

DOMAIN 5 RESPONDING TO THE ENVIRONMENT

The SOS Regulatory Network

LYLE A. SIMMONS, JAMES J. FOTI, SUSAN E. COHEN, AND
GRAHAM C. WALKER

Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

Received: 5 February 2008

Accepted: 17 April 2008

Posted: 25 July 2008

Supersedes previous posting at EcoSal.org.

Editor: James M.lauch, The School of Molecular and Cellular Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL

Citation: EcoSal Plus 2013; doi:10.1128/ecosalplus.5.4.3.

Correspondence: Graham C. Walker: gwalker@mit.edu

Copyright: © 2013 American Society for Microbiology. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1128/ecosalplus.5.4.3

ABSTRACT All organisms possess a diverse set of genetic programs that are used to alter cellular physiology in response to environmental cues. The gram-negative bacterium *Escherichia coli* induces a gene regulatory network known as the “SOS response” following exposure to DNA damage, replication fork arrest, and a myriad of other environmental stresses. For over 50 years, *E. coli* has served as the paradigm for our understanding of the transcriptional and physiological changes that occur after DNA damage. In this chapter, we summarize the current view of the SOS response and discuss how this genetic circuit is regulated. In addition to examining the *E. coli* SOS response, we include a discussion of the SOS regulatory networks found in other bacteria to provide a broad perspective on the mechanism and diverse physiological responses that ensue to protect cells and maintain genome integrity.

All organisms possess a diverse set of genetic programs that are used to alter cellular physiology in response to environmental cues. The gram-negative bacterium *Escherichia coli* mounts what is known as the “SOS response” following DNA damage, replication fork arrest, and a myriad of other environmental stresses. For over 50 years, *E. coli* has served as the paradigm for our understanding of the transcriptional and physiological changes that occur following DNA damage (1). In this chapter, we summarize the current view of the SOS response and discuss how this genetic circuit is regulated. In addition to examining the *E. coli* SOS response, we also include a discussion of the SOS regulatory networks in other bacteria to provide a broader perspective on how prokaryotes respond to DNA damage.

OVERVIEW OF THE SOS RESPONSE

In *E. coli*, DNA damage and replication perturbations results in the SOS response, a genetic program that transcriptionally up-regulates over 50 unlinked genes (Table 1). The term “SOS” was coined by Miroslav Radman in

Table 1 SOS-regulated genes

LexA dependent genes	Function	Identification as LexA dependent	LexA box(es)^a
<i>polB (dinA)</i>	-2 frame shifts and replication restart after UV treatment (3 , 4 , 5 , 6)	Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (7)	-71 (75, 113)
<i>dinB (dinP)</i>	Translesion synthesis of N ² -dG adducts and -1 frame shifts (8 , 9)	Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (7)	-32 (75, 113)
<i>hokE (ybdY)</i>	Killing protein (10)	Northern analysis (10)	-97 (75, 113)
<i>uvrB</i>	Involved in nucleotide excision repair (11)	UV resistance during Hfr mating; Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (7 , 11 , 12)	-92 (75, 113)
<i>dinG</i>	5'-3' ssDNA helicase (13 , 14 , 15)	Galactokinase gene fusion (16)	-105, -34 (75, 113)
<i>ftsk (dinh)</i>	Chromosome segregation at cell division plane (17)	Galactokinase gene fusion (16)	-96 (75, 113, 207)
<i>sulA</i>	Inhibitor of cell division (18)	SOS chromtest, Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (19 , 20)	-42 (75, 113)
<i>dinI</i>	Stabilizes RecA/ssDNA filaments (21 , 22)	Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>); Suppressor <i>dinD68</i> , <i>lacZ</i> fusion (7 , 22 , 23)	-37 (75, 113)
<i>umuCD</i>	DNA pol V involved in SOS mutagenesis and translesion DNA synthesis (24 , 25 , 26)	LexA inhibition of in vitro transcription, Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (27 , 28)	-331, -351, -57, -37 (75, 113, 190)
<i>yebG</i>	Unknown	Operon fusion (29)	-35, (75, 113, 225)
<i>ruvAB</i>	Holiday junction branch migration (RuvA DNA binding/RuvB helicase motor) (30 , 31)	LexA repression of in vitro RNA pol assay, LacZ fusion (32 , 33)	-67 (75, 113)
<i>sbmC</i>	DNA gyrase inhibitor (34 , 35 , 36)	Microcin resistance (34)	-32 (75, 113)
<i>ssb</i>	Single-stranded binding protein (37 , 38 , 39)	S1 mapping, galactokinase gene fusion (40)	-170 (113)
<i>molR (dinO, sosF)</i>	Molybdate transport (41)	Northern analysis (10)	-27 (75, 113)
<i>recN</i>	Involved in recombinational repair (42 , 43 , 44 , 45 , 46)	2D-gel electrophoresis, Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (42 , 47 , 48)	-28, -46, -66 (75, 113)
<i>recA</i>	SOS regulation and mutagenesis/homologous recombination (49 , 50 , 51 , 52 , 53 , 54 , 55 , 56 , 57 , 58 , 59)	DNase I protection assay, LacZ fusion (59 , 60)	-77 (75, 113)
<i>pcsA (dinD)</i>	Unknown	Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (7)	-61 (75, 113)
<i>uvrD</i>	DNA helicase II (61)	Complementation UV' and MMS' (62)	-74 (75, 113)
<i>dinF</i>	Unknown downstream of LexA	Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (7)	-24, -45 (75, 113)
<i>LexA</i>	Transcriptional repressor of SOS genes (54 , 59 , 63 , 64 , 65 , 66)	DNase I protection assay (59)	-24, -45 (75, 113)
<i>uvrA (dinE)</i>	Involved in nucleotide excision repair (67)	UV resistance during Hfr mating, Mud1 (Ap <i>lac</i>) (11 , 68)	-101/-168 (75, 113)
<i>dinQ</i>	Unknown	Northern analysis (10)	-139 (113)
<i>ydjQ</i>	Putative UvrC homolog, function unknown (67)	Northern analysis (10)	-33 (75, 113)
<i>ysdAB (tisAB)</i>	Toxic protein expressed under stress condition (69)	Northern analysis (10)	-142 (113)
<i>ydjM</i>	Inner membrane protein (70)	Northern analysis (10)	-34, -52 (113)
<i>dins</i>	Putative transposase (10)	Northern analysis (10)	-74 (113)
<i>yigN</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-61, -63, (75, 113)
<i>ybfE</i>	Unknown	Northern analysis (10)	-136 (113)
<i>yjiW (dinL, sosC)</i>	Unknown	Northern analysis (10)	-95 (75, 113)
<i>borD</i>	Homolog of prophage protein expressed during lycogeny (72 , 73)	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ybiN</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND

(continued)

Table 1 SOS-regulated genes (continued)

LexA dependent genes	Function	Identification as LexA dependent	LexA box(es)^a
<i>grxA</i>	Glutoredoxin, hydrogen donor for ribonucleotide reductase (74)	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>yccF</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ymfD</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ymfE</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-280
<i>Lit</i>	Protease for EF-Tu (75)	Microarray (71)	-193
<i>intE</i>	Predicted phage integrase	Microarray (71)	84, -192, -195 (75)
<i>ymfG</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ymfH</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ymfI</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	84
<i>ymfJ</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ycgH</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ydeO</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-272
<i>ydeS</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-43
<i>ydeT</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ydeR</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>arpB</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>yoaB</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-123
<i>ogrK</i>	Regulate gene transcription of phage P2 (76, 77)	Microarray (71)	-193, 8
<i>yqgC</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-41, -193
<i>yqgD</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>yhiJ</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>yhiL</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-63, -187
<i>glvB</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	-174
<i>ibpB</i>	Heat-inducible chaperone (78)	Microarray (71)	ND
<i>ibpA</i>	Heat-inducible chaperone (78)	Microarray (71)	-249
<i>yifL</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)	ND
LexA independent genes	Function	Identification as SOS induced	
<i>dinY</i>	Mutant defective in Weigle reaction of UV-irradiated bacteriophage λ (79)	MudI (Ap lac) (79)	
<i>dnaA</i>	Initiation protein for chromosomal replication (80)	Transcriptional fusions, S1 nuclease mapping, immunoblot analysis (81)	
<i>dnaB</i>	Replicative DNA helicase (82)	<i>lacZ</i> fusion (83)	
<i>dnaN</i>	Pol III processivity factor, β-subunit (84)	<i>lacZ</i> fusion (84)	
<i>dnaQ</i>	Pol III proofreading factor, ε-subunit (84)	<i>lacZ</i> fusion (84)	
<i>hga</i>	2-Keto-4-hydroxyglutarate adolase, respiration recovery after UV exposure (85, 86)	2D-gel electrophoresis, peptide sequencing, and O ₂ consumption (87)	
<i>ihfA (himA)</i>	Site-specific recombination (88, 89, 90)	<i>lacZ</i> fusion, radiolabeled 2D-gel electrophoresis (91)	
<i>nrdAB</i>	Ribonucleotide reductase (92, 93, 94, 95, 96)	<i>lacZ</i> fusion (97)	
<i>phr</i>	DNA photolyase (98)	<i>lacZ</i> fusion (99, 100)	
<i>hslVU</i>	Protease of SulA (101, 102, 103, 104)	Microarray (71)	
<i>cvpA</i>	Colicin production (105)	Microarray (71)	

(continued)

Table 1 SOS-regulated genes (continued)

LexA independent genes	Function	Identification as SOS induced
<i>purF</i>	Purine biosynthesis (106)	Microarray (71, 107)
<i>upp</i>	Pyrimidine scavaging (108)	Microarray (71)
<i>rpoD</i>	RNA polymerase sigma factor (109)	Microarray (71)
<i>dnaG</i>	DNA primase (110, 111)	Microarray (71, 110)
<i>rpsU</i>	Ribosomal subunit (112)	Microarray (71)
<i>yfaE</i>	Unknown	Microarray (71)
<i>yecf</i>	Putative amino acid transporter	Microarray (71)
<i>recX</i>	Inhibitor of RecA (113)	Microarray (71)
<i>recQ</i>	DNA helicase (114)	Suppression <i>dnaE486</i> , in vitro helicase assays (115)
<i>sfiC</i>	Inhibition of cell division (116)	Cell filamentation in <i>recA sfiA99</i> Mud (Ap lac) strain (116)

^a Distance from ATG start codon.

1974 when he postulated the existence of the pathway on the basis of a set of physiological responses induced by DNA damage whose regulation was controlled by the *lexA*⁺ and *recA*⁺ gene products (2). Radman defined “SOS” as a distress signal used to sense DNA damage or replication fork blockages.

Since the original hypothesis, the distress signal has been shown to be the accumulation of single-stranded DNA (ssDNA). As described in greater detail below, LexA protein is a negative regulator of the SOS response by acting as a transcriptional repressor. RecA is a positive regulator of this response, and the interaction between LexA and RecA polymerized on ssDNA is required to relieve LexA-dependent transcriptional repression of SOS genes. Of the >50 unlinked genes that constitute the SOS response, several are directly involved in DNA repair, DNA damage tolerance, or induction of a DNA damage checkpoint by blocking cell division.

The SOS response is wired to allow for high-fidelity repair to take place before giving way to a more mutagenic mode allowing for cell survival. When the SOS response is induced the first set of genes to be expressed are gene products involved in high-fidelity DNA repair. Further into SOS induction, *sula* gene expression is induced and this protein causes a DNA damage checkpoint by inhibiting cell division. The Sula-dependent checkpoint allows cells time to repair their DNA before damaged chromosomes are segregated into daughter cells. Late in the SOS response, *umuC* and *umuD* genes are expressed and these gene products assemble into a translesion DNA polymerase that has mutagenic potential, as high-fidelity

repair gives way to lower-fidelity damage tolerance. This lower-fidelity DNA damage tolerance pathway is so named because the damage is not removed, but instead tolerated.

Below, we review and discuss the experiments leading toward our current understanding of the SOS response. We also provide a comprehensive summary (Table 1) of all the genes known to be LexA regulated, bringing the total number to 57. Moreover, we include a table of genes that are potentially LexA regulated but have yet to be verified (Table 2).

