



HAL
open science

Mechanism of transmembrane signaling by sensor histidine kinases

Ivan Yu. Gushchin, Igor I Melkinov, Vitaly Polovinkin, Andrii Ishchenko, Anastasia Yuzhakova, Pavel Buslaev, Gleb Bourenkov, Sergei Grudinin, Ekaterina Round, Taras Balandin, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Ivan Yu. Gushchin, Igor I Melkinov, Vitaly Polovinkin, Andrii Ishchenko, Anastasia Yuzhakova, et al.. Mechanism of transmembrane signaling by sensor histidine kinases. *Science*, 2017, 356 (6342), pp.eaah6345. 10.1126/science.aah6345 . hal-01526454

HAL Id: hal-01526454

<https://hal.science/hal-01526454>

Submitted on 11 Jun 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Copyright

1 **Title: Mechanism of transmembrane signaling by sensor histidine kinases**

2 **Authors:** Ivan Gushchin^{1,2,*}, Igor Melnikov³, Vitaly Polovinkin^{1,2,4}, Andrii Ishchenko^{1,5,#},
3 Anastasia Yuzhakova^{1,2}, Pavel Buslaev², Gleb Bourenkov⁶, Sergei Grudinin^{7,8,9},
4 Ekaterina Round^{1,4}, Taras Balandin¹, Valentin Borshchevskiy^{1,2}, Dieter Willbold^{1,10},
5 Gordon Leonard³, Georg Büldt², Alexander Popov³, Valentin Gordeliy^{1,2,4,*}

6 **Affiliations:**

7 ¹Institute of Complex Systems (ICS), ICS-6: Structural Biochemistry, Research Centre Jülich,
8 52425 Jülich, Germany.

9 ²Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, 141700 Dolgoprudniy, Russia.

10 ³European Synchrotron Radiation Facility, F-38043 Grenoble, France.

11 ⁴Institut de Biologie Structurale J.-P. Ebel, Université Grenoble Alpes-CEA-CNRS, F-38000
12 Grenoble, France.

13 ⁵Institute of Crystallography, University of Aachen (RWTH), 52056 Aachen, Germany.

14 ⁶European Molecular Biology Laboratory, Hamburg Outstation, 22607 Hamburg, Germany.

15 ⁷Université Grenoble Alpes, LJK, F-38000 Grenoble, France.

16 ⁸CNRS, LJK, F-38000 Grenoble, France.

17 ⁹Inria, F-38000 Grenoble, France.

18 ¹⁰Institute of Physical Biology, Heinrich-Heine University, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany

19 *Correspondence to: I.G. (ivan.gushchin@phystech.edu) and V.G. (valentin.gordeliy@ibs.fr).

20 #Current address: Department of Chemistry, Bridge Institute, University of Southern California,
21 Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA.

22
23 This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here by permission of the AAAS for personal use,
24 not for redistribution. The definitive version was published in Science Vol. 356, Issue 6342,
25 eaah6345, 09 Jun 2017, doi: 10.1126/science.aah6345.

26
27

1 **Abstract:** One of the major and essential classes of transmembrane (TM) receptors, present in all
2 domains of life, is sensor histidine kinases (HKs), parts of two-component signaling systems
3 (TCS). The structural mechanisms of transmembrane signaling by these sensors are poorly
4 understood. We present here crystal structures of the periplasmic sensor domain, the TM domain
5 and the cytoplasmic HAMP domain of the *Escherichia coli* nitrate/nitrite sensor HK NarQ in the
6 ligand-bound and mutated ligand-free states. The structures reveal that the ligand binding
7 induces significant rearrangements and piston-like shifts of TM helices. The HAMP domain
8 protomers undergo lever-like motions and convert the piston-like motions into helical rotations.
9 Our findings provide the structural framework for complete understanding of TM TCS signaling
10 and for development of antimicrobial treatments targeting TCS.

11

12 **One Sentence Summary:** Crystal structures of bacterial nitrate sensor NarQ with and without its
13 ligand reveal a structural basis for signal propagation through the cell membrane in histidine
14 kinases: piston-like motions of transmembrane helices and scissor-like motions in the ubiquitous
15 signaling module HAMP domain.

1 Main Text:

2 3 Introduction

4
5 Microorganisms obtain most of the information about their environments through membrane-
6 associated signaling systems. One of the major and most abundant classes of membrane
7 receptors, present in all domains of life, is sensor histidine kinases, members of two-component
8 signaling systems (TCS) (1–3). Overall, tens of thousands of TCS are known (4). Many of these
9 systems are essential for cell growth, survival or pathogenicity and consequently can be targeted
10 to reduce virulence (5–7).

11
12 Membrane-associated sensor kinases generally function as homodimers and possess a
13 periplasmic, membrane or intracellular sensor module, a transmembrane (TM) domain, often one
14 or several intracellular signal transduction domains such as HAMP, PAS or GAF, and an
15 intracellular autokinase module (DHp and CA domains), which phosphorylates the response
16 regulator protein (1, 8, 9) (Figure S1). Other TCS TM sensors, chemo- and photo-receptors, have
17 domain organization similar to that of sensor histidine kinases as they possess the sensor module,
18 TM and HAMP domains, but lack the autokinase module and control separate kinase protein
19 (CheA) via the kinase control module (Figure S1). Also, the core functional unit of
20 chemoreceptors and phototaxis systems is not a dimer but a trimer of dimers (10–12), which may
21 then pack into higher-order oligomeric assemblies (13).

22
23 Molecular mechanisms of the TM signal transduction in different classes of TCS are expected to
24 be somewhat similar, since in a vast majority of the sensors there is a dimeric four-helical TM
25 core in the TM domain, often followed by the HAMP domain downstream. At present, only two
26 reports on atomic-resolution structures of the TM domains are available, both describing isolated
27 TM fragments and thus providing little insight into the signal transduction in and out of the TM
28 domain of a typical TCS sensor. The first report provided crystallographic structure of the
29 complex between the photoreceptor sensory rhodopsin and the transmembrane domain of its
30 transducer protein (14). In the second report, NMR structures of non-physiological monomeric
31 TM domains of histidine kinases from three different classes have been described (15). Finally,
32 several low resolution models of the TM helices in the context of full-length proteins such as
33 chemoreceptor Tar or histidine kinase PhoQ have been constructed based on disulfide
34 crosslinking and modeling (16, 17). Due to limitations of all these studies, atomic details of TM
35 signal transduction are still not resolved (8, 9). As for the HAMP domain, multiple experimental
36 structures of the domains from different proteins are available, and there are several competing
37 hypotheses on the HAMP domain signaling (8, 9, 18).

38
39 To complement the above reports we present here our studies of the *Escherichia coli*
40 nitrate/nitrite sensor kinase NarQ. Similarly to NarX, another *E. coli* nitrate/nitrite sensor, NarQ
41 consists of seven major structural elements: the periplasmic sensor domain, the TM domain, the
42 HAMP domain, the signaling helix, the GAF-like domain, the DHp domain and the kinase CA
43 domain (18–20) (Figure S1). While no structural information is available for NarQ, crystal
44 structures of NarX sensor domain in *apo* and *holo* states have been determined (21), as well as
45 multiple structures of the HAMP, GAF, DHp and kinase domains of other proteins (8, 9).

1 Here, we used the *in meso* (22–24) and single wavelength anomalous dispersion (SAD) (25)
2 approaches to crystallize and determine the crystal structures, at resolutions of up to 1.9 Å, of a
3 fragment of the nitrate sensor NarQ that contains the sensor, TM and HAMP domains. We
4 determined the symmetric *apo* state structure of a conservative mutant and symmetric and highly
5 asymmetric *holo-S* and *holo-A* state structures of the wild type protein (Figures 1 and S2).
6 Comparison of the *apo* and *holo* structures reveals extensive structural rearrangements and
7 provides a direct demonstration of signal transduction through the TM and HAMP domains,
8 including a piston-like motion of TM helices and a lever-like rotation of HAMP domain
9 protomers. Comparison of *holo-S* and *holo-A* structures shows that the signal transduction in
10 NarQ can be achieved via different sets of conformational changes. Overall, the presented
11 findings clarify the mechanism of TM signaling in TCS receptors.

