Serine-Rich Repeat Protein adhesins from *Lactobacillus reuteri* display strain specific glycosylation profiles

Dimitrios Latousakis[1], Ridvan Nepravishta[2], Martin Rejzek[3], Udo Wegmann[1], Gwenaelle Le Gall[1], Devon Kavanaugh[1], Ian J. Colquhoun[1], Steven Frese[4], Donald A. MacKenzie[1], Jens Walter[5,6], Jesus Angulo[2], Rob Field[3] and Nathalie Juge[1,*]

[1]The Gut Health and Food Safety Institute Strategic Programme, Quadram Institute Bioscience, Norwich Research Park, Norwich NR4 7UA, UK

[2]School of Pharmacy, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

[3]Department of Biological Chemistry, John Innes Centre, Norwich Research Park, Norwich NR4 7UH, UK

[4]Evolve Biosystems, Davis, California, USA

[5]Department of Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

[6]Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: Nathalie Juge: Quadram Institute Bioscience, Norwich Research Park, NR4 7UA Norwich, UK. Phone: +44 (0)1603255068. Fax: +44 (0)1603507723. E-mail: nathalie.juge@quadram.ac.uk.

Running title: Glycosylation of *L. reuteri* Serine-Rich Repeat Proteins

Suppl. data submitted: Figures S1-S5, Tables S1-S2

1 **Keywords:** gut commensal bacteria, accessory secretion system, glycosyltransferase, *O*-linked
2 glycosylation, sugar nucleotides

3 **Abstract**

4 *Lactobacillus reuteri* is a gut symbiont inhabiting the gastrointestinal tract of numerous
5 vertebrates. The surface-exposed Serine-Rich Repeat Protein (SRRP) is a major adhesin in
6 Gram-positive bacteria. Using lectin and sugar nucleotide profiling of wild-type or *L. reuteri*
7 isogenic mutants, MALDI-ToF-MS, LC-MS and GC-MS analyses of SRRPs, we showed that *L.*
8 *reuteri* strains 100-23C (from rodent) and ATCC 53608 (from pig) can perform protein *O*-
9 glycosylation and modify $SRRP_{100-23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$ with Hex-Glc-GlcNAc and di-GlcNAc
10 moieties, respectively. Furthermore, *in vivo* glycoengineering in *E. coli* led to glycosylation of
11 $SRRP_{53608}$ variants with α-GlcNAc and GlcNAcβ(1→6)GlcNAcα moieties. The
12 glycosyltransferases involved in the modification of these adhesins were identified within the
13 SecA2/Y2 accessory secretion system and their sugar nucleotide preference determined by
14 saturation transfer difference NMR spectroscopy and differential scanning fluorimetry. Together,
15 these findings provide novel insights into the cellular *O*-protein glycosylation pathways of gut
16 commensal bacteria and potential routes for glycoengineering applications.

17

18

1 **Introduction**

2 Although originally believed to be restricted to eukaryotes, protein glycosylation, i.e. the
3 covalent attachment of a carbohydrate moiety to specific protein targets, is emerging as an
4 important feature in bacteria and archaea, revealing an important diversity of glycan structures
5 and pathways within and between microbial species (Schäffer, C. and Messner, P. 2017). To
6 date, protein glycosylation has been widely studied in pathogenic bacteria, where glycoproteins
7 are often essential for virulence and pathogenicity (Eichler, J. and Koomey, M. 2017). However,
8 the nature and function of protein glycosylation in gut commensal bacteria remains largely
9 unexplored (Latousakis, D. and Juge, N. 2018).

10 *Lactobacillus reuteri* is a Gram-positive bacterial symbiont inhabiting the gastrointestinal (GI)
11 tract of a range of vertebrates (including humans) that displays a remarkable degree of host
12 specialization (Duar, R.M., Lin, X.B., et al. 2017, Frese, S.A., Benson, A.K., et al. 2011, Frese,
13 S.A., Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013, Oh, P.L., Benson, A.K., et al. 2010, Wegmann, U.,
14 MacKenzie, D.A., et al. 2015). One of the mechanisms mediating specific interaction of *L.*
15 *reuteri* strains with the host is provided by cell surface proteins that facilitate adherence to
16 epithelial or mucosal surface along the GI tract, depending on the niche colonized by the bacteria
17 (Etzold, S., Kober, O.I., et al. 2014, Mackenzie, D.A., Jeffers, F., et al. 2010, Sequeira, S.,
18 Kavanaugh, D., et al. 2018). Previous analyses of the rodent strain *L. reuteri* 100-23C identified
19 a gene encoding a predicted surface-exposed serine-rich repeat protein ($SRRP_{100-23}$) that was
20 essential for *L. reuteri* biofilm formation in the forestomach of mice (Frese, S.A., Mackenzie,
21 D.A., et al. 2013). Inactivation of $SRRP_{100-23}$ completely abrogated epithelial association,
22 indicating that initial adhesion represented the most significant step in biofilm formation, likely
23 conferring host specificity (Frese, S.A., Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013).

SRRPs are a family of adhesins found in many Gram-positive bacteria (Lizcano, A., Sanchez, C.J., et al. 2012). These proteins were originally identified in pathogenic bacteria, such as streptococci and staphylococci (Bensing, B.A. and Sullam, P.M. 2002, Li, Y., Huang, X., et al. 2014, Seo, H.S., Xiong, Y.Q., et al. 2013, Wu, H., Mintz, K.P., et al. 1998, Zhou, M. and Wu, H. 2009), where their expression has been linked to virulence (Sanchez, C.J., Shivshankar, P., et al. 2010, Shivshankar, P., Sanchez, C., et al. 2009). SRRPs are composed of distinct subdomains: a cleavable and unusually long signal peptide which, in some cases, is followed by an alanine-serine-threonine rich (AST) motif, a short serine rich repeat region (SRR1), a binding region (BR), a second and much larger SRR2, and an LPXTG cell wall anchoring motif (Rigel, N.W. and Braunstein, M. 2008). Previous studies on SRRPs from pathogenic organisms have shown that these proteins are *O*-glycosylated on serine or threonine residues and exported *via* an accessory secretion (SecA2/Y2) system (Bensing, B.A., Gibson, B.W., et al. 2004, Bensing, B.A. and Sullam, P.M. 2002, Chaze, T., Guillot, A., et al. 2014, Li, Y., Huang, X., et al. 2014, Siboo, I.R., Chaffin, D.O., et al. 2008, Takamatsu, D., Bensing, B.A., et al. 2004). This specialised secretion system is encoded by genes that are normally co-located within a gene cluster and is composed of the motor protein SecA2, the translocon channel SecY2 and three to five accessory Sec proteins (Asp1-5). In addition, this gene cluster also contains genes encoding a variable number of glycosyltransferases (GTs), ranging between two to ten (Bensing, B.A., Seepersaud, R., et al. 2014). The best studied examples of SecA2/SecY2-mediated glycosylation systems are from pathogenic *Streptococcus parasanguinis*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Streptococcus gordonii*, *Streptococcus agalactiae*, and *Staphylococcus aureus* (Jiang, Y.-L., Jin, H., et al. 2017, Takamatsu, D., Bensing, B.A., et al. 2004, Zhu, F., Zhang, H., et al. 2016). In all cases, the glycosylation process is initiated by a 2-protein glycosyltransferase complex, consisting of GtfA

1 and GtfB, that mediate the addition of *N*-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) to serine and threonine
2 residues within the SRR domains of the adhesins. This is sometimes followed by the extension of
3 the core glycan *via* the action of additional GTs whose number and type vary between species,
4 resulting in a range of glycan structures (Chen, Y., Bensing, B.A., et al. 2018, Jiang, Y.-L., Jin,
5 H., et al. 2017, Zhu, F., Zhang, H., et al. 2016). Recently, a SecA2/Y2 cluster encoding three
6 SRRPs has been identified in the commensal species *Streptococcus salivarius* JIM8777;
7 unusually the first glycosylation step was carried out by two genetically linked GTs outside of
8 the cluster (Couvigny, B., Lapaque, N., et al. 2017).

9 To date, SecA2/Y2 clusters have been identified in the genomes of various *Lactobacillus* species
10 (Latousakis, D. and Juge, N. 2018, Sequeira, S., Kavanaugh, D., et al. 2018, Tytgat, H.L.P. and
11 de Vos, W.M. 2016). In *L. reuteri*, the intact cluster has mostly been found in strains of murine
12 or porcine origin, and it appears to be absent from strains of human origin (Frese, S.A., Benson,
13 A.K., et al. 2011, Frese, S.A., Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013, Sequeira, S., Kavanaugh, D., et al.
14 2018, Wegmann, U., MacKenzie, D.A., et al. 2015). The SecA2/Y2 cluster in the *L. reuteri*
15 rodent strain 100-23C is crucial for ecological fitness and adhesion of the bacteria to the
16 forestomach epithelium of the murine GI tract (Frese, S.A., Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013). Using
17 proteomics, we showed that $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$ is the primary cell wall-associated protein of *L. reuteri*
18 100-23C strain that is secreted through the accessory SecA2/Y2 system *in vivo* (Frese, S.A.,
19 Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013). In addition, our analysis of the completed genome of the pig
20 isolate *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608 revealed the presence of aSecA2/Y2 system with an associated
21 SRRP sharing the same domain organization as $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$ (Wegmann, U., MacKenzie, D.A., et
22 al. 2015). Further analysis of the pangenome of *L. reuteri* pig isolates also revealed the presence
23 of a SecA2/Y2 system with an associated SRRP in these strains (Wegmann, U., MacKenzie,

1 D.A., et al. 2015), suggesting a conserved role of SecA2/Y2 among *L. reuteri* strains that possess
2 the cluster. We confirmed that the SRRPs from *L. reuteri* pig strains were secreted during growth
3 *in vitro* (Sequeira, S., Kavanaugh, D., et al. 2018), as previously shown for $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$ (Frese,
4 S.A., Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013). However, despite the central importance of the SecA2/Y2
5 cluster and SRRPs in specific *L. reuteri* strains, how SRRPs are glycosylated in lactobacilli has
6 not yet been determined.

