The environmentally-regulated interplay between local three-dimensional chromatin architecture and gene expression

Rashid, F.Z.M.

Chapter 1:
Chromosome organization in bacteria: mechanistic insights into genome structure and function

This chapter is based on:

Dame, R.T., Rashid, F.Z.M. and Grainger, D.C., 2020. Chromosome organization in bacteria: mechanistic insights into genome structure and function. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, pp.1-16.

Abstract

Bacterial chromosomes are folded to compact DNA and facilitate cellular processes. Studying model bacteria has revealed aspects of chromosome folding that are applicable to many species. Primarily controlled by nucleoid-associated proteins (NAPs), chromosome folding is hierarchical, from large-scale macrodomains to smaller-scale structures that influence DNA transactions including replication and transcription. Here, we review the environmentally regulated, architectural, and regulatory roles of NAPs and implications for bacterial cell biology. We also highlight similarities and differences in chromosome folding mechanisms of bacteria and eukaryotes.

Introduction

In all organisms, DNA is folded to fit inside the cell or its compartments. This is necessary because an organism's chromosome exceeds the cell's length by several orders of magnitude. Since the 1950's 'spreads' of liberated intracellular macromolecules, visualized by electron microscopy, have demonstrated the magnitude of this task. Genetic material readily spills out of lysed cells or nuclei to fill a volume many times larger than originally occupied (1). Precise mechanisms of DNA folding were first understood for eukaryotes. The basic structural units of eukaryotic folded DNA – nucleosomes (Figure 1.1a) – were identified as 'beads on a string' (2). The identification of higher-order structures (chromatin) was facilitated by the large size of eukaryotic cells that make them more amenable to light microscopy. Indeed, the basic dynamics of eukaryotic chromosomes during cell division were evident even before the genetic code was understood (3). It has taken much longer to understand chromosome organization in bacteria. Repeating structural units have never been identified, and early visualizations showed little more than a tangled mess (1). In retrospect, this is unsurprising. Bacteria lack most DNA folding factors present in eukaryotes so few cues can be taken. Furthermore, bacterial nucleoids undergo large changes in organization at different growth phases.

When we previously reviewed this topic in 2011 (4), evidence was emerging that bacterial chromosomes are not merely unstructured bodies of DNA, rather, the chromosomes fold into independent domains finely structured at the nanoscale. Advances in microscopy, structural biology, and genome-scale approaches (Box 1.1) have revealed many of the underlying molecular mechanisms. In this Review, we discuss these mechanisms and their impact on wider cell biology. Beginning at the level of individual DNA folding proteins we explain how DNA in bacteria is folded into myriad structures by looping, bending and twisting of the DNA. Subsequently, we explain how these DNA contortions influence not only nucleic acid compaction but also gene expression and DNA replication. On a whole-chromosome scale, we describe the characteristics of individual domains and discuss the possibility that the principles of chromosome folding are conserved across bacterial species. Throughout, we highlight similarities and differences in the DNA folding mechanisms used by bacteria and eukaryotes.

The principles of chromosome folding have been the subject of a long-standing research interest at Leiden University. The groups of Prof. dr. Pieter van de Putte and Prof. dr. Leendert Bosch advanced our understanding of the DNA binding and

structuring properties of factor for inversion stimulation (Fis) and Integration Host Factor (IHF), and highlighted their role in the regulation of genome transactions (5–11). The work presented in this thesis shows our continued interest in this field and carries on their heritage.

The nucleoid-associated proteins

Unlike eukaryotes, chromosomes of bacteria are not usually folded into regularly repeating structural units (Figure 1.1a). Instead, the chromosome is folded into a range of different conformations by nucleoid-associated proteins (NAPs) (Figure 1.1b-e). These are described further below.



Figure 1.1: DNA is locally folded by NAPs in bacteria, histones in eukaryotes, and the evolutionarily conserved SMC complex. a: Eukaryotic chromosomes are folded into nucleosomes. Typically, a nucleosome is a regularly repeating structural unit that consists of 147 bp of DNA wrapped

around an octameric histone core; **b:** The 'daisy chaining' of H-NS along the DNA by head-to-head and tail-to-tail contacts forms H-NS:DNA filaments (top) and DNA:H-NS:DNA bridges (bottom), the latter of which results in the formation of DNA loops (12–14). *In vitro* studies indicate that the switch between the two modes of DNA binding by H-NS is mediated by changes in temperature and osmolarity (15–19); **c:** Structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) complexes are DNA looping proteins comprising a pair of SMC monomers, kleisin, and the 'kite' (kleisin interacting winged-helix tandem elements) or 'hawk' (HEAT repeat subunits containing proteins associated with kleisins) accessory/regulatory proteins. Each SMC monomer consists of a 'hinge' dimerization domain, an ATPase 'head' domain, and an anti-parallel coiled-coil 'arm' extending between the hinge and head domains. SMC complexes form DNA loops either by embracing a pair of DNA segments in a single ring, or by the dimerization of two rings that each trap a DNA segment (20–25) (also see Figure 1.2); **d:** Fis binds its target sequences as a dimer and induces a 50o–90o bend in the DNA (26, 27); **e:** IHF and HU also function as DNA bending proteins. IHF generates sharp 160o hairpin bends in the DNA, whereas HU functions as a flexible hinge (28) — it bends DNA less sharply, but over a range of different angles (29, 30).

Loop and filament formation by H-NS. The histone-like nucleoid structuring protein (H-NS) is a small (137 amino acids in *Escherichia coli*) polypeptide that binds the DNA minor groove via a C-terminal arginine hook motif (31). This is favoured for DNA with an elevated AT-content containing a TpA dinucleotide or 'step' (32). Hence, H-NS-bound genomic segments are AT-rich and have often been acquired by horizontal gene transfer (33–37). The N-terminal domain of H-NS contains two sites that facilitate 'daisy chaining' of the protein via head-to-head and tail-to-tail contacts (Figure 1.1b) (12). This drives the formation of lateral nucleoprotein filaments (Figure 1.1b, top) or loops between DNA segments bridged by H-NS (Figure 1.1b, bottom) (13, 14).

Proteins functionally similar to H-NS are found in diverse bacteria. Often, these have arisen via convergent evolution, that is, the independent evolution of the same function. For example, in *Burkholderia* spp. and *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, the functional equivalents of *E. coli* H-NS are Bv3f and Lsr2, respectively. The proteins share structural similarity only in the arginine hook motif responsible for DNA binding (32, 38). *Bacillus subtilis* Rok shares no structural similarity with H-NS, Bv3f or Lsr2 yet fulfils the same physiological role (39, 40), by binding AT-rich DNA and having a strong preference for sequences containing a TpA step (41). The interaction, however, is not mediated by an arginine hook. Instead, lysine side chains in a winged helix make contacts with the DNA backbone (41). The MvaT protein of the *Pseudomonas* species also uses lysine residues in an AT-pincer motif to make similar contacts (42).

DNA looping by SMC proteins. Structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) complexes are tri-partite rings comprised of a pair of SMC monomers, kleisin, and the accessory/regulatory proteins 'kite' (kleisin interacting winged-helix tandem

elements) or 'hawk' (HEAT repeat subunits containing proteins associated with kleisins) (20–23). Each SMC monomer consists of a 'hinge' dimerization domain involved in the formation of a V-shaped SMC dimer, an ATPase 'head' domain, and an anti-parallel coiled-coil 'arm' extending between the hinge and head domains. The SMC dimer is bound to a kleisin complex to form a ring that captures DNA (20, 22, 24, 25), and, by encompassing two DNA segments, form a loop (Figure 1.1c; Figure 1.2, top) (43). Such a loop may also form by the dimerization of SMC dimers that each embrace a DNA segment (Figure 1.2, bottom) (44). Kleisins also recruit the regulatory kite and hawk proteins. Bacterial and archaeal SMC–kleisin complexes, and the eukaryotic Smc5–Smc6 complex, recruit the kite proteins. The condensin and cohesin SMC complexes of eukaryotes recruit the hawk proteins (21, 23).

In bacteria, three classes of SMC family proteins have been identified. SMC-ScpAB in *B. subtilis* and *Caulobacter crescentus*, SMC-like MukBEF in *E. coli* and other γ- and δ-proteobacteria, and the MukBEF-like MksBEF that has been detected in a wider range of bacterial species. These SMC family proteins are involved in segregation of newly replicated sister chromosomes (45–54). SMC–kleisin complexes are loaded onto the chromosome at the centromere-like *parS* sequences, positioned close to the origin of replication, by the *parS*-binding protein, ParB (55–57). Loading factors for SMC-like proteins, MukBEF and MksBEF, are currently unknown. Once associated with DNA, SMC complexes generate and maintain DNA loops, and are mechanistically characterized as loop extruding factors (Figure 1.2) (58, 59). By contrast, there is currently no evidence to suggest that SMC-like MukBEF and MksBEF play the same role. First proposed in 2001 (60), and formalized theoretically in 2012 (61), loop extrusion involves the clamping the protein complex around contiguous DNA sequences (Figure 1.2a) (60). The factor then 'pulls' the DNA through the clamp to produce a growing, unknotted loop of DNA (Figure 1.2b) (58). SMC proteins bi-directionally extrude DNA and progressively move along the chromosome (61) towards the terminus (Figure 1.2bc). The SMC extrusion complex may consist of a pair of DNA molecules pulled through one SMC ring referred to as the 'one ring, two DNA' model (Figure 1.2, top) (43), or one DNA molecule pulled through each ring of a 'handcuffed' pair (Figure 1.2, bottom) (44). The rate of loop extrusion by SMC is affected by transcription. Oppositely oriented highly-expressed genes (HEGs) attenuate the progression of SMC (Figure 1.2d) (56, 62). For instance, in *B. subtilis*, SMC progression can be slowed by >80% due to an oppositely-oriented HEG (62). As with other DNA looping proteins, SMC proteins have been suggested

to function by static loop formation — stably anchoring a pair of DNA loci to form a loop (63). However, as support that SMC proteins largely function by active loop extrusion in bacteria, chromosome arms progressively align from origin to terminus upon replenishment of the SMC loading factor ParB in *B. subtilis* (62), and they aberrantly align upon repositioning *parS* sites in *C. crescentus* (56).



Figure 1.2: SMC proteins function as loop extruding factors. a: The structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) complex is loaded onto the DNA at ParB-bound parS sites in bacteria (55–57); **b:** The SMC complex then bi-directionally 'pulls' the DNA through its ring to extrude a growing, unknotted loop of DNA (58, 60, 61). The loop may be formed by an SMC complex entrapping two DNA strands within a single ring **(one ring, two DNA model (top))**, or by a dimer of two SMC rings that each trap one DNA segment **(handcuffing model (bottom))**; **c:** Loop extrusion allows bacterial SMC complexes to progressively move from the ParB-bound parS sites that are positioned close to the origin of replication towards the terminus (Ter) region (56, 62); **d:** The progression of SMC along the DNA is slowed by convergent transcription (56, 62), and may be slowed by up to 80% upon encountering an oppositely-oriented highly expressed gene (HEG) (62).

DNA bending by IHF, HU and Fis. Whereas H-NS and SMC proteins manage DNA loops (64), other NAPs primarily bend the DNA. For example, the factor for inversion stimulation (Fis) binds DNA as a dimer (Figure 1.1d) by virtue of a helix-turn-helix motif (26). Fis recognizes a 15 bp degenerate DNA palindrome characterized by a G at position 1 and a C at position 15 (5′ GNNVRWWWWWYVNNC-3′). Target recognition is driven by the shape of the minor groove resulting from the binding site sequence rather than the sequence itself (26). The degree of DNA bending induced by Fis binding can vary between 50° and 90° (Figure 1.1d) depending on the flanking DNA sequence (27). Fis is

often found at points where DNA duplexes cross (65, 66). This may stabilize plectonemes in supercoiled DNA.

DNA bending by integration host factor (IHF) is more severe, generating 160° bends (Figure 1.1e) (28). IHF binds its consensus sequence (5′-WATCAANNNNTTR-3′) (67) as a heterodimer, composed of α and β subunits. The minor groove is contacted by a β ribbon arm that protrudes from each subunit of the heterodimer (Figure 1.1e). This interaction is favoured by A-tracts. The insertion of a proline residue at the tip of each β-arm into the DNA base stack induces a hairpin bend in the DNA by kinking the DNA on either side of the hairpin apex (28). High intracellular concentrations of IHF permit non-specific interactions with many non-specific DNA targets, probably in a manner similar to HU (see below). The IHF protein has only been identified in gram-negative bacteria.

Heat-stable protein from *E. coli* strain U93 (HU) shares 40% sequence identity to IHF subunits (68). Unlike IHF, HU is found widely distributed among bacteria (69). In *E. coli*, HU forms heterodimers of α and β subunits. However, HU homodimers predominate across other bacteria in which, often, a single gene encoding HU is present. HU has no sequence specificity, but its mode of target recognition is similar to that of IHF. DNA is bent to a lesser extent by HU than IHF and over a range of different angles — akin to a flexible hinge (29, 30). Binding of HU also occurs preferentially at naturally bent or distorted DNA (70). The bends induced by each HU β-arm force the DNA out of a single angular plane (29, 71). Consequently, sequential binding of HU dimers induces coiling of the DNA around the bound proteins to form filaments. This means that HU can restrain negative supercoils in DNA and, alongside topoisomerase I, introduce negative supercoils in circular DNA (72–74). Generally, DNA is negatively supercoiled in bacteria to facilitate DNA transactions that require DNA melting (75).

