# Bacterial Actins and Their Diversity

Ertan Ozyamak,[†] Justin M. Kollman,[‡] and Arash Komeili*,[†]

[†]Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, United States

[‡]Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology and Groupe de Recherche Axé sur la Structure des Protéines, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec H3A 2B2, Canada

ABSTRACT: For many years, bacteria were considered rather simple organisms, but the dogmatic notion that subcellular organization is a eukaryotic trait has been overthrown for more than a decade. The discovery of homologues of the eukaryotic cytoskeletal proteins actin, tubulin, and intermediate filaments in bacteria has been instrumental in changing this view. Over the past few years, we have gained an incredible level of insight into the diverse family of bacterial actins and their molecular workings. Here we review the functional, biochemical, and structural features of the most well-studied bacterial actins.

Different actin-like proteins in a bacterial cell

Bacteria exhibit an incredible level of subcellular organization and rely on fine-tuned processes for their growth and development. Similar to eukaryotic cells, cytoskeletal proteins play a key role in the regulation of many cellular functions in bacteria. Of particular interest is the large and incredibly diverse family of bacterial actin-like proteins that are intimately involved in numerous activities ranging from the coordination of cell wall synthesis to the positioning of subcellular structures. Despite showing limited sequence relatedness, bacterial and eukaryotic actins share a common ancestry and an overall similar tertiary structure. In addition, bacterial actin sequences are highly divergent and can be grouped into distinct protein families on the basis of their phylogenetic and functional relatedness (Figure 1A,B). It is becoming increasingly evident that different bacterial actin families possess unique biochemical and structural features that distinguish them not only from actin but also from each other. Here, we discuss a selection of well-studied bacterial actins and their functional, biochemical, and structural features. We refer readers to a number of excellent previous reviews on bacterial actins and other bacterial cytoskeletal proteins.[1−7]

ACTIN AND THE DISCOVERY OF BACTERIAL ACTINS

Actin is a highly conserved protein in eukaryotes with many diverse roles in central processes such as cell shape maintenance, cell motility, and cytokinesis.[8,9] The quintessential property of actin is its ability to undergo the transition between monomeric and filamentous states. This transition is largely controlled by the binding and hydrolysis of ATP and through the action of a great number of actin-modulating proteins.[8,9] Structurally, actin is composed of two domains with similar folds (domains I and II). A hinge region allowing interdomain movements associated with different functional states of the protein connects domains I and II. ATP, together with Mg^{2+}, binds in this interdomain region (Figure 1B).[10,11] Actin assembles into a two-stranded helical filament with a distinct asymmetry at the filament ends, which is due to the head-to-tail assembly of the asymmetric structure of actin monomers (Figure 1C). The two filament ends exhibit differential assembly and disassembly kinetics, resulting in a polar dynamic behavior commonly termed treadmilling. Here, ATP-bound actin monomers preferentially join the so-called barbed end. Once in a filament, the ATP is hydrolyzed to form actin−ADP subunits that dissociate faster from the so-called pointed end. At steady state, this kinetic asymmetry results in the flux of subunits through the filaments, hence the term treadmilling.[8−11]

The wealth of knowledge about the function, structure, and biochemical activities of eukaryotic actin played a key role in the discovery of bacterial actins. A major step toward the identification, and ultimately the characterization, of bacterial actins was bioinformatics work by Bork et al.[12] Crystallographic evidence that actin, Hsc70, and hexokinase (three functionally distinct proteins with a low degree of overall sequence homology) share extensive structural similarity was used by the authors to define "fingerprint" motifs for actin family proteins. Although these motifs are spread throughout the length of the protein sequence, in the three-dimensional structure they are clustered near the ATP binding site. Significantly, Bork et al.[12] determined that bacterial proteins MreB, FtsA, and SbtA (now known as ParM) had the same fingerprint and they predicted a common core region with actin. At the time, only the broad functions of these bacterial

Figure 1. Diversity of bacterial actins. (A) Phylogenetic tree of some actin-like proteins indicating functions for characterized members. The asterisk indicates that the role of this protein in plasmid segregation was not confirmed. Sequences were aligned with ClustalW2, and the phylogenetic tree was drawn in FigTree version 1.4. Eukaryotic actins: *Homo sapiens* (4501885), *Caenorhabditis elegans* (17568985), *Drosophila melanogaster* (17530805), *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (14318479), *Giardia lamblia* (159108769). *Escherichia coli*: ParM-R1 (134954), ParM-pB171 (10955418), MreB (486290201), FtsA (446511017). *Bacillus subtilis*: AlfA pLS32 (323651003), Alp7A pLS20 (323651170), MreB (142855), FtsA (221309402). *Caulobacter crescentus*: MreB (16125790), FtsA (16126780). *Thermotoga maritima*: MreB (15643354), FtsA (15643598). *Salmonella enterica*: ParM-R64 (32470180), ParM-R621a (345134017). *Clostridium tetani*: Alp12 pE88 (28373143). *Magnetospirillum magneticum* AMB-1: MreB (83312612), FtsA (83312952), MamK (83310064). *Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense* MSR-1: MamK (33945229). *Desulfovibrio magneticus* RS-1: MamK (239908729). *Mycobacterium marinus* MC-1: MamK (117925549). *Cd.M.multicellularis*: MamK (317383429). (B) The known crystal structures of bacterial actins all share a conserved structural core, with two domains that can each be subdivided into two subdomains: Ia (light blue), Ib (pink), IIa (dark blue), and IIb (red). ATP (orange) binds in a cleft between the domains. FtsA contains a unique domain insertion (yellow) within

Figure 1. continued

subdomain Ia. The Protein Data Bank entries for the crystal structures are 1ATN for actin, 1JCG for MreB, 4A2B for FtsA, 1MWM for R1 ParM, 3JS6 for pSK41 ParM, and 2FSN for TA0583. (C) Diverse filament architecture of bacterial actins. Although all bacterial actins assemble filaments, these vary dramatically in their quaternary structures. Interstrand interactions vary extensively, giving rise to changes in filament twist, handedness, filament registration, and filament number. These differences correlate with different dynamic behaviors, suggesting a functional consequence of structural variation. Structures of actin,[93] R1 ParM,[18] AlfA,[20] MamK,[19] and Alp12.[22] A short length of filament is shown for each actin, both in a side view (top) and down the helical axis (bottom).

proteins were known, and whether they were true actin homologues was questioned. However, several years later a rapid succession of crystal structures from the Löwe group demonstrated that FtsA,[13] MreB,[14] and ParM[15] all share the actin fold and subsequent structures of two other homologues confirmed the conservation[16,17] (Figure 1B). In addition to the actin core structure, its conformational plasticity through domain movements at the hinge,[15,18] thought to play an important role in modulating filament structure, dynamics, and interaction with binding partners, is also conserved. Moreover, all of the bacterial actins that have been examined form ATP-dependent filaments *in vitro*[16,19−25] and have filamentous localization patterns *in vivo*,[26−29] suggesting conservation of core actin-like cytoskeletal functions in this diverse family.

Despite the conservation of tertiary structure and assembly properties among the bacterial actins, the filaments they form show a surprising degree of variation (Figure 1C). As described below, the variation includes dramatic changes in twist, registration between strands, changes in strand number, and even the possibility of antiparallel strands. In most of the filaments, similar surfaces mediate subunit interactions along each strand, and variation arises primarily from changes to interstrand contacts. Differences in filament structure correlate with variation in filament dynamics, supporting a causal link between filament architecture and dynamics.

Recent bioinformatic analyses suggest the existence of more than 35 different families of actin-like proteins in bacteria.[27] Whether all of these families are true actin-like proteins, and what cellular functions they might fulfill, is currently unknown. Below, we will highlight the functional, biochemical, and structural features of the most-well-studied bacterial actins.