THE GENETICS OF SOS REGULATION

The SOS response is a genetic circuit that is regulated by the LexA and RecA proteins (56, 57, 64, 66, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122) (Fig. 1). LexA is a transcriptional repressor that occupies its cognate operator binding site (SOS box) as a homodimer, thereby blocking RNA polymerase (RNAP) binding and transcription (59, 123, 124, 125, 126). LexA has a cryptic autocleavage activity that is activated when LexA interacts with a RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament. Expression of *recA*⁺ and *lexA*⁺ gene products are regulated in an SOS-dependent fashion and RecA is rather abundant in the noninduced state (127). Considerable in vitro and in vivo evidence has shown that when bacterial DNA is damaged, ssDNA is generated (see “Mechanisms generating ssDNA,” below). RecA binds ssDNA forming a nucleoprotein filament (128, 129, 130, 131). Interaction between the RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament and LexA activates LexA auto-digestion, thereby inactivating LexA as a repressor and

Table 2 Potential SOS-regulated genes

Genes with potential SOS boxes ^a	LexA box(es) relative to promoter +1 start site
<i>ydiM</i>	-34
<i>ilbL</i>	-330
<i>minC</i>	-277
<i>ycgJ</i>	-262
<i>yafL</i>	-193
<i>dinJ (sosA)</i>	-32
<i>ybiA</i>	-105
<i>tyrS (dinN, sosE)</i>	275
ORF within <i>yeeI</i>	-55, -118
ORF within <i>cgM</i>	-57
<i>mug (tng, ygfF)</i>	-69
ORF within <i>ydbK</i>	-122
<i>ygiS</i>	-173
<i>yciG</i>	-157
ORF within <i>ygiT</i>	-45
<i>xylE</i>	-23
<i>ydbH</i>	1
<i>creA</i>	-145
<i>rob</i>	-81
<i>brnQ</i>	-87
<i>yiaO</i>	-92
<i>hofQ</i>	-100
<i>metE</i>	-205
<i>metR</i>	-51
ORF within <i>ydcl</i>	-101
<i>yhiX</i>	-47
<i>pshM</i>	-89
<i>ycgL</i>	-57
<i>rfaJ</i>	-39
<i>yjgN</i>	-55
<i>ybiT</i>	-3
<i>ilvD</i>	-19
<i>yecS</i>	-73
<i>ecpD</i>	-79
<i>ydeJ</i>	-62
<i>ycbU</i>	-100
<i>yfiK</i>	-30
<i>ymfM</i>	-122, -222, -173
<i>ymfN</i>	-152, -312
<i>ymgF</i>	-105
<i>ymgH</i>	6
<i>yoaA</i>	-24

Table 2 Potential SOS-regulated genes (*continued*)

Genes with potential SOS boxes ^a	LexA box(es) relative to promoter +1 start site
<i>yneL</i>	-57
<i>glvG</i>	0, 211
<i>glvC</i>	214, 578
<i>yfiE</i>	-92

^a Location of potential SOS box from Woodgate (10) and Courcelle (71).

leading to the transcription of LexA repressed genes (64, 118, 120, 132, 133). Below, we review the sophisticated network of proteins that influence the magnitude and timing of SOS induction.

The *recA*⁺ Gene Product

RecA, a key player in DNA repair, is required for homologous recombination, SOS induction, and translesion synthesis (TLS). Many of the original *recA* mutant allele studies suggested that RecA is a positive regulator of SOS because these alleles were defective in recombination and SOS induction (135, 136). It is now known that RecA is required to facilitate LexA autocleavage and thus is a coprotease. The role of RecA in SOS induction was genetically defined when alleles of *recA* were isolated that result in constitutive SOS induction in the absence of exogenous DNA damage (137, 138). These coprotease constitutive *recA* alleles [*recA*(Cpt^c)] induce SOS during normal growth conditions, or, in the case of *recA441*, a temperature shift to 42°C to induce SOS (139, 138). Biochemical examination of the proteins encoded by *recA441* and *recA730* showed that these proteins displayed an exceptionally high affinity for ssDNA and are able to displace single-strand binding protein (SSB), an activity that is not observed with wild-type RecA protein (137, 140). It is hypothesized that *recA* coprotease constitutive mutants are able to compete with SSB for the low levels of ssDNA present at the replication fork during normal replication. It should be noted that RecA803 is capable of SSB displacement under specific in vitro conditions, but does not result in constitutive SOS in vivo (140, 141, 142). These results can be explained by the idea that more than ssDNA binding is important for SOS induction or by the observation that RecA803 displaces SSB in vitro only under certain conditions that are not mimicked in vivo (140, 141, 142). Taken together, RecA binding to ssDNA is a critical step toward SOS induction, but more than ssDNA binding is involved, including proper protein-protein interaction between RecA/ssDNA and LexA.




Figure 1 A model for SOS induction. (A) In the uninduced state, replication proceeds unperturbed and the limited amount of ssDNA present at the replication fork is not available for RecA binding. Transcription of *lexA*⁺ (green), *recA*⁺ (purple), *sulA*⁺ (orange), and other SOS-regulated genes is largely repressed. After DNA damage (red circle), RecA binds to the increasing amount of ssDNA in the cell creating the RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament (purple and yellow). The RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament acts as a coprotease to cleave LexA, resulting in the expression of the SOS regulon. As the gene products of the SOS regulon repair the DNA damage, the cell will return to the uninduced state as normal replication proceeds and the switch is reset. (B) Generation and stabilization of a RecA nucleoprotein filament is regulated by a number of cellular factors. RecBCD and RecFOR can act at a stalled replication fork (Left) to generate ssDNA for RecA binding. RecA binding and filamentation can be aided by RecFOR or prevented by RecX (Center). Once formed, the RecA filament can be stabilized by DinI binding (Right). Adapted from an illustration by Patricia J. Wynne and *Cell* (134) with permission (<http://www.sciencedirect.com>).

Other classes of *recA* point mutants that interfere with the ability of RecA to regulate SOS have also been described (143). For example, RecA430 is proficient for homologous recombination, but inefficient as a LexA coprotease (143, 144). To date, several hundred *recA* alleles have been isolated and examined for repair and SOS defects (for a review, see reference 145).

The *lexA*⁺ Gene Product

Alleles of the *lexA* gene have been identified that are defective in SOS induction [*lexA*(Ind⁻)] (146, 147, 148), as well as alleles that encode variants of the LexA protein that fail to act as a repressor, thereby resulting in constitutive SOS induction [*lexA*(Def)] (149). The *lexA*(Ind⁻) class are dominant alleles so named for their lack of SOS induction. These alleles encode mutations that prevent autocleavage by altering the LexA cleavage site, or by altering the interaction between LexA and the RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament. *lexA*(Def) alleles are lethal in an otherwise wild-type *E. coli* genetic background, a factor that complicated their isolation (150). LexA protein represses *sulA*⁺ (also called *sfiA*⁺) (151), which inhibits cell division by blocking FtsZ ring assembly (152). Therefore, *lexA*(Def) mutations must be propagated in a *sulA*-deficient background to prevent a Sula-dependent block to cell division. The *lexA*(Def) mutation alone results in excessive Sula-dependent filamentation and cell death. Sula homologs are not as widespread as LexA homologs. For example, in *Bacillus subtilis*, SOS-dependent cell filamentation is mediated by YneA a protein that interferes with FtsZ ring polymerization, but does not share sequence similarity to *E. coli* Sula (153).

These genetic studies established that RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament formation activates the cryptic protease activity of LexA resulting in cleavage, and derepression of LexA-repressed genes. Although *recA*⁺ and *lexA*⁺ are the two key regulatory elements of the SOS regulon, a growing list of proteins are involved in modulating SOS induction through positive or negative regulation of RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament formation, LexA cleavage, or both (for an overview of the SOS response, see Fig. 1).

LexA Binds to SOS Boxes and Inhibits Transcription

In addition to genetic studies, which indicated that LexA is a negative regulator of SOS, in vitro studies have demonstrated that purified LexA protein can bind to

operator sites resulting in inhibition of transcription (59, 63, 118, 154, 155, 156, 157). Comparisons of these sequences led to the discovery of a LexA binding site known as an SOS box, with a consensus sequence of TACTGTATATATACAGTA in *E. coli* (154). All known SOS operators contain a 5' CTGT consensus sequence with some preference for alternating (AT)₄ sequences. Within the 5' CTGT consensus sequence, the central T and G bases are absolutely required for LexA binding. Mutations that result in an operator-constitutive phenotype have also been isolated, causing increased expression of the affected LexA-controlled gene (158, 159, 160, 161). Diversity within SOS boxes contributes to temporal activation of gene expression as well as final induced levels. Induction ranges from about 100-fold in the case of *sulA*⁺, one of the most tightly repressed SOS genes, to 4- to 5-fold in the case of *uvrA*⁺, *uvrB*⁺ and *uvrD*⁺, *ruvAB*⁺, and *lexA*⁺ (157). Many parameters may be attributed to the differences in expression besides operator strength, such as location of operator relative to the promoter, promoter strength, and existence of additional, constitutive promoters. SOS boxes have been mapped to many locations, including overlapping with the -35 promoter region (*uvrA*⁺), between the -10 and -35 regions (*recA*⁺, *uvrB*⁺), overlapping with the -10 region (*sulA*⁺, *umuDC*⁺), as well as downstream of the transcriptional start site (*uvrD*⁺, *cea*⁺, and *caa*⁺) (154, 157), thus allowing for a multivariable coordination of expression throughout the SOS response (for SOS box locations throughout the genome see Tables 1 and 2).

In vitro studies have shown that LexA binds to DNA as a dimer. Dimerization has proven critical for the repression of the SOS response. LexA consists of two structurally defined domains joined by a flexible hinge region (162). The N-terminal domain, amino acids 1 to 84, specifically recognizes SOS boxes, although at a lower affinity than the intact protein (125, 126, 132, 163). The C-terminal domain is necessary for dimerization, with both intact and C-terminal fragments forming dimers in solution, with a dissociation constant <20 pM (164, 165). LexA cleavage of the Ala⁸⁴-Gly⁸⁵ bond located within the hinge region during SOS induction separates the two domains, inactivating LexA as a transcriptional repressor. This cleavage not only regulates LexA activity, lowering LexA's affinity for DNA, but also LexA's stability by exposing residues that target LexA for degradation by ClpXP protease (166) (see "Posttranslational regulation of SOS-induced proteins," below).

VARIOUS MECHANISMS OF SOS INDUCTION

Extensive analyses have shown that several seemingly unrelated stresses result in DNA lesions that impede replication, ultimately resulting in SOS induction. Experimental evidence suggests that these lesions are processed to ssDNA leading to SOS induction through RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament-mediated cleavage of the transcriptional repressor LexA. The mechanisms ultimately leading to the formation of ssDNA are not well understood for all the SOS-inducing stresses. Furthermore, it is becoming more apparent that many bacterial species utilize the SOS response to promote cell survival during a variety of stressful environmental conditions.

DNA-Damaging Agents

A myriad of DNA-altering or -damaging agents have been shown to induce the SOS response in *E. coli*, including nalidixic acid, 3'-azido-3'-deoxythymidine (AZT), nitrofurazone, mitomycin C, benzo[a]pyrene diol epoxide, hydrogen peroxide, and 4-nitroquinoline, among many others (20, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174). The lesions created by these agents (altered nucleotides, ssDNA nicks, gaps, dsDNA breaks, etc.) can impede DNA replication and must be removed by DNA repair mechanisms or tolerated by using DNA damage tolerance pathways, which are integrated into the SOS circuit. However, more than 1,000 *E. coli* genes are regulated in response to mitomycin C exposure, suggesting that SOS-induced genes may not be sufficient for recovery after treatment (175).

High Pressure

Hydrostatic pressure was recently shown to induce a *recA*⁺, *recB*⁺, and *lexA*⁺-dependent SOS response in *E. coli* (176). The requirements for RecB suggests that ssDNA is formed through the processing of a double-strand break intermediate. Subsequent experiments revealed that an endogenous restriction endonuclease Mrr generates a double-strand break after high-pressure stress (177). The mechanism responsible for high-pressure stress activation of Mrr is unknown, but represents an example of self-targeted DNA restriction, a rather unusual method to manage stress. Although *E. coli* is not naturally subjected to high-pressure environments, foods are often subjected to a combination of bacterial stresses, such as high pressure, to inactivate food-borne pathogens such as *E. coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella*, and *Listeria monocytogenes* (178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183).

