



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Molecular Insights into How the Motions of the  $\beta$ -Barrel and POTRA Domains of BamA Are Coupled for Efficient Function*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/230991/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Csoma, N., Machin, J.M., Whitehouse, J.M. et al. (10 more authors) (Accepted: 2025)  
Molecular Insights into How the Motions of the  $\beta$ -Barrel and POTRA Domains of BamA Are Coupled for Efficient Function. Nature Communications. ISSN: 2041-1723 (In Press)

---

This is an author produced version of an article accepted for publication in , made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**Molecular Insights into How the Motions of the  $\beta$ -Barrel and POTRA Domains of BamA Are Coupled for Efficient Function**

**Naemi Csoma<sup>1,2,\$</sup>, Jonathan M. Machin<sup>3,\$</sup>, James M. Whitehouse<sup>3,\$</sup>, Raquel Rodriguez-Alonso<sup>1,2</sup>, Monika Olejnik<sup>3</sup>, Adam K. Cahill<sup>3</sup>, Seung-Hyun Cho<sup>1,2</sup>, Till F. Schäberle<sup>4,5,6</sup>, Bogdan I. Iorga<sup>2,7</sup>, Neil A. Ranson<sup>3</sup>, Sheena E. Radford<sup>3\*</sup>, Antonio N. Calabrese<sup>3\*</sup>, Jean-François Collet<sup>1,2\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>WELBIO department, WEL Research Institute, avenue Pasteur, 6, 1300 Wavre, Belgium

<sup>2</sup>de Duve Institute, Université catholique de Louvain (UCLouvain), Avenue Hippocrate 75, 1200 Brussels, Belgium

<sup>3</sup>Astbury Centre for Structural Molecular Biology, School of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Insect Biotechnology, Justus-Liebig-University Giessen, 35392 Giessen, Germany

<sup>5</sup>German Center for Infection Research (DZIF), Partner Site Giessen-Marburg-Langen, 35392 Giessen, Germany

<sup>6</sup>Branch for Bioresources, Fraunhofer Institute for Molecular Biology and Applied Ecology (IME), 35392 Giessen, Germany

<sup>7</sup>Université Paris-Saclay, Institut de Chimie des Substances Naturelles, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

<sup>\$</sup> These authors contributed equally

\*Correspondence: s.e.radford@leeds.ac.uk (S.E.R), a.calabrese@leeds.ac.uk (A.N.C),

jfcollet@uclouvain.be (J.-F.C.)

## Abstract

The  $\beta$ -barrel assembly machinery (BAM) inserts  $\beta$ -barrel proteins into the outer membrane of Gram-negative bacteria, forming an essential permeability barrier. The core BAM component, BamA, is a  $\beta$ -barrel protein with an N-terminal periplasmic extension comprising five polypeptide transport-associated (POTRA) domains. Whilst BamA's structure is well characterised, it remains unclear how  $\beta$ -barrel and POTRA domain motions are coordinated. Using BamA variants with mutations in the hinge region between these two domains, we demonstrate that hinge flexibility is required for BAM function. Cryo-electron microscopy suggests that hinge rigidity impairs function by structurally decoupling these domains. A screen for spontaneous suppressors identified a mutation at position T434 in an extracellular loop of BamA, which has been previously shown to suppress BAM defects. Studying this variant provides insights into its function as a general rescue mechanism. Our findings underscore how BamA's sequence has been evolutionarily optimised for efficient function.

## Introduction

The cell envelope of diderm bacteria consists of two membranes that enclose the periplasm, an aqueous, oxidizing compartment containing the peptidoglycan cell wall. The inner membrane is a typical phospholipid bilayer, while the outer membrane exhibits a distinctive composition, with its inner leaflet composed of phospholipids and its outer leaflet consisting of lipopolysaccharides (LPS)<sup>1,2</sup>. The outer membrane plays a major role in maintaining the integrity of the cell, serving both as a permeability barrier against toxic compounds<sup>3</sup> and a load-bearing structure that enables the buildup of periplasmic turgor<sup>4,5</sup>. Two groups of proteins are present in the outer membrane. Lipoproteins, which are globular proteins anchored to the membrane by a lipid moiety<sup>6</sup>, and outer membrane proteins (OMPs) that are integral membrane proteins adopting a  $\beta$ -barrel conformation<sup>7,8</sup>. OMPs are synthesised in the cytoplasm and are secreted, unfolded, into the periplasm via the Sec pathway. They are escorted, unfolded, to the outer membrane by periplasmic chaperones, which deliver them to the  $\beta$ -Barrel Assembly Machinery (BAM) for insertion into the outer membrane<sup>2,9</sup>.

BamA, the central component of the BAM complex, is a 16-stranded  $\beta$ -barrel that belongs to the highly conserved OMP85 superfamily<sup>10-13</sup>. At its N-terminus, BamA features five polypeptide transport-associated (POTRA) domains located in the periplasm. In the bacterium *Escherichia coli*, the BAM holocomplex includes four accessory lipoproteins (BamB, BamC, BamD and BamE) which interact with the POTRA domains<sup>14-16</sup>. BamA and BamD are essential, but all BAM components are necessary for optimal function<sup>10,17,18</sup>.

Several cryo-electron microscopy (cryoEM) and crystal structures have provided detailed insights into the mechanism(s) used by BAM to insert  $\beta$ -barrels into the outer membrane.

67 Central to this mechanism is the ability of BamA to adopt multiple conformations which can  
68 be grouped into two distinct families : an inward-open conformation <sup>19,20</sup>, where the BamA  
69  $\beta$ -barrel is sealed at its lateral gate involving  $\beta$ -strands 1 and 16, and an outward-open  
70 conformation <sup>19,21,22</sup>, in which the lateral gate in BamA opens between  $\beta$ -strands 1 and 16.  
71 Cycling between these conformations is essential for insertion and folding of OMPs <sup>19,23</sup>.  
72 Currently available data suggest that OMP folding is initiated by binding of a sequence in the  
73 C-terminal  $\beta$ -strand of the substrate (known as the  $\beta$ -signal) to the first  $\beta$ -strand ( $\beta$ 1) of  
74 BamA <sup>24,25</sup>. Thereafter, sequential addition of  $\beta$ -strands towards the N-terminus of the  
75 substrate ultimately results in the formation of an asymmetrical hybrid BamA-substrate  
76 barrel in which BamA is found in its outward-open conformation <sup>26,27</sup>. Promoted by outer  
77 membrane tension <sup>26</sup> and BamA-induced membrane destabilization <sup>11,28-31</sup>, the client OMP is  
78 finally released into the membrane. Conformational changes also occur in the POTRA  
79 domains during the OMP folding and assembly cycle: they are located under the barrel,  
80 extending into the periplasm, and occlude access to the lumen of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel when  
81 the lateral gate is open, but move away when the lateral gate is closed, opening a  
82 periplasmic entry pore to the barrel lumen <sup>17,31</sup>.  
83  
84 Despite extensive knowledge about BamA structure and function, many questions remain  
85 regarding its mechanical properties and structural transitions and how these factors relate  
86 to regulation of BAM's foldase activity. For instance, while the function of the lateral gate  
87 and  $\beta$ 1 in initiating OMP folding has been well documented <sup>23,25,32</sup>, and demonstrated by the  
88 bactericidal natural products, darobactin and dynobactin, that bind at this site <sup>33,34</sup>, the  
89 precise contribution of the POTRA domains in this process remains poorly understood.  
90 Additionally, how the movements between the POTRA and  $\beta$ -barrel domains of BamA are

coordinated remains unknown. The rotation of the POTRA domains and associated lipoproteins appears to be coupled with the opening and closing of the lateral gate<sup>19</sup>, but it is still unclear which movement induces the other.

Here, using a BamA variant with mutations in the hinge region between its  $\beta$ -barrel and POTRA domains, in combination with *in vivo*, structural, biochemical and proteomics studies, we obtained mechanistic insights into how motions in the  $\beta$ -barrel domain are coupled to the movement of the POTRA domains throughout the BamA functional cycle. First, we find that introducing an LVPR tetrapeptide in the hinge, which acts to rigidify the linker region between the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel and the POTRA domains, impairs BAM function *in vitro* and in bacteria by causing conformational decoupling between the BamA barrel and its POTRA domains. In contrast, inserting a flexible GSGS sequence had no impact on bacterial growth and only minor effects on BAM function, confirming that maintaining flexibility in the hinge region is necessary for optimal BAM activity. The growth defects we observed with the LVPR insertion are thus mainly due to sequence specific effects on hinge flexibility.

A search for spontaneous suppressors able to rescue the defects caused by the LVPR insertion led to the identification of a BamA mutant in which threonine 434, a residue located on an extracellular loop of the barrel, is replaced by an alanine (BamA<sub>T434A</sub>). Interestingly, mutations affecting T434 have been found previously to suppress various BAM defects, including inhibition by darobactin, a BAM-specific antibiotic, and the absence of BAM accessory lipoproteins<sup>35,36</sup>. Intrigued by the fact that mutating T434 appears to function as a general reset mechanism to rescue compromised BAM function, we characterised BamA<sub>T434A</sub>. Our data suggest that while the T434A mutation does not severely

115 affect BAM folding activity, it results in altered BamA conformational dynamics and  
116 suboptimal adaptation to stress leading to outer membrane defects. Together, our results  
117 demonstrate that the motions of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel and POTRA domains are intricately  
118 coupled, highlighting how evolution has precisely tuned the native BamA sequence to  
119 ensure optimal OMP assembly and maintain outer membrane integrity.

120

121

## Results

We previously reported the identification of a BamA variant (BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>) with decreased assembly function<sup>37</sup>. In this variant, a short peptide (lysine-valine-proline-arginine—LVPR) is introduced into the hinge region between the  $\beta$ -barrel and POTRA domains of BamA (Fig. 1a). This insertion, originally intended to introduce a thrombin cleavage site between the two domains of BamA, was found to be toxic. Cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> displayed a growth defect in rich medium (LB) at 37 °C. Interestingly, however, these cells grow well in minimal medium at 30 °C, where a lower rate of OMP folding into the outer membrane is required, suggesting that the BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> variant cannot cope with a higher flux of substrates<sup>37</sup>. Consequently, we decided to use BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> as a molecular tool to explore the functional importance of the hinge region between the  $\beta$ -barrel and periplasmic domains of BamA and gain mechanistic insights into the conformational dynamics of the BAM complex.

### *Cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> have an impaired outer membrane with decreased OMP levels*

To start our investigation, we assessed the outer membrane integrity of cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> in a range of non-permissive conditions. We found that these cells are more sensitive to large antibiotics (vancomycin, bacitracin, novobiocin, rifampin) and bile salts than bacteria expressing wild-type BamA (Fig. 1b). Given that proper assembly of the outer membrane is crucial for its function as a permeability barrier, increased sensitivity to antibiotics and detergents is indicative of outer membrane assembly defects<sup>38</sup>. Second, we probed the expression levels of LptD, a protein required for LPS insertion into the outer membrane<sup>39-42</sup>; LptD is challenging to fold and is particularly sensitive to BAM malfunction<sup>43-46</sup>. Notably, LptD levels were found to be decreased dramatically in cells expressing



BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> in rich media at 30 °C (Fig. 1c). Next, we used label-free quantitative proteomics to analyse the impact of BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> expression on the entire *E. coli* proteome (Fig. 1d). To circumvent the severe growth defect in rich medium, cells were grown in minimal medium at 30 °C. In the quantitative proteomics experiment, 16 OMPs were detected, and the expression levels of 11 of these decreased in cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>, including the major OMPs OmpA and OmpC, which was confirmed by western blot (Fig. 1c). Together, these results indicate that introducing the LVPR peptide into the hinge region between the  $\beta$ -barrel and POTRA domains of BamA affects the function of BAM, resulting in outer membrane defects and decreased OMP folding. Accumulation of unfolded OMPs occurs when BAM activity is compromised, triggering the SigmaE stress response<sup>35,47,48</sup>. Consistent with this, SigmaE regulon members such as SurA and BepA were found to be more abundant in cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> (Fig. 1d) and activation of SigmaE was confirmed under both growth conditions using a reporter strain (Fig. 1e and Supplementary Fig. 1b). Together, the results show that the insertion of LVPR into the hinge region between the  $\beta$ -barrel and POTRA domains of BamA results in outer membrane assembly defects by compromising BAM function.

