Published in final edited form as:

ACS Chem Biol. 2011 January 21; 6(1): 106–116. doi:10.1021/cb100269f.

Synthetic lethal compound combinations reveal a fundamental connection between wall teichoic acid and peptidoglycan biosyntheses in *Staphylococcus aureus*

Jennifer Campbell¹, Atul K. Singh^{1,2}, John P. Santa Maria Jr.¹, Younghoon Kim³, Stephanie Brown¹, Jonathan G. Swoboda^{1,4}, Eleftherios Mylonakis³, Brian J. Wilkinson², and Suzanne Walker^{1,*}

¹ Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts 02115

² Department of Biological Sciences, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61790

³ Division of Infectious Diseases, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts 02114

Abstract

Methicillin resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus* depends on the production of *mecA*, which encodes penicillin-binding protein 2A (PBP2A), an acquired peptidoglycan transpeptidase (TP) with reduced susceptibility to beta-lactam antibiotics. PBP2A crosslinks nascent peptidoglycan when the native TPs are inhibited by beta-lactams. Although *mecA* expression is essential for beta-lactam resistance, it is not sufficient. Here we show that blocking the expression of wall teichoic acids (WTAs) by inhibiting the first enzyme in the pathway, TarO, sensitizes MRSA strains to beta-lactams even though the beta-lactam-resistant transpeptidase, PBP2A, is still expressed. The dramatic synergy between TarO inhibitors and beta-lactams is noteworthy not simply because strategies to overcome methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) are desperately needed, but because *neither* TarO *nor* the activities of the native TPs are essential in MRSA strains. The “synthetic lethality” of inhibiting TarO and the native TPs suggests a functional connection between ongoing WTA expression and peptidoglycan assembly in *S. aureus*. Indeed, transmission electron microscopy shows that *S. aureus* cells blocked in WTA synthesis have extensive defects in septation and cell separation, indicating dysregulated cell wall assembly and degradation. Our studies imply that WTAs play a fundamental role in *S. aureus* cell division and raise the possibility that synthetic lethal compound combinations may have therapeutic utility for overcoming antibiotic resistant bacterial infections.

INTRODUCTION

Most bacteria are surrounded by a tough polysaccharide matrix known as peptidoglycan (PG). This matrix, which is essential for survival, protects bacteria from lysis due to high internal osmotic pressures. PG biosynthesis is the target of the beta-lactams (*e.g.*, penicillin), which are among the safest and most effective antibiotics ever developed for clinical use (1). The beta-lactams covalently inactivate the transpeptidase (TPase) domains of high molecular weight penicillin binding proteins (HMW-PBPs), which crosslink the

* Corresponding author, suzanne_walker@hms.harvard.edu..

⁴Current Address: The Skaggs Institute of Chemical Biology and Department of Chemistry, The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, California 92037

Supporting Information Available: This material is available free of charge *via* the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

polysaccharide chains of PG. Unfortunately, resistance to beta-lactams is now widespread and has become a particular problem in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Invasive beta-lactam-resistant *S. aureus* (methicillin-resistant SA, or MRSA) infections are directly responsible for 20,000 deaths annually in the United States (2). Although two new classes of antibiotics have been introduced since 2000 to treat these infections, clinical resistance to both has already been observed (3,4), highlighting the ongoing need for new strategies to overcome MRSA.

The most common mechanism of bacterial resistance to the beta-lactams involves inactivation by beta-lactamases, and a successful strategy to overcome this form of inactivation by combining a beta-lactam and a beta-lactamase inhibitor has been used clinically (5). Unfortunately, MRSA strains develop resistance through a different mechanism: the acquisition of a beta-lactam-resistant TPase, PBP2A (6,7). This gene is not native to *S. aureus* (6), but was acquired by lateral transfer from another organism (8) and has spread widely. When other *S. aureus* PBPs are inhibited by beta-lactams, PBP2A compensates by crosslinking the PG polysaccharides that are produced (9). One strategy being explored to overcome beta-lactam resistance in MRSA is to develop beta-lactam analogs that are capable of inhibiting PBP2A (10). An alternative strategy, examined here, would be to use existing beta-lactams in combination with compounds that inhibit other targets involved in the expression of methicillin resistance in MRSA (11).

In 1994, Maki *et al.* used transposon insertional inactivation to identify a gene, *llm*, which seemed to play an important role in methicillin resistance in MRSA (12). This gene was reported to encode a multipass transmembrane protein of unknown function. Sequence comparisons suggest that *llm* encodes TarO (also known as TagO), which catalyzes the first step in wall teichoic acid (WTA) biosynthesis in *S. aureus* (13). TarO facilitates the transfer of GlcNAc-1-phosphate from UDP-GlcNAc to an undecaprenyl carrier to produce a lipid-linked monosaccharide that is further elaborated into a long anionic polymer comprising ribitol phosphate repeats (Figure 1) (14-17). The polymer is subsequently exported from the cytoplasm and coupled to PG, resulting in a cell envelope containing layers of PG densely functionalized with negatively-charged WTAs (18). WTAs are not essential for *S. aureus* survival *in vitro* since *tarO* can be deleted with minimal effects on growth rate; however, they are critical for establishing infections in some animal models (19,20), and it has been suggested that WTAs are virulence factors required for *staphylococcal* adhesion to host tissue (21).