7 Here we provide a comprehensive analysis of the glycosylation of *L. reuteri* SRRPs (*Lr*SRRPs)
8 from *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608 (pig) and 100-23C (rodent) strains. Using a combination of
9 bioinformatics analysis, lectin screening, LC-MS-based sugar nucleotide profiling, MALDI-ToF
10 and GC-MS analyses, we showed that the *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608 and 100-23C strains are
11 capable of performing protein glycosylation and that $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$ are glycosylated
12 with hexose $(Hex)_2$-*N*-acetylhexosamine (HexNAc) and di-HexNAc moieties, respectively.
13 Following *in vivo* glycoengineering in *E. coli*, NMR analysis and enzymatic treatment showed
14 that $SRRP_{53608}$ is glycosylated with GlcNAcβ(1→6)-GlcNAc moieties. In addition, using
15 Differential Scanning Fluorimetry (DSF) and Saturation Transfer Difference (STD) NMR, we
16 provide biochemical insights into the specificity of the glycosyltransferases involved in the
17 SecA2/Y2 accessory pathway leading to the protein glycosylation of these adhesins in gut
18 symbionts.

19

20 **Results**

21 *SRRPs from L. reuteri strains 100-23C and ATCC 53608 are glycosylated*

1 To determine whether *L. reuteri* strains 100-23C and ATCC 53608 are capable of performing
2 protein glycosylation of *Lr*SRRPs, the proteins from the spent media (SM) were separated by
3 SDS-PAGE and analysed by western blot using a range of fluorescein (*f*)-labelled lectins. A
4 similar lectin recognition profile was observed between proteins from both *L. reuteri* strains with
5 binding to *f*-WGA, *f*-RCA and *f*-SNA (**Figure 1A**) while no binding was observed with *f*-ConA,
6 *f*-LTL, *f*-PNA, or *f*-UEA (**data not shown**). This suggests the presence of glycoproteins carrying
7 GlcNAc, sialic acid or galactose (Gal) residues. A large protein with an apparent molecular
8 weight (MW) >300 kDa was detected in both *L. reuteri* strains by *f*-WGA but not with any of
9 the other lectins tested. This protein was also recognised by anti-SRRP-BR$_{53608}$ antibodies in *L.*
10 *reuteri* ATCC 53608 SM, suggesting that it corresponds to SRRP$_{53608}$ (**Figure 1B**). It is of note
11 that Coomassie-staining cannot efficiently detect *Lr*SRRPs, probably due to their unusual amino
12 acid composition. The anti-SRRP-BR$_{53608}$ does not cross-react with SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$ which may be due
13 to the low amino acid similarity (48%) between the two binding regions of the two adhesins
14 (Sequeira, S., Kavanaugh, D., et al. 2018). Previous reports have also shown that lectins can
15 detect SRRPs with greater sensitivity than antibodies, since the high degree of glycosylation
16 masks the underlying amino acid and protein antigens (Siboo, I.R., Chaffin, D.O., et al. 2008).
17 Therefore, to confirm the identity of the putative SRRP glycoprotein secreted by *L. reuteri* 100-
18 23C, the lectin binding profile of *L. reuteri* 100-23C *Δsrr* mutant (lacking SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$ expression,
19 see (Frese, S.A., Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013)) was determined as above following western blot
20 analysis with *f*-labelled lectins. The protein band >300 kDa recognised by *f*-WGA in the *L.*
21 *reuteri* 100-23C wild-type strain was missing in the *Δsrr* mutant (**Figure 1C**) while no other
22 difference in the lectin recognition pattern was observed with *f*-WGA or when the SM proteins
23 were probed with *f*-RCA or *f*-SNA (data not shown), confirming that this protein is SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$

1 (marked with an arrow in **Figure 1A**). It is interesting to note that the theoretical MW of
2 $SRRP_{53608}$ and $SRRP_{100-23}$ is 116 kDa and 224 kDa respectively, therefore the high apparent MW
3 of *Lr*SRRPs is in line with the potential glycosylation of these adhesins. The lectin recognition
4 pattern of *Lr*SRRPs suggests that these adhesins are glycosylated with glycans carrying GlcNAc
5 residues.

6 In support of this analysis, the profile of intracellular sugar nucleotides produced by *L. reuteri*
7 strains was determined as described in (Rejzek, M., Hill, L., et al. 2017) with some modifications
8 specific for the cell lysis of Gram-positive bacteria. The LC-MS/MS based analysis revealed the
9 presence of six abundant nucleotide 5'-diphosphosugar (NDP-sugar) species in *L. reuteri* 100-
10 23C and ATCC 53608 (**Figure 2**) at concentrations ranging from low nmol to low µmol per
11 gram of wet cell pellet (**Table S1**). UDP-GlcNAc and UDP-Glc were detected in both strains of
12 *L. reuteri* at high levels (**Figure 2**). UDP-Gal was also found in both strains but at significantly
13 lower levels in *L. reuteri* 100-23C, under the conditions tested. These results are in line with the
14 bioinformatics analyses showing the genetic requirement for the synthesis of UDP-GlcNAc,
15 UDP-Glc, UDP-Gal (data not shown) which are commonly used as sugar donors by GTs in
16 protein glycosylation (Freeze, H.H., Hart, G.W., et al. 2017) and in agreement with the presence
17 of GlcNAc moieties onto *Lr*SRRPs, as suggested by the lectin screening.

18 *$SRRP_{100-23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$ are glycosylated with $Hex_2GlcNAc$ and di-GlcNAc moieties,*
19 *respectively*

20 To identify the glycans decorating *Lr*SRRPs, $SRRP_{100-23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$ were purified from *L.*
21 *reuteri* culture supernatant by affinity chromatography using an agarose-bound WGA (agWGA)
22 column. The purified proteins migrated at a MW >300 kDa on SDS-PAGE and were recognised
23 by *f*-WGA (**Figure 1D**) on western blot. The purified *Lr*SRRPs were then subjected to reductive

1 β-elimination, and the chemically released glycans permethylated and analysed by MALDI-ToF.
2 The spectra of $SRRP_{100-23}$ showed a peak at 738 Da, corresponding to $Hex_2HexNAc$ (**Figure 3A**)
3 and fragmentation of this ion species suggested a linear glycan structure (**Figure 3B**). The peak
4 at 330 Da corresponds to reduced, permethylated HexNAc, suggesting some degree of
5 heterogeneity in the glycosylation of $SRRP_{100-23}$ which may also explain the recognition of
6 $SRRP_{100-23}$ by WGA. Interestingly, the Hex-HexNAc intermediate could not be identified in the
7 sample. As further support of $SRRP_{100-23}$ glycosylation, SM proteins from *L. reuteri* 100-23C
8 *asp2* and *gtfB* mutants (Frese, S.A., Mackenzie, D.A., et al. 2013) were analysed by western blot
9 using *f*-WGA. The WGA-band corresponding to $SRRP_{100-23}$ was missing in both mutants (**Figure**
10 **1C**) and glycomics analysis of SM proteins from the *gtfB* mutant showed a loss of the peak at
11 738 Da compared to the wild-type strain (**Suppl. Figure S1**), further confirming that this
12 modification was due to SecA2/Y2 mediated protein glycosylation. To identify the nature of the
13 monosaccharides constituting $SRRP_{100-23}$ glycans, the adhesin was treated with α- or β-
14 glucosidase, or α-, or β- galactosidase and the reaction product was analysed by western blot,
15 using *f*-WGA. The results showed that treatment with either α-glucosidase or α-galactosidase led
16 to reduction of the apparent MW of the adhesin after SDS-PAGE (**Figure 3C**), suggesting that
17 the terminal hexoses could be either Glc or Gal. Further analysis of the monosaccharides in the
18 elution fraction of the agWGA affinity chromatography by GC-MS, following methanolysis *N*-
19 acetylation and TMS-derivatisation of the released methyl-glycosides, showed that Glc and Gal
20 were the only hexoses present, supporting the enzymatic deglycosylation data (**Figure 3D**). The
21 analysis also showed that GlcNAc was the only HexNAc present. Together these results suggest
22 that $SRRP_{100-23}$ is modified with GlcNAc and Glc or Gal moieties with GlcNAc being at the
23 reducing end of the glycans.

1 MALDI-ToF analysis of $SRPP_{53608}$ glycans revealed a single peak at 575 Da, which corresponds
2 to the mass of a reduced, permethylated sodiated di-HexNAc (**Figure 4A**). Further fragmentation
3 of this species confirmed the nature of the glycan, as it produced two main peaks at 282 Da and
4 316 Da, corresponding to a non-reducing and a reducing terminal HexNAc, respectively (**Figure**
5 **4B**). To determine the nature of the glycan residues, the carbohydrate content of purified
6 $SRRP_{53608}$ was further analysed by GC-MS. The chromatogram showed a single HexNAc peak
7 with a retention time (~29 min) corresponding to that of GlcNAc (**Figure 4C**).

8 Taken together, these data suggest that $SRRP_{100-23}$ is mainly glycosylated with Hex-Hex-
9 GlcNAc- and $SRRP_{53608}$ with di-GlcNAc moieties. These results are in agreement with the lectin
10 and sugar nucleotide profiling of *L. reuteri* strains 100-23C and ATCC 53608.

11 *$SRRP_{100-23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$ display different glycosylation pathways*

12 In addition to the SecA2 and SecY2 translocases and the accessory secretion associated proteins
13 Asp1-3, the *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608 SecA2/Y2 glycosylation system contains genes encoding the
14 priming $GtfA_{53608}$ and $GtfB_{53608}$, and a gene encoding $GtfC_{53608}$ (**Figure 5**) whereas in *L. reuteri*
15 100-23C, the SecA2/Y2 cluster includes eight genes encoding predicted GTs, including $GtfA_{100-}$
16 $_{23}$, $GtfB_{100-23}$ and $GtfC_{100-23}$ (**Figure 5**). Based on homologous SecA2/Y2 clusters in
17 streptococcal and staphylococcal systems, GtfA and GtfB are predicted to act together to initiate
18 glycosylation of SRRPs by the addition of a GlcNAc residue, whereas GtfC is predicted to
19 mediate the second glycosylation step (Couvigny, B., Lapaque, N., et al. 2017, Jiang, Y.-L., Jin,
20 H., et al. 2017, Zhu, F., Zhang, H., et al. 2016). Based on the $SRRP_{100-23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$
21 glycosylation profile determined above, $GtfC_{53608}$ and $GtfC_{100-23}$ are predicted to add a GlcNAc
22 residue or a Hex residue, respectively to the GlcNAc core, while sharing 97% identity in amino
23 acid sequence (**Suppl. Figure S2**). To confirm the ligand specificity of these enzymes, $GtfC_{53608}$