#### *Flexibility is required in the hinge region of BamA for optimal activity*

We next asked whether the impairment in BamA's function observed in BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> results from intrinsic features of the LVPR sequence or simply from the addition of a tetrapeptide between the  $\beta$ -barrel domain and periplasmic POTRA domain 5 (POTRA5). Proline residues are known to restrict protein conformational space<sup>49,50</sup>; and thus, it was possible that the impact of the insertion on BamA function was due to restricted flexibility of the hinge region. Interestingly, analysis of the secondary structure of the hinge region in >2000 BamA

homologs revealed that, despite variable amino acid composition, this region is consistently predicted to be disordered, underscoring the critical importance of maintaining its flexibility (Fig. 1f). To test the hinge region's capacity to accommodate the insertion of a tetrapeptide while preserving its flexibility, we replaced LVPR with the Glycine-Serine-Glycine-Serine (GSGS) sequence, generating BamA<sub>GSGS</sub>. Molecular dynamics simulations of NTGS (wild-type), LVPR, and GSGS sequences, as isolated peptide sequences, followed by a dihedral angle distribution analysis of the C $\alpha$  atoms, showed that for the LVPR sequence the dihedral angle distribution is highly restricted, indicating low levels of conformational flexibility. In contrast, NTGS and GSGS exhibit broad dihedral angle distributions, confirming that the presence of these sequences in the hinge are compatible with maintaining flexibility in this region (Fig. 1g). Remarkably, cells expressing BamA<sub>GSGS</sub> exhibit a phenotype similar to that of bacteria expressing wild-type BAM: they grow on rich medium at 37 °C, are resistant to bile salts, and only moderately sensitive to large antibiotics (reduced zone of inhibition in the presence of bacitracin compared to BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>, and no growth inhibition by novobiocin unlike BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>) (Fig. 1b). Furthermore, levels of OmpA, OmpC, and LptD are similar to those observed in wild-type cells, both in rich and minimal media (Fig. 1c and Supplementary Fig. 1a). Finally, the SigmaE response in bacteria expressing BamA<sub>GSGS</sub> is only moderately increased when cells are grown in LB, and does not turn on in minimal media (Fig. 1e and Supplementary Fig. 1b). These findings indicate that inserting a tetrapeptide between the two domains of BamA has only a slight effect on BAM function when the tetrapeptide is flexible, but significantly impairs function when access to conformational space is limited, as in LVPR.

*The activity of BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> is decreased in an in vitro folding assay*

Next, we compared the folding activity of BAM containing either BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> or BamA<sub>GSGS</sub> to complexes containing wild-type BamA using an *in vitro* OMP folding assay with a reconstituted BAM complex<sup>31</sup>. In these experiments, we analysed the folding kinetics of two 8-stranded OMP  $\beta$ -barrels, OmpX and a truncated version of OmpA lacking its periplasmic domain (tOmpA). These experiments showed that inserting the LVPR peptide markedly affects BAM activity: after a three-hour folding period, only about 54% of tOmpA and 30% of OmpX achieved their folded state, compared to 96% and 84% folding efficiency, respectively, with wild-type BamA (Fig. 2a, b and Supplementary Table 1). The GSGS insertion in BamA does not substantially affect BAM's ability to fold tOmpA (75% of tOmpA was folded in presence of BAM<sub>GSGS</sub>), consistent with the *in vivo* results presented above that show wild-type levels of growth for cells expressing BamA<sub>GSGS</sub>. However, no benefits from BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> compared to BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> were observed for the OmpX substrate (Fig. 2b), which could reflect some OMP specificity on BAM's ability to fold its substrates, at least under the conditions used for our *in vitro* folding assay (note that wild-type BAM folds OmpX more slowly than tOmpA, despite both OMPs being 8-stranded (Supplementary Table 2)). Incubation of these OMP substrates with the different BAM complexes for longer periods (overnight) yielded high yields (70-90%) for both proteins, indicating that the mutations introduced into BamA reduce its catalytic efficiency, but do not prevent folding (Supplementary Table 1 and 2). Overall, the *in vitro* data support the *in vivo* observations presented above and suggest that although lengthening the hinge of BamA has an impact on the function of BAM, rigidifying this region is even more deleterious leading to the lethality of the LVPR insertion in rich media.

220 *The  $\beta$ -barrel domain is decoupled from the POTRA domains in BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>*

221

222 To better understand the impact of the hinge insertions on BAM function, we next used  
223 cryoEM to solve the structures of BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> and BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> in dodecyl maltoside (DDM) micelles  
224 to 4.3 Å and 4.2 Å resolution, respectively (Fig. 3a, b and Supplementary Fig.2). The  
225 structures are similar, including the subunit interaction interface (fitted model RMSD: 2.2 Å,  
226 Fig. 3c), although the inserted hinge region and the base of the barrel around the insert ( $\beta$ 1-  
227 3) are more poorly resolved (Supplementary Fig. 3). Strikingly, while the periplasmic  
228 lipoproteins and BamA's POTRA domains are arranged in a BAM outward-open  
229 conformation with POTRA5 obscuring the base of the  $\beta$ -barrel (Fig. 3d, Supplementary Fig.  
230 2), the BamA transmembrane barrel resembles the inward-open conformation with a closed  
231 lateral gate (Fig. 3d-e). Although the barrel's lateral gate is unambiguously closed, the base  
232 of the barrel is narrower than in the canonical inward-open conformation, with BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>  
233 being more constricted than BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> (Fig. 3e, Supplementary Fig. 2). This is likely due to  
234 constraints imposed by the relative rigidity of the LVPR insert compared to the GSGS insert  
235 that prevents a full relaxation to the lateral gate closed conformation. At low contour levels  
236 there is also evidence of a subpopulation of particles with a narrower barrel in the BAM<sub>GSGS</sub>  
237 density, although this was too weak to separate via classification (Supplementary Fig. 3),  
238 further indicating the highly flexible nature of the GSGS linker. The results are strikingly  
239 different to the structure of wild-type BAM in DDM micelles obtained by cryoEM, which  
240 adopts an outward-open conformation<sup>21,51</sup>, and of BAM in DDM micelles in the presence of  
241 the BAM inhibitor, darobactin B, in which BamA adopts a lateral closed conformation in  
242 which the POTRA domains are rotated to block the entrance to the BamA barrel in a  
243 canonical inward-open conformation<sup>51</sup>. Hence, our result show that increasing the length of  
244 the linker between the BamA barrel and POTRA5 leads to structural uncoupling between the

BamA barrel and its POTRA domains, facilitating their independent motion. While a previously published cryoEM structure of wild-type BAM also displayed an outward-open conformation of the periplasmic domains but with a closed lateral gate<sup>52</sup>, in this structure the base of the barrel and extracellular loop 3 remain in their outward-open conformation, with only the highly flexible extracellular loops 1 and 2 shifting to the inward-open state (Supplementary Fig. 2). This observation indicates that the hinge insertion is necessary to fully decouple the motion of the two domains. It is important to note that we have chosen to focus our discussion here on the clear differences observed between the structures determined for BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> and BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> and their relationship to other available BAM structures, especially with respect to the status of the lateral gate and the orientation of the periplasmic domains. There may be additional small differences in these structures, for example as a result of subtle variations in lipoprotein orientation, that could be functionally important, but these differences are at the resolution limit of the cryoEM maps and hence are not highlighted or discussed further. Higher resolution maps would be needed to resolve the significance of any such smaller changes between the different structures.

#### *A mutation in extracellular loop 1 suppresses the effect of BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>*

We next embarked on a search for spontaneous suppressors that could restore the growth defect of cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> under non-permissive conditions (LB, 42 °C). One such mutant (BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>\*) mapped to *bamA*; and, upon sequencing, we discovered the replacement of threonine 434 by an alanine (Fig. 4a). T434 is located in extracellular loop 1 (eL1) between  $\beta$ 1-  $\beta$ 2 of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel, near the seam of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel involving  $\beta$ -strands  $\beta$ 1 and  $\beta$ 16. When the lateral gate is closed<sup>19,20</sup>, but not when it is open<sup>19,21,22</sup>, the hydroxyl side chain of T434 forms a hydrogen bond with a backbone hydrogen of F804, a

residue that lies in the C-terminal  $\beta$ -strand ( $\beta$ 16) of the BamA barrel. Replacement of T434 by an alanine will prevent the formation of this hydrogen bond.

Cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>\* have no growth defects in rich medium at 37 °C (Fig. 4b) and partially restore levels of OmpA, OmpC, and LptD (Fig. 1c). They exhibit only modest outer membrane permeability to antibiotics and detergents (Fig. 4b). However, SigmaE activity is still upregulated and only weakly decreased compared with bacteria expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> (Fig. 4c). Resolving the cryoEM structure of BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>\* confirmed that the T434A substitution had no major impact on the overall structure of BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> (model RMSD: 1.0 Å, Fig. 4d). It is remarkable that a single amino acid substitution in eL1 can restore the functional defects caused by an insertion in the hinge region of BamA, located ~3 nm away in the periplasm. This suggests a communication between this loop and the hinge region, where alterations in one region can compensate for the disruptions in the other.

#### *Mutation of threonine 434 results in an altered outer membrane and affects the conformational plasticity of BAM*

Interestingly, two previous studies have reported mutations that involve T434 which also act as suppressors of loss of BAM function. First, the T434A mutation was identified in several different triple mutants that rescue BAM from darobactin inhibition<sup>35</sup>. Darobactin is a novel class of antibiotic that exerts its mechanism of action by mimicking the  $\beta$ -signal of OMP  $\beta$ -barrels, hydrogen bonding to the  $\beta$ 1 strand of BamA<sup>33</sup>. This interaction stabilises the inward-open conformation of BamA, and inhibits the essential docking of the OMP  $\beta$ -signal to the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel required to initiate OMP folding at the BAM complex<sup>35,51</sup>. Second, a BamA mutant harboring a T434I mutation was identified in a search for suppressors of the

295  $\Delta bamB \Delta bamE$  synthetic lethal phenotype<sup>36</sup>. Intrigued by the ability of mutations affecting  
296 T434 to rescue various BAM defects, we introduced the T434A mutation into wild-type  
297 BamA (named BamA<sub>T434A</sub>) to investigate its impact on BAM activity and gain insights into  
298 how it can compensate for the effects of the LVPR insertion in the hinge region.  
299  
300 The introduction of the T434A substitution into wild-type BamA was found to have no  
301 impact on BAM activity *in vitro* as BAM<sub>T434A</sub> did not exhibit any folding defects in our *in vitro*  
302 folding assay (Fig. 5a, Supplementary Fig. 7). The point-mutation is also well tolerated *in vivo*  
303 as cells expressing BamA<sub>T434A</sub> did not exhibit any growth defects under the tested conditions  
304 (Fig. 4b, top) and were as sensitive to large antibiotics as cells expressing wild-type BamA  
305 (Fig. 4b, lower). Additionally, there was no significant change in the abundance of LptD,  
306 OmpA or OmpC as judged by western blotting (Fig. 1c) nor of most OMPs (apart from small  
307 changes in OmpX and MipA levels) as detected by proteomic analysis (Supplementary Fig.  
308 8). Thus, BAM appears to tolerate the T434A substitution in BamA without major effects on  
309 its function. Interestingly, we found that BamA<sub>T434A</sub> was more efficient than the wild type at  
310 folding tOmpA and OmpX in the presence of darobactin B, both in terms of initial rate of  
311 OMP folding (Fig. 5a and Supplementary Fig. 7) and in the yield of folded OMP after  
312 overnight incubation (63% to 80% and 5% to 37%, respectively (Supplementary Table 3)).  
313 These findings align with results obtained *in vivo*<sup>35</sup> and suggest that the T434A substitution  
314 is a major contributor to the resistance phenotype observed with darobactin.  
315  
316 However, while the T434A substitution did not severely impact BAM function, it did affect  
317 outer membrane integrity. Cells expressing BamA<sub>T434A</sub> were more sensitive to SDS-EDTA at  
318 37 °C and deoxycholate at 30 °C compared to cells expressing wild-type BamA, indicating

319 membrane defects (Fig. 5b). Interestingly, these cells were more resistant to vancomycin at  
320 15 °C compared to the wild type (Fig. 5c). Sensitivity to vancomycin at this temperature is  
321 thought to result from transient cracks in the brittle LPS layer<sup>53,54</sup>. Thus, increased  
322 resistance to vancomycin also suggests altered outer membrane properties due to the  
323 T434A mutation. Together, these observations suggest that although the T434A mutation  
324 has no impact on the function of BAM in normal growth conditions, it impairs the  
325 adaptability of the complex to some stresses.

