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SUMMARY
Interactions between microbes and hosts can be a benign, deleterious, or even fatal, resulting in death of the host, the microbe, or both. Sialic acid-binding immunoglobulin-like lectins (Siglecs) suppress infection responses to sialylated pathogens. However, most pathogens are nonsialylated. Here we determined Siglecs respond to nonsialylated Gram-negative bacteria (Escherichia coli 25922 and DH5α) and Gram-positive bacteria (Staphylococcus aureus and Listeria monocytogenes). We found that Siglec-E−/− mice had higher mortality than wild-type mice following Gram-negative but not Gram-positive bacterial infection. Better survival in wild-type mice depended on more efficient clearance of Gram-negative than Gram-positive bacteria. Gram-negative bacteria upregulated Siglec-E, thus increasing reactive oxygen species (ROS); Tyr432 in the ITIM domain of Siglec-E was required to increase ROS. Moreover, Gram-negative bacteria upregulated Siglec-E via TLR4/MyD88/JNK/NF-κB/AP-1, whereas Gram-positive bacteria downregulated Siglec-E via TLR2/RANKL/TRAF6/Syk. Thus, our study describes a fundamentally new role for Siglec-E during infection.

INTRODUCTION
Interactions between host molecules and bacterial antigens are dynamic and can be benign, deleterious, or even fatal, resulting in death of the host, microbe, or both (Merrell and Falkow, 2004; Ottemann and Kenney, 2019; Medzhitov, 2007; Bhavsar et al., 2007; Casadevall and Pirofski, 2000). Many microbial pathogens avoid host recognition or dampen subsequent immune activation through interactions with host responses, but some pathogens benefit from stimulating inflammatory responses (Vimr and Lichtensteiger, 2002). Sialic acids are a family of nine-carbon sugars, and N-Glycolylneuraminic acid (Neu5Gc) and N-acetylneuraminic acid (Neu5Ac) are major sialic acids (Chen et al., 2014b). In mammalian cells, sialic acid is usually the terminal sugar residue on the oligosaccharide chains of cell-surface glycopeptides or glycolipids, where it functions in recognition and anti-recognition in regulation of cell-cell interactions (Chen et al., 2014b). Although some oropharyngeal pathogens express sialic acid units on their surfaces, mimicking the sialyl-rich mucin layer coating host epithelial cells to masquerade as “self” while eluding host immune mechanisms, most microbes do not express sialic acid on their surface (Vimr and Lichtensteiger, 2002). How hosts respond to nonsialylated microbial pathogens is poorly understood.

The host’s response to a pathogen involves both the innate and adaptive immune systems, with Toll-like receptors (TLRs) playing an important role. TLRs recognize conserved structures in pathogens and have revealed how the body senses pathogen invasion, triggers innate immune responses, and primes antigen-specific adaptive immunity (Akira and Takeda, 2004; Liew et al., 2005; Trinchieri and Sher, 2007; Barton and Kagan, 2009; Kawai and Akira, 2010, 2011; Mills, 2011; Kondo et al., 2012). TLRs are divided into two groups based on their cellular localization and pathogen-associated molecular pattern (PAMP) ligands. One group, including TLR1, TLR2, TLR4, TLR5, TLR6, and TLR11, is expressed on cell surfaces and recognizes microbial membrane components such as lipids, lipoproteins, and proteins. The other group, including TLR3, TLR7, TLR8, and TLR9, is expressed exclusively in intracellular vesicles such as the endoplasmic reticulum (ER), endosomes, lysosomes, and endolysosomes, where they recognize microbial nucleic acids (Akira and Takeda, 2004; Liew et al., 2005; Trinchieri and Sher, 2007; Barton and Kagan, 2009; Kawai and Akira, 2010, 2011; Mills, 2011; Kondo et al., 2012). TLR4 responds to bacterial lipopolysaccharide (LPS), an outer membrane component of Gram-negative bacteria that can cause septic shock. TLR4 contributes to the recognition of a wide range of PAMPs derived from bacteria, fungi, parasites, and viruses. These PAMPs include lipopeptides and peptidoglycan from bacteria and lipoteichoic acid (LTA) from...
Siglecs are membrane-bound lectins comprising the sialic acid-binding immunoglobulin superfamily, and each Siglec has a distinct cellular distribution and glycan specificities (Crocker et al., 2007). Siglecs predominantly bind to sialic acids on cell surface proteins (Crocker, 2002) and participate in the internalization of sialic acid-expressing pathogens (Yu et al., 2014; Tateno et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2003), self-tolerance (Bokers et al., 2014), and endotoxin tolerance (Wu et al., 2016a). Previously, we found an interaction between CD24 and Siglec-G/10 selectively suppresses the inflammatory response to damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs) in tissue injury and is a key regulator of polybacterial sepsis. This interaction requires sialylation of CD24 (Chen et al., 2009, 2011). Moreover, the Siglec-G/CD24 axis controls the severity of graft versus host disease (GVHD), and enhancing this interaction may mitigate GVHD (Toubai et al., 2014, 2017). The CD24/siglec-10 signaling pathway protects cancer cells from the immune system, indicating a potential target for cancer immunotherapy (Barkal et al., 2019). The broad spectrum of interaction between Siglecs and TLR further indicates that Siglecs may be the central regulator of the innate immune response against bacterial infections. Neutrophils generate high levels of ROS using a superoxide-generating NADPH oxidase complex. NOX2, a membrane-bound subunit of the NADPH oxidase complex, is a large protein complex composed of the transmembrane proteins gp91phox and gp22phox, as well as three cytosolic components (p40phox, p47phox, and p67phox). NOX2 activation recruits cytosolic subunits to the membrane and mediates sustained ROS production (Brandes et al., 2014; Bedard and Krause, 2007). Although many regulators of ROS production in phagocytes have been described, our knowledge about its precise control is still limited. Here we show Siglec-E controls bacterial survival by regulating ROS generation by neutrophils during bacterial infection.