12
13

1 **Results**

2 3 *Structure of the sensor domain*

4
5 In all of the presented structures, including the asymmetric ligand-bound form, the NarQ sensor
6 domain is a symmetric dimer of two monomers comprised of four α -helices H1-H4, with the
7 helices H2 and H4 being broken into sub-helices (Figure S3). The loop between the helices H2
8 and H3 is anchored into the membrane by residues Trp89 and Tyr90. Nitrate binds at the
9 symmetry axis between the helices H1 and H1' of the two protomers, where it is coordinated by
10 the side chains of the residues Arg50 and Arg50' (Figure S3E). The ligand was observed in all
11 crystals of the wild type (WT) protein, including those obtained without supplementation of the
12 protein purification and crystallization solutions with nitrate. This is probably a consequence of
13 the combination of following factors: high ligand affinity of the crystallized fragment for nitrate,
14 presence of nitrate impurities in the aforementioned solutions and the very low amount of nitrate
15 needed to saturate the binding sites in the ~ 0.5 millimolar receptor solution used for
16 crystallization. Consequently, we generated a conservative R50K mutant to obtain the crystal
17 structure of NarQ in its *apo* state. This mutation is known to lock the receptor in the off state (26)
18 but was not expected to alter the local structure of the sensor domain since arginine and lysine
19 side chains are similar in size and charge. Indeed, the structures of the NarQ sensor domain in
20 the *apo* R50K and *holo-S* and *holo-A* WT forms reported here closely resemble those of the *apo*
21 and *holo* WT NarX sensor domain (21), respectively. In particular, the positions of the
22 membrane-proximal ends of helices H1 and H4, responsible for downstream signaling, are
23 identical in the corresponding structures (Figures S3C,F) and we thus conclude that introduction
24 of the mutation results in correct reproduction of the structural features of the WT ligand-free
25 protein.

26 27 *Structure of the TM domain*

28
29 In all of the structures presented here, the NarQ TM domain is an anti-parallel 4-stranded coiled
30 coil (CC) consisting of 9 CC layers (Figures 1, 2 and S4). Several ordered lipid fragments are
31 observed in the *holo-S* structure, one fragment in observed in the *holo-A* structure, and no
32 fragments are observed in the *apo* structure. However, due to the small size of the fragments,
33 reliable identification of the corresponding lipidic moieties is not possible.

34
35 There are notable variations in the packing of the TM helices. The *apo* state structure is best
36 described as a dimeric CC comprised of helices TM1 and TM1', with TM2 and TM2' flanking
37 this. The symmetric *holo-S* state structure is a traditional four-helical CC, switching from a 7/2-
38 period left-handed CC at the periplasmic side to a 11/3-period structure with close to zero
39 supercoil twist on the cytoplasmic side. Finally, in the asymmetric *holo-A* state, the TM domain
40 is a highly distorted CC, where the relative arrangement of the helices in layers 1-4 and 9
41 resembles that observed in the symmetric *holo-S* state and the arrangement in layers 7 and 8
42 resembles that seen in the *apo* state (Figure S4).

43
44 In general, the cytoplasm-proximal layers are more hydrophobic and are packed tightly, whereas
45 those proximal to the periplasm contain hydrated cavities and multiple polar (Ser22, Ser25,
46 Thr26, Thr32, Ser154, Thr163) and somewhat disordered glycine residues (Gly27, Gly157,

1 Gly158 and Gly160, Figure S2E). While the role of water molecules and glycine residues in the
2 NarQ TM domain is not clear, similar α -helix-destabilizing features are observed in the TM
3 domains of other histidine kinases (Figure S5) and they probably impart the TM domain with the
4 flexibility needed to accommodate signaling-associated transitions, similarly to the glycine hinge
5 in the cytoplasmic part of chemoreceptors (27).

6
7 The α -helical composition of the TM region of TCS receptors has long been predicted (8, 9, 14–
8 17). However, the structure of the NarQ TM domain is notably different from that of the sensory
9 rhodopsin transducer TM domain (Figure S5). In NarQ, the TM region is either a simple 4-
10 helical CC, or has a dimeric CC core consisting of the helices TM1, whereas *NpHtrII* has a
11 dimeric CC core consisting of the helices TM2 (14, 28). Also, in NarQ, there is either zero or
12 left-handed supercoil twist, while in *NpHtrII* this changes from close to zero at the periplasmic
13 side to right-handed at the cytoplasmic side (Figure S5). As for the comparison with the TM
14 fragments of ArcB, QseC and KdpD, unfortunately, the NMR structures do not provide the
15 information about the dimerization interfaces and CC packing in the physiological dimers of any
16 of these kinases (15).

17 *The junctions between TM and adjacent domains.*

18
19
20 Our crystal structures of NarQ reveal details of the interactions of the TM domain with the
21 membrane-proximal domains (Figure S6). On the periplasmic side of the protein, in the *apo*
22 state, there is a continuous transition of the helices TM1 and TM2 into the helices H1 and H4,
23 respectively, whereas in both *holo-A* and *holo-S* state there is a break in the α -helical structure
24 between TM1 and H1 (see Figures S6A,D for comparison of *apo* and *holo-S* states).

25
26 At the cytoplasmic side, in all states the cytoplasmic side of TM1 and the protein's N-terminus
27 make extensive contacts with the HAMP domain. The highly conserved glutamic acid residue
28 Glu207 of the membrane-proximal region of HAMP domain helix AS2 (29) forms two hydrogen
29 bonds with the backbone nitrogens of helix TM1 residues (Figures S6B,E), similarly to what has
30 been observed in the structure of the soluble mutant of protein Af1503 (30) (Figure S7A). As for
31 the TM2-AS1 junction, there is a proline-induced kink (Figures S6C,F), again as also seen for
32 the protein Af1503 (30) (Figure S7B).

33 34 *The HAMP domain*

35
36 The NarQ HAMP domain displays a typical parallel 4-stranded CC fold (18), with each protomer
37 consisting of two α -helices AS1 and AS2, separated by an unstructured linker (Figure S8). In all
38 of the structures, the HAMP domain is less ordered than the sensor and TM domains, and in the
39 *apo* state structure, the positions of the side chains of Leu225 and Tyr226 are not resolved.
40 Overall, the *apo* state structure is similar to the structure of the Af1503 HAMP domain (Figure
41 S9). The structure observed for the symmetric *holo-S* state HAMP domain is influenced by
42 crystal contacts: the helices AS2 are interspersed with the same helices of an adjacent dimer
43 (Figures S2 and S8), and consequently there is no contact between the Leu225 side chains facing
44 towards the CC core. While such conformation would be consistent with an antiparallel 4-
45 helical CC downstream domain, such as in bacterial chemoreceptors (31), it is unusual in the
46 structural context of histidine kinases. The crystal contacts mentioned above are absent in the

1 asymmetric *holo-A* state structure (space group P2). There, the hydrophobic Leu225 side chains
2 are less exposed to the solvent and are in contact with each other. Thus, we conclude that the
3 *holo-A* structure represents a better model of the activated NarQ HAMP domain.

4 5 *The signaling helix region*

6
7 In order to obtain insights into signal transduction through and downstream of the HAMP
8 domain, we have constructed atomic models of the adjacent signaling helix region (residues 224-
9 245, see NarQ domain architecture in Figure S1). The signaling helix is a common sequence
10 motif in sensor kinases (32) and sensory rhodopsin transducers (33), and two CC heptad repeat
11 pattern assignments are possible for NarQ based on the positions of hydrophobic and hydrophilic
12 residues (Figure S10). Neither of the models is compatible with the *holo* state HAMP domain
13 structures, but both, especially model 2, are compatible with the structure of the *apo* state HAMP
14 domain (see layer 6 in Figure S8 and layer 1 in Figure S10). Model 1 comprises a phase stutter
15 that is also observed in other histidine kinases and chemoreceptors (18, 19, 34) and may be
16 required for destabilization of the signaling helix for it to be able to adopt different signaling
17 states. However, model 2 appears to be more probable judging from the protein sequence (19).

