Acta Crystallographica Section F Structural Biology and Crystallization Communications

ISSN 1744-3091

Yi-Ting Liao,^a Ko-Hsin Chin,^b Wei-Ting Kuo,^a Mary Lay-Cheng Chuah,^c Zhao-Xun Liang^c and Shan-Ho Chou^{a,b,d}*

^aInstitute of Biochemistry, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung 40227, Taiwan, ^bAgricultural Biotechnology Center, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung 40227, Taiwan, ^cSchool of Biological Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637551, Singapore, and ^dGraduate Institute of Basic Medical Science, China Medical University, Taichung 40402, Taiwan

Correspondence e-mail: shchou@nchu.edu.tw

Received 9 December 2011 Accepted 6 January 2012



© 2012 International Union of Crystallography All rights reserved

Crystallization and preliminary X-ray diffraction characterization of the XccFimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP and XccFimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP–XccPilZ complexes from Xanthomonas campestris

c-di-GMP is a major secondary-messenger molecule in regulation of bacterial pathogenesis. Therefore, the c-di-GMP-mediated signal transduction network is of considerable interest. The PilZ domain was the first c-di-GMP receptor to be predicted and identified. However, every PilZ domain binds c-di-GMP with a different binding affinity. Intriguingly, a noncanonical PilZ domain has recently been found to serve as a mediator to link FimX^{EAL} to the PilB or PilT ATPase to control the function of type IV pili (T4P). It is thus essential to determine the structure of the FimX^{EAL}–PilZ complex in order to determine how the binding of c-di-GMP to the FimX^{EAL} domain induces conformational change of the adjoining noncanonical PilZ domain, which may transmit information to PilB or PilT to control T4P function. Here, the preparation and preliminary X-ray diffraction studies of the XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP and XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP-XccPilZ complexes from Xcc (Xanthomonas campestris pv. campesteris) are reported. Detailed studies of these complexes may allow a more thorough understanding of how c-di-GMP transmits its effects through the degenerate EAL domain and the noncanonical PilZ domain.

1. Introduction

Cyclic di-GMP (c-di-GMP) was first identified as a positive allosteric effector of cellulose synthase in the bacterium Acetobacter xylinum more than 20 years ago (Ross et al., 1987, 1990), but has recently emerged as an important secondary messenger that controls a variety of cellular activities, such as the biogenesis of biofilms, flagella and pili in diverse bacteria. These activities have been correlated with bacterial pathogenicity (Römling et al., 2005; Jenal & Malone, 2006; Römling & Amikam, 2006). Diguanylate cyclases (DGCs) containing the GGDEF domain and phosphodiesterases (PDEs) containing the EAL domain (Tal et al., 1988; Simm et al., 2004; Tischler & Camilli, 2004; Römling et al., 2005) or the HD-GYP domain (Slater et al., 2000; Ryan et al., 2006) are responsible for the synthesis and degradation of c-di-GMP, respectively. However, it is still unclear how many targets of c-di-GMP are available and how this important secondary messenger mediates signal transduction in the cell. The components and responses of c-di-GMP signalling pathways are hot topics that are still being actively pursued (Römling, 2011).

PilZ-domain-containing proteins were suggested to be c-di-GMP receptors by a bioinformatics study (Amikam & Galperin, 2006) and this was subsequently demonstrated to be the case by several biochemical and structural studies (Ryjenkov et al., 2006; Merighi et al., 2007; Pratt et al., 2007; Ramelot et al., 2007). However, two types of PilZ domains were soon discovered: a type I PilZ domain that contains conserved RXXXR and D/NXSXXG signature motifs in the N-terminal region and experiences considerable conformational changes upon c-di-GMP binding (Benach et al., 2007), and a type II PilZ domain that lacks such signature motifs and is unable to bind c-di-GMP directly. PA2960 from Pseudomonas aeruginosa is possibly the best known type II protein and is the first PilZ domain (Alm et al., 1996) known to be required for T4P-mediated twitching mobility (Mattick, 2002). In Xanthomonas campestris pv. campesteris (Xcc), four PilZ-domain proteins were discovered and were found to be essential for its pathogenicity (McCarthy et al., 2008); two of them contain a regular type I sequence and the other two contain a type II noncanonical sequence. XCC_{1028} is one of the type II domaincontaining proteins; it adopts a similar five-stranded β -barrel structure, yet exhibits considerable differences at the N-terminal end owing to a lack of the characteristic N-terminal c-di-GMP binding signature motifs (Li, Chin, Liu *et al.*, 2009). XCC_{6012} is another example; it adopts a monomer structure similar to that of XCC_{1028} , yet is interrupted in the middle by two extra long helices between the β 1 and β 2 strands and self-assembles into a tetramer *via* the extra α 3 heptad-repeat helix (Li *et al.*, 2011). How type II PilZ domains respond to the c-di-GMP signal remains unclear to date.