326

327 Preventing the formation of the hydrogen bond between T434 and F804 likely changes the  
328 conformational dynamics of BamA, allowing this mutation to mitigate toxic mechanisms  
329 such as those caused by hinge insertion and inhibition with darobactin while altering BAM's  
330 optimal functioning. To investigate the conformational dynamics of BAM and BAM variants,  
331 we utilised differential hydrogen-deuterium exchange mass spectrometry (HDX-MS)  
332 (Methods). The rate and extent of deuterium exchange in an HDX-MS experiment are  
333 determined by the solvent accessibility and intra-protein hydrogen bonding of each residue.  
334 Consequently, HDX-MS can reveal subtle changes in the conformational dynamics of  
335 proteins and protein assemblies<sup>55</sup>. Significant differences were observed in the extent of  
336 deuterium incorporation in BAM<sub>T434A</sub> and wild-type BAM, suggesting that this single residue  
337 substitution results in altered conformational dynamics across the complex (Fig. 6a, b).  
338 Notably, BamB, the POTRA domains (POTRA2/3), and eL6 of BamA were significantly more  
339 protected from hydrogen-deuterium exchange in BAM<sub>T434A</sub> compared with wild-type BAM  
340 complexes, suggesting reduced conformational flexibility or reduced solvent accessibility in  
341 the mutant complex. The alterations in the dynamics of eL6 are of particular interest,  
342 considering the high conservation of residues 675-700 in this loop among members of the



OMP85 superfamily<sup>56,57</sup> and its critical role in BAM function<sup>58</sup>. The large distance separating residue 434 and those affected by its substitution adds further weight to the observation that residue 434 must be part of an allosteric network connecting the status of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel domain not only to the location of its POTRA domains (Fig. 6a, b), but also to the associated BamB lipoprotein. Further to this, comparative HDX-MS of BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> with wild-type BAM demonstrates that the insertion of LVPR also perturbs BAM dynamics (Fig. 6c), with the LVPR insertion resulting in increased protection from hydrogen exchange in the periplasmic region of the protein (specifically POTRA2, BamB and BamD). Combined, this analysis suggests that BAM conformational dynamics is precisely controlled, and that mutations/insertions in the BamA sequence in eL1 and in the  $\beta$ -barrel-POTRA5 linker can perturb the precise molecular motions of, and intermolecular interactions within, BAM that are critical for its foldase function.

## Discussion

Understanding the molecular details of how BAM inserts OMPs into the bacterial outer membrane has been the subject of intensive research since the discovery of the complex in the early 2000s<sup>10,14,59</sup>. Significant insights into the mechanism of BAM have been gained through structural resolution of the complex in crystals and using cryoEM, revealing the complex to adopt varied conformations which can be grouped into two distinct categories: inward-open, in which the BamA lateral gate is closed and the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel is accessible from the periplasm, and outward-open wherein the lateral gate is open and access to the BamA barrel from the periplasm blocked by its POTRA5 domain<sup>19-22</sup>. In parallel, biochemical studies designed to capture OMP folding intermediates on the BAM complex<sup>25-27,32</sup>, and other approaches<sup>31,51,60,61</sup> have revealed details of how BAM facilitates OMP folding into the

368 outer membrane via growth of the OMP barrel, templated from the BamA  $\beta$ 1 strand in the  
369 lateral gate. However, many questions remain unresolved, particularly concerning how the  
370 conformational changes of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel are linked to, and coordinated with,  
371 movement of its POTRA domains and associated BamB-E lipoproteins that reside in the  
372 periplasm. Recently, BAM lipoproteins were found to play a crucial role in membrane  
373 destabilisation, presumably facilitating OMP insertion into the outer membrane when  
374 released from BAM<sup>31</sup>. While the dynamics and flexibility of BamA's POTRA domains have  
375 been studied in detail and shown to be critical for BAM activity<sup>17,28,62</sup>, how POTRA domain  
376 movements are coordinated with motions at the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel to achieve BAM function  
377 remains elusive.

378

379 Here, we show that the flexibility between the POTRA domains and the  $\beta$ -barrel domain of  
380 BamA is crucial for the optimal functionality of the complex. We show that inserting a rigid  
381 tetrapeptide (LVPR) into the hinge region between POTRA5 and the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel impairs  
382 BAM activity *in vitro* and in bacteria, whereas adding a flexible GSGS insertion at the same  
383 site has little effect on BAM activity. This suggests that the rigidity imposed by the LVPR  
384 insertion is responsible for the observed severe phenotype, but the molecular mechanism  
385 underlying this observation remains unclear. Notably, our findings with BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> align with  
386 previous studies showing that tethering POTRA5 to the base of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel—thereby  
387 reducing flexibility between the POTRA and  $\beta$ -barrel domains—is lethal *in vivo*<sup>19</sup> and results  
388 in substantially decreased BAM-assisted OMP folding activity *in vitro*<sup>31</sup>. Furthermore, our  
389 structural data show that maintaining a flexible hinge region between POTRA5 and the  
390 BamA  $\beta$ -barrel aids in coordinating the motions between the barrel and POTRA domains in  
391 BamA, as the insertion of the rigid LVPR sequence leads to new states in which coordination

of the movement of the lateral gate and rotation of POTRA5 are uncoupled. Given the resolution of our cryoEM maps (4.3 Å and 4.2 Å) we cannot rule out that subtle structural differences that are at, or beyond, the resolution limit of our cryoEM maps may be involved in the structural coupling of the BamA lateral gate domain structure and the organisation of the POTRA domains and the BamB, C, D, E lipoproteins. Additional mechanistic studies are needed to determine precisely how signals are transduced between the POTRA domains and the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel and to clarify the exact role of the hinge sequence in this coordination. For example, it remains unclear whether insertion in the hinge region could impact the binding of BAM to SurA, the chaperone that delivers OMPs to the BAM complex<sup>63</sup>, or BepA, a chaperone/protease that plays a key role in OM quality control<sup>64</sup>. Indeed, recent cryoEM structures have shown that SurA forms extensive interactions with POTRA1, POTRA2 and BamB<sup>63,65</sup>, whereas evidence from crosslinking suggests that BepA engages in interactions with POTRA3, BamC and BamD<sup>64</sup>. All of the interprotein contacts mediating recruitment of these key folding factors to BAM could be affected by altering BAM dynamics and the coupling of the motions of the BamA lateral gate to those of the POTRA domains and their associated lipoproteins. Whilst here we show that the LVPR insertion results in a reduction in folding efficiency in an *in vitro* BAM folding assay, future studies investigating how altering BAM dynamics impacts on engagement with these folding factors are needed to answer these questions. Such studies could include, for example, a comprehensive biophysical characterization of the affinities and nature of the interactions between BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> with SurA/BepA, as alterations in these interactions could be determinants of the growth defects observed in the BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> strain.

Another key finding of our work is the identification of the T434A suppressor mutation, located on eL1 of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel, which can partially restore defects caused by the distal insertion of the sequence LVPR in the hinge region. Remarkably, mutations affecting T434 have previously been shown to rescue BAM from two distinct stresses. First, the T434I mutation was identified as a suppressor of the conditionally lethal  $\Delta bamB \Delta bamE$  double mutant, whose lethality arises from BamA being jammed by the lipoprotein stress sensor RcsF, likely locking BamA in the inward-open conformation<sup>36,37</sup>. Second, a T434A mutation was found in two different sets of three mutations capable of rescuing BAM from the inhibitory effects of darobactin A, a  $\beta$ -strand mimetic that binds to  $\beta 1$  at the BamA lateral gate, preventing its opening and shifting the equilibrium of the BAM complex toward the inward-open conformation<sup>33,35,51</sup>. Confirming these results and the direct role of T434 in the allosteric control network of BamA, we found through an *in vitro* folding assay that BAM<sub>T434A</sub> can fold the OMPs, tOmpA and OmpX, in the presence of darobactin B, albeit with reduced efficiency compared to that in the absence of darobactin. Thus, in both cases — the  $\Delta bamB \Delta bamE$  mutant and darobactin inhibition — the dynamic, coordinated cycling of BAM is disrupted, but can be restored by mutating T434, similar to the observations presented here for BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>. Overall, therefore, the T434 mutation seems to act as a reset button, restoring BAM activity in the face of various defects. A hydrogen bond between the sidechain of T434 and the mainchain of F804 in  $\beta 16$  of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel, is disrupted by the T434A mutation. We propose that this facilitates opening of the lateral gate, thereby helping to rescue compromised BAM function.

Further supporting the idea that the T434A mutation modifies the dynamics of the BAM complex, HDX-MS results revealed that eL6 of the BamA  $\beta$ -barrel is less accessible to solvent

439 and hence stabilised in BAM<sub>T434A</sub> compared to the wild type. This impact on eL6 is  
440 interesting given the conservation of this loop in all members of the OMP85 superfamily and  
441 the physiological importance of eL6 in BamA, which was shown to be important for OMP  
442 substrate insertion<sup>56,58</sup>. Finally, the observation of increased protection from hydrogen  
443 exchange of residues that reside distal to T434, including residues in POTRA2/3 and BamB  
444 that lie more than 4 nm from T434, start to reveal an allosteric coupling mechanism that  
445 spans the length of the entire BAM complex. Our data show that both the T434A mutation  
446 and LVPR insertion modulate BAM dynamics in disparate regions of the complex distal to  
447 the sites of modification, suggesting different allosteric impacts on BAM dynamics.  
448 Combined with the impacts of the T434A and LVPR variants on BAM function, this suggests a  
449 functional role for such an allosteric network, although the precise molecular details of such  
450 allosteric coupling remain to be discovered.

451

452 If the T434A mutation provides a functional advantage by rescuing BAM from different  
453 blockages, why has it not been selected by evolution? The answer may lie in the results of  
454 our phenotypic assays, where we compared the behaviour of cells expressing BamA<sub>T434A</sub> to  
455 that of wild-type cells. Notably, cells expressing BamA<sub>T434A</sub> show increased sensitivity to SDS-  
456 EDTA and deoxycholate, indicating altered outer membrane properties, likely due to  
457 suboptimal activity of BamA<sub>T434A</sub> under these conditions. Additionally, these cells exhibit  
458 increased resistance to vancomycin at 15 °C, further supporting the idea of modified  
459 BamA<sub>T434A</sub> function. At lower temperatures, cells are generally more sensitive to vancomycin  
460 due to cold-induced transient cracks in the brittle LPS layer<sup>53,54</sup>. They also adapt by  
461 modifying their phospholipid composition, decreasing the length and saturation of acyl  
462 chains to maintain membrane fluidity<sup>66</sup>. Thus, the increased resistance to vancomycin likely

results from altered BamA<sub>T434A</sub> activity compared to the wild type. Together, these observations suggest that in the wide variety of conditions that Gram-negative bacteria encounter, the fitness cost of expressing BamA<sub>T434A</sub> likely outweighs any potential benefits of heightened ability to survive under different growth conditions. These findings are reminiscent of previous findings on the essential *E. coli* chaperone, GroEL, which akin to BAM, has also evolved to fold a diversity of substrates. Specialisation of the GroEL sequence towards enhanced folding of a single substrate was also found to compromise the folding of others<sup>67,68</sup>. This underscores the delicate balance required to fine-tune the activity of essential proteins – BamA and GroEL – for bacterial growth and survival and illustrates the compromises inherent in evolutionary adaptations.

## Methods

### *Media*

M9 minimal media was prepared with 1X solution of M9 salts (MP Biomedicals) and supplemented with 0.2% (w/v) glucose, 1 mM MgSO<sub>4</sub>, 0.1 mM CaCl<sub>2</sub>.

### *Bacterial strains, plasmids, and primers*

Details of the bacterial strains, plasmids and primers used in this study are listed in Supplementary Table 4-6, respectively. MG1655 was used as the wild-type strain throughout this study. To delete *bamA* from the chromosome, we followed the same workflow as previously described<sup>37</sup>. The plasmid pBamA<sub>GSGS</sub> was generated by site-directed mutagenesis using primers “RRA93-bamA GSGS-F” and “RRA94-bamA GSGS-R”, and pBamA as template. The plasmid pNCA162 was generated by mutagenesis using primers “BamA hinge F” and BamA hinge R” and pJH114 as a template. The T434A point mutation was introduced by site-directed mutagenesis using primers “RRA97-BamAT434A-F” and “RRA98-BamAT434A-R”.

### *Suppressor selection*

To select for BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> suppressor mutations, 0.1 mL of an overnight culture of SEN1772 grown in M9 minimal medium was plated onto LB agar. Bacterial colonies with spontaneous BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> mutations appeared after overnight incubation at 42 °C. The BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> containing plasmid (with spontaneous mutations) was isolated from the bacteria using the Monarch Plasmid Miniprep Kit (New England BioLabs). DNA sequencing was performed using primers against the gene of interest, *bamA* (Eurofins). Plasmids carrying the suppressor mutation in

502 *bamA*<sub>L<sup>VPR</sup></sub> were transformed into a DH300 strain where the chromosomal *bamA* was deleted  
503 as described above.

