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## ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Comparative Analyses of Transport Proteins in the Genus Leptospira by

Bora Buyuktimkin<br>Master of Science in Biology<br>University of California, San Diego, 2014<br>Professor Milton Saier Jr., Chair

Select species of the bacterial genus Leptospira are causative agents of leptospirosis, an emerging global zoonosis affecting nearly one million people worldwide annually. We examined two Leptospira pathogens, L. interrogans serovar Lai str. 56601 and L. borgpetersenii serovar Hardjo-bovis str. L550, as well as the freeliving leptospiral saprophyte, L. biflexa serovar Patoc str. 'Patoc 1 (Ames)'. The transport proteins of these leptospires were identified and compared through bioinformatics to determine which proteins are related to pathogenesis, and
saprophytism. L. biflexa possesses a disproportionately high number of secondary carriers for metabolic uptake flexibility and environmental adaptability, as well as an increased number of inorganic cation transporters providing ionic homeostasis and effective osmoregulation in a rapidly changing environment. L. interrogans and $L$. borgpetersenii possess remarkably similar transporter proteomes (transportomes), with near-equivalent representation in most transporter families. The Leptospira pathogens possess complete sphingomyelinases, holins, and virulent outer membrane porins. These transport-related virulence factors, in conjunction with decreased transporter substrate versatility, indicates that pathogenicity arose in Leptospira as a result of progressively narrowing ecological niches and the emergence of a limited set of proteins responsible for host invasion. The variability of host tropism and mortality rates by infectious leptospires suggests that small differences in individual sets of proteins play important physiological and morphological roles.

## INTRODUCTION

Leptospirosis is an emerging zoonotic disease that affects about 900,000 people annually worldwide. It is caused by members of the bacterial genus Leptospira within the Spirochaete phylum (Bharti et al. 2003). The disease poses a tremendous public health risk in tropical environments, especially as it is transmitted through contaminated water, infected tissue, and the urine of mammalian hosts (Bharti et al. 2003). Once infected, patients can potentially experience a variety of symptoms ranging from fever, myalgia, and fatigue to refractory shock, jaundice, renal failure, and pulmonary hemorrhage (Bharti et al. 2003). At-risk populations for this disease are primarily, but not exclusively associated with tropical climates in developed and underdeveloped countries. Cases throughout the United States have also been reported e.g. Hawaii, Baltimore, New Orleans, etc. (Duplessis et al. 2011, Vinetz et al. 1996, Toliver and Krane 2014). Factors that increase risk include conditions of slum living, recreational water activities, and flooding (Bharti et al. 2003). Nonetheless, leptospirosis is found globally, and various animals can serve as reservoirs for its transmissions to humans such as rats, bats, and marsupials as well as domesticated animals like dogs and cows (Paixao Mdos et al. 2014, Vashi et al. 2010, Ayral et al. 2014) Human to human transmission is rare, but it is believed that globalization and ecotourism contribute significantly to the emergence of this zoonosis (Bandara et al. 2014).

The causative agents of leptospirosis, Leptospira spp., are spiral-shaped, thin, aerobic, gram-negative bacteria of highly divergent spirochetes, whose primary
carbon sources are long-chain fatty acids (Adler and de la Pena Moctezuma 2010). Despite its threat to global public health, the genus of Leptospira is not entirely filled with pathogenic species (Cerqueira and Picardeau 2009). It is divided up into saprophytes (e.g. L. biflexa, L. wolbachii, L. meyeri), pathogens (e.g. L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, L. kmetyi), and intermediate pathogens (e.g. L. licerasiae, L. wolfii, L. broomii) (Cerqueira and Picardeau 2009). Among these characteristically distinct leptospira, practice among scientists has been to distinguish leptospires from each other by means of serotyping and antigenic similarity instead of genetic similarity (Cerqueira and Picardeau 2009). Consequently, serotyping has resulted in the identification of over 230 different serovars among Leptospira with serovars crossing species lines (Cerqueira and Picardeau 2009). The limited ability of sequencing technology at the advent of the identification and characterization of members of Leptospira was a driving force for this behavior, but rapid sequencing technology such as qPCR has begun to enable scientists and clinicians to rapidly and effectively identify infecting leptospires (Gonzalez et al. 2013).
L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii are two of many species that have been identified as pathogens of leptospirosis (Adler and de la Pena Moctezuma 2010). Their most common reservoir animals are rats and cows, respectively, although these two spirochetes are not exclusive to these two animals (Loffler et al. 2014, Fang et al. 2014). Working closely with these and other aforementioned animals, or being in proximity to them or their urine, gives increased likelihood to contracting the pathogen (Munoz-Zanzi et al. 2014). L. biflexa, on the other hand, is a free-living
saprophyte isolated from stream water, whose antigenic properties have been used as a basis for antigenic testing of pathogenic leptospires (Victoria et al. 2008).

In our study, the publicly available genomes of the following representative organisms were examined: L. interrogans serovar Lai str. 56601, Leptospira borgpetersenii serovar Hardjo-bovis str. L550, Leptospira biflexa serovar Patoc str. 'Patoc 1 (Ames)'. Table 1 shows the nomenclature for these organisms used in this study as well as additional information about the organisms. L. interrogans and $L$. borgpetersenii allow comparison and identification of hallmarks of pathogenic leptospires, and L. biflexa enables comparison for identification of transport proteins and mechanisms unlikely to be related to pathogenicity.

In general, the mechanisms of pathogenesis in leptospirosis are relatively poorly understood. However, there are several suggested mechanisms of Leptospira pathogenesis (Adler and de la Pena Moctezuma 2010). The coiled shape of Leptospira is relevant to its corkscrew-like motility through viscous media, which provides an efficient mechanism of dissemination after entry into various organs such as the lungs, liver, kidneys, eyes, and brain (Adler and de la Pena Moctezuma 2010) Genes associated with motility and methyl-accepting chemotaxis are known to play a role in virulence (Adler 2014). Among proposed factors that may facilitate virulence during migration through host tissues are hemolytic sphingomyelinases and phospholipases (Adler 2014). Additional components of Leptospira virulence promote adhesion and
invasion of host cells, although intracellular pathogenicity has not been demonstrated (Adler 2014).

Chronically infected animals (rats, bats, and marsupials) are usually asymptomatic but show high levels of leptospiral excretion through the urine, supporting the hypothesis that renal colonization is important for Leptospira in reservoir selection and pathogenesis (Adler and de la Pena Moctezuma 2010, Hsu et al. 2010). Kidney histological studies further support this hypothesis, as kidneys show interstitial nephritis during infection but no such damage in chronic carriers (Ferrer et al. 2014). Kidney nephritis, along with damage to connective tissues, evident from hemorrhagic manifestations in lungs, supports virulence mechanisms involving invasion and damage to connective tissues (Stevenson et al. 2007). Leptospiral lipopolysaccharide (LPS), known to be less toxic than the typical LPSs of other gramnegative bacteria, more strongly activates Toll-like receptor 2 (TLR2) than TLR4, conventionally achieved by gram-negative LPS in macrophages (Wang et al. 2012).

Ultimately, these hemolytic sphingomyelinase and phospholipase activities, together with the identified motility and chemotaxis factors of Leptospira, damage host tissue and activate the inflammatory response of the host immune system to potentially cause significant damage, eventually resulting in death of the host (Bharti et al. 2003). Identification of transporters relevant to pathogenesis might reveal the presence of pore-forming toxins, transporters facilitating basic nutrient uptake, and the protein secretion systems necessary to release proteinaceous virulence factors.

Furthermore, Leptospira pathogenic species are known to maintain poor viability in acidic urine relative to alkaline urine which suggests a preference of sodium cations $\left(\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right)$in some transport systems that establish or utilize the proton motive force or the sodium motive force (Adler and de la Pena Moctezuma 2010).

Pathogenic species of Leptospira must encode the proteins that mediate virulence. Both L.interrogans and L. borgpetersenii might be expected to show similar pathogenesis-related transporters, but this postulate had not been examined. $L$. biflexa would be expected to have few, or incomplete sets of these proteins (Picardeau et al. 2008). Studies on L. biflexa, L. interrogans, and L. borgpetersenii have suggested that L. biflexa is most closely related to the common Leptospira ancestor, and that pathogenicity is an acquired feature (Picardeau et al. 2008) Consequently, the saprophytic and free-living nature of L. biflexa suggests that its genome enables it to live with high versatility in a range of environments (Picardeau et al. 2008, Bulach et al. 2006). The suggested flexibility of L. interrogans to live within a host and also in the external environment combined with the greater dependence of L. borgpetersenii for survival in the host in spite of its relatively small genome due to insertion sequence (IS)-mediated reduction (Bulach et al. 2006), suggests that increased host tropism and pathogenicity favor decreased versatility and reduced genetic diversity. The encoded transport proteins should reflect these characteristics.

## METHODS

The spirochete genomes analyzed were the most complete and up to date versions for each organism at the time these studies were initiated. The FASTA formatted protein coding sequences of Leptospira interrogans serovar Lai str. 56601, Leptospira biflexa serovar Patoc str. 'Patoc 1 (Ames)', and Leptospira borgpetersenii serovar Hardjo-bovis str. L550 were used (Ren et al. 2003, Bulach et al. 2006, Picardeau et al. 2008). Each protein sequence from the respective proteomes was queried and blasted against the Transporter Classification Database (TCDB; www.tcdb.org) using the program GBlast (Reddy and Saier 2012). GBlast retrieves the TC top hit sequence, TC number, protein size in number of amino acyl residues, the number of predicted TMSs using the HMMTop 2.0 Program, the E-value for the query and hit proteins, regions of sequence similarity, and regions of TMS overlap. The low complexity filter was not used as it is normally of value only for larger datasets including proteins with multiple repeat elements. The Web-based Hydropathy, Amphipathicity and Topology (WHAT) program (Tusnady and Simon 2001, Zhai and Saier 2001) was used with a window size of 19 residues and an angle of 100 degrees (as is appropriate for alpha helices) to display the hydropathy plot for individual proteins in conjunction with TOPCONS for consensus prediction (TOPCONS, www.topcons.net) in order to resolve the differences in the number of TMSs between the proteins retrieved and their TCDB homologues. The plot generated by WHAT allows the user to judge if a program such as HMMTOP has missed a TMS or has predicted a TMS inappropriately. A cut-off E-value of 0.001 was used with the

GBlast program to eliminate false positives and proteins with unreliable degrees of sequence divergence.

Proteins with no predicted TMSs were eliminated so that only integral membrane proteins, primarily multispanning membrane proteins, were retrieved. Proteins with only an N -terminal signal sequence are numerous because these proteins include almost all secreted proteins that are exported via the general secretory (Sec) pathway or twin arginine translocase (TAT) (Pugsley 1993, Sargent et al. 2006). The topological prediction programs often miss these TMSs, recording the proteins to have zero TMSs. Consequently, the number of zero or one TMS proteins retrieved were not reliable and were therefore not always recorded. Furthermore, TMSs detected by GBlast are only of the $\alpha$-helix-type transporters and not $\beta$-sheet-type porins. Transporters known to have $\beta$-sheet, porins found primarily in TC subclasses 1.B and partly in 1.C, were further analyzed for $\beta$ strands using PRED-TMBB with all three decoding methods (Bagos et al. 2004).

Transport proteins thus obtained from query Leptospira sequences were tabulated, and unusual characteristics were identified based in part on topologies that differed from corresponding family members in TCDB as well as E-values obtained with GBlast. Unusual properties can result from events such as genetic deletion and fusion, sometimes resulting in the gain or loss of extra domains or the generation of multifunctional proteins. Such results can be reflective of the protein sequence, but they can be artifacts due to sequencing errors or incorrect initiation codon assignment.

In the latter cases, but not the former, the protein sequences were either corrected when possible or eliminated from our study.

Candidate proteins were examined in greater detail to estimate their probable substrate specificities on the basis of their predicted structures and numbers and degrees of sequence similarity with entries of known function in TCDB. Transport proteins were also classified into families and subfamilies of homologous transporters according to the classification system presented in TCDB (Saier et al. 2006, Saier et al. 2009, Saier et al. 2014). Regions of sequence similarity were examined to ensure that homology was in the transmembrane region(s) and not merely in hydrophilic domains (Youm and Saier 2012). The substrate specificities of particular homologues identified in the sequenced genomes were often predicted based on homology to functionally characterized proteins. Assignment to a family or subfamily within the TC system often allows prediction of substrate type with confidence (Busch and Saier 2002, Felce and Saier 2004, Saier 2000).

## RESULTS

Three Leptospira genomes were analyzed for the occurrence of transport proteins using the Transporter Classification Database (TCDB; www.tcdb.org, (Yen et al. 2009)) and the GBlast program (Reddy and Saier 2012). The results are summarized according to TC subclass in Table 2. Examining the total number of transport proteins present in these three genomes, we see that L. borgpetersenii has the fewest at 260 . The most found in any genome is 337 for L. biflexa, 77 more than in L. borgpetersenii. However, the two pathogenic species (L.interrogans and L. borgpetersenii) combined contained 110 unique transport proteins lacking in $L$. biflexa, the saprophyte.

## Transport Protein Subclasses

TC subclass 1.A in TCDB includes all $\alpha$-type channels except for holins which are found in subclass 1.E. 17, 21, and 26 of these $\alpha$-type channel proteins were identified in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa, respectively. L. biflexa possesses the greatest number of unique families in this subclass, many of which are cationic channels including two mercuric ion channels, suggesting greater versatility in the saprophyte than in the pathogens. Furthermore, L. interrogans possesses eight proteins belonging to the 1.A. 30 Outer Membrane Transporter Energizer (Mot-Exb) Superfamily compared to the fifteen found in both L. biflexa and L. borgpetersenii.

TC subclass 1.B includes outer membrane $\beta$-type porins. 38 were identified in L. interrogans, 32 in L. borgpetersenii, and 39 in L. biflexa. The distribution of these
porins does not suggest a major contribution to pathogenicity. Since these proteins localize to the outer membrane via $\beta$-strands instead of $\alpha$-helixes, those containing zero or one predicted $\alpha$-helical TMSs were included in our study.

