes; red circle= 100 RNAPs actively transcribing rRNA; black circle= 100 RNAPs actively transcribing something other than rRNA; grey circle= 100 inactive RNAPs. In this context, "inactive" includes ribosomes that are not yet mature, or are in the process of terminating translation and being recycled to initiate a new protein, or are sequestered, and RNAPs that are non-specifically associated with DNA, or bound at promoters but not yet transcribing, or are sequestered. The area of each symbol is to scale. Numbers for fast and slow growth are from [67]. The ribosome numbers for stationary phase are from [19]. The RNAP number in stationary phase is a rough estimate, by extrapolation from measurements in [68] to stationary phase. The number of active RNAP in stationary phase is not known but is likely small. The reallocation of proteome resources during the transition from fast to slow growth is driven in large part by cAMP [35], while (p)ppGpp is a major regulator of the transition to growth arrest [18,46].

550
551



Figure 3: Nucleotide pools are tightly regulated, impact many biosynthetic processes, and change in growth arrest. Sizes of boxes represent estimated sizes of nucleotide pools, based on [53,69]. Direct synthesis reactions are represented by black arrows, stimulatory effects are represented by green arrows, and inhibitory effects are represented by red symbols (nucleotides play roles both as regulators and as direct substrates for DNA and RNA synthesis). The amounts of cAMP and the nucleotide sugars were not directly measured at the entry to growth arrest. The synthesis of high amounts of (p)ppGpp can divert a measurable fraction of purine nucleotides away from other processes, and then actively represses new purine synthesis. Pyrimidine biosynthetic enzymes bind (p)ppGpp and may be directly repressed but are also indirectly downregulated by a decrease in purine levels, as purines are positive allosteric effectors. At the same time, consumption of nucleotides by growth-related processes is also reduced, such that pyrimidine pools actually slightly increase. How the cell adapts to the growth-arrest status of nucleotide pools and fluxes, and how it escapes this state to return to active growth, are largely unknown.

552