FimX is a large multi-domain protein containing a tandem of REC, PAS, GGDEF and EAL domains that governs bacterial twitching motility (Huang *et al.*, 2003; Kazmierczak *et al.*, 2006). Interestingly, the REC, GGDEF and EAL domains in FimX are all degenerate: the REC domain lacks the crucial Asp essential for phosphotransfer, the GGDEF domain contains a rather unusual GDSIF motif and the EAL domain contains a modified EVL motif at the active site. Several biochemical and structural analyses have revealed the role of the degenerate EAL domain as the high-affinity binding receptor of c-di-GMP (Navarro *et al.*, 2009; Qi *et al.*, 2011). The crystal structure of a degenerate EAL domain from *P. aeruginosa* has also been solved (Navarro *et al.*, 2009).

Recently, a detailed study of the interaction between the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Fim}} X^{\ensuremath{\mathsf{EAL}}}$ and PilZ domains from Xac (X. axonopodis pv. citri) has been carried out using a variety of techniques such as NMR, thermal melting, far-Western blotting and in vivo motility assay methods (Guzzo et al., 2009). From these studies, it was concluded that XacPilZ binds to the XacPilB ATPase required for T4P polymerization and to the XacFimX^{EAL} domain required for binding c-di-GMP to regulate T4P biogenesis. However, the crucial FimX^{EAL}-PilZ complex structure is not available to date. Since the sequence and structure of XacPilZ were found to be identical to those of $XccPilZ_{1028}$ (Guzzo *et al.*, 2009; Li, Chin, Liu et al., 2009), and the FimX^{EAL} sequences from both Xcc and Xac align very well with an identity of 90.9% and a similarity of 93.3% (data not shown), a similar interaction between the FimX^{EAL} and PilZ domains is very likely to exist in Xcc. Here, we report the expression, purification, crystallization and preliminary X-ray diffraction studies of the XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP and XccFimX^{EAL}c-di-GMP- $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complexes from Xcc. This phytopathogen is ideal for studying c-di-GMP-related issues since it contains a considerable number of GGDEF-domain, EAL-domain, HD-GYPdomain and PilZ-domain proteins (Ryan et al., 2007; McCarthy et al., 2008). Detailed studies of the XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP and XccFim-FimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP-XccPilZ complexes may allow a more thorough understanding of how c-di-GMP transmits its effects through noncanonical PilZ-domain proteins.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Reagents

c-di-GMP was produced by an enzymatic method using an altered thermophilic DGC enzyme as described previously (Rao *et al.*, 2009).

2.2. Cloning and purification

*Xcc*FimX^{EAL} was PCR-amplified directly from the plant pathogen *X. campestris* pv. *campestris* strain 17 (*Xcc*) using the forward primer 5'-TACTTCCAATCCAATGCTGAGGAAGAACGCATCGAGCG-C-3' and the reverse primer 5'-TTATCCACTTCCAATGCTAGTA-GTCGCCCGGCCACCCGCG-3'. The PCR fragment exhibited the correct size in an agarose-gel electrophoresis experiment and was