and GtfC$_{100\text{-}23}$ were heterologously expressed in *E. coli* and the recombinant enzymes first analysed by differential scanning fluorimetry (DSF). Interactions of proteins with their ligands often lead to increased stabilisation of the protein, and this is reflected by an increased melting temperature (Tm) (D'Urzo, N., Malito, E., et al. 2012). GtfC$_{53608}$ showed a UDP-GlcNAc concentration-dependent increase in Tm, from 42°C in the absence of the ligand to 47°C in the presence of 4 mM UDP-GlcNAc (**Figure 6A**). The specificity of GtfC$_{53608}$ interaction was further tested against UDP, UDP-Gal, and UDP-Glc, showing a concentration-dependent increase in Tm for all ligands tested (**Figure 6B**) but lower than the interaction with UDP-GlcNAc (**Figure 6B & 6C**), indicating a preference of GtfC$_{53608}$ towards UDP-GlcNAc. GtfC$_{100\text{-}23}$ showed an increase in Tm of up to 3°C in the presence of UDP-Glc, whereas other ligands had a reduced effect at concentrations up to 4 mM (**Figure 6D**), indicating a preference of GtfC$_{100\text{-}23}$ for UDP-Glc. DSF was also used to investigate the dependency of GtfC$_{53608}$ and GtfC$_{100\text{-}23}$ to metal ions. The Tm of GtfC$_{53608}$ was increased by 2.5^{o}C in the presence of 5 mM of the divalent ions (Mg^{2+}, Mn^{2+}, Ca^{2+}) and by 7°C when both the sugar ligand UDP-GlcNAc and metal ions were present (**Figure 6E**). A smaller shift in Tm (< 1°C) was detected when the ions were added to GtfC$_{100\text{-}23}$ in the absence or presence of UDP-Glc (**Figure 6F**). These results suggest that GtfC$_{53608}$ and GtfC$_{100\text{-}23}$ have different requirements for divalent ions for optimum binding.

Saturation Transfer Difference (STD) NMR was used to obtain structural insights into the interaction between GtfC$_{53608}$ or GtfC$_{100\text{-}23}$ and these sugar nucleotides. We obtained binding epitope maps (maps of distribution of STD$_0$(%) factors along the molecule) for each ligand tested (UDP, UDP-Gal, UDP-Glc and UDP-GlcNAc), reflecting the main contacts with the surface of the protein in the bound state. For each ligand, the highest STD$_0$(%) factors were observed for the uracil and ribose moieties whereas the hexopyranose moieties (Glc, GlcNAc, and Gal)

showed lower STD_0(%) factors (**Figure 6G-L**). In addition, there were differences between the ligand binding epitopes in complex with $GtfC_{53608}$ or $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$. UDP-GlcNAc showed higher STD_0(%) factors on average in the presence of $GtfC_{53608}$ (**Figure 6J**), supporting a preference of this protein for UDP-GlcNAc whereas $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$ showed a binding preference for UDP-Glc (**Figure 6H**). UDP-Gal showed only weak interactions with $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$ or $GtfC_{53608}$ (**Figure 6I & 6L**). STD NMR titrations were carried out to determine the ligand affinity of $GtfC_{53608}$ and $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$. Since the stability of the protein samples imposed time constraints on the NMR measurements precluding an STD initial slope titration approach to get thermodynamic values (Angulo, J., Enriquez-Navas, P.M., et al. 2010), the K_D values were considered as apparent. All apparent K_D values, were in excellent agreement with the binding epitope data, except for the K_D of the complex $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$/UDP-Gal which was lower than $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$/UDP-Glc. In order to explore this further, a competitive STD NMR study was performed where the STD factors for the complexes $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$/UDP-Glc, $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$/UDP-GlcNAc, $GtfC_{53608}$/UDP-GlcNAc, and $GtfC_{53608}$/UDP-Glc were determined in the absence or presence of UDP-Gal. The results (**Table 1, Suppl. Figure S3**) were in excellent agreement with the epitope mappings of the sugar nucleotides, supporting the preference of $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$ towards UDP-Glc, despite the lower apparent K_D obtained for UDP-Gal. The difference in apparent K_D may be due to a conformational rearrangement of $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$ in the presence of UDP-Glc, reducing the kinetics rate of the association process (on-rate, k_{ON}), leading to an underestimation of affinity due to ligand rebinding (Angulo, J., Enriquez-Navas, P.M., et al. 2010), as was previously reported for the complex of the human blood group B galactosyltransferase and its donor substrate UDP-Gal (Angulo, J., Langpap, B., et al. 2006).

1 Taken together, these results suggest that GtfA/B are involved in GlcNAc attachment to
2 $SRRP_{100-23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$ while $GtfC_{53608}$ extends the chain with a GlcNAc residue and $GtfC_{100-}$
3 $_{23}$ with Glc.

4 *In vivo glycoengineering of SRR1 domain*

5 To gain further insights into the glycosylation of $SRRP_{53608}$, a sequence encoding a His-tagged
6 SRR1 region covering aa 81-236 of $SRRP_{53608}$ was co-expressed in *E. coli* together with an
7 operon encoding $GtfA_{53608}$, $GtfB_{53608}$ and $GtfC_{53608}$. MS analysis after trypsin digest of protein
8 bands at 60, 50 and 40 kDa (**Suppl. Figure S4A**), confirmed that these correspond to the
9 successfully expressed $GtfA_{53608}$, $GtfB_{53608}$, and $GtfC_{53608}$, respectively (data not shown). The
10 protein extract was further analysed by western blotting with *f*-WGA. A protein migrating
11 between 45 and 60 kDa was detected by *f*-WGA when $GtfA/B/C_{53608}$ and SRR1, were co-
12 expressed, but not in the control experiment expressing SRR1 only (**Suppl. Figure S4B**),
13 suggesting that this protein corresponds to glycosylated SRR1 (gSRR1). The his-tagged gSRR1
14 was purified by IMAC and subjected to reductive β-elimination. Analysis of the permethylated
15 glycans by MALDI-ToF MS showed a peak at 575 Da (**Suppl. Figure S5A**), consistent with the
16 presence of di-HexNAc species, as seen for the glycans from the native $SRRP_{53608}$. The
17 assignment of this peak as a di-HexNAc-ol was also supported by fragmentation of the species at
18 575 Da that showed dominant peaks at 316 and 282 Da **(Suppl. Figure S5A)**. Two weak signals
19 at 330 Da and at 534 Da, corresponding to the mass of a permethylated, sodiated HexNAc and
20 Hex-HexNAc-ol, respectively, were also observed (**Suppl. Figure S5A**).

21 The released, underivatised glycans were analysed using 2D NMR and DEPT experiments in
22 order to characterise the conformation and linkage of the disaccharide. NMR spectra of α/ β-
23 GlcNAc and GlcNAc-ol standards were recorded for comparison with the experimental samples.

1 The NMR analysis of the gSRR1 glycans confirmed the presence of a di-GlcNAc disaccharide
2 (**Table 2**), in agreement with the MS analysis of gSRR1 and the glycosylation of native
3 $SRRP_{53608}$. The disaccharide was determined to be β-GlcNAc-(1→6)-GlcNAc-ol (**Suppl. Figure**
4 **S5B-C**). In addition, the released glycan fraction also revealed the presence of free GlcNAc-ol
5 and the two mixture components were present in the proportions GlcNAc-ol (60%): disaccharide
6 (40%) (**Suppl. Figure S5B**), suggesting that the glycosylation of gSRR1 in *E. coli* consists of a
7 combination of mono- and di-GlcNAc side chains. A minor doublet was detected at 4.50 ppm
8 suggesting the presence of a second disaccharide on gSRR1, in agreement with the MALDI-ToF
9 analysis that showed the presence of a Hex-HexNAc-ol. The β-conformation of the non-reducing
10 GlcNAc was further confirmed by treatment of recombinant gSRR1 with a commercially
11 available β-*N*-acetylhexosaminidase$_f$. The enzymatically-treated gSRR1 showed reduced
12 apparent size on western blot following detection by *f*-WGA as compared to non-treated gSRR1
13 (**Suppl. Figure S5C**).

14 To determine the configuration of GlcNAc linked to the protein, NMR experiments were carried
15 out on the intact gSRR-1 protein. NMR assignments of the sugar residues in gSRR1 are reported
16 in **Table 2** and details of how the assignments were made are provided in the Suppl. Figure S5
17 captions (**Suppl. Figure S6**). The analysis revealed that GlcNAc was α-linked to gSRR1 and
18 confirmed that both single α-GlcNAc and GlcNAcβ-(1→6)-GlcNAcα disaccharide side chains
19 were present. In the ^{1}H spectrum of gSRR1 the anomeric signal of β-GlcNAc appeared as a
20 simple doublet, $J_{1,2}$ = 8.6 Hz, at δ 4.54, but the anomeric signal of α-GlcNAc appeared as a broad
21 feature centred at δ 4.87. This broad feature consisted of a superposed series of doublets, all with
22 $J_{1,2}$ = 3.9 Hz, but with displaced δH1 chemical shifts in the range 4.91-4.85 ppm (**Suppl. Figure**
23 **S6C**). The displacement arises because the sugars are linked to Ser residues that occupy slightly

1 different environments as a result of the protein secondary structure. By integrating the α- and β-
2 ^{1}H anomeric signals (**Suppl. Figure S6D**) it was possible to estimate the proportions of mono- to
3 disaccharide side chains as 64%:36%, in agreement with the result obtained from the released
4 glycans mixture.

5 Together these data showed that GtfA, GtfB and GtfC can glycosylate gSRR1 in an *E. coli*.
6 Detailed NMR analysis of the intact glycoprotein, as well as the released glycans, showed that
7 gSRR1 is modified with α-linked GlcNAc residues and GlcNAcβ1-6GlcNAcα moieties at a ~ 4 :
8 6 ratio with a small fraction of a Hex-GlcNAc species further identified by MS and NMR.