Here we use both genetic and pharmacological approaches to show that blocking TarO, and thus preventing WTA expression, specifically sensitizes MRSA strains to beta-lactams. The beta-lactam susceptibility is due to the combined inactivation of the native PBPs and TarO, two classes of targets that have non-essential enzymatic activities in MRSA. The synthetic lethality of this compound combination suggests that ongoing WTA expression is coupled to the assembly of PG, and we present evidence that supports this hypothesis. The work described here provides a possible new strategy for treating MRSA infections by combining a beta-lactam and a TarO inhibitor, and also reveals that ongoing WTA expression is required for properly coordinated cell division in *S. aureus*.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

WTA expression is required for methicillin resistance in MRSA

Transposon insertion in a gene of unknown function, *llm*, was shown to reduce beta-lactam resistance and increase Triton X-induced autolysis in a wide variety of MRSA strains (12). The reported gene sequence is identical to the gene sequence for *S. aureus tarO*, suggesting that WTA expression is required for high-level methicillin resistance. To confirm that

WTAs do indeed play a role in methicillin resistance, we generated a *tarO*-null mutant of MW2, a well-characterized MRSA strain that displays moderate resistance to beta-lactams. This mutant strain shows increased Triton X-induced autolysis (not shown) and is approximately eight-fold more sensitive than the parent strain to beta-lactam antibiotics, including methicillin, imipenem, ceftazidime, and cephradine (Supplementary Table 2). These results confirm that the expression of WTAs is required for methicillin resistance in MRSA *in vitro*. Preventing WTA biosynthesis also restored susceptibility to beta-lactams in an *in vivo* *C. elegans* MRSA infection model (Supplementary Figure 1). These studies imply that small molecules that block WTA expression should sensitize MRSA strains to beta-lactams.

Tunicamycin is a selective inhibitor of *S. aureus* WTA expression

Tunicamycin is a natural product inhibitor of a large family of enzymes that transfer hexose-1-phosphates from nucleotide-sugar donors to membrane-embedded lipid phosphates to form lipid-pp-hexose products (Figure 1) (22). In *S. aureus*, this family of enzymes includes both TarO and Mray, an essential enzyme involved in PG biosynthesis. Tunicamycin is known to be selective for transferases that use UDP-GlcNAc as a substrate over transferases that use other UDP-sugars as substrates (22). To characterize the selectivity of tunicamycin for inhibition of TarO over Mray, we grew several *S. aureus* strains, including both methicillin-sensitive (MSSA) and MRSA strains, in increasing concentrations of tunicamycin and then analyzed extracted WTAs via silver-stained PAGE (23). WTA expression began to decrease at tunicamycin concentrations of 0.02 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ and WTAs were undetectable in all strains at concentrations of 0.2 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ (Figure 2, panel a and Supplementary Figure 2).

Exponential phase growth rates were measured for the same set of *S. aureus* strains in the presence of increasing concentrations of tunicamycin (Figure 2, panel b and Supplementary Figure 3). Growth rates for available $\Delta tarO$ strains were also measured and showed modest defects compared with the wildtype strains. The tunicamycin-treated strains grew identically to the $\Delta tarO$ controls even at concentrations sixteen-fold greater than those required to abolish WTA biosynthesis. At higher concentrations, growth inhibition was observed as tunicamycin began to inhibit Mray (MICs ranged from 10–40 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$). Thus, there is a large window between the tunicamycin concentrations required to fully inhibit TarO and those that hamper growth through Mray inhibition. Consistent with this, WTA-inhibitory concentrations of tunicamycin that do not affect growth rates (0.4 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) had no effect on [^{14}C]-GlcNAc incorporation into *S. aureus* PG, but dramatically reduced labeling of the extracted WTA fraction compared with the untreated controls (Supplementary Table 3). These experiments fully validate tunicamycin as a selective chemical probe to study the effects of inhibiting WTA expression in *S. aureus*.

Tunicamycin inhibition of WTA expression sensitizes MRSA strains to beta-lactams

To assess whether pharmacological inhibition of WTA expression sensitizes MRSA to beta-lactams, we tested the beta-lactam MICs of several MRSA strains in the presence of tunicamycin in a checkerboard assay. The heat map for a representative MRSA strain treated with tunicamycin and the beta-lactam oxacillin shows biphasic behavior in response to the presence of tunicamycin (Figure 3, panel a). That is, the oxacillin MIC for the strain, clinical isolate 1784A, decreases abruptly from 50 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ to 0.4 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ at a tunicamycin concentration of 0.08 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$, and then plateaus over a wide concentration range before dropping again at tunicamycin concentrations exceeding 10 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$. This biphasic behavior is consistent with the selective tunicamycin inhibition of a non-lethal target followed by the subsequent inhibition of a lethal target. Similar behavior is observed for other MRSA strains and beta-lactams (Supplementary Figure 4). We infer that the dramatic

beta-lactam sensitization (synergy) observed at low tunicamycin concentrations is due to TarO inhibition, while the lethal effects of tunicamycin at high concentrations are related to inhibition of MraY.

We also measured the MICs of several MRSA strains against a panel of beta-lactams in the presence or absence of tunicamycin at a concentration that inhibits WTA expression but not PG synthesis ($0.4 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$). The tunicamycin-treated strains showed increased sensitivity to all beta-lactams tested (Table 1). Kill curve analyses were carried out for one strain, COL, and showed that when WTA synthesis is prevented, methicillin becomes bactericidal at concentrations that normally do not affect growth (Figure 3, panel b). Transcriptomes of COL treated with tunicamycin and methicillin alone or in combination were also consistent with the data showing that tunicamycin sensitizes MRSA strains to beta-lactams (Supplementary Tables 5 and 6). That is, the compound combination, but not the individual compounds, induced a massive cell wall stress response that is similar to those observed for susceptible *S. aureus* strains treated with beta-lactams only (24-28).