Cross-talk between NAPs. The cross-talk between NAPs regulates the structural conformation adopted by the resulting nucleoprotein complex (76). *In vitro* atomic force microscopy studies indicate that the combinatorial effect of NAPs is influenced by DNA topology and the orientation of high-affinity NAP binding sites in the underlying DNA sequence (77, 78). In 42.6 kb DNA molecules, the differential structural effects of NAPs were only observed in negatively-supercoiled, hyperplectonemic structures. The binding of both H-NS and Fis unravelled the hyperplectoneme into individual plectonemes constrained by H-

NS-mediated bridges. DNA cross-over points in the complex were bound by Fis (77). In a pair of relaxed plasmids and corresponding linear DNA constructs that differed only in the order of high affinity Fis and H-NS binding regions — the upstream activating sequence of the tyrosine tRNA, and the negative regulatory element of the *proVWX* operon, respectively — the presence of both Fis and H-NS resulted in the folding of the DNA duplexes as a consequence of H-NS-mediated bridging. Fis occupied the cross-over points. Interestingly, the construct with high-affinity H-NS and Fis binding regions oriented in a Fis:H-NS:H-NS:Fis manner, but not the Fis:H-NS:Fis:H-NS construct, organised into a stem-loop formed by an H-NS-mediated bridge book-ended by Fis binding. The NAPs also 'phase separated' in the structure: the binding of Fis (a NAP conducive to transcription) excluded H-NS (a repressive NAP) from the looped DNA, a region that H-NS occupies in the absence of Fis (78). Collectively, these limited studies point to a model of the bacterial chromosome structured into chromatin islands of Fis-bound, transcriptionally-active, 'open' chromatin and H-NS-bound, transcriptionally-silent, 'closed' chromatin, the organisation of which is encoded as NAP binding sites in the genome and modulated by NAP availability and supercoiling density (77, 78).

Modulation of NAP function by other proteins. The architectural properties of NAPs may be regulated by paralogues and NAP modulators. For instance, DNA binding by H-NS is regulated by its paralogue StpA, and by Hha, a NAP modulator that belongs to the YmoA family of proteins (15, 79). StpA shares 58% sequence identity with H-NS and forms homodimers, and heterodimers with H-NS *in vitro*. Heterodimers are likely to predominate *in vivo* since the StpA homodimer is susceptible to proteolysis (80, 81). Therefore, H-NS-bound regions of the chromosome also contain StpA (82). StpA stimulates DNA bridging by H-NS and stabilizes the structure against changes in temperature and Mg^{2+} or K^{+} concentration (79). Hha is an 8 kDa protein involved in the regulation of H-NS-like proteins. Factors like Hha lack a DNA-binding domain and interact with the N-terminal domain of H-NS to enhance DNA bridging (15, 79, 83, 84). Disruption of the H-NS–Hha interaction relieves the repression of H-NS–Hha co-regulated operons, such as *hilA*, with minimal disruption of the H-NS binding profile at the operon (84).

Comparison with eukaryotic and archaeal DNA-folding proteins. The nomenclature for NAPs, for instance, 'histone-like nucleoid structuring protein' for H-NS, can imply a relationship to eukaryotic histones. However, there are few

similarities at the protein level. Most notably, H-NS is histone-like in only one regard: it is an abundant DNA-binding protein. Even so, there are many examples of eukaryotic DNA-binding proteins that utilize arginine hooks to bind AT-rich DNA (85). These can have global DNA-folding properties. For example, the metazoan special AT-rich sequence-binding protein 1 (SATB1) has genome-wide roles in DNA folding and, like H-NS, might link higher-order nucleoprotein structures and gene regulation (86–88). The HU protein, like histones, is able to induce DNA supercoiling (72–74). Indeed, the ability of HU to wrap DNA in filaments hints that the protein has the capacity to form structures similar to hypernucleosomes in archaea (89, 90). However, although the protein–DNA co-crystal structures are comparable for archaeal histones and HU, solution studies do not support this model (30). Structurally and functionally, SMC complexes in bacteria and eukaryotes have similar functions in managing DNA loops (see below).

Analogous to eukaryotic histones, bacterial NAPs also undergo post-translational modifications (PTMs). To date, 29 PTMs have been identified for *E. coli* H-NS that may fine-tune its properties. Acetylation neutralizes charges of Lys83, Lys87, Lys96, Lys120 and Lys121 that are known to facilitate DNA binding. Succinylation of Lys96, Lys120, and Lys121 may also interfere with DNA binding due to steric hindrance (91–94). Some HU proteins have terminal extensions enriched for lysine, proline or alanine repeats, reminiscent of the (S/T)PKK motifs found in eukaryotic histone H1 that are subject to post-translational modification (69).

Local patterns of DNA folding

Chromosome interaction domains. At a scale of tens to hundreds of kilobases, the bacterial chromosome (Figure 1.3Aa) is partitioned into chromosome interaction domains (CIDs) (Figure 1.3Ab) (95, 96), analogous to the topologically associating domains (TADs) in eukaryotes (compare Figures 1.3Ab and 1.3Bb) (97–99). CIDs and TADs exhibit a high degree of self-interaction and are insulated from flanking regions.

Hi-C in *C. crescentus* indicates that the chromosome is organized into 23 CIDs during exponential growth in rich medium and 29 CIDs in starvation conditions, with the length of these domains varying between 30 and 420 kb (95, 100). The boundaries between CIDs correspond to positions of HEGs that are >2kb in length (95, 100) (Figure 1.3Ab). In *C. crescentus*, these include, for instance, genes within the ATP synthase and NADH–quinone oxidoreductase gene clusters during

exponential growth in rich medium, and starvation-induced genes such as CCNA03169 (Lrp-like asnC family transcription regulator), and CCNA03327 (histidine kinase involved in signal transduction) during periods of starvation. House-keeping genes such as those within the ribosomal protein gene cluster form CID boundaries during both conditions, albeit of different strength. The ribosomal protein gene cluster forms a sharp CID boundary in exponential phase. At this stage of growth, the genes in the cluster exhibit a high transcription rate. During starvation, in accordance with the decreased rate of gene expression within the cluster, the sharpness of the boundary diminishes (95). Recombination-based experiments indicate that while HEGs generally form plectoneme-free regions that act as supercoil diffusion barriers, only long HEGs can generate extended barriers that insulate CIDs by physically separating flanking chromatin (100). Indeed, the ectopic insertion of a long, highly-expressed gene is sufficient to establish a CID boundary in the chromosome (95).

The *B. subtilis* chromosome is organized into 20 CIDs 50–300 kb in length. While 60% of the CID boundaries coincide with HEGs, ~30% overlap with sections of the genome bound by the Rok protein (96). This observation implies that Rok (and by extrapolation other bacterial NAPs) could function as domain barriers. The *E. coli* chromosome appears to be organized into 31 CIDs between 40 to ~300 kb in size. 22 of the CID boundaries correspond to the positions of HEGs, and 9 boundaries coincide with positions of genes that code for proteins with an export signal sequence (101). This may be relevant in light of the hypothesis that chromosomes are membrane-appended by coupled transcription–translation–translocation (102).

While multiple systems contribute to the formation of CID boundaries in bacterial chromosomes, the hierarchical structural organization that they contribute to is conserved. Bacterial CIDs exhibit a nested domain organization with each domain composed of smaller sub-domains (Figure 1.3Ad–e) (95, 96, 101). The smallest units of this organization may correspond to individual operons (Figure 1.3Ac)

In eukaryotic chromosomes (Figure 1.3B), TADs are typically formed by loop extrusion (61, 103, 104). Several lines of evidence suggest that SMC complexes including cohesin, condensin and Smc5/6 function as loop extruding factors. Unlike their bacterial counterparts, eukaryotic SMC complexes do not appear to be loaded onto the chromosome/chromatin at a specific DNA sequence. Upon clamping around the DNA, eukaryotic SMC complexes continue to extrude loops

until the complexes either spontaneously dissociate from the DNA, collide with another factor, or encounter an appropriately oriented TAD boundary element (61, 103, 104). TAD boundaries are encoded in the genome as CCCTC-binding factor (CTCF) binding sites. These sites exhibit a directionality, such that a TAD only forms between a pair of inward-facing CTCF sites (Figure 1.3Bb) (105–107). Indeed, deletion or inversion of CTCF binding sites disrupts TAD boundaries *in vivo* (104). Curiously, in *Drosophila melanogaster*, SMC complexes and CTCF are not markedly enriched at TAD boundaries. In flies, this role is played by the insulator complexes BEAF-32–CP190 and BEAF-32–Chromator (108–110).

As in bacteria, the TADs of eukaryotic genomes are nested (105, 109, 111). The smallest organizational units of TADs correspond to individual genes in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Figure 1.3Be) (111). The functional relevance of this organization and the molecular determinants of the boundaries are still unclear.

Archaea are an evolutionary link between the bacterial and eukaryotic branches of life, with the physiology of archaeal cells often manifesting as an amalgamation of the physiologies of bacterial and eukaryotic cells (112). A 3C-based study of the model crenarchaea *Sulfolobus acidocaldarius* and *Sulfolobus islandicus* indicates that crenarchaeal chromosomes are compartmentalised into a transcriptionally active A-compartment and a transcriptionally repressed B-compartment – a feature characteristic of eukaryotic genomes (113). The chromatin in both compartments organises into self-interacting CIDs, the boundaries between which are formed by highly-transcribed genes (114) reminiscent of bacterial chromosomes (95, 96, 100). The maintenance of CIDs in the B-compartment, the repression of transcription units within the structures, and its separation from the A-compartment is facilitated by an SMC-like protein termed Coalescin (113, 114). The chromosome contact maps of *Sulfolobus* show evidence of the formation of transcription hubs. Genes involved in ribosomal biogenesis form long-range loops that appear to be dependent on active transcription. Decreased expression of the ribosomal biogenesis genes as a result of entry into stationary phase or treatment with actinomycin D reduces the strength of the loops (114). On the other hand, the organisation of chromosomes in the euryarchaeaota, represented at present by *Haloferax volcanii*, *Halobacterium salinarum*, and *Thermococcus kodakarensis*, involves folding into CIDs and absence of A/B compartmentalization (115). In *H. volcanii*, CIDs are formed by archaeal SMC proteins (a eukaryotic feature) and transcription (a bacterial feature) as evidenced by the loss of looping and CID

boundaries in a Δ*smc* mutant and in wild-type cells treated with actinomycin D (115).



Figure 1.3: Chromosomes are hierarchically organized in bacteria and eukaryotes. A: Bacterial chromosome organization. At a global scale, the bacterial chromosome is spirally folded to fit within the bacterial cell **(Aa)**. Regions of the chromosome sequentially close to each other interact in three-dimensional space as evidenced by the presence of a primary diagonal of high interaction frequency in a Hi-C contact map **(Ad)**. Except for *Escherichia coli*, all reported bacterial chromosome interaction profiles also show a secondary diagonal of low interaction frequency that lies perpendicular to the primary diagonal **(Ad)**. This feature indicates interaction between the chromosomal arms that run

alongside each other in the spirally organized chromosome (inter-arm interaction) (95, 96, 101, 116). At the scale of tens to hundreds of kilobases, the chromosome is subdivided into chromosome interaction domains (CIDs) **(Ab)** (95, 96). CIDs exhibit self-interaction and are insulated from flanking chromatin. These structures are observed as squares along the primary diagonal of a Hi-C map **(Ad)** or as triangles when observing one half of the symmetric Hi-C map **(Ae)**. Bacterial CIDs are nested (95, 96, 101): larger domains (broken yellow line) are organized into smaller sub-domains (solid yellow line) **(Ae)** (95). The boundaries between the domains are typically formed by highly expressed genes (HEGs) >2kb in length that physically separate the flanking chromatin **(Ab)** (95, 100). The smallest structural unit of organization of the bacterial chromosome may correspond to loops formed at the level of individual operons by nucleoid-associated proteins (NAPs) **(Ac)**. **B: Eukaryotic chromosome organization.** The eukaryotic chromosome, localized inside the nucleus **(Ba)**, is organized into topologically associating domains (TADs) **(Bb)**, analogous to the bacterial CIDs. TADs are formed by loop extrusion (61, 103, 104). Eukaryotic structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) proteins load onto the chromosome and extrude DNA loops (Figure 1.2) until the complexes collide with inward-facing CTCF binding sites **(Bb)** (61, 103, 104). Indeed, TAD boundaries — identified as the region between two squares along the diagonal of a Hi-C matrix — occur at genomic regions enriched for CTCF **(Bd)** (105–107). Eukaryotic TADs are nested, with the smallest sub-TAD interaction domains typically comprising up to 5 genes **(Bc,Be)** (111). Hi-C contact maps in parts Ad and Ae are modified with permission from (95). GM12878 Hi-C map ad CTCF-ChIP profile in part Bd is modified with permission from (106). *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Micro-C map in part Be is modified with permission from (111).

The impact of DNA supercoiling. Local patterns of DNA supercoiling influence DNA folding within topologically isolated regions of the *E. coli* chromosome (Figure 1.3Ab). However, tools to measure chromosome-wide patterns of DNA folding have only become accessible in recent years (117, 118). As noted above, DNA is in an average state of negative supercoiling. However, supercoiling density is unevenly distributed and varies across phases of growth. In particular, a gradient of increased negative supercoiling runs from the origin of replication to the terminus, along each arm of the chromosome, only in starved cells (117). This gradient requires the HU protein. The wrapping of DNA around HU, and the change in twist of the double-helix mediated by the protein are consistent with effects of HU on global DNA supercoiling (117). The expression levels of HU also vary strongly across different phases of growth (119), potentially explaining effects on DNA topology. Collectively, this may also explain why loss of HU has different effects on intra-chromosome interactions in different bacteria (95, 101) with different levels of DNA supercoiling (120).

Interactions between chromosomal arms. In bacteria, progression of SMC from the origin to the terminus mediates contacts between the right and left replichores, resulting in their parallel alignment. This manifests itself as a characteristic ‘secondary diagonal’, perpendicular to the main diagonal in Hi-C matrices of bacterial chromosomes (95, 96, 116) (Figure 1.3Ad). Curiously, this secondary diagonal is absent in the contact maps of the *E. coli* chromosome (101) despite the presence of the SMC-like MukBEF system. The MukBEF complex, in the absence

of ATP, consists of a V-shaped MukB dimer, the MukF kleisin that extends between the pair of MukB head domains, and four MukE kite proteins. Unlike other characterized kleisins, MukF is not monomeric (20, 21, 121). Instead, MukF forms a dimer via its N-terminal winged-helix domain and binds MukB via its C-terminal domain (122, 123). Upon binding ATP, the MukB ATPase heads dimerize and sterically displace one of the two MukF monomers, rendering the N-terminal of the MukB-bound MukF available for dimerizing with another ATP-bound MukBEF complex (123). The subsequently formed dimer is the minimal functional unit of MukBEF (124). ATP-bound MukBEF stably associates with the chromosome and is involved in its condensation while ATP hydrolysis results in MukBEF dissociation (124, 125). The hydrolysis of both ATP molecules contained within the dimerized head domains is required for a single MukBEF unit to release the DNA (123–125).