■ MREB, AN ESSENTIAL BACTERIAL ACTIN

MreB, one of the first characterized bacterial actins, is fully integrated into the cellular physiology and plays several essential roles. MreB has a major impact on the synthesis of the cell wall, which is a key determinant of cell shape and integrity in bacteria. Because of its central role in the coordination of the cell wall synthesizing machinery, a lack of MreB results in large cell morphological defects in most rod-shaped bacteria where it is found (Figure 2A).[30−34] However, MreB also participates in the localization of a number of other proteins, including the gliding motility complexes in *Myxococcus xanthus*[35] and pilus-associated proteins in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.[36] Furthermore, MreB appears to be involved in chromosome segregation.[37−39]

Subcellular imaging of MreB originally indicated that it forms a continuous, helical structure running along the length of the bacteria. These structures were located just below the cytoplasmic membrane and correlated with the organization and/or localization of several enzymes involved in cell wall synthesis. These observations led to a widely accepted model in which MreB forms a helical scaffold, or track, for cell wall synthesis. However, this helical MreB model has been

Figure 2. Bacterial actins in cells. (A) The left panels shows depletion of essential protein MreB[44] or FtsA[94] results in cell morphological defects in *E. coli*. The right panel shows deletion of *mamK* affects magnetosome (yellow) organization in *M. magneticum* AMB-1. Electron cryotomography reconstruction.[75] (B) The top and left panels show the localization of GFP-MreB[95] (dashed lines outline the cell), AlfA-GFP[26] (cell membrane in red), Alp7A-GFP,[27] and YFP-FtsA[96] in *B. subtilis* cells. The right panels shows immunofluorescence microscopy (IFM) visualizing ParM (green) and segregated plasmid (red) in an *E. coli* cell.[29] MamK-GFP fluorescence in *M. magneticum* AMB-1.[28]

challenged in recent years.[40−43] Advanced high-resolution imaging by electron cryotomography (ECT) of wild-type cells failed to detect continuous helical structures either near or along the surface of the inner membrane.[42] A number of recent discoveries suggest instead that MreB exists as discrete "patches" that move perpendicular to the cell axis.[40,41,43] This discrepancy can be rationally explained. The early studies of MreB visualization largely relied on fusions of the fluorescent protein to either its N- or C-terminus. However, the fusion perturbs MreB function because these derivatives do not complement *mreB* deletion strains.[33,44] Furthermore, this alteration to the protein can also lead to gross localization artifacts. ECT imaging shows that MreB forms helical structures in *E. coli* when fused to yellow fluorescent protein.[45] The molecular reasons promoting the formation of these extensive structures are unclear. However, because some forms of

commonly used fluorescent proteins can dimerize, their fusion to a protein that itself oligomerizes could result in the formation of long-ranging structures. It is also worth noting that optical artifacts or misinterpretation of the visual data might have fed the model of a continuous, helical MreB structure in cells.[46] An important step toward a better understanding of the true ultrastructural organization of MreB in cells, and its dynamics, relied on the use of the so-called "sandwich fusions" to MreB. In these functional forms of MreB, the fluorescent protein is not fused to the N- or C-terminus but rather inserted elsewhere between the termini, hence the term "sandwich". In the case of MreB, the suitable location was determined empirically.[44] The visualization of sandwich fusions by fluorescence microscopy showed that MreB patches, presumably composed of several filaments, are highly dynamic and move perpendicular to the cell length. Interestingly, it appears that entire patches move independently of each other, as well as bidirectionally.[40,41,43] This behavior argues against a model from previous *in vivo* studies using the nonfunctional MreB derivatives, which had suggested that MreB polymers moved by treadmilling,[47,48] like actin. Interestingly, MreB patch movements are dependent on the cell wall synthesis machinery, indicating that the cell wall synthesis itself drives MreB motion and dynamics. This could be in line with a scaffolding role of MreB for the cell wall synthesis machinery. Moreover, MreB organization and movement appear to be influenced by growth conditions.[49]

Assembly of MreB Filaments *in Vitro*. The study of the MreB protein *in vitro* was crucial in revealing its close relationship to actin. To date, MreB from *T. maritima* (*Tm*MreB), *B. subtilis* (*Bs*MreB), and *E. coli* (*Ec*MreB) have been investigated. The crystal structure of *Tm*MreB[14] unequivocally showed that this protein adopts an actin-like topology (Figure 1B). The overall protein fold between actin and MreB was conserved, and remarkably, the MreB crystal packing contacts closely resembled the longitudinal contacts between subunits in an actin filament. Essentially, MreB was incorporated into the crystal lattice as single-stranded protofilaments.[14] The conservation of longitudinal interaction surfaces appears to be true for most bacterial actin filaments, which is surprising given the low level of sequence conservation at these sites between different bacterial actins.

In addition to crystallographic evidence, the assembly properties of MreB proteins in solution show some parallels to actin. Actin polymerization requires ATP and Mg^{2+} as cofactors, as mentioned previously. The presence of these cofactors kinetically favors the formation of a nucleation seed onto which additional subunits can assemble to form a filament. Furthermore, seed formation is favored above a certain actin monomer level termed the critical concentration.[11] MreB also polymerizes in the presence of ATP and Mg^{2+}, and with critical concentrations that are similar to that of actin.[50−53] However, the role of these cofactors in MreB assembly has been less clear because of conflicting reports. Early suggestions that Mg^{2+} is not strictly required for assembly of *Tm*MreB[14] or is even inhibitory[54] were contrasted by a study showing that Mg^{2+} was necessary for rapid and extensive *Tm*MreB polymerization.[50] In addition to the unresolved role of Mg^{2+}, the role of ATP was also questioned because *Bs*MreB appeared to form filaments equally well in the presence of ATP and ADP or even in the complete absence of any nucleotide.[51] The reason for this discrepancy between *Tm*MreB and *Bs*MreB is unclear. An interesting aspect to consider is that different MreB proteins

have species-specific adaptations and properties. *Tm*MreB and *Bs*MreB, for example, have approximately 60% identical and 75% similar sequences but are native to bacteria with presumably different physiologies. *T. maritima* is an aquatic and hyperthermophilic bacterium, whereas *B. subtilis* is a soil bacterium and grows at moderate temperatures. At this time, no study has compared different MreBs side by side. Therefore, one cannot rule out experimental factors and general circumstances as artifactual sources of the different MreB behaviors.

In contrast to the varying requirements for Mg^{2+} and ATP, the effect of K^+ on MreB assembly is more consistent between different MreB proteins. In most bacteria, K^+ is the major cation and plays important roles, such as maintaining cell turgor pressure and pH homeostasis.[55,56] Interestingly, MreB assembly is modulated negatively or inhibited by physiological K^+ concentrations.[50−52] One possibility is that MreB proteins may be tuned in such a way that the K^+ in the cytoplasm prevents excessive polymerization. An "overassembly" could potentially alter the balance with its interaction partners or interfere with other cellular processes.

Further *in vitro* investigations will likely provide a better framework for understanding the molecular mechanisms of MreB function *in vivo*. In fact, recent insights dramatically changed our view of MreB assembly in cells and challenged the relevance of previous *in vitro* observations. As mentioned earlier, in cells MreB filaments (or patches of filaments) are located close to the inner membrane. This localization was believed to be mediated via MreB's interactions with membrane-bound proteins and the cell wall synthesizing machinery. However, Salje and colleagues[24] demonstrated that a structural feature on MreB itself allows the direct interaction with phospholipid membranes. In the case of *Tm*MreB, this is mediated by a small membrane insertion loop, consisting of two hydrophobic residues, close to the N-terminus. For *Ec*MreB, however, direct membrane association involves an N-terminal amphipathic helix.[24] The reason for the different mechanisms of membrane attachment is unknown, but this finding illustrates the existence of species-specific traits within the MreB protein family. In addition to investigations of membrane binding, the authors also studied the MreB filament assembly in more detail. Purified *Tm*MreB assembles on a lipid monolayer into filaments that consist of two protofilaments,[24] like other actin homologues. The two-stranded MreB filaments are, however, distinct from the filaments of other actin homologues in two ways: binding along the lipid monolayer constrains them to being straight rather than twisted, and the two strands are in register rather than staggered. The orientation of the protofilaments relative to each other is yet unknown.[24] An antiparallel arrangement would place the membrane insertion loops in both protofilaments toward the membrane, maximizing the surface binding area potential. If confirmed, this would be the first case of an antiparallel arrangement in any actin filament. Interestingly, the discovery of binding of MreB to membranes also explains a number of previous *in vivo* observations. As discussed earlier, N- or C-terminal fusions of fluorescent protein to MreB are not functional in cells. In the MreB monomer, both termini are located close to the each other; hence, fusions to both ends would interfere with membrane binding. In line with this is the functionality of sandwich fusions to MreB. Here, the fluorescent protein is inserted between helices 6 and 7 of MreB, meaning far from the membrane interaction site.[44]

It is still unknown whether the entire cellular pool of MreB is actually membrane-bound. If so, it raises another important question: Can insights gained from *in vitro* experiments in solution be readily translated to membrane-associated MreB? It is conceivable that at least the assembly kinetics would be influenced as some components of reactions are restricted to only two rather than three dimensions. At the very basic level, this could mean that the critical concentration for filament formation *in vivo* may be lower than that determined *in vitro*. Overall, although MreB is one of the most extensively studied bacterial actins, it is clear that our understanding of MreB function at the molecular levels is still incomplete.