TC subclass 1.C includes pore-forming toxins. L.interrogans encodes ten putative toxins showing sequence similarity to established toxins belonging to four families, whereas L. borgpetersenii contains eight and L. biflexa contains seven. The 1.C. 67 family of SphH Hemolysins is notably absent in L. biflexa but present in $L$. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii with four and two members, respectively. Although hemolysins have not been unequivocally shown to be essential for leptospiral pathogenesis, their presence in pathogens is likely to be of significance (Adler 2014). Hemolysins have been shown to strongly induce proinflammatory cytokines (Wang et al. 2012). The three other families represented in subclass 1.C contain similar representation in the three leptospires examined. It should be noted that toxins with zero or one predicted transmembrane $\alpha$-helices were included in this study as many secreted toxins can exist in both soluble and membrane integrated forms, and many are known to be pore-forming $\beta$-type toxins (see TCDB).

TC subclass 1.E consists of Holins. Both L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii encode a protein that hits the Mycobacterial 4 TMS Phage Holin (MP4 Holin) (TC\#1.E.40.3.6). Holins have a variety of proposed functions in prokaryotes, and may play a role in cell lysis and biofilm formation (Saier and Reddy 2014). The
presence of these holins in L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii and their aforementioned functions may promote pathogenicity in these leptospires.

The largest number of transporters for all three species is found in TC subclass 2.A, secondary carriers. L. interrogans encodes 75, L. borgpetersenii 70, and L. biflexa 110 . Given the substantial difference in the number of secondary carriers found in L. biflexa, the relative presence (or lack thereof) of a variety of transporters may help to distinguish between the two Leptospira pathogens and free living bacteria. L. biflexa appears to have much greater metabolic flexibility than its two pathogenic cousins.

TC subclass 2.C includes energizers for motility and outer-membrane transport. All three species encode a single TolB protein that is necessary to energize the stable construction of the outer membrane. The MotAB and ExbBD $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$ channel-forming proteins (TC\#1.A.30) energizes outer membrane transport and periplasmic accumulation of solutes, dependent on TonB and outer membrane receptors (OMRs; TC\#1.B.14). Further analysis of these energizers will be reported below.

TC subclass 3.A are pyrophosphate hydrolysis-driven primary active transporters, usually multi-component systems. With 56, 49, and 67 integral membrane transport proteins of this subclass found in L. interrogans, $L$. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa, respectively, these proteins make up a significant
portion of the total transport proteins found in these organisms. The variety and wealth of transporters found in this subclass clearly play an important role in spirochetes. The 3.D TC subclass of ion-pumping electron carriers are represented in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa with 25, 30, and 32, respectively.

TC class 4 includes group translocators that are believed to modify their substrates in processes coupled to transport. TC 4.B subclass includes members of the nicotinamide ribonucleoside (NR) group translocating uptake permease (PnuC) family. Only L. biflexa encodes such a protein.

TC subclass 4.C includes fatty-acyl-coenzyme A ligases that activate fatty acids for lipid biosynthesis and may function in transport via group translocation. All three species contain one each. GBLAST revealed more fatty-acyl-coenzyme A ligases in all three leptospires, but the absence of transmembrane segments in addition to an unproven transport function in leptospires warranted their exclusion from our analyses.

All three Leptospira species have proteins belonging to TC subclass 4.D, putative group translocating glycosyl transferase. L. interrogans and L. biflexa encodes three, whereas L. borgpetersenii encodes four. Proteins in this family have demonstrated exopolysaccharide synthesis activities thought to be coupled to polysaccharide secretion. As exopolysaccharides can contribute to biofilm formation,
all three leptospires likely benefit from the presence of these proteins, for both freeliving and/or host colonization purposes.

Subclass 5.A includes electron-carriers that transfer an electron pair from one side of the membrane to the other, thereby influencing cellular energetics. $L$. interrogans was found to have two, whereas L. borgpetersenii and L. biflexa have three. Among these are disulfide bond oxidoreductases and prokaryotic molybdopterin-containing oxidoreductases. These proteins might play a role in establishing the proton motive force, but they probably do not contribute to pathogenicity.

Subclass 5.B in TCDB consists of one electron transmembrane carriers. None of the leptospires were found to contain integral membrane carriers in this subclass. However, all three contain multiple copies of cytochrome c peroxidases (TC\#5.B.3.1.1) for extracellular reduction of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (unpublished results).

Subclass 8.A represents auxiliary proteins with one in L. interrogans and $L$. borgpetersenii, and three in L. biflexa. All three encode a stomatin-like protein which may help with localization and insertion of proteins into the outer membrane. $L$. biflexa is the only one to encode a membrane fusion protein (TC\#8.A.3.2.1), which probably functions with an ABC exporter.

Subclass 9.A in TCDB contains known transport proteins whose biochemical mechanism of transport is unknown. These proteins are generally poorly characterized from a mechanistic standpoint. All three leptospires have the same four subclass 9.A protein homologs (TC\#9.A.8.1.4, 9.A.25.1.1, 9.A.40.2.2, and 9.A.58.2.4).

TC Subclass 9.B includes a variety of proteins that are putatively classified as transporters. Further study of a given 9.B protein might either confirm its involvement in transport, or warrant its removal from the TC classification system if a transport function is disproven. L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii have 34 while L. biflexa has 38 of these proteins.

## Transporter Superfamilies and Families

Figure 1 details protein families found in some, but not all three leptospiral species. 21 families are shown to be unique to L. biflexa, dwarfing the three families each unique to $L$. interrogans and $L$. borgpetersenii. This is reflective of the large differences in the numbers of total transporters (Table 1) and the disproportionately high number of 2.A carriers (Table 3). Analyses of these families may reveal key features of free-living saprophytes.

Unique families of transporters found in L. biflexa presented in Table 3 reveals ten families in the 2.A subclass. Families of transporters with substrates unique to L. biflexa are TC\#1.A.72, 2.A.51, 2.A.56, 2.A.59, 2.A.102, and 4.B. 1 that
transport mercury, chromate, dicarboxylates, arsenic, sulfites, and nicotinamide mononucleotide and related compounds, respectively. All of these substrates are transported only by L. biflexa, suggesting increased versatility over $L$. borgpetersenii and L. interrogans.

Families of transporters unique to L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii (Table 3) are less numerous than those unique to L. biflexa. Members of TC\#1.A. 43 and TC\#2.A. 121 transport fluoride and sulfate, respectively. They are the only ones specific to L. interrogans. L. borgpetersenii, on the other hand, does not appear to have unique transporter families. Families belonging to both pathogens are TC\#1.A.23, 1.C.67, 1.E.40, 2.A.114, 2.A. 115 and 9.B. 125 encoding small mechanosensitive ion channels, hemolysins, holins, peptide transporters, multidrug exporters, and unknown substrates, respectively. The families unique to $L$. interrogans may confer increased environmental versatility over L. borgpetersenii, but the shared transport families may play roles in pathogenesis.

## Interesting Facets of Channel Proteins

A limited number of channel protein families were represented in the three Leptospira examined. Most channel proteins are involved in ionic and water homeostasis, but some also serve functions in stress responses. These will be described below.

Only a single member of the Voltage-gated Ion Channel Superfamily (TC\#1.A.1) was identified, and this protein was found only in L. biflexa. It proved to be a 6 TMS cyclic nucleotide-dependent channel, almost certainly a potassium channel like those characterized in cyanobacteria and other spirochetes (Brams et al. 2014).

A single member of the MIP Family (TC\#1.A.8) of aquaporins and glycerol facilitators was found in each of the three leptospires. These three proteins are probably aquaporins capable of transporting three-carbon compounds such as glycerol and dihydroxyacetone (Bienert et al. 2013). The high scores, all matching the same TCDB entry, suggest that these three proteins are orthologous.

Ammonium channels are prevalent in leptospires but in variable numbers; thus, L. interrogans has two dissimilar paralogs, and L. biflexa has three, but $L$. borgpetersenii has only one. Interestingly, it appears that one of these proteins in each organism hits the homolog from Azospirillum brasilense (TC\#1.A.11.1.4) with excellent comparable scores. These three proteins are undoubtedly orthologs. It is worth noting that the $A$. brasilense protein is subject to multiple mechanisms of regulation which may be applicable to the spirochete proteins as well (Huergo et al. 2007).

The three Leptospira species examined possess either one or two homologs of Epithelial Chloride Channels (TC\#1.A.13), characterized only in animals. Although
bacterial homologs have been identified, none has been characterized. However, our results reveal that these proteins from spirochetes exhibit the same topology as the mammalian proteins, suggesting a similar function. We suggest that these proteins will prove to exhibit chloride channel activities comparable to those found in eukaryotes.

The three leptospires display either zero or one Mechanosensitive Ion Channel (MscS; TC\#1.A.23), and interestingly, L. biflexa is the one that lacks such a protein. All three organisms lack an MscL channel (TC\#1.A.22). These proteins are known to function in osmotic adaptation (Pivetti et al. 2003).

All three spirochetes possess a member of the MgtE Family (TC\#1.A.26) of magnesium uptake channels. These three proteins hit the same TC entry with the same high score, clearly indicating orthology.

The three Leptospira species examined all possess multiple paralogs of the $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$-translocating MotAB/ExbBD/TolQR channel-forming constituents (TC\#1.A.30). While MotAB proteins function to energize motility (Lo et al. 2013, Nan et al. 2011), ExbBD channels energize transport across the outer membrane (Noinaj et al. 2010), and TolQR channels are believed to energize assembly of the outer membrane, promoting stability of this structure (Lazzaroni et al. 1999) All three spirochetes possess two MotAB energizers which presumably function in motility, possibly one utilizing the proton motive force and the other utilizing the
sodium motive force. On the other hand, the occurrence of ExbBD/TolQR energizers are variable in these three species with two in L. interrogans, four in $L$.
borgpetersenii, and five in L. biflexa. These results suggest that L. interrogans, like E. coli, possesses the equivalent of one ExbBD complex and one TolQR complex (Tang and Saier 2014, Held and Postle 2002, Goemaere et al. 2007) However, the other two leptospires have an increased number of these $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$channel proteins. The functions of these proteins will be interesting targets of future investigations.

Remaining families of channel proteins are present only in select Leptospira species. The CorA Metal Ion Transporter Family (TC\#1.A.35) is only represented in L. interrogans and L. biflexa. Only L. interrogans possesses a member of the Camphor Resistance Family (TC\#1.A.43). These proteins have recently been shown to be fluoride export channels which protect the bacterium against the toxic effects of fluoride (Stockbridge et al. 2013, Li et al. 2013). For both the Homotrimeric Cation Channel Family (TC\#1.A.62) and the Mer Superfamily (TC\#1.A.72) only L. biflexa has constituent channels. While the former proteins have not been characterized in bacteria, the latter function in the uptake of mercuric ions for the purpose of reduction to metallic mercury by a cytoplasmic mercuric reductase, a detoxification reaction (Pivetti et al. 2003).

## Interesting Facets of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$-type porins

$\beta$-type porins represent a significant portion of the channel proteins found in the Leptospira examined. The leptospiral outer membrane is of particular interest as
it contains cell surface antigens that can be used for vaccine production, and they can also serve as potential drug targets (Raja and Natarajaseenivasan 2013). Members of sixteen different families of outer membrane porins were identified in at least one of the three Leptospira species examined, and interestingly, fourteen of these families are represented in all three species. Just two of the families (POP; 1.B. 5 and SAP; 1.B.16) were found only in L. biflexa, not in the two pathogenic species. While the POP Family is concerned with anion transport, the SAP Family mediates urea and short-chain amide transport.

Some of the families represented in all three organisms have only a single protein per organism, and these may be orthologs of each other as all three proteins hit the same TC entry (see for example 1.B.4, 1.B.6, 1.B.9, and 1.B.13). Striking differences occur in some of the other families, for example, the Outer Membrane Receptor (OMR) Family (TC\#1.B.14), where each organism exhibits different sets of these pore-forming receptors. This fact can be explained by the different specificities of these receptors as illustrated in Table 2. Similar observations were made for the Outer Membrane Factor (OMF) Family (TC\#1.B.17), and again, the different specificities of these porins provide an explanation. It seems likely that the complement of OMRs and OMFs reflect the specific environments in which these organisms are found.

The remaining families in this subclass consist of macromolecular transporters for protein secretion (TC\#1.B.22; TC\#1.B.48), outer membrane protein
insertion (TC\#1.B.33), lipid export (TC\#1.B.42), outer membrane lipid insertion (TC\#1.B.46), and polysaccharide export for protection and biofilm formation (TC\#1.B.55). All leptospires possess members of these families which represent core components of the Leptospira outer membrane proteome.

## Interesting Facets of Secondary Carriers (TC Subclass 2.A)

In most organisms, the Major Facilitator Superfamily (MFS; TC\#2.A.1) is the largest superfamily of secondary carriers. However, in the pathogenic leptospires, the MFS is poorly represented. Both species have only six MFS members and zero members of the related GPH Family (TC\#2.A.2). By contrast, L. biflexa has fifteen MFS porters and two GPH porters. Thus, its MFS representation is almost three times that of the pathogens. Of particular note is the presence of multiple multidrug efflux pumps of MFS subfamily 21, nitrate/nitrite transporters, and several MFS families of unknown function. Also, while the pathogens possess only a single member of the APC amino acid transporters, L. biflexa has three such members, each derived from a separate subfamily.

Divalent cation transporters can mediate either uptake or efflux of these essential but potentially toxic substances. While the CDF Family (TC\#2.A.4) catalyzes heavy metal export and has equal numbers of these proteins in all three leptospires, the ZIP Family (TC\#2.A.5) and the NRAMP Family (TC\#2.A.55) catalyze heavy metal uptake and are found only in L. biflexa. Interestingly, the

Chromate Resistance (CHR) Family (TC\#2.A.51) and the Arsenical Resistance-3 (ACR3) Family (TC\#2.A.59) are also restricted to L. biflexa.

The RND Superfamily is by far the largest superfamily of secondary carriers present in these spirochetes with sixteen in L. interrogans, fourteen in $L$. borgpetersenii, and twenty in L. biflexa. These proteins are divided about equally between heavy metal efflux pumps and multidrug resistance pumps. Only the SecD and SecF proteins, present in single copy in all three organisms, fall outside of these two groups. These two proteins function together as a single RND pump to facilitate proton-driven protein secretion via the General Secretory Pathway (Sec; TC\#3.A.5) (Arkowitz and Wickner 1994). Finally, the two pathogens, but not L. biflexa, possess a single member of the poorly characterized putative Hydrophobe/Amphiphile Efflux-3 (HAE3) subfamily (TC\#2.A.6.7) of the RND superfamily.