18 19 **Discussion**

20 21 *Signal transduction in NarQ*

22
23 Comparison of the *apo* and *holo* state crystal structures of NarQ reveals that binding of nitrate
24 causes significant rearrangements in the TM region that can be represented as a combination of
25 changes in the lateral arrangement of the TM helices and piston-like shifts of the helices in the
26 direction perpendicular to the membrane plain. At the same time, comparison of the *holo-S* and
27 *holo-A* states reveals profound differences in the middle of the TM segment but identical
28 conformations at its periplasmic and intracellular sides (see Movie S1 for comparison of *apo* and
29 *holo-S* state structures, and Movie S2 for comparison of *holo-S* and *holo-A* structures). We make
30 several observations from these comparisons.

31
32 First, binding of nitrate in the vicinity of Gly47 causes disruption in the α -helix H1 and
33 appearance of a 3_{10} -helix element: Gly47 carbonyl switches from Met51 amide hydrogen to
34 Arg50 amide hydrogen (from $i \rightarrow i+4$ helical hydrogen bonding to $i \rightarrow i+3$, Figures S3 and S11).
35 3_{10} -helices have a higher helical rise per residue than α -helices (35), and as a result the
36 membrane-proximal part of H1 moves slightly towards the membrane and rotates. This rotation
37 of the membrane-proximal part of H1 opens a “hole” near the residues Ile43 and Ala46, which is
38 then occupied by Val136 “knob” (36). Consequently, H4 rotates as well and moves away from
39 the membrane, which results in a piston-like displacement of H4 relative to H1 for ~ 0.5 - 1.0 Å.
40 Also, the helices H4 and H4' are brought much closer to the helices H1 and H1'. This
41 interpretation is supported by mutagenesis data: mutation of Ala46 to serine is inconsequential,
42 mutation to threonine results in impaired signaling, and mutations to much bulkier asparagine
43 and isoleucine lock NarQ in the ‘off’ state (37). The observed conformational changes in NarQ
44 are identical to the changes observed in isolated NarX sensor domain (Figure S3) (21).

1 Rotation of the membrane-proximal parts of H1 and H1' and approach of H4 and H4' upon
2 binding of nitrate result in disruption of the TM1/H1-TM1'/H1' CC interface, appearance of
3 discontinuity between the α -helices TM1 and H1, and distancing of TM1 and TM1' periplasmic
4 sides (Figures 3 and S11, and Movie S1). The introduced discontinuity between TM1 and H1
5 further increases the relative piston-like displacement from ~ 1 Å for H1 relative to H4 (as in
6 NarX, (21)) to ~ 2.5 Å for TM1 relative to TM2 (Figure S11). Importance of the TM1-H1 helical
7 break for kinase activation is also highlighted by mutagenesis study: introduction of a proline
8 into the TM1-H1 junction (mutation E41P) locks the receptor in the 'on' state, whereas other
9 nonconservative mutations of Glu41 (E41R, E41H and E41L) do not disrupt the function of the
10 receptor (37).

11
12 Whereas conformational changes in the sensor domain and at the sensor-TM junction are
13 moderate and identical in *holo-A* and *holo-S* structures, the rearrangements in the TM domain
14 are much more pronounced and are different between *holo-A* and *holo-S*. Helices TM1, which
15 form a tight CC interface in the *apo* state, are not fully separated in the *holo-A* structure
16 (Figure S4). In the *holo-S* state the four TM helices form a traditional four-helical coiled coil
17 (Figures 2 and S4). However, there is a similarity between the *holo-A* and *holo-S* structures: in
18 both the ~ 2.5 Å relative piston-like displacement of the TM helices is fully transduced towards
19 the HAMP domain (Figures 2 and 3, Movies S1 and S2). Conformational changes at the TM-
20 HAMP interface are also identical in the *holo-S* and *holo-A* structures as compared to the *apo*
21 state structure. Thus, comparison of the asymmetric *holo-A* and symmetric *holo-S* state
22 structures presents an insight into receptor flexibility and robustness of signal transduction by the
23 TM domain despite the ~ 9 Å difference in the position of the HAMP domain (Figures 1, 3, S4
24 and S8).

25
26 Finally, in the cytoplasmic part of NarQ, the piston-like displacements of the TM helices, caused
27 by binding of the ligand, are amplified through the lever-like rotations of the HAMP domain
28 protomers around the Pro179 hinge into roughly 7 Å displacements of the output ends of the AS2
29 helices (Figure 3). During these conformational rearrangements, each HAMP domain protomer
30 behaves essentially as a rigid body. RMSD of the backbone atoms positions of the helices AS1
31 (residues 179 to 192) and AS2 (residues 206 to 225) is ~ 0.6 Å between the *apo* and both *holo-S*
32 and *holo-A* structures, and ~ 0.4 Å between the *holo-S* and *holo-A* structures, which is
33 comparable to crystal-to-crystal variation and typical crystallographic error of atomic positions.
34 However, due to relative motions of the HAMP domain protomers, the whole dimeric HAMP
35 domain itself changes significantly: RMSD of the backbone atoms positions of the helices AS1
36 (residues 179 to 192) and AS2 (residues 206 to 225) is ~ 2.9 Å between the *apo* and *holo-S*
37 structures and 3.0 Å between the *apo* and *holo-A* structures, as opposed to ~ 1.2 Å between the
38 *holo-S* and *holo-A* structures.

39
40 Details of the signal transduction in NarQ downstream of the HAMP domain are less clear due to
41 truncation of the crystallized construct. In the *apo* state, the CC register of the AS2 output ends is
42 consistent with the CC register of the signaling helix. However, in the *holo-A* and *holo-S* states
43 the CC helical phase is much less consistent with that of the signaling helix. Therefore, it appears
44 that the signaling helix should be destabilized and/or dissociated upon binding of the ligand
45 (Figure 4). Signaling-related dissociation or destabilization of signaling helix was also observed

1 in Af1503-EnvZ chimeras (34) and histidine kinases BvgS and DesK (38, 39) and may thus be
2 the general mechanism for signal propagation towards the DHp domain in TCS sensor kinases.

3 4 *Mechanism of transmembrane signaling by TCS receptors*

5
6 Several hypotheses concerning transmembrane signaling mechanisms in TCS receptors have
7 been proposed (8, 9). For sensor histidine kinases, the crystal structures of α -helical NarX and
8 TorS sensor domains hinted at piston-like conformational changes (21, 40). The crystal
9 structures of the mixed α/β tandem PAS sensor domain of HAMP-less kinase LuxQ revealed
10 rotation of signal output helices (41), which was also demonstrated in another HAMP-less kinase
11 AgrC where the sensor domain is integral to the membrane (42). Recent crosslinking study
12 revealed scissor-like diagonal displacement of the TM helices in the kinase PhoQ (17). For
13 chemoreceptors with α -helical sensor domains, such as aspartate receptor Tar, the major model is
14 piston-like displacement of the TM helices in the direction normal to the membrane plane (13,
15 31). For chemoreceptor McpB with mixed α/β tandem PAS sensor domain, the signal was found
16 to be transduced via rotation of TM helices (43). Finally, in the sensory rhodopsin-cognate
17 transducer complex, where sensor is integral to the membrane, a combination of a piston-like
18 motion and a rotation of the signal output helices was observed (44). While the piston-like
19 displacements, helical rotations, CC phase changes, and scissoring motions are not mutually
20 exclusive and possibly coupled to each other, the consensus on the transmembrane signaling
21 mechanism in TCS sensors is currently lacking (8, 9).

22
23 Our results show that binding of ligand to NarQ causes a piston-like displacement of the TM
24 helices, which is accompanied by extensive symmetric or asymmetric rearrangements and
25 scissoring of the TM helices. The rearrangements are different in the two presented *holo* state
26 structures, but the piston-like displacement is perfectly conserved. Thus, the latter appears to be a
27 more robust mechanism of TM signal transduction.

28
29 Also, our data shows that symmetrical changes in the sensor domain may result both in
30 symmetrical changes in the TM domain (as in the *holo*-S structure), and in asymmetrical changes
31 (as in the *holo*-A structure). Asymmetry only changes the position of the HAMP domain relative
32 to the TM domain and not its signaling state (Figure 1). Sensor domains of several histidine
33 kinases are known to reside in asymmetric conformations in the inactive state and in symmetric
34 conformations in the active state (40). The aspartate chemoreceptor can be activated both by
35 asymmetric changes in the sensor domain upon binding of a ligand (31, 45) and presumably
36 symmetric conformational changes upon mutations of aminoacids at the membrane/water
37 interfaces (46, 47). Thus, whether the asymmetric changes in the sensor domain can result in
38 symmetric changes in the TM domain, and the exact relations between asymmetry and
39 activation, are not clear and remain to be investigated.