Antibiotics

Cell wall stress induced by treatment with β -lactam antibiotics or by compromising penicillin-binding protein 3 (*ftsI*⁺) activity induces the DpiBA two-component signal transduction system in *E. coli* (184, 185). DpiA binds A+T-rich sequences, thereby preventing DnaA and DnaB activity at the origin of replication resulting in SOS induction (184). Induction of SOS leads to the transcriptional up-regulation of the *sulA*⁺ gene. SulA binds to FtsZ, thereby blocking FtsZ ring formation, which temporarily prevents cell division and provides protection against cell death (186, 187, 188). Many recent studies suggest that the pathogens *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* utilize the SOS response as a mechanism to promote antibiotic resistance (189, 190, 191, 192). For example, SOS induction by antibiotics not only results in increased TLS-dependent mutagenesis, but can also lead to transfer of pathogenicity islands (192, 193).

Starvation

Under starvation conditions in late-stationary phase, the mechanistically controversial phenomenon known as adaptive mutagenesis is observed. An increase in -1-bp frameshift of *lacZ* revertants is used to measure adaptive mutagenesis. This is measured when cells are starved for lactose by using a genetic system harboring F' plasmids with an inactive lactose gene (*lac*) that can revert to *lac*⁺ by a specific mutation (194, 195, 196, 197, 198). The -1 frameshift reversion depends on DNA Pol IV encoded by the *dinB* gene. Several studies suggest that the SOS response is required for the increase in point mutations by DinB (199, 200). It is possible that DinB maybe induced by the production of ssDNA during F' amplification segregation (198). However, maximal DinB induction in late stationary phase requires the general stress response regulator RpoS (201). RpoS is necessary not only for adaptive point mutation but also for adaptive amplification in the Lac system, suggesting that transient genetic instability is induced in late stationary phase (202). In addition to carbon limitation, amino acid starvation also triggers the SOS response upon resumption of growth on glycerol (203).

Intracellular pH

E. coli cells regulate their intracellular pH through redox and proton pumps (204, 205). However, improper regulation can result in SOS induction (206). The mechanism

for pH-induced expression of SOS-regulated genes might be explained by the result that pH alters the structure of the transcriptional repressor LexA (207, 208). It has been proposed that the structurally altered LexA aggregates, is degraded, and ultimately results in derepression of LexA-regulated genes ().

MECHANISMS GENERATING ssDNA

The major SOS-inducing signal is the accumulation of ssDNA, which is generated by a number of different mechanisms that ultimately result in SOS induction. During normal growth, the limited amount of ssDNA generated during DNA replication is tolerated *in vivo*. However, an increase in the amount of ssDNA provides a sensitive signal that requires a very low threshold for SOS induction. The most common situation that results in an increase in ssDNA occurs when the cell attempts to replicate damaged DNA (see below). However, generation of the SOS response by conversion of dsDNA to ssDNA can occur by a number of other mechanisms.

Replication of Damaged DNA

Replication is required to induce the SOS response following UV irradiation. Evidence that DNA lesions were not sufficient to induce the SOS response was obtained in experiments in which a *dnaC28^{TS}* derivative in a nucleotide excision repair defective genetic background was exposed to UV light (209). The *dnaC28^{TS}* strain has impaired DNA replication at 42° because of its temperature-sensitive helicase loader allele. When shifted to 42° after UV exposure, the *uvrBdnaC28^{TS}* double mutant fails to induce SOS, implying a role for DNA replication in the induction of the SOS response (209). Furthermore, following a 70-minute shift to 42°, UV-irradiated *dnaC28^{TS}* cells fail to cleave LexA protein, in comparison with 70% cleavage of LexA in a wild-type strain within 10 minutes at the permissive temperature of 30° (127). These results indicate that the presence of UV lesions is not sufficient to induce SOS in cells lacking nucleotide excision repair, and that an active replication fork must attempt to replicate over DNA lesions for SOS induction to occur. A slight SOS induction does occur in *dnaC28^{TS}* strains at high UV doses at the restrictive temperature, implying either that removal of lesions results in gaps that are sufficient for SOS induction (209) or that a low level of replication is supported by the *dnaC28^{TS}* allele at the restrictive temperature.

Double-Strand Breaks Are Processed by RecBCD

The spontaneous rate of double-strand break formation under normal growth conditions is very low with 0.01 breaks detected per genome for *E. coli* (210). Several stresses, however, including nalidixic acid, high pressure, and gamma irradiation, result in SOS induction as the result of a dsDNA break intermediate processed to ssDNA (168, 174, 211, 212). Experimental evidence suggests that the RecBCD helicase/exonuclease degrades and unwinds dsDNA creating a 3' ssDNA tail that induces SOS (Fig. 1) (213, 214). A crystal structure of the RecBCD enzyme suggests that, once the enzyme complex binds blunt-ended DNA, unwinding is initiated by the two helicases RecB and RecD and splits the two strands around the pin of RecC (215). RecB, a helicase and nuclease, initially degrades the 5' tail less efficiently than the 3' tail, which is channeled into the nuclease active site. As the 3' tail is moved toward the nuclease active site, RecC scans the DNA and binds when it recognizes a chi (5'-GCTGGTGG) sequence. Binding to a chi sequence prevents further degradation of the 3' tail and allows the 5' tail to be degraded, thus creating a 3' ssDNA tail for RecA binding. An *in vitro* reconstitution assay consisting of RecA, RecBCD, SSB, and LexA recapitulated the LexA derepression of an SOS promoter in the presence of a double-stranded break on DNA containing a chi site (216).

RecFOR-Mediated Processing of Arrested Replication Forks Generates ssDNA

Replication forks frequently stall because of physical blocks. The formation of an activated RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament in response to a replication fork encountering a physical block, such as a UV photoproduct, requires processing by the RecFOR complex (Fig. 1) (described in detail below). *recF*, *recO*, and *recR* are sensitive to DNA-damaging agents, and exhibit delayed SOS induction (6, 217, 218). Several studies suggest that these proteins form a complex that enhances and stabilizes RecA binding to ssDNA, in part, through clearing SSB from ssDNA to nucleate RecA/ssDNA binding (217, 219, 220).

Furthermore, RecFOR function is required to prevent inappropriate RecQ- and RecJ-dependent degradation of the nascent strand at stalled replication forks. However, some RecQ- and RecJ-dependent processing of nascent DNA is required for replication restart following UV irradiation (217, 221). A current model, based on *in vitro*

data, for nascent strand processing suggests that RecQ, a 3' to 5' helicase, unwinds template dsDNA ahead of the fork to remove impeding structures. RecQ then switches to the lagging strand and begins to unwind, creating a ssDNA substrate for RecJ. Limited RecJ degradation of nascent DNA provides an area of ssDNA for RecA filament formation (222), which in turn prevents extensive DNA degradation (217).

Foreign DNA

Indirect SOS induction occurs when UV-irradiated foreign DNA such as F or F' plasmids, P1, M13, bacteriophage λ , and Hfr DNA is introduced into cells (223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228). The kinetics of SOS induction by plasmid P1 and λ are similar, as measured by *sulA::lac* fusion expression. However, induction of SOS is markedly reduced without bacteriophage λ DNA replication, suggesting that replication of damaged DNA and subsequent processing of the lesion are necessary at least for bacteriophage λ (225).

DNA Metabolism Mutants

Mutations in genes encoding proteins that participate in DNA metabolism can result in SOS induction; these include *dam* (229, 230), *dnaQ* (231, 232), *polA* (233), *priA* (234, 235), and *uvrD* (236). Point mutants in essential genes encoding components of the replicative polymerase DNA Pol III and those necessary for chromosome segregation can also induce the SOS response. Mutants of Pol III subunits, including *dnaN159* (the β processivity clamp), display a partial chronic induction of SOS because of an impaired ability to interact with the catalytic subunit (237). *xerCD*, *div*, and *ftsK* mutants suffer from a more acute induction after the dividing septum shears chromosomes that fail to properly segregate (238, 239). Single-cell studies of mutants expressing *SulA::GFP* suggest that, in the case of DNA metabolism mutants, SOS induction only occurs in a subpopulation. In contrast, SOS induction in *lexA(Def)* mutants occurs uniformly in all cells within the culture (240), an issue that is discussed below in more detail (see "Single-cell analysis of the SOS response," below). It was suggested that SOS induction occurs in a subpopulation of the DNA metabolism mutants because the cell has several pathways to process DNA intermediates. The noninduced cells may not have experienced enough DNA damage or the cell utilized a pathway that does not require the mutated gene product for repair (240).

Decreased Nucleotide Pools Result in SOS Induction

Exposing *E. coli* cells to hydroxyurea, a specific inhibitor of ribonucleotide reductase, decreases the intracellular concentration of dNTPs resulting in replication fork pausing and SOS induction (167). RecA, SulA, and λ prophage induction as a result of hydroxyurea exposure is RecBC independent. Although RecA requires ATP for LexA cleavage, intracellular ATP pools are not a limiting factor for SOS induction (57, 167, 241). Survival during nucleotide starvation is enhanced by the SOS-regulated Y-family polymerases UmuC and DinB (242), possibly due to their higher affinity for dNTPs as compared with Pol III. Interestingly, in the opportunistic pathogen *Serratia marcescens*, hydroxyurea treatment results in the LexA-dependent induction of an exocellular nuclease-scavenging pathway (243).

STRUCTURAL INSIGHTS INTO RecA/DNA NUCLEOPROTEIN FILAMENT

Structural data are available for both the *E. coli* (Fig. 2) and an inactive compact *Mycobacterium smegmatis* complex with a bound nucleotide between RecA monomers (244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249) showing 6 RecA monomers per turn (Fig. 2). Furthermore, conserved residues in all bacterial RecA proteins lie along the RecA monomer interface, highlighting their importance for filament formation. The recent advances in optical techniques have allowed for the real-time visualization of RecA or Rad51 polymerization on ssDNA and suggest that nucleation is the rate-limiting step (250, 251, 252). A reconstruction of electron micrographs with RecA bound to dsDNA in the presence of LexA has also been generated (253). These results show that LexA is bound to a deep groove of the RecA/dsDNA nucleoprotein filament (253). LexA contacts two adjacent RecA monomers within the 6₁ helical structure composed of 6 RecA monomers. These studies have collectively provided a picture of how RecA and RecA-like proteins form filaments on DNA in vivo.

RecA-Modulating Proteins

Proteins RecX, DinI, PsiB, RdgC, RecFOR, SSB, RecBCD, HU, and UvrD affect the formation or disassembly of RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filaments, thereby modulating the magnitude of the SOS response (Fig. 1). In this section, we discuss the current view of how these proteins affect SOS and direct readers to reviews that provide an




Figure 2 Model of the RecA filament. By using electron microscopy, a model of the RecA filament was generated that positions ATP between RecA subunits. (A) The RecA filament is shown to display the DNA binding channel (Left) and then subsequently turned 90° (Right). (B) An ATP molecule (shown) binds at the interface of two RecA subunits, positioning it to explain the cooperative nature of ATP hydrolysis observed for RecA-DNA filaments. Conserved residues in bacterial RecA proteins (green) are positioned along the subunit interface near the ATP binding pocket. The figure was generated using PyMOL and PDB file 1N03. Adapted from *Structure* (254) with permission (<http://www.sciencedirect.com>).

in-depth view of how these proteins regulate RecA-mediated repair.

Antagonistic Functions of RecX and DinI Modulate the Stability of RecA Filaments

RecX prevents RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament extension, thereby decreasing SOS induction (113). In contrast, DinI stabilizes the filament, increasing SOS induction (22, 23, 255). RecX is an SOS-induced gene product that caps the RecA filament, preventing polymerization (256, 257, 258). In vivo, RecX overexpression decreases SOS induction in some bacteria (259, 260) and, in *M. smegmatis*, overexpression of MsRecA is toxic in the absence of MsRecX (261, 262). However, *recX E. coli* strains fail to show an observable phenotype, suggesting that any RecX effect in *E. coli* is subtle (113, 263). It should be noted here that RecF has an inhibitory effect on RecX (264). RecF interacts with RecX and prevents RecX from exerting a negative effect on RecA (264).

The SOS-regulated DinI protein binds to and stabilizes RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filaments (22, 255, 265). In addition to this function, DinI interferes with UmuD cleavage to UmuD' (21, 266, 267, 268). As discussed previously, the differential affinity of LexA for SOS boxes allows for genes to be turned on early or late in the SOS response. DinI is expressed early in SOS to stabilize RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filaments and may thus inhibit UmuD cleavage, thereby delaying mutagenic TLS and allowing for higher-fidelity repair to take place prior

to lower-fidelity TLS (7, 22, 23). The effect of DinI on RecA and UmuD is an excellent example of how many different layers of regulation help make the *E. coli* SOS response a sophisticated physiological response to genotoxic stress.

