

1 **Biofilm switch and immune response determinants at early stages of infection**

2 **Jaione Valle, Cristina Solano, Begoña García, Alejandro Toledo-Arana and Iñigo Lasa***

3 Laboratory of Microbial Biofilms. Instituto de Agrobiotecnología, Idab, Universidad Pública de Navarra-
4 CSIC-Gobierno de Navarra, Campus de Arrosadía, Pamplona-31006, Navarra, Spain;

5

6

7

8 * Corresponding author: Instituto de Agrobiotecnología. Universidad Pública de Navarra. Pamplona-
9 31006, SPAIN

10 Tel: 34 948 168007

11 Fax: 34 948 232191

12 Email: ilasa@unavarra.es

13

14

15

16 **Keywords: biofilm, chronic infections, innate immune response, c-di-GMP,**

17 **STING, PAMPs, type I interferon, cGAS**

18

19

1 **Abstract**

2 Biofilm development is recognized as a major virulence factor underlying most
3 bacterial chronic infections. When a biofilm community is established, planktonic cells
4 growing in the surroundings of a particular tissue switch to a sessile lifestyle and start
5 producing a biofilm matrix. Initial steps of *in vivo* biofilm development are poorly
6 characterized and difficult to assess experimentally. A great amount of *in vitro* evidence
7 have shown that accumulation of high levels of cyclic di-nucleotides (c-di-NMPs) is the
8 most prevalent hallmark governing the initiation of biofilm development in bacteria.
9 Recent studies also link detection of c-di-NMPs by host cells with the activation of type
10 I interferon immune response against bacterial infections. Here, we discuss c-di-NMP
11 signaling and the host immune response in the context of the initial steps of *in vivo*
12 biofilm development.

13

1 **Uncertainties in the initiation of biofilm formation in chronic infections**

2 Bacterial infections in the human body are classically divided into acute or chronic
3 infections. This useful clinical classification usually reflects differences in the
4 expression of gene products known as virulence factors as well as in the lifestyle that
5 bacteria causing the infection adopt. Acute infections last a short time and involve
6 single planktonic (free-swimming) bacteria that cause tissue damage through the
7 production of a large amount of virulence factors. They typically cause severe clinical
8 symptoms and can generally be efficiently treated with either one or more antibiotics. In
9 contrast, chronic infections are characteristically associated with bacterial aggregates,
10 commonly referred to as biofilms, where bacteria are physically joined together and
11 encased in a self-produced extracellular matrix made of exopolysaccharides, large
12 surface proteins, fatty acids and DNA. Biofilm-mediated infections persist in spite of
13 antibiotic therapy and the host's innate and adaptive immune responses [1-4]. Although
14 the biofilm is the predominant mode of growth for bacteria in most natural and clinical
15 environments, some bacterial species are more prone to produce chronic infections,
16 suggesting either that they have a high capacity to reach locations suitable for biofilm
17 settlement or that they possess special skills to efficiently switch from a planktonic to a
18 sessile lifestyle on the surface of inert or living tissues. Despite the wealth of knowledge
19 gained over the years on the biofilm formation process and their implication in chronic
20 infections [5,6] very little is known about how the biofilm development process starts
21 on the surface of host tissues and how the host cell responds to this process. In this
22 regard, the animal models currently used to examine *in vivo* biofilm infections, such as
23 device-related endocarditis or placement of a piece of catheter under the skin, provide
24 insights into the factors required for the progression of the infection. However, new
25 methodological strategies, such as direct observation of biofilm development on tissue

1 surfaces and *in situ* genome-wide transcriptomic profiling, are needed to further explore
2 initial steps governing *in vivo* biofilm development for the progression of a chronic
3 infection. Significant challenges for the implementation of these methods will be the
4 low number of planktonic bacteria from which biofilm infection is supposed to start and
5 also the short period of time occurring between initial bacterial adhesion and the switch
6 to a sessile lifestyle. Thus, taking into consideration the scarce background information,
7 we first provide a brief overview of the main signal transduction pathway, based on
8 cyclic di-nucleotides (c-di-NMPs) secondary messengers, that governs the initial
9 planktonic-to-biofilm switch and then discuss the emerging information about the role
10 of c-di-NMPs as pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) triggering a host
11 innate immune response. Subsequently, we raise the possibility that both processes
12 might be connected during the initial steps of biofilm development that precede the
13 establishment of a chronic infection.

14

15 **Switch to biofilm formation and signal transduction**

16 A first step to trigger the transition between a motile, single-cell state to an adhesive,
17 multicellular state on the surface of a particular tissue is the recognition and
18 transmission of signals that bacteria use to identify it is appropriate to settle down.
19 Several signals have been shown to favor early settlement of bacteria on human tissues
20 including: (i) the presence of inert surfaces (plastics, metals and devitalized bone); (ii)
21 increased amounts of extracellular iron and ferritin that induce a *Pseudomonas*
22 *aeruginosa* biofilm phenotype in sputum of cystic fibrosis patients; (iii) compromised
23 tissues with elevated levels of glucose in diabetic patients; (iv) imbalances in the
24 commensal microbial communities caused by antibiotic treatments, or age-related
25 deterioration; (v) simultaneous or a previous viral infection; (vi) hydrogen peroxide