**RESULTS**

**Siglec−/− Mice Are less Resistant to E. coli 25922 and DH5α but Not S. aureus and L. monocytogenes Infection Than Siglec+/+ Mice**

Recent studies indicated Siglec-E represses the immune response by direct binding to heavily sialylated Group B streptococcus via α2-3-linked sialyllactosamine capsular polysaccharide (Chang et al., 2014; Saito et al., 2016; Chang and Nizet, 2014). Most pathogens do not contain α2-3 or α2-6 linked sialylation, but some pathogens bear capsules that are polymers of α2-8-linked polysialic acid (PSA) (Devi et al., 1991). To characterize the role of Siglec-E during microbial infections with nonsialylated bacteria, we carried out experiments in Siglec-E deficient mice (as shown in Figures S1A–S1C, the mice were further characterized) (Wu et al., 2016b; Chen et al., 2014a). Siglec-E-deficient and wild-type littermates were infected intraperitoneally (i.p.) with Gram-negative E. coli 2922 or DH5α or Gram-positive S. aureus or L. monocytogenes. These bacteria are nonsialylated as revealed by staining with Sambucus nigra lectin (SNA) and Maackia amurensis lectin (MAA) (Figure S2) and showed no binding activity to soluble Siglec-E IgG Fc fusion protein (Figure S3). We found wild-type mice were more likely to survive than Siglec-E−/−.
mice after infection with Gram-negative bacteria, but this advantage was not observed when mice were infected with Gram-positive bacteria (Figure 1A–1D) or treated with LPS (Figure S4).

To dissect the mechanism responsible for the survival disadvantage of Siglec-e<--/-- mice, we determined bacterial burdens in systemic organs 16 h post infection. Notably, the liver and spleen of Siglec-e<--/-- mice contained significantly more bacteria than those of wild-type littermates after infection with *E. coli* 25922 and *DH5a* but not with *S. aureus* and *L. monocytogenes* (Figure 1E–1H). Accordingly, Siglec-e<--/-- mice produced more IL-6 and TNF-α than wild-type littermates after infection with *E. coli* 25922 or *DH5a*.
but not with S. aureus or L. monocytogenes (Figure S5). Pathogen load was also increased at various times after infection with E. coli 25922GFP as assessed by measuring the mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) of neutrophils and monocytes (Figure 1I).

To examine the role of Siglec-E in an alternative infection route, we infected Siglec−/− and wild-type littermates with E. coli 25922GFP intravenously (i.v.). Similar to mice infected i.p. (Figures 1E and 1F), Siglec−/− mice infected i.v. showed significantly higher bacterial burden in the blood, liver, kidney, and spleen than wild-type littermates 16 h post infection, indicating that wild-type littermates cleared E. coli 25922GFP more efficiently than Siglec−/− mice (Figures 1J and 1K).

Nine Siglecs have been identified in mouse; among them, Siglec-E and Siglec-F reportedly mediate uptake of sialylated bacteria (Tateno et al., 2007). We found no difference in survival, cytokine production, and bacterial clearance between Siglec-F knockout and wild-type mice with E. coli 25922 infection (i.p.) (Figure S6), suggesting Siglec-F has no effect on bacterial clearance. These results demonstrate a critical role for Siglec-E but not for Siglec-F in regulating the clearance of bacterial pathogens such as Gram-negative E. coli 25922 and DH5α but not Gram-positive S. aureus and L. monocytogenes.

**Siglec-E Is Required for Bacterial Clearance but Not Bacterial Uptake**

To elucidate the signaling mechanisms by which Siglec-E regulates bacterial infection, we examined bacterial clearance in vitro by using neutrophils isolated from wild-type littermates and Siglec-E-deficient mouse bone marrow (Figure S7). Neutrophils were co-incubated with E. coli 25922GFP or carboxyfluorescein succinimidyl ester (CFSE)-labeled live or heat-treated bacteria (Figure S8) for 60 min in antibiotic-free medium. Next, the medium was changed and the cells were washed with PBS to remove non-phagocytosed bacteria. Phagocytosed bacteria were measured by flow cytometry. The bacterial content was equal at this time as indicated by comparable MFI (Figures 2A–2C). Similar results were obtained for peritoneal macrophages (Figures S9 and S10), demonstrating equal uptake and phagocytic capacity in both genotypes.

We used a gentamicin-killing assay to investigate whether Siglec-E regulates bacterial clearance during infection. Neutrophils isolated from wild-type and Siglec-E-deficient mouse bone marrow were co-incubated with live bacteria for 60 min in antibiotic-free medium. The cells were collected after additional 30-, 90-, 150-, 210-, and 270-min incubations with medium containing gentamycin, and intracellular bacterial burdens were quantified. Wild-type neutrophils efficiently cleared bacteria, whereas bacterial content increased over time in Siglec-E-deficient neutrophils (Figure 2D). The two genotypes showed no differences in clearance of L. monocytogenes (Figure 2E).

These results suggest uptake and phagocytosis of Gram-positive S. aureus and L. monocytogenes and Gram-negative E. coli 25922 and DH5α by Siglec-E-deficient neutrophils were comparable with those of wild-type neutrophils. However, Siglec-E participates in intracellular killing of ingested live Gram-negative bacteria but not Gram-positive L. monocytogenes as intracellular killing of E. coli 25922 was markedly lower in Siglec-E-deficient neutrophils than in wild-type neutrophils. Therefore, a difference in bacterial clearance likely underlies the resistance of wild-type mice to Gram-negative bacterial infection.

**Tyr432 in the ITIM Domain of Siglec-E Is Critical for ROS Production**

The surface expression of Siglec-E on immune cells was determined by flow cytometry. Consistent with published data (McMillan et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2004), neutrophils showed the highest expression of Siglec-E, followed by monocytes, CD4+ T cells, CD8+ T cells, B cells, and a small population of regulatory T cells (Tregs) (Figure 3). These findings suggest Siglec-E may have an important role in these cells.