confirmed by DNA sequencing. A ligation-independent cloning (LIC) approach (Aslanidis & de Jong, 1990; Stols et al., 2001; Wu et al., 2005) was used to obtain the desired constructs. The final construct codes for an N-terminal His₆ tag, a 17-amino-acid linker and the XccFimX^{EAL} target under the control of a T7 promoter. Overexpression of the His₆-tagged target protein was induced by the addition of 800 ul 500 mM IPTG to the medium solution (to give a final IPTG concentration of 0.5 mM) at 293 K for 18 h. The target protein was purified by immobilized metal-affinity chromatography (IMAC) on a nickel column (Sigma) equilibrated with a buffer consisting of 20 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 80 mM NaCl. The target protein was eluted with a gradient of 50-300 mM imidazole in the same buffer. The fractions containing *Xcc*FimX^{EAL} were monitored using 13% SDS-PAGE and recombined. The His₆ tag and linker were then cleaved from the XccFimX^{EAL} target using TEV (tobacco etch virus) protease at 289 K for 10 h. For crystallization, the *Xcc*FimX^{EAL} protein was further purified on a Sephadex gel-filtration column (ÄKTA, Pharmacia Inc.). The final target-protein sample exhibited a purity greater than 99% as revealed by SDS-PAGE gel analysis (Fig. 1). It contained only an extra tripeptide (SNA) from the vector at the N-terminal end. SeMet-labelled XccFimX^{EAL} was prepared in a similar way, except that it was produced using a nonauxotroph Escherichia coli strain BL21 (DE3) as host in the absence of methionine but with ample amounts of SeMet (100 mg l^{-1}). The M9 medium consisted of 1 g ammonium chloride, 3 g KH₂PO₄, 6 g



Figure 1

(a) The domain architecture and constructs used in these studies. (b) SDS–PAGE (13%) monitoring of the overexpression and purification of *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}. Lane 1, protein markers (labelled in kDa); lane 2, whole cell lysate before IPTG induction; lane 3, whole cell lysate after IPTG induction; lane 4, supernatant of His₆-tagged *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}; lane 5, gel-purified *Xcc*FimX^{EAL} after TEV cleavage.

Table 1

Summary of the native and Se-SAD crystallographic data for the *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP and SeMet-*Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP–*Xcc*PilZ₁₀₂₈ complexes.

Values in parentheses are for the outermost shell.

	XccFimX ^{EAL} –c-di-GMP Native	$\frac{\text{SeMet-}XccFimX^{\text{EAL}}-}{\text{c-di-}GMP-XccPilZ_{1028}\dagger}$ Peak
Beamline	NSRRC BL13B1	Spring-8
Wavelength (Å)	1.00000	0.97934
Space group	P3 ₂ 21	P6322
Unit-cell parameters (Å, °)	a = b = 65.67, c = 121.29, y = 120	a = b = 158.22, c = 64.81, v = 120
Resolution range (Å)	30-2.5 (2.59-2.50)	30-2.7 (2.80-2.70)
Total reflections	68379 (5890)	189837 (16170)
Unique reflections	19685 (1899)	49419 (4899)
Multiplicity	3.5 (3.1)	3.8 (3.3)
Completeness (%)	97.1 (93.5)	99.4 (98.7)
$R_{\text{merge}} \ddagger (\%)$	3.6 (22.1)	13.8 (55.2)
$\langle I/\sigma(I) \rangle$	30.5 (5.4)	7.8 (1.8)
Matthews coefficient ($Å^3 Da^{-1}$)	2.74	2.93
Solvent content (%)	55.2	58.0

[†] The FOM (figure of merit) for the SAD data for this complex was 0.37. [‡] $R_{merge} = \sum_{hkl} \sum_i |I_i(hkl) - \langle I(hkl) \rangle | / \sum_{hkl} \sum_i I_i(hkl)$, where $I_i(hkl)$ is the *i*th intensity measurement of reflection *hkl*, including symmetry-related reflections, and $\langle I(hkl) \rangle$ is its average.

 Na_2HPO_4 supplemented with 20%(*w*/*v*) glucose, 0.3%(*w*/*v*) MgSO₄ and 10 mg FeSO₄ in 11 double-distilled water. Induction was sustained at 293 K for 18 h by the addition of 0.45 ml 0.5 m*M* IPTG. The purification of the SeMet-labelled *Xcc*FimX^{EAL} protein was performed using the same procedure as for the native protein.