The Drug/Metabolite Transporter (DMT) Superfamily is the third largest superfamily in these spirochetes. L. interrogans has four such members, $L$. borgpetersenii has five, and L. biflexa has nine. Most of the top hits in TCDB have not been functionally characterized, so specific substrates cannot be assigned. However, all known members of this superfamily function in the transport of small metabolites and drugs.

Interestingly, all three leptospires have a single homolog of the Sweet family of putative sugar transporters (TC\#2.A.123). The homologs identified have a 3 TMS
subunit structure. Several 7 TMS Sweet family members have been shown to transport sugars such as glucose and fructose (Chen et al. 2010), presently two 3D structures of a 3 TMS Sweet glucose transporter from $L$ biflexa has been solved (Xu et al. 2014). Transport mediated by this protein appears to be that of a secondary carrier (Xu et al. 2014).

Table 2 reveals the presence of secondary carriers belonging to many other families, and almost all of these are well-represented in all three leptospires. These families will not be further discussed here.

## Interesting Facets of Primary Active Transporters

TC subclass 3.A contains the largest superfamily of transporters found in all three Leptospira species, the ABC Superfamily (TC\#3.A.1). While L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii possess 28 and 27 of these proteins, respectively, L. biflexa possesses 41. The ABC Superfamily is represented in all domains of life and is known to transport a wide variety of substrates for both uptake and export. Of note, L. biflexa is the only leptospire to possess ABC transporters for putrescine/spermidine, phosphate, thiamine, zinc $\left(\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}\right)$, iron siderophores, and fatty acyl-CoA. However, all three organisms possess good representation of oligopeptide transporters, suggesting that these substances are important to the nutrition of these organisms. All three organisms have ABC uptake systems for sulfate and for lipids.

ABC efflux systems are present in numbers that are similar to those of the uptake systems in all three spirochetes. The primary substrates for these exporters are

1) lipids and lipoproteins, 2) proteins and peptides, 3) exopolysaccharides, and 4) multiple drugs. Most of these transporters, except for those specific for lipids, are found in similar numbers in the three spirochetes examined. Only a few ABC export systems are specific to L. biflexa. One of these is a putative organoanion (fatty acid?) exporter (TC\#3.A.1.203.8), and the others undoubtedly exhibit specificity for specific proteins (TC\#3.A.1.109, 3.A.1.110, 3.A.1.111). Interestingly, a single member of the Membrane Fusion Protein (MFP) Family (TC\#8.A.1) was found exclusively in L. biflexa, correlating with the presence of these ABC protein exporters.

All three leptospires possess orthologous sets of the integral membrane components of the ATP synthases in the F-ATPase Superfamily (TC\#3.A.2) for subunits $a, b$, and $c$. The reversibility of the enzyme for both the establishment of the proton motive force and ATP synthesis is a key characteristic of this system. Additionally, all three Leptospira have a $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$-translocating pyrophosphatase (TC\#3.A.10). While the TC hit for L. biflexa (TC\#3.A.10.1.1) is different from that for L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii (TC\#3.A.10.1.6), sequence comparison of these entries show that these proteins are probably orthologous.

Of note is the variance of P-type ATPases (TC\#3.A.3) in Leptospira species. L. interrogans possesses six of these transporters with substrate specificities for magnesium $\left(\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}\right)$, copper $\left(\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}\right)$, and potassium $\left(\mathrm{K}^{+}\right)$. L. borgpetersenii, however, possesses only two, one specific for copper $\left(\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}\right)$ and the other for calcium $\left(\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}\right)$.

While the $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{K}^{+}$systems catalyze uptake, the $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$ systems probably catalyze efflux. L. biflexa has six including a putative $\mathrm{Na}^{+} / \mathrm{K}^{+}$ATPase, two copper $\left(\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}\right)$ transporters, a calcium $\left(\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}\right)$ transporter, and a heavy metal $\left(\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right)$ transporter. The diversity of these transporters presumably reflects the types of stress that these organisms encounter. Thus, most prokaryotic P-type ATPases function in stress relief (Chan et al. 2010, Thever and Saier 2009).

All three leptospires have proteins with sequence similarity to the three integral membrane components of the General Secretory Pathway (Sec) Family (TC\#3.A.5), which transports most secreted proteins across the inner cytoplasmic membrane. The presence of $\operatorname{SecDF}$ (TC\#2.A.6.4) as well as the associated YajC protein (TC\#9.B.18) in all three species reveals the genus-wide presence of the integral membrane constituents of the general secretory pathway. In addition, we found the constituents of the outer membrane protein secreting Main Terminal Branch (MTB) Family (TC\#3.A.15). These proteins proved to be distantly related to the MTB constituents previously tabulated in TCDB, and consequently we have entered all constituents of this system from L. interrogans into TCDB under TC\# 3.A.15.4.1. The MTB Family is believed to export hundreds of proteins across the outer membranes of gram negative bacteria initially secreted across the cytoplasmic by the Sec system (Nivaskumar and Francetic 2014).

Not surprisingly, all motile leptospires possess the flagellar (Type III) secretion complex (TC\#3.A.6). The constituents recorded in Table 2 include six
integral membrane constituents of this system whose near-identical E-values for all components suggest orthology of the entire system in this genus. Although L. biflexa is non-pathogenic, it is likely that motility, and hence flagelli, are essential for pathogenesis. However, the striking similarity between Type III secretion systems and flagellar export systems gives rise to the possibility that these systems export of virulence factors in addition to flagellar subunits as has been demonstrated for these systems in other bacteria (Lambert et al. 2012, Nguyen et al. 2000).

As expected, all leptospires have the Septal DNA Translocase (TC\#3.A.12), involved in DNA transfer across the completed septa of newly divided cells. However, while these organisms lack a type IV protein secretion system involved in conjugation, they do possess components of Bacterial Competence-related DNA Transformation (DNA-T) systems (TC\#3.A.11). Interestingly, while L. interrogans and L. biflexa appear to have all constituents of these systems, only two were found in L. borgpetersenii. Possibly this last organism has lost some of the constituents of these systems and therefore has lost competence. Surprisingly, nothing seems to have been published on competence in Leptospira species for DNA uptake.

None of the spirochetes examined appear to have a $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$-transporting carboxylic acid decarboxylase of the NaT-DC Family (TC\#3.B.1). These organisms do have decarboxylases, but they lack the integral membrane protein which is required for $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$extrusion. We therefore conclude that this mechanism for generating a sodium motive force is lacking in these organisms, in agreement with the
conclusion that these ion pumps are largely restricted to anaerobes (Granjon et al. 2010).

Constituents of most, but not all, of the primary proton pumping electron transfer complexes present in mitochondria and many aerobic bacteria were found in the leptospires. These include the proton-translocating NADH dehydrogenase (TC\#3.D.1), proton-translocating transhydrogenase (TC\#3.D.2), and protontranslocating cytochrome oxidase (TC\#3.D.4), but not the proton-translocating quinol:cytochrome c reductase (TC\#3.D.3). Additionally, leptospires possess prokaryotic succinate dehydrogenase (TC\#3.D.10). These results are consistent with the conclusion that leptospires use electron transfer as a primary mechanism for generating a proton motive force, subsequently used for ATP synthesis. As expected, these aerobic bacteria possess members of the disulfide bond oxidoreductase D (DsbD) and Molybdopterin-containing Oxidoreductase (PMO) Family (TC\#5.A. 1 and 5.A.3, respectively), but surprisingly not the single electron transferring DsbB complex.

## Possible Group Translocators (TC Class 4)

None of the leptospires possess a phosphoenolpyruvate-dependent sugar transporting phosphotransferase system (PTS) although such systems have been found in other spirochetes (Saier et al. 1977). However, L. biflexa appears to have a nicotinamide ribonucleoside uptake permease (TC\#4.B), thought to function by a group translocation mechanism (Foster et al. 1990). Each spirochete also has a
membrane-associated acyl-CoA ligase (TC\#4.C) that could function in transport (Black and DiRusso 2007). Finally, each leptospire possesses three or four polysaccharide synthase/exporters (TC\#4.D), all of which give low scores to the proteins in TCDB. These putative enzyme/porters may catalyze vectorial glycosyl polymerization (Davis 2012, Hubbard et al. 2012).

## Poorly Characterized Transporters (TC Class 9)

TC subclass 9.A represents known transport systems that function by an unknown mechanism of action. Three such systems are found in all three spirochetes, and no other members of this subclass were identified. The first of these families is the FeoB family of ferrous iron uptake transporters (TC\#9.A.8). The second family is a multicomponent protein secretion system characterized only in Bacteroidetes (TC\#9.A.25). Homologs of only one constituent of this family were identified, suggesting that the complete system is not present. Members of the third family, (HlyC/CorC; TC\#9.A.40) may function as divalent cation channels. TC subclass 9.B includes putative transporters, where even transport function is not established. These proteins are listed in Table 2 but will not be discussed.

## Transporter Substrates

The substrates of transporters found in these leptospires likely reflect the physiological characteristics of each organism. In Figure 3, the distribution of substrates by category and subcategory is shown. Each chart in the top row represents the percentage of substrate types in each category for a given leptospire, and the chart below corresponds to the subclasses.

All three spirochetes have very similar percentages of the various substrate categories and subcategories. The most obvious difference between the three species is the relatively larger size of certain categories and subcategories in L. biflexa. Whereas L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii have 87 and 89 inorganic substrate transporters, respectively, L. biflexa has 123, suggesting that this organism must be capable of maintaining intracellular ionic homeostasis under a much greater range of environmental conditions than for the two pathogens. Similarly, L. biflexa has a greater number of transporters for each category of substrate except nonselective transporters. The same can be seen in most subcategories where L. biflexa has more transporters than the other two spirochetes.

Correlating with its greater capacity for maintaining ionic homeostasis, $L$. biflexa has 98 proteins involved in cation transport whereas L. interrogans and $L$. borgpetersenii have 68 and 71, respectively. The prevalence of these transporters correlates with the disproportionately high number of L. biflexa secondary carriers that can utilize protons $\left(\mathrm{H}^{+}\right)$or sodium $\left(\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right)$for symport or antiport. This fact also indicates a reliance on transport that is energized by the proton (or sodium) motive force over other energy-coupling mechanisms such as those driven by ATP hydrolysis. In addition to ionic homeostasis, cation symport and antiport facilitate osmotic regulation (Pivetti et al. 2003) and heavy metal resistance (Silver and Phung 1996). Other inorganic monovalent and divalent cationic substrates pumped by these three organisms include potassium $\left(\mathrm{K}^{+}\right)$, calcium $\left(\mathrm{Ca}^{+}\right)$, magnesium $\left(\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}\right)$, and
various cations of metals including copper, iron, zinc, cobalt, cadmium, mercury, and manganese.

Transporters specific for inorganic anions number 17 for L. interrogans, 15 for L. borgpetersenii, and 22 for L. biflexa. Anions, compared to cations, represent a much smaller proportion of the inorganic substrates transported by these leptospires. The latter play strong roles in redox processes, establishing, for example, the pmf or smf for energization. Anion transporters are found primarily in TC subclass 2.A, taking up or exporting bicarbonate, phosphate, arsenate, arsenite, telluride, chromate, chloride, and fluoride. Sulfate uptake, on the other hand, is mediated primarily by the CysPTWA ATP-dependent ABC system.

The three Leptospira species have only a small percentage of their transporters dedicated to organoanion transport. L. biflexa has four of these transporters, whereas L. interrogans has five and L. borgpetersenii has three. Fatty acids and other carboxylic acids, bile acids and their conjugates, taurine, and carnitine are the main substrates in of this subclass of carbon sources. These spirochetes also exhibit good representation of carboxylate transporters with six in $L$. biflexa, two in L. borgpetersenii, and three in L. interrogans. Pyruvate, malate, succinate, acetate, hydroxybenzoate, citrate, and fumarate are all probably transported. These leptospires have outer membrane porins dedicated to fatty acid and hydrophobic compound uptake (TC\#1.B.9.3.3). Fatty acid group translocation
may be catalyzed by transporters in the FAT Family (TC\#4.C.1) (Nevoigt and Stahl 1997, Patarakul et al. 2010, Brihuega et al. 2012).

Sugars and polyols taken up include glycerol, glycerol-3-phosphate, monoand disaccharides. L. biflexa possesses eleven such proteins, whereas L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii each possesses seven. As Leptospira utilize fatty acids as primary carbon sources, this subclass of carbon sources may play roles in osmoregulation, alternative metabolic pathways in differentially expressed genes, and membrane construction (Nevoigt and Stahl 1997, Patarakul et al. 2010, Brihuega et al. 2012).
L. biflexa has disproportionately high numbers of proteins involved in the transport of amines, amides, and polyamines (ten proteins compared to two each in $L$. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii). Among such transported substrates are putrescine, spermidine, ethanolamine, choline, and quaternary ammonium compounds. Transport of polyamines is associated with cellular growth and proliferation and may alleviate stress resulting from elevating external pH (Igarashi 2006, Grillo and Colombatto 1994, Tomitori et al. 2012).

All three leptospires have transporters for amino acids and their conjugates, primarily members of TC subclass 2.A. Constituents can be found in the APC (TC\#2.A.3), DMT (TC\#2.A.7), AGCS (TC\#2.A.25), and ABC (TC\#3.A.1) families.

There appears to be substantial diversity in the types of amino acids transported. Of additional note, the three Leptospira species possess at least seven homologs to a putative alanyl teichoic acid synthesis protein DltB (TC\#2.A.50). These homologs possess domains that strongly match with a DltB domain (e-48), and another weaker match for an O-acyltransferase (e-24) (unpublished results). The strong match warrants inclusion of these proteins in this study as potential transporters of activated d-alanine, an amino acid conjugate.