9

10 **Discussion**

11 Protein glycosylation is emerging as an important feature in bacteria. Protein glycosylation
12 systems have been reported and studied in many pathogenic bacteria, revealing an important
13 diversity of glycan structures and pathways within and between bacterial species. Studies
14 focused on SRRPs from streptococci and staphylococci have demonstrated that these adhesins
15 are *O*-glycosylated. In these closely related bacteria, glycosylation of SRRPs is initiated by a
16 complex between GtfA and GtfB that adds GlcNAc to the SRR domains of the adhesins while
17 additional GTs, including GtfC, may further modify SRR glycosylation by sequentially adding
18 other glycan moieties onto the GlcNAc core (Jiang, Y.-L., Jin, H., et al. 2017, Shi, W.-W., Jiang,
19 Y.-L., et al. 2014, Takamatsu, D., Bensing, B.A., et al. 2004, Zhu, F., Zhang, H., et al. 2016).
20 Here we showed that the gut symbiont *L. reuteri* is capable of performing *O*-glycosylation on
21 proteins, and that *L. reuteri* strains differentially modify SRRPs. $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$ is glycosylated with
22 GlcNAc and Hex-Glc-GlcNAc whereas $SRRP_{53608}$ is glycosylated with GlcNAc and di-GlcNAc

1 moieties. *L. reuteri* GtfAB are expected to be involved in the addition of the core GlcNAc to
2 serine, in agreement with the glycan structure of $SRRP_{100-23}$ and $SRRP_{53608}$ and with their high
3 sequence homology with other functionally characterised GtfAs (e.g. ~46% identity with GtfA
4 from *S. pneumoniae* TIGR4 (Jiang, Y.-L., Jin, H., et al. 2017), E-value < 10^{-150}). In addition to
5 the SecA2/SecY2 export system dedicated to the glycosylation of SRRPs, a general *O*-
6 glycosylation system has been reported in *L. plantarum* WCFS1 where homologues of *L. reuteri*
7 Sec2/Y2 GtfA and GtfB have been shown to be involved in the addition of a single HexNAc
8 molecule onto the glycosylation site of the acceptor proteins (Lee, I.C., van Swam, I.I., et al.
9 2014). These two enzymes contain a DUF1975 in the N-terminus which probably mediates the
10 interaction between the two GTs and the target proteins and a GT domain in the C-terminus, as
11 demonstrated for GtfA and GtfB from *S. parasanguinis* FW213 (Wu, R. and Wu, H. 2011),
12 suggesting a similar mode of action to the SecA2/Y2-specific GtfA and GtfB.

13 The glycosylation of $SRRP_{100-23}$ with Hex-Glc-GlcNAc, is in line with the specificity of $GtfC_{100-}$
14 $_{23}$ to UDP-Glc by DSF and STD NMR. The second Hex (either Glc or Gal) may be the result of
15 another GT present in the *L. reuteri* 100-23C SecA2/Y2 cluster (see **Figure 5**). The number of
16 GTs in the *L. reuteri* 100-23C SecA2/Y2 cluster exceeds the number of sugars on $SRRP_{100-23}$, as
17 also reported for the pneumonococcal SecA2/Y2 system (Jiang, Y.-L., Jin, H., et al. 2017). Here
18 the putative $GtfD_{100-23}$ and $GtfE_{100-23}$ encoded genes share a similar organisation with a GT4 in
19 the N-terminus and a DUF1792 in the C-terminus. In addition, $GtfF1_{100-23}$ and $GtfF2_{100-23}$ may be
20 part of the same gene separated by a gene encoding a putative transposase, with $GtfF1_{100-23}$
21 encoding a GT4 domain in the N-terminus and part of a DUF1792 domain in the C-terminus and
22 $GtfF2_{100-23}$ encoding the remaining part of the DUF1792 domain. Glycosyltransferases
23 possessing a DUF1792 has been shown to be involved in the third glycosylation step of the

1 SRRPs, Fap1 and PsrP, from *S. parasanguinis* FW213 and *S. pneumoniae* TIGR4, respectively
2 (Jiang, Y.-L., Jin, H., et al. 2017, Zhang, H., Zhu, F., et al. 2014). While DUF1792 has been
3 shown to expand the Fap1 glycan with Glc moieties in *S. parasanguinis* (Zhang, H., Zhu, F., et
4 al. 2014), DUF1792 from *S. pneumoniae* showed a relaxed specificity transferring either Glc or
5 Gal to SRR1 in *E. coli* (Jiang, Y.-L., Jin, H., et al. 2017). As all additional GTs in the *L. reuteri*
6 100-23C SecA2/Y2 cluster contain such a domain, it is possible that only one of these enzymes
7 is active or that there is redundancy in their function. Taken together with the $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$
8 enzymatic deglycosylation data, it is likely that $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$ is modified by Glc-Glc-GlcNAc or
9 Gal-Glc-GlcNAc. Interestingly, the Glc-GlcNAc intermediate could not be identified by
10 MALDI-ToF analysis, suggesting that the addition of the third monosaccharide onto the
11 expanding glycan is a rapid reaction, as observed for Fap1 in *S. parasanguinis* FW213 (Zhang,
12 H., Zhu, F., et al. 2014).

13 To date, all characterised GtfCs have been shown to add a Glc residue onto the GlcNAc core,
14 therefore the glycosylation of $SRRP_{53608}$ by di-GlcNAc was unexpected. The specificity of *L.*
15 *reuteri* $GtfC_{53608}$ was further supported by DSF and STD NMR analyses, showing a preference
16 for UDP-GlcNAc, in line with the MS/GC-MS analyses. This is therefore the first report of a
17 GtfC from the SecA2/Y2 system showing ligand specificity to UDP-GlcNAc. In addition, we
18 showed that $GtfC_{53608}$ (and $Gft_{100\text{-}23}$ to a lesser extent) bound to divalent ions, suggesting that they
19 may contribute to optimum enzyme activity. Although these enzymes do not possess the DxD
20 motif, commonly involved in ion binding, they harbour a DxE motif that could have a similar
21 role. Such dependency for divalent ions is well established in Leloir GTs, and some examples
22 have recently been reported in prokaryotic systems such as the dGT1-mediated glycosylation of

1 Fap1 in *S. parasanguinis* (Zhang, H., Zhu, F., et al. 2014). However, no divalent ions have been
2 identified so far in GtfCs from other microorganisms (Zhu, F., Erlandsen, H., et al. 2011).

3 $SRRP_{53608}$ glycosylation was further confirmed by the introduction of $GtfA/B/C_{53608}$ into *E. coli*,
4 resulting in glycosylation of a co-expressed SRR1 domain by mono- and di-GlcNAc, as shown
5 by MS and NMR. Heterogeneity in the glycosylation of SRRPs has been reported in SRR
6 glycoproteins from *Streptococcus* species (Chaze, T., Guillot, A., et al. 2014, Couvigny, B.,
7 Lapaque, N., et al. 2017, Jiang, Y.-L., Jin, H., et al. 2017, Zhang, H., Zhu, F., et al. 2014), where
8 deposition of GlcNAc moieties is not followed by further elongation of the glycan, suggesting
9 this is a common feature among SRRPs. This heterogeneity was also observed in the
10 glycosylation of $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$ (see Results section) and could explain the recognition of $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$
11 by WGA.

12 The NMR analysis also indicated that $SRRP_{53608}$ is glycosylated with GlcNAcβ(1→6)-GlcNAcα
13 moieties, providing a unique example of SRRP glycans extended with GlcNAc residues in the
14 second position. Although only so far reported for GlcNAc residues that are directly attached
15 onto the protein backbone, it is possible that $SRRP_{53608}$ contains additional *O*-acetyl group
16 moieties as previously identified in SRRPs from *S. gordonii* M99 (Seepersaud, R., Sychantha,
17 D., et al. 2017), *S. agalactiae* H36b (Chaze, T., Guillot, A., et al. 2014) and *S. salivarius*
18 JIM8777 (Couvigny, B., Lapaque, N., et al. 2017). In these *Streptoccocus* SRRPs, Asp2 was
19 found to be responsible for this modification, probably on the O-6 position (Seepersaud, R.,
20 Sychantha, D., et al. 2017). Since *L. reuteri* SecA2/Y2 clusters harbour a gene encoding a
21 predicted Asp2 with conserved catalytic residues, Asp2 may also carry out this function in *L.*
22 *reuteri* ATCC 53608. However, since the *O*-AcGlcNAc modification is lost under the conditions
23 used in our MALDI-ToF or GC-MS analyses (the high pH used for the release of the glycans

1 leads to base-catalysed ester hydrolysis and thus loss of the modification), more work is required
2 to establish whether Asp2 functions as an acetyltransferase that modifies GlcNAc moieties of
3 $SRRP_{53608}$. The α-linked configuration we demonstrated here for the first time for an SRRP is in
4 agreement with the retaining mechanism reported for GtfA from *S. gordonii* (Chen, Y.,
5 Seepersaud, R., et al. 2016) and *S. pneumoniae* (Shi, W.-W., Jiang, Y.-L., et al. 2014).

6 Interestingly, a small fraction of the gSRR1 glycans consisted of Hex-HexNAc moieties, a
7 modification that was not found on the native protein. This suggests that GtfC could mediate the
8 transfer of either Glc or GlcNAc in the *E. coli* glycosylation model, while showing a preference
9 for GlcNAc in *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608, in agreement with the enzyme donor specificity and the
10 increased levels of UDP-GlcNAc in *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608.

11 In *L. reuteri* 100-23C, the *Δasp2* and *ΔgtfB* mutants lost the WGA band corresponding to
12 $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$, indicating that, in this strain, Asp2 and GtfB are essential for glycosylation and/or
13 export of $SRRP_{100\text{-}23}$. In *S. gordonii,* Asp2 is involved in both the post-translational modification
14 and transport of SRR glycoproteins during their biogenesis (Seepersaud, R., Bensing, B.A., et al.
15 2012, Seepersaud, R., Sychantha, D., et al. 2017, Yen, Y.T., Seepersaud, R., et al. 2011). This
16 requirement for the coupling of glycosylation and secretion has been proposed as a mechanism
17 underpinning the co-evolution of SRR glycoproteins with their dedicated accessory SecA2/Y2
18 system such that the adhesin is optimally modified for binding (Seepersaud, R., Bensing, B.A., et
19 al. 2012).

20 In conclusion, we showed that *Lr*SRRP adhesins are differentially glycosylated in *L. reuteri*
21 strains 100-23C and ATCC 53608, reflecting differences in the organisation of the SecA2/Y2
22 accessory cluster of these strains. In addition, *Lr*SRRPs from pig and rodent strains differ with
23 respect to the number of repeat motifs and their sequences of their SRR regions (Sequeira, S.,

1 Kavanaugh, D., et al. 2018). The glycosylation of SRRPs in *Lactobacillus* species, as
2 demonstrated for the first time in this study, is likely to impact on the adhesion capacity of these
3 strains. A recent analysis of all available genomes of *L. reuteri* strains showed that homologues
4 of functional SRRPs (and the corresponding linked SecA2/Y2 gene cluster) were exclusively
5 found in rodent and pig isolates, with the exception of one chicken isolate (Sequeira, S.,
6 Kavanaugh, D., et al. 2018). Differences in *Lr*SRRP glycosylation profile may therefore
7 contribute to the mechanisms underpinning *L. reuteri* adaptation to these hosts. In addition,
8 bioinformatics analyses revealed the presence of complete SecA2/Y2 clusters with an intact
9 SRRP in the genomes of other *Lactobacillus* species including strains from *Lactobacillus oris*,
10 *Lactobacillus salivarius*, *Lactobacillus johnsonii*, and *Lactobacillus fructivorans* (Latousakis and
11 Juge, 2018; Sequeira et al., 2018), suggesting a common role of SRR glycoproteins in adhesion
12 to host epithelia, which may be related to the ecological context of these strains (see (Duar et al.,
13 2017) for a review). This aspect can be particularly important in the selection of probiotics
14 targeting different vertebrate hosts. Furthermore, knowledge of the cellular pathways of
15 glycosylation in gut symbionts expands the range of glycoengineering applications for the
16 recombinant production of glycoprotein conjugates in different cell types.