The $XccPilZ_{1028}$ sample was obtained using a similar protocol to that previously published (Li, Chin, Shih *et al.*, 2009).

2.3. Crystallization

For crystallization, the native $XccFimX^{EAL}$ protein was concentrated to 0.56 m*M* in 20 m*M* Tris–HCl pH 8.0, 80 m*M* sodium chloride using an Amicon Ultra-10 (Millipore). The SeMet- $XccFimX^{EAL}$ – $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complex (1:1 ratio) was concentrated to 0.075 m*M* in a similar way. Appropriate volumes of 25.6 m*M* c-di-GMP were added to the $XccFimX^{EAL}$ and SeMet- $XccFimX^{EAL}$ – $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complex solutions to prepare samples for cocrystallization with a 2:1 ligand: protein ratio. Screening for crystallization conditions for each protein

was performed using sitting-drop vapour diffusion in 96-well plates (Hampton Research) at 277 K by mixing 0.5 µl protein solution with 0.5 µl reservoir solution and equilibrating against 50 µl reservoir solution. Initial screens including the sparse-matrix Crystal Screen and Crystal Screen 2 (Hampton Research), a systematic PEG-pH screen and the PEG/Ion screen (Hampton Research) were performed using a Gilson C240 crystallization workstation. Cubic crystals of the *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP complex appeared in 7 d from drops equilibrated against 50 µl reservoir solution comprising 20% PEG 3350, 0.2 M sodium formate pH 7.2, while hexagonal crystals of the SeMet-*Xcc*FimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP-*Xcc*PilZ₁₀₂₈ complex appeared in 21 d from drops equilibrated against 50 µl reservoir solution comprising 0.2 M NaCl, 0.1 M HEPES pH 7.5, 20% PEG 3K (Fig. 2). Crystals of both complexes suitable for diffraction experiments were grown from drops by mixing 1.5 µl protein solution with 1.5 µl reservoir solution and equilibrating against 500 µl reservoir solution at 277 K. Crystals of the $XccFimX^{EAL}$ -c-di-GMP complex reached dimensions of 0.2 × 0.2×0.2 mm after one week, while those of the SeMet-*Xcc*FimX^{EAL}c-di-GMP-XccPilZ₁₀₂₈ complex reached dimensions of $0.01 \times 0.01 \times$ 0.01 mm after three weeks.

2.4. Data collection and processing

Crystals of both complexes were flash-cooled at 100 K under a stream of cold nitrogen gas using the reservoir solution as cryoprotectant. Before data collection, the crystals were scanned for Se absorption and 0.97934 Å was found to be the peak wavelength of the anomalous signal. X-ray diffraction data for the native $XccFimX^{EAL}$ c-di-GMP complex were obtained to 2.5 Å resolution on beamline 13B1 at the National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center (NSRRC), Taiwan, while those for the SeMet-XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP-XccPilZ₁₀₂₈ complex were collected to 2.7 Å resolution on beamline 12B2 at SPring-8, Japan (Fig. 3). The data were indexed and integrated using the HKL-2000 processing software (Otwinowski & Minor, 1997), generating data sets that were 97.1 and 99.4% complete with an overall R_{merge} of 3.6 and 13.8% on intensities, respectively. Determination and refinement of the selenium positions, phase calculation and density modification were carried out using the programs SOLVE and RESOLVE (Terwilliger & Berendzen, 1999). Molecular replacement was performed using CNS (Brünger *et al.*, 1998). The crystals of the $XccFimX^{EAL}$ -c-di-GMP complex belonged

Figure 2

Crystals of the *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP and SeMet-*Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP–*Xcc*PilZ₁₀₂₈ complexes. (*a*) *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP crystals grown in 0.2 *M* sodium formate pH 7.2, 20% PEG 3350 using the hanging-drop vapour-diffusion method at 277 K. These crystals reached average dimensions of $0.2 \times 0.2 \times 0.2 \times 0.2$ mm after one week. (*b*) SeMet-*Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP–*Xcc*PilZ₁₀₂₈ crystals grown in 0.1 *M* HEPES pH 7.5, 0.2 *M* NaCl, 20% PEG 3K using the hanging-drop vapour-diffusion method at 277 K. These crystals reached average dimensions of $0.01 \times 0.01 \times 0.01 \times 0.01$ mm after three weeks.