The three spirochetes in this study possess several proteins that function in the transport of peptides and their conjugates. Peptides in this subcategory can be di/tripeptides, oligopeptides, and peptidoglycan fragments. These transporters can additionally transport antibacterial agents, various nitrogen sources, and precursors of cell wall biosynthesis (Newstead 2014, Newstead 2011, Sobhanifar et al. 2013). These peptide transporters primarily belong to the POT/PTR and ABC families.

We found it of interest that the Leptospira have the Bacterial Competencerelated DNA Transformation Transporter (DNA-T) Family (TC\# 3.A.11), although L. borgpetersenii appears to have lost some constituents of the full system. Competence in these organisms seems not to have been reported. The low E-values obtained for some members of the DNA-T Family found in L.interrogans and $L$. biflexa suggest that uptake in these leptospires may exhibit unique features.

Proteins can be secreted by leptospires using multiple systems. The General Secretory Pathway (TC\#3.A.5) and the outer membrane secreting Main Terminal Branch (MTB) (TC\#3.A.15) probably provide the primary pathways for protein secretion across the two membranes of the cell envelope. However, flagellar proteins and possibly some virulence proteins are secreted by the Type III Secretory Pathway (TC\#3.A.6). Finally, the Outer Membrane Insertion BAM complex (TC\#1.B.33) probably inserts most outer membrane proteins into this structure.

A key feature of Leptospira is its outer membrane, composed of lipids, porins, lipoproteins, and lipopolysaccharide (LPS); this last constituent consists primarily of lipid A and O-antigen. The Outer Membrane Lipopolysaccharide Export Porin (LPS-EP) Family (TC\#1.B.42), the Outer Membrane LolAB Lipoprotein Insertion Apparatus Family (TC\#1.B.46), the Multidrug/Oligosaccharidyllipid/Polysaccharide Flippase Family (TC\#2.A.66), and members of the ABC Superfamily (TC\#3.A.1) are the primary systems dedicated to the export of lipids and LPS precursors to the outer membrane.

All three leptospires in this study possess proteins for the transport of drugs with sixteen in L. borgpetersenii, and twenty in both L. interrogans and L. biflexa. Multidrug resistance pumps are known to be prevalent in free living organisms which need to defend themselves against toxic substances produced by other microbes (Saier and Paulsen 2001). Further characterization of the members of the Drug/Metabolite Transporter Superfamily (TC\#2.A.7) should provide a more
accurate representation of the substrates transported by members of this superfamily. Drug exporters function to protect the cell from endogenously produced antibiotics, to remove exogenous and harmful substances produced by other microbes, and to export drug-like secondary metabolites such as siderophores, lipids, signalling peptides and periplasmic redox cofactors (Saier and Paulsen 2001).

The rest of the "Drugs, vitamins, siderophores \& cofactors" category of substrates in these three organisms is comprised of thirteen transporters in $L$. interrogans and L. biflexa, with only eight in L. borgpetersenii. All three leptospires transport Vitamin $\mathrm{B}_{12}$ (cobalamin), while only L. biflexa has a transporter designated as a Vitamin $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ (thiamine) transporter, and it belongs to the ABC Superfamily (TC\#3.A.1.17.8). Siderophore transporters, also of the ABC-type, are found in all three organisms, consistent with a need for iron in these aerobes.

Nonselective channels include $\alpha$-type channels, $\beta$-barrel porins, and poreforming toxins. The three leptospires examined have transporters in these subclasses with sixteen in L. interrogans, fifteen in L. borgpetersenii, and eleven in L. biflexa. These nonselective transporters can play receptor roles in the outer membrane, induce toxin-like effects in other bacteria, and regulate cellular osmolarity (see TCDB).

All three leptospires have a substantial proportion of transporters that are poorly defined, about $12 \%$. This represents a diverse subset of all leptospiral proteins
with no clearly demarcated (Ren et al. 2003, Bulach et al. 2006, Picardeau et al. 2008). Nonetheless, these putative transport proteins with currently unknown substrates and/or mechanism of action are likely to serve significant roles in metabolism and pathogenicity of these important bacteria.

## DISCUSSION

Members of the genus Leptospira cause leptospirosis, a zoonotic disease with global prevalence, affects nearly one million people annual with mortality ranging 5$25 \%$. Current treatment of its wide variety of symptoms relies heavily on symptom management and antibiotic administration. Antibiotics currently in use to treat leptospirosis include penicillin, doxycycline, and cephalosporin (the efficacy of which remains mixed and questionable) (Brett-Major and Coldren 2012, Guerrier and D'Ortenzio 2013, Wei et al. 2012, Griffith et al. 2007, Griffith et al. 2006). Prophylaxis usually involves vaccines of typically heat-attenuated leptospires with limited and mixed results. Chemoprophylactic treatment involves continual administration of doxycycline, a procedure that has been shown to reduce the incidence of the disease (Guidugli et al. 2000, Brett-Major and Lipnick 2009, Ricaldi and Vinetz 2006). Variation in the susceptibility of different strains of Leptospira to these treatments has been reported, but instances of asymptomatic carriers in humans complicates the issue (Ressner et al. 2008, Ganoza et al. 2010). The causes of the variable clinical manifestations of leptospirosis are poorly understood, and the entire Leptospira genus is poorly characterized.

Comparative analyses of transport proteins should provide clues as to the metabolic, pathological, and drug resistance properties of these spirochetes. By comparing and contrasting two known pathogenic members, Leptospira interrogans and Leptospira borgpetersenii, with a free-living saprophyte, Leptospira biflexa (Ren et al. 2003, Bulach et al. 2006, Picardeau et al. 2008, Johnson 1996), we have
generated data that will help define the metabolic capabilities of these organisms, allow identification of transporters common to these leptospires, and distinguish transport systems required for pathogenic versus saprophytic life.

Bioinformatics is a powerful tool in analyzing and assessing biological data, and this field enables supplementation of findings in the wet lab. The results provided by GBlast enables rudimentary compilation of potential transport proteins within an organism's genome, but it currently has limits. Since sequence similarity is the primary method used to determine the match of an unknown query to a known entry in TCDB, functionally distinct proteins with variations in sequence may result in a false positive for a given protein being declared a transporter, depicting sequence convergence where divergence would otherwise be expected. A few examples of this occurred in our study, most notably with query entries matching with members of the Pore-Forming RTX Toxin Family (TC\#1.C.11). For most of these proteins, the three leptospires examined were shown to have methyl-accepting chemotaxis protein domains, indicating that these toxin homologs may have other functions in these three organisms. All three organisms possess proteins that demonstrate strong sequence similarity to an activated D -alanine derivative exporter, belonging to the Glycerol Uptake Porter family (TC\#2.A.50). Activated D-alanine transporters have been found in gram-positive bacteria, and it is likely these leptospiral proteins belong to the membrane-bound o-acyltransferase family.

Leptospires exhibit profound changes in their transcriptomes in response to a changing external environment (Xue et al. 2010, Caimano et al. 2014). The findings
in our study reflect the total potential transporters available to respective Leptospira species. Other investigators have studied the transcriptional profiles of these organisms under various environmental conditions, especially for specific pathovars. Future efforts will look to integrate transporter proteomic studies with transcriptomic studies and the bioinformatic analyses explored here.

## Distinguishing Transporters of Three Leptospires

All identified transporters are compiled with their characteristics in Table 2, revealing many of the conclusions drawn in our study. We show that $L$.
borgpetersenii possesses 260 transport proteins, L. interrogans possesses 270, and L. biflexa possesses 337. The two pathogenic leptospires have a substantially smaller complement of transporters than the free-living L. biflexa. This difference is believed to arise from marked decreases in the secondary carriers, primary active transporters, and channel proteins in both L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii relative to $L$. biflexa as seen in figure 2. These transporters reflect the decreased transport capabilities and therefore metabolic diversity and potential for homeostatic control of the pathogens relative to the free-living saprophyte.

Figure 3 shows the very significant difference in the inorganic cation transporters of L. biflexa (98) compared to L.interrogans (68) and L. borgpetersenii (71). Transporters associated with these substrates include pmf and/or smf generators, osmotic and ionic homeostatic stress response regulators, and heavy metal resistance proteins. These cation transporters confer upon L. biflexa the ability
to survive in external environments through effective osmotic regulation, metabolic versatility, and by competing with other environmental microbes.

Reflecting the diversity of metabolites transported by L. biflexa are the increased numbers of transporters for carbon sources and amino acids relative to $L$. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii. Among these substrates are carboxylates, sugars, polyols, non-carboxylic organoanions, amines, amino acids \& their conjugates, and peptides \& their conjugates. With just two exceptions, L. biflexa has more transporters in each of these subcategories of substrates. This undoubtedly reflects its superior metabolic versatility, conferring the ability of this free-living organism to grow under a wide range of environmental conditions. Pathogenic species of Leptospira are known to lack proteins related to carbohydrate, nitrogen, and amino acid metabolism that correlate with their protracted growth in artificial media (Ricaldi et al. 2012). Many of the aforementioned transporters, as seen in Table 2, belong to the 2.A TC subclass, whose carriers are known to demonstrate lower affinities, but greater efficiencies at lower energy cost, than ABC transporters.

The relatively high affinity ABC transporters are well represented in all three leptospires, but L. biflexa has significantly more (67) of these transport proteins than L. interrogans (56) or L. borgpetersenii (49). Uptake systems for peptides and sulfate are also present, but L. biflexa possesses a system for putrescine/spermidine uptake, as well as ones for siderophore, $\operatorname{zinc}\left(\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}\right)$, and vitamin acquisition. High affinity acquisition of putrescine, critical in cell survival, demonstrates a crucial component
of L. biflexa saprophytism (Tabor and Tabor 1984). Similarly, uptake systems for iron siderophores, thiamine, and zinc $\left(\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}\right)$ can serve to accumulate them in high concentrations within the cell for use as cofactors where pathogens might have better access within a host. Macromolecular ABC export systems are similarly wellrepresented in all three species, transporting proteins and polysaccharides. They also exhibit differential abilities to export drugs including antibiotics. L. biflexa, however, has homologs of exporters for fatty acyl CoA and putative adhesin proteins. Fatty acyl CoA export may function to acylate the outer membrane and adhesin proteins, likely to play a role in biofilm formation in L. biflexa.

Interspecies differences in transporter classes and substrate categories are limited in Leptospira. A basis for pathogenesis in the Leptospira species examined has no likely root in gross characteristics of their respective transporter proteomes. Various individual transport proteins serve as likely contributors to pathogenesis in L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii. Both pathogens encode members of the SphH Hemolysin Family (TC\#1.C.67) that are notably absent in L. biflexa (Lee et al. 2002, Narayanavari et al. 2012, Zhang et al. 2008). Sph2 (Uniprot \# P59116; Table 2), is a sphingomyelinase with all active site residues essential for catalysis in vitro. Sphingomyelinase C (Uniprot \# Q04XS2) of L. borgpetersenii is closest in sequence similarity to Sph2. Both pathogens, but not L. biflexa, possess proteins with strong sequence similarity to a member of the Mycobacterial 4 TMS Phage Holin Family (TC\#1.E.40). The proposed roles of prokaryotic holins in cell lysis and biofilm formation indicate the potential role these proteins may play in pathogenesis (Saier
and Reddy 2014). Both L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii possess a member of the Putative Peptide Transporter Carbon Starvation CstA Family (TC\#2.A.114). Mutation of a homolog in C. jejuni revealed decreased host-pathogen interaction (Rasmussen et al. 2013). All three leptospires possess proteins exhibiting sequence similarity to a member (TC\#1.B.6.1.20) of the OmpA-OmpF Porin family. The $L$. interrogans protein queried has been shown to be Loa22, a protein essential for leptospiral virulence (Ristow et al. 2007). The relative dissimilarity of the L. biflexa homolog could render it avirulent.

## Transporter Hallmarks of Leptospira

Leptospira is a branch of a divergent phylum and represents a genetically isolated group of bacteria (Picardeau et al. 2008). Transporters identified in the leptospires in this study potentially serve novel roles for these gram-negative aerobes. All three leptospires possess a significant number of $\alpha$-type channels, most of which transport inorganic ions and small metabolites. The largest representative of these channels are the $\operatorname{Mot} \mathrm{AB} / E x b B D / T o l Q R$ channel-forming constituents (TC\#1.A.30) with roles of motility, energized outer membrane transport, and outer membrane stability, respectively. The presence of two MotAB energizers may permit one system to utilize the proton motive force utilization and the other the sodium motive force. L. interrogans is notably deficient in ExbBD/TolQR energizers relative to L. borgpetersenii and L. biflexa, which raises questions about the role of these energizers in Leptospira (Tang and Saier 2014, Held and Postle 2002, Goemaere et al. 2007).

Of strong clinical relevance is the leptospiral outer membrane proteome (surfaceome), constituted largely by a variety of $\beta$-type porins. It contains cell surface antigens for potential vaccine production and drug targets (Raja and Natarajaseenivasan 2013). As mentioned above, all three leptospires possess Loa22 (or a homolog), a surface-exposed porin, necessary for leptospiral virulence. Aside from this virulence factor, leptospires possess outer membrane transporters for the nonselective transport of small molecules, larger molecules including siderophores, proteins and membrane constituents. The leptospiral outer membrane plays a role in transport of substrates from the extracellular space to the periplasm.

The largest TC subclass identified in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and $L$. biflexa is 2.A, carrier proteins catalyzing uniport, antiport, and symport. The diversity of substrates transported is in part due to the Major Facilitator Superfamily (TC\#2.A.1) as well as the 40 other families within this TC subclass. This distribution of transporters suggests an important role of secondary carriers in nutrient acquisition over primary active transporters such as ABC systems. The distribution of secondary carriers and primary active transporters reveals the prioritization of the acquisition and export of various molecules. Metabolic flexibility should dictate utilization of low-affinity secondary carriers, whereas a specific metabolic need might necessitate other higher-affinity systems.

P-type ATPase (TC\#3.A.3) distribution varies between all three leptospires, but all three possess an exporter of copper $\left(\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}\right)$, indicating a critical need for strict intracellular copper regulation. Only L. interrogans possesses ATPases for the uptake of $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{K}^{+}$, suggesting these ions play critical roles for this organism to survive in the external environment and/or in the host. L. biflexa possess ATPases for $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$ export, heavy metal resistance $\left(\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right)$, and $\mathrm{Na}^{+} / \mathrm{K}^{+}$. These proteins, unique to L. biflexa, likely highlight its effective osmoregulation and capacity for membrane potential maintenance.