The MukBEF complex has been proposed to move along the chromosome as a 'rock climber'. In this model, ATP hydrolysis in a single unit of a MukBEF dimer releases it from the chromosome while the other unit remains bound. ATP binding then allows the released MukBEF unit to capture a different segment of the DNA and hence, move along the chromosome (124) (Figure 1.4A). The release–capture cycles of this model implies that the minimal functional unit of MukBEF in *E. coli* cannot promote and maintain inter-arm interactions as observed for loop-extruding SMCs such as SMC–ScpAB in *B. subtilis*. Other models which consider that a MukBEF dimer is not completely released from DNA upon ATP hydrolysis speculate that MukBEF may still carry a loop extrusion functionality (Figure 1.4B) (126).

Global chromosome organization

Over the past 10 years, advances in genome-scale approaches have improved our understanding of bacterial DNA folding at the micron scale (Box 1.1). Most notably, chromosomal patterns of NAP binding, and physical interaction frequencies have revealed independently organized macrodomains with distinct properties (4). Such structures are best defined for *E. coli* where the chromosome is divided into 4 macrodomains and two non-structured regions. All macrodomains exhibit reduced intracellular mobility compared to the non-structured chromosomal regions. Thus, macrodomains tend to interact with the non-structured regions but not with other macrodomains (127).

Constraint of Ori macrodomain mobility by MaoP. The Ori macrodomain contains the origin of chromosome replication *oriC* (128, 129). The constrained

mobility of Ori requires the *yifE* gene product, MaoP (macrodomain Ori protein) and a 17 bp motif in the upstream intergenic region (5′-CTAATACTCCGCGCCAT-3′) named *maoS* (macrodomain Ori sequence) (128). In otherwise wild-type cells, inactivation of *maoS*/MaoP specifically increased the mobility of Ori (128). It is not known how MaoP acts over long distances to constrain DNA mobility.



Figure 1.4: MukBEF moves along the chromosome as a 'rock climber'. A: MukBEF movement along a single DNA molecule (based on the rock climber model proposed in (124)**). Aa:** The minimal functional unit of the MukBEF complex corresponds to a dimer of dimers — $MukB_4E_4F_2$. When each of the MukB heads are bound to ATP, the MukBEF complex remains stably associated with the

chromosome. **Ab:** Hydrolysis of ATP in both MukB heads of the same dimer disengages the MukB heads, and releases the dimer from the chromosome. The MukBEF complex remains bound to the DNA via the ATP-bound dimer. **Ac:** ATP binding to MukB of the released dimer re-establishes chromosome contacts with a different chromosomal locus. **Ad–e:** A DNA segment release and capture cycle in the second MukBEF dimer allows the complex to move along the chromosome as a 'rock climer'. **Af:** Simultaneous hydrolysis of all four ATP molecules bound to a MukBEF complex releases it from the chromosome. This step may involve a MukBEF 'unloading' factor. **B: MukBEF as a loop extruding factor** (126)**. Ba:** ATP-bound MukBEF binds chromosomal DNA at the MukB head and hinge domains. **Bb:** ATP hydrolysis in a MukBEF dimer releases the chromosomal DNA segment bound at the MukB head domains. **Bc:** ATP binding re-establishes MukB head–DNA contacts at a new DNA segment, thus generating a DNA loop. **Bd–e:** A release–capture cycle in the second MukBEF dimer results in loop enlargement, hence, loop extrusion.

Condensation of Ter macrodomain structure by MatP. The Ter macrodomain is diametrically opposed to Ori (Figure 1.5Aa) and encompasses the replication terminus. A major breakthrough for understanding Ter was the identification of a sequence repeated 23 times in Ter but not elsewhere in the *E. coli* chromosome (5′ GTGACRNYGTCAC-3′) (130). The same sequence uniquely occurs in equivalent parts of many bacterial chromosomes (130). This DNA site, named macrodomain Ter sequence (*matS*) is the target of the macrodomain Ter protein (MatP). This interaction is highly specific, as shown by MatP exclusively binding these DNA targets in chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) experiments (130). Loss of MatP activity leads to decondensation of the Ter macrodomain (130). MatP consists of three domains: an N-terminal 4 helix bundle, a central β-strand helix-helix and a C-terminal coiled-coil (131). Interaction of MatP with DNA is mediated by the β-strand helix-helix that resembles ribbon helix-helix structures found in other DNA-binding proteins (131). MatP binds DNA as a dimer mediated by interactions involving both the N-terminal and central domains. The C-terminal coiled-coil is required for tetramerization of MatP. Such tetramers generate bridges between distal matS sites on the chromosome, effectively condensing the Ter macrodomain (131, 132). This is evident in Hi-C experiments: deletion of matP specifically restructures Ter with reduced intradomain interactions being observed (101). Loss of MatP also prevents correct positioning of the DNA replication at mid-cell and this depends on an interaction between MatP and division-apparatus-associated protein ZapB (133).

Other proteins with macrodomain-specific DNA-binding properties. In *E. coli* at least two additional proteins, SeqA and SlmA, have macrodomain-specific DNA-binding properties (134, 135). However, unlike MaoP and MatP, there is no evidence that SeqA and SlmA contribute to the overall folding of these domains. Briefly, SeqA is involved in sequestration of the DNA replication origin after a new round of DNA replication has been initiated (136). This is permitted because

newly replicated DNA is hemimethylated at 5′ GATC-3′ motifs targeted by DNA adenine methylase (Dam) and SeqA (137). These 5′ GATC-3′ motifs are underrepresented in the Ter macrodomain and overrepresented elsewhere, particularly near to the origin of replication (135). Similarly, SlmA binds throughout the *E. coli* chromosome, except in the Ter macrodomain (134). SlmA recognizes the sequence 5′ GTGAGTACTCAC-3′ and is required for correct cell division (134). SlmA, SeqA, MatP and MaoP are co-conserved in bacteria encoding Dam methylase, suggesting that these bacteria use similar strategies to organize their chromosomes. Indeed, even in bacteria lacking Dam, proteins with similar patterns of chromosome-wide DNA binding have been identified. For instance, in *B. subtilis* the nucleoid occlusion (Noc) protein appears to be the functional equivalent of SlmA (138). Similarly, in *C. crescentus*, GapR targets a large region surrounding the origin of replication (139, 140).

Environmental regulation

The structure of the bacterial chromosome changes in response to the environment (Figure 1.5Ab). In part, this is because a small number of NAPs (most notably H-NS, and MvaT) can undergo conformational changes in response to specific ligands (15, 141). More commonly, the intracellular concentration of NAPs alters in response to environmental triggers (119). These two scenarios are discussed in more detail below.

Studies on environmentally-triggered conformational changes of NAPs have largely focused on H-NS and H-NS-like proteins (15, 141, 142). In this regard, helix α3 of *E. coli* H-NS plays an osmosensory role. The helix is unstable and frequently buckles. This folds one of the DNA-binding domains of the H-NS dimer onto the body of the protein (15). A similar conformation is also adopted by the H-NS family protein MvaT under low-osmolarity conditions; electrostatic interactions occur between a positively charged patch at the C-terminal DNA-binding domain and a negatively charged patch at the N-terminal domain (141). In the folded conformation, one of the two DNA-binding domains of the protein dimer is unavailable for DNA binding, thus favouring the formation of lateral filaments along DNA (Figure 1.1b, top) (15, 141). Magnesium ions stabilize helix α3 in H-NS to prevent buckling (15). Correspondingly, high-osmolarity conditions destabilize the electrostatic interaction between the N- and C-terminal domains of MvaT (141). Hence, both DNA-binding domains of the H-NS and MvaT dimers become available for DNA binding and bridged loops can form (Figure 1.1b,

bottom) (15, 141). The osmosensory role of helix α3 of *E. coli* H-NS was verified by stabilising the helix with E43A,E44A,S45A mutations (15).

H-NS is also temperature sensitive. High temperatures reduce the co-operativity of H-NS oligomerization and favour its dissociation from DNA (16–19, 142). Helix α4 of *Salmonella typhimurium* H-NS, located in the protein's dimer-dimer interaction domain, functions as a thermosensor. Heat-induced unfolding of this helix destabilises H-NS oligomerisation. The disruption also folds the negatively-charged N-terminal region of the protein onto its positively charged C-terminal, sequestering the DNA binding domain in an 'auto-inhibited' conformation (142). The structural change may relieve H-NS-mediated repression and trigger the expression of toxicity islands at human body temperatures. *In silico* Molecular Dynamics simulations and *in vitro* thermolysin assays indicate that in contrast to *E. coli* H-NS, the structure of helix α3 of *S. typhimurium* H-NS does not respond to changing osmolarity (or temperature), and therefore, might not function as an 'environmental sensor' in this protein (142).

A less subtle mechanism controlling chromosome dynamics is based on levels of NAP expression, which can change substantially (reviewed in (76, 143, 144)). This is most notable during stress and starvation when the nucleoid is reorganized into a condensed crystalline structure (Figure 1.5B) (145). Most NAPs are present at lower levels in starved cells, and Fis, which is among the most abundant DNA-binding proteins during periods of rapid cell division, is undetectable (146). Conversely, DNA-binding protein from starved cells (Dps) and curved DNA-binding protein A (CbpA) – NAPs that are undetectable during rapid growth – accumulate to 175,000 and 14,000 copies per cell in stationary phase (119, 147). Both bind the DNA highly co-operatively, and interactions between DNA-bound protein molecules lead to DNA compaction (66, 148). Electron micrographs of Dps–DNA complexes reveal that they are organized in a crystalline lattice *in vitro* (Figure 1.5B) (149). A similar structure is observed *in vivo* when Dps is expressed in exponentially growing Δ*fis* strains (149, 150). Complexes of Dps or CbpA with DNA are resistant to damage induced by chemical and biological nucleases (66, 151). Hence, expression of these proteins is thought to protect the integrity of the genetic material in harmful environments. However, how these highly condensed protein–DNA structures co-exist with other cellular processes has been a mystery. Recent work has shed light on the puzzle, revealing that super-condensed nucleoids of starved *E. coli* cells are phase-separated organelles (151). Phase-separation is an inherent physical property of macromolecules (such as proteins)

to self-organize into condensates or 'droplets' in a crowded environment such as the cell interior. Binding of Dps to DNA *in vitro* blocks access to nucleases and hydroxyl radicals, but the DNA remains fully permissive to transcription (147, 151). This is because the physical properties of some molecules allows them to move between separated phases whilst other molecules are trapped within a specific phase.

Interplay with genome transactions

As eluded to above, understanding how chromosome folding impacts other cellular processes has been a longstanding area of interest. Although Dps seems unable to impede transcription, the same is not true of other NAPs that can have specific effects on gene expression. Furthermore, additional roles have been identified for NAPs in chromosome replication and segregation, as well as cell cycle progression. Here, we describe the intricate interplay between NAPs, genome structure and diverse types of genome transactions.



Figure 1.5: Environmental stimuli induce changes in chromosome organization. A: DNA re-organization in growing bacteria. Aa: Re-organization of the bacterial nucleoid is induced in response to environmental stimuli such as changes in osmolarity, temperature and pH. Consequently, activity of specific sets of genes required for environmental adaptation is altered. **Ab:** The transition between the exponential and stationary phases of growth of *Escherichia coli* is associated with a re-

organization of the bacterial chromosome. Specifically, the chromosome exhibits a weakening of compartmentalization into chromosome interaction domains (CIDs). This is observed as 'blurring' of the squares along the main diagonal (101). **B: Chromosome reorganization in starved bacteria.** Reorganization of the bacterial nucleoid can be induced by starvation or stress. Such changes are apparent by light microscopy and indicate compaction of the nucleoid, often accompanied by a reduction in the overall cell volume (145). The inset depicts the nucleoid structure in molecular detail as revealed by electron microscopy. Most notably, the Dps protein (pale blue spheres) drives the formation of an ordered crystal lattice that incorporates DNA (149). These structures are phase separated from other compartments of the cell and resistant to damage (66, 151). NSL, left non-structured region; NSR, right non-structured region; Ori, Ori macrodomain; Ter, Ter macrodomain. *E. coli* contact maps in part a are modified with permission from (101).

Silencing of horizontally acquired genes by H-NS. H-NS targets DNA sequences that have a high AT-content, often acquired by horizontal gene transfer. H-NS binding at these loci represses transcription (known as xenogeneic silencing) (35). Remarkably, the majority of transcription suppressed by H-NS at such loci is spurious in nature (152), arising due to the high probability of sequences that fortuitously resemble promoter elements for RNA polymerase in high AT-content DNA (153, 154). Left unchecked by H-NS, this transcription imposes a severe fitness defect due to titration of RNA polymerase and a global downshift in transcription of housekeeping genes (152).

Canonical gene regulation by H-NS. Although most promoters repressed by H-NS have spurious output, H-NS also plays a key role in regulating transcription of mRNAs. In these instances, the mechanisms by which H-NS influences promoter activity appear diverse. A common mechanism of repression by H-NS involves blocking the binding of RNA polymerase, or transcriptional activator proteins, completely (155, 156). Alternatively, at the *rrnB* P1 and *hdeAB* promoters, H-NS-induced DNA looping traps RNA polymerase, interfering with promoter escape (157, 158). Similarly, but not involving loop formation, a direct contact between RNA polymerase and H-NS can interfere with promoter clearance (159). Because H-NS-controlled looping is mediated by environmental factors, many H-NS-regulated genes are responsive to temperature and osmolarity. For instance, *proVWX* (*proU*) is an H-NS-regulated osmosensitive operon. Its regulation requires two elements, the upstream regulatory element (URE) positioned upstream of the transcription start site (TSS) and the downstream regulatory elements (DRE) in the coding region that extends across the TSS (160–162). The two elements operate synergistically in H-NS-mediated osmoregulation (163). Such synergy could imply lateral or bridge-mediated interactions between the elements. Although direct evidence is lacking, *in vitro* experiments showing that only H-NS-mediated bridging is sensitive to osmolarity lead us to hypothesize that H-NS

represses transcription of the *proU* operon by loop formation, and that relief of repression involves local restructuring of the chromosome (15, 19, 164). In pathogenic bacteria, H-NS can be utilized to control the expression of virulence factors during host colonization with contributions from additional proteins that alter the ability of H-NS to multimerize and/or bind DNA (165).