17

18 **Materials and Methods**

19 *Materials, strains and culture conditions*

20 Uridine diphosphate (UDP), UDP-glucuronic acid (UDP-GlcA), UDP-*N*-acetylglucosamine
21 (UDP-GlcNAc), UDP-*N*-acetylgalactosamine (UDP-GalNAc), UDP-glucose (UDP-Glc), UDP-
22 galactopyranose (UDP-Gal), thymidine diphosphate (TDP)-Glc and all chemical reagents were

1 from Merck (Gottingen, Germany), unless stated otherwise. TDP-rhamnose (TDP-Rha) was
2 prepared as described(Wagstaff, B.A., Rejzek, M., et al. In preparation). Polyclonal antiserum
3 against immobilized metal affinity chromatography (IMAC)-purified His6-SRRP$_{53608}$-BR was
4 raised in rabbits by BioGenes GmbH (Berlin, Germany) and provided at a titre of >1:200000, as
5 previously reported(Sequeira, S., Kavanaugh, D., et al. 2018). The lectins used in this study were
6 purchased from Vector Laboratories (Peterborough, UK) and are listed in **Table S1**.

7 The bacterial strains and plasmids used in this study are described in **Table S2**. The deMan-
8 Rogosa-Sharpe (MRS; Oxoid, Loughborough, UK) or lactobacillus defined medium-II (LDM-II
9 (Kotarski, S.F. and Savage, D.C. 1979)) medium was used for growth of *L. reuteri* strains at
10 37°C, and the media were supplemented with erythromycin (10 μg/ml) for *L. reuteri* 100-23C
11 mutants. The Luria-Bertani (LB) or terrific broth-based auto induction media supplemented with
12 trace elements (AIM; Formedium, Hunstanton, UK) were used for *Escherichia coli* growth at
13 37°C, 250 rpm. The media were supplemented with the relevant antibiotics as described in **Table**
14 **S2**.

15 *Lectin screening by western blot*

16 *L. reuteri* strains were grown in LDM-II overnight at 37°C under static conditions. This culture
17 was used to inoculate fresh LDM-II at 0.2 % vol/vol. Following incubation under static
18 conditions at 37°C overnight, the cultures were centrifuged at 4000 g for 5 min and the spent
19 media (SM) concentrated 10-fold by spin filtration using 10 kDa MWCO spin filters. The SM
20 proteins were analysed by SDS-PAGE, using Bis-Tris 4-12% or Tris-Acetate 3-8% NuPAGE
21 gels (ThermoFisher Scientific, Loughborough, UK) in 3-Morpholinopropane-1-sulfonic acid
22 (MOPS) or Tris-Acetate NOVEX buffer for 50 min at 200 V. The gels were then stained with
23 InstantBlue protein stain (Expedeon, Over, UK). Alternatively, proteins were transferred onto

1 PVDF membranes in NuPAGE transfer buffer, using an X-cell II blot module (ThermoFischer
2 Scientific, Loughborough, UK) at 30 V for 2 h. The membrane was then blocked for 1 h at RT
3 and probed with either fluorescein (*f*)-labelled lectins at 5 µg/ml or with anti-SRRP-BR$_{53608}$
4 primary antibody (1000-fold dilution). Alkaline phosphatase-conjugated anti-rabbit IgG antibody
5 Merck (Gottingen, Germany) was used as secondary antibody. Three washes with PBS
6 supplemented with 0.1% vol/vol Tween-20 were included between antibody incubations. Bound
7 antibody was detected using alkaline phosphatase substrate (nitroblue tetrazolium 0.1 mM, 5-
8 bromo-4-chloro-indolyl phosphate p-toluidine 1mM, in Tris-HCl 0.1M containing 4 mM $MgCl_2$)
9 at pH 9.6 and scanned in a GS-800 calibrated densitometer (Bio-Rad, UK).

10 *LrSRRP purification*

11 *L. reuteri* 100-23C and ATCC 53608 strains were grown in LDM-II for 24 h at 37°C. The
12 bacteria were removed following centrifugation at 10000 ×g for 10 min. Ammonium sulphate
13 was added to the spent media at a final concentration of 60% (w/v) to precipitate the proteins.
14 The suspension was stirred overnight. The precipitated proteins were recovered by centrifugation
15 at 10000 ×g for 20 min. The proteins were resuspended in HEPES buffer (HEPES 10 mM, NaCl
16 150 mM, pH 7.5) and *Lr*SRRP purified by gravity flow affinity chromatography, using agarose-
17 bound wheat germ agglutinin (agWGA). Loosely bound proteins were removed with 10 column
18 vol of HEPES buffer and the bound proteins were eluted with 6 column vol of HEPES buffer
19 containing 0.5 mM GlcNAc. The proteins were extensively dialysed in 50 mM ammonium
20 bicarbonate to remove the free GlcNAc.

21 *Proteomics*

1 Protein bands of interest were excised from SDS-NuPAGE gels and cut up to small cubic pieces.
2 After two washes with 200 µl of ABC buffer (200 mM aqueous ammonium bicarbonate in 50%
3 acetonitrile; ACN) for 15 min and then ACN for 10 min, the gel plugs were air-dried for 15 min.
4 Proteins were reduced in a DL-dithiothreitol solution (200 µl, 10 mM in 50 mM ammonium
5 bicarbonate) at 60ºC for 30 min and carboxymethylated with iodoacetamide (10 mM in 50 mM
6 ammonium bicarbonate) in the dark for an additional 30 min. The iodoacetamide solution was
7 removed and the washing and drying steps were repeated. Trypsin Gold (10 µl; 10 ng/µl;
8 Promega, UK) was added to the gel plugs along with equal amount of 10 mM ammonium
9 bicarbonate. After incubation at 37ºC for 3 h, 20 µl of 1% formic acid was added and the
10 samples were further incubated at room temperature for 10 min. The solution was then
11 transferred to a clean tube and tryptic peptides were further extracted from the gel plugs by
12 addition of 40 µl of 50% ACN and incubation for 10 min at room temperature. The samples were
13 pooled together and dried on a centrifugal evaporator. The peptide mixtures were analysed by
14 nano-scale liquid chromatographic tandem mass spectrometry (nLC MS/MS), using an Orbitrap
15 Fusion trihybrid mass spectrometer coupled with a nano flow ultra-high performance liquid
16 chromatography (UHPLC) system (ThermoFischer Scientific, UK). The peptides were separated
17 on a C18 pre-column, using a gradient of 3-40% ACN in 0.1% formic acid (vol/vol) over 50 min
18 at a flow rate of 300 nL/min at 40°C. The peptides were fragmented in the linear ion trap by a
19 data-dependent acquisition method, selecting the 40 most intense ions. Mascot (Matrix Science,
20 UK) was used to analyse the raw data against an in-house maintained database of the *L. reuteri*
21 and/or *E. coli* proteome. The tolerance on parent ions was 5 ppm and on fragments was 0.5 Da.
22 Carboxymethylation of cysteine was selected as fixed modification and oxidation of methionine
23 as variable modification. One miscleavage was allowed.

1 *Enzymatic treatment of SRRPs*

2 SRRP was treated with α-glucosidase from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, α-galactosidase from
3 green coffee beans, β-glucosidase from almonds or β-galactosidase from *Aspergillus oryzae* (0.5
4 U/µl; Merck Gottingen, Germany) in 50 mM sodium acetate, 5 mM $CaCl_2$, pH 6 for 16 h. The
5 reaction products were analysed by SDS-PAGE and western blot, as described above.

6 *Glycan analysis by Matrix Assisted Laser Desorption/Ionisation Time of Flight Mass*
7 *Spectrometry (MALDI-ToF)*

8 *Lr*SRRP glycans were released by β-elimination, after treatment of the purified proteins with 1
9 M $NaBH_4$ in 50 mM NaOH for 16 h at 45°C. Excess of $NaBH_4$ was neutralised by the addition of
10 acetic acid, before sodium ions were removed by ion-exchange chromatography, using a
11 DOWEX 50Wx8 H^+ column. Glycans were collected in the flow-through and wash fractions
12 using 5% acetic acid. These fractions were pooled and freeze-dried, prior to permethylation of
13 the glycans with 300 µl NaOH – anhydrous dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) slurry and 400 µl
14 iodomethane. The reaction was incubated at room temperature for 60 min under vigorous
15 shaking and quenched by the dropwise addition of H_2O, until fizzing stopped. The permethylated
16 glycans were extracted in 2 ml chloroform, washed three times with 2 ml H_2O. After drying the
17 organic phase under nitrogen, glycans were dissolved in 50 µl aqueous methanol 50% vol/vol
18 and loaded onto a pre-washed with methanol, acetonitrile and water Empore™ C18-SD cartridge
19 (7 mm; Merck, Germany). Hydrophilic contaminants were washed with 500 µl H_2O and 400 µl
20 15% vol/vol aqueous acetonitrile. Permethylated carbohydrates were eluted with 400 µl of 35%,
21 50% and 75% vol/vol aqueous acetonitrile. The eluants were dried under a gentle stream of
22 nitrogen, dissolved in 10 µl of TA30 [30% (vol/vol) ACN, 0.1% (vol/vol) trifluoroacetic acid]
23 and mixed with equal amount of 2,5-dihydroxybenzoic acid (DHB; Sigma-Aldrich, UK; 20

1 mg/ml in TA30), before being spotted onto an MTP 384 polished steel target plate (Bruker, UK).
2 The samples were analysed by MALDI-ToF, using the Bruker Autoflex™ analyzer mass
3 spectrometer (Bruker, UK) in the positive-ion and reflectron mode.

