Genome Report—A Genome Sequence Analysis of the RB51 Strain of *Brucella abortus* in the Context of Its Vaccine Properties

Betsy Bricker,* Nalin Goonesekere,[†] Darrell Bayles,* David Alt,* Steven Olsen,*

and Catherine Vrentas*,1,2

*Infectious Bacterial Diseases Research Unit, National Animal Disease Center, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Ames, IA, 50010 and [†]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA, 50614

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4697-1684 (N.G.)

ABSTRACT The RB51 vaccine strain of *Brucella abortus*, which confers safe and effective protection of cattle from *B. abortus* infection, was originally generated via serial passage of *B. abortus* 2308 to generate spontaneous, attenuating mutations. While some of these mutations have been previously characterized, such as an insertional mutation in the *wboA* gene that contributes to the rough phenotype of the strain, a comprehensive annotation of genetic differences between RB51 and *B. abortus* 2308 genomes has not yet been published. Here, the whole genome sequence of the RB51 vaccine strain is compared against two available 2308 parent sequences, with all observed single nucleotide polymorphisms, insertions, and deletions presented. Mutations of interest for future characterization in vaccine development, such as mutations in *eipA* and *narJ* genes in RB51, were identified. Additionally, protein homology modeling was utilized to provide *in silico* support for the hypothesis that the RB51 *capD* mutation is the second contributing mutation to the rough phenotype of RB51, likely explaining the inability of *wboA*-complemented strains of RB51 to revert to a smooth phenotype.

Brucellosis, a chronic and debilitating bacterial disease in humans, is spread zoonotically from infected ruminant species like goats and cattle, in which the disease causes reproductive dysfunction and abortion in pregnant animals (reviewed by de Figueiredo *et al.* 2015). Multiple species of *Brucella* are infectious to humans; *Brucella abortus* is often found in cattle, *Brucella suis* in pigs and feral swine, and *Brucella melitensis* in sheep and goats.

Vaccination of young animals is an important strategy for protection of both animals and humans against infection with *Brucella*

²Corresponding author: E-mail: cevrentas@gmail.com.

species. Multiple live, attenuated vaccines have been developed for protection of livestock against *Brucella abortus*, including RB51 (Schurig *et al.* 1991; Cheville *et al.* 1993), used in the U.S. in cattle herds. However, development of vaccines against *Brucella* species that are both safe and effective is made challenging by the intracellular nature of the bacterium.

Investigation of the characteristics of the RB51 *B. abortus* vaccine strain is of importance for development of future *B. melitensis* vaccines, due to its ability to elicit a strong protective, cell-based immune response without causing disease in livestock (reviewed by Schurig *et al.* 2002). While *B. melitensis* is highly virulent in humans and causes zoonotic transmission and persistent infection (reviewed by Atluri *et al.* 2011), no vaccines against *B. melitensis* are currently approved in the U.S. as safe and effective for use in humans. RB51 was derived from *B. abortus* strain 2308 by serial passage, and exhibits a rough phenotype in its cell envelope (Schurig *et al.* 1991). It is well-known that an IS711 element-caused disruption is present in the *wboA* gene of RB51; *wboA* encodes a glycosyltransferase necessary for lipopolysaccharide (LPS) biosynthesis, and this disruption is at least partially responsible for the rough morphology of RB51 (Vemulapalli *et al.* 1999). However, complementation of the defective gene with the

KEYWORDS

Brucella RB51 *B. abortus* Brucellosis vaccine sequence



Copyright © 2020 Bricker et al.

doi: https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.119.400964

Manuscript received December 3, 2019; accepted for publication February 23, 2020; published Early Online February 28, 2020.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Supplemental material available at figshare: https://doi.org/10.25387/ g3.11864358.

¹Present address: 4712 Bromley Lane, Richmond, VA, 23226.

wild-type *wboA* allele did not restore a smooth phenotype or restore virulence to RB51, so additional factors appear to contribute to the strain phenotype (Vemulapalli *et al.* 2000). Not all rough strains of *Brucella* confer the protective properties of RB51 (*i.e.*, Elzer *et al.* 1998), indicating that there are genetic changes specific to RB51 that contribute to its beneficial vaccine properties.

While sequencing of the RB51 genome has been attempted, previous sequences were either not closed to completion, or are disparate from expected allele sequences at the *wboA* gene locus (Ma *et al.* 2014; Table S1; Figure S1). Additionally, a genome-wide (complete) comparison of RB51 to the parent *B. abortus* 2308 strain has not yet been published. Therefore, to provide a complete picture of genetic changes that may contribute to RB51 properties, we present here a sequence of the RB51 vaccine strain closed to completion at the National Animal Disease Center, assess DNA mutations relative to the 2308 genome sequence, and compare findings to previous studies. Using protein modeling, we then predict the impact of mutations of particular interest for use in future vaccine development.

