ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Biotechnology Reports

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/btre



Genome modifications and cloning using a conjugally transferable recombineering system



Mohammad J Hossain^a, Charles M. Thurlow^a, Dawei Sun^b, Shamima Nasrin^a, Mark R. Liles^{a,*}

- ^a Department of Biological Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, United States
- ^b School of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Aquatic Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn AL 36849, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 3 July 2015 Received in revised form 24 August 2015 Accepted 24 August 2015 Available online 28 August 2015

Keywords: Recombineering Genetic modification Bacterial pathogens

ABSTRACT

The genetic modification of primary bacterial disease isolates is challenging due to the lack of highly efficient genetic tools. Herein we describe the development of a modified PCR-based, λ Red-mediated recombineering system for efficient deletion of genes in Gram-negative bacteria. A series of conjugally transferrable plasmids were constructed by cloning an oriT sequence and different antibiotic resistance genes into recombinogenic plasmid pKD46. Using this system we deleted ten different genes from the genomes of $Edwardsiella\ ictaluri$ and $Aeromonas\ hydrophila$. A temperature sensitive and conjugally transferable flp recombinase plasmid was developed to generate markerless gene deletion mutants. We also developed an efficient cloning system to capture larger bacterial genetic elements and clone them into a conjugally transferrable plasmid for facile transferring to Gram-negative bacteria. This system should be applicable in diverse Gram-negative bacteria to modify and complement genomic elements in bacteria that cannot be manipulated using available genetic tools.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Genetic manipulation of bacterial strains provides critical information on the contributions of specific loci to virulence or other cellular functions, and many systems have been developed to achieve genetic knockouts and modifications [4,5,18]. The modification of bacterial genomes using counter-selectable doublecrossover methods are labor intensive and sometimes very difficult to achieve due to the low frequency of recombination events [21,26,31]. In contrast, the λ Red recombineering system [39,41] has many advantages as a fast, efficient and reliable means of generating targeted genetic modifications in prokaryotes [11,61] and eukaryotes [7]. The λ Red system expresses Exo, Beta and Gam proteins that work coordinately to recombine single and double stranded DNA [11,38,61], and has been exploited for genome modifications in Escherichia coli, Salmonella enterica and other Gram-negative bacteria [9,11,40,61]. Exo has a 5'-3' double stranded DNA (dsDNA)-dependent exonuclease activity for generating 3' single stranded DNA (ssDNA) overhangs [6,32,34] which then serve as a substrate for ssDNA-binding protein Beta to anneal complementary DNA strands for recombination [8,28,38]. Gam, an inhibitor of host exonuclease activity due to RecBCD [44], helps to improve the efficiency of λ Red-mediated recombination with linear double-strand DNA. Unlike *recA*-dependent homologous recombination which requires longer regions of sequence homology with the targeted genetic region [25], the λ Red apparatus can efficiently recombine DNA with homologous regions as short as 30–50 bp which can directly be incorporated into oligonucleotide primers in a PCR [11,61]. The recombineering technique is widely used to generate precise deletions [11], substitutions [33], insertions [36] or tagging [57] of targeted genes. One of the biggest advantages of the recombineering method is that modifying DNA can precisely eliminate the antibiotic selection markers for subsequent modification of the targeted DNA [11,42,67].

While this recombineering system works well in a model bacterium such as $E.\ coli\ [37,39]$, bacteria often express restriction endonucleases that make them recalcitrant to foreign DNA even among naturally competent strains [1,3]. In fact, it was the study of experimental infections of $E.\ coli\$ strains with bacteriophage λ that led to the discovery of restriction-modification (RM) systems [2]. Overcoming host RM systems can be accomplished via the passage of plasmids through a methylation-minus $E.\ coli\$ strain [51], but in highly methylated bacterial strains it may be necessary to use an $in\ vitro\$ or $in\ vivo\$ methylation strategy to achieve more efficient electroporation [12,13,29]. However, modulating the plasmid DNA

^{*} Corresponding author at: 101 Life Sciences Building, 120 W. Samford Avenue, Auburn, AL 36849, United States.

methylation status is inefficient and labor-intensive compared to using conjugal transfer to introduce foreign DNA into a bacterial strain using a broad host range plasmid like IncP when electroporation is problematic [14,15,17].

Our need to generate targeted genetic deletions in Gramnegative bacterial pathogens of farmed catfish led to the development of recombinogenic plasmids that could be introduced into Gram-negative bacteria via conjugation. Our studies focused on two bacterial pathogens, including motile *Aeromonas* septicemia (MAS) and enteric septicemia of catfish (ESC) caused by *Aeromonas hydrophila* and *Edwardsiella ictaluri*, respectively, which are responsible for significant economic losses to the channel catfish industry in the Southeastern United States [56]. Fish diseases caused by strains of *E. ictaluri* are also frequently reported in catfish farming in Asia [46]. While *E. ictaluri* was formerly the most important bacterial pathogen in farmed US catfish, in 2009 US catfish farmers experienced epidemic disease outbreaks of motile *Aeromonas* septicemia (MAS) caused by a highly virulent

Aeromonas hydrophila strain [20]. This newly emergent and virulent A. hydrophila strain, which has been implicated to have an Asian origin [23], is responsible for the death of millions of pounds of food-sized channel catfish in the US [23]. Though both E. ictaluri and A. hydrophila pose serious threats to the US catfish industry [24,45,56] as well as global fish farming [46,62], highly efficient genome modification techniques have not been developed yet to study the virulence mechanisms and permit generation of avirulent vaccines for these two pathogens.