Recently, RecA has been fused to green fluorescent protein (GFP) to visualize localization during normal growth and following challenge with DNA-damaging agents. These experiments have revealed that the appearance and longevity of RecA-GFP foci (269, 270, 271) are altered by the absence of both *dinI* and *recX* (272). These experiments show that, although the phenotype of *dinI* and *recX* strains is subtle, the absence of these proteins affects RecA-GFP focus formation in vivo.

PsiB Limits SOS Induction during Plasmid Conjugation

PsiB protein, expressed from conjugative plasmids including F and IncN, is a potent inhibitor of the SOS response (273, 274, 275, 276, 277). During conjugation the *psiB* gene is located in the leading region of DNA that is transferred allowing for early expression in the recipient cell (273). The transferred ssDNA, in principle, could be considered “excess” and results in RecA binding and SOS induction. The early expression of PsiB protein prevents induction of the SOS response. Although the mechanistic details of this inhibition remain to be elucidated, the current model postulates that PsiB interferes with RecA function (for a review, see reference 278).

RdgC Competes with RecA for Binding and Inhibits LexA Cleavage in Vitro

Recombination-dependent growth (RdgC) is a DNA binding protein that binds both single- and double-stranded DNA and prevents RecA function by competing for binding sites on DNA (279, 280). The crystal structure of the RdgC dimer suggests dsDNA binding takes place in the central hole of the ring-shaped dimer (281). Binding of RdgC has been shown in vitro to inhibit RecA-dependent cleavage of LexA (279). Genetic experiments have demonstrated that the *rdgC*⁺ gene product is required for viability in *priA* mutant strains, which are deficient for replication fork restart (282). *recF*, *recO*, or *recR* mutants alleviate the growth phenotype of a *rdgC* strain, suggesting that RdgC might function in blocking aberrant RecA loading in certain genetic backgrounds (282).

RecFOR, SSB, RecBCD, and HU Influence RecA's Access to ssDNA

An underlying theme in this section is that SOS induction is mediated by RecA filament formation. The RecFOR, SSB, and RecBCD proteins all influence SOS by affecting the accumulation of ssDNA in vivo. As mentioned above, the RecFOR proteins stimulate the loading of RecA onto ssDNA generated during replication of damaged templates (283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288). *E. coli* strains that lack RecFOR function are delayed for SOS induction (289, 290). Genetic experiments have demonstrated that these proteins are in the same epistasis group, (288) and biochemical studies have shown that RecO and RecR, or RecFOR, load RecA onto SSB-covered ssDNA in purified enzyme assays (219, 291, 292, 293).

In undamaged cells, SSB affects SOS induction by outcompeting RecA for ssDNA at the replication fork, thereby preventing SOS induction (219, 294, 295). There are approximately 7,500 to 15,000 RecA monomers in *E. coli* when the SOS response is repressed (113, 127). In log phase cultures there are approximately 7,000 SSB monomers (~1,750 tetramers), an in vivo observation suggesting that SSB must have a stronger affinity for ssDNA to allow for normal replication to proceed in undamaged cells (296). Indeed, SSB has a strong affinity for ssDNA and SSB prevents RecA binding to ssDNA in vitro (219, 291, 292, 293). It has also been shown in vitro that RecA will only displace prebound SSB from ssDNA if RecO and RecR are added to the reaction (219, 291, 292, 293, 297). In limited circumstances, SSB can aid in

RecA filamentation by removing hairpins (or other secondary structures) from ssDNA (294).

As discussed previously, the RecBCD helicase/nuclease enzyme can have a positive affect on SOS induction. *E. coli* RecBCD and *B. subtilis* AddAB are enzymes that process double-strand breaks to yield a 3' ssDNA segment that is required for RecA filament formation (215, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302).

Many bacteria, including *E. coli*, contain the histone-like protein HU. HU is a heterodimer composed of Hup α and Hup β (303, 304, 305, 306). HU is important for maintenance of DNA topology involved in several aspects of DNA metabolism, including replication initiation (307, 308). Although HU binds DNA nonspecifically, HU binds to both recombination and replication intermediates with a higher affinity than it has for B-form DNA. Strains deficient for both the *hupA* and *hupB* genes show sensitivity to both UV and ionizing radiation. There are two possible reasons for this. One report shows that HU is important for SOS induction (309). A second report has shown the possibility of a direct role for HU in DNA repair. This report describes that HU binds preferentially to AP sites and contains AP lyase activity (310). However, more experiments are required to understand mechanistically how HU contributes to SOS.

POSTTRANSLATIONAL REGULATION OF SOS-INDUCED PROTEINS

The SOS response is also regulated by posttranslational protein modification. Interestingly, some of the first insights into regulation of the SOS response by posttranslational modifications came from studies on λ prophage, which can induce its lytic cycle upon sensing ssDNA. Early work by Roberts and colleagues demonstrated that exposure of λ lysogens to UV-irradiation or mitomycin C results in a RecA-dependent cleavage of λ cI, a repressor of phage lytic genes, resulting in induction of the lytic cycle. Experiments using *recA*(Def) and λ cI(Ind⁻) strains suggested that λ cI cleavage activates expression of phage genes and that RecA acts as a regulator of the protease or was the protease itself (311). Subsequent studies established that λ cI is cleaved between the Ala¹¹¹-Gly¹¹² bond, generating two nearly equal proteolytic fragments in an ATP/ssDNA-dependent reaction (54, 312, 313, 314). This cleavage prevents the formation of a λ cI homodimers that bind to λ operator sequences because the cleavage separates the operator

binding domain and the dimer interface domain (134). These results led to the conclusion that RecA is activated for an ATP-dependent role in λ repressor cleavage when bound to ssDNA in a ternary complex. The ternary complex, the RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament, is now understood to be a coprotease required to induce and stabilize a conformational change in λ CI that brings the self-cleavage site in close proximity to the serine protease active site (315, 316).

As described earlier, SOS-controlled genes are induced when the LexA repressor undergoes an autoproteolytic cleavage event similar to that of λ repressor. Like λ repressor, the cleavage of LexA is facilitated by the RecA nucleoprotein filament on ssDNA (54, 57, 59, 64, 66, 134). Experiments using extracts from cells containing radiolabeled LexA demonstrated that the protein is cleaved nearly in half. The cleavage of the 22.7-kDa protein occurs between the Ala⁸⁴-Gly⁸⁵ bond, and the kinetics suggest a more rapid cleavage event than λ phage (54, 59). In vivo, the half-life of LexA is approximately 1

hour in uninduced cells, but cleavage begins one minute after UV exposure and is complete within 5 minutes. The in vitro kinetics of LexA cleavage is first order and is independent of protein concentration, suggesting an intramolecular reaction with respect to the homodimer (127).

The domains necessary for RecA-mediated cleavage and autodigestion are located in the C-terminal domain of LexA (Fig. 3). Indeed, crystal structure analysis of the LexA C terminus suggests that the protein exists in two states, noncleavable and cleavable (162, 317). In the noncleavable form, the cleavage site is positioned 20 Å away from the Ser-Lys dyad cleavage active site. In the cleavable conformation, the Ala⁸⁴-Gly⁸⁵ bond is positioned to participate in the autoproteolytic cleavage reaction catalyzed by the Ser-Lys dyad. In the Ser-Lys dyad model of LexA cleavage, the uncharged Lys¹⁵⁶ removes a proton from Ser¹¹⁹ creating a nucleophile to attack the Ala⁸⁴-Gly⁸⁵ bond (147, 318, 319, 320). Isolation of *lexA* (Ind^S) mutants that increase the rate of LexA cleavage




Figure 3 Structural analysis of posttranslationally modified SOS proteins reveals catalytically competent and noncompetent protein conformations. LexA (A) and UmuD (B) proteins undergo a large rearrangement from a noncleavable conformation (NC) to a cleavable conformation (C). (A) LexA crystal structures indicate that the Ala⁸⁴-Gly⁸⁵ residues (purple) can be positioned 20 Å away from Lys¹⁵⁶ (green) and Ser¹¹⁹ (orange) in the NC form (Left) to a position allowing for an autoproteolytic cleavage event in the cleavable form (Right) (162). (B) Full-length models of the noncleavable (Left) and cleavable (Center) UmuD₂ dimer. The N-terminal arms of UmuD₂ (purple) fold to present the cleavage site (C24 purple spheres) to Ser⁶⁰ (orange) and Lys⁹⁷ (green) (compare Left and Center). NMR data suggest that after the cleavage event forming UmuD'₂ (Right), the dimer undergoes a significant conformational change that consequently alters cellular activity. Adapted from *Trends in Microbiology* (323), *Molecular Cell* (162), *Nature* (324), and *DNA Repair* (325) with permission (<http://www.sciencedirect.com>).

support the existence of two LexA structural conformations in vivo (321, 322). These results suggest that the RecA nucleoprotein filament does not participate directly in the proteolysis reaction, but instead induces a conformational change favoring LexA cleavage. For this reason RecA is termed a coprotease. In addition to the coprotease activity of RecA, full induction of the SOS response is ensured by ClpXP-mediated degradation of LexA fragments, preventing repressor activity mediated by the LexA N-terminal fragment (166).

UmuD also undergoes a similar Ser–Lys dyad-catalyzed proteolysis event (Fig. 3) that regulates TLS and a DNA damage prokaryotic checkpoint (see “Bacterial cell cycle checkpoints,” below). The catalytic core of UmuD shares structural homology to LexA and forms homodimers in solution (324, 325, 326). Like LexA, the proteolysis event is catalyzed by a Ser⁶⁰–Lys⁹⁷ dyad that is within hydrogen bonding distance with the cleavage site, Cys²⁴–Gly²⁵, in the presence of the RecA coprotease (324, 327, 328). Unlike LexA, UmuD structural studies support an intermolecular reaction due to the N-terminal arms folding in such a way as to then cleave sites in close proximity to the Ser–Lys dyad of the partner in the homodimer (325). The UmuD₂ proteolysis event removes the unstructured N-terminal 24 amino acids generating UmuD'. After cleavage, the new N terminus is able to move more freely and a large conformational change occurs, presumably activating the protein for TLS (323, 324).

IDENTIFICATION OF GENES IN SOS NETWORK

To understand the breadth of *E. coli* responses to DNA damage, a genetic approach was used in a systematic search for genes induced as part of the SOS network. The Mu d1 bacteriophage (329), which generates chromosomal operon fusions to *lacZ*, was used to create a set of random transcriptional fusions. These fusion strains were screened for genes that expressed a higher level of β-galactosidase when treated with UV or mitomycin C (MMC). From this experiment a set of *din* (damage-inducible) genes were isolated (7), whose expression was not detected in genetic backgrounds containing *recA* (Def) and *lexA* (Ind[−]) alleles. Later genetic and biochemical studies showed that LexA was the direct repressor of the *din* genes (330). This technique was also used in a more directed experiment to generate fusions to genes suspected to be controlled by the SOS regulon. Such genes include *uvrA*⁺ (68), *uvrB*⁺ (12, 68), *sulA*⁺ (19),

umuDC⁺ (27), *uvrD*⁺ (331, 332), *himA*⁺ (91), *ruvA*⁺ and *ruvB*⁺ (33), *recA*⁺ (60), and *recN*⁺ (42). At the time this chapter was written, 57 genes have been shown to be repressed by LexA (Table 1).

A computational search for LexA-regulated genes was enabled by identifying a consensus sequence for the LexA box and the complete genome sequence of *E. coli* (10). In this study, LexA-regulated genes were identified by searching the *E. coli* genome for potential LexA binding sites. These LexA-regulated genes were then verified to be damage inducible, and LexA regulated in vivo. This work also showed that LexA bound several of these promoter regions in vitro (10).

While *lacZ* transcriptional fusions and computational analysis were important breakthroughs in understanding the genes that comprise the SOS response, microarrays and chromatin immunoprecipitation followed by microarray analysis (ChIP-on-chip) now serve as a high-throughput method for monitoring changes in gene expression, and promoter occupation by LexA (71, 333). One microarray analysis (71) examined changes in gene expression following UV irradiation in wild-type and *lexA*(Ind[−]) genetic backgrounds. These results confirmed the induction of known *lexA*⁺-regulated genes, and also identified 17 previously unidentified *lexA*⁺-regulated genes. In addition, genes up-regulated by a *lexA*⁺-independent mechanism and genes down-regulated in response to SOS induction were also identified. Transcripts expressed independently of LexA can be explained by downstream or secondary affects of genes regulated directly by LexA. For example, LexA may repress a gene that is required to regulate expression of a second gene. It is still unknown if transcripts down-regulated by UV irradiation occur through a *lexA*⁺-dependent or independent mechanism. Other microarray studies have examined the transcriptional response to UV and mitomycin C (175, 334).