All three leptospires possess multiple systems for protein secretion. The primary pathways for protein secretion across the two membranes of the cell envelope are probably provided by the General Secretory Pathway (TC\#3.A.5) and the outer membrane secreting Main Terminal Branch (TC\#3.A.15). Flagellar proteins and potential virulence proteins are secreted by the Type III Secretory Pathway (TC\#3.A.6). This particular pathway is critical for virulence, as inhibition of flagellar motility in leptospires has been shown to render them avirulent (Lambert et al. 2012).

Common in all three leptospires are primary proton pumping electron transfer complexes inherently present in mitochondria and many aerobic bacteria including the proton-translocating NADH dehydrogenase (TC\#3.D.1), proton-translocating transhydrogenase (TC\#3.D.2), and proton-translocating cytochrome oxidase (TC\#3.D.4). The presence of these proton-translocating systems is consistent with
the conclusion that electron transfer is used as a primary mechanism to generate a proton motive force, subsequently used for ATP synthesis.

As leptospires are genetically divergent compared to most well studied bacteria, they are expected to share a strong core of proteins and possess unique systems for pathogenesis and free-living (Ren et al. 2003, Bulach et al. 2006, Picardeau et al. 2008). A significant portion of the identified transporter proteome in these leptospires are incompletely characterized proteins from TC subclasses 9.A and 9.B. Further identification and characterization of these proteins, in addition to the remaining encoded non-transport proteins, should provide a more complete understanding of leptospiral pathogenesis and saprophytism.

Key attributes of Leptospira are aligned with their motile and chemotactic abilities. The embedded flagelli permitting cork-screw like motility favors these organisms in host dissemination and environmental survival (Islam et al. 2014). Transport proteins identified in this study, including a flagellar export system, chemotaxis proteins, and flagellar motor energizers, should play roles in survival and virulence. Chemotaxis toward specific molecules like glucose may facilitate tissue tropism of Leptospira pathogens (Islam et al. 2014). Revealed in L. biflexa is its efficacy to persist over long periods of time in distilled water by forming biofilms, and aggregation has also been suggested to be a mechanism of environmental survival and host colonization (Brihuega et al. 2012, Barragan et al. 2011). Transport
proteins that excrete exopolysaccharides, signaling molecules, and adhesion proteins should promote biofilm formation for persistence.

Transport proteins represent a subset (about $10 \%$ ) of the entire proteome of an organism. However, intracellular processes are dependent on what materials are available in the cell. By providing an overview of the molecules transported and how they are imported and exported, conclusions about the metabolism and physiology of an organism can be drawn. In the case of Leptospira, the overall transportome (transporters of the proteome), reveals key characteristics of saprophytism and pathogenesis. L. biflexa demonstrates high flexibility and versatility in its transportome with a relatively large subset of secondary carriers and transporter families not found in the pathogens. In addition, L. biflexa possesses high-affinity transporters for critical cofactor import and increased numbers of uptake systems for carbon and nitrogen sources. Meanwhile, the pathogens possess remarkably similar transport protein profiles, suggesting the host tropism and environmental survival between the two relies on individual transporters and differences in the nontransporting proteome. Both possess factors that may be associated with pathogenesis, absent in L. biflexa, such as sphingomyelinases, holins, and virulencerelated outer membrane porins. The increased versatility of L. biflexa as a free-living organism likely reflects the inverse as the decreased versatility in the pathogens forces them to realize progressively narrower ecological niches. As leptospirosis manifests itself in a variety of symptoms, small differences within individual proteins and the leptospiral proteome may play roles in determining virulence and mortality in
humans (Spichler et al. 2011). The findings reported here on these leptospiral transporters should improve our understanding of the pathology of leptospirosis and allow more specific experimentation with L. biflexa as a model system for the Leptospira genus.
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## APPENDIX

Table 1. Overview of three Leptospira species and their basic traits.

| Species Name | Leptospira <br> interrogans <br> serovar Lai <br> str. 56601 | Leptospira <br> borgpetersenii <br> serovar Hardjo- <br> bovis str. L550 | Leptospira <br> biflexa serovar <br> Patoc str. 'Patoc <br> 1 (Ames)' |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chromosome I RefSeq | NC_004342.2 | NC_008508.1 | NC_010842.1 |
| Chromosome I Size (Mb) | 4.339 | 3.614 | 3.604 |
| Chromosome II RefSeq | NC_004343.2 | NC_008509.1 | NC_010845.1 |
| Chromosome II Size (Mb) | 0.359 | 0.317 | 0.278 |
| Plasmid p74 RefSeq |  |  | NC_010846.1 |
| Plasmid p74 Size (Mb) | 4.698 | 3.931 | 0.074 |
| Total Genome Size (Mb) | 3,683 | 2,945 | 3.956 |
| Total Protein \# | 270 | 260 | 3,600 |
| Transporters | 7.33 | 8.83 | 337 |
| Transporters as \% of Proteinss | Yes | Yes | 9.36 |
| Pathogenic? |  |  | No |

Table 2.
TC classification and functional prediction of transport-related proteins found in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa. Sequences were retrieved using GBlast with E-values of 0.001 or smaller. Transporters with E-values larger than e-12 are highlighted indicating low substrate-specificity confidence. Transporter Classification (TC)


| 1.A $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ - | ee Channels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.A. 1 | Voltage-gated Ion Channel (VIC) Superfamily | 1.A.1.5. 16 | Q10V66 | 6 | Cation ( $\mathrm{K}^{+}$) |  |  |  |  |  |  | BoS9V7 | 7 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}-75$ |
| 1.A. 8 | Major Intrinsic Protein (MIP) Family | 1.A.8.8.2 6 | D7V8E7 | 6 | Sugars \& Polyols (Glycerol) | Q8FON7 | 6 | 4.7E-62 | Q04YM4 | 6 | 2.9E-61 | B0S9P8 | 6 | 1.0E-59 |
| 1.A. 11 | Ammonia Channel Transporter (Amt) Family | 1.A.11.1.4 <br> 1.A.11.2.3 <br> 1.A.11.2.5 <br> 1.A.11.2.7 | O67997 <br> Q93IP6 <br> Q0IDE4 <br> O28528 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | Amines, amides, polyamines (Ammonia) Amines, amides, polyamines (Ammonia) Amines, amides, polyamines (Ammonia) Amines, amides, polyamines (Ammonia) | Q8EZP6 <br> Q8F074 | 12 <br> 12 | 1.6E-98 <br> 2.5E-93 | Q04XZ2 | 12 | 3.8E-99 | BOSD95 <br> BOS994 <br> BOSCI2 | 12 11 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 8.5 \mathrm{E}-97 \\ & 9.3 \mathrm{E}-97 \\ & 5.3 \mathrm{E}-97 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1.A. 13 | Epithelial Chloride Channel (E-CIC) Family | 1.A.13.4.1 | F8CM01 | 3 | Anion (C1) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Q8EY02 } \\ \text { Q8EY03 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.0 \mathrm{E}-19 \\ & 4.4 \mathrm{E}-18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Q04X11 } \\ \text { Q04X10 } \end{array}$ | $3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.4 \mathrm{E}-20 \\ & 1.4 \mathrm{E}-17 \end{aligned}$ | BOSIO2 | 3 | 3.1E-20 |
| 1.A. 23 | Small Conductance Mechanosensitive Ion Channel (MscS) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1.A.23.4.3 } \\ & \text { 1.A.23.4.10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P0AEB5 } \\ & \text { O25170 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Nonselective Nonselective | Q8F7F3 | 6 | 1.3E-13 | Q04YU2 | 6 | 1.3E-17 |  |  |  |
| 1.A. 26 | $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ Transporter-E (MgtE) Family | 1.A.26.1.2 | QSSMG8 | 5 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ ) | Q8F430 | 5 | 4.0E-56 | Q051E5 | 5 | 1.1E-55 | B0S9F9 | 5 | 6.6E-56 |
| 1.A. 30 | $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$-translocating Bacterial Flagellar Motor/ExbBD Outer Membrane Transporter Energizer (Mot-Exb) Superfamily | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1.A. } 30.1 .2 \\ & \text { 1.A. } 30.1 .3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O06874 } \\ & \text { P28612 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\mathrm{M}^{+}$cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$) <br> $\mathrm{M}^{+}$cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$) |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q054U9 } \\ & \text { Q051E6 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.3 \mathrm{E}-16 \\ & 4.5 \mathrm{E}-26 \end{aligned}$ | BOS9G1 BOS9P4 | 1 | 9.4E-28 <br> 8.3E-11 |

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Family } \\ & \text { TC\# } \end{aligned}$ | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hit } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value |
| Bacterial Hemolysin A (B-  <br> 1.C. 109 Hemolysin A) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1.C.109.1.4 | I6YB99 | 0 | Nonselective |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0S9.1 | 0 | 2.8E-36 |
|  |  | 1.C.109.1.5 | J8IXD8 | 0 | Nonselective |  | Q8F969 | 0 | 2.5E-44 | Q054H0 | 2 | 4.5E-45 |  |  |  |
| 1.E Holins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.E. 40 | Mycobacterial 4 TMS Phage Holin (MP4 Holin) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1.E.40.3.6 | Q8F0F1 | 4 | Proteins (Murein Hydrolase) |  | Q8F0F1 | 4 | 2.4E-66 | Q053Z9 | 4 | 5.6E-47 |  |  |  |
| 2.A Porters (Uniporters, Antiporters, Symporters) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 1 Major Facilitator Superfamily (MFS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.1.2.39 | Q5JAK9 | 12 | Multidrug (Tetracycline) |  | Q8F6D6 | 12 | 2.6E-75 | Q053S3 | 12 | 2.3E-73 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.1.2.73 | Q9D2V8 | 14 | Multidrug (Tetracycline) |  | Q8F4V6 | 12 | 2.3E-37 | Q050K3 | 12 | $4.1 \mathrm{E}-38$ | B0SC87 | 12 | 1.5E-37 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.2.82 | Q8EXM1 | 12 | Multidrug |  |  |  |  | Q04WQ1 | 12 | 0 | B0SCL6 | 12 | 6.4E-84 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.2.84 | Q9F632 | 12 | Sugars \& polyols (Arabinose) |  |  |  |  | Q04WK9 | 12 | 3.5E-66 | B0SH56 | 12 | 1.5E-78 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SBF2 | 12 | 2.4E-53 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.3.31 | A5H8A5 | 16 | Multidrug (Fluoroquinolone) |  | Q8F0F4 | 14 | 6.8E-113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.1.4.3 | P08194 | 12 | Sugars \& polyols (Glycerol-3Phosphate) |  | Q8EZ20 | 12 | 2.5E-89 | Q04XL4 | 12 | 7.7E-90 | B0SG38 | 11 | 2.5E-89 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.8.12 | 082811 | 12 | Anion (Nitrate, nitrite) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SEP4 | 13 | 2.6E-79 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.21.3 | 031137 | 12 | Multidrug (Tetracycline) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SGD2 | 12 | 3.5E-06 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0S9M0 | 12 | 0.0001 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.24.3 | A9WGR7 | 12 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SCK8 | 12 | $5.1 \mathrm{E}-23$ |
|  |  | 2.A.1.28.5 | B0SL69 | 12 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SCU1 | 12 | 0 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.38.2 | Q0E7C5 | 12 | Siderophores (Enterobactin) |  | Q8F767 | 12 | 1.9E-18 | Q053Z1 | 12 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-21$ | B0SAQ5 | 12 | 6.8E-21 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.59.1 | A6UVW2 | 12 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SEM9 | 12 | 0.0002 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.59.2 | B2.JBG5 | 12 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SCE0 | 11 | 2.2E-55 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.66.2 | Q8F7L4 | 12 | Putative Carboxylates (4hydroxybenzoate) |  | Q8F7L4 | 12 | 0 |  |  |  | B0SFG6 | 12 | 3.6E-160 |
|  |  | 2.A.1.81.1 | D5AKT2 | 12 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SAR3 | 12 | 5.0E-47 |

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Family } \\ & \text { TC\# } \end{aligned}$ | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hit } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | Query <br> TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot\# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value |
| 2.A. 2 | Glycoside-Pentoside-Hexuronide (GPH):Cation Symporter Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.2.3.1 } \\ & \text { 2.A.2.3.7 } \end{aligned}$ | P0CE45 Q0HIQ0 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | Sugars \& polyols (Melibiose) <br> Sugars \& polyols (Melibiose) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SDC6 B0SC42 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \mathrm{E}-16 \\ & 9.6 \mathrm{E}-36 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2.A. 3 | Amino Acid-Polyamine-Organocation (APC) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.3.4.7 } \\ & \text { 2.A.3.5.1 } \\ & \text { 2.A.3.8.17 } \\ & \text { 2.A.3.8.28 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q9KZF1 } \\ & \text { Q53148 } \\ & \text { P45539 } \\ & \text { K1M2K1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | Amino acids <br> Amines, amides, polyamines <br> (Ethanolamine) <br> Amino acids <br> Amino acids (Large, neutral) |  | Q8F8N1 | 11 | 9.8E-41 | Q04Z40 | 12 | 4.6E-41 | B0S9W8 <br> B0SFI5 <br> B0SBF7 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.6 \mathrm{E}-28 \\ & \\ & 4.0 \mathrm{E}-54 \\ & 2.4 \mathrm{E}-36 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2.A. 4 | Cation Diffusion Facilitator (CDF) Family | 2.A.4.1.3 | O07084 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cation }\left(\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right) \\ & \text { Cation }\left(\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | Q8F433 Q8EZ48 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \mathrm{E}-57 \\ & 3.3 \mathrm{E}-44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \text { Q051E7 } \\ \text { Q04XQ6 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.0 \mathrm{E}-56 \\ & 9.9 \mathrm{E}-42 \end{aligned}$ | B0S9G2 B0SAQ8 | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \mathrm{E}-41 \\ & 4.1 \mathrm{E}-39 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2.A. 5 | Zinc $\left(\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}\right)$-Iron $\left(\mathrm{Fe}^{2+}\right)$ Permease (ZIP) Family | 2.A.5.5.2 | Q8N1S5 | 8 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SIK7 | 8 | 2.4E-43 |
| 2.A. 6 | Resistance-Nodulation-Cell Division (RND) Family | 2.A.6.1.5 | Q88RT6 | 12 | $\text { Cation }\left(\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right)$ |  |  |  |  | Q052Z7 | 12 | 0 | B0SG51 <br> B0SFV0 <br> B0SHS1 <br> B0SGJ5 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 2.A.6.1.5 | Q88RT4 | 1 | Cation ( $\left.\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right)$ |  |  |  |  | Q050M6 | 1 | 4.5E-11 | B0SGJ7 | 1 | 2.2E-10 |
|  |  | 2.A.6.1.6 | Q1LCD7 | 1 | Cation ( $\left.\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right)$ |  |  |  |  | Q050M7 | 1 | 2.7E-17 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.6.1.6 | Q1LCD8 | 12 | Cation ( $\left.\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q8F4S4 } \\ & \text { Q8F4S3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | Q050M9 | 12 |  | B0SC24 | 12 | 0 |