40 41 *Signal transduction through the HAMP domain*

42
43 Currently, there are several competing hypotheses concerning the mechanism of signal
44 transduction through the HAMP domain (8, 9, 18): the gearbox model postulates rotation of the
45 HAMP domain helices in opposite directions (48, 49); the dynamic bundle model proposes that
46 signal transduction is associated with changes in HAMP domain stability (50, 51); several

1 reports based on crosslinking and crystallographic studies propose a variety of scissoring models
2 (52–54).

3
4 Our results indicate that in NarQ the HAMP domain serves as an amplifier and convertor of the
5 piston-like conformational changes in the TM domain. Piston-like displacements of TM1 and
6 TM1' cytoplasmic ends for 2.5 Å relative to the proline hinge result in lever-like rotations of the
7 protomers around their respective proline hinges and consequent 7 Å displacements in opposite
8 directions of AS2 and AS2' membrane-distal ends. This results in a ~90° change in the helical
9 phase and the output CC register (Figures 3 and S8). Thus, the membrane-proximal HAMP
10 domain acts as a convertor of the piston-like motions of TM domain helices into helical rotation
11 at its output helices. These conformational changes are similar to the scissoring models (52–54),
12 and are possibly accompanied by changes in the stability of the HAMP or adjacent domains.
13 However, our results do not support the gearbox hypothesis. We observe that the HAMP domain
14 protomers move relative to each other in a rigid body fashion, without rotation of the helices
15 AS1 and AS2 within each protomer. Also, we should note that observation of slightly different
16 HAMP domain conformations in *holo-A* and *holo-S* structures and increased B-factors in the
17 HAMP domain region underline its dynamic nature. It is possible that the domain exists in an
18 ensemble of similar conformations *in vivo*, whereas crystallographic structures provide only
19 static snapshots. Finally, due to absence of the adjacent signaling helix region in the crystallized
20 construct, the observed conformational changes may under- or overestimate the actual
21 transformations associated with signal transduction.

22
23 Interestingly, signal convertor role of the HAMP domain might reconcile the data on TM signal
24 transduction in histidine kinases that contain and those that lack the HAMP domains. In sensors
25 containing a membrane-proximal HAMP domain, binding of a ligand causes a piston-like
26 displacement of the TM helices (that may be accompanied by scissoring), which is then
27 converted into helical rotation by the HAMP domain. In sensors lacking the HAMP domain,
28 binding of ligand directly causes rotation of the TM signal output helices (41, 42). In both cases
29 the signal that is passed downstream is the helical rotation. Whether piston-like displacements
30 are present during PhoQ activation remains to be tested.

31 **Conclusions**

32
33
34 In this work, we described the structures of the TM and membrane-proximal domains of the
35 nitrate/nitrite receptor NarQ, and the conformational changes induced upon the binding of
36 nitrate. The multiple conformational states observed for the TM domains present a template for
37 studies of other TCS receptors, establish the importance of the piston-like displacements of the
38 TM helices and highlight the role of the HAMP domain as an amplifier and convertor of a
39 piston-like displacement into helical rotation. Overall, the results show how a mechanistic signal
40 is generated and amplified while being transduced through the protein over distances of 100 Å or
41 more. Since membrane-associated TCS are ubiquitous in microorganisms and are central for
42 bacterial sensing (1–4), we believe that the results reported here will help in understanding of a
43 broad range of cellular processes, ranging from basic metabolism to sporulation, quorum sensing
44 and virulence. They may also provide insights for development of novel antimicrobial treatments
45 targeting TCS (5–7).

1 **Materials and Methods:**

2 3 *Cloning, protein expression and purification*

4
5 The nucleotide sequence encoding residues 1-230 of NarQ was cloned from *Escherichia coli*
6 strain BL21 (DE3) and introduced into the pSCodon1.2 expression vector (StabyCodon T7,
7 Eurogentec, Belgium) via *NdeI* and *XhoI* restriction sites. Consequently, the construct harbored
8 C-terminal 6×His tag. Mutation R50K was introduced by site-directed mutagenesis. Both the
9 WT protein and the mutant version were expressed in *E. coli* strain SE1 (StabyCodon T7,
10 Eurogentec, Belgium). Cells were cultured in shaking baffled flasks in ZYP-5052 auto-inducing
11 medium (55) containing 100 mg/l ampicillin. After 2 hours of incubation at 37 °C, the
12 temperature was decreased to 30 °C and incubation continued overnight. Harvested cells were
13 disrupted in M-110P Lab Homogenizer (Microfluidics, USA) at 25000 psi in a PBS buffer with
14 addition of 50 mg/l DNase I (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) and EDTA-free protease inhibitor cocktail
15 Complete (Roche). The membrane fraction of cell lysate was isolated by ultracentrifugation at
16 90000 *g* for 1 h at 4° C. The pellet was resuspended in a buffer containing 50 mM
17 NaH₂PO₄/Na₂HPO₄, pH 8.0, 0.3 M NaCl and 2% DDM (Anatrace, Affymetrix, USA) and stirred
18 overnight for solubilization. The insoluble fraction was then removed by ultracentrifugation at
19 90000 *g* for 1 h at 4° C. The supernatant was loaded on a gravity flow column containing Ni-
20 NTA resin (Qiagen, Germany) and the protein was eluted in a buffer containing 20 mM Tris, pH
21 8.0, 0.3 M NaCl, 0.2 M imidazole and 0.1% DDM. Imidazole was removed by dialysis against
22 20 mM Tris, pH 8.0, 0.3 M NaCl and 0.1% DDM for 3 hours. The eluate was subjected to size-
23 exclusion chromatography on 125 ml Superdex 200 PG column (GE Healthcare Life Sciences,
24 USA) in a buffer containing 20 mM Tris, pH 8.0, 0.3 M NaCl, 0.1% DDM. Protein-containing
25 fractions were pooled and concentrated to 30 mg/ml for crystallization.

26 27 *Crystallization*

28
29 The crystals were grown using the *in meso* approach (22–24), similarly to our previous work (14,
30 56, 57). The solubilized protein in the crystallization buffer was added to the monooleoyl-formed
31 lipidic phase (Nu-Chek Prep, USA). Crystallization trials were set up using the NT8 robotic
32 system (Formulatrix, USA). The crystals were grown at 22 °C and reached the final size of 50-
33 150 μm within 2 weeks. The best *holo* state crystals in space groups F222 and P2 were obtained
34 using the precipitants 0.6 M KH₂PO₄/Na₂HPO₄ pH 4.6, 5 mM NaNO₃ and 0.3 M
35 KH₂PO₄/Na₂HPO₄ pH 7.6, 250 mM NaBr, respectively. The best *apo* state crystals in the space
36 group I2₁2₁ were obtained using the precipitant 1.6 M (NH₄)₃PO₄ pH 5.8. Before harvesting,
37 the crystals were incubated for 5 min in the respective precipitant solutions supplemented with
38 20% glycerol. For iodide-SAD experiments, the soaking solution additionally contained 0.5 M
39 NaI. All crystals were harvested using micromounts (MiTeGen), and were flash-cooled and
40 stored in liquid nitrogen.

41 42 *Acquisition and treatment of diffraction data*

43
44 The diffraction data were collected at 100 K at ESRF beamline ID23-1 (58) equipped with a
45 PILATUS 6M-F detector. The data collection statistics are reported in Table S1. In all cases the
46 diffraction was anisotropic as determined by decay of the CC_{1/2} values in 20° cones along the

1 reciprocal cell directions a^* , b^* , and c^* (59). In the space group $I2_12_12_1$, the resolution limits
2 along the directions a^* and b^* were 2.55 and 2.17 Å, and along the direction c^* the $CC_{1/2}$ value
3 was ~0.9 at the resolution cut-off of 1.9 Å. In the native dataset in the space group F222, the
4 resolution limits along the directions a^* and b^* were 2.26 and 1.94 Å, and along the direction c^*
5 the $CC_{1/2}$ value was ~0.8 at the resolution cut-off of 1.94 Å. In the space group P2, the resolution
6 limit along the direction a^* was 2.82 Å, and along the directions b^* and c^* the $CC_{1/2}$ values were
7 ~0.6 and 0.9 at the resolution cut-off of 2.42 Å. Diffraction images were processed using XDS
8 (60). XSCALE (60) was used to merge different datasets and to scale the data for the phasing
9 steps. POINTLESS (59) and AIMLESS (59) were used to merge, scale, assess the quality,
10 convert intensities to structure factor amplitudes and generate Free-R labels.