MATERIALS & METHODS

DNA isolation and purification

Genomic DNA was extracted as previously described (Halling *et al.* 2005) from approximately 1 X 10^{10} methanol-killed *Brucella abortus* RB51 (sub-strain ARS-1). After the second precipitation, the spooled DNA was washed for several days in periodic changes of 80% ethanol. The purified DNA was stored in 80% ethanol. As needed, precipitated flakes of DNA were removed and re-solubilized in 10 mM sodium hydroxide. When fully rehydrated, the pH was adjusted to 7.5 in the presence of 10 mM HEPES buffer, and stored at 4°.

DNA sequencing

The RB51 genomic DNA was sequenced by two methods. The first pass was done by Sanger sequencing of purified plasmid DNA from a shotgun library created from the RB51 genomic DNA. The DNA was sequenced on an ABI-PRISM DNA Sequencer, Model 3700, following treatment of the plasmid DNA with BigDye terminator nucleotides (ABI_PRISM BigDye Terminator Cycle Sequencing Kit ver. 3.0; Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) as directed by the manufacturer. A second round of sequencing was done by pyrosequencing with the high-throughput Roche GS FLX Sequencing System per manufacturer's directions (454 Life Sciences- A Roche company, Branford, CT, USA). Briefly, the RB51 purified DNA was sheared by nebulization to a range of approximately 500 to 700 base pairs. A single-strand template (sstDNA) shotgun library was created from the sheared fragments as directed in the GS FLX Standard Library Preparation Kit (Roche Applied Science, Indianapolis, IN, USA). DNA concentrations were measured with an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies, Palo Alto, CA, USA). The size range of the sheared DNA was analyzed on a DNA-7500 lab chip, while the concentration of the sstDNA library was determined on the Pico 6000 LabChip. The RB51-sstDNA library was amplified by emulsionbased clonal amplification (emPCR) as directed by the Shotgun GS FLX Standard emPCR kit (Roche Applied Science) manual. The DNA-bound beads were loaded onto a Pico Titer plate and sequenced with the GS LR70 Sequencing Kit per manufacturer's instructions.

Sequence assembly and annotation

Image processing of the raw data and signal processing (base calling) were performed using the Roche GS Run Processor pipeline according to the manufacturer's recommendations. Assembly of sequence

data into contigs was completed with Phred/Phrap and Consed software programs. Phred was used for base calling of the Sanger sequence reads, while Phrap was used to assemble both the Sanger and the pyrosequencing data. Consed was used for the graphical assembly and final editing. The annotated sequences were prepared for submission to GenBank with the IMG/ER software program (Joint Genomic Initiative; http://img.jgi.doe.gov/er; Markowitz et al. 2009). As needed, the annotated sequence was viewed with the Artemis sequence viewer and annotation tool (Genome Research Limited; http://www.sanger.ac.uk/Software/Artemis; Mural 2000). Results were compared manually with ACT, a DNA comparison viewer, part of the Artemis package. Genes were called using Glimmer (Salzberg et al. 1998), and compared to homologs using BLAST (Altschul et al. 1990). Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were identified with MUMmer (http://www.tigr.org/software/ mummer; Kurtz et al. 2004) and sequence alignment with Mauve (http://gel.ahabs.wisc.edu/mauve; Darling et al. 2004).

Protein modeling

Computational modeling of the C-terminal domain of CapD (residues 261 - 585) was performed using the program I-TASSER (Roy et al. 2010; https://zhanglab.ccmb.med.umich.edu/I-TASSER/). I-TASSER has been the top-ranked server in the last few Critical Assessment of Techniques for Protein Structure Prediction (CASP 7-10) competitions for homology modeling and threading. The C-terminal domain structure of PgIF (PDB ID: 5BJU), which had a sequence identity of 41% with the C-terminal domain of CapD, was used as the template. The five structural models normally returned by the program was collapsed to one, indicating the generation of a highquality model. This is confirmed by the high C-score (1.23) for the model (the C-score describes the quality of a predicted model, and ranges between -5 and 2). When the model was superposed with the C-terminal domain of PgIF, the only significant deviations occurred in two loop regions located far away from the active site of PgIF (Figure S2). PDB files were visualized using PyMol software.

Data availability

The genome information is publicly available on NCBI GenBank ("whole genome sequence of Brucella abortus RB51, ARS-1 isolate") under the BioProject accession PRJNA573988 and BioSample accession SAMN12837785. Strains are available upon request to the USDA ARS National Animal Disease Center. Table S1 provides an overview of features of RB51 genomes, and Table S2 provides an overview of features of this RB51 genome as compared to other published B. abortus genomes. Table S3 describes sequence analysis of LPS synthesis genes from RB51. Figure S1 depicts an alignment of the wboA sequences from NZ_AQIE00000000.1 and B. abortus 2308. Figures S2 and S4 depict alignment of the protein sequences of CapD and PglF. Figure S3 depicts superposition of structures of the PglF protein and the model of the CapD protein. Figure S5 depicts superposition of structures of the S. aureus CapE protein and the model of the CapD protein. Supplemental material available at figshare: https://doi.org/10.25387/g3.11864358.