◼ PARM AND OTHER PLASMID-SEGREGATING BACTERIAL ACTINS

A number of bacterial actins are not essential to cell survival but are important for plasmid segregation. The stable propagation of bacterial plasmids can be accomplished by two mechanisms: random and active segregation. Provided the copy number of the plasmid is sufficiently high, stochastic (or diffusive) events will be sufficient to ensure that a large fraction of the cells in the population will inherit the plasmid and traits encoded by it. However, some plasmids are maintained in the cell at a low copy number. For instance, virulence factors of pathogenic bacteria are sometimes encoded on large extrachromosomal plasmids that are kept at a low copy number (as few as 1−5 copies per cell), possibly to minimize the metabolic burden on the carrier cell. Relying on stochastic events for segregation in these instances is a risky strategy. It appears that plasmids evolved systems that govern their active transport into daughter cells.[57−59]

The ParMR/*parC* system of the R1 plasmid of enteropathogenic *E. coli* cells is the best-studied plasmid segregation system. It is composed of three basic components that are all encoded by the plasmid: (i) the "motor" protein ParM, (ii) the adaptor protein ParR, and (iii) and a centromere-like region termed *parC*. The ParR protein binds the *parC* sequence and couples the plasmids to ParM that, via its polymerization, pushes the plasmids apart.[57−59] At least two other plasmid segregation systems are driven by actin-like proteins and have been characterized in some detail. The bacterial actin AlfA is encoded on *B. subtilis* plasmid pLS32 and is found in an operon with AlfB (ParR-like) and a *parC* sequence.[20,26] The bacterial actin Alp7A, in conjunction with Alp7R (ParR-like) and a*lp7C* (*parC*-like), is responsible for the segregation of plasmid pLS20 in *B. subtilis*.[27,60] Although the basic architecture of all these systems is similar, there appears to be substantial differences between their bacterial actins, as we will discuss. Additionally, a number of uncharacterized families of bacterial actins are also found on naturally occurring plasmids, raising the possibility that the use of these proteins for DNA segregation is a common theme in nature.

One characteristic feature of ParM is its heterogeneous localization pattern in cells across a population. In some cells, ParM appears as a filamentous structure spanning the entire cell length (Figure 2B), while in the majority of cells, ParM is diffuse or appears as foci.[29,61] This heterogeneity is a reflection of the dynamic nature of ParM filaments in individual cells. ParM filaments elongate for a period of time before switching from elongation to rapid shortening.[62] This dynamic behavior is directly linked to the plasmid segregation process because filaments bound to plasmids are stabilized from disassembly and their elongation actively pushes plasmids apart[61,62] (Figure

2B). Once the plasmids reach the cell poles, ParM filaments disassemble, essentially completing the segregation event. However, plasmids do not remain at cell poles and can diffuse away, suggesting the lack of a cell pole-anchoring factor. Plasmids that "escape" can re-encounter ParM filaments and again be segregated. In fact, several rounds of segregation occur in a single cell cycle.[62]

The behavior of AlfA and Alp7A in cells indicates that some of ParM's key features are not shared by other plasmid-segregating bacterial actins. In contrast to ParM, AlfA-GFP filaments can be visualized in the vast majority of cells of a population[26] (Figure 2B). Furthermore, these filaments do not undergo rapid disassembly and assembly events. Nonetheless, AlfA-GFP filaments are dynamic when observed by a fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP) assay. It appears that AlfA's mode of dynamics is different from not only that of ParM but also that of actin. For AlfA-GFP, FRAP signal recovery occurs symmetrically from both sides of the bleached area and without polarity.[26] Signal recovery in FRAP experiments is often related to the exchange of bleached subunits with unbleached subunits as a result of assembly and disassembly. For a polar mode dynamics, such as actin treadmilling, one also would expect polar signal recovery. Despite these observations, one cannot exclude the possibility of treadmilling events for AlfA. An explanation for the observed signal recovery pattern could be the presence of bundles of filaments with different polarities that could undergo treadmilling. ATP hydrolysis is also important for the dynamics of AlfA filaments and its function, because a mutation expected to abolish nucleotide hydrolysis leads to static filaments and a segregation defect *in vivo*.[26] Dynamics are also important for the function of Alp7A. The behavior of Alp7A-GFP filaments (Figure 2B) appears to be more similar to ParM's dynamics, as time-lapse experiments reveal the rapid assembly and disassembly of filaments, but unlike ParM, Alp7A filaments can remain assembled and elongated after segregating plasmids and are still dynamic via a mechanism more consistent with treadmilling.[27]

Consistent with their different dynamic properties, ParM and AlfA have very different filament architectures (Figure 1C), supporting a causal link between structural polymorphisms and the variation in functional dynamics. ParM is the best structurally characterized bacterial actin, and the structure of its filaments highlights aspects of both conservation and divergence of bacterial actins from eukaryotic actin. Crystal structures of the ParM monomer clearly revealed a domain organization and conformational flexibility conserved with actin. However, ParM filaments, while two-stranded like actin, have the opposite twist,[18,63] indicating that the interstrand contacts have changed dramatically over the course of evolution. AlfA is more open and twisted than ParM, with more exposed surface between the strands;[20] understanding the functional impact of AlfA's unique filament architecture awaits higher-resolution structural studies.

The different behaviors of ParM, AlfA, and Alp7A in cells may suggest that the exact mechanism for plasmid segregation is not conserved between different systems. Investigations into common and variable features of different plasmid segregation systems require both *in vivo* and *in vitro* approaches. To date, we have gained insights into the *in vitro* properties of ParM proteins and AlfA. The bacterial actin Alp12, encoded on *C. tetani* plasmid pE88, has also been characterized in some detail *in vitro*, but to the best of our knowledge, it is unclear whether

Alp12 is actually involved in plasmid segregation. In the following sections, we review the behavior of these proteins outside the cell.

ParM Polymerization and Dynamics in Vitro. By now, a remarkable level of detail is available about ParM and its behavior in vitro. ParM can form filaments in the presence of ATP, GTP, or nonhydrolyzable ATP analogues provided Mg^{2+} is present. Consistent with their in vivo behavior, ParM filaments are unstable in vitro.[18,29,63,64] Total internal reflection fluorescence (TIRF) microscopy assessing the behavior of single filaments uncovered the fact that ParM filaments suddenly switch between phases of steady elongation and rapid disassembly. This type of behavior had previously been associated with eukaryotic microtubules and is termed dynamic instability.[64] ParM disassembly depends on ATP hydrolysis because either the presence of nonhydrolyzable ATP analogues or the mutational inactivation of ATPase activity results in stable filaments.[64] The molecular basis for the dynamic instability of ParM filaments appears to be nucleotide-dependent conformational changes within the ParM subunit. The crystal structure of ParM in the nucleotide-bound state is more closed than in the apo state, suggesting that the nucleotide plays a role in stabilizing a closed state.[15] These structural changes are somewhat reminiscent of the hingelike flexibility seen in actin in various states, but the magnitude of ParM movement is much greater. Cryo-EM structures of ParM filaments have also shown the subunits in open and closed states.[18] The proposed mechanism for dynamic instability is thus a conformational change within the subunits of a filament upon nucleotide release, leading to a disruption of the intersubunit contacts between subdomains IIa and IIb, and subsequent destabilization of the filament.

TIRF microscopy shows that ParM assembles and disassembles bidirectionally with similar kinetics at both ends,[64] in contrast to the kinetic polarity of, e.g., actin filaments. However, whether the growth of ParM filaments is truly symmetrical has been a matter of debate, because, like actin or MreB, ParM filaments have a structural polarity with distinct barbed and pointed ends. It has been suggested that antiparallel bundles of the ParM filament, with asymmetric growth, could lead to an apparent kinetic symmetry.[65] Another question raised by the structural polarity of filaments is how a single filament with different ends can bind the ParR–parC complex[66,67] equally well at both ends to segregate plasmids. One possibility is that the ParR–parC complex binds the end of the ParM filament like a collar, potentially allowing the interaction with similar surfaces on both ends.[68] Another possibility comes from a recent cocrystal of ParM with the ParM-interacting region of ParR (a 17-amino acid peptide), which suggests that ParR binds to the barbed end of ParM filaments.[69] The binding region of the ParR peptide overlaps with the ParM–ParM interaction surface, thus lending support to the idea that ParR can bind only one end of the filament, namely the barbed end.[69] In TIRF experiments, the ParR–parC complex accelerated filament growth and ParM monomers were only added at the ParR–parC complex-bound end of the filament, confirming an insertional ParM polymerization model. An appealing model is one in which the assembly of at least two filaments in an antiparallel fashion, each with one ParR–parC complex at the barbed end, allows for the bipolar segregation of plasmids.[69] Interestingly, a recent study[69] also presents data that could be consistent with an antiparallel packing of ParM filaments. TIRF microscopy indicates that single filaments can condense into bundles. Within bundles, ParM filaments appear to move by an interfilament sliding mechanism that is not yet fully understood. Molecular modeling of interfilament interaction surfaces favors a model in which ParM filaments are oriented in an antiparallel fashion. Furthermore, mutational analysis and TIRF microscopy of sliding mutant filaments appear to substantiate this model. Introducing negatively charged residues at the proposed antiparallel packing surface leads to splitting of bundles into constituent ParM filaments, because of repulsive electrostatic forces that are generated if antiparallel filaments slide against each other.[69] Building on previous and more recent insights, the Löwe group proposed an overall model for ParMR–parC complex-mediated plasmid segregation.[69] A critical concentration of ATP-bound ParM monomers can form filaments that disassemble because of dynamic instability, unless their barbed ends are stabilized by the ParR–parC complex. The ParR–parC complex accelerates filament growth at the barbed end. The pointed end remains susceptible to disassembly unless it is paired with another ParR–parC complex-bound filament in an antiparallel manner. Thus, for the bipolar segregation of plasmids, at least two antiparallel ParM filaments are needed.