504

#### 505 *Spotting assay for growth*

506

507 Cells were grown in LB medium at 30 °C until they reached an OD<sub>600</sub> of 0.5. Ten-fold serial  
508 dilutions were made in LB, and the cells were plated onto LB or MacConkey agar, and  
509 incubated at 30 °C or 37 °C. For sensitivity to deoxycholate or vancomycin, cells were grown  
510 in LB medium at 37 °C until they reached an OD<sub>600</sub> of 0.5. Ten-fold serial dilutions were  
511 made in LB and 2 µL of culture was plated onto LB agar plates containing 15 µg mL<sup>-1</sup>  
512 vancomycin or 1% deoxycholate, and plates were incubated at 15 °C or 30 °C, respectively.

513

514 SDS-EDTA gradient plates were prepared by pouring 25 mL of LB agar containing 0.5% (w/v)  
515 of SDS in a tilted squared petri dish. Once the layer was dry, the plate was laid flat and  
516 25 mL of LB agar containing the maximum concentration of the gradient was poured (0.5%  
517 (w/v) SDS and 0.4 mM EDTA). Cells were grown in LB medium at 37 °C until they reached an  
518 OD<sub>600</sub> of 0.5. 2 µL of culture was directly spotted onto the gradient plate. Plates were  
519 incubated at 37 °C.

520 Uncropped images of the plates are available in the Source Data file.

#### 521 *Sensidisc assays*

522

523 BBL Sensi-Disc Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test Discs (BBL) were used to test strain  
524 sensitivity to bacitracin (10 IU), rifampin (25 µg), vancomycin (30 µg) or novobiocin (5 µg).  
525 Disks containing the compounds at the quantities indicated were used in disk diffusion  
526 assays as follows. A 0.1 mL inoculum taken from overnight cultures grown in LB was mixed



with 3 mL of LB top agar (LB with 0.75% (w/v) agar) and poured over an LB agar plate. The disks containing antibiotics were placed on top of the LB top agar, and the plates were incubated overnight at 30 °C. The diameter of the zone of inhibition of growth around each disk was recorded in millimeters. Data from four biologically independent replicates were acquired.

### *Western blot analysis*

Cells were grown in LB media at 30 °C to an OD<sub>600</sub> of 0.5 and the proteins were precipitated by adding 10% (w/v) trichloroacetic acid (TCA). The pellets were washed with acetone and finally solubilised in 50 µL of SDS-sample buffer. Samples were boiled and loaded onto a 4-12% bis-Tris gel (Nupage, Invitrogen) and MOPS was used as a running buffer. After transfer of the proteins from the SDS-PAGE gel onto a nitrocellulose membrane, the membrane was blocked with 5% (w/v) skim milk in TBS (25 mM Tris, 3 mM KCl, 140 mM NaCl, pH 7.4) supplemented with 0.1% (v/v) Tween 20 (TBS-T). Membranes were then incubated with primary antibodies diluted in TBS-T, 1% (w/v) skim milk: anti-LptD (Shin-ichi Matsuyama) (1/5,000 dilution), anti-BamA (homemade)<sup>37</sup> (1/10,000 dilution), anti-OmpA (L4, Bernstein)<sup>69</sup> (1/5,000 dilution) or anti-OmpC (Gentaur A64454) (1/5,000 dilution). After incubation with primary antibody and washes with TBS-T, the membrane was incubated with horseradish peroxidase (HRP) conjugated donkey anti-rabbit IgG (Cytiva NA934) (1/10,000 dilution) in TBST-T 5% (w/v) skimmed milk. The membranes were washed, and the labeled protein was detected using a chemiluminescent HRP substrate (Immobilon, Millipore). Western blots were visualised using a CCD camera (ImageQuant 800, Cytiva). Uncropped and unprocessed images of the blots, as well as replicates, are available in the Source Data file.

552

553 *Proteomics*

554

555 Cells were either grown in 100 mL M9 glucose minimal medium at 30 °C (SEN1603 and  
556 SEN1722) or in 100 mL LB medium at 37 °C (NCAs580 and NCAs584) until an OD<sub>600</sub> of 0.8.  
557 Cells were harvested by centrifugation at 5,000 x *g* for 20 min at 4 °C. OM extracts were  
558 prepared by suspending cell pellet in 1 mL TSE buffer (0.2 M Tris (pH 8), 0.5 M sucrose,  
559 1 mM EDTA). Cells were incubated in TSE buffer on ice for 30 min, transferred to a 2 mL  
560 microcentrifuge tube, and centrifuged at 18,000 x *g* for 30 min at 4 °C. Supernatants were  
561 removed to a new microcentrifuge tube. The outer membrane fraction was collected by  
562 ultracentrifugation at 100,000 x *g* for 1 h. The pellet contained the OM extract and the  
563 proteins were resuspended in 100 µL of 1% (v/v) DDM. The protein concentration was  
564 measured by Bicinchoninic acid (BCA) assay. The proteins were precipitated with ice cold  
565 ethanol and the protein pellet suspended in Rapigest (Waters) for tryptic digestion. Digested  
566 material was analysed in Data-Dependent Acquisition mode on an Orbitrap Velos  
567 (comparing BamA and BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> strains) or Orbitrap Eclipse (comparing BamA and  
568 BamA<sub>T434A</sub> strains). For experiments using the Orbitrap Velos, peptides were analysed using  
569 an EASY-nLC 1000 Liquid Chromatograph (Thermo Fisher Scientific) connected to a custom-  
570 made 30-cm capillary emitter column (75 µm inner diameter, 3 µm Reprosil-Pur 120 C18  
571 media). Mass spectrometry analysis was performed on a linear quadrupole ion trap -  
572 orbitrap (LTQ-Orbitrap) Velos mass spectrometer (Thermo). The total acquisition time was  
573 set to 90 minutes, with a gradient of 3-22% (v/v) acetonitrile in 0.1% formic acid. For the  
574 survey scan, the resolving power was set at 60,000 with a scan range of 305-1350 amu. Data  
575 acquisition was performed in data-dependent analysis mode. MS/MS data were obtained by  
576 fragmenting up to the twenty most intense ions in the linear ion trap. For experiments using

the Orbitrap Eclipse, peptides were separated using a Vanquish Neo LC (Thermo Fisher Scientific) system. The peptides were trapped on a PepMap Neo C18 trap cartridge (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 5  $\mu\text{m}$  particle size, 300  $\mu\text{m}$   $\times$  0.5 cm) before separation using an Easy-spray reverse-phase column (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 2  $\mu\text{m}$  particle size, 75  $\mu\text{m}$   $\times$  500 mm). Peptides were separated by gradient elution of 2–40% (v/v) solvent B (0.1% (v/v) formic acid in acetonitrile) in solvent A (0.1% (v/v) formic acid in water) over 80 min at 250 nL min<sup>-1</sup>. The eluate was infused into an Orbitrap Eclipse mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) operating in positive-ion mode. Data acquisition was performed in data-dependent analysis mode. Each high-resolution full scan ( $m/z$  380–1,400,  $R$  = 60,000) was followed by high-resolution product ion scans ( $R$  = 30,000), with a stepped normalised higher energy collision induced dissociation energies of 21%, 26% and 31%. A cycle time of 3 s was used. Dynamic exclusion of 60 s was used.

589

Data were searched against the *E. coli* K12 proteome (MaxQuant v2.4.2.0) and protein abundance changes quantified by label free quantification (statistical analyses performed using Perseus v2.0.10.0), employing a false discovery rate (FDR) of 0.05 and  $s_0$  value of 0.1. Replicate measurements from three independent grows were analysed. Raw data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE<sup>70</sup> partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD057225.

596

#### 597 *Reporting SigmaE stress response activation*

598

Stress responses were monitored by measuring  $\beta$ -galactosidase activity as previously described<sup>71</sup>. To monitor the impact of the LVPR, GSGS, LVPR\* or T434A insertions in BamA on the SigmaE stress response, cells were grown overnight in LB or in M9 minimal media at

30 °C. Overnight cultures were diluted 1:250 (in M9) or 1:500 (in LB) and harvested once an OD<sub>600</sub> of 0.5 was reached. Twenty microliters of cell suspension was transferred to a 48-well plate and this was frozen at -20 °C until processing. For  $\beta$ -galactosidase measurement, the plates were thawed and 80  $\mu$ L of permeabilization solution (100 mM Na<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub>, 20 mM KCl, 2 mM MgSO<sub>4</sub>, 5.4  $\mu$ L/mL  $\beta$ -mercaptoethanol, 0.8 mg/mL hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide, 0.4 mg/mL sodium deoxycholate) was added. Plates were incubated for 60 min at 30 °C. Then, 600  $\mu$ L of substrate solution (60 mM Na<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub>, 40 mM NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 1 mg/mL o-nitrophenyl- $\beta$ -D-galactoside, 2.7  $\mu$ L/mL  $\beta$ -mercaptoethanol) was added. The reaction was stopped by the addition of 700  $\mu$ L of 1 M Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>. Samples were centrifuged to remove cell debris and 500  $\mu$ L of supernatant was moved to a new 48-well plate. The optical density was measured at 420 nm using a BioTek Synergy 1 plate reader (software: Gen5 2.06). The standardised amount of  $\beta$ -galactosidase activity was reported in Miller units<sup>71</sup>. 5 biological replicates (for LB) or 3 biological replicates (for M9) were performed, and data are reported as mean values +/- standard error of the mean (SEM). P-values were evaluated by a mixed model, with random plate effect, and multiple comparisons with adjustment by the Dunnett method. Graphs were generated with GraphPad Prism 9 software and statistical analysis were done on JMP Pro v.17.2.0.

#### *AlphaFold models of BamA homologs and analysis of secondary structure in the hinge region*

Our initial dataset included 3992 complete RefSeq bacterial genomes (one for each species) covering 34 phyla, each one being the RefSeq reference or representative genome for the corresponding species (Supplementary Data 1). Based on the gene annotation in the genomes, 2179 complete *bamA* genes were identified (one copy in 2085 genomes, two

copies in 92 genomes and three copies in 2 genomes). There were 23 duplicate accessions, which were removed. The remaining 2156 accessions were queried against UniProt, the corresponding accessions being retrieved for 765 of them (Supplementary Data 2). Among these, AlphaFold2 models were available in the AlphaFold Protein Structure Database at the EMBL-EBI [<https://alphafold.ebi.ac.uk/>] for only 761 entries. We computed locally the remaining 1395 AlphaFold2 models, using a local implementation of AlphaFold <sup>72</sup> based on MMseqs2 <sup>73</sup> and ColabFold <sup>74</sup>. The secondary structure of all models was analysed using DSSP version 2.2.1 <sup>75</sup>. The region corresponding to residues 413-432 in BamA from *E. coli* was extracted and used for the generation of sequence and secondary structure conservation plots using a local implementation of Weblogo version 3.7.12 <sup>76</sup>. All files were deposited in the repository [<https://github.com/lorgaLab/BamAset>] [<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13986908>] <sup>77</sup>.

#### *Molecular dynamics simulations*

Three-dimensional models of BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> and BamA<sub>GSGS</sub> were built with MODELLER 10.0 <sup>78</sup> using the structure of WT BamA (PDB 5LJO <sup>21</sup>) as a template. The tetrapeptides NTGS, LVPR and GSGS were extracted from WT BamA, BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> and BamA<sub>GSGS</sub>, respectively. Molecular dynamics simulations were performed using GROMACS 2020.3 <sup>79</sup> and the AMBER99SB-ILDN force field <sup>80</sup>. Each tetrapeptide was placed in a cubic periodic box of TIP3P waters, with a minimum distance of 1.0 nm on each side. The simulation box, obtained after hydration and neutralization with Na<sup>+</sup> and Cl<sup>-</sup> ions to physiological ionic strength (150 mM), was energy-minimized until convergence using a steepest descents algorithm to remove close contacts of water molecules with the solute. Molecular dynamics simulations with position restraints on

the solute atoms were then performed for 100 ps (50 ps NVT and 50 ps NPT) to relax the water molecules around the solute, followed by the production run of 1  $\mu$ s. During the position restraints and production runs, the Parrinello-Rahman and V-rescale methods were used for pressure and temperature coupling, respectively. Electrostatics were calculated with the particle mesh Ewald method. The P-LINCS algorithm was used to constrain bond lengths, and a time step of 2 fs was used throughout. All production simulations were performed using constant temperature, pressure, and number of particles (NPT) and periodic boundary conditions. The cut-off distance for Lennard-Jones interactions and electrostatic interactions were both set at 1.0 nm. The dihedral angle distribution was extracted using the *gmx angle* module implemented in GROMACS 2020.3 and plotted with Xmgrace. All files were deposited in the repository [<https://github.com/IorgaLab/BamAset>] [<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13986908>] <sup>77</sup>. The molecular dynamics checklist can be found in Supplementary Table 7.