1 produced by neutrophils during the oxidative burst; (vii) the presence of compounds
2 such as indol that has stimulating effects on biofilm formation by many gram-negative
3 bacteria including *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella oxytoca*, *Citrobacter koseri* and
4 *Haemophilus influenzae*; extracellular polyamines, calcium and bile salts that modulate
5 biofilm formation in *Vibrio cholerae*, *Yersinia pestis*, *P. putida* and *S. aureus* [7-12].
6 Bacteria have two major sensory systems for the recognition of these signals: two-
7 component systems (TCSs) and the c-di-GMP mediated signal transduction network.
8 TCSs are the basic stimulus-response coupling mechanism in bacteria. The best
9 characterized example of a TCS driving the motile/sessile switch is the intricate
10 LadS/RetS/Gac/Rsm signal transduction system of *P. aeruginosa*, where the
11 GacS/GacA TCS represses the expression of the CsrA homolog RsmA, which
12 reciprocally regulates factors involved in acute infection (motility and the type III
13 secretion system) and chronic infection (exopolysaccharides and the type VI secretion
14 system) (for review see [13,14]). However, TCSs are not typically implicated in
15 controlling the switch between planktonic and sessile lifestyles. Instead, they are
16 dedicated to match the production of specific compounds of the biofilm matrix with the
17 environmental conditions. The signal transduction system that has taken on the
18 responsibility to inhibit motility and promote biofilm development in a diverse range of
19 bacterial species is the one that depends on the secondary messenger c-di-GMP. In c-di-
20 GMP signaling, the sensor protein domain reacts to the stimulus by activating an output
21 domain located in the same protein that triggers the synthesis [diguanylate cyclase
22 (DGC), GGDEF domain containing proteins] or degradation [phosphodiesterase (PDE),
23 EAL and HD-GYP domain containing proteins] of c-di-GMP. Then, the resulting c-di-
24 GMP interacts with specific effectors that finally relay the signals to cellular processes
25 [15]. Based on *in vitro* studies carried out with different bacterial species, it is widely

1 accepted that a high concentration of c-di-GMP enhances biofilm development and
2 represses virulence factor expression whereas low c-di-GMP levels promote bacterial
3 motility and a planktonic lifestyle [16-19]. If this knowledge is extrapolated to what
4 should happen when bacteria start producing a biofilm on the surface of a host tissue,
5 the switch from a planktonic to a biofilm lifestyle would also depend on the
6 accumulation of c-di-GMP through the activation of specific GGDEF domain
7 containing proteins or the inhibition of EAL/HD-GYP domain proteins. Because very
8 often bacteria contain several GGDEF and EAL/HD-GYP domains linked to signal
9 input domains [including PAS, REC, Globin, blue light sensing (BLUF), haemerythrin,
10 GAF, CHASE or MASE domains], it is conceivable that one or more of these proteins
11 sense specific signals on the surface of host tissues, either upon surface contact or as a
12 prerequisite for attachment, to promote increased c-di-GMP accumulation [20].
13 Unfortunately, to date, there is very little information about the mechanisms that
14 regulate DGC and PDE activities *in vivo* and only few studies have been able to show a
15 role of c-di-GMP during chronic infections. For example, small colony variants of *P.*
16 *aeruginosa* with elevated c-di-GMP levels have been identified in cystic fibrosis sputum
17 samples [21-23]. Also, Byrd et al. were able to show that *P. aeruginosa* c-di-GMP
18 overproduction mutants had increased persistence as compared to the wild type strain in
19 a chinchilla middle ear infection model [24]. Considering that there is a general
20 agreement that c-di-GMP signaling is determinant for biofilm development, why has the
21 analysis of c-di-GMP contribution to *in vivo* infections and particularly to the initial
22 steps of infection trailed behind? Detection of c-di-GMP is technically very challenging
23 and current methods cannot be applied to measure c-di-GMP during infection. In this
24 regard, the development of a highly sensitive c-di-GMP-dependent reporter system to
25 rapidly monitor the level of the nucleotide in infecting living bacteria would be

1 extremely useful to investigate the role of this signaling pathway during infection.
2 Besides, since only a few c-di-GMP receptors have been identified, the experimental
3 strategy to characterize the role of c-di-GMP has been based on the analysis of bacterial
4 mutants overloaded with or depleted of c-di-GMP. This is in principal a valid approach
5 that has produced many important insights, but a serious problem related with it is that
6 constant high or low levels of c-di-GMP may affect the activity of several c-di-GMP
7 receptors at the same time and thus have an influence on more than one bacterial
8 process. This scenario may not necessarily resemble a real progression in the
9 establishment of a chronic infection. In support of this prediction, the pioneering work
10 of Pultz et al. [25] has shown differences in the affinities for c-di-GMP of receptor
11 proteins involved in the coordinated inhibition of bacterial motility and increased matrix
12 synthesis during *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium (*S. Typhimurium*) biofilm
13 formation. Such differences in binding affinity were demonstrated to account for a
14 mechanism for the selective activation of c-di-GMP controlled processes. Thus, this
15 model involves the sequential activation of c-di-GMP receptors so that whilst the c-di-
16 GMP concentration is maintained at a low level, bacteria are motile and do not produce
17 biofilm matrix compounds. Upon sensing appropriate environmental conditions, levels
18 of c-di-GMP rise, first activating the receptor responsible for flagella motility repression
19 and later the receptor that stimulates the synthesis of biofilm matrix compounds. This
20 model implies that when a *S. Typhimurium* mutant with high levels of c-di-GMP is used
21 for virulence studies, it is necessary to consider that the resulting phenotypes may be
22 due to both the inhibition of bacterial motility and shielding of cell surface receptors
23 with biofilm matrix compounds, which may not mimic the reality of sequential biofilm
24 formation events *in vivo*.