Neutrophils are the most abundant leukocytes in the blood and are crucial in immune responses against pathogens. Neutrophils produce several potent antimicrobial molecules like ROS and release cationic peptides, proteases, lactoferrin, and chromatin that form neutrophil extracellular traps to kill bacteria after encountering pathogens (Nguyen et al., 2017; Dahlgren et al., 2019). To further elucidate the molecular mechanisms of Siglec-E in bacterial clearance, we determined the production of ROS in neutrophils during infection. We used flow cytometry-based measurements after staining with 2’,7’-dichlorodihydrofluorescein diacetate (H2DCFDA, a cell-permeable indicator used to measure total intracellular ROS). We found
Figure 2. Siglec-E is Required for Efficient Bacterial Clearance

(A and B) Uptake (A) and phagocytosis (B) of bacteria (E. coli 25922GFP and L. monocytogenes) in isolated neutrophils from bone marrow are expressed as MFI. Neutrophils were co-incubated with E. coli 25922GFP or CFSE-labeled live or heat-treated bacteria for 60 min in antibiotic-free medium. Next, cells were washed to remove non-phagocytosed bacteria. Phagocytosed bacteria were measured by flow cytometry. Representative FACS profiles are shown. The bar graphs underneath the FACS profiles show the mean ± SEM MFI value from one representative experiment (n = 3, cells from three male mice). The colors used in the bar graphs correspond to the colors of the lines in the FACS profiles.

(C) Uptake and phagocytosis of bacteria (DH5a and S. aureus) in isolated neutrophils from bone marrow were expressed as MFI.

(D and E) In vitro growth of E. coli 25922 (D) and L. monocytogenes (E) in isolated neutrophils. Neutrophils were co-incubated with E. coli 25922 or L. monocytogenes for 60 min in antibiotic-free medium and then gentamycin (100 μg mL⁻¹) was added to the medium; neutrophils were collected after further 30-, 90-, 150-, 210-, and 270-min incubations, and the cells were lysed and plated to obtain the c.f.u. (n = 5).

Data are represented as mean ± SEM from two (D and E) and three (A–C) independent experiments. Student’s t test, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, n.s., not significant.
SiglecE−/− neutrophils produced significantly lower levels of ROS than wild-type neutrophils during infection with Gram-negative E. coli 25922 or DH5α but not with Gram-positive S. aureus or L. monocytogenes (Figure 4A). Neutrophils isolated from uninfected mice and then infected with E. coli 25922 in vitro showed similar results (Figure 4B).

Neutrophils contain a specialized enzyme system (NADPH oxidase) that enables ROS production. NADPH oxidase is a multicomponent enzyme consisting of membrane-bound gp91phox and p22phox, together with cytoplasmic subunits (p47phox, p40phox, and p67phox). Thus, we investigated how Siglec-E regulates ROS production by controlling the activity of NADPH oxidase. Given their colocalization in the membrane, we determined whether Siglec-E interacts with the NOX2 complex. We found endogenous Siglec-E interacts with endogenous gp91phox and p47phox in neutrophils after treatment with E. coli (Figure 4C). The interaction between siglec-E and gp91phox was dependent on the activation of TLR4, but the interaction between siglec-E and p47phox was not (Figure 4D). This interaction was further explored using immunoprecipitation of cell lysates of HEK293T cells transfected with expression vectors for Siglec-E, gp91phox, and p47phox (Figure 4E). Negative regulatory signaling by most Siglec proteins can be attributed to their immunoreceptor tyrosine-based inhibitory motif (ITIM) domains (Chen et al., 2014b). Thus, we made a short form of Siglec-E (SE-S: the cytoplasmic domain was deleted, including all ITIM domains in Siglec-E) and four Siglec-E point mutants, M-1 (R126D), M-2 (Y432F), M-3 (Y455F), and M-4 (both Y432F and Y455F), to map the site of association with p47phox on Siglec-E. We co-transfected HEK293T cells with plasmids encoding wild-type or mutated Siglec-E and FLAG-p47phox. Immunoprecipitation was performed with antibodies for Siglec-E or FLAG. Mutation of Arg126 did not affect the binding ability of Siglec-E to p47phox; in contrast, mutation of Tyr455 partially affected the binding ability of Siglec-E to p47phox (Figure 4F), but none of the mutants affected the interaction between Siglec-E and gp91phox (Figure 4G). Both short forms of
Siglec-E, M-2 and M-4, were unable to bind p47phox. Thus, we concluded Tyr432 on the ITIM domain in Siglec-E is critical for the interaction with p47phox.

We established Raw264.7 stable cell lines overexpressing different Siglec-E mutants to determine whether the ITIM domains of Siglec-E are required for ROS production. Overexpression of wild-type Siglec-E and mutant M-1 but not mutant M-2 and M-4 in RAW264.7 cells (Figure S11) significantly promoted ROS production (Figure 4H) during infection with *E. coli* 25922 but not *L. monocytogenes*, indicating Tyr432 in the ITIM domain is required for ROS production. Consistent with mutation of the Tyr455 site partially...
affecting the binding ability of Siglec-E to p47phox (Figure 4F), the production of ROS was also reduced with mutation of Y455F in Siglec-E (Figure 4H). As a control, overexpression of Siglec-1 had no effect on ROS production. Based on these findings, Siglec-E promotes production of ROS via Tyr432 in ITIM domain during bacterial infection. Overexpression of p47phox Raw264.7 cells further confirmed the Tyr432-dependent interaction between Siglec-E and p47phox is required for ROS production (Figure 4I).

Enhanced Monocyte and Neutrophil Recruitment in Gram-Negative but Not Gram-Positive Bacterial Infection in Siglec-E−/− Mice

Neutrophils develop in the bone marrow, and mature neutrophils egress into the circulation and migrate toward sites of infection to kill pathogens and remove cellular debris (Serbina and Pamer, 2006). Siglec-E reportedly controls neutrophil migration to the lungs following exposure to LPS. Thus, we determined whether Siglec-E also controls immune cell infiltration into the peritoneal cavity during bacterial infection. We measured immune cell infiltration in the peritoneal cavity of E. coli 25922 and L. monocytogenes-infected animals by flow cytometry. Significantly higher infiltration of neutrophils and monocytes was observed in the peritoneal cavity of E. coli 25922-infected Siglec-E-deficient mice than in that of wild-type littermates (Figures 5A and 5B) but not in L. monocytogenes-infected mice (Figure 5C).