11 *Structure determination and refinement*

12
13
14 The *holo*-S state structure in the space group F222 was solved using experimental phasing, and
15 the *apo* and *holo*-A state structures in the space groups $I2_12_12_1$ and P2, respectively, were solved
16 using molecular replacement with MOLREP (61) and the sensor domain from the structure in the
17 space group F222 as a search model. For the F222 structure solution, 8 isomorphous datasets
18 from NaI-soaked crystals were collected and merged for subsequent SAD phasing. The iodide
19 sites were determined using ShelxD (62) with the HKL2MAP (63) interface, with the CC_{all} and
20 CC_{weak} values of 40.0% and 15.4%. The resolution was extended to 1.94 Å using the native F222
21 data collected from a single crystal. 178 Ala residues were placed in 5×50 cycles of autotracing
22 and density modification using ShelxE (62). Initial model was improved using automatic model
23 building software ARP-wARP (64). The final F222 model was built using only the native data.
24 For the $I2_12_12_1$ and P2 structure solution, native datasets collected from single crystals were used
25 in each case. All models were refined manually using Coot (65) and REFMAC5 (66).
26 Intermediate conformations shown in movies S1 and S2 were calculated using the NOLB
27 algorithm (68).
28

References and Notes:

1. T. Krell *et al.*, Bacterial Sensor Kinases: Diversity in the Recognition of Environmental Signals. *Annual Review of Microbiology*. **64**, 539–559 (2010).
2. A. M. Stock, V. L. Robinson, P. N. Goudreau, Two-Component Signal Transduction. *Annual Review of Biochemistry*. **69**, 183–215 (2000).
3. P. M. Wolanin, P. A. Thomason, J. B. Stock, Histidine protein kinases: key signal transducers outside the animal kingdom. *Genome Biol.* **3**, 1–8 (2002).
4. L. E. Ulrich, I. B. Zhulin, The MiST2 database: a comprehensive genomics resource on microbial signal transduction. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **38**, D401–407 (2010).
5. Y. Gotoh *et al.*, Two-component signal transduction as potential drug targets in pathogenic bacteria. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*. **13**, 232–239 (2010).
6. B. LaSarre, M. J. Federle, Exploiting Quorum Sensing To Confuse Bacterial Pathogens. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* **77**, 73–111 (2013).
7. D. A. Rasko, V. Sperandio, Anti-virulence strategies to combat bacteria-mediated disease. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* **9**, 117–128 (2010).
8. C. P. Zschiedrich, V. Keidel, H. Szurmant, Molecular Mechanisms of Two-Component Signal Transduction. *Journal of Molecular Biology*. **428**, 3752–3775 (2016).
9. M. P. Bhate, K. S. Molnar, M. Goulian, W. F. DeGrado, Signal Transduction in Histidine Kinases: Insights from New Structures. *Structure*. **23**, 981–994 (2015).
10. M. Li, G. L. Hazelbauer, Core unit of chemotaxis signaling complexes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. **108**, 9390–9395 (2011).
11. C. M. Khursigara, X. Wu, S. Subramaniam, Chemoreceptors in *Caulobacter crescentus*: Trimers of Receptor Dimers in a Partially Ordered Hexagonally Packed Array. *J. Bacteriol.* **190**, 6805–6810 (2008).
12. P. S. Orekhov *et al.*, Signaling and Adaptation Modulate the Dynamics of the Photosensory Complex of *Natronomonas pharaonis*. *PLOS Computational Biology*. **11**, e1004561 (2015).
13. G. L. Hazelbauer, J. J. Falke, J. S. Parkinson, Bacterial chemoreceptors: high-performance signaling in networked arrays. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*. **33**, 9–19 (2008).
14. V. I. Gordeliy *et al.*, Molecular basis of transmembrane signalling by sensory rhodopsin II–transducer complex. *Nature*. **419**, 484–487 (2002).
15. I. Maslennikov *et al.*, Membrane domain structures of three classes of histidine kinase receptors by cell-free expression and rapid NMR analysis. *PNAS*. **107**, 10902–10907 (2010).

- 1 16. A. A. Pakula, M. I. Simon, Determination of transmembrane protein structure by disulfide
2 cross-linking: the Escherichia coli Tar receptor. *PNAS*. **89**, 4144–4148 (1992).
- 3 17. K. S. Molnar *et al.*, Cys-Scanning Disulfide Crosslinking and Bayesian Modeling Probe the
4 Transmembrane Signaling Mechanism of the Histidine Kinase, PhoQ. *Structure*. **22**, 1239–
5 1251 (2014).
- 6 18. J. S. Parkinson, Signaling Mechanisms of HAMP Domains in Chemoreceptors and Sensor
7 Kinases. *Annual Review of Microbiology*. **64**, 101–122 (2010).
- 8 19. V. Stewart, L.-L. Chen, The S Helix Mediates Signal Transmission as a HAMP Domain
9 Coiled-Coil Extension in the NarX Nitrate Sensor from Escherichia coli K-12. *J. Bacteriol.*
10 **192**, 734–745 (2010).
- 11 20. V. Stewart, Nitrate- and nitrite-responsive sensors NarX and NarQ of proteobacteria.
12 *Biochemical Society Transactions*. **31**, 1–10 (2003).
- 13 21. J. Cheung, W. A. Hendrickson, Structural Analysis of Ligand Stimulation of the Histidine
14 Kinase NarX. *Structure*. **17**, 190–201 (2009).
- 15 22. V. I. Gordeliy, R. Schlesinger, R. Efremov, G. Büldt, J. Heberle, in *Membrane Protein*
16 *Protocols: Expression, Purification, and Characterization* (ed. Selinsky, B) (Humana Press,
17 Totowa, New Jersey, 2003).
- 18 23. M. Caffrey, Crystallizing Membrane Proteins for Structure Determination: Use of Lipidic
19 Mesophases. *Annual Review of Biophysics*. **38**, 29–51 (2009).
- 20 24. V. Cherezov, Lipidic cubic phase technologies for membrane protein structural studies.
21 *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*. **21**, 559–566 (2011).
- 22 25. Z. Dauter, M. Dauter, K. R. Rajashankar, Novel approach to phasing proteins:
23 derivatization by short cryo-soaking with halides. *Acta Crystallographica Section D*
24 *Biological Crystallography*. **56**, 232–237 (2000).
- 25 26. S. B. Williams, V. Stewart, Discrimination between structurally related ligands nitrate and
26 nitrite controls autokinase activity of the NarX transmembrane signal transducer of
27 Escherichia coli K-12. *Molecular Microbiology*. **26**, 911–925 (1997).
- 28 27. M. D. Coleman, R. B. Bass, R. S. Mehan, J. J. Falke, Conserved Glycine Residues in the
29 Cytoplasmic Domain of the Aspartate Receptor Play Essential Roles in Kinase Coupling
30 and On–Off Switching†. *Biochemistry*. **44**, 7687–7695 (2005).
- 31 28. A. Ishchenko *et al.*, Ground state structure of D75N mutant of sensory rhodopsin II in
32 complex with its cognate transducer. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B:*
33 *Biology*. **123**, 55–58 (2013).