1 Despite the broad distribution of c-di-GMP signaling in bacteria, some bacteria lack the
2 enzymes required for c-di-GMP synthesis and instead they use c-di-AMP as a
3 secondary messenger [26-30]. A notable example is *Staphylococcus aureus*, which is
4 one of the bacterial species most frequently associated with biofilm-mediated infections
5 [31,32]. Although our knowledge about c-di-AMP-mediated signaling in bacteria is in
6 its infancy compared to the c-di-GMP network, it is already clear that c-di-AMP
7 controls cell wall properties, as an increase in c-di-AMP levels allows *S. aureus* to grow
8 in the absence of lipoteichoic acid, confers resistance to cell wall active antimicrobials
9 and induces the production of components involved in biofilm formation [28]. Also, it
10 has been shown that secretion of c-di-AMP in *Listeria monocytogenes* is responsible for
11 the induction of an interferon- β (IFN- β) mediated host immune response [29].
12 However, direct evidences showing that c-di-AMP controls the transition between a
13 planktonic and a sessile lifestyle are still missing.

14 Considering the prevalence of c-di-GMP signaling in inducing a planktonic/biofilm
15 switch in a broad range of bacteria and that bacteria have invariably linked the synthesis
16 of the biofilm matrix with the accumulation of high levels of c-di-GMP, one has to
17 wonder whether this accumulation has significant relevance during the infection process
18 and if it conditions the interplay between biofilm development and the host cell
19 response. One answer to this question might be that this c-di-GMP accumulation
20 provides an advantage during infection through the deviation of the innate immune
21 response. On the contrary, this accumulation might be detrimental for bacteria because
22 it might allow the immune system to recognize c-di-GMP as a signal to alert on the
23 presence of biofilm-mediated infections. This paradox is discussed below.

24

25 **Biofilm, innate immune response and c-di-NMPs**

1 Innate immunity is the first line of defense against infection. It recognizes and provides
2 rapid defense against pathogens. The recognition depends on receptors (pattern-
3 recognition receptors, PPRs) that trigger signaling pathways not only to alert the
4 immune system to the presence of infection but also to initiate adaptive immune
5 responses through activation of antigen presenting cells [33]. Even though several
6 classes of PRRs and their ligands are known, PRRs specific for microorganisms within
7 biofilms have not yet been identified. Recent studies have shown that bacterial c-di-
8 NMPs (c-di-GMP and c-di-AMP) act as PAMPs eliciting a host type I interferon (IFN)
9 innate immune response characterized by activation of IFN production (meter aquí el de
10 **chlamydia también**) [29,34-39]. Thus, bacterial c-di-NMPs produced at high levels
11 during biofilm development could serve as danger signals recognized by the host
12 immune system (Figure 1). Two distinct PPRs able to directly bind cyclic nucleotides
13 and mediate the induction of type I IFN have been described. Binding of c-di-GMP to a
14 dimer of the stimulator of interferon genes (STING) results in the activation of the IRF3
15 transcription factor, which is required for host transcriptional activation of type I IFNs
16 [40-42]. More recently, DDX41, a DEAD-box helicase, has been shown to directly bind
17 c-di-NMPs and mediate the induction of IFN through a pathway that likely converges
18 upstream of STING [43,44]. c-di-GMP binds STING and DDX41 with a dissociation
19 constant of $\sim 14.54 \mu\text{M}$ and $\sim 5.65 \mu\text{M}$, respectively [43,45]. These dissociation
20 constants are consistent with c-di-GMP concentrations in the bacterial cytoplasm, which
21 have been estimated to be in the sub- to low- micro-molar range [16,46,47]. Moreover,
22 STING dependent type I IFN production can also be strongly induced by endogenous
23 hybrid cyclic GMP-AMP synthesized by mammalian cyclic GMP-AMP synthase
24 (cGAS) in response to the presence of DNA in the cytoplasm [48,49]. It is tempting to

1 speculate that cGAS might also sense bacterial c-di-NMPs providing a mechanism of
2 signal amplification for a more sensitive innate immune response.

3 Because both STING and the DDX41 helicase are cytoplasmic proteins, it is assumed
4 that these proteins recognize and respond to DNA and c-di-NMPs derived from
5 microorganisms that enter the cytosol. In particular, it is possible that STING and
6 DDX41 could directly detect c-di-NMPs produced by intracellular biofilm
7 communities. Compelling evidence indicates that in addition to extracellular biofilms,
8 some bacteria can form biofilm-like polysaccharide-containing structures inside the host
9 epithelial cells named intracellular bacterial communities (Figure 1B). These structures
10 were firstly described in uropathogenic *Escherichia coli* (UPEC), the predominant
11 causative agent of urinary tract infections (UTIs) but they have also been recognized for
12 other bacterial pathogens such as *Klebsiella pneumoniae* [50], *P. aeruginosa* [51] and *S.*
13 *aureus* [52,53]. Because intracellular biofilms are not confined to a membrane, c-di-
14 GMP and/or c-di-AMP, if secreted, could freely diffuse in the cytoplasm of infected
15 cells and bind to cytoplasmic cell host receptors. Furthermore, a recent study has
16 provided evidence that STING is able to detect c-di-AMP synthesized by *Chlamydia*
17 *trachomatis* even though *Chlamydia* is confined to a membrane-bound vacuole. This
18 raises the possibility that STING can directly survey membrane-bound pathogen-
19 containing vacuoles for leaking microbe-specific metabolites to mount type I IFN
20 responses required to control microbial infections [54]. On the other hand, several lines
21 of evidences suggest that extracellular c-di-NMPs can also elicit an immune response.
22 Studies for evaluating the immunostimulatory and immunomodulatory properties of c-
23 di-AMP and c-di-GMP suggest that these external molecules could be able to activate
24 IFN acting via up-to-now uncharacterized surface receptors or nucleotide transporters
25 [55-59]. Furthermore, c-di-GMP treatment reduces, in a dose-dependent manner,