Upregulation of Siglec-E Expression during Infection with Gram-Negative Bacteria

We sought to identify specific molecular mechanisms involved in the regulation of the innate response against Gram-negative bacterial infection. Therefore, we analyzed Siglec-E expression on splenic cells from mice infected with Gram-positive bacteria versus Gram-negative bacteria. Treatment with Gram-negative bacteria (E. coli 25922, DH5α) increased Siglec-E expression in splenic neutrophils and monocytes, whereas treatment with Gram-positive bacteria (S. aureus, L. monocytogenes) decreased expression of Siglec-E (Figures 6A and 6B). In contrast, Siglec-1 and Siglec-F were unaffected by infection with these bacteria (Figures 6C and 6D). Similar results were also obtained for mouse Raw264.7 cells (Figure 6E).

Moreover, Siglec-9, the human homolog of mouse Siglec-E, was upregulated in E. coli 25922 infection and downregulated in L. monocytogenes infection in human monocytic cell line THP-1 (Figure S12A).
Knockdown of Siglec-9 in THP-1 cells reduced ROS production during infection with *E. coli* 25922 (Figures S12B and S12C). Taken together, these data suggest infection with Gram-negative bacteria *E. coli* 25922 or *DH5a* upregulated Siglec-E expression in innate immune cells, whereas infection with Gram-positive bacteria *S. aureus* and *L. monocytogenes* downregulated Siglec-E but had no effect on Siglec-1 and F in innate immune cells.

*E. coli* 25922 Infection Upregulates Siglec-E Expression in Neutrophils via the TLR4/MyD88/JNK/NF-κB/AP-1 Signaling Pathway, whereas *L. monocytogenes* Infection Downregulates Siglec-E Expression in Neutrophils via the TLR2/RANKL/TRAF6/Syk Signaling Pathway

TLRs activate two distinct signaling pathways to control immune responses by recognizing conserved structures in pathogens: the MyD88-dependent and TRIF-dependent pathways (Wu et al., 2016b; Akira and Takeda, 2004; Liew et al., 2005; Kondo et al., 2012). The MyD88-dependent pathway is activated after the engagement of TLRs by their cognate PAMPs. For instance, after TLR4 encounters LPS, MyD88 recruits IL-1 receptor-associated kinases (IRAKs), which in turn activate NF-κB and MAPKs (Kondo et al., 2012; Kawai and Akira, 2010; Liew et al., 2005; Akira and Takeda, 2004). The TRIF-dependent pathway is triggered when TLR4 is delivered to endosomes and mediates activation of transcription factor IFN regulatory factor-3 (IRF3) through dimerization, which regulates type I IFN expression (Kondo et al., 2012; Kawai and Akira, 2010; Liew et al., 2005; Akira and Takeda, 2004).
Figure 7. TLR4 Signaling Pathway Is Required for *E. coli* 25922 Infection Induced-Siglec-E Upregulation, whereas TLR2 Signaling Pathway Is Required for *L. monocytogenes* Infection Induced-Siglec-E Downregulation.

(A) Flow cytometric analysis of Siglec-E expression

Wild-type and different knockout mice were i.p. injected with indicated bacteria. Spleen cells were collected 16 h after infection. Cell-surface Siglec-E was determined by flow cytometric analysis. The bar graphs show mean ± SEM MFI value from one representative experiment (n = 3, cells from three mice). Experiments in this figure were reproduced two times.

(B) Flow cytometric analysis of Siglec-E expression after inhibitor treatment. Neutrophils were isolated from bone marrow. Cell-surface Siglec-E was determined by flow cytometric analysis 6 h post infection with or without inhibitors (Syk inhibitor piceatannol [75 μM], JNK inhibitor SP600125 [10 μM], NF-kB inhibitor Bay11-7085 [50 μM]). The bar graphs show the mean ± SEM MFI value from one representative experiment (n = 3, cells from three mice). Experiments in this figure were reproduced twice. Student’s t test, ***p < 0.001, n.s., not significant.

(C–E) RAW264.7 cells were treated with different doses of JNK inhibitor SP600125 for 15 h and then infected with *E. coli 25922* or PBS for 1 h. The expression of Siglec-E (C) and ROS production (D) was determined by flow cytometry, and *in vitro* growth of *E. coli 25922* (E) was measured as in Figure 2D.

(F and G) Immunoblot analysis of the indicated molecules in lysates of RAW264.7 cells (F) and isolated neutrophils from mouse bone marrow (G) 5 h after infection. *E. coli, E. coli 25922, Lm, L. monocytogenes*. Representative western blot images from two independent experiments.
The mechanism underlying the regulation of Siglec-E expression during infection was further examined. Wild-type, TLR2, TLR4, and MyD88 knockout mice were infected with *E. coli* 25922 or *L. monocytogenes* for 16 h, and the expression of Siglec-E or Siglec-1 or Siglec-F on spleen cells was determined by flow cytometry. The upregulation of Siglec-E observed in splenic neutrophils from wild-type mice infected with *E. coli* 25922 was abolished in neutrophils from mice deficient in either MyD88 or TLR4 but not in those from TLR2 knockout mice (Figure 7A). Interestingly, infection with *L. monocytogenes* decreased Siglec-E expression in all groups except for TLR2-deficient neutrophils, which showed increased expression (Figure 7A). To understand the signaling mechanisms through which bacterial infections regulate Siglec-E expression, we first tested whether a protein kinase may modulate *E. coli*-induced Siglec-E expression. We isolated neutrophils from wild-type mouse bone marrow and pretreated with NF-κB or JNK or Syk inhibitors prior to infection with *E. coli* 25922 or *L. monocytogenes*. Treatment with NF-κB and JNK inhibitors abolished *E. coli* 25922-induced upregulation of Siglec-E expression, whereas Syk inhibitor rescued *L. monocytogenes*-induced downregulation of Siglec-E expression (Figure 7B). JNK inhibitor abolished *E. coli* 25922-induced upregulation of Siglec-E expression in a dose-dependent manner (Figure 7C). Correspondingly, ROS production was decreased (Figure 7D) and bacterial growth was increased (Figure 7E). Accordingly, *E. coli* 25922 infection triggered phosphorylation of JNK, whereas *L. monocytogenes* infection triggered phosphorylation of Syk in Raw264.7 cells and neutrophils isolated from mouse bone marrow (Figures 7F and 7G).