Figure 3

Diffraction patterns of the native $XccFimX^{EAL}$ -c-di-GMP and SeMet- $XccFimX^{EAL}$ -c-di-GMP- $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complexes collected on a MAR CCD system using synchrotron radiation on the 13B1 beamline at NSRRC in Taiwan and the BL12B1 beamline at SPring-8 in Japan. The exposure time was 1 s, the oscillation range was 1° per frame and the crystal-to-detector distance was 250 mm. The edge of the detector corresponds to a resolution of 2.5 and 3.2 Å, respectively.

to space group $P3_221$, while those of the *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP– *Xcc*PilZ₁₀₂₈ complex belonged to space group $P6_322$. The diffraction statistics are summarized in Table 1.

3. Results and discussion

In this manuscript, we report the successful cloning, protein expression and purification of the $XccFimX^{EAL}$ and $XccPilZ_{1028}$ proteins and the crystal screening and preliminary X-ray data analyses of the native XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP and SeMet-substituted XccFimX^{EAL}c-di-GMP-XccPilZ₁₀₂₈ complexes. Since the FimX protein is a large bacterial protein containing a tandem of REC, PAS, GGDEF and EAL domains, we tried to construct clones from different combinations of these domains as shown in Fig. 1(a) in order to express the domains and determine their structures using X-ray crystallography. Unfortunately, most of these constructs gave proteins in inclusion bodies and only *Xcc*FimX^{EAL} gave soluble protein. As shown in Fig. 1, the His₆ tag and linker of the XccFimX^{EAL} target could be successfully cleaved by TEV (tobacco etch virus) protease at 289 K for 10 h to obtain target protein that is more than 99% pure. It contains only an extra tripeptide (SNA) at the N-terminal end after further gelfiltration chromatography. However, in the absence of c-di-GMP no crystal formation was observed for the $XccFimX^{EAL}$ domain and only a poor diffraction pattern was detected for the XccFimX^{EAL}- $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complex even though it formed seemingly good crystals. These results indicated that c-di-GMP was crucial in forming compact crystals for both the XccFimX^{EAL} domain and the XccFimX^{EAL}- $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complex.

We were surprised by the apparent existence of data to higher resolution once data collection for the native *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP complex began (Table 1) and are considering an experimental effort

to collect these data for refinement of the structure at higher resolution.

Interestingly, although the EAL-domain structure has been solved and found to be conserved (Minasov et al., 2009; Navarro et al., 2009; Tchigvintsev et al., 2010), we were unable to solve the crystal structure of *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}–c-di-GMP using a molecular-replacement approach. Fortunately, we were able to crystallize the $XccFimX^{EAL} - XccPilZ_{1028}$ complex using an SeMet-substituted XccFimX^{EAL} domain in the presence of c-di-GMP. Although the resolution of the SeMet- $XccFimX^{EAL}$ -c-di-GMP- $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complex was a little poorer (2.7 Å) than that of native $XccFimX^{EAL}$ -c-di-GMP (2.5 Å), it should be possible to perform successful phasing of the protein using an Se-SAD approach based on the figure-of-merit statistic (Table 1). Indeed, the model of the $XccFimX^{EAL}$ domain in the SeMet- $XccFimX^{EAL}$ -c-di-GMP- $XccPilZ_{1028}$ complex was almost complete and the initial structure of $XccFimX^{EAL}$ was used as a model for molecular replacement to determine the phases of the XccFimX^{EAL}c-di-GMP complex. The Matthews coefficient and solvent content were 2.74 Å^3 Da⁻¹ and 55.2%, respectively, for the *Xcc*FimX^{EAL}c-di-GMP complex and 2.93 \AA^3 Da⁻¹ and 58.0%, respectively, for the SeMet-XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP-XccPilZ₁₀₂₈ complex. The c-di-GMP was clearly identified in the electron-density maps of both the XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP and the SeMet-XccFimX^{EAL}-c-di-GMP-XccPilZ₁₀₂₈ complexes. Refinement of both complexes is now in progress.