Behavior of Divergent Members of the ParM Family. Most studies to date have concentrated on the properties of the ParM protein from the E. coli R1 plasmid (ParM-R1); however, a number of ParM related proteins exist, and it is unclear whether ParM-R1's properties are shared by other proposed members of the ParM family. One divergent ParM member is encoded on E. coli plasmid pB171, the sequence of which is 41% identical and 52% similar to that of ParM-R1.[23] ParM-pB171 shows many of ParM-R1's traits. It polymerizes in the presence of ATP, exhibits a dependence on divalent cations, and is dynamically unstable. EM reconstruction shows that ParM-pB171 filaments are composed of two protofilaments that are helically wound, similar to ParM-R1 filaments. In fact, modeling of the ParM-R1 crystal structure into the ParM-pB171 filament reconstruction shows that inter- and intrastrand contacts between subunits are nearly identical to those in the ParM-R1 filament reconstruction.[23] Another proposed divergent member of the ParM family is ParM-pSK41 from Staphylococcus aureus.[16] ParM-pSK41 filaments also assemble in the presence of ATP and require divalent cations for assembly. However, these filaments exhibit a propensity to form well-ordered bundles. Filtered images of bundles showed that ParM-pSK41 forms filaments that are single-stranded, unlike the double-stranded ones from ParM-R1. Furthermore, the crystal structure of ParM-pSK41 shows a stronger correspondence to that of the archaeal actin-like protein Ta0583 from Thermoplasma acidophilum (Figure 1B), with which it shares 22% sequence identity (18% between ParM-R1 and ParM-pSK41). Interestingly, ParM-pSK41 does not exhibit significant dynamic instability but rather displays a form of treadmilling.[16] It remains to be seen whether other ParM proteins are more like ParM-R1 or ParM-pSK41. Considering the presence of other actin-like proteins that are unrelated to ParM but mediate plasmid segregation, it has been suggested that ParM-pSK41 actually exemplifies a novel family of bacterial actins.[23]

Assembly of AlfA and Alp12 Filaments. The two unrelated bacterial actins AlfA and Alp12 exhibit properties in vitro that are significantly different from those of ParM. Similar to ParM, both proteins assemble into filaments in the presence of ATP or GTP and Mg^{2+}, but the architecture and ultrastructure of these filaments are different.[20−22] AlfA

filaments have a strong propensity to form bundles *in vitro*. Bundle formation can be disrupted by very high levels of KCl (e.g., 2 M KCl), indicating that bundling is promoted by electrostatic interactions. Interestingly, EM analysis suggests that these bundles can be composed of filaments with mixed structural polarity. TIRF microscopy reveals AlfA filamentous structures of variable size and fluorescence intensity, consistent with bundles composed of various numbers of AlfA filaments. Bundles appear to grow bidirectionally, but frequent filament annealing events account for most size increases. AlfA filament bundles do not show ParM-like dynamic instability, also consistent with *in vivo* demonstrations of rather stable filamentous structures.[20] Moreover, the capacity to form mixed-polarity bundles is consistent with observations made in FRAP assays conducted using AlfA-GFP in *B. subtilis*.[26] Alp12 forms dynamically unstable filaments and can undergo repeated cycles of assembly and disassembly. Despite this similarity to ParM-R1, Alp12 shows a dramatically different filament architecture. EM reconstructions suggest that the Alp12 filament consists of two antiparallel strands that are twisted around each other. The strands themselves consist of two parallel protofilaments in total resulting in an Alp12 filament that is constructed from four protofilaments (Figure 1C).[22]

Behavior of ParM and Alp7A: Hints about the Existence of Nucleation Factors in Bacteria? The spontaneous assembly of actin *in vitro* is inefficient because the formation of a nucleus for assembly is kinetically unfavorable. In eukaryotes, a number of protein complexes that serve as nucleation factors for actin polymerization, such as the Arp2/3 complex, exist.[70] There has been a debate for many years about whether bacterial actins require nucleation factors, because they assemble quite readily *in vitro*. Several pieces of evidence hint at the presence of nucleation factors also for bacterial actins.

Early studies reported that ParM-R1 filaments could be visualized *in vivo* only when ParR and *parC* were present. Furthermore, *in vitro*, the presence of ParR and *parC* triggered ParM-R1 polymerization at a low ParM concentration at which usually no significant polymerization is seen.[29] These observations could be interpreted in two ways. Either the ParR–*parC* complex stabilizes ParM-R1 filaments from disassembly, or it acts as a nucleation point for ParM-R1 filaments. If the nucleation model is true, this could imply that ParM-R1 monomer levels *in vivo* are lower than the critical concentration measured *in vitro*. The cellular ParM-R1 concentration was estimated to be ~12 μM,[29] considerably higher than the critical concentration *in vitro* (~2 μM),[64] arguing against nucleation as a mode of ParM assembly regulation. However, it is worth pointing out that we do not know whether critical concentration values determined *in vitro* are a true reflection of the *in vivo* values. Interestingly, recent results for Alp7A also could argue in favor of a nucleation model. Alp7A itself is sufficient to produce filaments *in vivo* as long as it is expressed at sufficiently high levels (5-fold higher than the native level). However, at physiological levels, no filaments are observed unless Alp7R and *alp7A* are also present, indicating that these might serve as a nucleation factor.[60]

The question of whether bacterial actin assembly is nucleated *in vivo* remains largely underexplored. In general, we know little about binding partners of bacterial actins and how filament formation is integrated with general cell physiology. It will be interesting to see if bacteria control filament formation by strategically placing nucleation factors or even disassembly factors in their cytoplasm.

■ MAMK, A BACTERIAL ACTIN INVOLVED IN MAGNETOSOME ORGANIZATION

Whereas MreB and the plasmid-segregating actins appear to be widely present in bacteria, the bacterial actins of the MamK family, with a few exceptions, are found only in the phylogenetically diverse group of magnetotactic bacteria. In these bacteria, MamK is important for the subcellular organization of organelles termed magnetosomes.[71] Magnetosomes are specialized membrane compartments in which cells synthesize magnetic nanocrystals, such as magnetite or greigite. A given cell has a number of magnetosomes organized into a chain that runs along the length of the cell (Figure 2A). The magnetosome crystals are sufficiently large (30−120 nm in diameter) to hold a permanent dipole moment like small magnets. Their chainlike organization is significant for the cell because in this way a large dipole moment is created, thus maximizing overall magnetism. The cells, with their fixed magnetosome chain, essentially act as a small compass needle and align to geomagnetic field lines. This ability is thought to make their search for low oxygen concentrations in stratified aquatic environments more efficient.[71−74]