While it has been known for many years that LexA acts as a transcriptional repressor of the SOS response, recent studies suggest that sole repression of the SOS response by LexA may be an oversimplification. The SOS regulatory system has been used to construct synthetic gene networks, and in *E. coli* some *lexA*⁺-regulated genes have been shown to have another regulatory component (335, 336). For example, the *dinB*⁺ gene is a member of the SOS regulon, which is repressed by *lexA*⁺, but its expression is also regulated by the stress response sigma factor RpoS,

thereby inducing *dinB*⁺ transcript levels in stationary phase independently of LexA (201).

Similar efforts have been made to characterize the SOS response in a variety of other bacteria (for a review, see reference 337). Microarray data show that *B. subtilis* contains a *recA*⁺/*lexA*⁺-dependent SOS system, although only 8 genes of 62 induced by the SOS have analogous counterparts in *E. coli* (338). Interestingly, studies in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* and *Myxococcus xanthus* imply both a *lexA*⁺-dependent and an uncharacterized *lexA*⁺-independent mechanism for induction of the DNA damage response (339, 340).

SINGLE-CELL ANALYSIS OF THE SOS RESPONSE

The application of fluorescent microscopy to SOS studies has demonstrated the limitations of measuring SOS induction at the population level in cultures (240, 341). For example, when β-galactosidase activity is measured in cell culture by using a *lacZ* transcriptional fusion to an SOS-regulated promoter, the results represent a population average. In such experiments, it had not been clear whether a given promoter's activity is similar in every cell or differentially expressed in subpopulations of cells (7, 127, 209). These models have been described as the “uniform expression model” or the “two-population model,” respectively (240). To determine SOS induction at the single-cell level, *gfp*⁺ was fused to the SOS-regulated *sula*⁺ promoter. GFP fluorescence was measured in a comprehensive set of genetic backgrounds that have previously been shown to result in chronic SOS induction. Analysis of these results led to the conclusion that the “two-population model” can explain most strains deficient or conditional for genes involved in DNA metabolism. The exceptions to this conclusion are strains deficient for *lexA*⁺ or *recA*⁺ because these cells are either never induced or induced constitutively giving a uniform gene expression pattern (240).

SOS MUTAGENESIS

Mutagenesis, induced by UV as well as a variety of chemical agents, is an active process (136, 154, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347). This active cellular process involves specialized DNA polymerases that are capable of inserting nucleotides opposite a misinstructional or noninstructional lesion, allowing continuation of replicative DNA synthesis. These polymerases, termed translesion DNA polymerases, are the main contributors to the process

referred to as SOS mutagenesis, error-prone repair, SOS repair, misrepair, and SOS processing. UV-induced mutagenesis can be blocked by certain *lexA* and *recA* alleles, implying a role for SOS-induced gene products in SOS mutagenesis (148, 348, 349, 350, 351).

UmuD'₂C (Pol V)-Dependent Mutagenesis

A screen for nonmutable *E. coli* strains led to the discovery of the *umuD*⁺ and *umuC*⁺ genes. *umuD*⁺ and *umuC*⁺ are located in an operon, within the SOS regulon, and encode proteins with molecular weights of 15,000 and 45,000, respectively (352, 353). UmuD protein is present at ~180 copies per uninduced *lexA*⁺ cell and ~2,400 copies per *lexA*(Def) cell (354). The levels of UmuC protein in a *lexA*(Def) background is ~200 molecules per cell and was too low to be measured under non-SOS-induced conditions (354). UmuD forms dimers, which undergo RecA-mediated autocleavage, to form UmuD'₂ homodimers. It is these UmuD'₂ homodimers that function together with UmuC to form the active version of *E. coli* TLS polymerase Pol V (UmuD'₂C). Deletion of either the *umuD*⁺ or *umuC*⁺ genes abolishes the mutagenic affect of a wide variety of agents, including UV, 4-nitroquinoline-1-oxide and methyl methanesulfonate (1, 136, 154, 346, 352, 353, 355, 356, 357, 358). Strains defective in *umuC* or *umuD*, however, retain the ability to be mutated by certain agents, including the methylating agent *N*-methyl-*N'*-nitro-*N*-nitrosoguanidine (MNNG). MNNG generates O⁶-methylguanine, which has the potential to result in direct mispairing during replication because O⁶-methylguanine can pair with either C or T. Although *umuD* or *umuC* strains are UV sensitive, it is a modest phenotype, and not nearly as sensitive as *uvr* mutants. In addition, Pol V-dependent mutagenesis requires RecA to regulate the cleavage of UmuD to UmuD' (266, 327, 328, 359, 360). Recent results have shown that two RecA molecules are important for mediating Pol V lesion bypass (361, 362). Taken together, RecA and Pol V collaborate to form a complex capable of lesion bypass. Finally, the molecular chaperones GroES and GroEL are required for Pol V-dependent UV-induced mutagenesis, possibly functioning to help stabilize UmuC by facilitating proper folding (363, 364, 365). Consistent with this conclusion, the half-life of UmuC decreases in *groE* strains (364).

DinB (Pol IV)-Dependent Mutagenesis

Another *E. coli* TLS polymerase, Pol IV, encoded by *dinB*⁺, was identified among a series of damage-inducible (*din*) genes and plays a role in SOS mutagenesis

(7). DinB has a molecular weight of 40,000, and is present at ~250 molecules per *lexA*⁺ cell and ~2,500 molecules per *lexA*(Def) cell (366). While *dinB* phenotypes have been more elusive than those of *umuDC*, *dinB*⁺ is required for λ-untargeted mutagenesis. Untargeted mutagenesis of bacteriophage λ DNA is observed when UV-irradiated *E. coli* are transfected with unirradiated λ phage (50). DinB is also important for adaptive mutagenesis. Adaptive mutagenesis has been measured by using reversion of a –1 frameshift in a *lacI lacZ* fusion. In this assay developed by Cairns and Foster (199), cells are plated on minimal lactose medium, under nonlethal selection, resulting in the appearance of *lac*⁺ revertants over several days (for a review on adaptive mutagenesis, see reference 367). Although the mechanism by which adaptive mutations occur is controversial, it is clearly DinB dependent, because *dinB* strains result in a 5- to 10-fold reduction in adaptive mutants (367). DinB activity is modulated by a host of other proteins in vivo, including RpoS, GroE, and Ppk (for a review, see reference 195a). In addition, RecA, UmuD, and UmuD' regulate DinB –1 frameshift activity based on the structure of the DNA primer terminus demonstrating a nuanced regulation of –1 frameshift activity (368). These results demonstrate that RecA, UmuD, and UmuD' act as accessory factors for Pol IV, modulating the mutagenic capability of this polymerase. Furthermore, DinB allows for resistance to N²-dG adducts including N²-furfuryl-dG (8). It was shown that DinB preferentially bypassed N²-furfuryl-dG with higher proficiency than an undamaged dG, suggesting that DinB homologs are specialized for bypass of bulky N²-dG adducts in vivo (8).

Pol II-Dependent Mutagenesis

DNA Pol II is encoded by the *polB*⁺ (or *dinA*) gene, which is damage inducible (369, 370). Pol II translesion synthesis is often accurate across from 3, N¹-ethenocytosine adducts (371) and Pol II efficiently bypasses abasic as well as interstrand cross links (372, 373). Pol II contains the 3'-5' proofreading exonuclease activity present in high-fidelity polymerases, yet Pol II can be mutagenic. A rather striking observation is that Pol II is more mutagenic at AT-rich sites than in GC-rich sites, which is unexpected for a proofreading polymerase (374). It was reasoned that Pol II has a preference for extension in AT-rich sequences owing to the higher mutation frequency (374).

Also, challenge of *E. coli* with N²-acetylaminofluorene (AAF) results in –1 and –2 frameshift mutagenesis by

both Pol II and Pol V (375). Although this review does not cover the topic of replication fork restart, it should be noted that Pol II has an established role in this process. The action of Pol II is coordinated with primosomal protein PriA and the RecFOR proteins (5, 6, 376).

BACTERIAL CELL CYCLE CHECKPOINTS

Cell cycle checkpoints have been well studied in eukaryotic organisms because of their importance in understanding cell cycle regulation and the clear links between the bypass of checkpoints and the development of cancer (377, 378, 379, 380). *E. coli* spatially regulates the cell cycle, i.e., DNA replication can occur at the one-quarter and three-quarter positions in the cell while cell division mechanisms occur at midcell (381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386). This spatial separation of cell cycle events allows for initiation of a new round of replication before the previous round has completed (387, 388). The spatial regulation also allows arrest of certain cell cycle processes, but not necessarily arrest of all cell cycle processes (268, 389). The lack of temporal cell cycle stringency has resulted in qualifying prokaryotic checkpoints as “primitive checkpoints” and “checkpoint-like” (390, 391, 392).

The purpose of checkpoints, in both eukaryotes and prokaryotes, is to maintain genomic integrity and avoid cell death by preventing the overlap of cell cycle events. The cell is particularly vulnerable to loss of genomic integrity at ssDNA regions near stalled replication forks. Furthermore, formation of the RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament results in the induction of prokaryotic checkpoints that prevent overlap of cell cycle events. The DNA damage and cell division checkpoints are regulated by the SOS response specifically by inducing the *umuDC*⁺ and *sulA*⁺ (187, 392) gene products. Like their eukaryotic counterparts, these gene products are not necessary for the cell cycle events themselves but enforce proper execution, which is especially important following DNA damage.

The SulA-Dependent DNA Damage Prokaryotic Checkpoint

Expression of the cell division inhibitor SulA (also *sfiA*⁺) is controlled by LexA and is up-regulated following DNA damage. SulA directly prevents cell division by binding to FtsZ (152, 187, 393). FtsZ, a tubulin homolog, forms a ring at midcell (Z-ring) providing a scaffold for other cell division proteins to bind to and promote cytokinesis

(188). X-ray crystallography data show that SulA binds to FtsZ as a dimer (393). This direct interaction presumably prevents FtsZ polymerization into a Z-ring, thereby acting as a prokaryotic cell division checkpoint. The block to septation results in the formation of cellular filaments, cells that continue to grow but fail to divide, and was one of the first phenotypes observed in SOS-induced cells.

The presumed purpose of the SulA-dependent checkpoint is to prevent distribution of damaged chromosomes to daughter cells. This allows sister chromosomes to be used for homologous recombination to repair double-strand breaks and to tolerate DNA lesions. In addition, SulA helps temporally to coordinate repair functions and cell division. Without proper coordination, nucleoids can be guillotined, meaning that the cell division plane closes on unsegregated chromosomes resulting in a double-strand break. This phenotype is observed in *xerCD*, *div*, *ftsK*, and *sulA* mutants (188, 239, 394, 395). As mentioned above, FtsK is an SOS-inducible, ATP-dependent DNA pump that is required for cell division and chromosome localization under normal growth conditions. However, increased resistance to UV radiation and mitomycin C exposure have been observed after overexpression of FtsK (395). The mechanism for FtsK-mediated increase in survival is not known.

The UmuDC-Dependent DNA Damage Prokaryotic Checkpoint

A model for a *umuDC*⁺-dependent prokaryotic checkpoint was proposed on the basis of studies demonstrating cold sensitivity caused by UmuDC⁺ overexpression (396, 397). UmuDC's role in this cold-sensitive growth phenotype is distinct from UmuDC's role in SOS mutagenesis (397, 398). A *umuD* missense mutation (S60A) results in a noncleavable UmuD that prevents SOS mutagenesis, but has no adverse effect on UmuDC⁺-mediated cold sensitivity (398). Subsequent experiments with *umuD* (S60A) revealed that expression of the noncleavable UmuD protein resulted in increased survival following UV irradiation and a modest decrease in DNA replication in a *uvr*⁺-dependent manner (392). The increase in UV resistance and a decrease in DNA replication occurred despite the inability of a noncleavable UmuD to participate in translesion synthesis. In addition, kinetics of UmuD cleavage to UmuD' was comparable to the kinetics of UV-induced lesion removal by UvrA, and the kinetics of cleavage was UV dose dependent.