This work was supported in part by the Ministry of Education, Taiwan, ROC under the ATU plan and by the National Science Council, Taiwan, ROC (grant 97-2113-M005-005-MY3 to S-HC). We appreciate the Structural Genomics Databases service provided by the GMBD Bioinformatics Core (http://www.tbi.org.tw), NRPGM, Taiwan, ROC. We would also like to thank the Core Facilities for Protein X-ray Crystallography in the Academia Sinica, Taiwan, ROC for help in crystal screening, the National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center (NSRRC) in Taiwan and the SPring-8 Synchrotron facility in Japan for assistance in X-ray data collection. The National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center is a user facility supported by the National Science Council, Taiwan, ROC and the Protein Crystallography Facility is supported by the National Research Program for Genomic Medicine, Taiwan, ROC.

References

- Alm, R. A., Bodero, A. J., Free, P. D. & Mattick, J. S. (1996). J. Bacteriol. 178, 46–53.
- Amikam, D. & Galperin, M. Y. (2006). Bioinformatics, 22, 3-6.
- Aslanidis, C. & de Jong, P. J. (1990). Nucleic Acids Res. 18, 6069-6074.
- Benach, J., Swaminathan, S. S., Tamayo, R., Handelman, S. K., Folta-Stogniew, E., Ramos, J. E., Forouhar, F., Neely, H., Seetharaman, J., Camilli, A. & Hunt, J. F. (2007). *EMBO J.* 26, 5153–5166.
- Brünger, A. T., Adams, P. D., Clore, G. M., DeLano, W. L., Gros, P., Grosse-Kunstleve, R. W., Jiang, J.-S., Kuszewski, J., Nilges, M., Pannu, N. S., Read, R. J., Rice, L. M., Simonson, T. & Warren, G. L. (1998). Acta Cryst. D54, 905–921.
- Guzzo, C. R., Salinas, R. K., Andrade, M. O. & Farah, C. S. (2009). J. Mol. Biol. 393, 846–866.
- Huang, B., Whitchurch, C. B. & Mattick, J. S. (2003). J. Bacteriol. 185, 7068–7076.
- Jenal, U. & Malone, J. (2006). Annu. Rev. Genet. 40, 385-407.
- Kazmierczak, B. I., Lebron, M. B. & Murray, T. S. (2006). Mol. Microbiol. 60, 1026–1043.
- Li, T.-N., Chin, K.-H., Fung, K.-M., Yang, M.-T., Wang, A. H.-J. & Chou, S.-H. (2011). *PLoS One*, 6, e22036.
- Li, T.-N., Chin, K.-H., Liu, J.-H., Wang, A. H.-J. & Chou, S.-H. (2009). Proteins, 75, 282–288.
- Li, T.-N., Chin, K.-H., Shih, H.-L., Wang, A. H.-J. & Chou, S.-H. (2009). Acta Cryst. F65, 1056–1059.
- Mattick, J. S. (2002). Annu. Rev. Microbiol. 56, 289-314.
- McCarthy, Y., Ryan, R. P., O'Donovan, K., He, Y.-Q., Jiang, B.-L., Feng, J.-X., Tang, J.-L. & Dow, J. M. (2008). *Mol. Plant Pathol.* 9, 819–824.
- Merighi, M., Lee, V. T., Hyodo, M., Hayakawa, Y. & Lory, S. (2007). Mol. Microbiol. 65, 876–895.
- Minasov, G., Padavattan, S., Shuvalova, L., Brunzelle, J. S., Miller, D. J., Baslé, A., Massa, C., Collart, F. R., Schirmer, T. & Anderson, W. F. (2009). J. Biol. Chem. 284, 13174–13184.