TarO inhibition does not sensitize MRSA strains to other classes of antibiotics

To determine whether tunicamycin-treatment renders MRSA strains susceptible to other classes of antibiotics, we measured MICs for several, including chloramphenicol, which inhibits protein synthesis, ciprofloxacin, which inhibits DNA synthesis, and vancomycin, cycloserine, and moenomycin, all of which inhibit PG biosynthesis by mechanisms different from the beta-lactams (Table 1 and Supplementary Table 4). At concentrations that inhibit WTA expression but do not affect PG biosynthesis, tunicamycin had no effect on the MICs of these antibiotics against MRSA. Thus, TarO inhibition does not increase cell envelope permeability to antibiotics that have intracellular targets, nor does it generally enhance MRSA susceptibility to antibiotics that have cell wall targets. The sensitizing effects of TarO inhibition in MRSA strains are specific to beta-lactams.

Simultaneous inhibition of TarO and the native transpeptidases is synthetically lethal

Our results show that tunicamycin and the beta-lactams display dramatic synergy against MRSA strains. This synergy is distinct from “antibiotic synergy” (29-31) because the latter phenomenon involves two antibiotics that function by inhibiting essential targets. In MRSA strains, the crosslinking functions of the native PBPs are non-essential in the presence of beta-lactams since PBP2A performs crosslinking when they are inhibited. Furthermore, TarO is a non-essential target in *all S. aureus* strains and no MIC for its inhibition can be defined. Although tunicamycin has a secondary, lethal target in MraY, the concentrations that confer beta-lactam sensitization are two orders of magnitude *below* the concentrations required to inhibit MraY. Furthermore, the concentrations of beta-lactams that kill MRSA strains in the presence of tunicamycin are far below those required to inhibit PBP2A. Thus, the synergy observed is not “antibiotic synergy,” but “synthetic lethality”. Synthetic lethality results when inactivating mutations (or pharmacological inhibition) in two or more genes (or enzymes) has a lethal phenotype even though full inactivation of the individual genes/enzymes is tolerated. This phenomenon implies a functional connection between the inactivated genes/enzymes. Therefore, the synergy between TarO inhibition and inhibition of the native TPs in MRSA strains suggests that WTA biosynthesis is functionally coupled to PG biosynthesis in *S. aureus*.

Genetic deletion of the WTA biosynthetic pathway results in cell division defects

We examined the cellular architectures of several MSSA and MRSA strains and their $\Delta tarO$ counterparts by transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Figure 4 shows representative electron micrographs of wildtype (panel a) *S. aureus* RN6390 and its $\Delta tarO$ mutant (panel b; see also Supplementary Figures 5 and 6). The wildtype strains have the characteristic

appearance expected for *S. aureus* based on extensive EM studies by others. Cells have a continuous electron-dense (dark-staining) layer at the surface that continues down the center of the division plane as septation progresses. This material has been identified previously as WTA-rich PG. Although the electron-dense layer at the midzone appears as a single layer in TEM images, cryo-EM studies have shown that it comprises two layers separated by a less dense midzone (32). Efficient separation of daughter cells occurs once septation is complete, and is proposed to involve the action of hydrolytic enzymes that degrade cell wall material between the WTA-rich PG layers at the mid-zone to produce individual cells that each have a continuous WTA-rich surface layer. Separated hemispherical daughter cells rapidly “round up” to produce the characteristic coccoid shape of *S. aureus*, and each subsequent division event occurs along an axis orthogonal to the recently completed division plane.

In contrast to their wildtype counterparts, the $\Delta tarO$ mutants do not have a dark staining surface layer and their edges appear indistinct; furthermore, the material between daughter cells that have completed septation but have not undergone separation is uniformly light and typically thicker than in wildtype cells (Figure 4, panels a and b; see also Supplementary Figures 5–6). More strikingly, septation in the $\Delta tarO$ mutants is defective with respect to placement of new septa and exclusion of additional septa. For example, new division planes frequently initiate at angles that are not orthogonal to the previous division plane and multiple septa are often observed. These observations indicate that the biosynthetic machinery involved in cell division has become dysregulated. In addition, $\Delta tarO$ mutants fail to separate efficiently once division is complete, resulting in multicellular clusters. The effects described are seen in both MSSA and MRSA strains, indicating that WTA expression is required for normal cell division in *S. aureus*.

Time-dependent cell division defects occur upon pharmacological inhibition of WTA biosynthesis

Validated small molecule inhibitors of specific targets not only provide confirmation of genetic results, but also can have significant advantages. One particular advantage of using tunicamycin in imaging studies of *S. aureus* is that TarO inhibition is rapid, which means it is possible to follow phenotypic changes as they occur. We examined TEM images of several MSSA and MRSA strains after zero to four hours of growth in the presence of tunicamycin at $0.4 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ (Figure 4, panels c-f and Supplementary Figures 7–8). After one hour, most cells are undergoing, or have completed, a single cell division. Those undergoing division appear relatively normal in that, like wildtype cells, they divide in the middle (compare Figure 4, panels c and d). However, the densely stained material that runs along the midline of the division plane in wildtype cells is completely absent in these tunicamycin-treated cells, supporting the previous identification of this midzone material as WTA-rich PG. In addition, the densely staining surface layer surrounding the older portions of each daughter cell begins to peel away in large sections starting from the site of septal initiation.