RESULTS

RB51 gene sequence as compared to 2308 parent strain

We assembled to closure and annotated the sequence of both chromosomes of the *B. abortus* RB51 genome (genome size and characteristics provided in Table S2), and then compared our assembled genome with that of two GenBank submissions for

Table 1 Insertions and deletions in B. abortus RB51 compared to B. abortus 2308 and 2308A

Mutation	Chrom.	2308 A Location or Gene	2308 Location or Gene	Annotation	Comments
12 bp deletion in RB51	Ι	BAAA_1000022	BAB1_0022	Hypothetical protein	Results in 4 aa deletion but no frameshift
8 bp deletion in RB51 vs. 2308 A	I	60776	60773	8 bp VNTR intergenic	
16 bp insertion in RB51 vs. 2308				, ,	
8 bp deletion in RB51	I	84770	84778	8 bp VNTR intergenic	
842 bp insertion in RB51	I	BAAA_1001034	BAB1_0999	wboA	Insertion of IS711 into wboA gene
8 bp insertion in RB51 vs. 2308 A	П	241110	241135	8 bp VNTR intergenic	
8 bp deletion in RB51 vs. 2308					
24 bp insertion in RB51 vs. 2308 (only)	II	N/A	72916	8 bp VNTR intergenic	RB51 has 5 copies; 2308 A has 5 copies; 2308 has 8 copies
8 bp deletion in RB51 vs. 2308	11	241118	241142	8 bp VNTR intergenic	RB51 has 5 copies; 2308 Å has
8 bp insertion in RB51 vs. 2308 A				, 5	4 copies; 2308 has 6 copies
162 bp deletion in RB51	11	BAAA_7000898	BAB2_0906	narJ	Disrupted gene

B. abortus 2308 (Table 1). The first, designated 2308 in our tables, is fully annotated (NC_007618 and NC_007624; 2005). The second, designated in our tables as 2308 A, is a partially assembled and annotated draft assembly (GenBank wgs master record ACOR00000000; 2009), with nine contigs that span most of the 2308 genome.

Across both RB51 chromosomes, we identified a number of insertion/deletion mutations as well as single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) as compared to the 2308 reference strains. First, insertion/deletion mutations in RB51, as compared to 2308 and/or 2308 A, are displayed in Table 1. There are only two genes with major disruptions in sequence, one each on Chromosome I and Chromosome II. On Chromosome I, wboA, a homolog of BAB1_0999, is interrupted by an IS711 insertion sequence element, as expected from previous sequence analysis of RB51 (as described above). In the nitrate reductase operon on Chromosome II, the narJ gene has a 162-bp deletion in the RB51 sequence, representing a novel finding. NarJ is a chaperone for a subunit of the nitrate reductase enzyme in Brucella. Nitrate reductase catalyzes the first step in denitrification, a process by which nitrate is converted via several processing steps into ammonia under anaerobic conditions. Expression of enzymes in the denitrification pathway in Brucella has been linked to virulence (Haine et al. 2006). Additionally, a smaller gene disruption is present on RB51 Chromosome I. An unidentified hypothetical gene, homologous to BAB1_0022 (which has a highly repetitive protein sequence), is disrupted by a 12-bp deletion in the RB51 genome. However, it does not cause a frameshift in the gene, and results in a four amino acid deletion in the protein product.

There are 38 SNPs (single nucleotide polymorphisms) in the RB51 Chromosome 1 genome as compared to strain 2308 (Table 2). Five nonsynonymous SNPs (highlighted with asterisks in the far left column) occur in annotated genes and are present in both the 2308 and 2308A genomes. The D to Y substitution in the beta subunit of DNA-directed RNA polymerase (orf01229, BAB1_1264, and BAAA_20000170) has previously been recognized as the basis for the rifampin resistance phenotype, but the phenotypic impacts of the rest of the SNPs in RB51 Chromosome I have not previously been characterized. Additionally, we identified multiple SNPs in the RB51 Chromosome II genome (Table 3); however, all of these SNPs were synonymous.

Next, we compared our results to previously published reports of the RB51 genome sequence. In Ma *et al.* (2014), the RB51 genome was sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq platform, but the genome was not closed through the sequencing performed. While the specific locations of most SNPs were not elucidated in this report (Table S1), the authors did describe a SNP in the gene encoding the CapD protein that matches the SNP identified in our sequence. Therefore, there are multiple independent sources of confirmation of this mutation. A sequence has also been published to GenBank from the Broad Institute (NCBI reference NZ_AQIE00000000.1, not associated with a publication). Interestingly, we did not identify any of the non-synonymous SNPs described here in the NZ_AQIE00000000.1 sequence. Alignment of the Broad RB51 genome with our RB51 genome indicated that the expected *wboA* insertion, which is a defining characteristic of RB51, is not present in the Broad sequence (Figure S1).