#### *OMP purification*

OMP substrates tOmpA, and OmpX were expressed as inclusion bodies in *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) cells as previously described <sup>81</sup>. Inclusion bodies were solubilised in 25 mM Tris.HCl pH 8.0, 6 M guanidine HCl, and insoluble material removed by centrifugation (20,000 x *g*, 20 min, 4 °C). Solubilised inclusion bodies were further purified by size exclusion chromatography using a Superdex 75 HiLoad 26/600 column (GE Healthcare).

#### *SurA purification*

The plasmid encoding SurA with an N-terminal 6x His-tag followed by a TEV cleavage site <sup>81</sup> was transformed into BL21 (DE3) cells (Stratagene). Cells were grown in LB supplemented with 40  $\mu$ g/mL kanamycin at 37 °C at 200 rpm until the OD<sub>600</sub> reached ~0.6. The

675 temperature was reduced to 20 °C, and induction of expression was performed by addition  
676 of 0.4 mM IPTG. After incubation for ~18 h, the cells were harvested by centrifugation and  
677 resuspended in 20 mM Tris.HCl, pH 7.2, 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, containing EDTA-  
678 free protease inhibitor tablets (Roche). Cells were lysed with a cell disrupter (Constant Cell  
679 Disruption Systems), the lysate was centrifuged (20 min, 4 °C, 39,000 × *g*), and then applied  
680 to a HisTrap column (5 mL, Cytiva). The column was washed (20 mM Tris.HCl, pH 7.2,  
681 150 mM NaCl and 20 mM imidazole) and elution of SurA was performed with 20 mM  
682 Tris.HCl, 150 mM NaCl, 500 mM imidazole, pH 7.2. The eluate was dialysed overnight  
683 against 20 mM Tris.HCl, 150 mM NaCl, pH 8.0, and then TEV protease was added along with  
684 0.1% (v/v) β-mercaptoethanol. TEV cleavage was allowed to proceed overnight at 4 °C. The  
685 cleavage reaction was applied to a HisTrap column (5 mL, Cytiva) and the eluate which  
686 contained the cleaved SurA was dialysed against 20 mM Tris.HCl, 150 mM NaCl, pH 8.0,  
687 concentrated to ~200 μM with Vivaspin 20 concentrators (Sartorius; 5 kDa MWCO),  
688 aliquoted, snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at –80 °C.

689

#### 690 *BAM variant purification*

691

692 pTrc99a vectors containing the respective BAM variants were used to transform BL21 (DE3)

693 *E. coli*. Expression and purification followed the same protocol as described in <sup>31</sup>.

694

#### 695 *Reconstitution of BAM variants into E. coli polar lipid proteoliposomes*

696

697 *E. coli* polar lipid extract, purchased as powder from Avanti Polar Lipids, was dissolved in

698 80:20 (v/v) chloroform/methanol at 20 mg/mL. Appropriate volumes were dried to thin

699 films in clean Pyrex tubes at 42 °C under N<sub>2</sub> gas, and were further dried by vacuum

700 desiccation for  $\geq 3$  h. WT BAM, BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>, BAM<sub>T434A</sub> in TBS pH 8.0, 0.05% (w/v) DDM were  
701 mixed with *E. coli* polar lipid extract films solubilised in TBS pH 8.0, 0.05% (w/v) DDM in a 1:2  
702 (w/w) ratio. To remove detergent and promote liposome formation, the mixtures were  
703 dialysed against 2 L of 20 mM Tris.HCl pH 8.0, 150 mM KCl using 12–14 kDa MWCO D-Tube™  
704 Maxi Dialyzers (Merck) at room temperature for 48 h with a total of six buffer changes.  
705 Following dialysis, proteoliposomes were pelleted twice by ultracentrifugation at  
706  $135,000 \times g$  for 30 min at 4 °C and were resuspended in TBS pH 8.0. Protein concentration  
707 was determined using a BCA assay (ThermoScientific) and successful reconstitution was  
708 determined by SDS–PAGE.

709

#### 710 *In vitro folding assays*

711

712 Denatured OMP substrates were prepared in TBS pH 8.0, 8 M urea by buffer exchanging  
713 using Zeba™ Spin Desalting Columns (0.5 mL, 7 k MWCO, Thermo Scientific) and diluted to a  
714 concentration of 20  $\mu$ M. A pre-fold solution containing 4  $\mu$ M denatured OMP, 20  $\mu$ M SurA,  
715 TBS pH 8.0, 1.6 M urea was immediately diluted 2-fold into a solution of 2  $\mu$ M BAM-  
716 proteoliposomes to give final concentrations 1  $\mu$ M BAM variant, 2  $\mu$ M OMP, 0.8 M urea,  
717 10  $\mu$ M SurA. Samples were taken periodically, and the reaction quenched by dilution into 4X  
718 SDS loading buffer (final concentration of 50 mM glycine-NaOH, pH 6.8, 10% (v/v) glycerol,  
719 1.5% (w/v) SDS, 0.0015% (w/v) bromophenol blue), and a sample taken at the 3-hour  
720 timepoint was boiled ( $>95$  °C, 10 min). Reaction samples were loaded onto a 15% (w/v)  
721 acrylamide/bis-acrylamide (37.5:1) Tris-tricine SDS-PAGE gels and run at 60 mA until the  
722 dye-front reached the end of the gel. Gels were stained in InstantBlue™ (Experion) and were  
723 imaged using an Alliance Q9 Advanced gel doc (UVITEC, Cambridge, UK). Substrate folded  
724 and unfolded band intensities were quantified using ImageJ software (V1.53) (Fiji) and



plotted as a fraction folded ( $I_F/(I_F + I_{UF})$ ) against time. Data were fitted to a single exponential function in Igor Pro (V8.04), and initial rates were calculated by fitting the first 5% of the time course to a linear function. Uncropped and unprocessed gels used for quantification are available in the Source Data file.

#### *CryoEM grid preparation and data collection*

Purified BAM (both wild-type and variants) (0.05% DDM, TBS, pH 8.0) was diluted to ~3.3 mg/ml. 1.2/1.3 Quantifoil copper 300 mesh grids were glow-discharged in air-vacuum for 20 s at 60 mA in a GlowCube Plus (Electron Microscopy Sciences). 3  $\mu$ l of sample was applied to each grid, then blotted for 6 s with Whatman #1 filter paper at 4 °C and >80% humidity, before being plunge frozen into liquid ethane (Vitrobot Mark IV, ThermoFisher). Data were collected on a 300 keV Titan Krios (ThermoFisher) in transmission electron microscopy mode using EPU (ThermoFisher) equipped with a Falcon4i detector without (BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>) or with a Selectris energy filter (10 eV slit width; BAM<sub>GSGS</sub>, BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>\*). A 100  $\mu$ m objective aperture was used. Additional data collection parameters for each sample are shown in Supplementary Table 8.

#### *CryoEM image processing*

Image processing was carried out in RELION 3.1<sup>82</sup>/4.0<sup>83</sup> unless otherwise stated. All map sharpening, masking and fourier shell correlation (FSC) calculations were done in RELION, while angular distribution plots were generated in cryoSPARC. CryoEM processing workflows are shown in Supplementary Figs. 4-6.

750 *BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>*: 1,850 micrographs were collected and motion-corrected (1.1 e<sup>-</sup>/Å<sup>2</sup>/frame).  
751 Following contrast transfer function (CTF) estimation (CtfFind4 <sup>84</sup>), particles were initially  
752 picked with crYOLO's general model <sup>85</sup> yielding 421,707 particles extracted into a 240-pixel  
753 box with 4x binning, which were reduced to 54,325 particles with high-resolution features  
754 with two rounds of 2D classification. These particles were used to train a new crYOLO model  
755 which picked 765,341 particles with a low confidence-threshold of 0.1, extracted into a 240-  
756 pixel box with 4x binning. Following two rounds of 2D classification, 45,498 particles were  
757 used to generate an initial model, and the best 177,882 particles were unbinned and re-  
758 extracted into 320-pixel boxes. Following two rounds of 3D classification (into three classes),  
759 127,056 particles remained in a high-resolution class, which gave a 6.9 Å structure in an  
760 initial 3D refinement. The particles were then subjected to four cycles of polishing/CTF-  
761 refinement and masked 3D refinement (T=8), yielding a final model at 4.3 Å resolution.

762

763 *BAM<sub>GS GS</sub>*: 7,813 micrographs were collected and motion-corrected (0.9 e<sup>-</sup>/Å<sup>2</sup>/frame).  
764 Following CTF estimation, particles were picked from 2,313 micrographs with crYOLOs  
765 general model, yielding 342,172 particles which were extracted with 4x binning in a 240-  
766 pixel box. Following a single round of 2D classification, 31,400 BAM-like particles were used  
767 to generate an initial model, followed by one round of 3D classification, resulting in 17,810  
768 best particles. These were then used to train a new crYOLO model which picked 975,473  
769 with a low confidence-threshold of 0.1. Two rounds of 2D classification yielded 589,795  
770 particles and a round of 3D classification resulted in 269,212 good particles. The particle  
771 stack was then unbinned and extracted into a 320-pixel box. An additional two rounds of 3D  
772 classification in RELION yielded 123,985 particles, which were subjected to *ab initio*  
773 modelling in cryoSPARC to further classify them to final dataset of 75,556 particles. These

particles gave a 5.2 Å model in cryoSPARC's Non-Uniform refinement <sup>86</sup>, and were subsequently subjected to three cycles of polishing/CTF-refinement in RELION and cryoSPARC Non-Uniform refinement, resulting in a final model at 4.2 Å resolution.

*BAM<sub>LVPR-T434A</sub> (LVPR\*)*: 1,504 micrographs were collected and motion-corrected (1.0 e<sup>-</sup>/Å<sup>2</sup>/frame). Following CTF estimation, 159,488 particles were picked with crYOLOs general model and extracted in a 240-pixel box with 4x binning. A single round of 2D classification yielded 49,764 BAM-like particles which were subsequently used to generate an initial model and to train a new crYOLO model, which picked 393,859 particles at a low confidence-threshold of 0.1. Two rounds of 2D classification cleaned the particle stack to 161,586 particles, followed by a single round of 3D classification to 79,991 particles which were then extracted unbinned into 400-pixel boxes. The particles were subject to a final round of 2D classification, yielding a final stack of 62,266 particles. Additional 3D classification did not improve reconstructions. The particles were then reconstructed using cryoSPARC's Non-Uniform refinement <sup>86</sup>, resulting in a model of 6.2 Å, and subsequently subjected to two cycles of polishing/CTF-refinement in RELION and cryoSPARC Non-Uniform refinement <sup>86</sup>, resulting in a final model of 4.0 Å.

#### *CryoEM model building*

For *BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>* an initial model was constructed using the BamA barrel from PDB 5D0O <sup>19</sup> and the POTRA/periplasmic domains from PDB 8BWC <sup>51</sup>, with the LVPR insert. The model was then optimised in ISOLDE <sup>87</sup> and subsequently passed through real-space refinement in PHENIX <sup>88</sup> (v1.20) with secondary structure restraints, and manually optimised in COOT <sup>89</sup>. Geometry was assessed using molprobity <sup>90</sup>. *BAM<sub>GSGS</sub>* and *BAM<sub>LVPR-T434A</sub>* followed the same

process but using BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> (with appropriate mutations) as the initial model. Model statistics are shown in Supplementary Table 8. Images were generated in ChimeraX 1.7 or Pymol 2.5.5. Structure images in Figure 1a and Figure 4a were generated in ChimeraX-1.8 and 1.10.

#### *Hydrogen-deuterium exchange mass spectrometry*

An automated HDX robot (LEAP Technologies) was coupled to a Acquity M-Class LC fitted with a HDX manager (Waters). Samples comprised BAM, BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> or BAM<sub>T434A</sub> (10  $\mu$ M) in 10 mM potassium phosphate, pH 8.0, 0.02% n-dodecyl- $\beta$ -d-maltoside (DDM). To initiate the HDX experiment, 95  $\mu$ L of deuterated buffer (10 mM potassium phosphate, pH 8.0, 0.02% DDM) was added to 5  $\mu$ L of protein-containing solution, and the mixture was incubated at 4 °C for 0.5, 2, or 30 min, as outlined previously<sup>91</sup>.