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Family } \\ & \text { TC\# } \end{aligned}$ | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | Hit TMS \# | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value |
|  |  | 2.A.7.23.1 | P42243 | 10 | Putative Amino Acid (Tryptophan) |  | Q8F6G7 | 10 | 1.1E-27 | Q053U1 | 10 | 3.8E-26 | B0SIH0 | 10 | 8.7E-33 |
|  |  | 2.A.7.26.4 | A9T501 | 4 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SBU1 | 4 | 9.1E-24 |
|  |  | 2.A.7.33.5 | U2UX39 | 4 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SFC0 | 4 | 0.0005 |
|  |  | 2.A.7.34.2 | B0RV55 | 4 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SCR7 | 4 | 2.1E-28 |
|  |  | 2.A.7.34.5 | Q11YS2 | 4 | Unknown |  |  |  |  | Q052T3 | 4 | 2.9E-25 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.7.34.6 | G0ENB6 | 4 | Unknown |  | Q8F5V6 | 3 | 3.5E-22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 9 | Cytochrome Oxidase Biogenesis (Oxa1) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.9.2.1 | Q8LBP4 | 6 | Proteins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SAE6 | 5 | 2.1E-36 |
|  |  | 2.A.9.3.1 | P25714 | 3 | Proteins |  | P97041 | 5 | 4.2E-34 | Q04XE2 | 5 | 1.2E-32 |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 17 | Proton-dependent Oligopeptide Transporter (POT/PTR) Family |  |  |  |  |  | Q8F319 | 12 | 1.6E-61 | Q051N8 | 11 | 2.5E-67 | B0S9V2 | 11 | 1.1E-54 |
|  |  | 2.A.17.1.4 | P75742 | 14 | Peptides (Dipeptide/Tripeptide) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.17.1.6 | Q5M4H8 | 14 | Peptides (Dipeptide/Tripeptide) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 19 | $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$ :Cation Antiporter (CaCA) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.19.5.3 | Q57556 | 10 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SCN8 | 10 | 1.2E-30 |
| 2.A. 21 | Solute:Sodium Symporter (SSS) Family |  |  |  |  |  | Q8F864 Q8F4A8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3.6 \mathrm{E}-36 \\ & 1.6 \mathrm{E}-29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q04YE1 } \\ & \text { Q051V1 } \end{aligned}$ | 1513 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.7 \mathrm{E}-37 \\ & 3.5 \mathrm{E}-31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B0SA99 } \\ & \text { B0S8V1 } \\ & \text { B0SF07 } \\ & \text { B0S9U4 } \end{aligned}$ | 14151313 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.2 \mathrm{E}-48 \\ & 8.2 \mathrm{E}-16 \\ & 1.2 \mathrm{E}-21 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 2.A.21.3.2 | P96169 | 14 | Sugars \& polyols (Glucose) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.21.3.8 | A1S2A8 | 15 | Sugars \& polyols (Glucose) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.21.5.1 | Q92911 | 13 | Carboxylates (Monocarboxylate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.21.8.3 | B0S9U4 | 13 | Amines, amides, polyamines (Choline) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 22 | Neurotransmitter:Sodium Symporter (NSS) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.22.4.2 | O67854 | 12 | Amino acids |  | Q8F511 | 12 | 6.6E-92 | Q050H6 | 12 | 3.5E-89 | B0S8U1 | 12 | 1.7E-90 |
| 2.A. 23 | Dicarboxylate/ Amino Acid: Cation Symporter (DAACS) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.23.1.5 | 059010 | 9 | Amino acid (Leucine) |  | Q8F9X1 | 9 | 1.4E-55 | Q04X74 | 9 | 1.0E-53 | B0SHY9 | 9 | 7.2E-50 |

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family TC\# Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hit } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query <br> TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query <br> TMS \# | E-value |
| 2.A. 25 Alanine or Glycine:Cation Symporter (AGCS) Family | 2.A.25.1.6 | B0SM05 | 12 | Amino acid (Alanine) |  | Q8F2Z5 | 12 | 0 | Q050F6 | 12 | 0 | B0SDH7 | 12 | 0 |
| 2.A. 28 Bile Acid: $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$Symporter (BASS) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.28.1.2 } \\ & \text { 2.A.28.2.2 } \\ & \text { 2.A.28.2.4 } \end{aligned}$ | Q12908 E0D3H5 Q9K0A9 |  | Organoanion (Bile Acid) <br> Carboxylates (Pyruvate) <br> Organoanion |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q8CXS2 } \\ & \text { Q8CXT7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \mathrm{E}-32 \\ & 4.1 \mathrm{E}-28 \end{aligned}$ | Q053T9 | 9 | 9.5E-31 | B0S9L2 B0SIE8 B0S9M3 | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 10 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \mathrm{E}-38 \\ & 5.8 \mathrm{E}-53 \\ & 1.5 \mathrm{E}-29 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2.A. $33 \mathrm{NhaA} \mathrm{Na}^{+}: \mathrm{H}^{+}$Antiporter (NhaA) Family | 2.A.33.1.1 | P13738 | 10 | Cation ( $\left.\mathrm{Na}^{+}, \mathrm{H}^{+}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SBD5 | 10 | 1.9E-87 |
| 2.A. $35 \mathrm{NhaC} \mathrm{Na}{ }^{+}$: $\mathrm{H}^{+}$Antiporter (NhaC) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.35.1.1 } \\ & \text { 2.A.35.1.2 } \\ & \text { 2.A.35.1.6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P27611 } \\ & \text { P54571 } \\ & \text { O07553 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cation }\left(\mathrm{Na}^{+}, \mathrm{H}^{+}\right) \\ & \text {Cation }\left(\mathrm{Na}^{+}, \mathrm{H}^{+}\right) \\ & \text {Cation }\left(\mathrm{Na}^{+}, \mathrm{H}^{+}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | Q8F621 | 7 | 1.7E-47 | Q04ZN5 | 10 | 1.2E-80 | B0SDV2 | 12 | 8.5E-56 |
| 2.A. 36 Monovalent Cation:Proton Antiporter-1 (CPA1) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.36.6.3 } \\ & \text { 2.A.36.6.4 } \end{aligned}$ | Q87KV8 Q0ZAH6 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cation }\left(\mathrm{K}^{+}, \mathrm{H}^{+}\right) \\ & \text {Cation }\left(\mathrm{K}^{+}, \mathrm{H}^{+}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | Q8EZ70 | 11 | 5.7E-75 |  |  |  | B0SBF6 | 9 | 1.2E-71 |
| 2.A. 37 Monovalent Cation:Proton Antiporter-2 (CPA2) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.37.1.1 } \\ & \text { 2.A.37.1.3 } \\ & \text { 2.A. } 37.1 .8 \\ & \text { 2.A.37.4.2 } \end{aligned}$ | P03819 <br> Q0ZAH7 <br> Q8VYR9 Q9SUQ7 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | Cation <br> Cation <br> Cation <br> Cation |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q8EYB5 } \\ & \text { Q8EYC0 } \\ & \text { Q8F5W8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ $15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \mathrm{E}-133 \\ & 2.9 \mathrm{E}-35 \\ & 9.5 \mathrm{E}-71 \end{aligned}$ | Q056M0 Q056J5 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \mathrm{E}-131 \\ & 2.5 \mathrm{E}-30 \end{aligned}$ | B0SB61 <br> B0SA59 <br> B0S9J4 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.1 \mathrm{E}-125 \\ & \\ & 1.1 \mathrm{E}-29 \\ & 1.8 \mathrm{E}-85 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2.A. $38 \mathrm{~K}^{+}$Transporter (Trk) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.38.4.3 } \\ & \text { 2.A.38.4.4 } \\ & \text { 2.A.38.4.6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O32081 } \\ & \text { P39760 } \\ & \text { G8V398 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 1 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | Cation ( $\mathrm{K}^{+}$) <br> Cation ( $\mathrm{K}^{+}$) <br> Cation ( $\mathrm{K}^{+}$) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q8EZ85 } \\ & \text { Q8EZ84 } \\ & \text { Q8F982 } \end{aligned}$ | 14 <br> 1 <br> 11 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 \mathrm{E}-68 \\ & \\ & 1.9 \mathrm{E}-26 \\ & 4.5 \mathrm{E}-44 \end{aligned}$ | Q04Y32 <br> Q04Y02 | 16 | 8.7E-65 $2.7 \mathrm{E}-46$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { B0S9Q8 } \\ \text { B0SF50 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \mathrm{E}-63 \\ & 2.4 \mathrm{E}-40 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family TC\# Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | Hit <br> TMS \# | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query <br> TMS \# | E-value |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { Divalent Anion:Na }{ }^{+} \text {Symporter (DASS) } \\ \text { 2.A. } 47 & \text { Family }\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.47.1.13 } \\ & \text { 2.A.47.5.1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q65NC0 } \\ & \text { Q58086 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | Anion (Sulfate) <br> Anion (Sulfate) |  | Q8F5L4 | 15 | 9.1E-45 | Q052K5 | 15 | 1.1E-43 | B0SA86 | 14 | $8.1 \mathrm{E}-40$ |
| 2.A. 49 Chloride Carrier/Channel (ClC) Family | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.A.49.4.1 } \\ & \text { 2.A.49.5.4 } \\ & \text { 2.A.49.8.2 } \end{aligned}$ | Q57753 <br> A8AGW0 M2XWR6 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 11 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Anion ( $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$) <br> Anion ( $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$) <br> Anion ( $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$) |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { Q8EYK3 } \\ \text { Q8F243 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \mathrm{E}-30 \\ & 5.0 \mathrm{E}-30 \end{aligned}$ | Q055Z2 | 12 | 7.7E-31 | B0SCJ7 <br> B0SCW6 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \mathrm{E}-35 \\ & 1.1 \mathrm{E}-19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2.A. 50 Glycerol Uptake (GUP) Family | 2.A.50.2.1 | P39580 | 12 | Amino Acid (d-Alanine) | putative alanyl teichoic acid synthesis protein, DltB (may transport activated alanine across the membrane) | Q8F3B8 <br> Q8F3V9 <br> Q8F3Z3 <br> Q8F2K0 <br> Q8F4B7 <br> Q8F6E3 <br> Q8F6U7 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 12 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & 11 \\ & 12 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \mathrm{E}-24 \\ & 7.5 \mathrm{E}-23 \\ & 1.1 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 1.9 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 5.1 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 2.3 \mathrm{E}-20 \\ & 3.8 \mathrm{E}-18 \end{aligned}$ | Q050T2 Q05113 Q051C2 Q051V7 Q04ZV0 Q053P8 Q04ZC3 Q04WR7 Q04WR5 Q04WG6 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 12 \\ & 13 \\ & 11 \\ & 13 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.1 \mathrm{E}-24 \\ & 2.2 \mathrm{E}-23 \\ & 8.8 \mathrm{E}-23 \\ & 1.2 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 1.5 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 7.8 \mathrm{E}-20 \\ & 6.5 \mathrm{E}-19 \\ & 4.2 \mathrm{E}-26 \\ & 1.5 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 2.0 \mathrm{E}-22 \end{aligned}$ | B0S9E5 <br> B0S9T1 <br> B0SCF8 <br> B0SG46 <br> B0SEG5 <br> B0SDB0 <br> B0SBZ5 <br> BOSAS0 <br> B0SFH7 <br> B0SIQ2 <br> B0SIN3 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 12 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \mathrm{E}-26 \\ & 2.6 \mathrm{E}-25 \\ & 9.2 \mathrm{E}-24 \\ & 1.5 \mathrm{E}-23 \\ & 2.6 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 4.9 \mathrm{E}-22 \\ & 2.9 \mathrm{E}-21 \\ & 3.5 \mathrm{E}-21 \\ & 2.4 \mathrm{E}-19 \\ & 2.1 \mathrm{E}-24 \\ & 1.3 \mathrm{E}-22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2.A. 51 Chromate Ion Transporter (CHR) Family | 2.A.51.1.3 | P14285 | 11 | Anion (Chromate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SAX7 | 11 | 2.8E-24 |
| 2.A. 53 Sulfate Permease (SulP) Family | $\begin{aligned} & 2 . A .53 .3 .8 \\ & 2 . A .53 .5 .1 \end{aligned}$ | Q8F8H7 Q9SL95 | 10 <br> 11 | Anion (Bicarbonate) <br> Anion (Molybdate) |  | Q8F8H7 | 10 | 0 | Q04YH8 | 10 | 0 | B0S8R9 B0SFZ1 B0SEN7 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 14 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \mathrm{E}-144 \\ & 5.6 \mathrm{E}-74 \\ & 1.1 \mathrm{E}-47 \end{aligned}$ |
| Metal Ion ( $\mathrm{Mn}^{2+}$ - iron) Transporter (Nramp) <br> 2.A. 55 Family | 2.A.55.3.4 | Q93JK1 | 11 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Mn}^{2+}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SDV1 | 11 | 1.0E-10 |