Using gene locations on the BioCyc browser, we examined the location of each of the intergenic mutations, to consider the potential for each of these mutations to influence gene expression. Potential implications of the intergenic mutations are limited; mutations in RB51 observed within 50 bp of the upstream end of a predicted gene are indicated in Tables 2 and 3 (see Annotation column).

Notably, a previous study characterized the sequences of LPS synthesis genes in *B. abortus* RB51 in an attempt to understand the basis of the rough phenotype. Adone *et al.* (2011) amplified 21 genes known to be involved in LPS synthesis and compared their sequences to the *B. melitensis* 16M genome (Table S3). However, since RB51 is derived from *B. abortus* 2308, the 2308 parent strain is the proper point of comparison. Therefore, we analyzed the RB51 mutations identified by Adone *et al.* (2011) to compare them to the 2308 reference sequence. Consistent with our genome sequencing, only *wboA* (insertion) and *wbkD* (corresponds to *capD* in *B. abortus* 2308; all other mutations identified by Adone *et al.* (Table S3) reflect sequence variation between *B. abortus* and *B. melitensis.*

In silico evidence supports the importance of the CapD mutation to the rough phenotype of RB51

Based on its predicted function in bacterial envelope biosynthesis, the CapD mutation in RB51, relative to the 2308 sequence, is a promising candidate to explain the rough phenotype of the strain in conjunction with the *wboA* gene disruption. When the full-length CapD sequence (622 residues) was subjected to protein-protein BLAST against the Protein Data Bank (PDB) database, the top hit was the C-terminal domain of PgIF (E-value of 3e-82 for an alignment spanning 90% of residues of the PgIF C-terminal domain; Figure S2). PgIF is a sugar dehydratase in *Campylobacter jejuni*, for which the prokaryotic N-linked glycosylation pathway has been characterized in detail.

	Annotation		Secretion protein HlyD	Polymorphytic biographics and on Con	Transposse ISS/IS1182 family	Transposase, 154	Transposase, IS4	Transposase, IS4	Pseudogene region	Glutathione-S-transferase	Lipocalin-related protein Ppx/GppA	phosphatase	Ribonuclease D	Hypothetical cytosolic protein	Endoribonuclease L-PSP	Tetracycline resistance protein TetB	.	Ribosomal protein S14	Ribosomal protein L5	Ribosomal protein L5	Upstream (within 40 bp) of hypothetical	protein BAB1_1262	Upstream (within 20 bp) of hypothetical	protein BABI_1202	RNA polymerase, beta subunit	235 rKINA	23S rRNA	23S rRNA	I	16S rRNA	16S rRNA	I										
AA change	(RB51/2308 A/2308)	intergenic	E/A/A	intergenic v/r/r	אימיר	svnonvmorus	shomymous	synonymous	Stop	T/K/K	A/A/V		A/A/E	Frameshift in 2308	M/L/L	shoonymous	intergenic	KKO	L/L/F	L/L/F	intergenic		intergenic		Y/D/D	Z35 FRINA	23S rRNA	23S rRNA	intergenic	16S rRNA	16S rRNA	intergenic	tool for molecular typing.									
	Locus ID	intergenic	BAAA_1000329	intergenic BAAA 1000548	BAAA 1000546	BAAA 1000567	BAAA 1000567	BAAA_1000567	BAAA_1000581	BAAA_1000669	BAAA_1000793		BAAA_1000794	BAAA_2000049	BAAA_2000088	BAAA_2000120	BAAA_2000120	BAAA 2000148	BAAA_2000149	BAAA_2000149	BAAA_2000168		BAAA_2000168		BAAA_2000170	Z/GUUU2_AAA	BAAA_2000572	intergenic	intergenic	ribosomal	ribosomal	intergenic	opaul <i>et al.</i> (2010) as a									
2308 A	SNP	I	υı	– ر <u>ا</u>)⊢	- 0	ט נ <i>ו</i>	IJ	U	٩	U		IJ		U	U	U	⊢	U	U	٩		∢		υ	ر	Ι	A	U	F	Þ	U	U	U	U	U				⊢	U	study, by G
	Contig-Residue	I-277620	1-319733	I-464196 I 5ролбб	1-527414	1-542466	1-542531	I-542543	1-551607	I-642010	I-754042		I-755412	2-47001	2-89420	2-116926	2-117870	2-141203	2-141269	2-141272	2-152471		2-152492		2-159822	2-531/68	2-531918	2-532859	2-532877	2-532879	2-532899	2-532925	2-533271	2-533710	2-533729	2-533748	2-534267	3-1252	3-1591	3-2860	3-52245	data generated in this
	Locus ID	intergenic	BAB1_0322	intergenic BAB1 0524		BAB1 0551	BAB1 0551	BAB1_0551	BAB1_0562	BAB1_0649 ^a	BAB1_0773		BAB1_0774	BAB1_1145	BAB1_1186	BAB1_1216	intergenic	BAB1_1242	BAB1_1243	BAB1_1243	intergenic		intergenic		BAB1_1264	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	BAB1_2222	intergenic	BAB1_2225	BAB1_2225	intergenic	y us, based on the
2308	SNP	U	U	୯	,⊢	- 0	ט נ <i>ו</i>	IJ	⊢	٩	⊢		⊢	U	IJ	۷	A	U	A	۷	υ				υ		U		⊢	۷	IJ	⊢	⊢	٩	۷	۷	U	⊢	U	υ	⊢	reported b interest.
	Residue	277613	319726	464188 520477	542406	542458	542523	542535	551604	642002	754034		755404	1115316	1157735	1185241	1186185	1209518	1209584	1209587	1220786		1220806		1228136	1 00000	1600232	1601172	1601190	1601192	1601212	1601238	1601584	1602023	1602042	1602061	1602581	1603372	1603712	1604981	1654366	49 mutation was ous mutations of
	SNP	I	۱ ک	⊢ <	ניט) ⊲	< ⊲	⊢	U	U	U		IJ		⊢	U	IJ	⊢	U	IJ	۷		∢		∢ (ر		A	IJ	⊢	Þ	U	U	U	U	U		I		⊢	⊢	e BAB1_06
RB51	Residue	277608	*319721	464184 *520443	542402	542454	542519	542531	551600	*641998	754030		755400	1116155	*1158574	1186080	1187024	1210357	1210423	1210426	1221625		1221646		*1228976	1600922	1601072	1602012	1602031	1602033	1602053	1602075	1602425	1602864	1602883	1602902	1603421	1604211	1604550	1605819	1655204	^a Note that th * Highlights ne