For each time point and condition, three replicate measurements were performed. The HDX reaction was quenched by adding 100  $\mu$ L of quench buffer (10 mM potassium phosphate, 4 M guanidine hydrochloride, pH 2.2) to 50  $\mu$ L of the labelling reaction. The quenched sample (50  $\mu$ L) was proteolysed by flowing through an immobilised pepsin column (Enzymate, Waters). The produced peptides were trapped on a VanGuard Pre-column [Acquity UPLC BEH C18 (1.7  $\mu$ m, 2.1 mm  $\times$  5 mm, Waters)] for 3 min and the peptides were separated using a C18 column (75  $\mu$ m  $\times$  150 mm, Waters, UK) by gradient elution of 0–40% (v/v) acetonitrile (0.1% v/v formic acid) in H<sub>2</sub>O (0.3% v/v formic acid) over 7 min at 40  $\mu$ L min<sup>-1</sup>.

Peptides were detected using a Synapt G2Si mass spectrometer (Waters) operating in HDMS<sup>E</sup> mode, with dynamic range extension enabled. Ion mobility separation was used to separate peptides prior to fragmentation by collision induced dissociation (CID) in the transfer cell. CID data were used for peptide identification, and uptake quantification was performed at the peptide level. Data were analysed using PLGS (v3.0.2) and DynamX (v3.0.0) software (Waters). Search parameters in PLGS were as follows: peptide and fragment tolerances = automatic, min fragment ion matches = 1, digest reagent = non-specific, false discovery rate = 4. Restrictions for peptides in DynamX were as follows: minimum intensity = 1000, minimum products per amino acid = 0.3, max sequence length = 25, max ppm error = 10, file threshold = 3. The software Deuterios 2.0 was used to identify peptides with statistically significant increases/decreases in deuterium uptake (hybrid significance test with a 95 % confidence interval,  $p < 0.05$ ) and to prepare Wood's plots<sup>92</sup>. The raw HDX-MS data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE<sup>70</sup> partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD057055. A summary of the HDX-MS data, as recommended by reported guidelines is shown in Supplementary Table 9. Sequence coverage maps of BAM subunits are shown in Supplementary Fig. 9 and Wood's plots are shown in Supplementary Figs. 10-14.

841 **Data availability**

842 CryoEM reconstructions and corresponding coordinates have been deposited in the Electron  
843 Microscopy Data Bank (EMDB) and the Protein Data Bank (PDB), respectively: BAM-LVPR  
844 (EMD-51930 [<https://www.ebi.ac.uk/pdbe/entry/emdb/EMD-51930>], 9H84  
845 [<https://doi.org/10.2210/pdb9h84/pdb>]), BAM-GSGS (EMD-51931  
846 [<https://www.ebi.ac.uk/pdbe/entry/emdb/EMD-51931>], 9H85  
847 [<https://doi.org/10.2210/pdb9h85/pdb>]) and BAM-LVPR\* (EMD-51933  
848 [<https://www.ebi.ac.uk/pdbe/entry/emdb/EMD-51933>], 9H89  
849 [<https://doi.org/10.2210/pdb9h89/pdb>]). Previous published structures referenced in this  
850 study are available in the PDB under accession codes: 5D0O  
851 [<https://doi.org/10.2210/pdb5D0O/pdb>]; 4C4V [<https://doi.org/10.2210/pdb4C4V/pdb>];  
852 8BWC [<https://doi.org/10.2210/pdb8BWC/pdb>]; 6LYU  
853 [<https://doi.org/10.2210/pdb6LYU/pdb>]. The raw proteomics data have been deposited to  
854 the ProteomeXchange Consortium via PRIDE <sup>70</sup> partner repository with the dataset identifier  
855 PXD057225. The raw HDX-MS data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange  
856 Consortium via the PRIDE <sup>70</sup> partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD057055. All  
857 files for the AlphaFold models of BamA homologs, the analysis of the secondary structure in  
858 the hinge region, and molecular dynamics simulations files (input .tpr files, final coordinates  
859 in .gro format for the three replicas, and raw data for the dihedral angle distribution plots)  
860 were deposited in the repository [<https://github.com/lorgaLab/BamAset>]  
861 [<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13986908>] <sup>77</sup>.  
862 The source data underlying Figures 1b-c, 1e, 2, 4b-c, 5, Supplementary Tables 1-3 and  
863 Supplementary Figs 1 and 7 are provided as a Source Data file.

864

## References:

- 1 Silhavy, T. J., Kahne, D. & Walker, S. The bacterial cell envelope. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* **2**, a000414, doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a000414 (2010).
- 2 Guest, R. L. & Silhavy, T. J. Cracking outer membrane biogenesis. *Biochim Biophys Acta Mol Cell Res* **1870**, 119405, doi:10.1016/j.bbamcr.2022.119405 (2023).
- 3 Konovalova, A., Kahne, D. E. & Silhavy, T. J. Outer Membrane Biogenesis. *Annu Rev Microbiol* **71**, 539-556, doi:10.1146/annurev-micro-090816-093754 (2017).
- 4 Rojas, E. R. *et al.* The outer membrane is an essential load-bearing element in Gram-negative bacteria. *Nature* **559**, 617-621, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0344-3 (2018).
- 5 Deghelt, M. *et al.* Peptidoglycan-outer membrane attachment generates periplasmic pressure to prevent lysis in Gram-negative bacteria. *Nat Microbiol* **10**, 1963-1974, doi:10.1038/s41564-025-02058-9 (2025).
- 6 El Rayes, J., Rodriguez-Alonso, R. & Collet, J. F. Lipoproteins in Gram-negative bacteria: new insights into their biogenesis, subcellular targeting and functional roles. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **61**, 25-34, doi:10.1016/j.mib.2021.02.003 (2021).
- 7 Rollauer, S. E., Soorreshjani, M. A., Noinaj, N. & Buchanan, S. K. Outer membrane protein biogenesis in Gram-negative bacteria. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **370**, doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0023 (2015).
- 8 Horne, J. E., Brockwell, D. J. & Radford, S. E. Role of the lipid bilayer in outer membrane protein folding in Gram-negative bacteria. **295**, 10340-10367, doi:10.1074/jbc.REV120.011473 (2020).
- 9 Schiffrin, B., Brockwell, D. J. & Radford, S. E. Outer membrane protein folding from an energy landscape perspective. *BMC Biol* **15**, 123, doi:10.1186/s12915-017-0464-5 (2017).
- 10 Voulhoux, R., Bos, M. P., Geurtsen, J., Mols, M. & Tommassen, J. Role of a highly conserved bacterial protein in outer membrane protein assembly. *Science* **299**, 262-265, doi:10.1126/science.1078973 (2003).
- 11 Noinaj, N. *et al.* Structural insight into the biogenesis of beta-barrel membrane proteins. *Nature* **501**, 385-390, doi:10.1038/nature12521 (2013).
- 12 Albrecht, R. *et al.* Structure of BamA, an essential factor in outer membrane protein biogenesis. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr* **70**, 1779-1789, doi:10.1107/S1399004714007482 (2014).
- 13 Ni, D. *et al.* Structural and functional analysis of the beta-barrel domain of BamA from Escherichia coli. *FASEB J* **28**, 2677-2685, doi:10.1096/fj.13-248450 (2014).
- 14 Wu, T. *et al.* Identification of a multicomponent complex required for outer membrane biogenesis in Escherichia coli. *Cell* **121**, 235-245, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2005.02.015 (2005).
- 15 Sklar, J. G. *et al.* Lipoprotein SmpA is a component of the YaeT complex that assembles outer membrane proteins in Escherichia coli. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **104**, 6400-6405, doi:10.1073/pnas.0701579104 (2007).
- 16 Kim, S. *et al.* Structure and function of an essential component of the outer membrane protein assembly machine. *Science* **317**, 961-964, doi:10.1126/science.1143993 (2007).
- 17 Wu, R., Stephenson, R., Gichaba, A. & Noinaj, N. The big BAM theory: An open and closed case? *Biochim Biophys Acta Biomembr* **1862**, 183062, doi:10.1016/j.bbamem.2019.183062 (2020).
- 18 Malinverni, J. C. *et al.* YfiO stabilizes the YaeT complex and is essential for outer membrane protein assembly in Escherichia coli. *Mol Microbiol* **61**, 151-164, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2958.2006.05211.x (2006).
- 19 Gu, Y. *et al.* Structural basis of outer membrane protein insertion by the BAM complex. *Nature* **531**, 64-69, doi:10.1038/nature17199 (2016).
- 20 Han, L. *et al.* Structure of the BAM complex and its implications for biogenesis of outer-membrane proteins. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **23**, 192-196, doi:10.1038/nsmb.3181 (2016).

916 21 Iadanza, M. G. *et al.* Lateral opening in the intact beta-barrel assembly machinery captured by  
917 cryo-EM. *Nat Commun* **7**, 12865, doi:10.1038/ncomms12865 (2016).

918 22 Bakelar, J., Buchanan, S. K. & Noinaj, N. The structure of the beta-barrel assembly machinery  
919 complex. *Science* **351**, 180-186, doi:10.1126/science.aad3460 (2016).

920 23 Noinaj, N., Kuszak, A. J., Balusek, C., Gumbart, J. C. & Buchanan, S. K. Lateral opening and exit  
921 pore formation are required for BamA function. *Structure* **22**, 1055-1062,  
922 doi:10.1016/j.str.2014.05.008 (2014).

923 24 Robert, V. *et al.* Assembly factor Omp85 recognizes its outer membrane protein substrates by  
924 a species-specific C-terminal motif. *PLoS Biol* **4**, e377, doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040377  
925 (2006).

926 25 Doyle, M. T. & Bernstein, H. D. Bacterial outer membrane proteins assemble via asymmetric  
927 interactions with the BamA beta-barrel. *Nat Commun* **10**, 3358, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-  
928 11230-9 (2019).

929 26 Doyle, M. T. *et al.* Cryo-EM structures reveal multiple stages of bacterial outer membrane  
930 protein folding. *Cell* **185**, 1143-1156 e1113, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2022.02.016 (2022).

931 27 Tomasek, D. *et al.* Structure of a nascent membrane protein as it folds on the BAM complex.  
932 *Nature* **583**, 473-478, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2370-1 (2020).

933 28 Iadanza, M. G. *et al.* Distortion of the bilayer and dynamics of the BAM complex in lipid  
934 nanodiscs. *Commun Biol* **3**, 766, doi:10.1038/s42003-020-01419-w (2020).

935 29 Schiffrin, B. *et al.* Effects of Periplasmic Chaperones and Membrane Thickness on BamA-  
936 Catalyzed Outer-Membrane Protein Folding. *J Mol Biol* **429**, 3776-3792,  
937 doi:10.1016/j.jmb.2017.09.008 (2017).

938 30 Gessmann, D. *et al.* Outer membrane beta-barrel protein folding is physically controlled by  
939 periplasmic lipid head groups and BamA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **111**, 5878-5883,  
940 doi:10.1073/pnas.1322473111 (2014).

941 31 White, P. *et al.* The role of membrane destabilisation and protein dynamics in BAM catalysed  
942 OMP folding. *Nat Commun* **12**, 4174, doi:10.1038/s41467-021-24432-x (2021).

943 32 Lee, J. *et al.* Formation of a beta-barrel membrane protein is catalyzed by the interior surface  
944 of the assembly machine protein BamA. *Elife* **8**, doi:10.7554/eLife.49787 (2019).

945 33 Kaur, H. *et al.* The antibiotic darobactin mimics a beta-strand to inhibit outer membrane  
946 insertase. *Nature* **593**, 125-129, doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03455-w (2021).

947 34 Miller, R. D. *et al.* Computational identification of a systemic antibiotic for gram-negative  
948 bacteria. *Nat Microbiol* **7**, 1661-1672, doi:10.1038/s41564-022-01227-4 (2022).

949 35 Imai, Y. *et al.* A new antibiotic selectively kills Gram-negative pathogens. *Nature* **576**, 459-464,  
950 doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1791-1 (2019).

951 36 Tata, M. *et al.* High-throughput suppressor screen demonstrates that RcsF monitors outer  
952 membrane integrity and not Bam complex function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **118**,  
953 doi:10.1073/pnas.2100369118 (2021).

954 37 Rodriguez-Alonso, R. *et al.* Structural insight into the formation of lipoprotein-beta-barrel  
955 complexes. *Nat Chem Biol* **16**, 1019-1025, doi:10.1038/s41589-020-0575-0 (2020).

956 38 Ruiz, N., Falcone, B., Kahne, D. & Silhavy, T. J. Chemical conditionality: a genetic strategy to  
957 probe organelle assembly. *Cell* **121**, 307-317, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2005.02.014 (2005).

958 39 Braun, M. & Silhavy, T. J. Imp/OstA is required for cell envelope biogenesis in Escherichia coli.  
959 *Mol Microbiol* **45**, 1289-1302, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2958.2002.03091.x (2002).

960 40 Bos, M. P., Tefsen, B., Geurtsen, J. & Tommassen, J. Identification of an outer membrane  
961 protein required for the transport of lipopolysaccharide to the bacterial cell surface. *Proc Natl*  
962 *Acad Sci U S A* **101**, 9417-9422, doi:10.1073/pnas.0402340101 (2004).