These observations led to the *umuDC*⁺-dependent, DNA damage prokaryotic checkpoint model in which UmuD has two distinct roles. First, the UmuD₂ dimer in complex with UmuC delays the recovery of DNA replication and cell growth after DNA damage possibly by inhibiting Pol III at replication forks. This DNA damage checkpoint allows accurate repair of DNA damage before replication is attempted. If accurate repair mechanisms are insufficient, the eventual RecA-mediated cleavage of UmuD₂ to UmuD'₂ then permits UmuD'₂C (DNA Pol V) to carry out TLS over any remaining damage (392).

The *umuDC*⁺ DNA damage checkpoint model suggests that both UmuD₂C and UmuD'₂C have access to the replication fork and slow or arrest Pol III. Indeed, UmuD and UmuD' have been shown to interact with various subunits of the Pol III holoenzyme (399). Affinity chromatography has shown that UmuD₂ has a greater affinity for the β processivity clamp than does UmuD'. In contrast, UmuD' interacts more strongly than UmuD₂ with the catalytic subunit, while both proteins interact equally with the epsilon proofreading subunit. Subsequent genetic analysis demonstrated that co-overexpression of β or epsilon with UmuDC abrogated the cold-sensitive phenotype (267).

INDUCIBLE GENE EXPRESSION INDEPENDENT OF THE CLASSICAL SOS REGULON

It has become increasingly clear that many bacteria mount a robust transcriptional response to DNA damage independently of *recA*⁺ and *lexA*⁺. Although a large proportion of the DNA damage-inducible genes in *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* are regulated by *recA*⁺ and *lexA*⁺, others are not (Table 1) (71, 175, 400). In both of these organisms, many genes that lack an identifiable SOS box are expressed following challenge with DNA-damaging agents in *lexA* (Ind⁻) or *recA* strains. In *E. coli*, transcription of approximately one third of the open reading frames in the genome is altered following mitomycin C challenge (175). This could be explained by the fact that mitomycin C is not specific for DNA and it reacts with other cellular components including proteins contributing to alterations in gene expression. Other DNA-damaging agents such as UV irradiation are much more specific for DNA (401) and it is this difference that likely accounts for the gene expression data that were observed following challenge with MMC. In *B. subtilis*, the expression of 668 genes is altered following replication fork arrest with

HPUra, 500 of which are regulated by *recA*⁺ and/or *lexA*⁺ (400). Most of these 500 genes are thought to be regulated indirectly since SOS boxes are located upstream of only a subset of these genes.

DnaA protein is required for the initiation of DNA replication and it acts as a transcription factor. DnaA is an example of a transcription factor that affects gene expression in response to DNA damage and replication fork arrest independent of the *lexA* and *recA* genes. In *B. subtilis*, DnaA regulates 12 genes following treatment with mitomycin C and 57 genes following replication fork arrest with the selective replicative polymerase inhibitor HPUra (338, 400, 402).

Microarrays have been used to characterize the DNA damage response in several bacteria, including *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, *Myxococcus xanthus*, and *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus*. These studies have shown that damage-inducible gene expression, in these species, can also occur independently of the *recA*⁺ or *lexA*⁺ genes (339, 340, 403, 404). Taken together, the transcriptional response to DNA damage encompasses more than just *lexA*⁺*recA*⁺-regulated genes.

THE DNA DAMAGE RESPONSE REGULATES VIRULENCE FACTORS

In several pathogenic bacteria, mobile genetic elements encode virulence factors. In addition, many of these elements are regulated by the DNA damage response (for a review, see reference 405). In *S. aureus*, bacteriophage ϕ 11 and 80 α are under control of SOS (192, 193, 406, 407, 408, 409). Replication and transfer of these phages results in horizontal gene transfer of virulence factors (408). *Vibrio cholerae* contains SXT, an integrative conjugative element (ICE) that contains several genes encoding antibiotic resistance to chloramphenicol, trimethoprim, streptomycin, and sulfamethoxazole. Transfer of SXT is regulated by the DNA damage response (410, 411, 412, 413, 414). SXT encodes SetR, which interacts with the RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament, resulting in cleavage of SetR. SetR normally represses the expression of several activators that are required for SXT transfer. RecA/ssDNA cleavage of SetR thereby alleviates repression of the activators necessary for transfer of the element (412, 413). *V. cholerae* also encodes CTX ϕ , a temperate filamentous phage that encodes cholera toxin (415, 416). LexA cleavage through interaction with RecA/ssDNA nucleoprotein filament is required for CTX ϕ induction.

The LexA binding site overlaps with the promoter region recognized by the alpha C-terminal domain of RNA polymerase preventing gene activation (415, 417, 418).

In enteropathogenic *E. coli*, the locus of enterocyte effacement (LEE) is SOS regulated and responds to positive regulation by Ler and negative regulation by LexA (419). The LEE locus also encodes the type III secretion system responsible for secretion of virulence-associated factors into host cells. The components of the type III secretion are encoded by the divergently transcribed LEE2 and LEE3 operons contained within LEE (420). LexA occupies the divergent promoter region repressing transcription of LEE2/3 (419). Furthermore, the expression of LEE2/3 requires a cleavable LexA. These examples demonstrate that the DNA damage response regulates the dissemination of antibiotic resistance genes, genes encoding the cholera toxin, and the type III secretion system in some bacteria.

CONCLUSIONS

The SOS response in *E. coli* is a complex genetic circuit that allows cells to sense damage to their genetic material and respond with both high- and low-fidelity repair. This chapter highlights many experiments that have shaped our understanding of the SOS response in *E. coli* and other organisms. We hope that readers have gained not only an appreciation for what is known about the response, but also an appreciation for the complexity of this response and the work that has yet to be done. Two of the major challenges will be to understand how cells coordinate DNA damage recognition with DNA replication and to provide a structural basis for how protein-protein interactions contribute to regulation of the pathway. Other challenges in understanding the SOS response in *E. coli* will be to determine how the SOS response is coordinated with other physiological responses.

The analysis of SOS in other bacteria has opened an entirely new area of investigation. We think it is clear that many gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria respond to DNA damage by affecting gene expression, but the specific genes affected vary considerably from organism to organism. Detailed examination of SOS in a variety of bacterial species will add considerably to our knowledge of the mechanisms regulating SOS and the genes under SOS control. These studies will help determine how the SOS circuitry is plugged into other gene networks that allow for a given bacterium to thrive within its niche.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the tireless efforts of all the laboratories around the world that have studied the SOS response over the past 50 years. We thank John W. Foster and two anonymous reviewers for their comments that have strengthened this chapter. We also apologize to our colleagues for not being able to cite all of the papers that have contributed to our understanding of the SOS response.

This work was supported by National Cancer Institute Grant CA21615 (to G.C.W.), National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences Grant P30 ES002109 (to G.C.W.), and an American Cancer Society Research Professorship (to G.C.W.). A postdoctoral fellowship from the National Cancer Institute supported L.A.S.

No potential conflicts of interest relevant to this review were reported.

REFERENCES

- Wechsler JA, Gross JD. 1971. *Escherichia coli* mutants temperature-sensitive for DNA synthesis. *Mol Gen Genet* **113**:273–284.
- Quinones M, Kimsey HH, Waldor MK. 2005. LexA cleavage is required for CTX prophage induction. *Mol Cell* **17**:291–300.
- Becherel OJ, Fuchs RP. 2001. Mechanism of DNA polymerase II-mediated frameshift mutagenesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **98**:8566–8571.
- Fuchs JA, Neuhaard J. 1973. A mutant of *Escherichia coli* defective in ribonucleosidediphosphate reductase. 1. Isolation of the mutant as a deoxyuridine auxotroph. *Eur J Biochem* **32**:451–456.
- Rangarajan S, Gudmundsson G, Qiu Z, Foster PL, Goodman MF. 1997. *Escherichia coli* DNA polymerase II catalyzes chromosomal and episomal DNA synthesis *in vivo*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **94**:946–951.
- Rangarajan S, Woodgate R, Goodman MF. 1999. A phenotype for enigmatic DNA polymerase II: a pivotal role for pol II in replication restart in UV-irradiated *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **96**:9224–9229.
- Kenyon CJ, Brent R, Ptashne M, Walker GC. 1982. Regulation of damage-inducible genes in *Escherichia coli*. *J Mol Biol* **160**:445–457.
- Jarosz DF, Beuning PJ, Cohen SE, Walker GC. 2007. Y-family DNA polymerases in *Escherichia coli*. *Trends Microbiol* **15**:70–77.
- Kim B, Little JW. 1993. LexA and λ cI repressors as enzymes: specific cleavage in an intermolecular reaction. *J Bacteriol* **73**:1165–1173.
- Fernandez De Henestrosa AR, Ogi T, Aoyagi S, Chafin D, Hayes JJ, Ohmori H, Woodgate R. 2000. Identification of additional genes belonging to the LexA regulon in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* **35**:1560–1572.
- Horii Z, Clark AJ. 1973. Genetic analysis of the *recF* pathway to genetic recombination in *Escherichia coli* K12: isolation and characterization of mutants. *J Mol Biol* **80**:327–344.
- Fogliano M, Schendel PF. 1981. Evidence for the inducibility of the *uvrB* operon. *Nature (London)* **289**:196–198.
- Koch HK, Woodgate R. 1998. The SOS response, p 107–134. In Nickoloff JA and Hoekstra MF (ed), *DNA Damage and Repair*, vol. 1. *DNA Repair in Prokaryotes and Lower Eukaryotes*. Humana Press, Totowa, NJ.
- Vogel J, Argaman L, Wagner EG, Altuvia S. 2004. The small RNA IstR inhibits synthesis of an SOS-induced toxic peptide. *Curr Biol* **14**:2271–2276.
- Voloshin ON, Ramirez BE, Bax A, Camerini-Otero RD. 2001. A model for the abrogation of the SOS response by an SOS protein: a negatively charged helix in DinI mimics DNA in its interaction with RecA. *Genes Dev* **15**:415–427.
- Lewis LK, Harlow GR, Gregg-Jolly LA, Mount DW. 1994. Identification of high affinity binding sites for LexA which define new DNA damage-inducible genes in *Escherichia coli*. *J Mol Biol* **241**:507–523.
- Dorazi R, Dewar SJ. 2000. The SOS promoter *dinH* is essential for *fisK* transcription during cell division. *Microbiology* **146**(Pt 11):2891–2899.
- Gellert M, Mizuuchi K, O’Dea M, Itoh T, Tomizawa J-I. 1977. Nalidixic acid resistance: a second genetic character involved in DNA gyrase activity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **74**:4772–4776.
- Howard-Flanders P, Boyce RP, Theriot L. 1964. Three loci in *Escherichia coli* that control the excision of pyrimidine dimers and certain mutagenic products from DNA. *Genetics* **53**:1119–1136.
- Qiu Z, Goodman MF. 1997. The *Escherichia coli* *polB* locus is identical to *dinA*, the structural gene for DNA polymerase II. Characterization of Pol II purified from a *polB* mutant. *J Biol Chem* **272**:8611–8617.
- Voloshin ON, Camerini-Otero RD. 2007. The DinG protein from *Escherichia coli* is a structure-specific helicase. *J Biol Chem* **282**:18437–18447.
- Wuytack EY, Diels AM, Michiels CW. 2002. Bacterial inactivation by high-pressure homogenisation and high hydrostatic pressure. *Int J Food Microbiol* **77**:205–212.
- Yasuda T, Morimatsu K, Kato R, Usukura J, Takahashi M, Ohmori H. 2001. Physical interactions between DinI and RecA nucleoprotein filament for the regulation of SOS mutagenesis. *EMBO J* **20**:1192–1202.
- Napolitano R, Janel-Bintz R, Wagner J, Fuchs RP. 2000. All three SOS-inducible DNA polymerases (Pol II, Pol IV and Pol V) are involved in induced mutagenesis. *EMBO J* **19**:6259–6265.
- Pennington JM, Rosenberg SM. 2007. Spontaneous DNA breakage in single living *Escherichia coli* cells. *Nat Genet* **39**:797–802.
- Snyder M, Drlica K. 1979. DNA gyrase on the bacterial chromosome: DNA cleavage induced by oxolinic acid. *J Mol Biol* **131**:287–302.
- Bagg A, Kenyon CJ, Walker GC. 1981. Inducibility of a gene product required for UV and chemical mutagenesis in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **78**:5749–5753.
- Kim SR, Matsui K, Yamada M, Gruz P, Nohmi T. 2001. Roles of chromosomal and episomal *dinB* genes encoding DNA pol IV in targeted and untargeted mutagenesis in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Genet Genomics* **266**:207–215.
- Lobrich M, Jeggo PA. 2007. The impact of a negligent G2/M checkpoint on genomic instability and cancer induction. *Nat Rev Cancer* **7**:861–869.
- Trusca D, Scott S, Thompson C, Bramhill D. 1998. Bacterial SOS checkpoint protein Sula inhibits polymerization of purified FtsZ cell division protein. *J Bacteriol* **180**:3946–3953.
- Tsaneva IR, Illing G, Lloyd RG, West SC. 1992. Purification and properties of the RuvA and RuvB proteins of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **235**:1–10.
- Shinagawa H, Kato T, Ise T, Makino K, Nakata A. 1983. Cloning and characterization of the *umu* operon responsible for inducible mutagenesis in *Escherichia coli*. *Gene* **23**:167–174.
- Shinagawa H, Makino K, Amemura M, Kimura S, Iwasaki H, Nakata A. 1988. Structure and regulation of the *Escherichia coli* *ruv* operon involved in DNA repair and recombination. *J Bacteriol* **170**:4322–4329.