1

Table 3 Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs)—Chromosome II

RB51			230	8		230	A80							
Residue	SNP	Residue	SNP	Locus ID	Residue	SNP	Locus ID	AA change	Annotation					
292556	С	292588	Т	BAB2_0299	292548	С	BAAA_7000304	synonymous	ABC sugar transporter, ATPase					
381134	_	381167	С	intergenic	381147	_	intergenic	intergenic						
492775	С	492808	Т	BAB2_0500	492767	С	BAAA_7000503	synonymous	Glycine-betaine/L-proline ABC					
									transporter ATPase; ProV					
593384	Α	593417	Т	intergenic	593376	А	intergenic	intergenic						
593387	G	593420	Т	intergenic	593379	G	intergenic	intergenic	_					
593400	_	593433	Т	intergenic	593392	_	intergenic	intergenic	_					
593408	С	593441	G	intergenic	593400	С	intergenic	intergenic	_					
593410	G	593443	А	intergenic	593402	G	intergenic	intergenic	_					
806397	Α	806431	_	intergenic	806389	А	intergenic	intergenic	Upstream (within 50 bp) of BAB2_0821					
866443		866476	С	intergenic	866435		intergenic	intergenic						
1011554	Α	1006508	_	intergenic	1011708	А	BAAA_7001034	intergenic	(Pseudogene region)					
1011651	Т	1006605		intergenic	1011805	Т	BAAA_7001034	intergenic	_					
1061165	_	1056118	А	23S rRNA	N/A	N/A	N/A	ribosomal	23S ribosomal RNA					

More than sixty proteins in *C. jejuni* are glycosylated by a conserved heptasaccharide (Szymanski *et al.* 1999; Scott *et al.* 2011) that includes QuiNAc4NAc (2,4-diacetamido-2,4,6-trideoxy- α -D -glucopyranose) as one of its components. PgIF catalyzes the first step in the synthesis of QuiNAc4NAc, the dehydration of UDP-GlcNAc to UDP-2acetamido-2,6-dideoxy- α -D-xylo-hexos-4-ulose. The enzymes involved in such 4,6-dehydratase events are known to belong to the NAD(H)- or NADP(H)-dependent short-chain dehydrogenase/ reductase (SDR) superfamily (Kallberg *et al.* 2002a; Kallberg *et al.* 2002b; Kavanagh *et al.* 2008; Kallberg *et al.* 2010). In these enzymes, the dehydration step is flanked by dehydrogenation/ hydrogenation steps involving NAD(P).

PglF is a NAD⁺-dependent membrane associated protein (590 residues) composed of three domains: an N-terminal motif containing four transmembrane regions, a linker section of unknown function, and a C-terminal catalytic domain (Schoenhofen *et al.* 2006). The structure of the C-terminal domain of PglF (Ala 244 to Lys 587) has been solved by x-ray crystallography (Protein Data Bank ID 5BJU; Riegert *et al.* 2017). A BLAST alignment performed between the full-length sequences of CapD and PgIF (Figure S4) yields a highly significant E-value (7e-97), indicating that the homology between CapD and PgIF extends to the entire protein. Moreover, as in PgIF, CapD is also predicted to contain four transmembrane helices in the N-terminal region (data not shown).