963 41 Wu, T. *et al.* Identification of a protein complex that assembles lipopolysaccharide in the outer  
964 membrane of Escherichia coli. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **103**, 11754-11759,  
965 doi:10.1073/pnas.0604744103 (2006).



966 42 Chng, S. S., Ruiz, N., Chimalakonda, G., Silhavy, T. J. & Kahne, D. Characterization of the two-  
967 protein complex in Escherichia coli responsible for lipopolysaccharide assembly at the outer  
968 membrane. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **107**, 5363-5368, doi:10.1073/pnas.0912872107 (2010).  
969 43 Chimalakonda, G. *et al.* Lipoprotein LptE is required for the assembly of LptD by the beta-  
970 barrel assembly machine in the outer membrane of Escherichia coli. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*  
971 **108**, 2492-2497, doi:10.1073/pnas.1019089108 (2011).  
972 44 Chng, S. S. *et al.* Disulfide rearrangement triggered by translocon assembly controls  
973 lipopolysaccharide export. *Science* **337**, 1665-1668, doi:10.1126/science.1227215 (2012).  
974 45 Ruiz, N., Chng, S. S., Hiniker, A., Kahne, D. & Silhavy, T. J. Nonconsecutive disulfide bond  
975 formation in an essential integral outer membrane protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **107**,  
976 12245-12250, doi:10.1073/pnas.1007319107 (2010).  
977 46 Mikheyeva, I. V., Sun, J., Huang, K. C. & Silhavy, T. J. Mechanism of outer membrane  
978 destabilization by global reduction of protein content. *Nat Commun* **14**, 5715,  
979 doi:10.1038/s41467-023-40396-6 (2023).  
980 47 Mecsas, J., Rouviere, P. E., Erickson, J. W., Donohue, T. J. & Gross, C. A. The activity of sigma  
981 E, an Escherichia coli heat-inducible sigma-factor, is modulated by expression of outer  
982 membrane proteins. *Genes Dev* **7**, 2618-2628, doi:10.1101/gad.7.12b.2618 (1993).  
983 48 Hart, E. M. *et al.* A small-molecule inhibitor of BamA impervious to efflux and the outer  
984 membrane permeability barrier. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **116**, 21748-21757,  
985 doi:10.1073/pnas.1912345116 (2019).  
986 49 MacArthur, M. W. & Thornton, J. M. Influence of proline residues on protein conformation. *J*  
987 *Mol Biol* **218**, 397-412, doi:10.1016/0022-2836(91)90721-h (1991).  
988 50 Schimmel, P. R. & Flory, P. J. Conformational energies and configurational statistics of  
989 copolypeptides containing L-proline. *J Mol Biol* **34**, 105-120, doi:10.1016/0022-  
990 2836(68)90237-4 (1968).  
991 51 Haysom, S. F. *et al.* Darobactin B Stabilises a Lateral-Closed Conformation of the BAM Complex  
992 in E. coli Cells. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl*, e202218783, doi:10.1002/anie.202218783 (2023).  
993 52 Xiao, L. *et al.* Structures of the beta-barrel assembly machine recognizing outer membrane  
994 protein substrates. *FASEB J* **35**, e21207, doi:10.1096/fj.202001443RR (2021).  
995 53 Stokes, J. M. *et al.* Cold Stress Makes Escherichia coli Susceptible to Glycopeptide Antibiotics  
996 by Altering Outer Membrane Integrity. *Cell Chem Biol* **23**, 267-277,  
997 doi:10.1016/j.chembiol.2015.12.011 (2016).  
998 54 Nikaido, H. Restoring permeability barrier function to outer membrane. *Chem Biol* **12**, 507-  
999 509, doi:10.1016/j.chembiol.2005.05.001 (2005).  
1000 55 Calabrese, A. N. & Radford, S. E. Mass spectrometry-enabled structural biology of membrane  
1001 proteins. *Methods* **147**, 187-205, doi:10.1016/j.ymeth.2018.02.020 (2018).  
1002 56 Noinaj, N., Rollauer, S. E. & Buchanan, S. K. The beta-barrel membrane protein insertase  
1003 machinery from Gram-negative bacteria. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* **31**, 35-42,  
1004 doi:10.1016/j.sbi.2015.02.012 (2015).  
1005 57 Diederichs, K. A., Buchanan, S. K. & Botos, I. Building Better Barrels - beta-barrel Biogenesis  
1006 and Insertion in Bacteria and Mitochondria. *J Mol Biol* **433**, 166894,  
1007 doi:10.1016/j.jmb.2021.166894 (2021).  
1008 58 Leonard-Rivera, M. & Misra, R. Conserved residues of the putative L6 loop of Escherichia coli  
1009 BamA play a critical role in the assembly of beta-barrel outer membrane proteins, including  
1010 that of BamA itself. *J Bacteriol* **194**, 4662-4668, doi:10.1128/JB.00825-12 (2012).  
1011 59 Doyle, M. T. & Bernstein, H. D. Function of the Omp85 Superfamily of Outer Membrane  
1012 Protein Assembly Factors and Polypeptide Transporters. *Annu Rev Microbiol* **76**, 259-279,  
1013 doi:10.1146/annurev-micro-033021-023719 (2022).  
1014 60 Mamou, G. *et al.* Peptidoglycan maturation controls outer membrane protein assembly.  
1015 *Nature* **606**, 953-959, doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04834-7 (2022).

1016 61 Thewasano, N., Germany, E. M., Maruno, Y., Nakajima, Y. & Shiota, T. Categorization of  
1017 Escherichia coli outer membrane proteins by dependence on accessory proteins of the beta-  
1018 barrel assembly machinery complex. *J Biol Chem* **299**, 104821, doi:10.1016/j.jbc.2023.104821  
1019 (2023).

1020 62 Warner, L. R., Gatzeva-Topalova, P. Z., Doerner, P. A., Pardi, A. & Sousa, M. C. Flexibility in the  
1021 Periplasmic Domain of BamA Is Important for Function. *Structure* **25**, 94-106,  
1022 doi:10.1016/j.str.2016.11.013 (2017).

1023 63 Fenn, K. L. *et al.* Outer membrane protein assembly mediated by BAM-SurA complexes. *Nat*  
1024 *Commun* **15**, 7612, doi:10.1038/s41467-024-51358-x (2024).

1025 64 Daimon, Y. *et al.* The TPR domain of BepA is required for productive interaction with substrate  
1026 proteins and the beta-barrel assembly machinery complex. *Mol Microbiol* **106**, 760-776,  
1027 doi:10.1111/mmi.13844 (2017).

1028 65 Lehner, P. A. *et al.* Architecture and conformational dynamics of the BAM-SurA holo insertase  
1029 complex. *Sci Adv* **11**, eads6094, doi:10.1126/sciadv.ads6094 (2025).

1030 66 Sinensky, M. Homeoviscous adaptation--a homeostatic process that regulates the viscosity of  
1031 membrane lipids in Escherichia coli. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **71**, 522-525,  
1032 doi:10.1073/pnas.71.2.522 (1974).

1033 67 Wang, J. D., Herman, C., Tipton, K. A., Gross, C. A. & Weissman, J. S. Directed evolution of  
1034 substrate-optimized GroEL/S chaperonins. *Cell* **111**, 1027-1039, doi:10.1016/s0092-  
1035 8674(02)01198-4 (2002).

1036 68 Horwich, A. L. & Fenton, W. A. Chaperonin-assisted protein folding: a chronologue. *Q Rev*  
1037 *Biophys* **53**, e4, doi:10.1017/S0033583519000143 (2020).

1038 69 Hussain, S. & Bernstein, H. D. The Bam complex catalyzes efficient insertion of bacterial outer  
1039 membrane proteins into membrane vesicles of variable lipid composition. *J Biol Chem* **293**,  
1040 2959-2973, doi:10.1074/jbc.RA117.000349 (2018).

1041 70 Perez-Riverol, Y. *et al.* The PRIDE database resources in 2022: a hub for mass spectrometry-  
1042 based proteomics evidences. *Nucleic Acids Res* **50**, D543-D552, doi:10.1093/nar/gkab1038  
1043 (2022).

1044 71 Miller, J. *Experiments in Molecular Genetics*. (1972).

1045 72 Jumper, J. *et al.* Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* **596**, 583-  
1046 589, doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2 (2021).

1047 73 Mirdita, M., Steinegger, M. & Soding, J. MMseqs2 desktop and local web server app for fast,  
1048 interactive sequence searches. *Bioinformatics* **35**, 2856-2858,  
1049 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty1057 (2019).

1050 74 Mirdita, M. *et al.* ColabFold: making protein folding accessible to all. *Nat Methods* **19**, 679-  
1051 682, doi:10.1038/s41592-022-01488-1 (2022).

1052 75 Kabsch, W. & Sander, C. Dictionary of protein secondary structure: pattern recognition of  
1053 hydrogen-bonded and geometrical features. *Biopolymers* **22**, 2577-2637,  
1054 doi:10.1002/bip.360221211 (1983).

1055 76 Crooks, G. E., Hon, G., Chandonia, J. M. & Brenner, S. E. WebLogo: a sequence logo generator.  
1056 *Genome Res* **14**, 1188-1190, doi:10.1101/gr.849004 (2004).

1057 77 Csoma, N., Cho, S.-H., Collet, J.-F., & Bogdan I. BamAset: v0.2. *Zenodo*, doi:  
1058 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13986908> (2025).

1059 78 Sali, A. & Blundell, T. L. Comparative protein modelling by satisfaction of spatial restraints. *J*  
1060 *Mol Biol* **234**, 779-815, doi:10.1006/jmbi.1993.1626 (1993).

1061 79 Van Der Spoel, D. *et al.* GROMACS: fast, flexible, and free. *J Comput Chem* **26**, 1701-1718,  
1062 doi:10.1002/jcc.20291 (2005).

1063 80 Lindorff-Larsen, K. *et al.* Improved side-chain torsion potentials for the Amber ff99SB protein  
1064 force field. *Proteins* **78**, 1950-1958, doi:10.1002/prot.22711 (2010).

1065 81 Calabrese, A. N. *et al.* Inter-domain dynamics in the chaperone SurA and multi-site binding to  
1066 its outer membrane protein clients. *Nat Commun* **11**, 2155, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15702-1  
1067 (2020).

1068 82 Zivanov, J., Nakane, T. & Scheres, S. H. W. Estimation of high-order aberrations and anisotropic  
1069 magnification from cryo-EM data sets in RELION-3.1. *IUCr* **7**, 253-267,  
1070 doi:10.1107/S2052252520000081 (2020).

1071 83 Kimanius, D., Dong, L., Sharov, G., Nakane, T. & Scheres, S. H. W. New tools for automated  
1072 cryo-EM single-particle analysis in RELION-4.0. *Biochem J* **478**, 4169-4185,  
1073 doi:10.1042/BCJ20210708 (2021).

1074 84 Rohou, A. & Grigorieff, N. CTFFIND4: Fast and accurate defocus estimation from electron  
1075 micrographs. *J Struct Biol* **192**, 216-221, doi:10.1016/j.jsb.2015.08.008 (2015).

1076 85 Wagner, T. *et al.* SPHIRE-crYOLO is a fast and accurate fully automated particle picker for cryo-  
1077 EM. *Commun Biol* **2**, 218, doi:10.1038/s42003-019-0437-z (2019).

1078 86 Punjani, A., Zhang, H. & Fleet, D. J. Non-uniform refinement: adaptive regularization improves  
1079 single-particle cryo-EM reconstruction. *Nat Methods* **17**, 1214-1221, doi:10.1038/s41592-  
1080 020-00990-8 (2020).

1081 87 Croll, T. I. ISOLDE: a physically realistic environment for model building into low-resolution  
1082 electron-density maps. *Acta Crystallogr D Struct Biol* **74**, 519-530,  
1083 doi:10.1107/S2059798318002425 (2018).

1084 88 Afonine, P. V. *et al.* Real-space refinement in PHENIX for cryo-EM and crystallography. *Acta*  
1085 *Crystallogr D Struct Biol* **74**, 531-544, doi:10.1107/S2059798318006551 (2018).

1086 89 Emsley, P., Lohkamp, B., Scott, W. G. & Cowtan, K. Features and development of Coot. *Acta*  
1087 *Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr* **66**, 486-501, doi:10.1107/S0907444910007493 (2010).

1088 90 Chen, V. B. *et al.* MolProbity: all-atom structure validation for macromolecular  
1089 crystallography. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr* **66**, 12-21,  
1090 doi:10.1107/S0907444909042073 (2010).