Regulation of transcription elongation by H-NS. As well as regulating the initiation of transcription, H-NS can control transcription elongation by impeding the progression of RNA polymerase. This depends on the type of H-NS–DNA complex. For example, RNA polymerase can transcribe through lateral H-NS–DNA filaments (Figure 1.6a, top panel), whereas H-NS–DNA bridges efficiently block transcript extension and are likely to trap RNA polymerase in the loops formed (Figure 1.6a, bottom panel) (19). In both cases, it is not known if RNA polymerase advancement removes H-NS from the DNA or if the nucleoprotein complex is transiently remodelled (166).

Roles of bacterial H-NS in regulating transcription versus eukaryotic nucleosomes. In summary regarding the transcriptional roles of H-NS, loci bound by H-NS are often not permissive to binding of RNA polymerase or regulatory proteins but can be remodelled for transcription to occur. By analogy, in eukaryotes, nucleosomes block transcription initiation, and so promoters are usually nucleosome free. Histone modifications lead to remodelling of chromatin that impacts transcription (167). For H-NS, transcription itself could lead to local remodelling of the nucleoprotein complex (166). Furthermore, 'anti-silencing' transcription factors can perturb repressive nucleoprotein filaments or interfere with their formation (31).

Activation and repression of specific promoters by Fis. In general, Fis activates the expression of genes encoding products that are important for rapid cell division (168). Conversely, Fis is often a repressor of genes that allow utilization of alternative carbon sources or terminal electron acceptors (169, 170). Interestingly, the DNA folding activity of Fis appears to be important for counteracting the super-condensation of chromosomes mediated by Dps (150). Taken together with the gene regulatory roles of Fis, this implies the protein is crucial to prepare cells for maximal rates of growth on exiting periods of starvation. This is consistent with observations that Fis is only present at detectable levels when cells are dividing rapidly (146). The ability of Fis to activate or repress transcription is dependent on the position of binding, and interactions with other regulators at a given

promoter. Hence, the mechanisms by which Fis activates and represses transcription are similar to those utilized by canonical transcription factors. For instance, to activate transcription of rRNA operons, Fis facilitates the recruitment of the transcriptional apparatus via a specific contact with the C-terminal domain of the RNA polymerase alpha subunit (alpha-CTD) (171). The same contact is made by many canonical transcriptional activators (172). Similarly, mechanisms of transcription repression by Fis are not unusual and involve occlusion of RNA polymerase or transcription factors (169, 170).

Stabilization of DNA repression loops by HU. Although it is unable to recognize specific DNA sequences, HU can regulate transcription from specific promoters. This results from the ability of HU to bind and stabilize certain deformations in DNA. This behaviour has been described for the *E. coli* galactose operon regulatory region. Two promoters at this locus are repressed by the activity of the repressor protein, GalR. Maximal repression by GalR is mediated by interactions between GalR molecules bound at distal sites to create a repression loop. HU binds at the apex of the DNA loop and stabilizes the complex, thus enhancing repression (173) (Figure 1.6b). As HU affects global patterns of DNA supercoiling, genes responsive to DNA topology are part of the HU regulon (174, 175).

IHF can regulate transcription by bending the DNA. Like Fis, IHF is able to activate and repress transcription by binding to specific sites near promoters. This can be due to the ability of IHF to sharply bend DNA. For instance, IHF binds upstream of many *E. coli* promoters dependent on the alternative σ factor, σ^{54}. σ factors are general transcription factors (functionally similar to those found in eukaryotes) that are used by bacterial RNA polymerases to bind selectively to specific promoters. By bending the DNA, IHF facilitates interactions between RNA polymerase and enhancer proteins bound upstream. This stimulates promoter opening to activate transcription (176) (Figure 1.6c). The binding and bending of DNA by IHF can also repress transcription. In one example, at the *E. coli nrf* promoter, DNA binding by IHF alters interactions with a bound activator to hinder transcription activation (177). The role of IHF as an activator or repressor depends on local nucleoprotein organization. Hence, there is no universal position upstream of a promoter from which IHF consistently exerts an activating versus repressive effect on transcription.



Figure 1.6: Modulation of transcription by nucleoid-associated proteins. a: Alternative types of H-NS:DNA complexes have different effects on transcription elongation. Top panel: lateral H-NS:DNA filaments can be invaded by RNA polymerase (RNAP). These H-NS:DNA complexes are unable to prevent transcription elongation and are either transiently displaced or remodelled as a result (19, 166). **Bottom panel:** bridged DNA:H-NS:DNA complexes are potent blocks to transcription and result in stalled elongation complexes (19); **b: Stabilization of a DNA bend by HU facilitates repression.** At the *Escherichia coli* gal operon the GalR repressor protein forms a repressosome that is stabilized by HU binding to the bent DNA (173); **c: Activation of transcription by DNA bending.** Promoters that are dependent on enhancer-binding proteins for transcription require IHF as a co-factor. The sharp DNA bend introduced by IHF brings the distally bound enhancer-binding protein into the proximity of RNA polymerase so transcription can be activated (176).



Figure 1.7: Chromosome organization has an impact on chromosome segregation and cell cycle progression. A: ParAB–*parS*-mediated chromosome segregation. Structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) complexes are loaded at ParB-bound *parS* sites in the origin domain (51, 55, 57). SMC complexes progressively move along the chromosome (not to scale) towards the terminus (Ter) domain, driving the alignment of chromosome replichores and promoting the segregation of sister chromosomes (56, 62, 96). For ease of representation, the handcuffing model (Figure 1.2, bottom) has not been shown in this figure. **B: MukBEF-mediated origin segregation. Ba:** ATP-bound MukBEF complexes are recruited to the replicated origins (52, 178, 179). **Bb:** MukB recruits TopoIV, a type II topisomerase, that decatenates the entangled sister origins (180, 181). **Bc–d:** Once decatenated, the sister origins, associated with MukBEF, move from the mid-cell position towards the quarter positions in the cell (52, 124). The segregation is proposed to be driven by a self-organizing gradient of MukBEF and the origin of replication (182). **C: Cell cycle progression.** Cell division requires FtsZ ring assembly. FtsZ polymerization occurs at mid-cell where the segregating terminus (Ter) domains are located and SlmA is occluded. DNA-bound SlmA promotes the depolymerization of FtsZ at non-Ter regions preventing 'guillotining' of the chromosome (134, 183–185).

Interplay with replication and chromosome segregation. Chromosome architecture and NAPs also influence chromosome replication and segregation. The bacterial equivalent of the mitotic apparatus, the ParAB–*parS* partitioning system, and SMC proteins that are proposed to regulate origin firing in *B. subtilis* (96), are evidently involved in the segregation of bacterial chromosomes into opposite cell halves concomitantly with replication (186–188) (Figure 1.7A). In *C. crescentus* and *B. subtilis*, the ParB partitioning protein binds to the *parS* sequences present close to OriC to form a nucleoprotein complex on both sister chromosomes (Figure 1.7A). The ParA ATPase is recruited to the complex and generates the free energy required for the resolution of the sister origins and their segregation (189). The loop extruding complex SMC-ScpAB is also recruited to the origin of replication by ParB (51, 55, 57, 190), from where it migrates along the chromosome to the terminus extruding disentangled DNA of a single chromosome. This structurally separates sister chromosomes and favours their segregation (Figure 1.7A) (56, 62, 96, 190).

The ParAB–*parS* partitioning system is absent in some species of the γ- and δ-proteobacteria. In these organisms, the SMC-like MukBEF complex participates in chromosome segregation. In *E. coli*, MukBEF complexes containing an ATP-bound MukB are recruited to the origin (52, 178, 179). MukB, in turn, recruits TopoIV, a type-II topoisomerase, that decatenates replicated sister origins (180, 181). Immediately after decatenation, the segregated origins, and the associated MukBEF clusters, move towards the quarter positions of the cell (Figure 1.7B) (52, 124). Computational modelling suggests that segregation is driven by a self-organizing gradient of MukBEF and ori (182). MukBEF is also recruited to *matS* sites in the Ter macrodomain. At these sites, MatP and ATP hydrolysis by MukB release MukBEF complexes and associated TopoIV enzymes. In Δ*matP* strains, and strains with an ATPase-defective MukB, MukBEF accumulates in the Ter macrodomain where it recruits TopoIV and promotes early resolution of the chromosome terminus (191).

Interplay with cell cycle progression. GapR, a conserved NAP of the α-proteobacteria is a master regulator of cell cycle progression. Its binding sites overlap with loci bound by other regulators of cell cycle progression including CtrA, MucR1, MucR2, and GcrA169. GapR-depleted and Δ*gapR* strains of *C. crescentus* are temperature sensitive and exhibit cell division defects, forming filamentous, undivided cells or anucleate cells (139, 140, 192). GapR binds to the

origin of replication of the *C. crescentus* chromosome where it is involved in the initiation of replication (140). GapR also binds DNA ahead of the replication fork (139) where it interacts with DNA gyrase or TopoIV to relieve positive superhelical stress (193). Indeed, GapR deletion is associated with a lengthened S-phase and stalling of the replication fork (139). Furthermore, GapR binds the *parS* locus at which it plays a role in the segregation of newly replicated sister origins (140). Sister chromosome segregation in *C. crescentus* constitutes a ParA-independent slow step that involves the separation of the pair of *parS*–ParB nucleoprotein complexes, and a ParA-dependent fast step that localizes one of the sister origins to the opposite pole. GapR regulates the initial slow step of segregation, as evidenced by the remerging of resolved *parS*–ParB complexes in Δ*gapR* cells (140).

The NAP SlmA also controls cell cycle progression (183). SlmA bound to SlmA-binding sites (SBSs) on the chromosome are involved in signalling the polymerization of the cytokinetic FtsZ ring (134). As a nucleoid occlusion factor, SlmA also ensures that the FtsZ ring is precisely positioned around the site of Ter decatenation to prevent the 'guillotining' of the chromosome (184). SlmA plays its role by regulating the dynamics of FtsZ polymerization within phase-separated FtsZ droplets. In membrane-bound phase-separated systems, FtsZ polymerizes within phase-separated droplets to form filaments at membrane boundaries. The presence of SBS-bound SlmA counteracts this polymerization (183). This suggests that in FtsZ phase-separated structures in the bacterial cytoplasm, SBS-bound SlmA antagonizes the assembly of the FtsZ ring (183). In *E. coli*, SlmA-binding sites occur throughout the chromosome except at the Ter region (134, 185). This way, an SlmA-free region is produced within the cell when replication reaches the chromosome terminus. The FtsZ ring assembles at this site to initiate bacterial cytokinesis (Figure 1.7C) (183). The precise positioning of the FtsZ ring is reinforced by MatP-mediated condensation of the Ter macrodomain (130). MatP also interacts with the ZapA and ZapB septal proteins to position Ter at mid-cell (133).

Conclusions and perspectives

The past 10 years have seen the establishment of broadly applicable models for the folding of bacterial chromosomes. DNA bending and bridging proteins play a key role in chromosome folding at the level of individual genes and in the formation of CIDs with sizes up to 300 kb. Higher-order chromosome folding leads to the formation of macrodomains. Although these principles have been best studied in *E. coli*, biased binding of proteins across the chromosomes of distantly

related bacteria suggests widespread relevance (138–140). The next challenges in the field of bacterial chromosome biology include better understanding local changes in DNA folding, and how these impact on other nucleic acid transactions within living cells. For example, biophysical techniques have defined the structures that H-NS can form with nucleic acids *in vitro* but it is still not clear whether and how such structures impact transcription *in vivo*. Furthermore, although we understand how individual NAPs organize DNA it is not obvious how the concerted efforts of all NAPs combine within cells.

This thesis addresses these challenges. Chapter 2 describes Hi-C, a proximity ligation-based technique that reveals the contact probability of genomic loci in three-dimensional space. In Chapter 3, RT-qPCR, 3C-qPCR – a modification of the Hi-C technique described in Chapter 2, single molecule Förster resonance energy transfer, and live-cell FRET are used to show that the local three-dimensional folding of the *proVWX* operon of *E. coli* responds to osmotic stress and that this response is associated with a change in the transcriptional profile of the operon. The RT-qPCR studies reported in Chapter 3 also demonstrate how a heteromeric complex of H-NS and StpA oligomerized over the *proV* open reading frame differs in functionality from a homomeric structure comprising of H-NS.

The dynamic organisation of the chromosome necessitates its visualisation in live cells. In Chapter 4, HI-NESS, a novel DNA label designed by the translational fusion of a fluorescent protein to the DNA binding domain of H-NS (H-NS-dbd), is described. The higher DNA dissociation constant of the H-NS-dbd (13) compared to full-length H-NS is exploited in HI-NESS to minimise the perturbation of chromosome structure and genomic transactions that are observed with the use of organic DNA labelling dyes and fluorescent protein fusions to full-length NAPs.

Whilst it is expected that general principles of DNA organization are conserved throughout the bacterial domain of life, and in fact all domains of life (194), we speculate that organisms occupying extreme environmental niches may have fine-tuned the molecular mechanisms to better cope with environmental challenges. In Chapter 5, preliminary chromosome contact profiles of *Haloquadratum walsbyi*, a hyperhalophilic archaeon, are discussed in context of chromosome organisation in model bacteria and archaea.