Therefore, we utilized the PglF structure to model the impact of the CapD mutation, using the crystal structure of the C-terminal domain of PglF as a template to construct a model of the C-terminal domain (residues 261 – 585) of CapD. In the structural superposition (Figure S3), the key active site residues of PglF superposed with residues of CapD (in parentheses) as follows: 395 Thr (413 Ser), 396 Asp (414 Asp), 397 Lys (415 Lys). Accordingly, two of the active site residues are strictly conserved in CapD, while the third is a conservative Thr to Ser substitution. Thr 395 Ser PgIF mutants have been shown to be fully active (Riegert *et al.* 2017). Thus, the "CapD-C-term" model provides strong evidence that CapD acts as a sugar 2,4-dehydratase. PgIF belongs to a subclass of the SDR superfamily in which the Tyr in the YXXXK signature sequence (Kallberg *et al.* 2002) has been replaced by a Met. The structural alignment also suggests



Figure 1 Glu 559 of CapD is predicted to be directly linked to enzyme activity. (A). In the CapD homolog PgIF (PDB ID 5BJU), the corresponding glutamate, Glu 526, makes hydrogen bonding interactions with the C-2 hydroxyl group of the ribose moiety in UDP. (B). In the model for the C-terminal domain of CapD (CapD-C-term), Glu 559 participates in salt bridge type interactions with Arg 488 and Arg 556 (similar interactions are seen in PgIF). The Glu 559 Lys mutation in strain RB51 would be predicted to create repulsive interactions between positively charged side chains, disrupting the putative binding site for UDP.

that CapD belongs to this same subclass (Met 423 of CapD superposes with Met 405 of PgIF).

Structural superposition of the CapD-C-term model with the C-terminal domain of PgIF (Figure S2) shows Glu 559 of CapD superposing with Glu 526 of PgIF. Importantly, Glu 526 is part of the binding pocket for one of the substrates of PgIF, uridine-5'-diphosphate (UDP); Glu 526 specifically forms hydrogen bonding interactions with the ribose moiety of UDP (Figure 1A). In addition, Glu 526 makes salt bridge-type interactions with two arginine residues, stabilizing the binding pocket for UDP. The model for the C-terminal domain of CapD (CapD-C-term) does not contain UDP, but the close superposition of the C-terminal domains suggests that Glu 559 of CapD could make similar hydrogen bonding interactions with a putative UDP substrate. Further, in CapD-C-term, Glu 559 makes stabilizing salt bridge interactions with two Arg residues (Figure 1B) similar to that observed for Glu 257 in PgIF (as discussed above).

Finally, additional evidence for the functional importance of Glu 559 of CapD comes from mutational studies previously performed on the related SDR superfamily member CapE of *S. aureus*. The structural superposition between CapD-C-term and the crystal structure of CapE (Figure S5) indicates that Glu 257 of CapE superposes with Glu 559 of CapD. Mutating Glu 257 of CapE to Ala leads to a loss of activity (Miyafusa *et al.* 2013), suggesting that the Glu 559 Lys mutation observed in RB51 CapD would also lead to a similar loss of activity, and impaired glycosylation of proteins in the RB51 strain.

DISCUSSION

The presentation of a complete RB51 genome comparison to two published 2308 sequences defines a set of mutations for future genetic analysis of the properties of *B. abortus* and/or *B. melitensis* strains modified at one or more of these genetic locations. Our data not only confirm the presence of the CapD mutation in RB51, but utilize *in silico* modeling to provide evidence supporting the hypothesis that this mutation is the second key RB51 mutation contributing to a rough strain phenotype. Previous studies have demonstrated that *B. melitensis* strains carrying a *wboA* mutation are attenuated and have increased vaccination efficacy (Li *et al.* 2015); therefore, the *Brucella capD* gene is a candidate for future mutation in vaccine development.

Additionally, the other mutations identified in RB51 chromosome II serve as the basis for future wet lab studies of the influence of these genes on Brucella phenotypes. Recently, Herrou et al. (2019) reported on the first structural and functional characterization of the protein product of BAB1_1186, which they have named EipA; EipA is conserved in Brucella and is proposed to be involved in cell envelope homeostasis. Deletion of eipA in B. abortus revealed that the protein is not required for initial spleen colonization in mice, but is involved in persistence in the spleen (Herrou et al. 2019). BLAST analysis reveals that the L \rightarrow M mutation in EipA observed in RB51 is not present in other Brucella species; this biochemical change has the potential to influence function as a destabilizing mutation (Lipscomb et al. 1998), and is a candidate for future investigation. Finally, the disruption of narJ is of phenotypic interest, due to the potential to compromise survival of the vaccine strain in macrophages. Introduction of the RB51 complement of genetic mutations, or a subset of these, into B. melitensis could provide the basis for a new attenuated vaccine candidate in this closely related, but challenging, species.