To determine why infection with Gram-negative bacteria induced the expression of Siglec-E but infection with Gram-positive bacteria reduced the expression of Siglec-E, we tested the effects of TLR4 ligand LPS and TLR2 ligand LTA on Siglec-E expression in neutrophils isolated from wild-type mouse bone marrow (Figure 7H). LPS treatment induced Siglec-E expression, whereas LTA treatment reduced Siglec-E expression (Figure 7H). Next, we determined whether Siglec-E was upregulated by signaling events downstream of TLR4/MyD88/JNK/NF-κB/AP-1. We found two AP-1 sites located 710 and 740 bp upstream of the translational start site of Siglec-E (Figure S13). We constructed luciferase reporters driven by the Siglec-E promoter containing a wild-type or mutated AP-1 site. Wild-type Siglec-E promoter-driven luciferase activity significantly increased in Raw264.7 cells treated with LPS, but promoter activity significantly decreased after LTA treatment (Figure 7I). Moreover, disruption of the AP-1 site in Mut2 but not Mut1 led to a complete elimination of LPS-induced promoter activities but had no effect on LTA treatment (Figure 7I). This finding suggests the AP-1 site in Mut2 is critical for the upregulation of Siglec-E expression during infection with Gram-negative bacteria.

The mechanisms underlying Siglec-E downregulation during infection with *L. monocytogenes* was further investigated. To confirm the results from the inhibitor studies (Figure 7B), we created JNK and Syk knockdown Raw264.7 cell lines using siRNA (Figure S14). We treated JNK and Syk knockdown Raw264.7 cells with LPS or LTA. As shown in Figure 7J, JNK knockdown blocked LPS-induced upregulation of Siglec-E expression and Syk knockdown restored LTA-induced downregulation of Siglec-E expression in Raw264.7 cells. RANKL and TRAF6 are regulators of *L. monocytogenes* infection via the TLR2 pathway, and upregulated RANKL and TRAF6 reduce phosphorylation of Syk (Leite, 2014; Konno et al., 2009; Knoop et al., 2009). Real-time PCR revealed the expression of RANKL and TRAF6 was significantly increased after infection with *L. monocytogenes* on neutrophils isolated from mouse bone marrow (Figures 7K and 7L).
These results suggest *E. coli* infection upregulates Siglec-E expression in neutrophils via the TLR4/MyD88/JNK/NF-κB/AP-1 signaling pathway, whereas infection with *L. monocytogenes* downregulates Siglec-E expression in neutrophils via the TLR2/RANKL/TRAf6/Syk signaling pathway.

**DISCUSSION**

Siglec-E is mainly expressed on neutrophils. Neutrophils participate in the response to bacterial infection by producing several potent antimicrobial molecules like ROS and releasing cationic peptides, proteases, lactoferrin, and chromatin that form neutrophil extracellular traps (NETs) to kill bacteria after encountering pathogens. We show Siglec-E controls bacterial infections through regulating bacterial clearance by binding to gp91phox and p47phox to maintain the stability of the NOX2 complex, thereby promoting ROS...
production. During infection, neutrophils produce ROS to kill bacteria. However, their potential to form NETs, an anti-microbial defense mechanism that clears microorganisms, is compromised. Therefore, further investigation is required to determine whether Siglec-E plays a role in NET formation during infection with unsialylated bacteria.

In sepsis induced by Gram-negative bacteria, LPS from Gram-negative bacteria, CD14, and TLR4 form a complex to activate several intracellular signaling pathways including NF-κB, MAPKs (such as p38), JNK, and Erk. In turn, these components synergize while activating transcriptional factors AP-1 and IRF3, which control the expression of immune genes and production of cytokines (Akira and Takeda, 2004; Liew et al., 2005; Kondo et al., 2012; Kawai and Akira, 2010). We show Gram-negative bacterial infection upregulates Siglec-E expression via the TLR4/MyD88/JNK/NF-κB/AP-1 signaling pathway, whereas infection with Gram-positive bacteria downregulates Siglec-E expression via the TLR2/RANKL/TRAF6/Syk signaling pathway.

Our study describes a new role for Siglec-E during infection. We demonstrate genes intricately regulated during host-pathogen interactions. Enhanced Siglec-E expression dampens the innate response to Gram-negative bacterial infection. In contrast, Gram-positive bacteria avoid host defenses by repressing Siglec-E expression. Moreover, inhibition of Siglec-E expression by inhibitors or Siglec-E antibodies will reduce ROS production but induce neutrophil migration. Thus, Siglec-E is a potential target for future treatments of patients with sepsis.

Limitations of the Study
Here, we determined Siglecs respond to nonsialylated Gram-negative bacteria (Escherichia coli 25922 and DH5a) and Gram-positive bacteria (Staphylococcus aureus and Listeria monocytogenes). Siglecε−/− mice had higher mortality than wild-type mice following Gram-negative but not Gram-positive bacterial infection. Although most microbial pathogens are nonsialylated, some oropharyngeal pathogens express sialic acid units on their surface. Therefore, further analyses using bacteria with sialic acid residues as controls are necessary to determine if Siglecε−/− mice show any change in mortality compared with wild-type mice following sialylated bacterial infection. Remaining questions include: are the bacteria carrying sialylated glycans efficiently cleared by Siglecs? Do these bacteria affect the expression of Siglecs? In addition, several glycans carry sugar residues that are very similar to sialic acid, such as deaminated neuraminic acid (KDN). How do Siglecs respond to infection with bacteria carrying these glycans?
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FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure S1. Characterization of Siglec-E knockout mice, Related to Figure 1. A, Siglec-E localization in Chromosome 7. B, Single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNPs) found between C57BL/6 and 129/Sv in the genomic DNA sequence region from Chr7:14570236 to Chr7:66715023 (within 100 mb of SiglecE) were randomly selected as indicated for confirmation by PCR-sequencing. C, SNP rs16793422 G/A at generation 3 was backcrossed into A/A at generation 8.