1091 91 Schiffrin, B. *et al.* Dynamic interplay between the periplasmic chaperone SurA and the BAM  
1092 complex in outer membrane protein folding. *Commun Biol* **5**, 560, doi:10.1038/s42003-022-  
1093 03502-w (2022).

1094 92 Lau, A. M., Claesen, J., Hansen, K. & Politis, A. Deuterios 2.0: peptide-level significance testing  
1095 of data from hydrogen deuterium exchange mass spectrometry. *Bioinformatics* **37**, 270-272,  
1096 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa677 (2021).

## 1100 **Acknowledgements**

1101 We are indebted to the members of the Collet, Radford, Ranson and Calabrese laboratories  
1102 for many helpful suggestions and discussions. We thank S-I Matsuyama (Rikkyo University,  
1103 Japan) and H. Bernstein (NIH, Bethesda, USA) for providing antibodies, H. Bernstein for  
1104 providing plasmids and C.A. Gross (UCSF, San Francisco, USA) for providing strains. J.-F.C.  
1105 acknowledge support of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique (FNRS) grant agreements  
1106 WELBIO-CR-2019C-03, the Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles (ARC 17/22-087) awarded to J.-  
1107 F.C.. N.C. was a research fellow of FNRS. R.R.A was funded by the European commission via  
1108 the International Training Network Train2Target (no. 721484). A.N.C. and M.O. acknowledge  
1109 support of a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship (awarded to A.N.C.) jointly funded by Wellcome and  
1110 the Royal Society (220628/Z/20/Z). A.K.C. acknowledges award of a studentship funded by  
1111 EPSRC (EP/W524372/1, project reference 2879844) A.N.C and S.E.R. acknowledge funding  
1112 from the BBSRC (BB/Y00034X/1). Funding from BBSRC (BB/M012573/1), and Wellcome  
1113 (208385/Z/17/Z) enabled the purchase of mass spectrometry equipment. S.E.R. is funded by  
1114 a Royal Society Professorial Fellowship (RSRP\R1\211057). J.M.M. was funded by Wellcome  
1115 (222373/Z/21/Z). J.M.M., S.E.R and N.A.R also thanks MRC for funding (MR/Y012453/1). We  
1116 thank E.O.S. (G0G0818N/EOS, ID 30550343) and the University of Leeds for funding J.M.W.  
1117 via an International Institutional Award (BB/Y514160/1). CryoEM data were collected at the  
1118 Astbury Biostructure Laboratory, funded by the University of Leeds and Wellcome  
1119 (108466/Z/15/Z; 221524/Z/20/Z) and we thank facility staff for their technical input. B.I.I is  
1120 supported by a grant from the French National Research Agency (ANR) through the PPR  
1121 Antibioresistance program (ANR-20-PAMR-0010). T.F.S. was funded by the German Federal  
1122 Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF, via grant GBi2S) and German Centre for  
1123 Infection Research (DZIF) 09.918.

1124

1125 **Author contributions**

1126 Writing: J.-F.C., S.E.R., A.N.C., N.C., J.M.M. and N.A.R.. Conceptualisation: N.C., R.R.A. , S.-  
1127 H.C., J.-F.C. S.E.R and A.N.C. Investigation, strain construction, construct cloning, protein  
1128 expression and purification: N.C., J.M.W. and R.R.A.. Proteomics: A.N.C. M.O. A.K.C.  
1129 Phylogenetic analysis and molecular dynamics simulations: B.I.I.. Structure determination  
1130 and analysis: J.M.M., N.A.R. HDX: A.N.C., J.M.W.. Provided darobactin B for the study: T.F.S.  
1131 Data analysis and interpretation: N.C., J.M.M, J.M.W., R.R.A., A.N.C., S.E.R. and J.-F.C. All  
1132 authors discussed the results and commented on the manuscript.

1133

1134 **Competing Interests**

1135 The authors declare no competing interests.

1136

1137

## Figure Legends

**Figure 1. The insertion of the rigid LVPR sequence in the hinge region of BamA leads to altered outer membrane permeability and OMP folding defects**

**a** The hinge region (V418-G424) between the  $\beta$ -barrel and the POTRA domains of BamA is depicted in pink on a BAM structure (PDB 5D0O<sup>19</sup>). LVPR is inserted before residue G424. **b** and **c** Cells expressing BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> have growth defects and a more permeable outer membrane due to decreased OMP levels. *bamA::kan* cells expressing variants of BamA from a plasmid were grown in LB at 30 °C until mid-log phase. **b (top)** Ten-fold serial dilutions were made in LB, plated onto LB or MacConkey agar plates and incubated at 37 °C. **b (bottom)** Sensi-Disc Susceptibility Tests were used to test strain sensitivity to antibiotics (see Methods). The diameter of growth inhibition around each disk was recorded in millimeters. Values correspond to means  $\pm$  standard deviations (SD) (n=4 independent experiments). ND: not detectable (i.e. no growth inhibition). **c** Western blot of trichloroacetic acid (TCA) precipitates of annotated cells, using primary antibodies against different OMPs (representative of n=3, biological replicates). **d and e** Cells harboring the BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> mutant have an altered envelope proteome and a SigmaE signature. **d** Volcano plot showing the difference in protein abundance between cells expressing WT BamA or BamA<sub>LVPR</sub>. P-values were evaluated by a two-sample t-test. Detected OMPs are labelled in red and periplasmic chaperones and stress-related proteins are in blue. Proteins above the black line, have statistically significantly different expression levels. **e** SigmaE activity measured by  $\beta$ -galactosidase assay was reported using the transcriptional rpoHP3'-lacZ fusion on the chromosome. Error bars represent standard error of the mean (n=5 biological replicates, cells were grown in LB medium at 30 °C). P-values were evaluated by a mixed model, with

random plate effect, and multiple comparisons with adjustment by the Dunnet method (\*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ ). **f** The hinge region of BamA is conserved to be disordered. Weblogo sequence and secondary structure conservation plots for the BamA hinge region (E: “extended strand in parallel and/or anti-parallel  $\beta$ -barrel”; C: “coil”) (see Methods). **g** The LVPR tetrapeptide has a restricted C-alpha dihedral angle distribution compared to NTGS (WT) and GSGS. Data extracted from 1  $\mu$ s molecular dynamics simulations in explicit solvent (n=3) (see Methods).

**Figure 2. The insertion of four amino acids in the hinge region of BamA impairs BAM-mediated OMP folding *in vitro***

Rigidifying the hinge region of BamA (LVPR insertion) has greater impact on the ability of BAM to fold tOmpA than when the intrinsic flexibility of this region is preserved (GSGS insertion), but the LVPR and GSGS insertions equally perturb the folding of OmpX. **a** and **b** Quantification of folded and unfolded bands from SDS-PAGE band-shift assay plotted as fraction folded against time for tOmpA or OmpX respectively. The folded fraction values calculated from at least two technical replicate measurements are shown and dashed lines represent a single exponential fit to the data. Folding experiments were performed at 25 °C. Average initial rates, normalised data and mean/ranges for the replicate data presented are listed in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2.

**Figure 3. Insertion of a tetrapeptide in the hinge region of BamA structurally uncouples the membrane and periplasmic domains**

CryoEM structure of **a** BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> and **b** BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> in DDM micelles; in both structures the hinge region and the initial  $\beta$ -strands of the barrel are of lower resolution and hence presumably

destabilised relative to the back of the barrel (c.f. insets). **c** BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> and BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> are globally similar, structures aligned on BamA transmembrane  $\beta$ 8-11 (BamA POTRA1 was poorly resolved and not modelled). **d** Comparison between BamA of canonical inward-open and outward-open conformations and BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>, only the transmembrane domain and POTRA5 are shown for clarity. BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> is similar to BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> (Supplementary Fig. 2). **e** Comparison between the transmembrane domains of BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>, BAM<sub>GSGS</sub> and BAM-WT inward-open, showing lateral-gate closure and incomplete expansion at the base of the barrel. *Inset:* Inward-open like orientation of extracellular loop 3 in BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> and BAM<sub>GSGS</sub>, which is disordered and not resolved in BAM-WT outward-open. PDBs: 8BWC<sup>51</sup> (outward-open), 5D0O<sup>19</sup> (inward-open).

**Figure 4. A distal point-mutation on eL1 can partially overcome a rigid hinge in BamA**

**a** Zoom of the  $\beta$ -barrel of BamA (PDB 4C4V<sup>12</sup>) with T434 and F804 represented in dark blue (side chains shown).  $\beta$ -strands 1 and 16 are colored in light grey and eL1 is represented in pink. The boxed area is enlarged and depicted below. Possible hydrogen bonds between the hydroxyl side chain of T434 and the backbone of F804 are represented by dashed blue lines. **b-c** The T434A mutation in BamA partially restores the phenotypical defects induced by the LVPR insertion in the hinge region of BamA. *bamA::kan* cells expressing variants of BamA from a plasmid were grown in LB medium at 30 °C until mid-log phase. Results for BamA<sub>WT</sub> and BamA<sub>LVPR</sub> are from Fig. 1b and 1e, shown for comparison. **b (top)** Ten-fold serial dilutions were made in LB media, and the bacteria were plated onto LB or MacConkey agar plates and incubated at 37 °C. **b (bottom)** Sensi-Disc Susceptibility Test Discs were used to test strain sensitivity to compounds (methods). Plates were incubated overnight at 30 °C. The diameter of the zone of inhibition of growth around each disk was recorded in



1210 millimeters. Values correspond to means  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) (n=4 independent  
1211 experiments). ND: not detectable. **c** SigmaE activity measured by  $\beta$ -galactosidase assay as  
1212 reported using the transcriptional rpoHP3'-lacZ fusion on the chromosome. Error bars  
1213 represent standard error of the mean (n=5 biological replicates). P-values were evaluated by  
1214 a mixed model, with random plate effect, and multiple comparisons with adjustment by the  
1215 Dunnet method (\*\*p=0.004). **d** BAM<sub>LVPR</sub> and BAM<sub>LVPR\*</sub> are structurally identical, structures  
1216 aligned on BamA transmembrane  $\beta$ -strands 8 to 11 (POTRA1 was poorly resolved and not  
1217 modelled).

1218

1219 **Figure 5. The T434A mutation has an impact on BamA's function leading to an altered**  
1220 **outer membrane**

1221 **a** The T434A mutation on BamA decreases the effect of darobactin B on the folding activity  
1222 of BAM in an *in vitro* folding assay. Quantification of the folded fraction of tOmpA against  
1223 time, from the SDS-PAGE band-shift assay. The folded fraction values calculated from two  
1224 technical repeats are shown and dashed lines represent a single exponential fit to the data.  
1225 **b** and **c** Cells expressing a BamA variant with the T434A point-mutation have outer  
1226 membrane defects. *bamA::kan* cells expressing variants of BamA from a plasmid were  
1227 grown in LB medium at 37 °C until mid-log phase. **b** Cells were spotted on a gradient plate  
1228 containing a fixed concentration of SDS (0.5% (w/v)) and a gradient of EDTA (0-0.4 mM)  
1229 (top) and incubated overnight at 37 °C. For the deoxycholate (DOC) 1% (w/v) plate (bottom),  
1230 ten-fold serial dilutions were made in LB and spotted onto the plate and plates were  
1231 incubated at 30 °C. **c** Ten-fold serial dilutions were made in LB medium and plated on LB  
1232 agar plates (top) or plates containing 15  $\mu$ g/mL of vancomycin (bottom). Plates were  
1233 incubated for 5 days at 15 °C.

1234

1235 **Figure 6. The T434A mutation and the LVPR insertion in the hinge region alter BamA**

1236 **conformational dynamics**

1237 **a** Structure of BAM in a lateral-open conformation (PDB 5LJO <sup>21</sup>) with each subunit coloured.

1238 **b and c** BAM structures showing regions of HDX protection and deprotection in the BAM

1239 complex in the presence of the **b** T434A mutation or **c** LVPR insertion. Regions protected or

1240 deprotected from hydrogen exchange in the mutant complexes are highlighted in blue or








1241 red, respectively. Regions in white show no change in deuterium uptake, while those in



1242 black denote sequences for which peptides were not detected. Sequence coverage maps






1243 are shown in Supplementary Fig. 9, and Wood's plots are shown in Supplementary Figs. 10-





1244 14.




1245






**a****b****c****d****e**




**a****b****c**


**a**



**b** BAM vs BAM<sub>T434A</sub>



**c** BAM vs BAM<sub>LVPR</sub>





1 BamA is the catalytic core of the BAM complex, which inserts proteins into bacterial  
2 outer membranes. Here, the authors show that hinge flexibility between BamA's  $\beta$ -barrel  
3 and POTRA domains is vital, demonstrating how evolution has fine-tuned the BamA  
4 sequence and structure for function.