LITERATURE CITED

Adone, R., M. Muscillo, G. La Rosa, M. Francia, and M. Tarantino, 2011 Antigenic, immunologic and genetic characterization of rough strains *B. abortus* RB51, *B. melitensis* B115 and *B. melitensis* B18. PLoS One 6: e24073. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024073

- Altschul, S. F., W. Gish, W. Miller, E. W. Myers, and D. J. Lipman, 1990 Basic local alignment search tool. J. Mol. Biol. 215: 403–410. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/S0022-2836(05)80360-2
- Atluri, V. L., M. N. Xavier, M. F. de Jong, A. B. den Hartigh, and R. M. Tsolis, 2011 Interactions of the human pathogenic *Brucella* species with their hosts. Annu. Rev. Microbiol. 65: 523–541. https://doi.org/ 10.1146/annurev-micro-090110-102905
- Cheville, N. F., M. G. Stevens, A. E. Jensen, F. M. Tatum, and S. M. Halling, 1993 Immune responses and protection against infection and abortion in cattle experimentally infected with mutant strains of *Brucella abortus*. Am. J. Vet. Res. 54: 1591–1597.
- Darling, A. C., B. Mau, F. R. Blattner, and N. T. Perna, 2004 Mauve: multiple alignment of conserved genomic sequence with rearrangements. Genome Res. 14: 1394–1403. https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.2289704
- de Figueiredo, P., T. A. Ficht, A. Rice-Ficht, C. A. Rossetti, and L. G. Adams, 2015 Pathogenesis and immunobiology of brucellosis: review of *Brucella*-host interactions. Am. J. Pathol. 185: 1505–1517. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ajpath.2015.03.003
- Elzer, P. H., F. M. Enright, J. R. McQuiston, S. M. Boyle, and G. G. Schurig, 1998 Evaluation of a rough mutant of *Brucella melitensis* in pregnant goats. Res. Vet. Sci. 64: 259–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-5288(98)90135-7
- Gopaul, K. K., J. Sells, B. J. Bricker, O. R. Crasta, and A. M. Whitmore, 2010 Rapid and reliable single nucleotide polymorphism-based differentiation of *Brucella* live vaccine strains from field strains. J. Clin. Microbiol. 48: 1461–1464. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02193-09
- Halling, S. M., B. D. Peterson-Burch, B. J. Bricker, R. L. Zuerner, Z. Qing et al., 2005 Completion of the genome sequence of *Brucella abortus* and comparison to the highly similar genomes of *Brucella melitensis* and *Brucella suis*. J. Bacteriol. 187: 2715–2726. https://doi.org/10.1128/ JB.187.8.2715-2726.2005
- Haine, V., M. Dozot, J. Dornand, J. J. Letesson, and X. De Bolle, 2006 NnrA is required for full virulence and regulates several *Brucella melitensis* denitrification genes. J. Bacteriol. 188: 1615–1619. https://doi.org/10.1128/ JB.188.4.1615-1619.2006
- Herrou, J., J. W. Willett, A. Fiebig, L. M. Varesio, D. M. Czyz et al., 2019 Periplasmic protein EipA determines envelope stress resistance and virulence in *Brucella abortus*. Mol. Microbiol. 111: 637–661.
- Kallberg, Y., U. Oppermann, H. Jornvall, and B. Persson, 2002a Short-chain dehydrogenases/ reductases (SDRs). Eur. J. Biochem. 269: 4409–4417. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1432-1033.2002.03130.x
- Kallberg, Y., U. Oppermann, H. Jornvall, and B. Persson, 2002b Short-chain dehydrogenase/ reductase (SDR) relationships: a large family with eight clusters common to human, animal, and plant genomes. Protein Sci. 11: 636–641. https://doi.org/10.1110/ps.26902
- Kallberg, Y., U. Oppermann, and B. Persson, 2010 Classification of the short-chain dehydrogenase/reductase superfamily using hidden Markov models. FEBS J. 277: 2375–2386. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-4658.2010.07656.x
- Kavanagh, K. L., H. Jornvall, B. Persson, and U. Oppermann, 2008 Mediumand short-chain dehydrogenase/reductase gene and protein families: the SDR superfamily: functional and structural diversity within a family of metabolic and regulatory enzymes. Cell. Mol. Life Sci. 65: 3895–3906. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00018-008-8588-y
- Kurtz, S., A. Philippy, A. L. Delcher, M. Smoot, M. Shumway *et al.*,
 2004 Versatile and open software for comparing large genomes. Genome
 Biol. 5: R12. https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2004-5-2-r12
- Li, Z. Q., J. X. Shi, W. D. Fu, Y. Zhang, Z. Wang et al., 2015 A Brucella melitensis M5–90 wboA deletion strain is attenuated and enhances vaccine efficacy. Mol. Immunol. 66: 276–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.molimm.2015.04.004
- Lipscomb, L. A., N. C. Gassner, S. D. Snow, A. M. Eldridge, W. A. Baase et al., 1998 Context-dependent protein stabilization by methionine-to-leucine substitution shown in T4 lysozyme. Protein Sci. 7: 765–773. Erratum: 1481. https://doi.org/10.1002/pro.5560070326