At later time points, representing subsequent cell divisions, abnormalities in septal placement are observed, with new division sites initiating along non-orthogonal planes. Partial or complete duplicate septa are frequently observed in the same cell, sometimes right next to each other, but often at angles that cut off a small portion of the cell (Figure 4, panels e and f). The stripping of the electron dense layer from the cell surface, which begins with the first division cycle, continues with each subsequent cycle until the surface layer is completely absent. The terminal phenotypes of the tunicamycin-treated cells closely resemble those seen in the $\Delta tarO$ mutants, with multiple septal defects and significant numbers of pseudomulticellular clusters in which cells have failed to separate effectively following division (Supplementary Figure 9).

Ongoing WTA synthesis is required for proper septation

The imaging studies reported here show that ongoing WTA synthesis is required for proper septation, a result consistent with the synthetic lethality of tunicamycin and beta-lactam combinations. During normal cell division, *S. aureus* divides along orthogonal planes. It is not known exactly how these orthogonal division planes are established, but it was recently reported that thick rings, or ribs, of PG form prior to centripetal assembly of the septal disks and are retained after division is complete. These ribs are proposed to act as ultrastructural elements that mark the location of previous division planes and thus determine the placement of future division planes (33), perhaps by scaffolding proteins involved in cell wall assembly. Like PG elsewhere in the cell, the PG in these ultrastructural elements is likely functionalized with WTAs. Since preventing WTA synthesis leads to misplaced and duplicated septa, we suggest that WTAs also play a role in encoding septal placement. Whether the PG rings form correctly when WTA synthesis is blocked can now be addressed using tunicamycin as a chemical probe.

Ongoing WTA synthesis is required for efficient cell separation

Our TEM studies also indicate that ongoing WTA synthesis is required for proper regulation of the “splitting system” involved in cell separation. Cell separation normally occurs due to the action of a hydrolytic enzyme complex, which degrades the less dense material between WTA-rich layers once the division plane is complete (32,34,35). There is evidence that WTAs mask, via steric and/or electrostatic mechanisms, enzyme binding and cleavage sites on the PG to which they are attached, thus protecting PG from exogenous and endogenous hydrolases (36,37). It has been suggested that by excluding autolytic enzymes from certain areas, WTAs may regulate PG degradation (37). In wildtype *S. aureus*, the WTA-rich layers along the division plane may protect the underlying PG layers from degradation as the autolysins track between them to enact cell separation. In cells lacking WTAs, the hydrolytic machinery does not function at the division site once the septum is complete and so multicellular clusters with thick septal PG form. Cell separation eventually occurs, but is presumed to involve a mechanical process (34).

Remarkably, although septal hydrolysis is inefficient when WTAs are absent, the WTA-rich surface layers are stripped off so rapidly in tunicamycin-treated cells that the process must involve some hydrolytic machine (*i.e.*, “stripping system”) (34). The stripping process appears to occur between the WTA-rich surface layer and an electron-dense membrane layer that is proposed to comprise PG threaded with membrane-bound lipoteichoic acids (LTAs). These LTAs may protect the underlying layers of PG from catastrophic hydrolysis in much the same manner that the WTA-rich layers are proposed to protect septal PG from hydrolysis as the autolysins track between them (Figure 5).

Conclusion

It has been appreciated for decades that WTAs are important in the physiology of Gram-positive organisms, but specific roles have been difficult to identify because WTAs are highly abundant anionic polymers that affect many cell envelope properties (13,17,18). Furthermore, these and other functions partially overlap with those of LTAs, a structurally related class of anionic polymers that are anchored in the cell membranes (rather than to the cell walls) of Gram-positive organisms (17). Nevertheless, recent studies in the rod-shaped organism *Bacillus subtilis* have suggested that WTAs play an integral role in PG synthesis. For example, deletion of *B. subtilis* tagO leads to the rounding of cells, showing that WTAs are required for proper cell morphology, which depends on correct assembly of the bacterial sacculus (38). Moreover, the *B. subtilis* WTA biosynthetic enzymes localize in a helical pattern reminiscent of the organization of nascent PG, and they have been shown to interact with MreC and MreD, which help scaffold PG biosynthetic enzymes. It has thus been

suggested that WTA biosynthesis in *B. subtilis* is carried out by a multienzyme complex that is associated with the PG biosynthetic machinery (39).

Similar localization studies have not been carried out in *S. aureus*. However, the results reported here, which combine the use of specific small molecule probes for PG and WTA biosynthesis with transmission electron microscopy, show that WTA expression plays a fundamentally important role in cell division in *S. aureus*. We do not yet understand the molecular mechanisms that link WTA and PG synthesis, nor can we yet explain the molecular basis for the synthetic lethality of tunicamycin and a beta-lactam. However, we do not think that the bacteria die primarily from a weakened and more accessible cell wall for the following reasons (40-42). First, although WTA-null strains do show increased rates of Triton-X-induced autolysis, perhaps because WTA depletion allows activated hydrolases better access to susceptible PG bonds, there is no evidence that such strains spontaneously lyse at significantly increased rates compared with wildtype cells. Second, if beta-lactam sensitization merely reflected increased hydrolysis of a weakened cell envelope, one might expect to observe synergy between tunicamycin and other cell wall active antibiotics that weaken the cell wall, such as vancomycin. At tunicamycin concentrations that only affect WTA synthesis, this is not the case. A final argument against increased hydrolytic susceptibility as the major explanation for the observed tunicamycin-beta-lactam synergy is that it does not take into account the dramatic septal defects that occur in both MSSA and MRSA strains upon blocking WTA synthesis. These defects lead us to suggest that the beta-lactam sensitization observed in MRSA strains upon WTA inhibition is related to defective assembly of the PG biosynthetic machinery.