References:

1. Cairns,J. (1963) The Chromosome of Escherichia coli. *Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol.* , **28**, 43–46.
2. Olins,D.E. and Olins,A.L. (1972) Physical studies of isolated eucaryotic nuclei. *J. Cell Biol.*, 10.1083/jcb.53.3.715.
3. BAKER,J.R. (1955) The Cell-theory: a Restatement, History, and Critique. *Q. J. Microsc. Sci.*, **s3-96**, 449 LP – 481.
4. Dame,R.T., Kalmykowa,O.J. and Grainger,D.C. (2011) Chromosomal macrodomains and associated proteins: Implications for DNA organization and replication in gram negative bacteria. *PLoS Genet.*, 10.1371/journal.pgen.1002123.
5. Goosen,N. and van de Putte,P. (1984) Regulation of Mu transposition. I. Localization of the presumed recognition sites for HimD and Ner functions controlling bacteriophage Mu transcription. *Gene*, 10.1016/0378-1119(84)90103-3.
6. Goosen,N., van Heuvel,M., Moolenaar,G.F. and van de Putte,P. (1984) Regulation of Mu transposition II. The Escherichia coli HimD protein positively controls two repressor promoters and the early promoter of bacteriophage Mu. *Gene*, 10.1016/0378-1119(84)90017-9.
7. Zulianello,L., De Rosny,E.D.L.G., Van Ulsen,P., Van De Putte,P. and Goosen,N. (1994) The HimA and HimD subunits of integration host factor can specifically bind to DNA as homodimers. *EMBO J.*, 10.1002/j.1460-2075.1994.tb06415.x.
8. Nilsson,L., Vanet,A., Vijgenboom,E. and Bosch,L. (1990) The role of FIS in trans activation of stable RNA operons of E. coli. *EMBO J.*, 10.1002/j.1460-2075.1990.tb08166.x.
9. Verbeek,H., Nilsson,L. and Bosch,L. (1991) FIS-induced bending of a region upstream of the promoter activates transcription of the E coli thrU (tufB) operon. *Biochimie*, 10.1016/0300-9084(91)90051-2.
10. Nilsson,L., Verbeek,A., Vijgenboom,E., Van Drunen,C., Vanet,A. and Bosch,L. (1992) FIS-dependent trans activation of stable RNA operons of Escherichia coli under various growth conditions. *J. Bacteriol.*, 10.1128/jb.174.3.921-929.1992.
11. Verbeek,H., Nilsson,L. and Bosch,L. (1992) The mechanism of trans-activation of the escherichia coli operon thru(tufB) by the protein FIS. A model. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 10.1093/nar/20.15.4077.
12. Arold,S.T., Leonard,P.G., Parkinson,G.N. and Ladbury,J.E. (2010) H-NS forms a superhelical protein scaffold for DNA condensation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **107**, 15728–15732.
13. Dame,R.T., Noom,M.C. and Wuite,G.J.L. (2006) Bacterial chromatin organization by H-NS protein unravelled using dual DNA manipulation. *Nature*, 10.1038/nature05283.
14. Dame,R.T., Wyman,C. and Goosen,N. (2000) H-NS mediated compaction of DNA visualised by atomic force microscopy. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **28**, 3504–3510.
15. van der Valk,R.A., Vreede,J., Qin,L., Moolenaar,G.F., Hofmann,A., Goosen,N. and Dame,R.T. (2017) Mechanism of environmentally driven conformational changes that modulate H-NS DNA-Bridging activity. *Elife*, 10.7554/eLife.27369.
16. Ono,S., Goldberg,M.D., Olsson,T., Esposito,D., Hinton,J.C.D. and Ladbury,J.E. (2005) H-NS is a part of a thermally controlled mechanism for bacterial gene regulation. *Biochem. J.*, **391**, 203–213.
17. Göransson,M., Sondén,B., Nilsson,P., Dagberg,B., Foreman,K., Emanuelsson,K. and Uhlin,B.E. (1990) Transcriptional silencing and thermoregulation of gene expression in Escherichia coli. *Nature*, 10.1038/344682a0.
18. Amit,R., Oppenheim,A.B. and Stavans,J. (2003) Increased bending rigidity of single DNA molecules by H-NS, a temperature and osmolarity sensor. *Biophys. J.*, 10.1016/S0006-3495(03)75051-6.
19. Kotlajich,M. V., Hron,D.R., Boudreau,B.A., Sun,Z., Lyubchenko,Y.L. and Landick,R. (2015) Bridged filaments of histone-like nucleoid structuring protein pause RNA polymerase and aid termination in bacteria. *Elife*, 10.7554/eLife.04970.
20. Nolivos,S. and Sherratt,D. (2014) The bacterial chromosome: Architecture and action of bacterial SMC and SMC-like complexes. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.*, 10.1111/1574-6976.12045.
21. Palecek,J.J. and Gruber,S. (2015) Kite Proteins: A Superfamily of SMC/Kleisin Partners Conserved Across Bacteria, Archaea, and Eukaryotes. *Structure*, 10.1016/j.str.2015.10.004.
22. Schleiffer,A., Kaitna,S., Maurer-Stroh,S., Glotzer,M., Nasmyth,K. and Eisenhaber,F. (2003) Kleisins: A superfamily of bacterial and eukaryotic SMC protein partners. *Mol. Cell*,

10.1016/S1097-2765(03)00108-4.
23. Wells,J.N., Gligoris,T.G., Nasmyth,K.A. and Marsh,J.A. (2017) Evolution of condensin and cohesin complexes driven by replacement of Kite by Hawk proteins. *Curr. Biol.*, **27**, R17–R18.
24. Melby,T.E., Ciampaglio,C.N., Briscoe,G. and Erickson,H.P. (1998) The symmetrical structure of structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) and MukB proteins: Long, antiparallel coiled coils, folded at a flexible hinge. *J. Cell Biol.*, **142**, 1595–1604.
25. Cuylen,S., Metz,J. and Haering,C.H. (2011) Condensin structures chromosomal DNA through topological links. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 10.1038/nsmb.2087.
26. Stella,S., Cascio,D. and Johnson,R.C. (2010) The shape of the DNA minor groove directs binding by the DNA-bending protein Fis. *Genes Dev.*, **24**, 814–826.
27. Hancock,S.P., Stella,S., Cascio,D. and Johnson,R.C. (2016) DNA sequence determinants controlling affinity, stability and shape of DNA complexes bound by the nucleoid protein Fis. *PLoS One*, **11**.
28. Rice,P.A., Yang,S.W., Mizuuchi,K. and Nash,H.A. (1996) Crystal structure of an IHF-DNA complex: A protein-induced DNA U-turn. *Cell*, 10.1016/S0092-8674(00)81824-3.
29. Swinger,K.K., Lemberg,K.M., Zhang,Y. and Rice,P.A. (2003) Flexible DNA bending in HU-DNA cocrystal structures. *EMBO J.*, 10.1093/emboj/cdg351.
30. Van Noort,J., Verbrugge,S., Goosen,N., Dekker,C. and Dame,R.T. (2004) Dual architectural roles of HU: Formation of flexible hinges and rigid filaments. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **101**, 6969–6974.
31. Grainger,D.C. (2016) Structure and function of bacterial H-NS protein. *Biochem. Soc. Trans.*, 10.1042/BST20160190.
32. Gordon,B.R.G., Li,Y., Cote,A., Weirauch,M.T., Ding,P., Hughes,T.R., Navarre,W.W., Xia,B. and Liu,J. (2011) Structural basis for recognition of AT-rich DNA by unrelated xenogeneic silencing proteins. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 10.1073/pnas.1102544108.
33. Grainger,D.C., Hurd,D., Goldberg,M.D. and Busby,S.J.W. (2006) Association of nucleoid proteins with coding and non-coding segments of the Escherichia coli genome. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 10.1093/nar/gkl542.
34. Oshima,T., Ishikawa,S., Kurokawa,K., Aiba,H. and Ogasawara,N. (2006) Escherichia coli histone-like protein H-NS preferentially binds to horizontally acquired DNA in association with RNA polymerase. *DNA Res.*, **13**, 141–153.
35. Navarre,W.W., Porwollik,S., Wang,Y., McClelland,M., Rosen,H., Libby,S.J. and Fang,F.C. (2006) Selective silencing of foreign DNA with low GC content by the H-NS protein in Salmonella. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.1128794.
36. Lucchini,S., Rowley,G., Goldberg,M.D., Hurd,D., Harrison,M. and Hinton,J.C.D. (2006) H-NS mediates the silencing of laterally acquired genes in bacteria. *PLoS Pathog.*, 10.1371/journal.ppat.0020081.
37. Kahramanoglou,C., Seshasayee,A.S.N., Prieto,A.I., Ibberson,D., Schmidt,S., Zimmermann,J., Benes,V., Fraser,G.M. and Luscombe,N.M. (2011) Direct and indirect effects of H-NS and Fis on global gene expression control in Escherichia coli. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **39**, 2073–2091.
38. Gordon,B.R.G., Li,Y., Wang,L., Sintsova,A., Van Bakel,H., Tian,S., Navarre,W.W., Xia,B. and Liu,J. (2010) Lsr2 is a nucleoid-associated protein that targets AT-rich sequences and virulence genes in Mycobacterium tuberculosis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **107**, 5154–5159.
39. Smits,W.K. and Grossman,A.D. (2010) The transcriptional regulator Rok binds A+T-rich DNA and is involved in repression of a mobile genetic element in Bacillus subtilis. *PLoS Genet.*, 10.1371/journal.pgen.1001207.
40. Qin,L., Erkelens,A.M., Ben Bdira,F. and Dame,R.T. (2019) The architects of bacterial DNA bridges: A structurally and functionally conserved family of proteins. *Open Biol.*, **9**.
41. Duan,B., Ding,P., Hughes,T.R., Navarre,W.W., Liu,J. and Xia,B. (2018) How bacterial xenogeneic silencer rok distinguishes foreign from self DNA in its resident genome. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 10.1093/nar/gky836.
42. Ding,P., McFarland,K.A., Jin,S., Tong,G., Duan,B., Yang,A., Hughes,T.R., Liu,J., Dove,S.L., Navarre,W.W., *et al.* (2015) A Novel AT-Rich DNA Recognition Mechanism for Bacterial Xenogeneic Silencer MvaT. *PLoS Pathog.*, 10.1371/journal.ppat.1004967.
43. Gruber,S., Haering,C.H. and Nasmyth,K. (2003) Chromosomal cohesin forms a ring. *Cell*, **112**, 765–777.
44. Zhang,N., Kuznetsov,S.G., Sharan,S.K., Li,K., Rao,P.H. and Pati,D. (2008) A handcuff model for

the cohesin complex. *J. Cell Biol.*, **183**, 1019–1031.
45. Minnen,A., Attaiech,L., Thon,M., Gruber,S. and Veening,J.W. (2011) SMC is recruited to oriC by ParB and promotes chromosome segregation in Streptococcus pneumoniae. *Mol. Microbiol.*, **81**, 676–688.
46. Schwartz,M.A. and Shapiro,L. (2011) An SMC ATPase mutant disrupts chromosome segregation in Caulobacter. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2011.07836.x.
47. Hiraga,S., Niki,H., Ogura,T., Ichinose,C., Mori,H., Ezaki,B. and Jaffe,A. (1989) Chromosome partitioning in Escherichia coli: Novel mutants producing anucleate cells. *J. Bacteriol.*, **171**, 1496–1505.
48. Niki,H., Jaffe,A., Imamura,R., Ogura,T. and Hiraga,S. (1991) The new gene mukB codes for a 177 kd protein with coiled-coil domains involved in chromosome partitioning of E. coli. *EMBO J.*, **10**, 183–193.
49. Jensen,R.B. and Shapiro,L. (1999) The Caulobacter crescentus smc gene is required for cell cycle progression and chromosome segregation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 10.1073/pnas.96.19.10661.
50. Moriya,S., Tsujikawa,E., Hassan,A.K.M., Asai,K., Kodama,T. and Ogasawara,N. (1998) A Bacillus subtilis gene-encoding protein homologous to eukaryotic SMC motor protein is necessary for chromosome partition. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1046/j.1365-2958.1998.00919.x.
51. Wang,X., Tang,O.W., Riley,E.P. and Rudner,D.Z. (2014) The SMC condensin complex is required for origin segregation in Bacillus subtilis. *Curr. Biol.*, 10.1016/j.cub.2013.11.050.
52. Danilova,O., Reyes-Lamothe,R., Pinskaya,M., Sherratt,D. and Possoz,C. (2007) MukB colocalizes with the oriC region and is required for organization of the two Escherichia coli chromosome arms into separate cell halves. *Mol. Microbiol.*, **65**, 1485–1492.
53. Petrushenko,Z.M., She,W. and Rybenkov,V. V. (2011) A new family of bacterial condensins. *Mol. Microbiol.*, **81**, 881–896.
54. Yu,W., Herbert,S., Graumann,P.L. and Götz,F. (2010) Contribution of SMC (Structural Maintenance of Chromosomes) and spoIIIE to chromosome segregation in staphylococci. *J. Bacteriol.*, **192**, 4067–4073.
55. Sullivan,N.L., Marquis,K.A. and Rudner,D.Z. (2009) Recruitment of SMC by ParB-parS Organizes the Origin Region and Promotes Efficient Chromosome Segregation. *Cell*, 10.1016/j.cell.2009.04.044.
56. Tran,N.T., Laub,M.T. and Le,T.B.K. (2017) SMC Progressively Aligns Chromosomal Arms in Caulobacter crescentus but Is Antagonized by Convergent Transcription. *Cell Rep.*, 10.1016/j.celrep.2017.08.026.
57. Gruber,S. and Errington,J. (2009) Recruitment of Condensin to Replication Origin Regions by ParB/SpoOJ Promotes Chromosome Segregation in B. subtilis. *Cell*, 10.1016/j.cell.2009.02.035.
58. Ganji,M., Shaltiel,I.A., Bisht,S., Kim,E., Kalichava,A., Haering,C.H. and Dekker,C. (2018) Real-time imaging of DNA loop extrusion by condensin. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.aar7831.
59. Kim,E., Kerssemakers,J., Shaltiel,I.A., Haering,C.H. and Dekker,C. (2020) DNA-loop extruding condensin complexes can traverse one another. *Nature*, 10.1038/s41586-020-2067-5.
60. Nasmyth,K. (2001) Disseminating the genome: Joining, resolving, and separating sister chromatids during mitosis and meiosis. *Annu. Rev. Genet.*, **35**, 673–745.
61. Alipour,E. and Marko,J.F. (2012) Self-organization of domain structures by DNA-loop-extruding enzymes. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **40**, 11202–11212.
62. Wang,X., Brandão,H.B., Le,T.B.K., Laub,M.T. and Rudner,D.Z. (2017) Bacillus subtilis SMC complexes juxtapose chromosome arms as they travel from origin to terminus. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.aai8982.
63. Hirano,T. (2002) The ABCs of SMC proteins: Two-armed ATPases for chromosome condensation, cohesion, and repair. *Genes Dev.*, 10.1101/gad.955102.
64. Cairns,J. (1963) The bacterial chromosome and its manner of replication as seen by autoradiography. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 10.1016/S0022-2836(63)80070-4.
65. Schneider,R., Lurz,R., Lüder,G., Tolksdorf,C., Travers,A. and Muskhelishvili,G. (2001) An architectural role of the Escherichia coli chromatin protein FIS in organising DNA. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **29**, 5107–5114.
66. Cosgriff,S., Chintakayala,K., Chim,Y.T.A., Chen,X., Allen,S., Lovering,A.L. and Grainger,D.C. (2010) Dimerization and DNA-dependent aggregation of the Escherichia coli nucleoid protein