4 *Monosaccharide analysis by gas chromatography (GC)-MS*

5 *Lr*SRRPs were treated with methanolic HCl (1M) for 16 h and 5 µg of myo-inositol added as
6 internal standard. Silver carbonate (~50 mg) was added to the solution, followed by 100 µl acetic
7 anhydride and the reactions were incubated at room temperature for 16 h in the dark. Lipids were
8 removed by three washes with heptane and the remaining methanolic phase was dried under a
9 gentle nitrogen flow. Tri-Sil HTP reagent (200 µl) (ThermoFischer Scientific, Loughborough,
10 UK) was added to the dried sample and the reaction was incubated at 80°C for 30 min. The
11 solution was dried under nitrogen and 1 ml of hexane was used to extract sugars by sonication
12 for 15 min. The samples were transferred to clean vials, dried and dissolved in dichloromethane
13 (100 µl) before injection onto the GC-MS. The samples were analysed on an Agilent 7890B GC-
14 MS system paired with an Agilent 5977A mass spectrometry detector (Agilent, UK), using a
15 BPX70 column (SGE Analytical Science, Australia). Helium was used as the carrier gas. The
16 inlet was maintained at 220°C, 12.9 psi, and 23 ml/min flow. The injection volume was 1 µl in
17 split mode (1:20). The oven temperature increased initially from 100°C to 120°C over 5 min,
18 followed by a second increase from 120°C to 230°C over 40 min.

19 *Cloning, expression and purification of glycosyltransfersases*

20 For the production of recombinant GtfC$_{53608}$, the coding region of *gtfC*$_{53608}$ was amplified by
21 PCR from the genomic DNA of *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608 using 0907-F and 0907-R primers
22 (**Table S2**) and cloned into a pOPINF vector linearised with *Kpn*I-HF and *Hin*dIII-HF, using the

1 In-Fusion HD kit (Clonetech, California, USA), following the manufacturer's instructions. The
2 recombinant vector was used to transform *E. coli* BL21 (DE3). AIM medium was inoculated
3 with an overnight culture of the recombinant clone at 1%. The fresh culture was incubated at
4 37°C for 3 h and then 16°C for 48 h. The cells were harvested by centrifugation at 10000 ×g,
5 resuspended in Tris buffer (Tris-HCl 50 mM, NaCl 150 mM, pH 7.5). The bacteria were lysed by
6 10 cycles of sonication and soluble, His_6-tagged proteins were purified by immobilised metal ion
7 affinity chromatography (IMAC). Bound proteins were eluted with Tris buffer containing 100
8 mM EDTA, concentrated by spin filtration, using a 10 kDa MWCO Vivaspin® Turbo 15 spin
9 filter (Sartorious, Gottingen, Germany) and buffer-exchanged in Tris buffer using PD10
10 desalting columns (GE Healthcare Lifesciences, Little Chalfont, UK), following the
11 manufacturer's instructions. Purified recombinant $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$ produced in *E. coli* was a kind gift
12 from Carl Young (Prozomix, UK).

13 *Glycosylation of SRR1*

14 For the glycosylation of SRR acceptor in *E. coli*, an artificial *gtfCAB*$_{53608}$ operon was cloned into
15 pETcoco-1 (Merck, Gottingen, Germany). Briefly, primer pairs nss_F and nss_R or gtfA_F and
16 gtfB_R (**Table S2**) were used together with ATCC 53608 template DNA to generate two PCR
17 products of 1055 bp or 2905 bp, respectively. Next, equimolar amounts of these products were
18 mixed and used as template together with the primers nss_F and gtf_R (**Table S2**) to generate the
19 final 3915 bp splice PCR product. Subsequently, the *Not*I restricted product was cloned into
20 pETcoco-1 that had been restricted with *Sph*I, treated with T4-polymerase (New England
21 Biolabs) and subsequently cut with *Not*I, resulting in pETcoco_*gtfCAB*$_{53608}$. Partial *srr* gene was
22 cloned into pET-15b. Briefly, a primer pair dsrr_F and dsrr_R (**Table S2**) was used to amplify a
23 487 bp product encoding the 81 – 236 aa region of $SRRP_{53608}$ that corresponds to the first serine-

1 rich repeat region (SRR1) of $SRRP_{53608}$. Restriction sites incorporated into the primers (**Table**
2 **S2**) enabled the restriction with *Nde*I and *Bam*HI and the subsequent ligation into pET-15b that
3 had been restricted in the same way resulting in pET-15b_*srr*1. Both pETcoco_$gtfCAB_{53608}$ and
4 pET-15b_*srr*1 were then used to transform *E. coli* BL21 (DE3). Induction of the expression and
5 purification of the His-tagged SRR1 were performed as described above for $GtfC_{53608}$.

6 *Differential scanning fluorimetry (DSF)*

7 DSF was used to assess glycosyltransferase – sugar donor interactions by measuring changes in
8 the melting temperature (Tm) of the protein upon interaction with sugar nucleotides. The
9 reactions were set up at a final volume of 20 µl in Tris-HCl 50 mM, pH 7.5. Proteins were used
10 at a final concentration of 10 µM and SYPRO Orange (ThermoFischer Scientific, UK), the
11 fluorescent dye used in the assay was used at 5× final concentration. Ligand and ion
12 concentration ranged from 0-50 mM. To measure the effect of divalent ions on the protein –
13 ligand interaction, sugar donors were used at 4 mM and divalent ions at 5 mM. The reactions
14 were initially kept at 10°C for 10 min and then the temperature increased in a step-wise manner,
15 with increments of 0.5°C every 15 s, up to 90°C. Measurement of the fluorescence was taken
16 every 15 s on a Real-Time PCR Detection System (Bio-Rad CFX96 Touch™). The results were
17 analysed using CFX Manager 3.5 (Bio-Rad, UK).

18 *Saturation Transfer Difference (STD) NMR experiments*

19 Proteins were exchanged using an Amicon centrifuge filter unit with a 3 kDa MW cutoff in 20
20 mM d_{19}-2,2-bis(hydroxymethyl)-2,2′,2″-nitrilotriethanol pH 7.4 (uncorrected for the deuterium
21 isotope effect on the pH glass electrode) and 50 mM NaCl. Ligands (UDP, UDP-GlcNAc, UDP-
22 Glc, UDP-Gal) were dissolved in 20 mM d_{19}-2,2-bis(hydroxymethyl)-2,2′,2″-nitrilotriethanol pH

1 7.4, 50 mM NaCl. The final ligand concentration was measured using 4,4-dimethyl-4-
2 silapentane-1-sulfonic acid as an internal standard of known concentration. The protein
3 concentration in the NMR tube (volume 500 µL) was 28 µM for $GtfC_{100-23}$ and 21 µM for
4 $GtfC_{53608}$. Ligands were used in concentrations ranging from 0.3 to 3.5 mM. The STD NMR
5 spectra were performed on a Bruker Avance 500 MHz at 298 K following published
6 methodology(Mayer, M. and Meyer, B. 1999). The on- and off-resonance spectra were acquired
7 using a train of 50 ms Gaussian selective saturation pulses at a fixed saturation time of 2 s (for
8 K_D determination) or variable saturation time from 0.5 s to 4 s (for binding epitope mapping
9 determination). The water signal was suppressed by using the WATERGATE technique as
10 described in(Piotto, M., Saudek, V., et al. 1992) while the remaining protein resonances were
11 filtered using a T_2 filter of 40 ms. The selective on-resonance irradiation was performed at 0.7
12 ppm while the off-resonance irradiation was performed at 40 ppm. The spectra were performed
13 with a spectral width of 5 KHz and 32768 data points. For determination of apparent K_D, the
14 spectra were collected with either 32 or 64 scans and 8 dummy scans at 2 s saturation time, while
15 for the binding epitope mapping the spectra were collected with 512 scans, 8 dummy scans and a
16 4 s relaxation delay for all the spectra. For each ligand interacting with $GtfC_{100-23}$ or $GtfC_{53608}$,
17 the STD build up curve was obtained and the STD_0 parameter (STD factor at time 0) was used to
18 derive the binding epitope. STD_0 was obtained by fitting the build-up curve data to the equation
19 $STD(t_{sat}) = STD_{max} * (1-exp(-k_{sat}*t_{sat}))$ where the STD_0 factor is calculated by $STD_{max}*k_{sat} =$
20 STD_0. For each proton STD_0 factors were normalized to the highest STD_0 within each ligand,
21 and expressed as relative STD_0(%) so that the binding epitope mappings could be derived.

22 *Sugar nucleotide profiling by liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry*
23 *(LC-MS/MS)*

1 *L. reuteri* strains 100-23C and ATCC 53608 were grown in 1 l MRS until OD_{600} reached ~1.0,
2 harvested by centrifugation at 10000 ×g for 10 min, washed three times in ice-cold PBS, and
3 resuspended in 70% ethanol. UDP-GlcA (1.6 nmol/gram wet pellet) was added to the suspension
4 as an internal standard. Cells were then lysed for 5 cycles of 50 s each using 100µm long glass
5 beads on a FastPrep®-24 homogeniser (MP Biomedicals, UK). Cells were kept on ice for 2 min
6 between cycles. After centrifugation at 10000 g for 20 min, the supernatant was recovered and
7 ethanol was evaporated under a stream of nitrogen. The aqueous residue was freeze-dried and
8 contaminating lipids were extracted with butan-1-ol as previously described(Turnock, D.C. and
9 Ferguson, M.A.J. 2007). Sugar nucleotides were dissolved in ammonium bicarbonate 5 mM and
10 extracted using ENVI-Carb cartridges as described in(Rabina, J., Maki, M., et al. 2001). The
11 samples were dissolved in 50 µl formic acid (80 mM) brought to pH 9.0 with ammonia (mobile
12 phase A) and analysed on a surface-conditioned porous graphitic carbon (PGC) column
13 (Hypercarb™, 100 x 1 mm, 5 µm; ThermoFischer. Loughborough, UK) with detection by
14 tandem quadrupole mass spectrometer in electrospray ionisation mode (ESI-MS/MS)(Pabst, M.,
15 Grass, J., et al. 2010), using Xevo TQ-S coupled to an Acquity UPLC (Waters, Elstree, UK), as
16 described previously (Rejzek, M., Hill, L., et al. 2017). Available sugar nucleotide standards (10
17 µM) were injected (5 µl) to determine retention times. The mass spectrometer was operated in
18 multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) mode. MRM transitions for sugar nucleotide standards
19 were generated using IntelliStart software as described in (Rejzek, M., Hill, L., et al. 2017). For
20 generic groups (e.g. UDP-*N*-acetylhexosamines, UDP-HexNAc) or where authentic standard was
21 not available (UDP-*N*-acetylmuramic acid, UDP-MurNAc) predicted MRM functions were
22 generated (Turnock, D.C. and Ferguson, M.A.J. 2007) (**Supplementary Table S1)**. MassLynx
23 software (Waters) was used to collect, to analyse and to process data. When needed, co-injection

1 of samples with standards was used to further confirm analyte identification. Analysis of 3
2 biological replicates was performed. To ensure reproducible retention times, the Hypercarb PGC
3 column was freshly regenerated before the analysis, as described in supplemental methods.