1 bacterial colonization by biofilm-forming *S. aureus* strains in a mouse model of mastitis
2 infection [57]. The concentration of c-di-GMP used in this study (50 nM) is close to the
3 physiological upper limit for freely diffusible c-di-GMP in the bacterial cytoplasm [60].
4 Independently of whether c-di-NMPs need to be present in the cytosol or can activate
5 the innate immune system from the outside to the inside of the cell, they need to be
6 released from bacteria at sufficient levels to activate host receptors. In the case of
7 *Listeria monocytogenes*, genetic and biochemical studies have identified two major
8 multidrug resistance (MDR) efflux pumps, MdrM and MdrT, as necessary and
9 sufficient for secretion of c-di-AMP and induction of the cytosolic surveillance pathway
10 (CSP) in host immune cells [29,61]. Bioinformatic analysis identified the widespread
11 presence of homologs of the MdrM and MdrT efflux pumps in bacteria, including
12 pathogenic *staphylococci*, *streptococci* and *mycobacteria*, strongly suggesting that these
13 bacteria could also secrete c-di-AMP. With respect to c-di-GMP, there is no evidence
14 suggesting the secretion of this nucleotide outside bacteria. However, one could imagine
15 that the interaction with the host cell may trigger c-di-GMP secretion during infection.
16 In summary, there is convincing support for the idea that c-di-NMPs are detected by the
17 innate immune system as a novel PAMP type. However, a deeper insight into the
18 mechanisms of c-di-NMPs detection by the host cell is needed to conclusively establish
19 that accumulation of c-di-NMPs during the biofilm switch alerts the innate immune
20 system of the presence of a bacterial infection.

21

22 **Does c-di-NMPs dependent activation of type I IFN production play a role against**
23 **biofilm-mediated infections?**

24 The answer to this question is unclear because conflicting reports about the role of type
25 I IFN during bacterial infection have been published [62-64]. In general, production of

1 type I IFN has been reported to be protective against extracellular bacteria. For instance,
2 stimulation of type I IFN production by *S. aureus* promotes an effective host defense
3 and also treatment of cutaneous infections with exogenous IFN- β promotes bacterial
4 clearance [65]. Similarly, *Streptococcus pyogenes* elicits type I IFN production and
5 inhibition of its production increases the susceptibility of the host to streptococcal
6 diseases [66,67]. The production of type I IFN is also required for resistance against
7 encapsulated *Escherichia coli* strains in a sepsis model of mice infection [68]. In
8 contrast, it is well known that the expression of type I IFN enhances the susceptibility to
9 infection by *L. monocytogenes* [69-71]. An interesting explanation for the mechanism
10 by which type I IFN production could be detrimental during *L. monocytogenes* infection
11 has been provided in a recent study with *S. Typhimurium* [72]. Using transgenic mice
12 deficient in the receptor for type I IFNs, Robinson *et al.* showed that *S. Typhimurium*
13 uses type I IFN signaling to kill macrophages through the induction of a specialized
14 pathway for programmed necrosis, referred to as necroptosis. In regards to c-di-NMPs
15 signaling, it is not difficult to imagine a scenario where local accumulation of c-di-
16 NMPs surrounding the bacterial biofilm could elicit type I IFN production, which would
17 protect biofilm bacteria by inducing the death of recruited macrophages (Figure 2).
18 However, because these studies have used acute infection models, it is necessary, before
19 drawing any conclusion about the role of type I IFN against biofilm infections, to
20 consider that soon after the switch to a sessile lifestyle, bacteria start producing the
21 biofilm matrix. The extracellular matrix is made of proteinaceous compounds and/or
22 exopolysaccharides and provides a mechanical stability and protection from host
23 defenses. One of the most common matrix exopolysaccharides secreted by a wide range
24 of bacteria is a polymer of β -1,6-N-acetyl-D-glucosamine called PGA or PIA/PNAG
25 [31,73,74]. This exopolysaccharide provides protection against phagocytosis by steric

1 hindrance and charge repulsion which reduces antibody and complement deposition on
2 the bacterial cell surface [75-79]. A more detailed analysis of the mechanisms that
3 account for the innate immune evasion during *S. aureus* biofilm infection strongly
4 suggests an active reprogramming of the innate immune response [80,81]. The
5 macrophages recruited at the host biofilm interface are polarized towards an alternative
6 activated M2 phenotype that possesses anti-inflammatory properties and shows reduced
7 induction of nitric oxide synthase concomitant with robust arginase-1 expression. In
8 addition, a rapid necrosis of those macrophages that invaded deep into the biofilm was
9 described. Interestingly, that these biofilms induced macrophage dysfunction might
10 provide a potential explanation as to why biofilm infections persist in an
11 immunocompetent host. Because classical TLR2 (cell enveloped compounds ligand)
12 and TLR9 (DNA ligand) recognition pathways apparently do not dictate biofilm
13 mediated immune response deviation [80], a possibility exists that signaling mediated
14 by c-di-NMPs might be related to the above described phenotypes. Future research
15 using biofilm infection models and genetically modified bacteria in which the synthesis
16 of c-di-NMPs exclusively occurred at the infection site would be useful to gain insight
17 into biofilm mediated chronic infections.