The molecular mechanisms of MamK function are not yet understood, but high-resolution ECT imaging of magnetosomes and the cytoplasmic space provides some clues. In two magnetotactic bacteria, *M. magneticum* AMB-1 (AMB-1) and *M. gryphiswaldense* MSR-1 (MSR-1), magnetosomes are flanked by a network of actin-like filaments.[75,76] In cells lacking the *mamK* gene, these filaments disappear, indicating that they are composed of MamK.[75,77] This is also supported by *in vitro* experimentation showing that the MamK protein is sufficient to form filamentous structures, as we will discuss later. A striking phenotype of cells lacking MamK is the altered magnetosome chain organization. However, depending on the species, the deletion results in slightly different phenotypes. In AMB-1 Δ*mamK* cells, individual magnetosomes are scattered and are no longer organized into a coherent chain along the length of the cell (Figure 2A).[75] In MSR-1 Δ*mamK* cells, magnetosome chains are shorter, fragmented, and placed ectopically at cell poles.[77] Several possible molecular functions of MamK could be envisaged. One possibility is that MamK filaments act as a scaffold maintaining the magnetosome chain after its formation. Alternatively, MamK filaments might play a more active role and establish the chain by guiding and pushing magnetosomes into place. Recent insights into the cell division process of MSR-1 may indicate that MamK fulfills a more active role.[78] In MSR-1, the magnetosome chain is located at the midcell, which is also the site for cell division. When cells are dividing, the magnetosome chain splits and the chain halves are essentially positioned at newly forming poles of daughter cells, even at the later stages of cell division.[78] However, in separated wild-type MSR-1 cells, the magnetosome chains are not located at cell poles, which suggests a rapid translocation of magnetosomes during the final stages of cell division.[78] The phenotype of a MSR-1 Δ*mamK* mutant may suggest that MamK filaments are involved in the segregation and midcell positioning of magnetosomes by exerting cytomotive force on magnetosomes.[77,78] Further research is, however, required to substantiate such a model. Whether MamK's exact molecular function is conserved between different magnetotactic bacteria is also an important question, because different magnetosome chain

assembly strategies appear to exist. In MSR-1, empty magnetosome compartments are formed throughout the cells' space, but their alignment requires magnetite synthesis and the magnetic interaction of adjacent magnetosomes.[76] In contrast, AMB-1 cells can align empty magnetosome compartments, even without the formation of a magnetite crystal.[75,79] The different phenotypes of *mamK* deletions in AMB-1 and MSR-1 are another indication of species-specific mechanisms. An additional difference between MSR-1 and AMB-1 is that the latter also encodes another homologue of MamK, named MamK-like.[80] It has been implied that if MamK-like performed a function similar to that of MamK, its presence could potentially explain the different phenotypes of AMB-1 and MSR-1 *mamK* deletion strains.[77]

Dynamic Behavior of MamK Filaments *in Vivo*. The question of whether MamK forms dynamic filaments has been investigated in AMB-1. FRAP assays using MamK-GFP have shown that, similar to other bacterial actins, MamK filaments are dynamic.[28] As with other bacterial actins, nucleotide hydrolysis is required for MamK dynamics because the mutational inactivation of its ATPase activity renders filaments static *in vivo*.[28] Investigations into the exact mechanism of MamK dynamics are still ongoing. ParM-like dynamic instability, involving cycles of assembly and rapid disassembly events, is not evident for MamK-GFP. Furthermore, unlike ParM, MamK-GFP appears as a continuous straight filament running from cell pole to cell pole (Figure 2B) in the vast majority of cells in a population.[28,75] FRAP assays appear to also exclude an actin-like treadmilling as a mode of dynamics, because the pattern of signal recovery lacks a clear directionality. However, the architecture of the MamK filament network in cells might limit the conclusions that can be reached from FRAP assays alone. ECT imaging of AMB-1 shows that many overlapping MamK filaments approximately 200−250 nm in length run parallel to magnetosomes, but not a continuous filament.[75] This discrepancy with the observations of pole-to-pole filaments with MamK-GFP mentioned above can be explained by the optical limitation of fluorescence microscopy. This limitation gives the impression of a continuous MamK-GFP filament. In fact, ECT imaging of cells with MamK-GFP shows that this fluorescently labeled protein also forms a network of filaments, just like the native protein.[75] An important point is that the polarity of individual filaments in this network cannot be determined. If the network is composed of filaments with mixed orientations, polar treadmilling events of individual filaments might be masked or canceled out during visualization. Alternatively, the observed fluorescence recovery events could be explained by sliding of entire unbleached filaments into the photobleached areas. The recent evidence of the movement of entire MreB filament patches[40,41,43] or even ParM filament sliding[69] makes this a plausible model.

Interestingly, the dynamics of MamK filaments in AMB-1 require the presence of other magnetosome proteins.[28] The majority of proteins required for magnetosome formation, including MamK, are encoded by a distinct genomic region called the magnetosome island (MAI).[71,74] The MAI varies in length between species, but in AMB-1, it is approximately 100 kb long. The MAI is flanked by two direct repeats, and recombination between these two direct repeats can lead to the loss of the entire MAI, thus leaving cells without the ability to form magnetosomes.[81] Significantly, the loss of the MAI also affects MamK filament dynamics. FRAP assays with ΔMAI cells expressing MamK-GFP from a plasmid show no fluorescence

signal recovery, implying that MamK filaments are no longer dynamic.[28] Genetic studies have identified at least two redundant proteins encoded by the MAI, MamJ and LimJ, that are important for MamK dynamics. In a strain lacking both these proteins, FRAP assays with MamK-GFP again do not show fluorescence signal recovery.[28] It appears, however, that MamJ or LimJ is not sufficient, because reconstitution of MamK-GFP and either of these proteins in ΔMAI cells could not restore MamK-GFP dynamics.[28] Interestingly, loss of both MamJ and LimJ also results in the disturbed organization of the magnetosome chain. In the absence of these proteins, the magnetosome chain is disrupted by large gaps to which bundles of MamK filaments are localized.[28] Whether this disrupted chain phenotype is directly related to additional functions of MamJ and LimJ or if it is a consequence of static instead of dynamic MamK filaments is an open question.

***In Vitro* Behavior of MamK Filaments and Implications in the Cellular Context.** Compared with those of MreB or ParM, comprehensive insights into MamK's assembly *in vitro* have only recently been gained. Studies so far have concentrated on MamK from three closely related *Magnetospirillum* species,[19,80,82,83] but MamK from AMB-1 has been studied most extensively.[19] In the presence of ATP and Mg^{2+}, MamK polymerizes with kinetics and a critical concentration similar to those of other bacterial actins. MamK can also assemble in the presence of GTP; however, assembly kinetics are generally slower than with ATP, and this is accompanied by a slightly higher critical concentration. MamK assembles into filaments composed of two protofilaments that are twisted around each other[19] (Figures 1C and 3). The protein can form

Figure 3. Longitudinal filament interactions are conserved in many bacterial actins. The end-to-end longitudinal interaction surfaces along each protofilament are largely conserved among actin, MreB, ParM, and MamK. Here, three subunits from each filament are shown, with the same subdomain coloring used in Figure 1B. FtsA also forms longitudinal-like contacts in its crystal packing; however, it is missing subdomain Ib, and a large insertion in subdomain Ia (yellow) stabilizes the longitudinal interactions.

single, well-separated filaments or bundles of filaments, depending on the experimental conditions.[19,80,82] For instance, in the presence of physiological levels of K^+, MamK forms well-structured bundles.[19] The filament structure of the MamK was recently determined by cryo-EM at 12 Å resolution.[19] As with MreB and ParM, the longitudinal contact surfaces in the MamK filament are conserved with actin. Similar to MreB, the two protofilaments of MamK are unstaggered. However, for MamK, it is clear that the two strands are parallel and not antiparallel as was suggested for MreB.[19] The unique architecture of MamK further highlights a common theme of variation in bacterial

actins: conserved longitudinal contacts along each strand but strong variation in cross-strand contacts (Figure 3).

MamK is an ATPase, and the mutation of a glutamate residue in the active site of MamK (E143A) abolishes its ATPase activity.[19] This glutamate residue is conserved across most bacterial actins, and in fact, the equivalent mutation also abolishes ParM-R1's ATPase activity.[64] Furthermore, these data are consistent with the ATP hydrolysis model for actin.[84] As seen for ParM, a lack of ATPase activity does not affect MamK's ability to form filaments in vitro. However, this leads to filaments that do not disassemble, as bulk measurements by light scattering assays show.[19] The mechanism by which MamK filaments undergo disassembly in vitro is currently unclear because single-filament measurements are not available. However, the bulk disassembly kinetics appear to be inconsistent with the rapid disassembly behavior of ParM.[19]

In addition to nucleotide hydrolysis, K$^+$ levels influence MamK filament disassembly in vitro. At physiological K$^+$ concentrations, when MamK filaments bundle, no bulk disassembly is obvious despite ATP hydrolysis.[19] This filament bundling and the lack of disassembly in vitro may be related to the static nature of the MamK filament in cells lacking MamJ and LimJ. As mentioned earlier, in this mutant, MamK filaments appear to bundle, clearly deviating from the behavior in wild-type cells. One possibility is that the interaction of MamK filaments with magnetosomes is impaired in cells lacking MamJ and LimJ. In such a model, filaments that are not bound to magnetosomes would be free to associate with each other, resulting in stable bundles. This would fit with the notion that MamJ may function as a magnetosome–MamK attachment protein,[85] although there is no strong evidence of this interaction.

In general, little is known about magnetosome or cellular protein binding partners of MamK. The MAI-encoded protein Amb0994 has been shown to colocalize and interact with MamK filaments at cell poles by bimolecular fluorescence complementation assays.[86] Amb0994 exhibits similarities to methyl-accepting chemotaxis proteins (MCP-like), and a possible role in magnetotaxis was suggested.[86] Another study also concluded the interaction with another MCP-like protein with MamK by genetic two-hybrid assays and cross-linking studies with purified proteins.[87] In general, it can be expected that a hunt for MamK interaction partners will bring us closer to understanding the true function of MamK and how the function of this protein is integrated with the cell's physiology.