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Family } \\ & \text { TC\# } \end{aligned}$ | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hit } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value | Uniprot \# |  | Query <br> TMS \# | E-value |
| 2.A. 86 | Autoinducer-2 Exporter (AI-2E) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.86.1.8 | O32095 | 8 | Sugars \& Polyols (AI-2) |  | Q8F3P6 | 7 | 4.0E-11 | Q051N2 | 7 | 1.1E-10 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.86.1.11 | F8FLY5 | 7 | Sugars \& Polyols (AI-2) |  | Q8F6G8 | 8 | 2.9E-25 | Q053U3 | 8 | $6.1 \mathrm{E}-27$ | B0SDC1 |  | 8 | 4.0E-23 |
|  |  | 2.A.86.2.3 | Q3IS50 | 7 | Sugars \& Polyols (AI-2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0S9U1 |  | 7 | 1.3E-11 |
| 2.A. 88 | Vitamin Uptake Porter (VUT or ECF) Family | 2.A.88.8.5 | B2FPS5 | 6 | Multidrug |  | Q8F440 | 6 | 3.2E-38 | Q051B8 | 6 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-36$ | B0S9G8 |  | 6 | 1.1E-40 |
| 2.A. 102 | 4-Toluene Sulfonate Uptake Permease (TSUP) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.102.4.5 | C7D714 | 9 | Anion (Sulfite) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SAD4 |  | 7 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
| 2.A. 109 | Tellurium Ion Resistance (TerC) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.109.1.2 | FON2E7 | 9 | Anion ( $\mathrm{Te}^{2}$ - |  |  |  |  | Q04WT2 | 9 | 6.4E-73 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.109.2.2 | Q7URC1 | 7 | Anion ( $\mathrm{Te}^{2}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SGK5 |  | 7 | 1.9E-52 |
|  |  | 2.A.109.2.3 | L5DDD7 | 7 | Anion ( $\mathrm{Te}^{2}$ ) |  | Q8F6U0 | 7 | 1.0E-53 | Q053Q6 | 7 | 4.3E-52 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 111 | $\mathrm{Na}^{+} / \mathrm{H}^{+}$Antiporter-E (NhaE) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.111.1.1 | Q8F285 | 12 | Cation $\left(\mathrm{Na}^{+}, \mathrm{H}^{+}\right)$ |  | Q8F285 | 12 | 0 | Q053F5 | 13 | 0 | B0SCS6 |  | 12 | 0 |
| 2.A. 114 | Putative Peptide Transporter Carbon Starvation CstA (CstA) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.114.1.8 | L0DJM9 | 15 | Peptides |  | B0SAH8 | 15 | 7.8E-38 | Q054Z2 | 15 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-45$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 115 | Novobiocin Exporter (NbcE) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.A.115.1.6 | E0HYB9 | 3 | Multidrug |  | Q8F8F1 | 3 | 2.8E-38 | Q04YI7 | 3 | 1.1E-39 |  |  |  |  |
| $\text { 2.A. } 121$ | Sulfate Transporter (CysZ) Family | 2.A.121.4.6 | Q8EZV9 | 5 | Putative Anion (Sulfate) |  | Q8EZV9 | 5 | 5.4E-110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.A. 123 | Sweet; PQ-loop; Saliva; MtN3 (Sweet) Family | 2.A.123.2.4 | Q8F4F7 | 3 | Sugars \& Polyols |  | Q8F4F7 | 3 | 8.7E-51 | Q051Z4 | 3 | 1.5E-38 | B0SHL1 |  | 3 | 3.9E-23 |
| 2.C Ion-Gradient-Driven Energizers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.C. 1 | TonB Family of Auxiliary Proteins for Energization of Outer Membrane Receptor (OMR)-mediated Active Transport |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.C.1.2.1 | P0A855 | 1 | Macromolecules (Proteins) |  | Q8CVE4 | 1 | 1.1E-05 | Q053X8 | 1 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | B0SDV7 | 1 |  | 3.6E-05 |

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Family } \\ & \text { TC\# } \end{aligned}$ | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hit } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query <br> TMS \# | E-value |
|  $\mathrm{H}^{+}$- or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$-tran <br> 3.A. 2 (F-ATPase) Su  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.2.1.2 | P21903 | 6 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F218 | 6 | 1.4E-07 | Q04ZT9 | 7 | 1.4E-05 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.2.1.6 | F8L1Z5 | 1 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F2J0 | 1 | 6.9E-13 | Q04ZU1 | 1 | 4.5E-12 | B0SDA1 | 1 | 7.5E-09 |
|  |  | 3.A.2.1.6 | F8L1Z6 | 2 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F219 | 2 | 2.0E-10 | Q04ZU0 | 2 | 2.5E-10 | B0SDA0 | 2 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  |  | 3.A.2.1.6 | F8L1Z7 | 6 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SD99 | 7 | 3.0E-11 |
| 3.A. 3 | P-type ATPase (P-ATPase) Superfamily |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.3.1.5 | B0SMV3 | 11 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Na}^{+}, \mathrm{K}^{+}$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SEB6 | 11 | 0 |
|  |  | 3.A.3.4.2 | Q72RN5 | 8 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ ) |  | Q8F426 | 7 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Cation ( $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ ) |  | Q8F427 | 2 | 5.2E-114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.3.5.4 | Q9ZHC7 | 9 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SBE3 | 7 | 0 |
|  |  | 3.A.3.5.23 | Q72N56 | 8 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ ) |  | Q8F8G3 | 8 | 0 | Q04YI2 | 10 | 0 | b0SEA5 | 8 | 0 |
|  |  | 3.A.3.6.10 | O32219 | 9 | Cation ( $\left.\mathrm{Co}^{2+}, \mathrm{Zn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Cd}^{2+}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SGJ3 | 8 | 1.5E-157 |
|  |  | 3.A.3.7.1 | P03959 | 12 | Cation ( $\mathrm{K}^{+}$) |  | Q8F1M1 | 10 | 2.1E-150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.3.7.2 | Q1m606 | 7 | Cation ( $\mathrm{K}^{+}$) |  | P59219 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.3.7.2 | Q1M607 | 1 | Cation ( $\mathrm{K}^{+}$) |  | Q8F1M2 | 1 | 1.4E-31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.3.27.2 | B0STR2 | 9 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SI48 | 9 | 0 |
|  |  | 3.A.3.30.3 | B0SLF7 | 10 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$ ) |  |  |  |  | Q050U1 | 9 | 0 | B0SCY0 | 10 | 0 |
| 3.A. 5 | General Secretory Pathway (Sec) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.5.1.1 | P0AG96 | 3 | Proteins |  | Q8F0R6 | 1 | 6.7E-06 | Q054E8 | 1 | 7.1E-06 | B0SAG7 | 1 | 5.0E-06 |
|  |  | 3.A.5.1.1 | P0AG99 | 3 | Proteins |  | Q8F5I6 | 2 | $7.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ | Q052H9 | 2 | 8.2E-09 | B0SB23 | 2 | 2.0E-09 |
|  |  | 3.A.5.2.2 | P0A5Z2 | 10 | Proteins |  | G1UB19 | 10 | 2.3E-94 | Q055C4 | 10 | 1.0E-94 | B0SA27 | 10 | 4.4E-93 |
|  |  | 3.A.5.7.2 | Q8U4B5 | 6 | Proteins |  | Q8F705 | 6 | 1.7E-06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.A. 6 | Type IIII (Virulence-related) Secretory Pathway (IIISP) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.6.2.1 | P54700 | 5 | Proteins |  | Q8F300 | 4 | 3.9E-51 | Q050G0 | 5 | 1.4E-51 | B0SDH3 | 5 | 2.7E-50 |
|  |  | 3.A.6.2.1 | P54702 | 6 | Proteins |  | Q8F302 | 6 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-20$ | Q050G2 | 6 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-20$ | B0SDH1 | 6 | 1.2E-18 |
|  |  | 3.A.6.2.1 | P40727 | 4 | Proteins |  | Q8F303 | 7 | 1.5E-36 | Q050G3 | 4 | $7.1 \mathrm{E}-38$ | B0SDH0 | 5 | 2.2E-44 |
|  |  | 3.A.6.2.1 | P15928 | 2 | Proteins |  | Q8F320 | 2 | 3.7E-32 | Q052W7 | 2 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-32$ | B0SCT6 | 2 | 7.3E-34 |
|  |  | 3.A.6.2.1 | P40729 | 7 | Proteins |  | Q8F304 | 7 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-122$ | Q050G4 | 7 | $6.2 \mathrm{E}-123$ | B0SDG9 | 9 | 1.9E-107 |
|  |  | 3.A.6.2.1 | P0A1L5 | 2 | Proteins |  | Q8F301 | 2 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}-10$ | Q050G1 | 2 | 4.7E-10 | B0SDH2 | 2 | 7.0E-09 |

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Family } \\ & \text { TC\# } \end{aligned}$ | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | Hit | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | Query |  | Uniprot \# | Query |  | Uniprot \# | Query |  |
| 3.A. 10 | $\mathrm{H}^{+}$, $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$-translocating Pyrophosphatase ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}$-PPase) Family |  |  |  | Anion (Pyrophosphate) |  | Q8F641 | 16 | 0 | Q04ZM0 | 16 | 0 | B0S8X5 | 16 | 0 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3.A.10.1.1 } \\ & \text { 3.A.10.1.16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P31414 } \\ & \text { O80384 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.A. 11 | Bacterial Competence-related DNA Transformation Transporter (DNA-T) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q04ZU7 | 1 | 0.006 | B0SDA7 <br> B0SF25 <br> B0SGF0 | 113 | 0.001 <br> 1.7e-09 <br> 4.2E-06 |
|  |  | 3.A.11.1.1 | P39694 | 1 | Nucleic acids (DNA) |  | Q8F2J7 | 1 | 1.1E-04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.11.1.1 | P39695 | 12 | Nucleic acids (DNA) |  | Q8F8Z2 | 11 | $9.2 \mathrm{E}-11$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.11.1.3 | Q8VRL2 | 10 | Nucleic acids (DNA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.A. 12 | Septal DNA Translocator (S-DNA-T) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.12.1.3 | K8ITE0 | 4 | Nucleic acids (DNA) |  | Q8F1W7 | 4 | 0 | Q04ZC6 | 4 | 0 | B0SGD5 | 4 | 0 |
| 3.A. 15 | Outer Membrane Protein Secreting Main Terminal Branch (MTB) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.15.1.1 | P15643 | 1 | Proteins |  | Q8F3M5 | 2 | 2.4E-05 | Q050Z8 | 2 | 2.8E-05 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.15.1.1 | P15750 | 1 | Proteins |  | Q8F3N3 | 2 | 7.4E-06 | Q051A6 | 2 | 0.0003 | B0S8Q9 | 1 | 3.8E-05 |
|  |  | 3.A.15.2.1 | Q8VRL3 | 4 | Proteins |  | Q8F3M8 | 5 | 8.8E-66 | Q051A1 | 5 | 1.4E-66 | B0S8Q4 | 6 | 1.6E-67 |
|  |  | 3.A.15.3.1 | O68433 | 6 | Proteins |  | Q8F6L1 | 6 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-07$ | Q04ZR7 | 6 | $8.6 \mathrm{E}-06$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.A.15.3.1 | Q9XD71 | 1 | Proteins |  | Q8F3M9 | 1 | 6.7E-19 | Q051A2 | 1 | 2.9E-19 | B0S8Q5 | 1 | 5.3E-14 |
| 3.B Dec | arboxylation-Drive Transporters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.B. 1 | Na+-transporting Carboxylic Acid Decarboxylase (NaT-DC) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.B.1.1.2 | Q57079 | 1 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$) |  | Q8F3H0 | 2 | 1.2E-78 | Q051Q3 | 2 | 1.3E-77 | B0SHH5 | 3 | 1.1E-80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SBL8 | 1 | 7.2E-77 |
|  |  | 3.B.1.1.5 | Q9V0A4 | 3 | Cation ( $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$) |  | Q8EZP9 | 3 | 1.1E-73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.D Oxi | doreduction-Driven Transporters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.D. 1 | $\mathrm{H}^{+}$or $\mathrm{Na}^{+}-$translocating NADH Dehydrogenase (NDH) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.D.1.1.1 | P0AFE0 | 5 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F7Q6 | 5 | 4.7E-10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.D.1.2.1 | P29919 | 3 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F7P9 | 3 | 4.8E-18 | Q04YA4 | 3 | 1.2E-17 | B0SFT4 | 3 | 5.93E-15 |
|  |  | 3.D.1.2.1 | P29923 | 3 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  |  |  |  | Q04YB2 | 3 | 2.5E-07 | B0SFU2 | 3 | 2.3E-16 |
|  |  | 3.D.1.2.1 | P29924 | 16 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F7Q8 | 19 | 2.0E-120 | Q04YB3 | 19 | $8.1 \mathrm{E}-122$ | B0SFU3 | 19 | 3.8E-114 |
|  |  | 3.D.1.2.1 | P29925 | 14 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  |  |  |  | Q04YB4 | 15 | 7.5E-84 | B0SFU4 | 15 | 4.0E-104 |
|  |  | 3.D.1.2.1 | P29926 | 15 | Cation( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SFU5 | 14 | 1.3E-51 |
|  |  | 3.D.1.3.1 | Q56218 | 1 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F7Q0 | 1 | 3.6E-47 | Q04YA5 | 1 | 1.4E-47 | B0SFT5 | 1 | 3.0E-47 |
|  |  | 3.D.1.3.1 | Q56222 | 1 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F7Q4 | 1 | 1.4E-119 | Q04YA9 | 1 | 2.7E-122 | B0SFT9 | 1 | 7.8E-117 |
|  |  | 3.D.1.3.1 | Q56226 | 3 | Cation ( $\mathrm{H}^{+}$) |  | Q8F7Q7 | 3 | 2.6E-09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. (continued)
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Table 2. (continued)