Figure S2. Determination of the sialylation level, Related to Figure 1 and 2. E. coli 25922 and DH5α were grown overnight in Luria-Bertani broth, collected by centrifugation at 1000 x g for 15 min and then washed twice with cold 1 x PBS. Listeria monocytogenes and Staphylococcus aureus were obtained from ATCC and propagated according to the manufacturer’s protocol. A, B, Bacteria were treated with PBS or 1 unit/ml sialidase (37°C for one hour in PBS) and then stained with biotin-conjugated Maackia amurensis lectin I (MAA) (1 µg/ml, B-1265) recognizing α2-3–linked terminal sialic acid or biotin-conjugated Sambucus nigra (elderberry) bark lectin (SNA) (1 µg/ml, B-1305) recognizing α2-6–linked terminal sialic acid. Then, bacteria were detected with PE-Streptavidin. A, Representative FACS profiles are shown. B, The bar graphs show the mean ± S.E.M MFI value from one representative experiment (n = 3, cells from three mice). Statistical analysis was performed using two-tailed Student’s t test. ***p < 0.001.

Figure S3. Flow cytometric analysis of bacterial interaction with Siglec-E, Related to Figure 1 and 2. A, B, Bacteria were stained with Siglec-E Fc (1 µg/ml, R & D, 5806-SL-050) or mouse IgG Fc (1 µg/ml) as a negative control and then detected with PE-anti-mouse IgG Fc. To prevent the internalization of MAA, SNA, Siglec E Fc, FITC-Streptavidin or PE-anti-mouse IgG
Fc by bacteria, all the staining steps were performed on ice for one hour. A, Representative FACS profiles are shown. B, The bar graphs present means ± SEM of mean fluorescence intensities (MFIs) pooled from three independent experiments. Statistical analysis was performed using two-tailed Student’s t test. n.s., not significant. ***p < 0.001. Raw264.7 as a positive control. Experiments in this figure were reproduced three times.

Figure S4. Mice survival analysis after LPS challenge, Related to Figure 1. (A) Kaplan-Meier curve for female mice treated with LPS (200 µg, i.p. injection). Log-rank (Mantel-Cox) test. (n=14 for Siglec+/+ mice, n=13 for Siglec-/− mice, combined from two independent experiments) (B) IL-6 in serum 16 h after LPS treatment. (n=5). Data shown are the means ± S.E.M. Student’s t-test, n.s., not significant. Experiments in this figure were reproduced two times.

Figure S5. Cytokine production after bacterial infection, Related to Figure 1. Serum concentration of TNF-α and IL-6 in mice after i.p. injection for 16 h with E. coli 25922 (n=5) (A), DH5α (n=5) (B), S. aureus (n=5) (C) and L. monocytogenes (n=5) (D). Data are represented as mean ± S.E.M from two independent experiments, Student’s t-test, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, n.s., not significant.

Figure S6. Siglec-F has no effect on bacterial clearance, Related to Figure 1. We used BALB/c mice as wild-type controls since Siglec+F− mice are on the BALB/c background. (A) Kaplan-Meier curve for Siglec+F− and BALB/c wild-type mice after i.p. injection with E. coli 25922 (n=8). Log-rank (Mantel-Cox) test. (B) Cytokine production in blood measured at 16 h post-infection. (n=5). (C) Bacterial loads in spleen and liver after i.p. injection with E. coli 25922 for 16 h. (n=4). Data are presented as the mean ± S.E.M from two independent experiments, Student’s t-test, n.s., not significant.
Figure S7. Flow cytometric analysis of neutrophils isolated from mouse bone marrow, Related to Figure 2. Neutrophils were isolated from mouse femurs as described previously (Swamydas and Lionakis, 2013). The purity of the cells was analyzed by staining with CD11b and Gr-1 antibodies. As shown, neutrophils collected from the interface were >90% pure, and no difference in purity was observed between the two genotypes. Representative FACS profiles are shown. Experiments in this figure were reproduced three times.

Figure S8. Flow cytometric analysis of bacteria labeled with CFSE (A), E. coli 25922GFP (B), Related to Figure 2. Bacteria were collected after overnight culture and washed twice in PBS. The pellet was suspended with 2 ml 10 µM CFSE (Sigma) in PBS, incubated at room temperature for 1 h, washed three times with PBS, and resuspended in PBS. The labeled bacteria were diluted, plated on agar plates and counted. For heat-killed bacteria, bacteria were incubated at 65°C for 20 min and stored at 4°C for later use.

Figure S9. Flow cytometric analysis of uptake and phagocytosis of bacteria in peritoneal macrophages, Related to Figure 2. Macrophages were collected from peritoneal washes and then incubated with E. coli 25922 GFP or CFSE-labeled live or heat-treated bacteria (MOI = 100) for 60 min in antibiotic-free medium, after which cells were washed to remove non-phagocytosed bacteria. Phagocytosed bacteria were measured by flow cytometry. Representative FACS profiles are shown. Experiments in this figure were reproduced three times.

Figure S10. Flow cytometric analysis of uptake and phagocytosis of bacteria in Trypan treated or untreated peritoneal macrophages after bacterial infection, Related to Figure 2. Macrophages were collected from peritoneal washes and then incubated with CFSE-labeled live or heat-treated bacteria (MOI = 100) for 30 min in antibiotic-free medium, after which cells were
washed to remove non-phagocytosed bacteria and then treated with trypan or untreated. Phagocytosed bacteria were measured by flow cytometry. Representative FACS profiles are shown. Experiments in this figure were reproduced three times.

**Figure S11. Establishing stable cell lines expressing of Siglec-E mutants in Raw264.7 cells, Related to Figure 4.** (A) Schematic map of mutation in Siglec-E. (B) Flow cytometric analysis of Siglec-E expression on Raw264.7 cells. As shown, same level of Siglec-E expressed on Raw264.7 cells. The bar graphs show the mean ± S.E.M MFI value from one representative experiment (n=3). Experiments in this figure were reproduced three times. Student’s t-test, n.s., not significant. Iso con: isotype control.

**Figure S12. Evaluation of Siglec expression in bacteria infected-THP-1 cells by real-time PCR using Siglec primer sets, Related to Figure 6.** A, THP-1 cells were infected with indicated bacteria (MOI = 100) for 5 h, and the expression of Siglecs was analyzed by real-time PCR. The bar graphs show the mean ± S.E.M. Experiments in this figure were reproduced two times. B, THP-1 cells were transfected with vectors expressing shRNA for Siglec-9 or scramble, and the expression of siglec-9 was analyzed by real-time PCR. The bar graphs show the mean ± S.E.M. Experiments in this figure were reproduced two times. C, ROS production after bacterial infection. THP-1 cells were infected with *E. coli* 25922 (MOI of 100:1) for 5 h at 37°C in vitro. ROS production was detected with H$_2$DCFDA. Data are presented as the mean ± S.E.M from two independent experiments, Student’s t-test, **p<0.001.