Funding:

This work was supported by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) Institute Strategic Programmes for The Gut Health and Food Safety (BB/J004529/1), Gut Microbes and Health (BB/R012490/1) and Understanding and Exploiting Metabolism (BB/j004561/1), the BBSRC grant BB/P010660/1 and the John Innes Foundation. DL acknowledges a PhD studentship with financial support from the Institute of Food Research (IFR)/Quadram Institute Bioscience (QIB) Extra.

Acknowledgements: The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of We would like to acknowledge Carl Young (Prozomix) for providing one of the recombinant enzymes and Dr. Gerhard Saalbach for assistance with proteomics.

References

Angulo J, Enriquez-Navas PM, Nieto PM. 2010. Ligand-Receptor Binding Affinities from Saturation Transfer Difference (STD) NMR Spectroscopy: The Binding Isotherm of STD Initial Growth Rates. *Chem-Eur J*, 16:7803-7812.
Angulo J, Langpap B, Blume A, Biet T, Meyer B, Krishna NR, Peters H, Palcic MM, Peters T. 2006. Blood group B galactosyltransferase: Insights into substrate binding from NMR experiments. *J Am Chem Soc*, 128:13529-13538.
Bensing BA, Gibson BW, Sullam PM. 2004. The Streptococcus gordonii platelet binding protein GspB undergoes glycosylation independently of export. *J Bacteriol*, 186:638-645.
Bensing BA, Seepersaud R, Yen YT, Sullam PM. 2014. Selective transport by SecA2: an expanding family of customized motor proteins. *Biochim Biophys Acta*, 1843:1674-1686.
Bensing BA, Sullam PM. 2002. An accessory sec locus of Streptococcus gordonii is required for export of the surface protein GspB and for normal levels of binding to human platelets. *Molecular Microbiology*, 44:1081-1094.

Chaze T, Guillot A, Valot B, Langella O, Chamot-Rooke J, Di Guilmi A-M, Trieu-Cuot P, Dramsi S, Mistou M-Y. 2014. O-Glycosylation of the N-terminal region of the serine-rich adhesin Srr1 of Streptococcus agalactiae explored by mass spectrometry. *Mol Cell Proteomics*, 13:2168-2182.
Chen Y, Bensing BA, Seepersaud R, Mi W, Liao M, Jeffrey PD, Shajahan A, Sonon RN, Azadi P, Sullam PM*, et al.* 2018. Unraveling the sequence of cytosolic reactions in the export of GspB adhesin from Streptococcus gordonii. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 293:5360-5373.
Chen Y, Seepersaud R, Bensing BA, Sullam PM, Rapoport TA. 2016. Mechanism of a cytosolic O-glycosyltransferase essential for the synthesis of a bacterial adhesion protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 113:E1190-1199.
Couvigny B, Lapaque N, Rigottier-Gois L, Guillot A, Chat S, Meylheuc T, Kulakauskas S, Rohde M, Mistou M-Y, Renault P*, et al.* 2017. Three glycosylated serine-rich repeat proteins play a pivotal role in adhesion and colonization of the pioneer commensal bacterium, Streptococcus salivarius. *Environ Microbiol*.
D'Urzo N, Malito E, Biancucci M, Bottomley MJ, Maione D, Scarselli M, Martinelli M. 2012. The structure of Clostridium difficile toxin A glucosyltransferase domain bound to Mn2+ and UDP provides insights into glucosyltransferase activity and product release. *FEBS J*, 279:3085-3097.
Duar RM, Lin XB, Zheng J, Martino ME, Grenier T, Pérez-Muñoz ME, Leulier F, Gänzle M, Walter J. 2017. Lifestyles in transition: evolution and natural history of the genus Lactobacillus. *Fems Microbiol Rev*, 41.
Eichler J, Koomey M. 2017. Sweet New Roles for Protein Glycosylation in Prokaryotes. *Trends Microbiol*, 25:662-672.
Etzold S, Kober OI, Mackenzie DA, Tailford LE, Gunning AP, Walshaw J, Hemmings AM, Juge N. 2014. Structural basis for adaptation of lactobacilli to gastrointestinal mucus. *Environ Microbiol*, 16:888-903.
Freeze HH, Hart GW, Schnaar RL. 2017. Glycosylation Precursors. In: rd, Varki A, Cummings RD, Esko JD, Stanley P, Hart GW, Aebi M, Darvill AG, Kinoshita T, Packer NH, et al. editors. *Essentials of Glycobiology*. Cold Spring Harbor (NY). p. 51-63.
Frese SA, Benson AK, Tannock GW, Loach DM, Kim J, Zhang M, Oh PL, Heng NCK, Patil PB, Juge N*, et al.* 2011. The evolution of host specialization in the vertebrate gut symbiont Lactobacillus reuteri. *Plos Genet*, 7:e1001314.
Frese SA, Mackenzie DA, Peterson DA, Schmaltz R, Fangman T, Zhou Y, Zhang C, Benson AK, Cody LA, Mulholland F*, et al.* 2013. Molecular characterization of host-specific biofilm formation in a vertebrate gut symbiont. *Plos Genet*, 9:e1004057.
Jiang Y-L, Jin H, Yang H-B, Zhao R-L, Wang S, Chen Y, Zhou C-Z. 2017. Defining the enzymatic pathway for polymorphic O-glycosylation of the pneumococcal serine-rich repeat protein PsrP. *J Biol Chem*.
Kotarski SF, Savage DC. 1979. Models for study of the specificity by which indigenous lactobacilli adhere to murine gastric epithelia. *Infect Immun*, 26:966-975.
Latousakis D, Juge N. 2018. How Sweet Are Our Gut Beneficial Bacteria? A Focus on Protein Glycosylation in *Lactobacillus*. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 19.
Lee IC, van Swam II, Tomita S, Morsomme P, Rolain T, Hols P, Kleerebezem M, Bron PA. 2014. GtfA and GtfB are both required for protein O-glycosylation in Lactobacillus plantarum. *J Bacteriol*, 196:1671-1682.
Li Y, Huang X, Li J, Zeng J, Zhu F, Fan W, Hu L. 2014. Both GtfA and GtfB are required for SraP glycosylation in Staphylococcus aureus. *Curr Microbiol*, 69:121-126.
Lizcano A, Sanchez CJ, Orihuela CJ. 2012. A role for glycosylated serine-rich repeat proteins in gram-positive bacterial pathogenesis. *Mol Oral Microbiol*, 27:257-269.
Mackenzie DA, Jeffers F, Parker ML, Vibert-Vallet A, Bongaerts RJ, Roos S, Walter J, Juge N. 2010. Strain-specific diversity of mucus-binding proteins in the adhesion and aggregation properties of Lactobacillus reuteri. *Microbiology (Reading, Engl)*, 156:3368-3378.
Mayer M, Meyer B. 1999. Characterization of ligand binding by saturation transfer difference NMR spectroscopy. *Angew Chem Int Edit*, 38:1784-1788.

Oh PL, Benson AK, Peterson DA, Patil PB, Moriyama EN, Roos S, Walter J. 2010. Diversification of the gut symbiont Lactobacillus reuteri as a result of host-driven evolution. *The ISME Journal*, 4:377-387.
Pabst M, Grass J, Fischl R, Leonard R, Jin CS, Hinterkorner G, Borth N, Altmann F. 2010. Nucleotide and Nucleotide Sugar Analysis by Liquid Chromatography-Electrospray Ionization-Mass Spectrometry on Surface-Conditioned Porous Graphitic Carbon. *Anal Chem*, 82:9782-9788.
Piotto M, Saudek V, Sklenar V. 1992. Gradient-Tailored Excitation for Single-Quantum NMR-Spectroscopy of Aqueous Solutions. *J Biomol Nmr*, 2:661-665.
Rabina J, Maki M, Savilahti EM, Jarvinen N, Penttila L, Renkonen R. 2001. Analysis of nucleotide sugars from cell lysates by ion-pair solid-phase extraction and reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography. *Glycoconj J*, 18:799-805.
Rejzek M, Hill L, Hems ES, Kuhaudomlarp S, Wagstaff BA, Field RA. 2017. Profiling of Sugar Nucleotides. *Method Enzymol*, 597:209-238.
Rigel NW, Braunstein M. 2008. A new twist on an old pathway - accessory secretion systems. *Molecular Microbiology*, 69:291-302.
Sanchez CJ, Shivshankar P, Stol K, Trakhtenbroit S, Sullam PM, Sauer K, Hermans PWM, Orihuela CJ. 2010. The pneumococcal serine-rich repeat protein is an intra-species bacterial adhesin that promotes bacterial aggregation in vivo and in biofilms. *PLoS Pathog*, 6:e1001044.
Schäffer C, Messner P. 2017. Emerging facets of prokaryotic glycosylation. *Fems Microbiol Rev*, 41:49-91.
Seepersaud R, Bensing BA, Yen YT, Sullam PM. 2012. The accessory Sec protein Asp2 modulates GlcNAc deposition onto the serine-rich repeat glycoprotein GspB. *J Bacteriol*, 194:5564-5575.
Seepersaud R, Sychantha D, Bensing BA, Clarke AJ, Sullam PM. 2017. O-acetylation of the serine-rich repeat glycoprotein GspB is coordinated with accessory Sec transport. *PLoS Pathog*, 13:e1006558.
Seo HS, Xiong YQ, Sullam PM. 2013. Role of the serine-rich surface glycoprotein Srr1 of Streptococcus agalactiae in the pathogenesis of infective endocarditis. *Plos One*, 8:e64204.
Sequeira S, Kavanaugh D, MacKenzie DA, Šuligoj T, Walpole S, Leclaire C, Gunning AP, Latousakis D, Willats WGT, Angulo J*, et al.* 2018. Structural basis for the role of serine-rich repeat proteins from *Lactobacillus reuteri* in gut microbe–host interactions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
Shi W-W, Jiang Y-L, Zhu F, Yang Y-H, Shao Q-Y, Yang H-B, Ren Y-M, Wu H, Chen Y, Zhou C-Z. 2014. Structure of a novel O-linked N-acetyl-D-glucosamine (O-GlcNAc) transferase, GtfA, reveals insights into the glycosylation of pneumococcal serine-rich repeat adhesins. *J Biol Chem*, 289:20898-20907.
Shivshankar P, Sanchez C, Rose LF, Orihuela CJ. 2009. The Streptococcus pneumoniae adhesin PsrP binds to Keratin 10 on lung cells. *Molecular Microbiology*, 73:663-679.
Siboo IR, Chaffin DO, Rubens CE, Sullam PM. 2008. Characterization of the accessory Sec system of Staphylococcus aureus. *J Bacteriol*, 190:6188-6196.
Takamatsu D, Bensing BA, Sullam PM. 2004. Four proteins encoded in the gspB-secY2A2 operon of Streptococcus gordonii mediate the intracellular glycosylation of the platelet-binding protein GspB. *J Bacteriol*, 186:7100-7111.
Turnock DC, Ferguson MAJ. 2007. Sugar nucleotide pools of Trypanosoma brucei, Trypanosoma cruzi, and Leishmania major. *Eukaryotic Cell*, 6:1450-1463.
Tytgat HLP, de Vos WM. 2016. Sugar Coating the Envelope: Glycoconjugates for Microbe-Host Crosstalk. *Trends Microbiol*, 24:853-861.
Wagstaff BA, Rejzek M, Kuhaudomlarp S, Hill L, Mascia I, Nepogodiev SA, Field RA. In preparation. NDP-β-L-rhamnose biosynthesis across the algal taxonomic groups; an evolutionary perspective.
Wegmann U, MacKenzie DA, Zheng J, Goesmann A, Roos S, Swarbreck D, Walter J, Crossman LC, Juge N. 2015. The pan-genome of Lactobacillus reuteri strains originating from the pig gastrointestinal tract. *BMC Genomics*, 16:1023.
Wu H, Mintz KP, Ladha M, Fives-Taylor PM. 1998. Isolation and characterization of Fap1, a fimbriae-associated adhesin of Streptococcus parasanguis FW213. *Molecular Microbiology*, 28:487-500.