■ FTSA IS AN UNUSUAL BACTERIAL ACTIN

A common feature of actin and bacterial actins is an overall similar protein fold. However, it appears that not all bacterial actins adhere to this principle. The structure of the essential cell division protein FtsA substantially deviates from the canonical actin fold in that subdomain IB is missing, and a novel domain has been inserted into subdomain IA (Figure 1B).[13] Considering this rather large deviation in structure, its ability to assemble into actin-like filaments has been debated for many years.

A number of genetic approaches showed that FtsA can interact with itself. In fact, the fusion of two FtsA monomers in a head-to-tail configuration, similar to the configuration in an actin-like filament, is functional in E. coli cells. Furthermore, dimerization or oligomerization was shown to be required for the in vivo function of FtsA during cell division.[88] Bacterial cell division requires the orchestrated assembly and colocalization of a number of proteins at the site of cell division. Through a C-terminal amphipatic helix, FtsA binds the cytoplasmic membrane and tethers another crucial cell division protein, the tubulin homologue FtsZ, to the cell division site. Moreover, FtsA is involved in the recruitment of a number of other components of the cell division apparatus.[89,90] When FtsA is depleted, cells are unable to divide and grow into long filamentous cells as a result (Figure 2A). In line with its role in cell division, FtsA exhibits a rather clear localization to the cell division site at the midcell, but in contrast to other bacterial actins, no filamentous structures are obvious (Figure 2B). Interestingly, GFP-FtsA lacking the amphipatic helix results in filamentous structures running along the length of E. coli cells,[91] indicating that membrane binding limits FtsA's ability to form larger polymers in vivo.

The formation of filaments in vitro was first shown for FtsA from *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (*Sp*FtsA), which forms large corkscrewlike polymers in the presence of ATP and Mg^{2+}.[92] Recently, FtsA from *T. maritima* (*Tm*FtsA) was shown to crystallize with longitudinal contacts similar to those of actin and MreB protofilaments,[25] further confirming the conservation of longitudinal contacts among members of the actin family (Figure 3). In MreB, longitudinal monomer–monomer interactions in the protofilament occur between subdomains IB and IIB on one subunit and subdomains IA and IIA on another. However, in strict terms, subdomain IB is no longer present in FtsA and is essentially replaced by a domain with unrelated sequence, termed subdomain IC. Thus, in an FtsA protofilament, interactions occur in a somewhat mixed fashion through subdomains IC and IIA on one monomer and subdomains IA and IIB on the other monomer (Figure 3). Similar to MreB, the *Tm*FtsA protein can form filaments on a lipid monolayer in vitro.[25] Whether the subunits in these filaments have the exact topology as the subunits in the crystal structure is unknown. However, the longitudinal spacing of subunits in lipid-assembled filaments and crystal protofilaments appears to be consistent. Interestingly, *Tm*FtsA filaments that form on the lipid share little similarity to the corkscrewlike structure observed for *Sp*FtsA and may hint at differences between FtsA proteins from different organisms. In any case, the physiological relevance of extensive filament formation observed in vitro remains unclear.

It will be interesting to see if other uncharacterized bacterial actins have undergone similarly drastic alterations in domain architecture.

■ CONCLUSIONS

Bacterial actins constitute a large, diverse family of proteins that share the core actin structural fold and are involved in many of the same cellular processes as eukaryotic actin, including cell shape, organelle positioning, and cell division (Figure 1A,B). Bacterial and eukaryotic actins also share evolutionarily conserved functional properties: they polymerize into dynamic filaments, their assembly dynamics are modulated by regulatory proteins, subunits undergo similar conformational changes, and the filaments can be assembled into larger bundled structures. However, unlike eukaryotic actin, in which a single filament form has been adapted to multiple cellular processes through a host of actin binding proteins, bacteria have evolved specialized actins for specific purposes that possibly require fewer interaction partners. This has relaxed evolutionary constraints and allowed bacterial actins to explore a greater range of sequence space. The result is a family of bacterial actins that

vary greatly in filament architecture and dynamics (Figure 1C), while retaining some evolutionarily conserved properties of eukaryotic actin. The functions, architecture, and biochemical properties of the vast majority of these bacterial actin families are unknown, thus providing an exciting new frontier in the study of bacterial cell organization.

■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author
*E-mail: komeili@berkeley.edu. Phone: (510) 642-2217.

Notes
The authors declare no competing financial interest.

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

■ REFERENCES

(1) Cabeen, M. T., and Jacobs-Wagner, C. (2010) The bacterial cytoskeleton. *Annu. Rev. Genet. 44*, 365–392.

(2) Shaevitz, J. W., and Gitai, Z. (2010) The structure and function of bacterial actin homologs. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspect. Biol. 2*, a000364.

(3) Pogliano, J. (2008) The bacterial cytoskeleton. *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol. 20*, 19–27.

(4) Michie, K. A., and Lowe, J. (2006) Dynamic filaments of the bacterial cytoskeleton. *Annu. Rev. Biochem. 75*, 467–492.

(5) Ingerson-Mahar, M., and Gitai, Z. (2012) A growing family: The expanding universe of the bacterial cytoskeleton. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev. 36*, 256–266.

(6) Aylett, C. H., Lowe, J., and Amos, L. A. (2011) New insights into the mechanisms of cytomotive actin and tubulin filaments. *Int. Rev. Cell Mol. Biol. 292*, 1–71.

(7) Lin, L., and Thanbichler, M. (2013) Nucleotide-independent cytoskeletal scaffolds in bacteria. *Cytoskeleton*, doi: 10.1002/cm.21126.

(8) Dominguez, R., and Holmes, K. C. (2011) Actin structure and function. *Annu. Rev. Biophys. 40*, 169–186.

(9) Pollard, T. D., and Cooper, J. A. (2009) Actin, a central player in cell shape and movement. *Science 326*, 1208–1212.

(10) Kabsch, W., and Holmes, K. C. (1995) The actin fold. *FASEB J. 9*, 167–174.

(11) Sheterline, P., Clayton, J., and Sparrow, J. (1995) Actin. *Protein Profile 2*, 1–103.

(12) Bork, P., Sander, C., and Valencia, A. (1992) An ATPase domain common to prokaryotic cell cycle proteins, sugar kinases, actin, and hsp70 heat shock proteins. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 89*, 7290–7294.

(13) van den Ent, F., and Lowe, J. (2000) Crystal structure of the cell division protein FtsA from *Thermotoga maritima*. *EMBO J. 19*, 5300–5307.

(14) van den Ent, F., Amos, L. A., and Lowe, J. (2001) Prokaryotic origin of the actin cytoskeleton. *Nature 413*, 39–44.

(15) van den Ent, F., Moller-Jensen, J., Amos, L. A., Gerdes, K., and Lowe, J. (2002) F-actin-like filaments formed by plasmid segregation protein ParM. *EMBO J. 21*, 6935–6943.

(16) Popp, D., Xu, W., Narita, A., Brzoska, A. J., Skurray, R. A., Firth, N., Ghoshdastider, U., Maeda, Y., Robinson, R. C., and Schumacher, M. A. (2010) Structure and filament dynamics of the pSK41 actin-like ParM protein: Implications for plasmid DNA segregation. *J. Biol. Chem. 285*, 10130–10140.

(17) Roeben, A., Kofler, C., Nagy, I., Nickell, S., Hartl, F. U., and Bracher, A. (2006) Crystal structure of an archaeal actin homolog. *J. Mol. Biol. 358*, 145–156.

(18) Galkin, V. E., Orlova, A., Rivera, C., Mullins, R. D., and Egelman, E. H. (2009) Structural polymorphism of the ParM filament and dynamic instability. *Structure 17*, 1253–1264.

(19) Ozyamak, E., Kollman, J., Agard, D. A., and Komeili, A. (2013) The bacterial actin MamK: In vitro assembly behavior and filament architecture. *J. Biol. Chem. 288*, 4265–4277.

(20) Polka, J. K., Kollman, J. M., Agard, D. A., and Mullins, R. D. (2009) The structure and assembly dynamics of plasmid actin AlfA imply a novel mechanism of DNA segregation. *J. Bacteriol. 191*, 6219–6230.

(21) Popp, D., Narita, A., Ghoshdastider, U., Maeda, K., Maeda, Y., Oda, T., Fujisawa, T., Onishi, H., Ito, K., and Robinson, R. C. (2010) Polymeric structures and dynamic properties of the bacterial actin AlfA. *J. Mol. Biol. 397*, 1031–1041.