- 1 29. S. Dunin-Horkawicz, A. N. Lupas, Comprehensive Analysis of HAMP Domains:
2 Implications for Transmembrane Signal Transduction. *Journal of Molecular Biology*. **397**,
3 1156–1174 (2010).
- 4 30. M. D. Hartmann *et al.*, A soluble mutant of the transmembrane receptor Af1503 features
5 strong changes in coiled-coil periodicity. *Journal of Structural Biology*. **186**, 357–366
6 (2014).
- 7 31. J. S. Parkinson, G. L. Hazelbauer, J. J. Falke, Signaling and sensory adaptation in
8 Escherichia coli chemoreceptors: 2015 update. *Trends in Microbiology*. **23**, 257–266
9 (2015).
- 10 32. V. Anantharaman, S. Balaji, L. Aravind, The signaling helix: a common functional theme
11 in diverse signaling proteins. *Biology Direct*. **1**, 25 (2006).
- 12 33. I. Gushchin, V. I. Gordeliy, S. Grudinin, Role of the HAMP Domain Region of Sensory
13 Rhodopsin Transducers in Signal Transduction. *Biochemistry*. **50**, 574–580 (2011).
- 14 34. H. U. Ferris *et al.*, Mechanism of Regulation of Receptor Histidine Kinases. *Structure*. **20**,
15 56–66 (2012).
- 16 35. R. S. Vieira-Pires, J. H. Morais-Cabral, 310 helices in channels and other membrane
17 proteins. *J Gen Physiol*. **136**, 585–592 (2010).
- 18 36. F. H. Crick, The packing of α -helices: simple coiled-coils. *Acta crystallographica*. **6**, 689–
19 697 (1953).
- 20 37. R. C. Chiang, R. Cavicchioli, R. P. Gunsalus, “Locked-on” and “locked-off” signal
21 transduction mutations in the periplasmic domain of the Escherichia coli NarQ and NarX
22 sensors affect nitrate- and nitrite-dependent regulation by NarL and NarP. *Mol. Microbiol.*
23 **24**, 1049–1060 (1997).
- 24 38. E. Lesne *et al.*, Balance between Coiled-Coil Stability and Dynamics Regulates Activity of
25 BvgS Sensor Kinase in Bordetella. *mBio*. **7**, e02089-15 (2016).
- 26 39. E. Saita *et al.*, A coiled coil switch mediates cold sensing by the thermosensory protein
27 DesK. *Molecular Microbiology*. **98**, 258–271 (2015).
- 28 40. J. O. Moore, W. A. Hendrickson, An Asymmetry-to-Symmetry Switch in Signal
29 Transmission by the Histidine Kinase Receptor for TMAO. *Structure*. **20**, 729–741 (2012).
- 30 41. M. B. Neiditch *et al.*, Ligand-Induced Asymmetry in Histidine Sensor Kinase Complex
31 Regulates Quorum Sensing. *Cell*. **126**, 1095–1108 (2006).
- 32 42. B. Wang, A. Zhao, R. P. Novick, T. W. Muir, Activation and Inhibition of the Receptor
33 Histidine Kinase AgrC Occurs through Opposite Helical Transduction Motions. *Molecular*
34 *Cell*. **53**, 929–940 (2014).

- 1 43. H. Szurmant, M. W. Bunn, S. H. Cho, G. W. Ordal, Ligand-induced Conformational
2 Changes in the *Bacillus subtilis* Chemoreceptor McpB Determined by Disulfide
3 Crosslinking in vivo. *Journal of Molecular Biology*. **344**, 919–928 (2004).
- 4 44. R. Moukhametzianov *et al.*, Development of the signal in sensory rhodopsin and its transfer
5 to the cognate transducer. *Nature*. **440**, 115–119 (2006).
- 6 45. S. A. Chervitz, J. J. Falke, Molecular mechanism of transmembrane signaling by the
7 aspartate receptor: a model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
8 *States of America*. **93**, 2545–2550 (1996).
- 9 46. A. S. Miller, J. J. Falke, Side Chains at the Membrane–Water Interface Modulate the
10 Signaling State of a Transmembrane Receptor. *Biochemistry*. **43**, 1763–1770 (2004).
- 11 47. R. R. Draheim, A. F. Bormans, R. Lai, M. D. Manson, Tryptophan Residues Flanking the
12 Second Transmembrane Helix (TM2) Set the Signaling State of the Tar Chemoreceptor.
13 *Biochemistry*. **44**, 1268–1277 (2005).
- 14 48. M. Hulko *et al.*, The HAMP Domain Structure Implies Helix Rotation in Transmembrane
15 Signaling. *Cell*. **126**, 929–940 (2006).
- 16 49. H. U. Ferris *et al.*, The Mechanisms of HAMP-Mediated Signaling in Transmembrane
17 Receptors. *Structure*. **19**, 378–385 (2011).
- 18 50. Q. Zhou, P. Ames, J. S. Parkinson, Mutational Analyses of HAMP Helices Suggest a
19 Dynamic Bundle Model of Input-Output Signaling in Chemoreceptors. *Mol Microbiol*. **73**,
20 801–814 (2009).
- 21 51. V. Stewart, The HAMP signal-conversion domain: static two-state or dynamic three-state?
22 *Molecular Microbiology*. **91**, 853–857 (2014).
- 23 52. K. E. Swain, J. J. Falke, Structure of the Conserved HAMP Domain in an Intact,
24 Membrane-Bound Chemoreceptor: A Disulfide Mapping Study. *Biochemistry*. **46**, 13684–
25 13695 (2007).
- 26 53. M. V. Airola, K. J. Watts, A. M. Bilwes, B. R. Crane, Structure of Concatenated HAMP
27 Domains Provides a Mechanism for Signal Transduction. *Structure*. **18**, 436–448 (2010).
- 28 54. I. Gushchin, V. Gordeliy, S. Grudinin, Two Distinct States of the HAMP Domain from
29 Sensory Rhodopsin Transducer Observed in Unbiased Molecular Dynamics Simulations.
30 *PLoS ONE*. **8**, e66917 (2013).
- 31 55. F. W. Studier, Protein production by auto-induction in high-density shaking cultures.
32 *Protein Expression and Purification*. **41**, 207–234 (2005).
- 33 56. I. Gushchin *et al.*, Crystal structure of a light-driven sodium pump. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. **22**,
34 390–395 (2015).

- 1 57. I. Gushchin *et al.*, Structural insights into the proton pumping by unusual proteorhodopsin
2 from nonmarine bacteria. *PNAS*. **110**, 12631–12636 (2013).
- 3 58. D. Nurizzo *et al.*, The ID23-1 structural biology beamline at the ESRF. *Journal of*
4 *Synchrotron Radiation*. **13**, 227–238 (2006).
- 5 59. P. Evans, Scaling and assessment of data quality. *Acta Crystallographica Section D*
6 *Biological Crystallography*. **62**, 72–82 (2005).
- 7 60. W. Kabsch, XDS. *Acta Crystallographica Section D Biological Crystallography*. **66**, 125–
8 132 (2010).
- 9 61. A. Vagin, A. Teplyakov, Molecular replacement with MOLREP. *Acta Crystallographica*
10 *Section D Biological Crystallography*. **66**, 22–25 (2009).
- 11 62. G. M. Sheldrick, Experimental phasing with SHELXC/D/E: combining chain tracing with
12 density modification. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*. **66**, 479–485 (2010).
- 13 63. T. Pape, T. R. Schneider, HKL2MAP: a graphical user interface for macromolecular
14 phasing with SHELX programs. *Journal of applied crystallography*. **37**, 843–844 (2004).
- 15 64. G. Langer, S. X. Cohen, V. S. Lamzin, A. Perrakis, Automated macromolecular model
16 building for X-ray crystallography using ARP/wARP version 7. *Nat. Protocols*. **3**, 1171–
17 1179 (2008).
- 18 65. P. Emsley, K. Cowtan, Coot: model-building tools for molecular graphics. *Acta*
19 *Crystallographica Section D Biological Crystallography*. **60**, 2126–2132 (2004).
- 20 66. G. N. Murshudov *et al.*, REFMAC5 for the refinement of macromolecular crystal
21 structures. *Acta Crystallographica Section D Biological Crystallography*. **67**, 355–367
22 (2011).
- 23 67. M. A. Lomize, I. D. Pogozheva, H. Joo, H. I. Mosberg, A. L. Lomize, OPM database and
24 PPM web server: resources for positioning of proteins in membranes. *Nucleic Acids*
25 *Research*. **40**, D370–D376 (2012).
- 26 68. A. Hoffmann, and S. Grudinin, NOLB: Nonlinear rigid block normal-mode analysis
27 method. *J. Chem. Theory Comput*. **13**, 2123–2134 (2017). doi:10.1021/acs.jctc.7b00197.