- Navarro, M. V., De, N., Bae, N., Wang, Q. & Sondermann, H. (2009). *Structure*, **17**, 1104–1116.
- Otwinowski, Z. & Minor, W. (1997). Methods Enzymol. 276, 307-326.
- Pratt, J. T., Tamayo, R., Tischler, A. D. & Camilli, A. (2007). J. Biol. Chem. 282, 12860–12870.
- Qi, Y., Chuah, M. L.-C., Dong, X., Xie, K., Luo, Z., Tang, K. & Liang, Z.-X. (2011). J. Biol. Chem. 286, 2910–2917.
- Ramelot, T. A., Yee, A., Cort, J. R., Semesi, A., Arrowsmith, C. H. & Kennedy, M. A. (2007). Proteins, 66, 266–271.
- Rao, F., Pasunooti, S., Ng, Y., Zhuo, W., Lim, L., Liu, A. W. & Liang, Z.-X. (2009). Anal. Biochem. 389, 138–142.
- Römling, U. (2011). Environ. Microbiol., doi:10.1111/j.1462-2920.2011.02617.x.
- Römling, U. & Amikam, D. (2006). Curr. Opin. Microbiol. 9, 218-228.
- Römling, U., Gomelsky, M. & Galperin, M. Y. (2005). Mol. Microbiol. 57, 629-639.
- Ross, P., Mayer, R., Weinhouse, H., Amikam, D., Huggirat, Y., Benziman, M., de Vroom, E., Fidder, A., de Paus, P., Sliedregt, L. A. J. M., van der Marel, G. A. & van Boom, J. H. (1990). J. Biol. Chem. 265, 18933–18943.
- Ross, P., Weinhouse, H., Aloni, Y., Michaeli, D., Weinberger-Ohana, P., Mayer, R., Braun, S., de Vroom, E., van der Marel, G. A., van Boom, J. H. & Benziman, M. (1987). *Nature (London)*, **325**, 279–281.
- Ryan, R. P., Fouhy, Y., Lucey, J. F., Crossman, L. C., Spiro, S., He, Y.-W., Zhang, L.-H., Heeb, S., Cámara, M., Williams, P. & Dow, J. M. (2006). Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA, 103, 6712–6717.
- Ryan, R. P., Fouhy, Y., Lucey, J. F., Jiang, B.-L., He, Y.-Q., Feng, J.-X., Tang, J.-L. & Dow, J. M. (2007). Mol. Microbiol. 63, 429–442.
- Ryjenkov, D. A., Simm, R., Römling, U. & Gomelsky, M. (2006). J. Biol. Chem. 281, 30310–30314.
- Simm, R., Morr, M., Kader, A., Nimtz, M. & Römling, U. (2004). Mol. Microbiol. 53, 1123–1134.
- Slater, H., Alvarez-Morales, A., Barber, C. E., Daniels, M. J. & Dow, J. M. (2000). Mol. Microbiol. 38, 986–1003.
- Stols, L., Gu, M., Dieckman, L., Raffen, R., Collart, F. R. & Donnelly, M. I. (2001). Protein Expr. Purif. 25, 8–15.
- Tal, R., Wong, H. C., Calhoon, R., Gelfand, D., Fear, A. L., Volman, G., Mayer, R., Ross, P., Amikam, D., Weinhouse, H., Cohen, A., Sapir, S., Ohana, P. & Benziman, M. (1988). J. Bacteriol. 180, 4416–4425.
- Tchigvintsev, A., Xu, X., Singer, A., Chang, C., Brown, G., Proudfoot, M., Cui, H., Flick, R., Anderson, W. F., Joachimiak, A., Galperin, M. Y., Savchenko, A. & Yakunin, A. F. (2010). J. Mol. Biol. 402, 524–538.
- Terwilliger, T. C. & Berendzen, J. (1999). Acta Cryst. D55, 849-861.
- Tischler, A. D. & Camilli, A. (2004). Mol. Microbiol. 53, 857-869.
- Wu, Y.-Y., Chin, K.-H., Chou, C.-C., Lee, C.-C., Shr, H.-L., Gao, F. P., Lyu, P.-C., Wang, A. H.-J. & Chou, S.-H. (2005). Acta Cryst. F61, 902– 905.