18

19 **Concluding remarks and future directions**

20 Despite the wealth of knowledge gained over the years about bacterial biofilm
21 formation and its involvement in the development of chronic infections, there are still
22 major unresolved questions about how the biofilm formation process starts on the
23 surface of host tissues (Box 1). A good example of the current uncertainty is the role
24 that c-di-NMPs and the innate immune system play during *in vivo* infection. A widely
25 accepted truth in the bacterial biofilm field is the crucial role that c-di-NMPs play to

1 control the transition between a free-swimming and a sessile lifestyle. At the same time,
2 several groups dedicated to identifying PRRs have recently discovered that c-di-NMPs
3 are recognized by the innate immune system leading to the induction of type I IFNs.
4 Considering that activation of biofilm development coincides with the accumulation of
5 highest levels of c-di-NMPs in all the bacteria tested to date, it seems reasonable to
6 assume that the innate immune system could recognize c-di-NMPs as a signal of the
7 presence of an incipient bacterial biofilm. **To investigate this hypothesis, future**
8 **challenges will be to develop methods to measure the accumulation of c-di-NMPs in**
9 **biofilm infected tissues and explore the mechanisms through which the innate immune**
10 **system recognizes extracellular c-di-NMPs.**

11 **¿por qué has quitado el resto?**

12

13 **Acknowledgments**

14 We apologize to those colleagues whose work could not be cited owing to space
15 constraints. J. Valle was supported by Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation
16 “Ramón y Cajal” contract. We thank Professor Angel L. Corbí and Dr. Estanislao Nistal
17 for excellent comments on the manuscript. Work in the Laboratory of Microbial
18 Biofilms is funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness grants
19 BIO2011-30503-C02-02, AGL2011-23954 and BFU2011-23222 as well as ERA-NET
20 Pathogenomics (PIM2010EPA-00606) and grants from the Departamento de
21 Innovación (IIQ14066.RI1 and IIM13329.RI1) and Departamento de Salud (Resolución
22 1312/2010), Gobierno de Navarra.

23

1 **Box 1. Outstanding questions**

- 2 1. Do c-di-NMPs play a role during early steps of bacterial biofilm formation that
3 precede the establishment of a chronic infection?
- 4 2. Are there biological markers of early biofilm formation process *in vivo*?
- 5 3. Does the interaction with the host cells induce the accumulation of c-di-NMPs?
6 If that is so, which are the signals in the host that induce the accumulation of c-
7 di-NMPs in bacteria?
- 8 4. Does the innate immune system recognize the incipient biofilm development
9 through the detection of c-di-NMPs?
- 10 5. Is cGAS able to sense bacterial c-di-NMPs in order to amplify the activation of
11 type I IFN production?
- 12 6. Does biofilm matrix composition confer different protection against type I IFN-
13 mediated immune response?
- 14 7. Do c-di-NMPs or biofilm matrix components condition macrophage polarization
15 for the subsequent immune response?
- 16 8. Does c-di-NMPs and DDX41/STING represent new targets for combating
17 chronic infections?

18

19

1 **Figure legends**

2

3 **Figure 1.**

4 **Stimulation of type I IFN production through DDX41 helicase and STING**

5 **activation by c-di-NMPs during bacterial biofilm infections.** Environmental signals

6 favor the initiation of a biofilm by transitioning from a planktonic to a surface attached

7 mode of growth. After adhesion, bacteria proliferate and synthesize a biofilm matrix,

8 establishing an extracellular biofilm on the cell surface (A). In some situations, bacteria

9 invade the host cell to proliferate within the cytoplasm developing an intracellular

10 biofilm (B). c-di-NMPs either produced by intracellular bacteria or internalized via

11 uncharacterized host cell surface proteins, interact with the DDX41 helicase and/or

12 STING. Movement of STING to a perinuclear punctuate structure is necessary for the

13 recruitment and activation of the kinase (TBK1) in order to phosphorylate the interferon

14 regulatory factor (IRF3) to induce production of type I IFNs (IFNs). Abbreviations: ER,

15 endoplasmic reticulum.

16

17 **Figure 2.**

18 **The bacterial cyclic di-nucleotides paradox.**

19 The drawing shows a working model about the double function that c-di-NMPs could

20 play during the first stages of biofilm related infections. On one hand, cyclic di-

21 nucleotide second messengers stimulate the synthesis of the biofilm matrix compounds.

22 On the other, the host cells have evolved a pathway to sense c-di-NMPs that might act

23 as biofilm specific PAMPs. As a consequence, type I IFN is produced priming a local

24 innate immune response. The biofilm matrix shields bacteria by constituting a steric

25 barrier against phagocytosis, hampering deposition of antibodies and protecting against

1 antimicrobial defensins. In addition, biofilms might induce a rapid macrophage death
2 and macrophage reprogramming towards a M2 phenotype characterized by a poorly
3 microbicidal activity. Abbreviations: NK, natural killer cells; macrophages; Th1, Th1
4 lymphocytes.