One possible mechanism for how the defective assembly of PG machinery due to TarO inhibition could result in beta-lactam mediated cell death would involve mislocalization of either PBP2 or PBP2A. Both enzymes must be colocalized in order for beta-lactam resistance to be expressed in MRSA. If preventing WTA synthesis affects localization of these PBPs, then beta-lactam treatment could become lethal even if PBP2A is expressed (as we know it is) and potentially active (43). Indeed, there is precedence for such a mechanism since (-)-epicatechin gallate, a component of green tea that is proposed to affect membrane fluidity, causes mislocalization of PBP2 and decreases beta-lactam resistance in MRSA strains (44). Tunicamycin, here validated as a highly selective TarO inhibitor, should provide a useful tool for efforts to identify the molecular mechanisms that link WTA and PG biosynthesis in *S. aureus*.

In closing, we emphasize that our studies also have significant implications for the use of synthetic lethal compound combinations (SLCCs) to overcome bacterial infections. "Chemical synthetic lethality" is an emerging strategy in cancer chemotherapy (45), but has not yet been deliberately exploited to overcome bacterial infections. We have demonstrated here that TarO inhibitors and beta-lactams comprise a useful synthetic lethal pair for killing MRSA strains. Although tunicamycin itself has eukaryotic toxicity, it should be possible to identify compounds that better discriminate between bacterial TarO and its eukaryotic orthologs.

METHODS

MIC measurement protocol

Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) assays were performed as follows. Compound dilutions (1:1) were made in a 96-well PCR plate using sterilized water as solvent, and then aliquotted (1.5 μ L) into 96-well plates (Corning® 3595). An overnight culture of *S. aureus* was diluted 1/1000 into fresh TSB to give *ca.* 5×10^5 CFU mL⁻¹, and 150 μ L were added to each well of the multititer plate. Erythromycin (10 μ g mL⁻¹) was used as a positive control

(full inhibition of growth) and solvent was used for the negative control (full growth). Plates were shaken at 30 °C for 16–20 h. The optical densities of the wells were measured on a plate reader and normalized to the positive and negative controls to give percent growth at each concentration. The MIC was defined as the lowest concentration that gave $\leq 10\%$ growth. When testing the MIC shift that occurs in the absence of WTAs, $0.4 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ tunicamycin was added to the media.

WTA extraction and PAGE analysis protocol

WTAs were isolated from 5–10 mL cultures of *S. aureus* stationary-phase cells grown in TSB overnight at 30 °C in the presence of varying concentrations of tunicamycin. Tunicamycin stocks were made and diluted in DMSO and then added to the media to give 1% (v/v) final DMSO concentration. WTAs were extracted and visualized as previously reported (16).

Growth curves in the presence of tunicamycin

Tunicamycin stocks were made and diluted in DMSO and aliquots (1.5 μL) were added in duplicate to the wells of a 96-well plate. Overnight cultures of *S. aureus* strains were diluted 1/200 in fresh TSB and 150 μL aliquots were added to the wells to give 1% (v/v) final DMSO concentration. The plate was then incubated at 30 °C (with shaking) and the optical density of each well was measured every 30 min for 7 h.

Checkerboard analyses of tunicamycin and beta-lactams in MRSA strains

Stock solutions of tunicamycin were diluted two-fold in DMSO. Aliquots (1.5 μL) were then transferred to the wells of a 96-well plate so that the concentrations varied along the rows. Solutions of beta-lactams were made in dH_2O and aliquotted (1.5 μL) into the wells of a 96-well plate so that dose responses ran down the columns. Stationary phase cultures of bacteria were diluted 1/1000 in fresh TSB and 150 μL aliquots were dispensed into all wells. The plates were then covered and incubated at 30 °C for 16–24 hours.

COL kill curve in the presence of methicillin and tunicamycin

An overnight culture of COL was diluted 1/500 into fresh TSB. The starter culture was enumerated and split into three tubes. Methicillin (8x MIC: $400 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) was added to one tube while tunicamycin ($0.4 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) was added to another. These cultures were shaken at 30 °C for 3 h, the tunicamycin-treated culture was split into two tubes, and methicillin was added to one of these. The cultures were shaken at 30 °C and colony counts were taken each hour for an additional 9 h.

Growth conditions for electron microscopy samples

Overnight cultures of *S. aureus* were diluted 1/50 into 5 mL of fresh TSB and shaken at 30 °C to OD~0.3. Compounds were added to the cultures, which continued to shake at 30 °C until harvesting. Samples were spun down ($7500 \times g$; 8 min) each hour following compound treatment. Pellets were resuspended in 0.25 mL TSB, and 0.25 mL glutaraldehyde fixative solution was then added to the sample. After 30 min at room temperature, the fixed samples were spun down and submitted to the Harvard Medical School EM Facility for processing. See Supporting Information for further details.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (F32AI084316 to JC, 1R15AI084006 to BJW, 5R01GM078477 to SW, and 1P01AI083214 to SW and EM). Methicillin was generously provided by Merck.