and chaperone CbpA. *Mol. Microbiol.*, **77**, 1289–1300.
67. Hales,L.M., Gumport,R.I. and Gardner,J.F. (1994) Determining the DNA sequence elements required for binding integration host factor to two different target sites. *J. Bacteriol.*, 10.1128/jb.176.10.2999-3006.1994.
68. Rouviere Yaniv,J. and Gros,F. (1975) Characterization of a novel, low molecular weight DNA binding protein from Escherichia coli. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **72**, 3428–3432.
69. Grove,A. (2011) Functional evolution of bacterial histone-like HU proteins. *Curr. Issues Mol. Biol.*, **13**, 1–12.
70. Swinger,K.K. and Rice,P.A. (2007) Structure-based Analysis of HU-DNA Binding. *J. Mol. Biol.*, **365**, 1005–1016.
71. Swinger,K.K. and Rice,P.A. (2004) IHF and HU: Flexible architects of bent DNA. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, **14**, 28–35.
72. Bensaid,A., Almeida,A., Drlica,K. and Rouviere-Yaniv,J. (1996) Cross-talk between topoisomerase I and HU in Escherichia coli. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 10.1006/jmbi.1996.0086.
73. Ghosh,S., Mallick,B. and Nagaraja,V. (2014) Direct regulation of topoisomerase activity by a nucleoid-associated protein. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **42**, 11156–11165.
74. Guo,F. and Adhya,S. (2007) Spiral structure of Escherichia coli HUαβ provides foundation for DNA supercoiling. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **104**, 4309–4314.
75. Witz,G. and Stasiak,A. (2009) DNA supercoiling and its role in DNA decatenation and unknotting. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **38**, 2119–2133.
76. Luijsterburg,M.S., Noom,M.C., Wuite,G.J.L. and Dame,R.T. (2006) The architectural role of nucleoid-associated proteins in the organization of bacterial chromatin: A molecular perspective. *J. Struct. Biol.*, 10.1016/j.jsb.2006.05.006.
77. Japaridze,A., Muskhelishvili,G., Benedetti,F., Gavriilidou,A.F.M., Zenobi,R., De Los Rios,P., Longo,G. and Dietler,G. (2017) Hyperplectonemes: A Higher Order Compact and Dynamic DNA Self-Organization. *Nano Lett.*, 10.1021/acs.nanolett.6b05294.
78. Japaridze,A., Yang,W., Dekker,C., Nasser,W. and Muskhelishvili,G. (2020) DNA sequence-directed cooperation between nucleoid-associated proteins. *bioRxiv*.
79. Boudreau,B.A., Hron,D.R., Qin,L., Van Der Valk,R.A., Kotlajich,M. V., Dame,R.T. and Landick,R. (2018) StpA and Hha stimulate pausing by RNA polymerase by promoting DNA-DNA bridging of H-NS filaments. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 10.1093/nar/gky265.
80. Johansson,J. and Uhlin,B.E. (1999) Differential protease-mediated turnover of H-NS and StpA revealed by a mutation altering protein stability and stationary-phase survival of Escherichia coli. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 10.1073/pnas.96.19.10776.
81. Johansson,J., Eriksson,S., Sondén,B., Sun Nyunt Wai and Uhlin,B.E. (2001) Heteromeric interactions among nucleoid-associated bacterial proteins: Localization of StpA-stabilizing regions in H-NS of Escherichia coli. *J. Bacteriol.*, 10.1128/JB.183.7.2343-2347.2001.
82. Uyar,E., Kurokawa,K., Yoshimura,M., Ishikawa,S., Ogasawara,N. and Oshima,T. (2009) Differential binding profiles of StpA in wild-type and hns mutant cells: A comparative analysis of cooperative partners by chromatin immunoprecipitation- microarray analysis. *J. Bacteriol.*, 10.1128/JB.01594-08.
83. Madrid,C., Balsalobre,C., García,J. and Juárez,A. (2007) The novel Hha/YmoA family of nucleoid-associated proteins: Use of structural mimicry to modulate the activity of the H-NS family of proteins. *Mol. Microbiol.*, **63**, 7–14.
84. Ali,S.S., Whitney,J.C., Stevenson,J., Robinson,H., Howell,P.L. and Navarre,W.W. (2013) Structural insights into the regulation of foreign genes in salmonella by the Hha/H-NS complex. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 10.1074/jbc.M113.455378.
85. Aravind,L. and Landsman,D. (1998) AT-hook motifs identified in a wide variety of DNA-binding proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **26**, 4413–4421.
86. Galande,S., Purbey,P.K., Notani,D. and Kumar,P.P. (2007) The third dimension of gene regulation: organization of dynamic chromatin loopscape by SATB1. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.*, 10.1016/j.gde.2007.08.003.
87. Naik,R. and Galande,S. (2019) SATB family chromatin organizers as master regulators of tumor progression. *Oncogene*, 10.1038/s41388-018-0541-4.
88. Yasui,D., Miyano,M., Cai,S., Varga-Weisz,P. and Kohwi-Shigematsu,T. (2002) SATB1 targets chromatin remodelling to regulate genes over long distances. *Nature*, **419**, 641–645.
89. Mattiroli,F., Bhattacharyya,S., Dyer,P.N., White,A.E., Sandman,K., Burkhart,B.W., Byrne,K.R.,

Lee,T., Ahn,N.G., Santangelo,T.J., *et al.* (2017) Structure of histone-based chromatin in Archaea. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.aaj1849.
90. Henneman,B., van Emmerik,C., van Ingen,H. and Dame,R.T. (2018) Structure and function of archaeal histones. *PLoS Genet.*, **14**.
91. Kuhn,M.L., Zemaitaitis,B., Hu,L.I., Sahu,A., Sorensen,D., Minasov,G., Lima,B.P., Scholle,M., Mrksich,M., Anderson,W.F., *et al.* (2014) Structural, kinetic and proteomic characterization of acetyl phosphate-dependent bacterial protein acetylation. *PLoS One*, **9**.
92. Schmidt,A., Kochanowski,K., Vedelaar,S., Ahrné,E., Volkmer,B., Callipo,L., Knoops,K., Bauer,M., Aebersold,R. and Heinemann,M. (2016) The quantitative and condition-dependent Escherichia coli proteome. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 10.1038/nbt.3418.
93. Weinert,B.T., Iesmantavicius,V., Wagner,S.A., Schölz,C., Gummesson,B., Beli,P., Nyström,T. and Choudhary,C. (2013) Acetyl-Phosphate is a critical determinant of Lysine Acetylation in E.coli. *Mol. Cell*, 10.1016/j.molcel.2013.06.003.
94. Dilweg,I.W. and Dame,R.T. (2018) Post-translational modification of nucleoidassociated proteins: An extra layer of functional modulation in bacteria? *Biochem. Soc. Trans.*, **46**, 1381–1392.
95. Le,T.B.K., Imakaev,M. V., Mirny,L.A. and Laub,M.T. (2013) High-resolution mapping of the spatial organization of a bacterial chromosome. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.1242059.
96. Marbouty,M., Le Gall,A., Cattoni,D.I., Cournac,A., Koh,A., Fiche,J.B., Mozziconacci,J., Murray,H., Koszul,R. and Nollmann,M. (2015) Condensin- and Replication-Mediated Bacterial Chromosome Folding and Origin Condensation Revealed by Hi-C and Super-resolution Imaging. *Mol. Cell*, 10.1016/j.molcel.2015.07.020.
97. Sexton,T., Yaffe,E., Kenigsberg,E., Bantignies,F., Leblanc,B., Hoichman,M., Parrinello,H., Tanay,A. and Cavalli,G. (2012) Three-dimensional folding and functional organization principles of the Drosophila genome. *Cell*, 10.1016/j.cell.2012.01.010.
98. Nora,E.P., Lajoie,B.R., Schulz,E.G., Giorgetti,L., Okamoto,I., Servant,N., Piolot,T., Van Berkum,N.L., Meisig,J., Sedat,J., *et al.* (2012) Spatial partitioning of the regulatory landscape of the X-inactivation centre. *Nature*, 10.1038/nature11049.
99. Dixon,J.R., Selvaraj,S., Yue,F., Kim,A., Li,Y., Shen,Y., Hu,M., Liu,J.S. and Ren,B. (2012) Topological domains in mammalian genomes identified by analysis of chromatin interactions. *Nature*, 10.1038/nature11082.
100. Le,T.B. and Laub,M.T. (2016) Transcription rate and transcript length drive formation of chromosomal interaction domain boundaries. *EMBO J.*, 10.15252/embj.201593561.
101. Lioy,V.S., Cournac,A., Marbouty,M., Duigou,S., Mozziconacci,J., Espéli,O., Boccard,F. and Koszul,R. (2018) Multiscale Structuring of the E. coli Chromosome by Nucleoid-Associated and Condensin Proteins. *Cell*, 10.1016/j.cell.2017.12.027.
102. Woldringh,C.L. (2002) The role of co-transcriptional translation and protein translocation (transertion) in bacterial chromosome segregation. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1046/j.1365-2958.2002.02993.x.
103. Fudenberg,G., Imakaev,M., Lu,C., Goloborodko,A., Abdennur,N. and Mirny,L.A. (2016) Formation of Chromosomal Domains by Loop Extrusion. *Cell Rep.*, **15**, 2038–2049.
104. Sanborn,A.L., Rao,S.S.P., Huang,S.C., Durand,N.C., Huntley,M.H., Jewett,A.I., Bochkov,I.D., Chinnappan,D., Cutkosky,A., Li,J., *et al.* (2015) Chromatin extrusion explains key features of loop and domain formation in wild-type and engineered genomes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 10.1073/pnas.1518552112.
105. Rao,S.S.P., Huntley,M.H., Durand,N.C., Stamenova,E.K., Bochkov,I.D., Robinson,J.T., Sanborn,A.L., Machol,I., Omer,A.D., Lander,E.S., *et al.* (2014) A 3D map of the human genome at kilobase resolution reveals principles of chromatin looping. *Cell*, **159**, 1665–1680.
106. Rowley,M.J., Nichols,M.H., Lyu,X., Ando-Kuri,M., Rivera,I.S.M., Hermetz,K., Wang,P., Ruan,Y. and Corces,V.G. (2017) Evolutionarily Conserved Principles Predict 3D Chromatin Organization. *Mol. Cell*, **67**, 837-852.e7.
107. Vietri Rudan,M., Barrington,C., Henderson,S., Ernst,C., Odom,D.T., Tanay,A. and Hadjur,S. (2015) Comparative Hi-C Reveals that CTCF Underlies Evolution of Chromosomal Domain Architecture. *Cell Rep.*, 10.1016/j.celrep.2015.02.004.
108. Cubenãs-Potts,C., Rowley,M.J., Lyu,X., Li,G., Lei,E.P. and Corces,V.G. (2017) Different enhancer classes in Drosophilabind distinct architectural proteins and mediate unique chromatin interactions and 3D architecture. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **45**, 1714–1730.