5

6 **References**

- 7 1 Costerton, J. *et al.* (1987) Bacterial biofilms in nature and disease. *Annu Rev*
8 *Microbiol* 41, 435–464
- 9 2 Costerton, J.W. *et al.* (1999) Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of persistent
10 infections. *Science* 284, 1318–1322
- 11 3 Sutherland, I. (2001) The biofilm matrix--an immobilized but dynamic microbial
12 environment. *Trends Microbiol* 9, 222–227
- 13 4 Mah, T.F. and O'toole, G.A. (2001) Mechanisms of biofilm resistance to
14 antimicrobial agents. *Trends in Microbiology* 9, 34–39
- 15 5 Joo, H.-S. and Otto, M. (2012) Molecular basis of in vivo biofilm formation by
16 bacterial pathogens. *Chemistry & Biology* 19, 1503–1513
- 17 6 Bjarnsholt, T., Ed. (2011) *Biofilm Infections*, Springer.
- 18 7 Sauer, K. and Camper, A.K. (2001) Characterization of phenotypic changes in
19 *Pseudomonas putida* in response to surface-associated growth. *J Bacteriol* 183,
20 6579–6589
- 21 8 Reid, D.W. *et al.* (2002) Iron deficiency in cystic fibrosis: relationship to lung
22 disease severity and chronic *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection. *Chest* 121, 48–54
- 23 9 Martino, P.D. *et al.* (2003) Indole can act as an extracellular signal to regulate
24 biofilm formation of *Escherichia coli* and other indole-producing bacteria. *Can J*
25 *Microbiol* 49, 443–449
- 26 10 Karatan, E. *et al.* (2005) NspS, a predicted polyamine sensor, mediates activation
27 of *Vibrio cholerae* biofilm formation by norspermidine. *J Bacteriol* 187, 7434–
28 7443
- 29 11 Patel, C.N. *et al.* (2006) Polyamines are essential for the formation of plague
30 biofilm. *J Bacteriol* 188, 2355–2363
- 31 12 Karatan, E. and Watnick, P. (2009) Signals, regulatory networks, and materials that
32 build and break bacterial biofilms. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 73, 310–347
- 33 13 Mikkelsen, H. *et al.* (2011) Key two-component regulatory systems that control
34 biofilm formation in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Environ Microbiol* 13, 1666–1681
- 35 14 Kong, W. *et al.* (2013) Hybrid sensor kinase PA1611 in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*
36 regulates transitions between acute and chronic infection through direct interaction
37 with RetS. *Mol Microbiol* DOI: 10.1111/mmi.12223
- 38 15 Romling, U. *et al.* (2013) Cyclic di-GMP: the First 25 Years of a Universal
39 Bacterial Second Messenger. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* 77, 1–
40 52
- 41 16 Simm, R. *et al.* (2004) GGDEF and EAL domains inversely regulate cyclic di-
42 GMP levels and transition from sessility to motility. *Mol Microbiol* 53, 1123–1134
- 43 17 Tamayo, R. *et al.* (2007) Roles of cyclic diguanylate in the regulation of bacterial
44 pathogenesis. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 61, 131–148

- 1 18 Solano, C. *et al.* (2009) Genetic reductionist approach for dissecting individual
2 roles of GGDEF proteins within the c-di-GMP signaling network in *Salmonella*.
3 *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 106, 7997–8002
- 4 19 Romling, U. *et al.* (2005) C-di-GMP: the dawning of a novel bacterial signalling
5 system. *Mol Microbiol* 57, 629–639
- 6 20 Jenal, U. (2004) Cyclic di-guanosine-monophosphate comes of age: a novel
7 secondary messenger involved in modulating cell surface structures in bacteria?
8 *Current Opinion in Microbiology* 7, 185–191
- 9 21 Meissner, A. *et al.* (2007) *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* cupA-encoded fimbriae
10 expression is regulated by a GGDEF and EAL domain-dependent modulation of
11 the intracellular level of cyclic diguanylate. *Environ Microbiol* 9, 2475–2485
- 12 22 Starkey, M. *et al.* (2009) *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* rugose small-colony variants
13 have adaptations that likely promote persistence in the cystic fibrosis lung. *J*
14 *Bacteriol* 191, 3492–3503
- 15 23 Malone, J.G. *et al.* (2012) The YfiBNR signal transduction mechanism reveals
16 novel targets for the evolution of persistent *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in cystic
17 fibrosis airways. *PLoS Pathog* 8, e1002760
- 18 24 Byrd, M.S. *et al.* (2011) Direct evaluation of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilm
19 mediators in a chronic infection model. *Infect Immun* 79, 3087–3095
- 20 25 Pultz, I.S. *et al.* (2012) The response threshold of *Salmonella* PilZ domain proteins
21 is determined by their binding affinities for c-di-GMP. *Mol Microbiol* 86, 1424–
22 1440
- 23 26 Bejerano-Sagie, M. *et al.* (2006) A checkpoint protein that scans the chromosome
24 for damage at the start of sporulation in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Cell* 125, 679–690
- 25 27 Witte, G. *et al.* (2008) Structural biochemistry of a bacterial checkpoint protein
26 reveals diadenylate cyclase activity regulated by DNA recombination
27 intermediates. *Molecular Cell* 30, 167–178
- 28 28 Corrigan, R.M. *et al.* (2011) c-di-AMP is a new second messenger in
29 *Staphylococcus aureus* with a role in controlling cell size and envelope stress.
30 *PLoS Pathog* 7, e1002217
- 31 29 Woodward, J.J. *et al.* (2010) c-di-AMP secreted by intracellular *Listeria*
32 *monocytogenes* activates a host type I interferon response. *Science* 328, 1703–1705
- 33 30 Kamegaya, T. *et al.* (2011) Identification of a *Streptococcus pyogenes* SF370 gene
34 involved in production of c-di-AMP. *Nagoya J Med Sci* 73, 49–57
- 35 31 Gotz, F. (2002) *Staphylococcus* and biofilms. *Mol Microbiol* 43, 1367–78.
- 36 32 Otto, M. (2013) Staphylococcal infections: mechanisms of biofilm maturation and
37 detachment as critical determinants of pathogenicity. *Annu. Rev. Med.* 64, 175–188
- 38 33 Medzhitov, R. and Janeway, C. (2000) The Toll receptor family and microbial
39 recognition. *Trends in Microbiology* 8, 452–456
- 40 34 Barbalat, R. *et al.* (2011) Nucleic acid recognition by the innate immune system.
41 *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* 29, 185–214
- 42 35 Blander, J.M. and Sander, L.E. (2012) Beyond pattern recognition: five immune
43 checkpoints for scaling the microbial threat. *Nat Rev Immunol* 12, 215–225
- 44 36 Burdette, D.L. and Vance, R.E. (2013) STING and the innate immune response to
45 nucleic acids in the cytosol. *Nat Immunol* 14, 19–26
- 46 37 McWhirter, S.M. *et al.* (2009) A host type I interferon response is induced by
47 cytosolic sensing of the bacterial second messenger cyclic-di-GMP. *J Exp Med*
48 206, 1899–1911
- 49 38 Abdullah, Z. *et al.* (2012) RIG-I detects infection with live *Listeria* by sensing
50 secreted bacterial nucleic acids. *EMBO J* DOI: 10.1038/emboj.2012.274