REFERENCES

1. Schneider T, Sahl HG. An oldie but a goodie - cell wall biosynthesis as antibiotic target pathway, *Int. J. Med. Microbiol.* 2010; 300:161–169.
2. Klevens RM, Morrison MA, Nadle J, Petit S, Gershman K, Ray S, Harrison LH, Lynfield R, Dumyati G, Townes JM, Craig AS, Zell ER, Fosheim GE, McDougal LK, Carey RB, Fridkin SK. Invasive methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in the United States. *JAMA.* 2007; 298:1763–1771. [PubMed: 17940231]
3. Mangili A, Bica I, Snyderman DR, Hamer DH. Daptomycin-resistant, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 2005; 40:1058–1060. [PubMed: 15825002]
4. Tsiodras S, Gold HS, Sakoulas G, Eliopoulos GM, Wennersten C, Venkataraman L, Moellering RC, Ferraro MJ. Linezolid resistance in a clinical isolate of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Lancet.* 2001; 358:207–208. [PubMed: 11476839]
5. Walsh, CT. Antibiotics: Actions, Origins, Resistance. ASM Press; Washington, DC: 2003.
6. Beck WD, Berger-Bachi B, Kayser FH. Additional DNA in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and molecular cloning of *mec*-specific DNA. *J. Bacteriol.* 1986; 165:373–378. [PubMed: 3003024]
7. Hartman BJ, Tomasz A. Low-affinity penicillin-binding protein associated with beta-lactam resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Bacteriol.* 1984; 158:513–516. [PubMed: 6563036]
8. Couto I, de Lencastre H, Severina E, Kloos W, Webster JA, Hubner RJ, Sanches IS, Tomasz A. Ubiquitous presence of a *mecA* homologue in natural isolates of *Staphylococcus sciuri*. *Microb. Drug Resist.* 1996; 2:377–391. [PubMed: 9158808]
9. Pinho MG, de Lencastre H, Tomasz A. An acquired and a native penicillin-binding protein cooperate in building the cell wall of drug-resistant *staphylococci*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* 2001; 98:10886–10891. [PubMed: 11517340]
10. Llarrull LI, Fisher JF, Mobashery S. Molecular basis and phenotype of methicillin resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus* and insights into new beta-lactams that meet the challenge. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 2009; 53:4051–4063. [PubMed: 19470504]
11. Berger-Bachi B, Rohrer S. Factors influencing methicillin resistance in *staphylococci*. *Arch. Microbiol.* 2002; 178:165–171. [PubMed: 12189417]
12. Maki H, Yamaguchi T, Murakami K. Cloning and characterization of a gene affecting the methicillin resistance level and the autolysis rate in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Bacteriol.* 1994; 176:4993–5000. [PubMed: 8051012]
13. Swoboda JG, Campbell J, Meredith TC, Walker S. Wall teichoic acid function, biosynthesis, and inhibition. *ChemBioChem.* 2010; 11:35–45. [PubMed: 19899094]
14. Baddiley J, Buchanan JG, Hardy FE, Martin RO, Rajbhandary UL, Sanderson AR. The structure of the ribitol teichoic acid of *Staphylococcus aureus* H. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta.* 1961; 52:406–407. [PubMed: 13863813]
15. Brown S, Zhang YH, Walker S. A revised pathway proposed for *Staphylococcus aureus* wall teichoic acid biosynthesis based on *in vitro* reconstitution of the intracellular steps. *Chem. Biol.* 2008; 15:12–21. [PubMed: 18215769]
16. Meredith TC, Swoboda JG, Walker S. Late-stage polyribitol phosphate wall teichoic acid biosynthesis in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Bacteriol.* 2008; 190:3046–3056. [PubMed: 18281399]
17. Xia G, Kohler T, Peschel A. The wall teichoic acid and lipoteichoic acid polymers of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Int. J. Med. Microbiol.* 2010; 300:148–154. [PubMed: 19896895]
18. Neuhaus F, Baddiley J. A Continuum of Anionic Charge: Structures and Functions of D-Alanyl-Teichoic Acids in Gram-Positive Bacteria. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* 2003; 67:686–723. [PubMed: 14665680]