**Figure S13. Siglec-E promoter and its putative AP-1 binding sites at 710 bp and 740 bp upstream of the translational start site (as +1) , Related to Figure 7.** AP-1 consensus binding sites are underlined. Mutated nucleotides in Mut1 and Mut2 are shown in lowercase.
Figure S14. Evaluation of JNK and Syk expression in Raw264.7 cells, Related to Figure 7.
Raw264.7 cells were treated with JNK or Syk siRNA or control siRNA for 48 h, and the expression of JNK or Syk was analyzed by real-time PCR using primer sets for JNK (A) or Syk (B), respectively. The bar graphs show the mean ± S.E.M. Experiments in this figure were reproduced two times.
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Transparent Methods

Reagents

Anti-Siglec-E-APC, anti-Siglec-F and anti-Gr-1(Ly-6G/Ly-6C) antibodies were purchased from BioLegend (San Diego, CA). Anti-mouse CD11b, CD4, CD8, and B220 antibodies were purchased from BD Bioscience (San Jose, CA). The following supplies were purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnology (Santa Cruz, CA): anti-Syk, JNK, P-JNK, P38, P-P38, Erk, P-ERK, and β-actin; Streptavidin-horseradish peroxidase (HRP) and HRP-conjugated anti-mouse, anti-goat or anti-rabbit secondary antibodies; and JNK, Syk, and control siRNA. Lentiviral vectors expressing Siglec-E shRNA or Siglec-9 shRNA were from Thermo Scientific (Waltham, MA). Puromycin was purchased from Sigma. Blasticidin was obtained from InvivoGen (San Diego, CA). LPS (from E. coli 0111:B4) was from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). Biotinylated *Maackia amurensis* lectin II (MAL II) and biotinylated SNA (EBL) were purchased from Vector Laboratories (Burlingame, CA). RAW264.7 cells were obtained from ATCC (Manassas, VA) and cultured in Dulbecco’s Modified Eagle’s Medium (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum, 2 mM glutamine, 100 µg/ml penicillin and streptomycin. Syk inhibitor piceatannol, JNK inhibitor SP600125, and NF-κB inhibitor Bay11-7085 were purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnology. Anti-Siglec-1 antibodies and Siglec-E Fc were obtained from R&D Systems (Minneapolis, MN) or prepared as previously reported (Chen et al., 2014).

Construction of plasmids

To generate a construct expressing mouse Siglec-E, cDNA for Siglec-E was amplified by RT-PCR and subcloned into expression vector pCDNA6 (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA). Siglec-
E mutants were made by using a QUIKCHANGE II XL SITE-DIRECTED MUTAGENESIS kit (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA) with the primers [M-1 (R126D): TTATACTTCTTTGACCTGGAGCGTGGA, TCCACGCTCCAGGTCAAAGAAGTATAA; M-2 (Y432F): GAAGAGATACATTGGACCCCTCAGC, GCTGAGGTGCAGAAAATGTATCTCTTC; M-3 (Y455F): ACTACCACGGAGTTCTCAGGATAAAG, CTTTATCTCTGAGAATCCGTGGTAGT; M4 (Y432F and Y455F)]. The shRNA targeted site in these expression vectors was further mutated with the primer (ttgagcctgtctccacagagctcagccaccctgtcggagatgatgatggggacctttg) without changing an amino acid. Primers used for generating constructs expressing wild-type and AP-1 binding site mutant Siglec-E promoter included: SE wild-type: cccgggAGCGTCAGTTGGGGAAGTGCCTCC; gagctCAGCATGTCCAGCTAAAAACTGTCTC; SE Ap1mut1: TCCCCGACaCAaaCATTGACTGAGCTTTT, AAGCTGATCAATGttTGtGTGGGGGA; SE Ap1mut2: TGATCAGGTTCTTTATGgCCACACTAGGGA, TCCCTGATTGGcCAATAAGAAGCTGATCA. All constructs were verified by restriction enzyme digestion and DNA sequencing.

**Cell culture and lentivirus infection**

A GFP lentiviral vector expressing Siglec-E shRNA was transfected into Raw264.7 cells. Stable clones were obtained after selection with puromycin (2.5 μg/ml) for 3 weeks after infection. One clone, with knockdown efficiency confirmed by flow cytometry, was transfected with the expression vectors to make Raw264.7 stable cell lines overexpressing wild-type Siglec-E; mutants M-1, M-2, M-3 and M-4; or empty vector. Stable clones were obtained after selection with Blasticidin. Lentiviral vectors expressing Siglec-9 shRNA were transfected into THP-1 cells, and stable clones were obtained after selection with puromycin.
Experimental animal models

All mice used were 6-8 weeks of age. Age- and sex-matched wild-type littermates were used as controls for Siglec-E knockout mice. The Siglec-E knockout mouse generated with 129/Sv ES cells was backcrossed to C57BL/6. Siglec-E deficient mice have been described (Wu et al., 2016b, Chen et al., 2014), and the mice appeared healthy and did not display gross abnormalities. It is difficult to rule out the influence of 129-derived passenger gene mutations even after more than 10 backcross generations (Vanden Berghe et al., 2015) because of the efficiency of genetic recombination. Nevertheless, genetic recombination is highly unlikely in the region flanking the targeted allele (Lusis et al., 2007, Holmdahl and Malissen, 2012, Vanden Berghe et al., 2015). The Casp11 gene contains a 129/Sv passenger mutation (Vanden Berghe et al., 2015, Broz et al., 2012). We previously typed Casp11 and excluded Casp11 mutation in Siglec-E knockout mice (Chen et al., 2014). Additionally, the expression and function of TLR4 and TLR2 were unaffected in Siglec-E knockout in our recent studies (Wu et al., 2016b). Furthermore, we confirmed Siglec-E knockout mice were backcrossed to C57BL/6 for 8 generations by genotyping single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs; MGI SNP database) located in the region flanking the Siglec-E targeted allele (the SNPs located 30 Mb upstream and 30 Mb downstream of Siglec-E were sequenced and confirmed) that distinguish the 129/Sv and C57BL/6 genomes (Figure S1). Moreover, Siglec-E knockout mice used were from more than 8 backcross generations, and wild-type littermates were used as controls in all the experiments. All animal procedures were approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee of University of Tennessee Health Science Center. Wild-type C57BL/6J, Siglec-F, MyD88, TLR2 and TLR4 knockout and FOPX3\textsuperscript{IRE\textsuperscript{S}-GFP} mice were obtained from The Jackson Laboratory (Bar Harbor, ME).