- 1 39 Shaw, N. *et al.* (2013) Binding of bacterial secondary messenger molecule c di-
2 GMP is a STING operation. *Protein Cell* 4, 117–129
- 3 40 Sauer, J.-D. *et al.* (2011) The N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea-induced Goldenticket mouse
4 mutant reveals an essential function of STING in the *in vivo* interferon response to
5 *Listeria monocytogenes* and cyclic dinucleotides. *Infect Immun* 79, 688–694
- 6 41 Burdette, D.L. *et al.* (2011) STING is a direct innate immune sensor of cyclic di-
7 GMP. *Nature* DOI: 10.1038/nature10429
- 8 42 Jin, L. *et al.* (2011) MPYS is required for IFN response factor 3 activation and type
9 I IFN production in the response of cultured phagocytes to bacterial second
10 messengers cyclic-di-AMP and cyclic-di-GMP. *J Immunol* 187, 2595–2601
- 11 43 Parvatiyar, K. *et al.* (2012) The helicase DDX41 recognizes the bacterial secondary
12 messengers cyclic di-GMP and cyclic di-AMP to activate a type I interferon
13 immune response. *Nat Immunol* DOI: 10.1038/ni.2460
- 14 44 Bowie, A.G. (2012) Innate sensing of bacterial cyclic dinucleotides: more than just
15 STING. *Nat Immunol* 13, 1137–1139
- 16 45 Ouyang, S. *et al.* (2012) Structural Analysis of the STING Adaptor Protein Reveals
17 a Hydrophobic Dimer Interface and Mode of Cyclic di-GMP Binding. *Immunity*
18 DOI: 10.1016/j.immuni.2012.03.019
- 19 46 Paul, R. *et al.* (2004) Cell cycle-dependent dynamic localization of a bacterial
20 response regulator with a novel di-guanylate cyclase output domain. *Genes Dev* 18,
21 715–727
- 22 47 Weinhouse, H. *et al.* (1997) c-di-GMP-binding protein, a new factor regulating
23 cellulose synthesis in *Acetobacter xylinum*. *FEBS Lett* 416, 207–211
- 24 48 Sun, L. *et al.* (2013) Cyclic GMP-AMP synthase is a cytosolic DNA sensor that
25 activates the type I interferon pathway. *Science* 339, 786–791
- 26 49 Wu, J. *et al.* (2013) Cyclic GMP-AMP is an endogenous second messenger in
27 innate immune signaling by cytosolic DNA. *Science* 339, 826–830
- 28 50 Rosen, D.A. *et al.* (2007) Detection of intracellular bacterial communities in
29 human urinary tract infection. *PLoS Med.* 4, e329
- 30 51 Garcia-Medina, R. *et al.* (2005) *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* acquires biofilm-like
31 properties within airway epithelial cells. *Infect Immun* 73, 8298–8305
- 32 52 Clement, S. *et al.* (2005) Evidence of an intracellular reservoir in the nasal mucosa
33 of patients with recurrent *Staphylococcus aureus* rhinosinusitis. *J INFECT DIS*
34 192, 1023–1028
- 35 53 Hensen, S.M. *et al.* (2000) Location of *Staphylococcus aureus* within the
36 experimentally infected bovine udder and the expression of capsular
37 polysaccharide type 5 *in situ*. *Journal of Dairy Science* 83, 1966–1975
- 38 54 Barker, J.R. *et al.* (2013) STING-Dependent Recognition of Cyclic di-AMP
39 Mediates Type I Interferon Responses during *Chlamydia trachomatis* Infection.
40 *mBio* 4,
- 41 55 Ebensen, T. *et al.* (2007) The bacterial second messenger cyclic diGMP exhibits
42 potent adjuvant properties. *Vaccine* 25, 1464–1469
- 43 56 Karaolis, D.K.R. *et al.* (2007) Bacterial c-di-GMP is an immunostimulatory
44 molecule. *J Immunol* 178, 2171–2181
- 45 57 Hu, D.-L. *et al.* (2009) c-di-GMP as a vaccine adjuvant enhances protection
46 against systemic methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infection.
47 *Vaccine* 27, 4867–4873
- 48 58 Libanova, R. *et al.* (2011) Cyclic di-nucleotides: new era for small molecules as
49 adjuvants. *Microbial Biotechnology* 5, 168–176
- 50 59 Chen, W. *et al.* (2010) The potential of 3′,5′-cyclic diguanylic acid (c-di-GMP) as