28
29
30

1 **Acknowledgments:**

2 Atomic coordinates and structure factors for the reported crystal structures have been deposited
3 with the Protein Data Bank under the accession codes 5IJI, 5JEF and 5JEQ. The work was
4 supported by the CEA(IFS) – HGF(FZJ) STC 5.1 specific agreement and the Russian Federal
5 Target Program 14.587.21.0026 (RFMEFI58716X0026). The work used the platforms of the
6 Grenoble Instruct Centre (ISBG; UMS 3518 CNRS-CEA-UJF-EMBL) with support from
7 FRISBI (ANR-10-INSB-05-02) and GRAL (ANR-10-LABX-49-01) within the Grenoble
8 Partnership for Structural Biology (PSB).

9

10

11 **Author contributions:**

12 I.G., A.I. and V.G. designed the study, A.I. expressed and purified the WT protein, I.G., P.B. and
13 T.B. helped with expression and purification of the WT protein, A.Yu. expressed and purified
14 the R50K mutant, I.G., I.M., V.P. and A.I. crystallized the protein, E.R. helped with
15 crystallization, A.P. solved the structures, G. Bourenkov and G.L. helped with structure solution,
16 I.G. and I.M. refined the structures, I.G. analyzed the structures, S.G., V.B., D.W. and G. Büldt
17 helped with structure analysis, I.G. and V.G. oversaw the study, analyzed the results and prepared
18 the manuscript with contributions from all other coauthors.

19

20 **Supplementary Materials:**

21 Figures S1-S10


22 Table S1

23 Movies S1-S2

24

1 **Figure captions**

2




3


4

5 **Figure 1. Overall structure of the crystallized NarQ fragment in *apo* and *holo* states.** The
 6 protein is observed as a symmetric dimer in both the *apo* and *holo-S* states in the space groups
 7 $I2_12_12_1$ and F222, respectively, and as an asymmetric dimer in *holo-A* state in the space group
 8 P2. Termini of the second protomer are denoted with primes. The crystallized fragment
 9 comprises the transmembrane domain (helices TM1 and TM2), the periplasmic sensor domain
 10 (helices H1-H4) with the nitrate ion binding at the dimerization interface, and the intracellular
 11 HAMP domain (helices AS1 and AS2). The structures are aligned by sensor domains.
 12 Hydrophobic membrane boundaries (black) were calculated using the OPM server (67) with the
 13 symmetric ligand-bound structure as a template.

14




1
 2 **Figure 2. Signaling-associated conformational changes in the NarQ TM domain.**
 3 Superposition of the *apo* state structure (grey) and symmetric *holo* state structure (colored) is
 4 shown. Left, changes in conformation of the helix TM1. Middle, changes in conformation of the
 5 helix TM2. Right, changes in the arrangement of the TM helices. C_{α} atom positions of the
 6 residues from CC layer 9 are marked with the spheres to highlight the displacements in the
 7 direction perpendicular to the membrane. The structures are aligned by the sensor domains.
 8




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

Figure 3. Details of the signal transduction from the TM domain to and through the HAMP domain. (A) inactive *apo* state. **(B)** active *holo-S* state. **(C)** superposition of the *apo* (grey) and *holo-S* (colored) states. A piston-like displacement of the cytoplasmic end of TM1 relative to TM2 and the TM2-AS1 hinge is transmitted to the membrane-proximal end of AS2 and results in lever-like rotations of the HAMP domain protomers around the hinges. Since the HAMP domain protomers move in opposite directions, the positions of membrane-distal ends of helices AS2 also change relative to each other. Positions of the Leu225 C α atom are marked with the spheres. The grey bar shows the position of TM1 ends in the *apo* state structure. The domains are aligned by the residues 175-177.




1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Figure 4. Mechanism of NarQ transmembrane signaling. Binding of the ligand results in a piston-like displacement towards the periplasm of the helices TM1 relative to TM2 and consequent lever-like conformational changes in the HAMP domain, which cause dissociation or destabilization of the signaling helix.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Figure S1. Domain architectures of representative microbial membrane sensor proteins. TM1 and TM2, transmembrane helices. AS1 and AS2, HAMP domain helices. NarQ is *E. coli* nitrate and nitrite sensor, Tsr is *E. coli* serine chemoreceptor, NpSRII and NpHtrII are *Natronomonas pharaonis* sensory rhodopsin II and sensory rhodopsin transducer II. In chemo- and photoreceptor systems, the kinase is a separate protein. While only monomers are shown, all of the proteins are normally dimeric with chemo- and photoreceptor dimers forming higher-order oligomeric assemblies.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Figure S2. Crystallographic details. (A-C) Data for the space group I₂1₂1₂ (symmetric *apo* state structure). (D-F) Data for the space group F222 (symmetric *holo* state structure). (G-I) Data for the space group P2 (asymmetric *holo* state structure). (A, D, G) Crystal packing. The NarQ dimers pack in layers, as is typical for Type I membrane protein crystals, obtained through *in meso* crystallization. (B, E, H) Relative distributions of the B-factor values. The scale in each drawing is different. In each space group, the membrane-distal parts of the HAMP domain are notably disordered. (C, F, I) Example of the electron density maps for the chain A residues around the ligand binding site. Weighted 2F_o-F_c electron density maps are contoured at the level of 1.5 σ.






Figure S3. Structure of the NarQ periplasmic sensor domain. (A-C) Structure of the sensor domain in the *apo* state. The R50K mutant was used for structure determination. (A) Overall structure of the domain. The H2-H3 loop is anchored into the membrane with the residues Trp89 and Tyr90. (B) Ligand-binding site of *apo* NarQ. Three ordered water molecules are observed. (C) Comparison of the NarQ (yellow) and NarX (green, chain A from PDB: 3EZI (21)) sensor domains in the absence of ligands. Positions of the backbone atoms of the helices H1 and H4 are virtually indistinguishable. (D-F) Structure of the sensor domain in the *holo* state. (D) Overall structure of the domain. The ligand is bound at the dimerization interface between the helices H1 and H1'. The H2-H3 loop is anchored into the membrane with the residues Trp89 and Tyr90. (E) Nitrate-binding site of NarQ. The ion is bound by Arg50 side chains and Gly47 backbone oxygen atoms. Below the nitrate ion, a tetrahedrally coordinated water molecule is observed. Potential hydrogen bonds are shown as black dashed lines. The interaction of NO₃⁻ partially positively charged nitrogen atom with the Gly47 partially negatively charged backbone oxygen atom is shown with orange dashed. (F) Comparison of the ligand-bound NarQ (yellow) and NarX (green, PDB: 3EZH (21)) sensor domains. Positions of the backbone atoms of the helices H1 and H4 are virtually indistinguishable. Positions of the TM2 backbone atoms present in the NarX construct used for crystallization(21) are also identical to those of NarQ. Positions of the NarX TM2' backbone atoms are different, possibly due to the absence of corresponding TM1 and TM1' residues that would stabilize the correct conformation. Note that NarX position relative to the membrane boundaries probably differs from that of NarQ (not shown).

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20



1
2
3
4
5
6
7


Figure S4. Structure of the NarQ transmembrane domain. TM1 is in blue, and TM2 is in yellow. (A) Apo state. (B) Symmetric holo state. (C) Asymmetric holo state. In each panel, overall structure (left) and side chain packings in the 9 CC layers (right, view from the periplasm) are shown. In each structure, ordered water molecules are observed in or around CC layer 4.



1

2 **Figure S5. Comparison of the experimentally determined structures of TCS TM domains.** In each case, the N-
3 terminal α -helix TM1 is shown in blue and the C-terminal one is shown in yellow. Glycine and proline residues of
4 the TM helices are shown with red spheres. There are generally more glycine and proline residues in the last TM
5 helix of the histidine kinases. The scale is the same for all of the proteins. X-ray structure of *NpHtrII* (28)
6 is aligned to ligand-bound NarQ structure using the positions of the HAMP-domain proximal residues that are similar,
7 opposite to the positions of the residues in the middle of the membrane and at the periplasmic side. Since there is no
8 sequence similarity between the TM domains, NMR structures of ArcB, QseC and KdpD (15) are aligned to the
9 NarQ structure so that their helices are roughly at the same positions relative to the membrane. Structural
10 comparison with ArcB, QseC and KdpD is hampered since the structures are monomeric and information about the
11 dimerization interfaces is lacking (15). It is not clear whether the ArcB and QseC fragments are in the correct
12 physiological state. In the KdpD structure, presence of the additional TM helices (TM2 and TM3, cyan and
13 magenta) probably ensures correct folding of the TM domain and proper orientations of the N-terminal and C-
14 terminal helices.