19. Weidenmaier C, Kokai-Kun J, Kristian S, Chanturiya T, Kalbacher H, Gross M, Nicholson G, Neumeister B, Mond J, Peschel A. Role of teichoic acids in *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal colonization, a major risk factor in nosocomial infections. *Nat. Med.* 2004; 10:243–245. [PubMed: 14758355]
20. Weidenmaier C, Peschel A, Xiong YQ, Kristian SA, Dietz K, Yeaman MR, Bayer AS. Lack of wall teichoic acids in *Staphylococcus aureus* leads to reduced interactions with endothelial cells and to attenuated virulence in a rabbit model of endocarditis. *J. Infect. Dis.* 2005; 191:1771–1777. [PubMed: 15838806]
21. Weidenmaier C, Peschel A. Teichoic acids and related cell-wall glycopolymers in Gram-positive physiology and host interactions. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 2008; 6:276–287. [PubMed: 18327271]
22. Price NP, Tsvetanova B. Biosynthesis of the tunicamycins: a review. *J. Antibiot. (Tokyo)*. 2007; 60:485–491. [PubMed: 17827659]
23. Swoboda JG, Meredith TC, Campbell J, Brown S, Suzuki T, Bollenbach T, Malhowski AJ, Kishony R, Gilmore MS, Walker S. Discovery of a small molecule that blocks wall teichoic acid biosynthesis in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *ACS Chem. Biol.* 2009; 4:875–883. [PubMed: 19689117]
24. Balibar CJ, Shen X, McGuire D, Yu D, McKenney D, Tao J. *cwrA*, a gene that specifically responds to cell wall damage in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Microbiology*. 2010; 156:1372–1383. [PubMed: 20167623]
25. Kuroda M, Kuroda H, Oshima T, Takeuchi F, Mori H, Hiramatsu K. Two-component system *VraSR* positively modulates the regulation of cell-wall biosynthesis pathway in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Mol. Microbiol.* 2003; 49:807–821. [PubMed: 12864861]
26. McAleese F, Wu SW, Sieradzki K, Dunman P, Murphy E, Projan S, Tomasz A. Overexpression of genes of the cell wall stimulon in clinical isolates of *Staphylococcus aureus* exhibiting vancomycin-intermediate-*S. aureus*-type resistance to vancomycin. *J. Bacteriol.* 2006; 188:1120–1133. [PubMed: 16428416]
27. Utaida S, Dunman PM, Macapagal D, Murphy E, Projan SJ, Singh VK, Jayaswal RK, Wilkinson BJ. Genome-wide transcriptional profiling of the response of *Staphylococcus aureus* to cell-wall-active antibiotics reveals a cell-wall-stress stimulon. *Microbiology*. 2003; 149:2719–2732. [PubMed: 14523105]
28. Wilkinson BJ, Muthaiyan A, Jayaswal R. The Cell Wall Stress Stimulon of *Staphylococcus aureus* and Other Gram-Positive Bacteria. *Curr. Med. Chem. - Anti-Infective Agents*. 2005; 4:259–276.
29. Sieradzki K, Tomasz A. Suppression of beta-lactam antibiotic resistance in a methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* through synergic action of early cell wall inhibitors and some other antibiotics. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 1997; 39(Suppl A):47–51. [PubMed: 9511062]
30. Torella JP, Chait R, Kishony R. Optimal drug synergy in antimicrobial treatments. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 2010; 6:e1000796. [PubMed: 20532210]
31. Huber J, Donald RG, Lee SH, Jarantow LW, Salvatore MJ, Meng X, Painter R, Onishi RH, Occi J, Dorso K, Young K, Park YW, Skwish S, Szymonifka MJ, Waddell TS, Miesel L, Phillips JW, Roemer T. Chemical genetic identification of peptidoglycan inhibitors potentiating carbapenem activity against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Chem. Biol.* 2009; 16:837–848. [PubMed: 19716474]
32. Matias VR, Beveridge TJ. Cryo-electron microscopy of cell division in *Staphylococcus aureus* reveals a mid-zone between nascent cross walls. *Mol. Microbiol.* 2007; 64:195–206. [PubMed: 17376082]
33. Turner RD, Ratcliffe EC, Wheeler R, Golestanian R, Hobbs JK, Foster SJ. Peptidoglycan architecture can specify division plans in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Nat. Comm.* 2010; 1 doi: 10.1038/ncomms1025.
34. Giesbrecht P, Kersten T, Maidhof H, Wecke J. *Staphylococcal* cell wall: morphogenesis and fatal variations in the presence of penicillin. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* 1998; 62:1371–1414. [PubMed: 9841676]
35. Yamada S, Sugai M, Komatsuzawa H, Nakashima S, Oshida T, Matsumoto A, Suginaka H. An autolysin ring associated with cell separation of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Bacteriol.* 1996; 178:1565–1571. [PubMed: 8626282]

36. Grundling A, Schneewind O. Cross-linked peptidoglycan mediates lysostaphin binding to the cell wall envelope of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Bacteriol.* 2006; 188:2463–2472. [PubMed: 16547033]
37. Schlag M, Biswas R, Krismer B, Kohler T, Zoll S, Yu W, Schwarz H, Peschel A, Gotz F. Role of staphylococcal wall teichoic acid in targeting the major autolysin Atl. *Mol. Microbiol.* 2010; 75:864–873. [PubMed: 20105277]
38. Soldo B, Lazarevic V, Karamata D. *tagO* is involved in the synthesis of all anionic cell-wall polymers in *Bacillus subtilis* 168. *Microbiology.* 2002; 148:2079–2087. [PubMed: 12101296]
39. Formstone A, Carballido-Lopez R, Noirot P, Errington J, Scheffers DJ. Localization and interactions of teichoic acid synthetic enzymes in *Bacillus subtilis*. *J. Bacteriol.* 2008; 190:1812–1821. [PubMed: 18156271]
40. de Jonge BL, Tomasz A. Abnormal peptidoglycan produced in a methicillin-resistant strain of *Staphylococcus aureus* grown in the presence of methicillin: functional role for penicillin-binding protein 2A in cell wall synthesis. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 1993; 37:342–346. [PubMed: 8452368]
41. Qoronfleh MW, Wilkinson BJ. Effects of growth of methicillin-resistant and -susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* in the presence of beta-lactams on peptidoglycan structure and susceptibility to lytic enzymes. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 1986; 29:250–257. [PubMed: 2872855]
42. Wyke AW, Ward JB, Hayes MV. Synthesis of peptidoglycan in vivo in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 1982; 127:553–558. [PubMed: 7173195]
43. Pinho MG, Errington J. Recruitment of penicillin-binding protein PBP2 to the division site of *Staphylococcus aureus* is dependent on its transpeptidation substrates. *Mol. Microbiol.* 2005; 55:799–807. [PubMed: 15661005]
44. Bernal P, Lemaire S, Pinho MG, Mobashery S, Hinds J, Taylor PW. Insertion of epicatechin gallate into the cytoplasmic membrane of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* disrupts penicillin-binding protein (PBP) 2A-mediated beta-lactam resistance by delocalizing PBP2. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2010; 285:24055–24065. [PubMed: 20516078]
45. Reinhardt HC, Jiang H, Hemann MT, Yaffe MB. Exploiting synthetic lethal interactions for targeted cancer therapy. *Cell Cycle.* 2009; 8:3112–3119. [PubMed: 19755856]
46. Watkinson RJ, Hussey H, Baddiley J. Shared lipid phosphate carrier in the biosynthesis of teichoic acid and peptidoglycan. *Nat. New Biol.* 1971; 229:57–59. [PubMed: 4250444]