- 1 an effective vaccine adjuvant. *Vaccine* 28, 3080–3085
- 2 60 Hengge, R. (2010) Cyclic-di-GMP reaches out into the bacterial RNA world. *Sci*
3 *Signal* 3, pe44
- 4 61 Schwartz, K.T. *et al.* (2012) Hyperinduction of Host Beta Interferon by a *Listeria*
5 *monocytogenes* Strain Naturally Overexpressing the Multidrug Efflux Pump MdrT.
6 *Infect Immun* 80, 1537–1545
- 7 62 Perry, R. *et al.* (2004) Temperature regulation of the hemin storage (Hms+)
8 phenotype of *Yersinia pestis* is posttranscriptional. *J Bacteriol* 186, 1638–1647
- 9 63 Decker, T. *et al.* (2005) The yin and yang of type I interferon activity in bacterial
10 infection. *Nat Rev Immunol* 5, 675–687
- 11 64 Ishii, K.J. *et al.* (2008) Host innate immune receptors and beyond: making sense of
12 microbial infections. *Cell Host & Microbe* 3, 352–363
- 13 65 Kaplan, A. *et al.* (2012) Failure to induce IFN- β production during *Staphylococcus*
14 *aureus* infection contributes to pathogenicity. *J Immunol* 189, 4537–4545
- 15 66 Gratz, N. *et al.* (2008) Group A streptococcus activates type I interferon
16 production and MyD88-dependent signaling without involvement of TLR2, TLR4,
17 and TLR9. *J. Biol. Chem.* 283, 19879–19887
- 18 67 Xiao, N. *et al.* (2009) The Tpl2 mutation Sluggish impairs type I IFN production
19 and increases susceptibility to group B streptococcal disease. *J Immunol* 183,
20 7975–7983
- 21 68 Mancuso, G. *et al.* (2007) Type I IFN signaling is crucial for host resistance
22 against different species of pathogenic bacteria. *J Immunol* 178, 3126–3133
- 23 69 O'Connell, R.M. *et al.* (2004) Type I interferon production enhances susceptibility
24 to *Listeria monocytogenes* infection. *J Exp Med* 200, 437–445
- 25 70 Auerbuch, V. *et al.* (2004) Mice lacking the type I interferon receptor are resistant
26 to *Listeria monocytogenes*. *J Exp Med* 200, 527–533
- 27 71 Carrero, J.A. *et al.* (2004) Type I interferon sensitizes lymphocytes to apoptosis
28 and reduces resistance to *Listeria* infection. *J Exp Med* 200, 535–540
- 29 72 Robinson, N. *et al.* (2012) Type I interferon induces necroptosis in macrophages
30 during infection with *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium. *Nat Immunol* 13,
31 954–962
- 32 73 Cramton, S. *et al.* (1999) The intercellular adhesion (*ica*) locus is present in
33 *Staphylococcus aureus* and is required for biofilm formation. *Infect Immun* 67,
34 5427–5433
- 35 74 Wang, X. *et al.* (2004) The *pgaABCD* locus of *Escherichia coli* promotes the
36 synthesis of a polysaccharide adhesin required for biofilm formation. *J Bacteriol*
37 186, 2724–2734
- 38 75 Maira-Litran, T. *et al.* (2005) Comparative opsonic and protective activities of
39 *Staphylococcus aureus* conjugate vaccines containing native or deacetylated
40 Staphylococcal Poly-N-acetyl-beta-(1-6)-glucosamine. *Infect Immun* 73, 6752–
41 6762
- 42 76 Vuong, C. *et al.* (2004) Polysaccharide intercellular adhesin (PIA) protects
43 *Staphylococcus epidermidis* against major components of the human innate
44 immune system. *Cell Microbiol* 6, 269–275
- 45 77 Kropec, A. *et al.* (2005) Poly-N-acetylglucosamine production in *Staphylococcus*
46 *aureus* is essential for virulence in murine models of systemic infection. *Infect*
47 *Immun* 73, 6868–6876
- 48 78 Cerca, N. (2006) Comparative Antibody-Mediated Phagocytosis of *Staphylococcus*
49 *epidermidis* Cells Grown in a Biofilm or in the Planktonic State. *Infect Immun* 74,
50 4849–4855

- 1 79 Schommer, N.N. *et al.* (2011) *Staphylococcus epidermidis* Uses Distinct
2 Mechanisms of Biofilm Formation To Interfere with Phagocytosis and Activation
3 of Mouse Macrophage-Like Cells 774A.1. *Infect Immun* 79, 2267–2276
4 80 Thurlow, L.R. *et al.* (2011) *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilms prevent macrophage
5 phagocytosis and attenuate inflammation in vivo. *J Immunol* 186, 6585–6596
6 81 Hanke, M.L. *et al.* (2013) Targeting Macrophage Activation for the Prevention and
7 Treatment of *Staphylococcus aureus* Biofilm Infections. *J Immunol* 190, 2159–
8 2168
9