15



1
 2 **Figure S6. Structure of the junctions between the NarQ TM helices and adjacent domains. (A-C) Apo state**
 3 **structure. (A)** Connections between the TM helices and the sensor domain. Both TM1-H1 and TM2-H4 transitions
 4 maintain the helical structure. A phosphate anion is bound close to the hydrophobic membrane boundary. Putative
 5 hydrogen bonds are shown with the black dashes. **(B)** and **(C)** Connections between the TM helices and the HAMP
 6 domain. **(B)** Structure of the proline kink in the TM2-AS1 junction. **(C)** Structure of the TM1-AS2 link.
 7 Cytoplasmic terminus of TM1 is connected to the membrane-proximal end of AS2 via two hydrogen bonds. One
 8 bond is direct (Val7-Glu207) and the other is mediated by a conserved water molecule (Ser8-Glu207). **(D-F) Holo-S**
 9 **symmetric state structure. (D)** Connections between the TM helices and the sensor domain. There is a break in the
 10 helical structure at the TM1-H1 junction, while the H4-TM2 transition is continuous. The break is stabilized by a
 11 water molecule and several hydrogen bonds (black dashes). **(E)** and **(F)** Connections between the TM helices and
 12 the HAMP domain. **(E)** Structure of the proline kink in the TM2-AS1 junction. There is a hydrogen bond between
 13 Asn206 and Gln175 backbone carbonyl oxygen atom that connects the cytoplasmic end of TM2 and membrane-
 14 proximal end of AS2. **(F)** Structure of the TM1-AS2 link. The cytoplasmic terminus of TM1 is connected to the
 15 membrane-proximal end of AS2 via two hydrogen bonds. One bond is direct (Val7-Glu207) and the other is
 16 mediated by a conserved water molecule (Ser8-Glu207). Glu207 side chain conformation is also stabilized by a
 17 hydrogen bond with Asn181' of the adjacent helix AS1'.

18
 19





Figure S7. Structure of the junctions between the TM helices and HAMP domain in Af1503 (PDB: 4CQ4 (30)). (A) Structure of the proline kink in the TM2-AS1 junction. (B) Structure of the TM1*-AS2 link. Cytoplasmic terminus of the helix TM1* is connected to the membrane-proximal end of AS2 via two hydrogen bonds. One bond is direct (Ile239*-Glu311) and the other is mediated by a water molecule (Ala240*-Glu311). The water molecule is also stabilized by a hydrogen bond with the side chain of Thr181' of the adjacent helix AS1'. Notation TM1* is chosen to emphasize that the structure corresponds to unnatural antiparallel tetramer of the construct comprising the mutated TM2 helix and the HAMP domain of the Af1503 protein (30). Consequently, positions of TM1 in the correctly folded full-length Af1503 can differ from those presented.

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12



1

2 **Figure S8. Structure of the NarQ HAMP domain in *apo*, symmetric *holo* and asymmetric *holo* states.**

3 Structures are aligned by the residues of the TM2-AS1 junction. In the *apo* state structure, side chains of the residues


4 Leu225 and Tyr226 are not resolved and consequently are marked with spheres. In the symmetric *holo* state

5 structure, AS2 helices of symmetry-related molecules are marked AS2'' and AS2'''', and only one of two alternative

6 side chain conformations of Leu225 is shown in each case. Note that Phe195 of layer 5 resides on the linker and not


7 on AS1 or AS2, and that not all of the linker residues are resolved in the *apo* and asymmetric *holo* state structures.

8




1
 2 **Figure S9. Comparison of the NarQ *apo* state HAMP domain and Af1503 soluble mutant HAMP domain. (A)**
 3 **Structure of the HAMP domain in the *apo* state of NarQ. (B) Structure of the HAMP domain in the soluble mutant**
 4 **of Af1503 receptor (PDB: 4CQ4) (30). (C) Superposition of the *apo*-state NarQ HAMP domain (grey) and Af1503**
 5 **HAMP domain (colored). The HAMP domain structures are similar. The grey line shows the position of TM1 ends**
 6 **in the *apo* state NarQ structure.**

7
 8



1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Figure S10. Coiled coil models of NarQ signaling helix domain. Two conformations are possible. Conformation 1 is shown in red and conformation 2 is shown in blue. The packing in the layers 1-3 is different, while the packing in the layers 4-6 is similar. The phase stutter is possible in the region of the residues 232-236. Residues Glu235, Lys236, Thr237 belong to the characteristic conserved signaling helix motif (32).



1
 2
 3 **Figure S11. Signaling-associated conformational changes in the NarQ sensor domain.** Superposition of the *apo*
 4 state structure (grey) and symmetric *holo* state structure (colored) is shown. The black arrows indicate the directions
 5 of the displacements of NarQ elements upon binding of the ligand (not drawn to scale). The structures are aligned
 6 using the residues 48–53 (membrane-distal part of the helix H1).

7
 8
 9

1 **Table S1. Data collection, phasing and refinement statistics**

	<i>Apo</i>	<i>Holo</i> F222 NaI	<i>Holo</i> F222 Native	<i>Holo</i> P2
Data collection				
Space group	I2 ₁ 2 ₁ 2 ₁	F222	F222	P2
Cell dimensions				
<i>a</i> , <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> (Å)	39.59, 59.37, 239.58	57.17, 73.48, 236.45	57.58, 73.87, 235.56	53.46, 39.87, 120.36
α , β , γ (°)	90, 90, 90	90, 90, 90	90, 90, 90	90, 100.62, 90
Wavelength (Å)	0.972	1.85	0.972	0.972
Resolution (Å)	47.64-1.90 (1.94-1.90)*	60-2.7 (2.9-2.7)	39.4-1.94 (1.99-1.94)	52.55-2.42 (2.51-2.42)
<i>R</i> _{merge} (%)	7.5 (156.4)	17.1 (74.4)	8.3 (98.9)	9.4 (66.6)
<i>I</i> / σ <i>I</i>	11.8 (1.2)	21.7 (3.4)	14.5 (2.0)	7.6 (1.8)
<i>CC</i> _{1/2} (%)	99.8 (80.2)	100 (93.9)	99.9 (77.9)	99.5 (67.2)
<i>CC</i> _{anom} (%)		79 (14)		
Completeness (%)	99.9 (99.9)	99.9 (99.8)	98.9 (98.1)	96.6 (96.6)
Unique reflections	22891 (1426)	13242 (2584)	18674 (1221)	18809 (1732)
Redundancy	6.4 (6.6)	43.0 (13.3)	5.5 (5.8)	2.8 (2.9)
Refinement				
Resolution (Å)	47.64-1.90		39.4-1.94	52.55-2.42
No. reflections	21742		17728	17932
<i>R</i> _{work} / <i>R</i> _{free} (%)	23.2/28.5		19.0/25.4	21.8/28.6
No. atoms				
Protein	1763		1849	3388
Ligand	0		4	4
Water and ions	119		172	62
Lipids	0		34	6
B-factors				
Protein	51.6		34.3	52.1
Ligand	-		27.7	28.2
Water and ions	61.5		42.8	41.0
Lipids	-		57.0	62.3
R.m.s deviations				
Bond lengths (Å)	0.007		0.008	0.006
Bond angles (°)	1.0		1.1	0.9
Ramachandran analysis				
Favored (%)	97		98	97
Allowed (%)	3		2	3
Outliers (%)	0		0	0

2 *Highest resolution shell is shown in parenthesis.

3

4

1 **Movie S1. Mechanism of transmembrane signaling by sensor histidine kinase NarQ.**

2

3 **Movie S2. Comparison of symmetric and asymmetric ligand-bound NarQ structures.**

4

5