Immunofluorescence microscopy
Spleen, liver or kidney was embedded in OCT compound and cryosectioned at 5 µm. Images were acquired with an EVOS FL Auto Imaging System (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

**Bacterial culture**

*E. coli 25922* (ATCC 25922), *E. coli 25922GFP* (ATCC 25922GFP) (this clone derived from *E. coli 25922* contains a multicopy vector encoding GFPmut3), *L. monocytogenes* (ATCC 19115) and *S. aureus* (ATCC 25923) were obtained from ATCC and propagated according to the manufacturer's protocol. Strains were grown overnight in Luria-Bertani (LB) broth, Brain Heart Infusion Agar/Broth or LB nutrient broth. In the logarithmic phase of the growth, the suspension was centrifuged at 1000 x g for 15 min, the supernatant was discarded, and the bacteria were resuspended and diluted with sterile 1 x PBS.

**In vivo bacterial infections and enumeration of bacterial burdens**

For i.p. infection, female mice were infected with at a dose of 5 x 10^5 colony-forming units (c.f.u.) *E. coli 25922* or *E. coli 25922GFP*, 1 x 10^7 c.f.u. *DH5α*, 1 x 10^6 c.f.u. *S. aureus*, or 1 x 10^6 c.f.u. *L. monocytogenes* unless otherwise specified. For i.v. infection, female mice were infected at a dose of 1 x 10^5 c.f.u. *E. coli 25922GFP*. Tissues were collected 16 h post-infection and homogenized. Dilutions were plated on LB agar. Bacterial numbers are expressed as c.f.u g⁻¹ tissue.

**In vitro bacterial infections**
Neutrophils were isolated from mouse femurs (Swamydas and Lionakis, 2013). Infections of neutrophils for an in vitro growth assay were at multiplicity of infection (MOI) of 100:1. Neutrophils were co-incubated with *E. coli* 25922GFP or CFSE-labeled live or heat-treated bacteria for 60 min in antibiotic-free medium. Next, cells were washed to remove non-phagocytosed bacteria. Phagocytosed bacteria were measured by flow cytometry. Gentamycin (100 µg ml⁻¹; Sigma-Aldrich) was added to the medium, and neutrophils were collected after 30-, 90-, 150-, 210-, and 270-min incubations. The cells were lysed with 0.2% Triton X-100, and c.f.u was measured.

**ROS staining by flow cytometry**

For detecting ROS levels, spleen cells from bacteria-infected mice or cultured cells were incubated with H₂DCFDA for 15 min (10 µM, Life Technologies). After incubation, the levels of fluorescence were measured by flow cytometry.

**Analysis of immune cell infiltration in the peritoneum**

Mice were infected with the indicated bacteria, and the cells were collected by peritoneal lavage in 6 ml PBS, washed twice with PBS and surface-stained for anti-CD11b and anti-Gr-1. Monocytes were characterized as CD11b⁺Gr-1⁻ cells, whereas CD11b⁺Gr-1⁺ cells were considered neutrophils.

**Flow cytometry**

Spleen cells from wild-type or Siglec-E knockout mice treated with PBS, *E. coli* 25922 or *E. coli* 25922GFP, *DH5a*, *L. monocytogenes*, *S. aureus* or cultured cells were washed with flow cytometry staining buffer (1 x PBS, 2% BSA), and then incubated for 1 h on ice with different
directly conjugated antibodies. The fluorescence intensity of cells was analyzed on LSRFortess Flow cytometer or Guava easyCyte™ System (EMD Millipore, Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany).

**Real-time quantitative PCR**

Total RNA was extracted with TRIzol (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) according to the manufacturer's protocol and reverse transcribed with random primers and Superscript III (Life Technologies). The mRNA expression of mouse and human Siglecs, JNK and Syk was measured by real-time polymerase chain reaction. Samples were run in triplicate, and the relative expression was determined by normalizing expression of each target to the endogenous reference, hypoxanthine phosphoribosyltransferase (Hprt) transcripts. Real-time PCR primers used for mouse and human Siglecs were described previously (Wu et al., 2016b, Chen et al., 2014, Wu et al., 2016a). Real-time PCR primers used for mouse JNK were ATGGCTGTGATATTCAACCAG, CCTCTTGGGCATACCCCAC and for Syk were CTACCTGCTACGCCAGAGC, GCCATTAAGTTCCCTCTCGATG.

**Immunoblotting**

RAW264.7 cells or neutrophils lysates were prepared in lysis buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl, 150 mM NaCl, 1 % Triton X-100, pH 7.6, including protease inhibitors, 1 µg ml⁻¹ leupeptin, 1 µg ml⁻¹ aprotinin and 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride), sonicated, centrifuged at 13,000 rpm for 5 min and then applied for Western blot analysis. The concentration of running gel was 10%. After blocking, the blots were incubated with primary antibody (1:1,000 dilution). After incubation with the second antibody (HRP-conjugated goat anti-rat IgG, rabbit anti-goat IgG, or
goat anti-mouse IgG) (1:5,000 dilution), the signal was detected with an ECL kit (Santa Cruz, CA).

**Measurement of inflammatory cytokines**

Blood samples were obtained at indicated time points, and cytokines in the serum were determined using a mouse cytokine bead array designed for inflammatory cytokines (BD Biosciences, 552364).

**Statistical analysis**

The differences in cytokine concentrations and bacterial clearance were analyzed by two-tailed t-tests in single pairwise comparisons calculated with Excel (Microsoft). Data are shown as the mean ± SEM. The differences in survival rates were analyzed by Kaplan-Meier plots, and statistical significance was determined using a log-rank (Mantel-Cox) test (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA). *P<0.05, **P<0.01, ***P<0.001, n.s., not significant.
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