- Ma, W., F. Guo, A. Wang, Z. Song, and C. Chen, 2014 Complete genome sequence of *B. abortus* RB51 and genomic comparison with *B. abortus*. J. Anim. Vet. Adv. 13: 582–588.
- Miyafusa, T., J. M. M. Caaveiro, Y. Tanaka, M. Tanner, and K. Tsumoto, 2013 Crystal structure of the capsular polysaccharide synthesizing protein CapE of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Biosci. Rep. 33: e00043. https:// doi.org/10.1042/BSR20130017
- Markowitz, V. M., K. Mavromatis, N. N. Ivanova, I. M. A. Chen, K. Chu et al., 2009 IMG ER: a system for microbial genome annotation expert review and curation. Bioinformatics 25: 2271–2278. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp393
- Mural, R. J., 2000 ARTEMIS: a tool for displaying and annotating DNA sequence. Brief. Bioinform. 1: 199–200. https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/ 1.2.199
- Riegert, A. S., J. B. Thoden, I. C. Schoenhofen, D. C. Watson, N. M. Young et al., 2017 Structural and Biochemical Investigation of PgIF from *Campylobacter jejuni* Reveals a New Mechanism for a Member of the Short Chain Dehydrogenase/Reductase Superfamily. Biochemistry 56: 6030– 6040. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.biochem.7b00910
- Roy, A., A. Kucukural, and Y. Zhang, 2010 I-TASSER: a unified platform for automated protein structure and function prediction. Nat. Protoc. 5: 725– 738. https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2010.5
- Salzberg, S. L., A. L. Delcher, S. Kasif, and O. White, 1998 Microbial gene identification using interpolated Markov models. Nucleic Acids Res. 26: 544–548. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/26.2.544
- Schoenhofen, I. C., D. J. McNally, E. Vinogradov, D. Whitfield, N. M. Young et al., 2006 Functional characterization of dehydratase/aminotransferase pairs from *Helicobacter* and *Campylobacter*: enzymes distinguishing the pseudaminic acid and bacillosamine biosynthetic pathways. J. Biol. Chem. 281: 723–732. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M511021200

- Scott, N. E., B. L. Parker, A. M. Connolly, J. Paulech, A. V. Edwards et al., 2011 Simultaneous glycan-peptide characterization using hydrophilic interaction chromatography and parallel fragmentation by CID, higher energy collisional dissociation, and electron transfer dissociation MS applied to the N-linked glycoproteome of *Campylobacter jejuni*. Mol. Cell. Proteomics 10: M000031–MCP201. https://doi.org/10.1074/ mcp.M000031-MCP201
- Schurig, G. G., R. M. Roop, 2nd, T. Bagchi, S. Boyle, D. Buhrman et al., 1991 Biological properties of RB51; a stable rough strain of *Brucella abortus*. Vet. Microbiol. 28: 171–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1135(91)90091-S
- Schurig, G. G., N. Sriranganathan, and M. J. Corbel, 2002 Brucellosis vaccines: past, present, and future. Vet. Microbiol. 90: 479–496. https:// doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1135(02)00255-9
- Szymanski, C. M., R. Yao, C. P. Ewing, T. J. Trust, and P. Guerry, 1999 Evidence for a system of general protein glycosylation in *Campylobacter jejuni*. Mol. Microbiol. 32: 1022–1030. https://doi.org/10.1046/ j.1365-2958.1999.01415.x
- Vemulapalli, R., J. R. McQuiston, G. G. Schurig, N. Sriranganathan, S. M. Halling et al., 1999 Identification of an IS711 element interrupting the wboA gene of *Brucella abortus* vaccine strain RB51 and a PCR assay to distinguish strain RB51 from other *Brucella* species and strains. Clin. Diagn. Lab. Immunol. 6: 760–764. https://doi.org/10.1128/CDLI.6.5.760-764.1999
- Vemulapalli, R., Y. He, L. S. Buccolo, S. M. Boyle, N. Sriranganathan et al., 2000 Complementation of *Brucella abortus* RB51 with a functional *wboA* gene results in O-antigen synthesis and enhanced vaccine efficacy but no change in rough phenotype and attenuation. Infect. Immun. 68: 3927– 3932. https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.68.7.3927-3932.2000

Communicating editor: Y. Kim