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Transporter Classification (TC) \& \& \& \& \& \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{L. interrogans} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{L. borgpetersenii} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{L. biflexa} \\
\hline Family
TC\# \& Hit TCID \& Hit Uniprot \# \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \hline \text { Hit } \\
\& \text { TMS \# }
\end{aligned}
\] \& Substrate(s) \& Comments \& Uniprot \# \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \hline \text { Query } \\
\& \text { TMS \# }
\end{aligned}
\] \& E-value \& Uniprot \# \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Query } \\
\& \text { TMS \# }
\end{aligned}
\] \& Evalue \& Uniprot \# \& Query TMS \# \& E-value \\
\hline \multicolumn{15}{|l|}{8.A Auxiliary Transport Proteins} \\
\hline 8.A. 1 Membrane Fusion Protein (MFP) Family \& 8.A.1.3.2 \& P11091 \& 0 \& Nontransport Auxillary \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& B0SAW6 \& 1 \& 3.0E-16 \\
\hline 8.A. 21 Stomatin/Podocin/Band 7/SPFH (Stomatin) Family \& 8.A.21.2.1 \& O59180 \& 3 \& Nontransport Auxillary \& \& Q8F4G9 \& 3 \& 9.7E-32 \& Q052A4 \& 3 \& 2.6E-31 \& B0SHK1 B0SHK0 \& \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 3.1 \mathrm{E}-29 \\
\& 8.8 \mathrm{E}-26
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multicolumn{15}{|l|}{9.A Recognized Transporters of Unknown Biochemical Mechanism} \\
\hline 9.A. 8 Ferrous Iron Uptake (FeoB) Family \& 9.A.8.1.4 \& Q5XPH7 \& 9 \& Cations ( \(\mathrm{Fe}^{2+}\) ) \& \& Q8F332 \& 10 \& 0 \& Q052W0 \& 10 \& 0 \& B0SDS9 \& 9 \& 0 \\
\hline 9.A. 25 Por Protein Secretin System (PorSS) Family \& 9.A.25.1.1 \& Q5EGM5 \& 1 \& Proteins \& \& Q8F1L4 \& 1 \& 1.2E-11 \& Q04XL1 \& 1 \& 1.9E-06 \& B0S970 \& 1 \& 1.7E-07 \\
\hline 9.A. 40 HlyC/CorC (HCC) Family \& 9.A.40.2.2 \& Q0PBV6 \& 4 \& Nonselective \& \& Q8EZB8 \& 4 \& 1.1E-78 \& Q04Y13 \& 4 \& 7.8E-77 \& B0SCR4 \& 4 \& 1.9E-70 \\
\hline \multicolumn{15}{|l|}{9.B Putative Transport Proteins} \\
\hline 9.B. 8 DUF2157 (DUF2157) Family \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 9 . B .8 .2 .1 \\
\& \text { 9.B.8.7.1 }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Q8F4I9 \\
B2U729
\end{tabular} \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 12 \\
\& 12
\end{aligned}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Unknown \\
Unknown
\end{tabular} \& \& Q8F419 \& 12 \& 0 \& Q052C2 \& 12 \& 9.8E-153 \& B0SFF8 \& 11 \& 4.3E-18 \\
\hline 9.B. 14 Putative Heme Handling Protein (HHP) Family \& \begin{tabular}{l}
9.B.14.1.2 \\
9.B.14.1.3 \\
9.B.14.1.10 \\
9.B.14.2.5
\end{tabular} \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { P45403 } \\
\& \text { P33927 } \\
\& \text { Q8F8J8 } \\
\& \text { I6ZP97 }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 15 \\
\& 15 \\
\& 19 \\
\& 6
\end{aligned}
\] \& Putative transporter Putative transporter Putative transporter Putative transporter \& \& \[
\begin{array}{|l|l}
\hline \text { Q8F0Z0 } \\
\text { Q8F8J8 }
\end{array}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
15 \\
19
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
6.6 \mathrm{E}-69
\] \\
0
\end{tabular} \& Q04YF7 \& 15
6 \& \(3.0 \mathrm{E}-67\)

$5.3 \mathrm{E}-12$ \& B0SCS1
B0SA08 \& 15

6 \& | 4.7E-64 |
| :--- |
| 2.2E-12 | <br>

\hline SecDF-associated Single Transmembrane Protein, 9.B. 18 YajC (YajC) Family \& 9.B.18.1.1 \& P0ADZ7 \& 1 \& Putative transporter \& \& Q8F707 \& 1 \& 6.4E-13 \& Q04ZD3 \& 1 \& 1.6E-10 \& B0SGE1 \& 1 \& 6.4E-06 <br>

\hline 9.B. 27 DedA or YdjX-Z (DedA) Family \& \[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 9.B. } 27 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 \\
& \text { 9.B.27.2.5 } \\
& \text { 9.B.27.3.3 }
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& | P0ABP6 |
| :--- |
| D6GX19 |
| B1J6T5 | \& | 6 |
| :--- |
| 5 |
| 4 | \& | Putative transporter |
| :--- |
| Putative transporter |
| Putative transporter | \& \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|l|}
\text { Q8F8I2 } \\
\text { Q8F3X4 } \\
\text { Q8F3P8 }
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 6 \\
& 4 \\
& 5
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
7.9 \mathrm{E}-59 \\
1.8 \mathrm{E}-09 \\
1.5 \mathrm{E}-14
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q04YH4 } \\
& \text { Q051H1 } \\
& \text { Q051N0 } \\
& \text { Q04WJ5 }
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 6 \\
& 4 \\
& 4 \\
& 4
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 7.7 \mathrm{E}-59 \\
& 5.0 \mathrm{E}-09 \\
& 1.2 \mathrm{E}-12 \\
& \hline 1.7 \mathrm{E}-13
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& B0SGX3

B0S9T9 \& 4
4 \& $1.1 \mathrm{E}-08$

$3.2 \mathrm{E}-15$ <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Family } \\ & \text { TC\# } \end{aligned}$ | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hit } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value | Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Query } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | E-value |
| 9.B. 29 | Small 5 TMS Putative Permease (5PP) Family |  |  |  |  |  | Q8EYR1 | 5 | 2.0E-114 | Q056F8 | 5 | 6.2E-85 | B0SBK6 | 4 | 1.7E-115 |
|  |  | 9.B.29.1.1 | Q8EYR1 | 5 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.29.1.2 | BOSJ50 | 4 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.B. 30 | Hly III (Hly III) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.30.1.1 | P54176 | 7 | Nonselective |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SD02 | 6 | 5.5E-49 |
| 9.B. 31 | YqiH (YqiH) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.31.1.2 | Q45064 | 5 | Unknown |  | P59247 | 5 | 7.0E-24 | Q04ZS2 | 5 | 3.3E-21 | B0SGF5 | 5 | 1.2E-24 |
| 9.B. 34 | Kinase/Phosphatase/Cyclic-GMP Synthase/Cyclic di-GMP Hydrolase (KPSH) Family | 9.B.34.1.2 | P0AAP1 | 5 | Unknown |  | Q8F2R4 | 5 | $9.9 \mathrm{E}-21$ | Q053C7 Q04WY9 | 53 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5 \mathrm{E}-21 \\ & 1.1 \mathrm{E}-24 \end{aligned}$ | B0S9C7 | 6 | 4.9E-21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.B. 44 | YiaA-YiaB (YiaAB) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.44.1.1 | P0ADJ8 | 4 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0S9N1 | 4 | 2.0E-34 |
| 9.B. 67 | Putative Inorganic Carbon (HCO3-) <br> Transporter/O-antigen Polymerase (ICT/OAP) Family | 9.B.67.4.2 | B0SEF1 | 9 | Putative anion (Bicarbonate) |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Q8F474 } \\ \text { Q8F4F2 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \mathrm{E}-85 \\ & 4.5 \mathrm{E}-37 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \mathrm{E}-88 \\ & 4.8 \mathrm{E}-36 \end{aligned}$ | B0SEF1 | 9 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { Acyltransferase-3/Putative Acetyl-CoA } \\ \text { 9.B. } 97 & \text { Transporter (ATAT) Family }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9.B. } 97.1 .6 \\ & \text { 9.B. } 97.1 .8 \\ & \text { 9.B. } 97.5 .1 \end{aligned}$ | Q8EY27 <br> B0SI19 <br> B9DIS8 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Q8F6C6 <br> Q8F968 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.0 \mathrm{E}-27 \\ 4.0 \mathrm{E}-16 \end{gathered}$ | Q04X27 | 11 | 4.9E-154 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B0SI19 } \\ & \text { B0SAM6 } \\ & \text { B0SBG8 } \\ & \text { B0SAH4 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 10 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1.7 \mathrm{E}-35 \\ & 3.6 \mathrm{E}-18 \\ & 2.4 \mathrm{E}-13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.B. 104 Rhomboid Protease (Rhomboid) Family |  |  | 9.B.104.1.2 | Q46G03 | 6 | Putative Proteins Cleavage |  | Q8F9S0 | 7 | 5.5E-14 |  |  |  | B0SH91 | 7 | $3.6 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q056S4 |  |  |  | 7 | 1.1E-12 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.104.1.3 | F0Z2G1 | 6 | Putative Proteins Cleavage |  | Q8F8A8 | 6 | 7.0E-10 |  |  |  | B0SDS2B0SEG0 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.104.1.5 | Q8F2A9 | 5 | Putative Proteins Cleavage |  | Q8F2A9 | 5 | 0 | Q053E1 | 5 | 9.8E-154 |  |  | 1.8E-56 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Q8F6T2 | 7 | 4.5E-18 | Q04ZF7 | 6 | 1.2E-15 | 8.1E-20 |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. (continued)

| Transporter Classification (TC) |  |  |  |  |  |  | L. interrogans |  |  | L. borgpetersenii |  |  | L. biflexa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family TC\# | Family Name | Hit TCID | Hit Uniprot \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hit } \\ & \text { TMS \# } \end{aligned}$ | Substrate(s) | Comments | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query <br> TMS \# | E-value | Uniprot \# | Query TMS \# | E-value |
| 9.B. 105 Lead Resistance Fusion Protein (PbrBC) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.105.1.1 | Q58AJ7 | 10 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F6H0 | 4 | 1.2E-05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.105.1.6 | Q8F9Y4 | 3 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F9Y4 | 3 | 2.0E-98 | Q04X88 | 3 | 3.5E-85 | B0SH38 | 3 | 1.5E-40 |
|  |  | 9.B.105.2.1 | Q8F224 | 9 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F224 | 9 | 0 | Q053H2 | 9 | 5.5E-119 | B0SGP8 | 9 | 1.7E-36 |
| 9.B. 107 | 8 TMS Putative Permease (8-PP) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B. 107.1.2 | B0RDT1 | 8 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SG05 | 8 | 1.3E-23 |
| 9.B. 114 | Vancomycin-sensitivity protein (SanA) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.114.1.1 | P0AFY2 | 2 | Unknown |  | Q8EYT9 | 1 | 5.3E-22 | Q04XG5 | 1 | 2.3E-20 | B0SA77 | 1 | 1.1E-18 |
| 9.B. 115 | Putative Integral Membrane Steroid 5alpha-reductase (SalphaR) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.115.1.1 | M2X3K0 | 7 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SIJ1 | 7 | 3.2E-15 |
|  |  | 9.B.115.1.6 | D7VS98 | 5 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F3E0 | 6 | 9.0E-49 | Q050V4 | 6 | 2.6E-48 | B0SE74 | 6 | 9.9E-45 |
| 9.B. 122 | DUF3592 or PF12158 (DUF3592) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B. 122.1.3 | A5FB62 | 2 | Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SET0 | 2 | 0.0002 |
| 9.B. 125 | AmpE/CobD (AmpE/CobD) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.125.2.1 | E3GWE8 | 6 | Unknown |  | Q8EXQ8 | 5 | 1.6E-44 | Q04WM3 | 5 | 1.2E-43 |  |  |  |
| 9.B. 142 | Integral membrane Glycosyltransferase family 39 (GT39) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.142.2.3 | G0LCP3 | 13 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F7U9 | 11 | 7.6E-24 | Q04Z16 | 11 | 5.7E-25 | B0SGB0 | 13 | 3.7E-30 |
|  |  | 9.B.142.2.6 | H8KSM2 | 13 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SED3 | 10 | 1.2E-13 |
|  |  | 9.B.142.3.10 | P73520 | 11 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SAX1 | 11 | 2.1E-08 |
|  |  | 9.B.142.4.3 | Q8F4R2 | 11 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F4R2 | 11 | 0 | Q050N2 | 11 | 0 | B0SAH9 | 11 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-37$ |
|  |  | 9.B.142.8.1 | H2CB90 | 13 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B0SBV4 | 9 | 2.2E-59 |
|  |  | 9.B.142.11.4 | G2LJT4 | 11 | Putative transporter |  |  |  |  | Q050P2 | 10 | $9.7 \mathrm{E}-23$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q04Y78 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.142.11.5 | R4TKC5 | 13 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F4Q7 | 9 | 2.1E-22 |  |  |  | B0SCA0 | 9 | 2.5E-22 |
| 9.B. 145 | DUF389/PF04087 (DUF389) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B.145.1.2 | A6DJZ4 | 6 | Unknown |  | Q8F1W6 | 7 | 1.3E-23 | Q054K9 | 7 | $9.0 \mathrm{E}-21$ | B0SE29 | 7 | 7.6E-24 |
| 9.B. 146 | Putative Undecaprenyl-phosphate N -Acetylglucosaminyl Transferase (MurG) Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 9.B. 146.1.2 | G2HLY8 | 11 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F131 | 11 | 1.8E-16 | Q053P4 | 11 | 3.3E-16 | B0SCS9 | 11 | 9.2E-22 |
|  |  | 9.B.146.1.3 | Q8F4J3 | 10 | Putative transporter |  | Q8F4J3 | 10 | 0 | Q04Y84 | 10 |  | B0S986 | 10 | 5.9E-142 |

Table 2. (continued)

${ }_{1}$ Substrate class with specific substrate in parenthesis if known.
${ }_{2}$ Represents Expect value (E) as x.xE-xx. Values represented are taken from GBlast results.


Figure 1. Representation of families unique to L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, L. biflexa, both L. biflexa and L. interrogans, both L. biflexa and L. borgpetersenii, and both L. interrogans and L. borgpetersenii. Families found in all three species are listed in central area.

Figure 2. Distribution of transporters based on TC (A) classes and (B) subclasses in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa.
B) Subclasses

Figure 2. (continued) Distribution of transporters based on TC (A) classes and (B) subclasses in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa.
A) Category

Figure 3. Distribution of transporters based on substrate (A) category and (B) subcategory in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa.
B) Subcategory

Figure 3. (continued) Distribution of transporters based on substrate (A) category and (B) subcategory in L. interrogans, L. borgpetersenii, and L. biflexa.