34. Baquero MR, Bouzon M, Varea J, Moreno F. 1995. *sbmC*, a stationary-phase induced SOS *Escherichia coli* gene, whose product protects cells from the DNA replication inhibitor microcin B17. *Mol Microbiol* **18**:301–311.
35. Chatterji M, Sengupta S, Nagaraja V. 2003. Chromosomally encoded gyrase inhibitor GyrI protects *Escherichia coli* against DNA-damaging agents. *Arch Microbiol* **180**:339–346.
36. Nakamura Y, Osawa T, Yura T. 1977. Chromosomal location of a structural gene for the RNA polymerase sigma factor in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **74**:1831–1835.
37. Alberts BM, Amodio FJ, Jenkins M, Gutmann ED, Ferris FL. 1968. Studies with DNA-cellulose chromatography. I. DNA-binding proteins from *Escherichia coli*. *Cold Spring Harbor Symp Quant Biol* **33**:289–305.
38. Menetski JP, Kowalczykowski SC. 1990. Biochemical properties of the *Escherichia coli* recA430 protein. Analysis of a mutation that affects the interaction of the ATP-recA protein complex with single-stranded DNA. *J Mol Biol* **211**:845–855.
39. Siegel EC. 1983. The *Escherichia coli* *uvrD* gene is inducible by DNA damage. *Mol Gen Genet* **191**:397–400.
40. Brandsma JA, Bosch D, de Ruyter M, van de Putte P. 1985. Analysis of the regulatory region of the *ssb* gene of *Escherichia coli*. *Nucleic Acids Res* **13**:5095–5109.
41. LeBowitz JH, McMacken R. 1986. The *Escherichia coli* *dnaB* replication protein is a DNA helicase. *J Biol Chem* **261**:4738–4748.
42. Livneh Z, Cohen-Fix O, Skaliter R, Elizur T. 1993. Replication of damaged DNA and the molecular mechanism of ultraviolet light mutagenesis. *CRC Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol* **28**:465–513.
43. McNally KP, Freitag NE, Walker GC. 1990. LexA independent expression of a mutant *mucAB* operon. *J Bacteriol* **172**:6223–6231.
44. Pham P, Seitz EM, Saveliev S, Shen X, Woodgate R, Cox MM, Goodman MF. 2002. Two distinct modes of RecA action are required for DNA polymerase V-catalyzed translesion synthesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **99**:11061–11066.
45. Sandler SJ, Samra HS, Clark AJ. 1996. Differential suppression of *priA2::kan* phenotypes in *Escherichia coli* K-12 by mutations in *priA*, *lexA*, and *dnaC*. *Genetics* **143**:5–13.
46. Wang T-CV, Smith KC. 1986. Postreplicational formation and repair of DNA double-strand breaks in UV-irradiated *Escherichia coli* *uvrB* cells. *Mutat Res* **165**:39–44.
47. Finch PW, Chambers P, Emmerson PT. 1985. Identification of the *E. coli* *recN* gene product as a major SOS protein. *J Bacteriol* **164**:653–658.
48. Picksley SM, Attfield PV, Lloyd RG. 1984. Repair of double-strand breaks in *Escherichia coli* requires a functional *recN* gene product. *Mol Gen Genet* **195**:267–274.
49. Blanco M, Herrera G, Collado P, Rebollo JE, Botella LM. 1982. Influence of RecA protein on induced mutagenesis. *Biochimie* **64**:633–636.
50. Brotcorne-Lannoye A, Maenhaut-Michel G. 1986. Role of RecA protein in untargeted UV mutagenesis of bacteriophage λ : evidence for the requirement for the *dinB* gene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **83**:3904–3908.
51. Cox MM, Lehman IR. 1982. RecA protein-promoted DNA strand exchange. Stable complexes of RecA protein and single-stranded DNA formed in the presence of ATP and single-stranded DNA binding protein. *J Biol Chem* **257**:8523–8532.
52. Ennis DG, Fisher B, Edmiston S, Mount DW. 1985. Dual role for *Escherichia coli* RecA protein in SOS mutagenesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **82**:3325–3329.
53. Griffith JD, Harris LD, Register J III. 1984. Visualization of SSB-ssDNA complexes active in the assembly of stable RecA-DNA filaments. *Cold Spring Harbor Symp Quant Biol* **49**:553–559.
54. Hochhut B, Beaber JW, Woodgate R, Waldor MK. 2001. Formation of chromosomal tandem arrays of the SXT element and R391, two conjugative chromosomally integrating elements that share an attachment site. *J Bacteriol* **183**:1124–1132.
55. Kowalczykowski SC, Krupp RA. 1987. Effects of *Escherichia coli* SSB protein on the single-stranded DNA-dependent ATPase activity of *Escherichia coli* RecA protein. Evidence that SSB protein facilitates the binding of RecA protein to regions of secondary structure within single-stranded DNA. *J Mol Biol* **193**:97–113.
56. Lin LL, Little JW. 1988. Isolation and characterization of non-cleavable (Ind⁻) mutants of the LexA repressor of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Bacteriol* **170**:2163–2173.
57. Little JW. 1983. The SOS regulatory system: control of its state by the level of *recA* protease. *J Mol Biol* **167**:791–808.
58. Little JW, Kim B, Roland KL, Smith MH, Lin LL, Sliaty SN. 1994. Cleavage of LexA repressor. *Methods Enzymol* **244**:266–284.
59. Little JW, Mount DW. 1982. The SOS regulatory system of *Escherichia coli*. *Cell* **29**:11–22.
60. Casaregola S, D'Ari R, Huisman O. 1982. Quantitative evaluation of *recA* gene expression in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **185**:430–439.
61. Nurse P, Zavitz K, Mariani K. 1991. Inactivation of the *Escherichia coli* PriA DNA replication protein induces the SOS response. *J Bacteriol* **173**:6686–6693.
62. Maiques E, Ubeda C, Tormo MA, Ferrer MD, Lasa I, Novick RP, Penades JR. 2007. Role of staphylococcal phage and SaPI integrase in intra- and interspecies SaPI transfer. *J Bacteriol* **189**:5608–5616.
63. Brent R. 1982. Regulation and autoregulation by *lexA* protein. *Biochimie* **64**:565–569.
64. Brent R, Ptashne M. 1980. The *lexA* gene product represses its own promoter. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **77**:1932–1936.
65. Galletto R, Amitani I, Baskin RJ, Kowalczykowski SC. 2006. Direct observation of individual RecA filaments assembling on single DNA molecules. *Nature* **443**:875–878.
66. Little JW, Edmiston SH, Pacelli Z, Mount DW. 1980. Cleavage of the *Escherichia coli* *lexA* protein by the *recA* protease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **77**:3225–3229.
67. Mohana-Borges R, Pacheco AB, Sousa FJ, Foguel D, Almeida DF, Silva JL. 2000. LexA repressor forms stable dimers in solution. The role of specific DNA in tightening protein-protein interactions. *J Biol Chem* **275**:4708–4712.
68. Kenyon CJ, Walker GC. 1980. DNA-damaging agents stimulate gene expression at specific loci in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **77**:2819–2823.
69. Villaverde A, Barbe J. 1992. SOS system induction in *Escherichia coli* cells with distinct levels of ribonucleotide reductase activity. *Mutat Res* **281**:137–141.
70. Daley DO, Rapp M, Granseth E, Melen K, Drew D, von Heijne G. 2005. Global topology analysis of the *Escherichia coli* inner membrane proteome. *Science* **308**:1321–1323.
71. Courcelle J, Khodursky A, Peter B, Brown PO, Hanawalt PC. 2001. Comparative gene expression profiles following UV exposure in wild-type and SOS-deficient *Escherichia coli*. *Genetics* **158**:41–64.
72. Barondess JJ, Beckwith J. 1990. A bacterial virulence determinant encoded by lysogenic coliphage lambda. *Nature* **346**:871–874.