Wu R, Wu H. 2011. A molecular chaperone mediates a two-protein enzyme complex and glycosylation of serine-rich streptococcal adhesins. *J Biol Chem*, 286:34923-34931.
Yen YT, Seepersaud R, Bensing BA, Sullam PM. 2011. Asp2 and Asp3 interact directly with GspB, the export substrate of the Streptococcus gordonii accessory Sec System. *J Bacteriol*, 193:3165-3174.
Zhang H, Zhu F, Yang T, Ding L, Zhou M, Li J, Haslam SM, Dell A, Erlandsen H, Wu H. 2014. The highly conserved domain of unknown function 1792 has a distinct glycosyltransferase fold. *Nat Commun*, 5:4339.
Zhou M, Wu H. 2009. Glycosylation and biogenesis of a family of serine-rich bacterial adhesins. *Microbiology (Reading, Engl)*, 155:317-327.
Zhu F, Erlandsen H, Ding L, Li J, Huang Y, Zhou M, Liang X, Ma J, Wu H. 2011. Structural and functional analysis of a new subfamily of glycosyltransferases required for glycosylation of serine-rich streptococcal adhesins. *J Biol Chem*, 286:27048-27057.
Zhu F, Zhang H, Yang T, Haslam SM, Dell A, Wu H. 2016. Engineering and Dissecting the Glycosylation Pathway of a Streptococcal Serine-rich Repeat Adhesin. *J Biol Chem*, 291:27354-27363.

Figures

Figure 1. Lectin screening of *L. reuteri* SM proteins. A) Western blot analysis of *L. reuteri* 100-23C and ATCC 53608 SM proteins, using *f*-WGA, *f*-RCA and *f*-SNA. The arrow indicates SRRP in *L. reuteri* 100-23C. **B**) Western blot analysis of *L. reuteri* ATCC 53608 SM proteins with *f*-WGA and anti-SRRP-BR$_{53608}$ antibody. **C**) Western blot analysis of *L. reuteri* 100-23C WT, *Δasp2, ΔgtfB* and *Δsrr* mutant SM proteins with *f*-WGA. **D**) Purification of SRRPs by affinity chromatography, using agWGA. SRRPs were eluted with 0.5 M GlcNAc.

Figure 2. LC-MS sugar nucleotide profiling of *L. reuteri* 100-23C and ATCC 53608 strains. The bars represent the standard error of three biological replicates. See also **Table S1** for MRM transitions, retention times and quantity of the sugar nucleotides.

Figure 3. Structural analysis of SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$ glycosylation A) MALDI-ToF analysis of SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$ released glycans found in the 35% ACN elution fraction. **B**) Fragmentation of the 738 Da peak. **C)** Western blot analysis of enzymatically deglycosylated SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$. 1. SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$ (1), treated with α- and β-glucosidase (2), or α- and β- galactosidase (3). **D**) Monosaccharide composition analysis of SRRP$_{100\text{-}23}$ glycans. Extracted ion chromatogram for ions at 204 and 173

Da, characteristic for monosaccharides. See also **Figure S1** for comparison of MALDI-ToF spectra of the fraction containing the released glycans of *L. reuteri* 100-23 WT and *ΔgtfB* mutant.

Figure 4. Structural analysis of $SRRP_{53608}$ glycosylation A) MALDI-ToF analysis of $SRRP_{53608}$ released glycans. **B**) Fragmentation of the 575 Da peak. **C**) Monosaccharide composition analysis of $SRRP_{53608}$ glycans. Extracted ion chromatogram for ions at 204 and 173 Da, characteristic for monosaccharides.

Figure 5. Schematic representation of the accessory SecA2/Y2 clusters from *L. reuteri* 100-23C and ATCC 53608.

Figure 6. Analysis of $GtfC_{100-23}$ and $GtfC_{53608}$ ligand specificity. A-F) Differential scanning fluorimetry (DSF) analysis. **A**) Melt curve of $GtfC_{53608}$ in the presence of increasing concentrations of UDP-GlcNAc. **B**) Tm of $GtfC_{53608}$ in the presence of increasing concentrations of UDP, UDP-Gal, UDP-Glc and UDP-GlcNAc. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean of four technical replicates. **C)** Melt curve of $GtfC_{53608}$ in the presence of 4 mM UDP-GlcNAc, UDP-Glc, UDP-Gal, and UDP. **D**) Melt curve of $GtfC_{100-23C}$ in the presence of 4 mM UDP-GlcNAc, UDP-Glc, UDP-Gal, and UDP. **E**) Melt curves of $GtfC_{53608}$ in the presence of 5 mM Mn^{2+} (left), or 5 mM Mn^{2+} and 4 mM UDP-GlcNAc. **F**) Melt curves of $GtfC_{100-23C}$ in the presence of 5 mM Mn^{2+} (left), or 5 mM Mn^{2+} and 4 mM UDP-Glc. Since no significant difference was observed between the different divalent ions, only Mn^{2+} is shown. **G-L) Saturation Transfer Difference (STD) NMR analysis. G), H), I)** binding epitope maps for the complexes of $GtfC_{100-23}$ with UDP-GlcNAc, UDP-Glc, and UDP-Gal, respectively. Bottom row, **J), K), L)** binding epitope maps for the complexes of $GtfC_{53608}$ with UDP-GlcNAc, UDP-Glc, and UDP-Gal, respectively. See also **Table 1** and **Figure S2** for the competition assays of the sugar nucleotides against $GtfC_{100-23}$ and $GtfC_{53608}$.

Tables

Table 1. Affinity ranking of UDP, UDP-GlcNAc, UDP-Glc, and UDP-Gal for $GtfC_{53608}$ and $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$ from different ^{1}H STD NMR approaches

STD-NMR determination of the ligand affinity of $GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$ and $GtfC_{53608}$				
Ligands	**$GtfC_{53608}$**		**$GtfC_{100\text{-}23}$**	
	K_D (mM)	**Affinity from Competition**	**K_D (mM)**	**Affinity from Competition**
UDP-Glc	**1.8**	+	**0.99**	++++
UDP-GlcNAc	**0.43**	++++	**2.4**	+
UDP-Gal	**1.66**	+	**0.31**	+

Table 2 ^{1}H and ^{13}C chemical shifts of reference standards, glycan released from gSRR1 and glycan units present in intact gSRR1. See also **Suppl Figure S5** and **Table S3** for information on the expression of GtfA, GtfB and GtfC, and glycosylation of gSRR1and **Suppl Figures S5** and **S6** for information on the structural characterisation of the gSRR1 released and native glycans by NMR.

NMR characterisation of the sSRR1 released glycans									
Reference Standards									
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**CH3**	**C=O**
α-GlcNAc	H	5.21	3.88	3.78	3.50	3.86	3.86,3.80	2.06	-
	C	93.70	56.96	73.52	72.91	74.44	63.42	24.77	177.40

β-GlcNAc	H	4.72	3.68	3.55	3.47	3.47	3.92,3.76	2.06	-
	C	97.79	59.54	76.73	72.69	78.81	63.58	25.05	177.65
GlcNAc-ol (*R*)	H	3.64,3.74	4.08	3.97	3.60	3.76	3.66,3.83	2.06	-
	C	63.68	56.58	71.14	73.79	73.93	65.62	24.96	177.35
Glycan released from gSRR1, β-GlcNAc-(1→6)-GlcNAc-ol									
β-GlcNAc(1→ (*B*)	H	4.55	3.75	3.57	3.46	3.47	3.95,3.76	2.07	-
	C	104.45	58.44	76.65	72.81	78.68	63.58	25.09	177.65
→6)GlcNAc-ol (*G*)	H	3.64,3.74	4.08	3.97	3.60	3.84	4.09	2.05	-
	C	63.73	56.55	70.95	73.65	72.49	73.75	24.94	177.35
GlcNAc units present in gSRR1, M = monosaccharide, D = disaccharide side-chain									
t-α-GlcNAc→Ser (*αM*)	H	4.87	3.92	3.72	3.47	3.62	3.84,3.78	~2.05	-
	C	100.61	56.35	73.86	72.68	75.15	63.44	~25.0	~177.0
→6)-α-GlcNAc→Ser (*αD*)	H	4.88	n.d.	n.d	n.d.	n.d.	4.13,3.80	n.d.	n.d.
	C	100.61	n.d.	73.87	72.54	n.d.	71.13	n.d.	-
t-β-GlcNAc(1→ (*βD*)	H	4.54	3.75	3.58	3.47	3.47	3.94,3.77	~2.07	-
	C	104.51	58.41	76.54	72.67	78.74	63.68	~25.2	~177.3

n.d. = not determined