(22) Popp, D., Narita, A., Lee, L. J., Ghoshdastider, U., Xue, B., Srinivasan, R., Balasubramanian, M. K., Tanaka, T., and Robinson, R. C. (2012) Novel actin-like filament structure from *Clostridium tetani*. *J. Biol. Chem. 287*, 21121–21129.

(23) Rivera, C. R., Kollman, J. M., Polka, J. K., Agard, D. A., and Mullins, R. D. (2011) Architecture and assembly of a divergent member of the ParM family of bacterial actin-like proteins. *J. Biol. Chem. 286*, 14282–14290.

(24) Salje, J., van den Ent, F., de Boer, P., and Lowe, J. (2011) Direct membrane binding by bacterial actin MreB. *Mol. Cell 43*, 478–487.

(25) Szwedziak, P., Wang, Q., Freund, S. M., and Lowe, J. (2012) FtsA forms actin-like protofilaments. *EMBO J. 31*, 2249–2260.

(26) Becker, E., Herrera, N. C., Gunderson, F. Q., Derman, A. I., Dance, A. L., Sims, J., Larsen, R. A., and Pogliano, J. (2006) DNA segregation by the bacterial actin AlfA during *Bacillus subtilis* growth and development. *EMBO J. 25*, 5919–5931.

(27) Derman, A. I., Becker, E. C., Truong, B. D., Fujioka, A., Tucey, T. M., Erb, M. L., Patterson, P. C., and Pogliano, J. (2009) Phylogenetic analysis identifies many uncharacterized actin-like proteins (Alps) in bacteria: Regulated polymerization, dynamic instability and treadmilling in Alp7A. *Mol. Microbiol. 73*, 534–552.

(28) Draper, O., Byrne, M. E., Li, Z., Keyhani, S., Barrozo, J. C., Jensen, G., and Komeili, A. (2011) MamK, a bacterial actin, forms dynamic filaments in vivo that are regulated by the acidic proteins MamJ and LimJ. *Mol. Microbiol. 82*, 342–354.

(29) Moller-Jensen, J., Jensen, R. B., Lowe, J., and Gerdes, K. (2002) Prokaryotic DNA segregation by an actin-like filament. *EMBO J. 21*, 3119–3127.

(30) Daniel, R. A., and Errington, J. (2003) Control of cell morphogenesis in bacteria: Two distinct ways to make a rod-shaped cell. *Cell 113*, 767–776.

(31) Doi, M., Wachi, M., Ishino, F., Tomioka, S., Ito, M., Sakagami, Y., Suzuki, A., and Matsuhashi, M. (1988) Determinations of the DNA sequence of the mreB gene and of the gene products of the mre region that function in formation of the rod shape of *Escherichia coli* cells. *J. Bacteriol. 170*, 4619–4624.

(32) Figge, R. M., Divakaruni, A. V., and Gober, J. W. (2004) MreB, the cell shape-determining bacterial actin homologue, co-ordinates cell wall morphogenesis in *Caulobacter crescentus*. *Mol. Microbiol. 51*, 1321–1332.

(33) Jones, L. J., Carballido-Lopez, R., and Errington, J. (2001) Control of cell shape in bacteria: Helical, actin-like filaments in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Cell 104*, 913–922.

(34) Kruse, T., Bork-Jensen, J., and Gerdes, K. (2005) The morphogenetic MreBCD proteins of *Escherichia coli* form an essential membrane-bound complex. *Mol. Microbiol. 55*, 78–89.

(35) Mauriello, E. M., Mouhamar, F., Nan, B., Ducret, A., Dai, D., Zusman, D. R., and Mignot, T. (2010) Bacterial motility complexes require the actin-like protein, MreB and the Ras homologue, MglA. *EMBO J. 29*, 315–326.

(36) Cowles, K. N., and Gitai, Z. (2010) Surface association and the MreB cytoskeleton regulate pilus production, localization and function in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Mol. Microbiol. 76*, 1411–1426.

(37) Gitai, Z., Dye, N. A., Reisenauer, A., Wachi, M., and Shapiro, L. (2005) MreB actin-mediated segregation of a specific region of a bacterial chromosome. *Cell 120*, 329–341.

(38) Kruse, T., Blagoev, B., Lobner-Olesen, A., Wachi, M., Sasaki, K., Iwai, N., Mann, M., and Gerdes, K. (2006) Actin homolog MreB and

RNA polymerase interact and are both required for chromosome segregation in *Escherichia coli*. *Genes Dev. 20*, 113−124.

(39) Kruse, T., Moller-Jensen, J., Lobner-Olesen, A., and Gerdes, K. (2003) Dysfunctional MreB inhibits chromosome segregation in *Escherichia coli*. *EMBO J. 22*, 5283−5292.

(40) Dominguez-Escobar, J., Chastanet, A., Crevenna, A. H., Fromion, V., Wedlich-Soldner, R., and Carballido-Lopez, R. (2011) Processive movement of MreB-associated cell wall biosynthetic complexes in bacteria. *Science 333*, 225−228.

(41) Garner, E. C., Bernard, R., Wang, W., Zhuang, X., Rudner, D. Z., and Mitchison, T. (2011) Coupled, circumferential motions of the cell wall synthesis machinery and MreB filaments in *B. subtilis*. *Science 333*, 222−225.

(42) Swulius, M. T., Chen, S., Jane Ding, H., Li, Z., Briegel, A., Pilhofer, M., Tocheva, E. I., Lybarger, S. R., Johnson, T. L., Sandkvist, M., and Jensen, G. J. (2011) Long helical filaments are not seen encircling cells in electron cryotomograms of rod-shaped bacteria. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 407*, 650−655.

(43) van Teeffelen, S., Wang, S., Furchtgott, L., Huang, K. C., Wingreen, N. S., Shaevitz, J. W., and Gitai, Z. (2011) The bacterial actin MreB rotates, and rotation depends on cell-wall assembly. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 108*, 15822−15827.

(44) Bendezu, F. O., Hale, C. A., Bernhardt, T. G., and de Boer, P. A. (2009) RodZ (YfgA) is required for proper assembly of the MreB actin cytoskeleton and cell shape in *E. coli*. *EMBO J. 28*, 193−204.

(45) Swulius, M. T., and Jensen, G. J. (2012) The helical MreB cytoskeleton in *Escherichia coli* MC1000/pLE7 is an artifact of the N-terminal yellow fluorescent protein tag. *J. Bacteriol. 194*, 6382−6386.

(46) Eraso, J. M., and Margolin, W. (2011) Bacterial cell wall: Thinking globally, actin locally. *Curr. Biol. 21*, R628−R630.

(47) Defeu Soufo, H. J., and Graumann, P. L. (2004) Dynamic movement of actin-like proteins within bacterial cells. *EMBO Rep. 5*, 789−794.

(48) Kim, S. Y., Gitai, Z., Kinkhabwala, A., Shapiro, L., and Moerner, W. E. (2006) Single molecules of the bacterial actin MreB undergo directed treadmilling motion in *Caulobacter crescentus*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 103*, 10929−10934.

(49) Reimold, C., Defeu Soufo, H. J., Dempwolff, F., and Graumann, P. L. (2013) Motion of variable-length MreB filaments at the bacterial cell membrane influences cell morphology. *Mol. Biol. Cell 24*, 2340−2349.

(50) Bean, G. J., and Amann, K. J. (2008) Polymerization properties of the *Thermotoga maritima* actin MreB: Roles of temperature, nucleotides, and ions. *Biochemistry 47*, 826−835.

(51) Mayer, J. A., and Amann, K. J. (2009) Assembly properties of the *Bacillus subtilis* actin, MreB. *Cell Motil. Cytoskeleton 66*, 109−118.

(52) Nurse, P., and Marians, K. J. (2013) Purification and characterization of *Escherichia coli* MreB protein. *J. Biol. Chem. 288*, 3469−3475.

(53) Popp, D., Narita, A., Maeda, K., Fujisawa, T., Ghoshdastider, U., Iwasa, M., Maeda, Y., and Robinson, R. C. (2010) Filament structure, organization, and dynamics in MreB sheets. *J. Biol. Chem. 285*, 15858−15865.

(54) Esue, O., Cordero, M., Wirtz, D., and Tseng, Y. (2005) The assembly of MreB, a prokaryotic homolog of actin. *J. Biol. Chem. 280*, 2628−2635.

(55) Booth, I. R. (1985) Regulation of cytoplasmic pH in bacteria. *Microbiol. Rev. 49*, 359−378.

(56) Epstein, W., and Schultz, S. G. (1965) Cation Transport in *Escherichia coli*: V. Regulation of cation content. *J. Gen. Physiol. 49*, 221−234.

(57) Ebersbach, G., and Gerdes, K. (2005) Plasmid segregation mechanisms. *Annu. Rev. Genet. 39*, 453−479.