Figure 1.

Wall teichoic acid (WTA) and peptidoglycan synthesis begin with similar reactions. TarO catalyzes the first step in the WTA biosynthetic pathway and utilizes bactoprenol-phosphate as a substrate; MraY, a related enzyme, catalyzes an essential step in PG biosynthesis using the same carrier lipid (46). The chemical structure of the natural product tunicamycin is shown; D=UDP-activated substrate.

Figure 2.

Tunicamycin selectively inhibits TarO in *S. aureus*. a) Representative gel showing levels of WTAs extracted from *S. aureus* strain Newman treated overnight with varying concentrations of tunicamycin. WTA expression is abolished at $0.1 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$; wt = Newman wildtype in the absence of tunicamycin. b) Growth curves of *S. aureus* strain Newman in the presence of various concentrations of tunicamycin. High concentrations of tunicamycin inhibit MraY, leading to growth inhibition. However, strains treated with lower concentrations of tunicamycin that abolish WTA expression grow similarly to the $\Delta tarO$ mutant.

Figure 3.

Methicillin and tunicamycin comprise a synthetic lethal combination in methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*. a) Checkerboard drug-interaction analysis in MRSA clinical isolate MRSA⁺ shows that tunicamycin, at concentrations that abolish WTA synthesis without affecting growth, sensitizes MRSA to the beta-lactam oxacillin. b) Kill curve analysis of methicillin (400 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) and tunicamycin (0.4 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) in COL shows a bactericidal mechanism of killing; methicillin was added to the tunicamycin-treated culture after 3 h.

Figure 4.

Electron micrographs of *S. aureus* strains show the effects of the lack of wall teichoic acid (WTA) expression on cell division. a) Wildtype MSSA RN6390 and b) its $\Delta tarO$ mutant. Cell division in WTA-null strains frequently occurs asymmetrically, and many cells contain duplicate septa. These septa can be parallel or occur at irregular angles, and many are incomplete. In addition, fields of cells contain numerous pseudomulticellular clusters with nonorthogonal division planes. c–f) A time course of electron micrographs of MSSA RN6390 treated with tunicamycin ($0.4 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) reveals that halting WTA expression is detrimental to cell division, leading to misplaced septa and cell separation defects; c) untreated control; d) 1 h; e) 2 h; f) 2 h (see Supplementary Figures 7 and 8 for time course images of MRSA strain COL treated with tunicamycin). Filled arrowheads point to the splitting system; empty arrowheads point to septa containing low density material; arrows point to secondary cell wall material that is peeling away from the cell surface; scale bars = 500 nm.

Figure 5.

Models of *S. aureus* cell division. *a*) Wildtype *S. aureus* cell division model adapted from Beveridge and coworkers (32). *b*) The effect of tunicamycin treatment on septal formation; the dark staining WTA-rich layer does not extend into the newly formed septum; autolysins are dysregulated by the absence of WTAs and cell separation is hindered, resulting in pseudomulticellular clusters; scale bars = 100 nm.

Table 1

MRSA strains are sensitized to beta-lactams when WTA biosynthesis is inhibited by tunicamycin at $0.4 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$

tunicamycin	MW2 MIC ($\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$)			MRSA MIC ($\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$)			1784A MIC ($\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$)		
	-	+	fold Δ	-	+	fold Δ	-	+	fold Δ
cefotaxime	12.5	1.6	8	25	<0.8	>32	12.5	1.6	8
cefoxitin	25	6.3	4	50	6.3	8	50	12.5	4
ceftazidime	100	12.5	8	>100	6.3	>16	100	6.3	16
cephradine	100	6.3	16	200	6.3	32	100	3.1	32
imipenem	0.4	0.1	4	1.6	<0.1	>16	1.6	<0.1	>16
methicillin	12.5	3.1	4	100	<3.1	>32	50	3.1	16
oxacillin	25	0.4	64	25	0.4	64	50	0.4	128
cycloserine	50	25	2	100	50	2	100	50	2
moenomycin	0.03	0.03	0	0.03	0.03	0	0.03	0.03	0
vancomycin	3.1	3.1	0	3.1	3.1	0	3.1	3.1	0