109. Wang,Q., Sun,Q., Czajkowsky,D.M. and Shao,Z. (2018) Sub-kb Hi-C in D. melanogaster reveals conserved characteristics of TADs between insect and mammalian cells. *Nat. Commun.*, 10.1038/s41467-017-02526-9.
110. Ulianov,S. V., Khrameeva,E.E., Gavrilov,A.A., Flyamer,I.M., Kos,P., Mikhaleva,E.A., Penin,A.A., Logacheva,M.D., Imakaev,M. V., Chertovich,A., *et al.* (2016) Active chromatin and transcription play a key role in chromosome partitioning into topologically associating domains. *Genome Res.*, **26**, 70–84.
111. Hsieh,T.H.S., Weiner,A., Lajoie,B., Dekker,J., Friedman,N. and Rando,O.J. (2015) Mapping Nucleosome Resolution Chromosome Folding in Yeast by Micro-C. *Cell*, **162**, 108–119.
112. Eme,L., Spang,A., Lombard,J., Stairs,C.W. and Ettema,T.J.G. (2017) Archaea and the origin of eukaryotes. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.*, 10.1038/nrmicro.2017.133.
113. Takemata,N., Samson,R.Y. and Bell,S.D. (2019) Physical and Functional Compartmentalization of Archaeal Chromosomes. *Cell*, 10.1016/j.cell.2019.08.036.
114. Takemata,N. and Bell,S.D. (2021) Multi-scale architecture of archaeal chromosomes. *Mol. Cell*, 10.1016/j.molcel.2020.12.001.
115. Cockram,C., Thierry,A., Gorlas,A., Lestini,R. and Koszul,R. (2021) Euryarchaeal genomes are folded into SMC-dependent loops and domains, but lack transcription-mediated compartmentalization. *Mol. Cell*, 10.1016/j.molcel.2020.12.013.
116. Umbarger,M.A., Toro,E., Wright,M.A., Porreca,G.J., Baù,D., Hong,S.H., Fero,M.J., Zhu,L.J., Marti-Renom,M.A., McAdams,H.H., *et al.* (2011) The three-dimensional architecture of a bacterial genome and its alteration by genetic perturbation. *Mol. Cell*, 10.1016/j.molcel.2011.09.010.
117. Lal,A., Dhar,A., Trostel,A., Kouzine,F., Seshasayee,A.S.N. and Adhya,S. (2016) Genome scale patterns of supercoiling in a bacterial chromosome. *Nat. Commun.*, 10.1038/ncomms11055.
118. Bermúdez,I., García-Martínez,J., Pérez-Ortín,J.E. and Roca,J. (2010) A method for genome-wide analysis of DNA helical tension by means of psoralen-DNA photobinding. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 10.1093/nar/gkq687.
119. Azam,T.A., Iwata,A., Nishimura,A., Ueda,S. and Ishihama,A. (1999) Growth phase-dependent variation in protein composition of the Escherichia coli nucleoid. *J. Bacteriol.*, **181**, 6361–6370.
120. Rovinskiy,N., Agbleke,A.A., Chesnokova,O., Pang,Z. and Higgins,N.P. (2012) Rates of Gyrase Supercoiling and Transcription Elongation Control Supercoil Density in a Bacterial Chromosome. *PLoS Genet.*, 10.1371/journal.pgen.1002845.
121. Uhlmann,F. (2016) SMC complexes: From DNA to chromosomes. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.*, 10.1038/nrm.2016.30.
122. Fennell-Fezzie,R., Gradia,S.D., Akey,D. and Berger,J.M. (2005) The MukF subunit of Escherichia coli condensin: Architecture and functional relationship to kleisins. *EMBO J.*, 10.1038/sj.emboj.7600680.
123. Woo,J.S., Lim,J.H., Shin,H.C., Suh,M.K., Ku,B., Lee,K.H., Joo,K., Robinson,H., Lee,J., Park,S.Y., *et al.* (2009) Structural Studies of a Bacterial Condensin Complex Reveal ATP-Dependent Disruption of Intersubunit Interactions. *Cell*, 10.1016/j.cell.2008.10.050.
124. Badrinarayanan,A., Reyes-Lamothe,R., Uphoff,S., Leake,M.C. and Sherratt,D.J. (2012) In vivo architecture and action of bacterial structural maintenance of chromosome proteins. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.1227126.
125. Chen,N., Zinchenko,A.A., Yoshikawa,Y., Araki,S., Adachi,S., Yamazoe,M., Hiraga,S. and Yoshikawa,K. (2008) ATP-induced shrinkage of DNA with MukB protein and the MukBEF complex of escherichia coli. *J. Bacteriol.*, **190**, 3731–3737.
126. Zawadzka,K., Zawadzki,P., Baker,R., Rajasekar,K. V., Wagner,F., Sherratt,D.J. and Arciszewska,L.K. (2018) MukB ATPases are regulated independently by the N-and C-terminal domains of MukF kleisin. *Elife*, 10.7554/eLife.31522.
127. Espeli,O., Mercier,R. and Boccard,F. (2008) DNA dynamics vary according to macrodomain topography in the E. coli chromosome. *Mol. Microbiol.*, **68**, 1418–1427.
128. Valens,M., Thiel,A. and Boccard,F. (2016) The MaoP/maoS Site-Specific System Organizes the Ori Region of the E. coli Chromosome into a Macrodomain. *PLoS Genet.*, **12**.
129. Duigou,S. and Boccard,F. (2017) Long range chromosome organization in Escherichia coli: The position of the replication origin defines the non-structured regions and the Right and Left macrodomains. *PLoS Genet.*, 10.1371/journal.pgen.1006758.

130. Mercier,R., Petit,M.A., Schbath,S., Robin,S., El Karoui,M., Boccard,F. and Espéli,O. (2008) The MatP/matS Site-Specific System Organizes the Terminus Region of the E. coli Chromosome into a Macrodomain. *Cell*, 10.1016/j.cell.2008.08.031.
131. Dupaigne,P., Tonthat,N.K., Espéli,O., Whitfill,T., Boccard,F. and Schumacher,M.A. (2012) Molecular Basis for a Protein-Mediated DNA-Bridging Mechanism that Functions in Condensation of the E. coli Chromosome. *Mol. Cell*, 10.1016/j.molcel.2012.09.009.
132. Thiel,A., Valens,M., Vallet-Gely,I., Espéli,O. and Boccard,F. (2012) Long-range chromosome organization in E. coli: A site-specific system isolates the ter macrodomain. *PLoS Genet.*, 10.1371/journal.pgen.1002672.
133. Espéli,O., Borne,R., Dupaigne,P., Thiel,A., Gigant,E., Mercier,R. and Boccard,F. (2012) A MatP-divisome interaction coordinates chromosome segregation with cell division in E. coli. *EMBO J.*, **31**, 3198–3211.
134. Cho,H., McManus,H.R., Dove,S.L. and Bernhardt,T.G. (2011) Nucleoid occlusion factor SlmA is a DNA-activated FtsZ polymerization antagonist. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 10.1073/pnas.1018674108.
135. Sánchez-Romero,M.A., Busby,S.J.W., Dyer,N.P., Ott,S., Millard,A.D. and Grainger,D.C. (2010) Dynamic distribution of SeqA protein across the chromosome of Escherichia coli K-12. *MBio*, **1**.
136. Lu,M., Campbell,J.L., Boye,E. and Kleckner,N. (1994) SeqA: A negative modulator of replication initiation in E. coli. *Cell*, **77**, 413–426.
137. Slater,S., Wold,S., Lu,M., Boye,E., Skarstad,K. and Kleckner,N. (1995) E. coli SeqA protein binds oriC in two different methyl-modulated reactions appropriate to its roles in DNA replication initiation and origin sequestration. *Cell*, 10.1016/0092-8674(95)90272-4.
138. Wu,L.J., Ishikawa,S., Kawai,Y., Oshima,T., Ogasawara,N. and Errington,J. (2009) Noc protein binds to specific DNA sequences to coordinate cell division with chromosome segregation. *EMBO J.*, **28**, 1940–1952.
139. Arias-Cartin,R., Dobihal,G.S., Campos,M., Surovtsev,I. V, Parry,B. and Jacobs-Wagner,C. (2017) Replication fork passage drives asymmetric dynamics of a critical nucleoid-associated protein in Caulobacter . *EMBO J.*, 10.15252/embj.201695513.
140. Taylor,J.A., Panis,G., Viollier,P.H. and Marczynski,G.T. (2017) A novel nucleoid-associated protein coordinates chromosome replication and chromosome partition. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 10.1093/nar/gkx596.
141. Qin,L., Bdira,F. Ben, Sterckx,Y.G.J., Volkov,A.N., Vreede,J., Giachin,G., Van Schaik,P., Ubbink,M. and Dame,R.T. (2020) Structural basis for osmotic regulation of the DNA binding properties of H-NS proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **48**, 2156–2172.
142. Hameed,U.F.S., Liao,C., Radhakrishnan,A.K., Huser,F., Aljedani,S.S., Zhao,X., Momin,A.A., Melo,F.A., Guo,X., Brooks,C., *et al.* (2019) H-NS uses an autoinhibitory conformational switch for environment-controlled gene silencing. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **47**, 2666–2680.
143. Hołówka,J. and Zakrzewska-Czerwińska,J. (2020) Nucleoid Associated Proteins: The Small Organizers That Help to Cope With Stress. *Front. Microbiol.*, 10.3389/fmicb.2020.00590.
144. Dame,R.T. (2005) The role of nucleoid-associated proteins in the organization and compaction of bacterial chromatin. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2005.04598.x.
145. Meyer,A.S. and Grainger,D.C. (2013) The Escherichia coli Nucleoid in Stationary Phase. In *Advances in Applied Microbiology*.
146. Ball,C.A., Osuna,R., Ferguson,K.C. and Johnson,R.C. (1992) Dramatic changes in Fis levels upon nutrient upshift in Escherichia coli. *J. Bacteriol.*, **174**, 8043–8056.
147. Almiron,M., Link,A.J., Furlong,D. and Kolter,R. (1992) A novel DNA-binding protein with regulatory and protective roles in starved Escherichia coli. *Genes Dev.*, 10.1101/gad.6.12b.2646.
148. Karas,V.O., Westerlaken,I. and Meyer,A.S. (2015) The DNA-binding protein from starved cells (Dps) utilizes dual functions to defend cells against multiple stresses. *J. Bacteriol.*, **197**, 3206–3215.
149. Wolf,S.G., Frenkiel,D., Arad,T., Finkeil,S.E., Kolter,R. and Minsky,A. (1999) DNA protection by stress-induced biocrystallization. *Nature*, **400**, 83–85.
150. Ohniwa,R.L., Morikawa,K., Kim,J., Ohta,T., Ishihama,A., Wada,C. and Takeyasu,K. (2006) Dynamic state of DNA topology is essential for genome condensation in bacteria. *EMBO J.*, **25**, 5591–5602.

151. Janissen,R., Arens,M.M.A., Vtyurina,N.N., Rivai,Z., Sunday,N.D., Eslami-Mossallam,B., Gritsenko,A.A., Laan,L., de Ridder,D., Artsimovitch,I., *et al.* (2018) Global DNA Compaction in Stationary-Phase Bacteria Does Not Affect Transcription. *Cell*, **174**, 1188-1199.e14.
152. Lamberte,L.E., Baniulyte,G., Singh,S.S., Stringer,A.M., Bonocora,R.P., Stracy,M., Kapanidis,A.N., Wade,J.T. and Grainger,D.C. (2017) Horizontally acquired AT-rich genes in Escherichia coli cause toxicity by sequestering RNA polymerase. *Nat. Microbiol.*, 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.249.
153. Singh,S.S. and Grainger,D.C. (2013) H-NS Can Facilitate Specific DNA-binding by RNA Polymerase in AT-rich Gene Regulatory Regions. *PLoS Genet.*, **9**.
154. Singh,S.S., Singh,N., Bonocora,R.P., Fitzgerald,D.M., Wade,J.T. and Grainger,D.C. (2014) Widespread suppression of intragenic transcription initiation by H-NS. *Genes Dev.*, 10.1101/gad.234336.113.
155. Myers,K.S., Yan,H., Ong,I.M., Chung,D., Liang,K., Tran,F., Keleş,S., Landick,R. and Kiley,P.J. (2013) Genome-scale Analysis of Escherichia coli FNR Reveals Complex Features of Transcription Factor Binding. *PLoS Genet.*, **9**.
156. Haycocks,J.R.J., Sharma,P., Stringer,A.M., Wade,J.T. and Grainger,D.C. (2015) The Molecular Basis for Control of ETEC Enterotoxin Expression in Response to Environment and Host. *PLoS Pathog.*, 10.1371/journal.ppat.1004605.
157. Shin,M., Song,M., Joon,H.R., Hong,Y., Kim,Y.J., Seok,Y.J., Ha,K.S., Jung,S.H. and Choy,H.E. (2005) DNA looping-mediated repression by histone-like protein H-NS: Specific requirement of Eσ70 as a cofactor for looping. *Genes Dev.*, 10.1101/gad.1316305.
158. Dame,R.T., Wyman,C., Wurm,R., Wagner,R. and Goosen,N. (2002) Structural basis for H-NS-mediated trapping of RNA polymerase in the open initiation complex at the rrnB P1. *J. Biol. Chem.*, **277**, 2146–2150.
159. Shin,M., Lagda,A.C., Lee,J.W., Bhat,A., Rhee,J.H., Kim,J.S., Takeyasu,K. and Choy,H.E. (2012) Gene silencing by H-NS from distal DNA site. *Mol. Microbiol.*, **86**, 707–719.
160. Dattananda,C.S., Rajkumari,K. and Gowrishankar,J. (1991) Multiple mechanisms contribute to osmotic inducibility of proU operon expression in Escherichia coli: Demonstration of two osmoresponsive promoters and of a negative regulatory element within the first structural gene. *J. Bacteriol.*, **173**, 7481–7490.
161. Gowrishankar,J. (1989) Nucleotide sequence of the osmoregulatory proU operon of Escherichia coli. *J. Bacteriol.*, 10.1128/jb.171.4.1923-1931.1989.
162. Lucht,J.M., Dersch,P., Kempf,B. and Bremer,E. (1994) Interactions of the nucleoid-associated DNA-binding protein H-NS with the regulatory region of the osmotically controlled proU operon of Escherichia coli. *J. Biol. Chem.*, **269**, 6578–6586.
163. Nagarajavel,V., Madhusudan,S., Dole,S., Rahmouni,A.R. and Schnetz,K. (2007) Repression by binding of H-NS within the transcription unit. *J. Biol. Chem.*, **282**, 23622–23630.
164. Rashid,F.Z.M. (2021) Chapter 3: Regulation of proVWX transcription by local chromatin re-modelling.
165. Madrid,C., Nieto,J.M. and Juárez,A. (2001) Role of the Hha/YmoA family of proteins in the thermoregulation of the expression of virulence factors. *Int. J. Med. Microbiol.*, **291**, 425–432.
166. Wade,J.T. and Grainger,D.C. (2018) Waking the neighbours: disruption of H-NS repression by overlapping transcription. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1111/mmi.13939.
167. Mai,X., Chou,S. and Struhl,K. (2000) Preferential Accessibility of the Yeast his3 Promoter Is Determined by a General Property of the DNA Sequence, Not by Specific Elements. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, 10.1128/mcb.20.18.6668-6676.2000.
168. Schneider,D.A., Ross,W. and Gourse,R.L. (2003) Control of rRNA expression in Escherichia coli. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.*, 10.1016/S1369-5274(03)00038-9.
169. Browning,D.F., Cole,J.A. and Busby,S.J.W. (2000) Suppression of FNR-dependent transcription activation at the Escherichia coli nir promoter by Fis, IHF and H-NS: Modulation of transcription by a complex nucleo-protein assembly. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1046/j.1365-2958.2000.02087.x.
170. Browning,D.F., Grainger,D.C., Beatty,C.M., Wolfe,A.J., Cole,J.A. and Busby,S.J.W. (2005) Integration of three signals at the Escherichia coli nrf promoter: A role for Fis protein in catabolite repression. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2005.04701.x.
171. Bokal,A.J., Ross,W., Gaal,T., Johnson,R.C. and Gourse,R.L. (1997) Molecular anatomy of a transcription activation patch: FIS-RNA polymerase interactions at the Escherichia coli rrnB P1