(58) Gerdes, K., Howard, M., and Szardenings, F. (2010) Pushing and pulling in prokaryotic DNA segregation. *Cell 141*, 927−942.

(59) Salje, J., Gayathri, P., and Lowe, J. (2010) The ParMRC system: Molecular mechanisms of plasmid segregation by actin-like filaments. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 8*, 683−692.

(60) Derman, A. I., Nonejuie, P., Michel, B. C., Truong, B. D., Fujioka, A., Erb, M. L., and Pogliano, J. (2012) Alp7R regulates expression of the actin-like protein Alp7A in *Bacillus subtilis*. *J. Bacteriol. 194*, 2715−2724.

(61) Moller-Jensen, J., Borch, J., Dam, M., Jensen, R. B., Roepstorff, P., and Gerdes, K. (2003) Bacterial mitosis: ParM of plasmid R1 moves plasmid DNA by an actin-like insertional polymerization mechanism. *Mol. Cell 12*, 1477−1487.

(62) Campbell, C. S., and Mullins, R. D. (2007) In vivo visualization of type II plasmid segregation: Bacterial actin filaments pushing plasmids. *J. Cell Biol. 179*, 1059−1066.

(63) Popp, D., Narita, A., Oda, T., Fujisawa, T., Matsuo, H., Nitanai, Y., Iwasa, M., Maeda, K., Onishi, H., and Maeda, Y. (2008) Molecular structure of the ParM polymer and the mechanism leading to its nucleotide-driven dynamic instability. *EMBO J. 27*, 570−579.

(64) Garner, E. C., Campbell, C. S., and Mullins, R. D. (2004) Dynamic instability in a DNA-segregating prokaryotic actin homolog. *Science 306*, 1021−1025.

(65) Popp, D., Yamamoto, A., Iwasa, M., Narita, A., Maeda, K., and Maeda, Y. (2007) Concerning the dynamic instability of actin homolog ParM. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 353*, 109−114.

(66) Moller-Jensen, J., Ringgaard, S., Mercogliano, C. P., Gerdes, K., and Lowe, J. (2007) Structural analysis of the ParR/parC plasmid partition complex. *EMBO J. 26*, 4413−4422.

(67) Salje, J., and Lowe, J. (2008) Bacterial actin: Architecture of the ParMRC plasmid DNA partitioning complex. *EMBO J. 27*, 2230−2238.

(68) Choi, C. L., Claridge, S. A., Garner, E. C., Alivisatos, A. P., and Mullins, R. D. (2008) Protein-nanocrystal conjugates support a single filament polymerization model in R1 plasmid segregation. *J. Biol. Chem. 283*, 28081−28086.

(69) Gayathri, P., Fujii, T., Moller-Jensen, J., van den Ent, F., Namba, K., and Lowe, J. (2012) A bipolar spindle of antiparallel ParM filaments drives bacterial plasmid segregation. *Science 338*, 1334−1337.

(70) Campellone, K. G., and Welch, M. D. (2010) A nucleator arms race: Cellular control of actin assembly. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol. 11*, 237−251.

(71) Komeili, A. (2012) Molecular mechanisms of compartmentalization and biomineralization in magnetotactic bacteria. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev. 36*, 232−255.

(72) Bazylinski, D. A., and Frankel, R. B. (2004) Magnetosome formation in prokaryotes. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 2*, 217−230.

(73) Murat, D. (2013) Magnetosomes: How do they stay in shape? *J. Mol. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 23*, 81−94.

(74) Schuler, D. (2008) Genetics and cell biology of magnetosome formation in magnetotactic bacteria. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev. 32*, 654−672.

(75) Komeili, A., Li, Z., Newman, D. K., and Jensen, G. J. (2006) Magnetosomes are cell membrane invaginations organized by the actin-like protein MamK. *Science 311*, 242−245.

(76) Scheffel, A., Gruska, M., Faivre, D., Linaroudis, A., Plitzko, J. M., and Schuler, D. (2006) An acidic protein aligns magnetosomes along a filamentous structure in magnetotactic bacteria. *Nature 440*, 110−114.

(77) Katzmann, E., Scheffel, A., Gruska, M., Plitzko, J. M., and Schuler, D. (2010) Loss of the actin-like protein MamK has pleiotropic effects on magnetosome formation and chain assembly in *Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense*. *Mol. Microbiol. 77*, 208−224.

(78) Katzmann, E., Muller, F. D., Lang, C., Messerer, M., Winklhofer, M., Plitzko, J. M., and Schuler, D. (2011) Magnetosome chains are recruited to cellular division sites and split by asymmetric septation. *Mol. Microbiol. 82*, 1316−1329.

(79) Komeili, A., Vali, H., Beveridge, T. J., and Newman, D. K. (2004) Magnetosome vesicles are present before magnetite formation, and MamA is required for their activation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 101*, 3839−3844.

(80) Rioux, J. B., Philippe, N., Pereira, S., Pignol, D., Wu, L. F., and Ginet, N. (2010) A second actin-like MamK protein in *Magnetospirillum magneticum* AMB-1 encoded outside the genomic magnetosome island. *PLoS One 5*, e9151.

(81) Murat, D., Quinlan, A., Vali, H., and Komeili, A. (2010) Comprehensive genetic dissection of the magnetosome gene island reveals the step-wise assembly of a prokaryotic organelle. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 107*, 5593−5598.

(82) Sonkaria, S., Fuentes, G., Verma, C., Narang, R., Khare, V., Fischer, A., and Faivre, D. (2012) Insight into the assembly properties and functional organisation of the magnetotactic bacterial actin-like homolog, MamK. *PLoS One 7*, e34189.

(83) Taoka, A., Asada, R., Wu, L. F., and Fukumori, Y. (2007) Polymerization of the actin-like protein MamK, which is associated with magnetosomes. *J. Bacteriol. 189*, 8737−8740.

(84) Vorobiev, S., Strokopytov, B., Drubin, D. G., Frieden, C., Ono, S., Condeelis, J., Rubenstein, P. A., and Almo, S. C. (2003) The structure of nonvertebrate actin: implications for the ATP hydrolytic mechanism. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 100*, 5760−5765.

(85) Scheffel, A., and Schuler, D. (2007) The acidic repetitive domain of the *Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense* MamJ protein displays hypervariability but is not required for magnetosome chain assembly. *J. Bacteriol. 189*, 6437−6446.

(86) Philippe, N., and Wu, L. F. (2010) An MCP-like protein interacts with the MamK cytoskeleton and is involved in magnetotaxis in *Magnetospirillum magneticum* AMB-1. *J. Mol. Biol. 400*, 309−322.

(87) Pan, W., Xie, C., and Lv, J. (2012) Screening for the interacting partners of the proteins MamK & MamJ by two-hybrid genomic DNA library of *Magnetospirillum magneticum* AMB-1. *Curr. Microbiol. 64*, 515−523.

(88) Shiomi, D., and Margolin, W. (2007) Dimerization or oligomerization of the actin-like FtsA protein enhances the integrity of the cytokinetic Z ring. *Mol. Microbiol. 66*, 1396−1415.

(89) Egan, A. J., and Vollmer, W. (2013) The physiology of bacterial cell division. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 1277*, 8−28.

(90) Lutkenhaus, J., Pichoff, S., and Du, S. (2012) Bacterial cytokinesis: From Z ring to divisome. *Cytoskeleton 69*, 778−790.

(91) Pichoff, S., and Lutkenhaus, J. (2007) Identification of a region of FtsA required for interaction with FtsZ. *Mol. Microbiol. 64*, 1129−1138.

(92) Lara, B., Rico, A. I., Petruzzelli, S., Santona, A., Dumas, J., Biton, J., Vicente, M., Mingorance, J., and Massidda, O. (2005) Cell division in cocci: Localization and properties of the *Streptococcus pneumoniae* FtsA protein. *Mol. Microbiol. 55*, 699−711.

(93) Fujii, T., Iwane, A. H., Yanagida, T., and Namba, K. (2010) Direct visualization of secondary structures of F-actin by electron cryomicroscopy. *Nature 467*, 724−728.

(94) Pichoff, S., and Lutkenhaus, J. (2005) Tethering the Z ring to the membrane through a conserved membrane targeting sequence in FtsA. *Mol. Microbiol. 55*, 1722−1734.

(95) Defeu Soufo, H. J., and Graumann, P. L. (2005) *Bacillus subtilis* actin-like protein MreB influences the positioning of the replication machinery and requires membrane proteins MreC/D and other actin-like proteins for proper localization. *BMC Cell Biol. 6*, 10.

(96) Strahl, H., and Hamoen, L. W. (2010) Membrane potential is important for bacterial cell division. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 107*, 12281−12286.