Though recombineering techniques are widely being used for genome modification of domesticated laboratory isolates such as E. coli strains, the implementation of these techniques for primary pathogenic isolates is quite challenging. In this study, we modified the available λ Red recombination tools [11,54] to generate markerless mutants of E. ictaluri and A. hydrophila. Several conjugally transferable and temperature-sensitive plasmids were constructed to facilitate the genome modification by recombineering and removal of antibiotic resistance marker followed by

 Table 1

 List of bacterial strains and plasmids used in this study.

thi-1thr leutonAlacYsupE recA::RP4-2-TcT::Mu Km ^r λpir	
thi-1thr leutonAlacYsupE recA::RP4-2-TcT::Mu Km ^r λpir	
	[50]
F-, Δ (araD-araB) 567, Δ lacZ4787(::rrnB-3), λ^- , rph-1, Δ (rhaD-rhaB) 568, hsdR514, pKD46	[11]
F-, Δ (argF-lac) 169, ϕ 80dlacZ58(M15), glnV44(AS), λ -, rfbC1, gyrA96(NalR), recA1,	[11]
endA1, spoT1, thiE1, hsdR17, pCP20	
F-, Δ (araD-araB) 567, Δ lacZ4787(::rrnB-3), Δ (phoB-phoR) 580, λ^- , galU95, Δ uidA3::pir * , recA1,	[11]
endA9(del-ins)::FRT, rph-1, Δ(rhaD-rhaB) 568, hsdR514, pKD4	
$F^-mcrA\Delta(mrr-hsdRMS-mcrBC)$ end $A1$ rec A $\phi 80dlacZ\Delta M15\Delta lacX74$ ara $D139$ Δ (ara,leu)	Lucigen Corp. W
7697 galU galK rpsL (StrR) nupG λ^- tonA	
Pathogenic isolates from diseased catfish	[22]
E. ictaluri strain Alg-08-183 with plasmid pMJH46	This study
Highly hemolytic E. ictaluri strain from diseased catfish	[59]
E. ictaluri strain R4383 with plasmid pMIH46	This study
	This study
	This study
	This study
·	This study
	This study
1 0	This study
	This study
	This study
In-frame deletion of hemolysin gene eihA	This study
A. hydrophila ML09-119 with pMIH46	This study
	This study
A. hydrophila ML09-119 with pBBC2	This study
Cloning vector with p15A origin of replication	[63]
	[11]
	[11]
	This Study
	[7]
	[27]
	endA1, spoT1, thiE1, hsdR17, pCP20 F-, Δ(araD-araB) 567, ΔlacZ4787(::rrnB-3), Δ(phoB-phoR) 580, λ-, galU95, ΔuidA3::pir*, recA1, endA9(del-ins)::FRT, rph-1, Δ(rhaD-rhaB) 568, hsdR514, pKD4 F-mcrAΔ(mrr-hsdRM5-mcrBC) endA1 recA φ80dlacZΔM15ΔlacX74 araD139 Δ (ara,leu) 7697 galU galK rpsL (StrR) nupG λ- tonA Pathogenic isolates from diseased catfish E. ictaluri strain Alg-08-183 with plasmid pMJH46 Highly hemolytic E. ictaluri strain from diseased catfish E. ictaluri strain R4383 with plasmid pMJH46 Replacement of hemolysin ompLC gene with kanR gene E. ictaluri Alg-08-183 ompLC::kanR with pCP20 Replacement of hemolysin dtrA gene with kanR gene E. ictaluri Alg-08-183 drtA::kanR with pCP20 In-frame deletion of ompLC gene In-frame deletion of dtrA gene Replacement of hemolysin eihA gene with kanR gene E. ictaluri R4383eihA::kanR with pCP20 In-frame deletion of hemolysin gene eihA A. hydrophila ML09-119 with pMJH46 A. hydrophila ML09-119 with pMJH65 A. hydrophila ML09-119 with pMJH65 A. hydrophila ML09-119 with cat gene Unmarked deletion of ymcC gene Replacement of waaL gene with cat gene Unmarked deletion of iolA gene Replacement of hyd gene with cat gene Unmarked deletion of iolA gene Replacement of var3 gene with cat gene Replacement of var3 gene with cat gene Replacement of var3 gene with cat gene Unmarked deletion of var3 gene with cat gene Deletion of genetic region 3822,4773,822,683 of ML09-119

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/870596

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/870596

<u>Daneshyari.com</u>