promoter. *EMBO J.*, 10.1093/emboj/16.1.154.
172. McLeod,S.M., Aiyar,S.E., Gourse,R.L. and Johnson,R.C. (2002) The C-terminal domains of the RNA polymerase α subunits: Contact site with Fis and localization during co-activation with CRP at the Escherichia coli proP P2 promoter. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 10.1006/jmbi.2001.5391.
173. Semsey,S., Tolstorukov,M.Y., Virnik,K., Zhurkin,V.B. and Adhya,S. (2004) DNA trajectory in the Gal repressosome. *Genes Dev.*, **18**, 1898–1907.
174. Oberto,J., Nabti,S., Jooste,V., Mignot,H. and Rouviere-Yaniv,J. (2009) The HU regulon is composed of genes responding to anaerobiosis, acid stress, high osmolarity and SOS induction. *PLoS One*, **4**.
175. Mangan,M.W., Lucchini,S., Cróinín,T.Ó., Fitzgerald,S., Hinton,J.C.D. and Dorman,C.J. (2011) Nucleoid-associated protein HU controls three regulons that coordinate virulence, response to stress and general physiology in Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium. *Microbiology*, **157**, 1075–1087.
176. Zhang,N., Darbari,V.C., Glyde,R., Zhang,X. and Buck,M. (2016) The bacterial enhancer-dependent RNA polymerase. *Biochem. J.*, 10.1042/BCJ20160741C.
177. Browning,D.F., Beatty,C.M., Wolfe,A.J., Cole,J.A. and Busby,S.J.W. (2002) Independent regulation of the divergent Escherichia coli nrfA and acsP1 promoters by a nucleoprotein assembly at a shared regulatory region. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 10.1046/j.1365-2958.2002.02776.x.
178. Adachi,S., Kohiyama,M., Onogi,T. and Hiraga,S. (2005) Localization of replication forks in wild-type and mukB mutant cells of Escherichia coli. *Mol. Genet. Genomics*, **274**, 264–271.
179. Badrinarayanan,A., Lesterlin,C., Reyes-Lamothe,R. and Sherratt,D. (2012) The escherichia coli SMC complex, MukBEF, shapes nucleoid organization independently of DNA replication. *J. Bacteriol.*, **194**, 4669–4676.
180. Nicolas,E., Upton,A.L., Uphoff,S., Henry,O., Badrinarayanan,A. and Sherratt,D. (2014) The SMC complex MukBEF recruits topoisomerase IV to the origin of replication region in live Escherichia coli. *MBio*, **5**.
181. Hayama,R. and Marians,K.J. (2010) Physical and functional interaction between the condensin MukB and the decatenase topoisomerase IV in Escherichia coli. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **107**, 18826–18831.
182. Hofmann,A., Mäkelä,J., Sherratt,D.J., Heermann,D. and Murray,S.M. (2019) Self-organised segregation of bacterial chromosomal origins. *Elife*, **8**.
183. Monterroso,B., Zorrilla,S., Sobrinos-Sanguino,M., Robles-Ramos,M.A., López-Álvarez,M., Margolin,W., Keating,C.D. and Rivas,G. (2019) Bacterial FtsZ protein forms phase-separated condensates with its nucleoid-associated inhibitor SlmA. *EMBO Rep.*, **20**.
184. Bernhardt,T.G. and De Boer,P.A.J. (2005) SlmA, a nucleoid-associated, FtsZ binding protein required for blocking septal ring assembly over chromosomes in E. coli. *Mol. Cell*, **18**, 555–564.
185. Tonthat,N.K., Arold,S.T., Pickering,B.F., Van Dyke,M.W., Liang,S., Lu,Y., Beuria,T.K., Margolin,W. and Schumacher,M.A. (2011) Molecular mechanism by which the nucleoid occlusion factor, SlmA, keeps cytokinesis in check. *EMBO J.*, **30**, 154–164.
186. Toro,E. and Shapiro,L. (2010) Bacterial chromosome organization and segregation. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.*, 10.1101/cshperspect.a000349.
187. Wang,X., Montero Llopis,P. and Rudner,D.Z. (2013) Organization and segregation of bacterial chromosomes. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, **14**, 191–203.
188. Mierzejewska,J. and Jagura-Burdzy,G. (2012) Prokaryotic ParA-ParB-parS system links bacterial chromosome segregation with the cell cycle. *Plasmid*, 10.1016/j.plasmid.2011.08.003.
189. Toro,E., Hong,S.H., McAdams,H.H. and Shapiro,L. (2008) Caulobacter requires a dedicated mechanism to initiate chromosome segregation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **105**, 15435–15440.
190. Böhm,K., Giacomelli,G., Schmidt,A., Imhof,A., Koszul,R., Marbouty,M. and Bramkamp,M. (2020) Chromosome organization by a conserved condensin-ParB system in the actinobacterium Corynebacterium glutamicum. *Nat. Commun.*, **11**.
191. Nolivos,S., Upton,A.L., Badrinarayanan,A., Müller,J., Zawadzka,K., Wiktor,J., Gill,A., Arciszewska,L., Nicolas,E. and Sherratt,D. (2016) MatP regulates the coordinated action of topoisomerase IV and MukBEF in chromosome segregation. *Nat. Commun.*, **7**.
192. Ricci,D.P., Melfi,M.D., Lasker,K., Dill,D.L., McAdams,H.H. and Shapiro,L. (2016) Cell cycle progression in Caulobacter requires a nucleoid-associated protein with high AT sequence

recognition. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **113**, E5952–E5961.
193. Guo,M.S., Haakonsen,D.L., Zeng,W., Schumacher,M.A. and Laub,M.T. (2018) A Bacterial Chromosome Structuring Protein Binds Overtwisted DNA to Stimulate Type II Topoisomerases and Enable DNA Replication. *Cell*, **175**, 583-597.e23.
194. Luijsterburg,M.S., White,M.F., Van Driel,R. and Th. Dame,R. (2008) The major architects of chromatin: Architectural proteins in bacteria, archaea and eukaryotes. *Crit. Rev. Biochem. Mol. Biol.*, **43**, 393–418.
195. Dekker,J., Rippe,K., Dekker,M. and Kleckner,N. (2002) Capturing chromosome conformation. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.1067799.
196. Lieberman-Aiden,E., Van Berkum,N.L., Williams,L., Imakaev,M., Ragoczy,T., Telling,A., Amit,I., Lajoie,B.R., Sabo,P.J., Dorschner,M.O., *et al.* (2009) Comprehensive mapping of long-range interactions reveals folding principles of the human genome. *Science (80-.).*, 10.1126/science.1181369.
197. van Berkum,N.L., Lieberman-Aiden,E., Williams,L., Imakaev,M., Gnirke,A., Mirny,L.A., Dekker,J. and Lander,E.S. (2010) Hi-C: A method to study the three-dimensional architecture of genomes. *J. Vis. Exp.*, 10.3791/1869.
198. Nagano,T., Lubling,Y., Stevens,T.J., Schoenfelder,S., Yaffe,E., Dean,W., Laue,E.D., Tanay,A. and Fraser,P. (2013) Single-cell Hi-C reveals cell-to-cell variability in chromosome structure. *Nature*, 10.1038/nature12593.
199. Nagano,T., Lubling,Y., Várnai,C., Dudley,C., Leung,W., Baran,Y., Mendelson Cohen,N., Wingett,S., Fraser,P. and Tanay,A. (2017) Cell-cycle dynamics of chromosomal organization at single-cell resolution. *Nature*, 10.1038/nature23001.
200. Stevens,T.J., Lando,D., Basu,S., Atkinson,L.P., Cao,Y., Lee,S.F., Leeb,M., Wohlfahrt,K.J., Boucher,W., O'Shaughnessy-Kirwan,A., *et al.* (2017) 3D structures of individual mammalian genomes studied by single-cell Hi-C. *Nature*, 10.1038/nature21429.

Acknowledgements
The authors thank the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research [VICI 016.160.613] (R.T.D.), Wellcome Trust (212193/Z/18/Z) (D.C.G.), Leverhulme Trust (RPG-2018-198) (D.C.G.), BBSRC (BB/H010289/1) (D.C.G.) and the Human Frontier Science Program (HFSP) [RGP0014/2014] (R.T.D. and D.C.G.) for funding of current research in our labs.

Author contributions
All authors researched data for the article, substantially contributed to discussion of content, and wrote the article. R.T.D. and D.C.G. reviewed/edited the manuscript before submission.

Competing interests
The authors declare no competing interests.







Box 1.1: Techniques used to study chromosome structure and organization. Hi-C: Hi-C is a chromosome conformation capture (3C)-based method used to study the three-dimensional organization of the chromosome (195–197). It is a high-throughput technique that determines the probability of interaction between pairs of genomic loci in an unbiased manner at resolutions of up to 1kb (105, 196). Hi-C enables studies of chromosome organization in situ in the nucleus or nucleoid, changes therein in response to environmental stimuli, and — by alignment with genome-wide protein-occupancy profiles such as chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) datasets — identification of proteins involved in chromosome structuring (56, 62, 95, 96, 100, 104–106, 196). Hi-C is generally an ensemble technique providing an averaged chromosome interaction profile. Single-cell Hi-C is gaining momentum in the field of chromosome biology, yet still has to be applied to bacterial organisms (198–200). The technique involves treating cells in culture with formaldehyde to chemically crosslink all

DNA–protein and protein–protein interactions within the cell, hence, fixing the structure of the chromosome (see the figure, part a). Of the remaining steps outlined in the figure part a, the key principle is that loci that are close to each other in three dimensional space are ligated into individual DNA ligation products regardless of their position along the primary genome sequence. Ligation products are read out using high-throughput sequencing to identify interacting pairs of genomic loci en masse. The sequencing data are represented as a heatmap of genome-wide interaction probabilities. **Flourescent repressor operator system (FROS):** FROS is a microscopy-based technique used to determine the position and track the dynamics of specific DNA loci in living cells. Loci of interest are marked with an array of 'operator' sequences that can be recognized and bound by ectopically expressed 'repressor' proteins that are translationally fused to flourescent protein labels (see the figure, part b). Different loci can be tagged and independently tracked in live cells to determine the spatial position and interrelationship of positions, establishing changes in structure in response to environmental stimuli. Changes in chromosome structure are evident as changes in distance between pairs of loci. FROS is a single-cell technique that reveals non-averaged chromosome dynamics. Despite limitations in its throughput, it is more powerful in establishing direct structure–function relations than Hi-C. **Chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP):** ChIP uses antibodies that target a DNA-binding protein of interest to isolate the factor and the chromosomal regions associated with it, following enzymatic, chemical or physical genome fragmentation. Often combined with high-throughput sequencing (ChIP-seq), the technique measures genome-wide patterns of DNA binding at single base-pair resolution. In this method, the chromosome of cells in culture is fixed with formaldehyde to crosslink all protein–protein and protein–DNA interactions (see the figure, part c). The chromosome is fragmented and antibodies are used to immunoprecipitate any DNA segments that are bound by the protein of interest. In ChIP-seq, the immunoprecipitated library is then purified and sequenced to determine the genome-wide DNA binding profile of the protein of interest.

Glossary

Chromosome
An essential molecule containing some or all of the genes required by an organism to survive and reproduce. Whereas chromosomes are made of DNA, not all DNA is chromosomal. Extra-chromosomal DNA molecules such as plasmids also encode genes, although these genes are not absolutely required for an organism's survival and reproduction.

Chromatin
A compact macromolecular complex of DNA and structuring proteins.

Nucleoid
A structure found in prokaryotic cells that contains chromosome(s), bound proteins and other associated molecules (e.g. RNAs). Nucleoids are functionally similar to the nuclei of eukaryotic cells but not enclosed within a membrane. Note that nucleoids can be found in eukaryotic organelles believed to be bacterial in origin.

Genome
The complete set of genes encoded by the DNA content of a given organism. The genome includes genes encoded by chromosomal and extra-chromosomal DNA, and intervening non-coding regions.

Nucleoid-associated proteins
(NAPs). A broad term to describe any proteins implicated in organizing bacterial chromosomes. Here, we consider structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) proteins as NAPs due to their association with the nucleoid and role in shaping nucleoid structure. SMC proteins — discovered later than other NAPs and initially studied primarily in the context of chromosome segregation — have historically (and in our view unjustly) not been classified as NAPs.

Nucleoprotein
A generic term, applicable to prokaryotes and eukaryotes, to describe DNA in complex with bound proteins.

Plectonemes

DNA loops in which the double-stranded DNA is wrapped around itself as a result of supercoiling.

Hyperplectoneme
Higher-order plectonemic structure formed by the winding of multiple plectonemes into a filament.

Supercoiled
Pertains to supercoiling, which is under- or over-winding of the double helix that causes the double-stranded DNA to fold into higher-order structures: plectonemes and toroids. To alter DNA supercoiling levels enzymatic breaking and rejoining of DNA strands is required.

Topoisomerase
An enzyme that alters DNA supercoiling by breaking and rejoining DNA strands. Mechanistically, topoisomerases are distinguished by whether they break and re-join either a single strand (type I) or both strands (type II).

Replichores
The sections of a chromosome between the origin and terminus of replication. Circular chromosomes are usually divided into a left and right replichore.