73. Barondess JJ, Beckwith J. 1995. *bor* gene of phage lambda, involved in serum resistance, encodes a widely conserved outer membrane lipoprotein. *J Bacteriol* **177**:1247–1253.
74. Prasad TK, Yeykal CC, Greene EC. 2006. Visualizing the assembly of human Rad51 filaments on double-stranded DNA. *J Mol Biol* **363**:713–728.
75. George J, Devoret R, Radman M. 1974. Indirect ultraviolet-reactivation of phage lambda. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **71**:144–147.
76. Goranov AI, Kuester-Schoeck E, Wang JD, Grossman AD. 2006. Characterization of the global transcriptional responses to different types of DNA damage and disruption of replication in *Bacillus subtilis*. *J Bacteriol* **188**:5595–5605.
77. Witkin EM, McCall JO, Volkert MR, Wermundsen IE. 1982. Constitutive expression of SOS functions and modulation of mutagenesis resulting from resolution of genetic instability at or near the *recA* locus of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **185**:43–50.
78. Krasin F, Hutchinson F. 1977. Repair of DNA double-strand breaks in *Escherichia coli*, which requires RecA function and the presence of a duplicate genome. *J Mol Biol* **116**:81–98.
79. Peterson KR, Mount DW. 1993. Analysis of the genetic requirements for viability of *Escherichia coli* K-12 DNA adenine methylase (*dam*) mutants. *J Bacteriol* **175**:7505–758.
80. Wang Z, Lazarov E, O'Donnell M, Goodman MF. 2002. Resolving a fidelity paradox: why *Escherichia coli* DNA polymerase II makes more base substitution errors in AT-compared with GC-rich DNA. *J Biol Chem* **277**:4446–4454.
81. Quillardet P, Rouffaud MA, Bouige P. 2003. DNA array analysis of gene expression in response to UV irradiation in *Escherichia coli*. *Res Microbiol* **154**:559–572.
82. Layton JC, Foster PL. 2003. Error-prone DNA polymerase IV is controlled by the stress-response sigma factor, RpoS, in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* **50**:549–561.
83. Kitagawa Y, Akaboshi E, Shinagawa H, Horii T, Ogawa H, Kato T. 1985. Structural analysis of the *umu* operon required for inducible mutagenesis in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **82**:4336–4340.
84. Joo C, McKinney SA, Nakamura M, Rasnik I, Myong S, Ha T. 2006. Real-time observation of RecA filament dynamics with single monomer resolution. *Cell* **126**:515–527.
85. Egan SE, Fliege R, Tong S, Shibata A, Wolf RE Jr, Conway T. 1992. Molecular characterization of the Entner-Doudoroff pathway in *Escherichia coli*: sequence analysis and localization of promoters for the *edd-eda* operon. *J Bacteriol* **174**:4638–4646.
86. Papavinasundaram KG, Movahedzadeh F, Keer JT, Stoker NG, Colston MJ, Davis EO. 1997. Mycobacterial *recA* is cotranscribed with a potential regulatory gene called *recX*. *Mol Microbiol* **24**:141–153.
87. Cayrol C, Petit C, Raynaud B, Capdevielle J, Guillemot JC, Defais M. 1995. Recovery of respiration following the SOS response of *Escherichia coli* requires RecA-mediated induction of 2-keto-4-hydroxyglutarate aldolase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **92**:11806–11809.
88. Miller C, Thomsen LE, Gaggero C, Mosseri R, Ingmer H, Cohen SN. 2004. SOS response induction by beta-lactams and bacterial defense against antibiotic lethality. *Science* **305**:1629–1631.
89. Miller HI, Friedman DI. 1980. An *E. coli* gene product required for lambda site-specific recombination. *Cell* **20**:711–719.
90. Miller HI, Kirk M, Echols H. 1981. SOS induction and auto-regulation of the *himA* gene for site-specific recombination in *E. coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **78**:6754–6758.
91. Miller HI, Kikuchi A, Nash HA, Weisberg RA, Friedman DI. 1979. Site-specific recombination of bacteriophage lambda: the role of host gene products. *Cold Spring Harbor Symp Quant Biol* **43**(Pt 2):1121–1126.
92. Friedberg EC, Walker GC, Siede W, Wood RD, Schultz RA, Ellenberger T. 2005. *DNA Repair and Mutagenesis*, 2nd ed. ASM Press, Washington, DC.
93. Fuchs JA. 1977. Coordinate control of the synthesis of ribonucleoside diphosphate reductase components in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **130**:957–959.
94. Fuchs JA, Karlstrom HO. 1976. Mapping of *nrdA* and *nrdB* in *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Bacteriol* **128**:810–814.
95. Fuchs JA, Karlstrom HO. 1973. A mutant of *Escherichia coli* defective in ribonucleosidediphosphate reductase. 2. Characterization of the enzymatic defect. *Eur J Biochem* **32**:457–462.
96. Fuchs JA, Karlstrom HO, Warner HR, Reichard P. 1972. Defective gene product in *dnaF* mutant of *Escherichia coli*. *Nat New Biol* **238**:69–71.
97. Georgiou T, Yu YN, Ekuwe S, Buttner MJ, Zuurmond A, Kraal B, Kleanthous C, Snyder L. 1998. Specific peptide-activated proteolytic cleavage of *Escherichia coli* elongation factor Tu. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **95**:2891–2895.
98. Sancar GB, Sancar A, Little JW, Rupp WD. 1982. The *uvrB* gene of *Escherichia coli* has both *lexA*-repressed and *lexA*-independent promoters. *Cell* **28**:523–530.
99. Hurstel S, Granger-Schnarr M, Schnarr M. 1988. Contacts between the LexA repressor—or its DNA binding domain—and the backbone of the *recA* operator. *EMBO J* **7**:269–275.
100. Patterson MF, Kilpatrick DJ. 1998. The combined effect of high hydrostatic pressure and mild heat on inactivation of pathogens in milk and poultry. *J Food Prot* **61**:432–436.
101. Roberts JW, Roberts CW. 1975. Proteolytic cleavage of bacteriophage lambda repressor in induction. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **72**:147–151.
102. Schuldiner S, Agmon V, Brandsma J, Cohen A, Friedman E, Padan E. 1986. Induction of SOS functions by alkaline intracellular pH in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **168**:936–939.
103. Yasuda T, Nagata T, Ohmori H. 1996. Multicopy suppressors of the cold-sensitive phenotype of the *pcsA68* (*dinD68*) mutation in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **178**:3854–3859.
104. Yoo SJ, Seol JH, Kang MS, Chung CH. 1996. Poly-L-lysine activates both peptide and ATP hydrolysis by the ATP-dependent HslVU protease in *Escherichia coli*. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* **229**:531–535.
105. Fath MJ, Mahanty HK, Kolter R. 1989. Characterization of a *purF* operon mutation which affects colicin V production. *J Bacteriol* **171**:3158–3161.
106. Roland KL, Smith MH, Rupley JA, Little JW. 1992. *In vitro* analysis of mutant LexA proteins with an increased rate of specific cleavage. *J Mol Biol* **228**:395–408.
107. Rolfes RJ, Zalkin H. 1988. *Escherichia coli* gene *purR* encoding a repressor protein for purine nucleotide synthesis. Cloning, nucleotide sequence, and interaction with the *purF* operator. *J Biol Chem* **263**:19653–19661.
108. Andersen PS, Smith JM, Mygind B. 1992. Characterization of the *upp* gene encoding uracil phosphoribosyltransferase of *Escherichia coli* K12. *Eur J Biochem* **204**:51–56.
109. Murli S, Walker GC. 1993. SOS mutagenesis. *Curr Opin Genet Dev* **3**:719–725.

110. Benz EW Jr, Reinberg D, Vicuna R, Hurwitz J. 1980. Initiation of DNA replication by the *dnaG* protein. *J Biol Chem* **255**:1096–106.
111. Simmons LA, Grossman AD, Walker GC. 2007. Replication is required for the RecA localization response to DNA damage in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**:1360–1365.
112. Dabbs ER. 1980. The gene for ribosomal protein S21, *rpsU*, maps close to *dnaG* at 66.5 min on the *Escherichia coli* chromosomal linkage map. *J Bacteriol* **144**:603–607.
113. Steinborn G. 1978. Uvm mutants of *Escherichia coli* K12 deficient in UV mutagenesis. I. Isolation of *uvm* mutants and their phenotypical characterization in DNA repair and mutagenesis. *Mol Gen Genet* **165**:87–93.
114. Umezū K, Kolodner RD. 1994. Protein interactions in genetic recombination in *Escherichia coli*. Interactions involving RecO and RecR overcome the inhibition of RecA by single-stranded DNA-binding protein. *J Biol Chem* **269**:30005–30013.
115. Imlay JA, Linn S. 1987. Mutagenesis and stress responses induced in *Escherichia coli* by hydrogen peroxide. *J Bacteriol* **169**:2967–2976.
116. D'Ari R, Huisman O. 1983. Novel mechanism of cell division inhibition associated with the SOS response in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **156**:243–250.
117. Aksenov SV. 1999. Dynamics of the inducing signal for the SOS regulatory system in *Escherichia coli* after ultraviolet irradiation. *Math Biosci* **157**:269–286.
118. Brent R, Ptashne M. 1981. Mechanism of action of the *lexA* gene product. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **78**:4204–4208.
119. Calsou P, Villaverde A, Defais M. 1987. Activated RecA protein may induce expression of a gene that is not controlled by the LexA repressor and whose function is required for mutagenesis and repair of UV-irradiated bacteriophage lambda. *J Bacteriol* **169**:4816–4821.
120. DiCapua E, Cuillel M, Hewat E, Schnarr M, Timmins PA, Ruigrok RW. 1992. Activation of *recA* protein. The open helix model for LexA cleavage. *J Mol Biol* **226**:707–719.
121. Kobayashi H, Kaern M, Araki M, Chung K, Gardner TS, Cantor CR, Collins JJ. 2004. Programmable cells: interfacing natural and engineered gene networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **101**:8414–8419.
122. Little J. 1991. Mechanism of specific LexA cleavage: auto-digestion and the role of RecA coprotease. *Biochimie* **73**:411–422.
123. Adams RL, Burdon RH, MacKinnon K, Rinaldi A. 1983. Stimulation of *de novo* methylation following limited proteolysis of mouse ascites DNA methylase. *FEBS Lett* **163**:194–198.
124. Berg O. 1988. Selection of DNA binding sites by regulatory proteins: the LexA protein and the arginine repressor use different strategies for functional specificity. *Nucleic Acids Res* **16**:5089–5105.
125. Bertrand-Burggraf E, Hurstel S, Daune M, Schnarr M. 1987. Promoter properties and negative regulation of the *uvrA* gene by the LexA repressor and its amino-terminal DNA binding domain. *J Mol Biol* **193**:293–302.
126. Huisman O, D'Ari R. 1981. An inducible DNA replication-cell division coupling mechanism in *E. coli* *Nature (London)* **290**:797–799.
127. Sargentini NJ, Smith KC. 1986. Quantitation of the involvement of the *recA*, *recB*, *recC*, *recF*, *recJ*, *recN*, *lexA*, *radA*, *radB*, *uvrD*, and *umuC* genes in the repair of X-ray-induced DNA double-strand breaks in *Escherichia coli*. *Radiat Res* **107**:58–72.
128. Dutreix M, Burnett B, Bailone A, Radding CM, Devoret R. 1992. A partially deficient mutant, *recA1730*, that fails to form normal nucleoprotein filaments. *Mol Gen Genet* **232**:489–497.
129. Greenberg J, Donch J, Berends L. 1975. The dominance of *exrB* over *exrB⁺*. *Genet Res* **25**:39–44.
130. Sigal N, Delius H, Kornberg T, Gefter ML, Alberts B. 1972. A DNA-unwinding protein isolated from *Escherichia coli*: its interaction with DNA and with DNA polymerases. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **69**:3537–3541.
131. Yu X, Egelman EH. 1993. The LexA repressor binds within the deep helical groove of the activated RecA filament. *J Mol Biol* **231**:29–40.
132. Hurstel S, Granger-Schnarr M, Daune M, Schnarr M. 1986. *In vitro* binding of LexA repressor to DNA: evidence for the involvement of the amino-terminal domain. *EMBO J* **5**:793–798.
133. Little JW, Harper JE. 1979. Identification of the *lexA* gene product of *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **76**:6147–6151.
134. Little JW, Kleid DG. 1977. *Escherichia coli* protein X is the *recA* gene product. *J Biol Chem* **252**:6251–6252.
135. Morimatsu K, Kowalczykowski SC. 2003. RecFOR proteins load RecA protein onto gapped DNA to accelerate DNA strand exchange. A universal step of recombinational repair. *Mol Cell* **11**:1337–1347.
136. Witkin EM. 1974. Thermal enhancement of ultraviolet mutability in a *tif-1 uvrA* derivative of *Escherichia coli* B/r: evidence that ultraviolet mutagenesis depends upon an inducible function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **71**:1930–1934.
137. Kleinsteuber S, Quinones A. 1995. Expression of the *dnaB* gene of *Escherichia coli* is inducible by replication-blocking DNA damage in a *recA*-independent manner. *Mol Gen Genet* **248**:695–702.
138. Witkin EM. 1976. Ultraviolet mutagenesis and inducible DNA repair in *Escherichia coli*. *Bacteriol Rev* **40**:869–907.
139. Castellazzi M, George J, Buttin G. 1972. Prophage induction and cell division in *E. coli* I Further characterization of the thermo-sensitive mutation *tif-1* whose expression mimics the effects of UV irradiation. *Mol Gen Genet* **119**:139–152.
140. Lau IF, Filipe SR, Soballe B, Okstad OA, Barre FX, Sherratt DJ. 2003. Spatial and temporal organization of replicating *Escherichia coli* chromosomes. *Mol Microbiol* **49**:731–743.
141. Lusetti SL, Hobbs MD, Stohl EA, Chitteni-Pattu S, Inman RB, Seifert HS, Cox MM. 2006. The RecF protein antagonizes RecX function via direct interaction. *Mol Cell* **21**:41–50.
142. Madiraju MV, Clark AJ. 1990. Use of *recA803*, a partial suppressor of *recF*, to analyze the effects of the mutant *ssb* (single-stranded DNA-binding) proteins *in vivo* and *in vitro*. *Mol Gen Genet* **224**:129–135.
143. Devoret R, Pierre M, Moreau PL. 1983. Prophage $\phi 80$ is induced in *Escherichia coli* K12 *recA430*. *Mol Gen Genet* **189**:199–206.
144. Mellies JL, Haack KR, Galligan DC. 2007. SOS regulation of the type III secretion system of enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **189**:2863–2872.
145. McCool JD, Long E, Petrosino JF, Sandler HA, Rosenberg SM, Sandler SJ. 2004. Measurement of SOS expression in individual *Escherichia coli* K-12 cells using fluorescence microscopy. *Mol Microbiol* **53**:1343–1357.
146. Grambow NJ, Birkeland NK, Anders DL, Christie GE. 1990. Deletion analysis of a bacteriophage P2 late promoter. *Gene* **95**:9–15.
147. Lin L, Little JW. 1989. Autodigestion and RecA-dependent cleavage of Ind⁻ mutant LexA proteins. *J Mol Biol* **210**:439–452.
148. Mount DW. 1971. Isolation and genetic analysis of a strain of *Escherichia coli* K-12 with an amber *recA* mutation. *J Bacteriol* **107**:388–389.

149. Calsou P, Defais M. 1985. Weigle reactivation and mutagenesis of bacteriophage λ in *lexA* (Def) mutants of *E. coli* K12 *Mol Gen Genet* **201**:329–333.
150. Mount DW, Low KB, Edmiston S. 1972. Dominant mutations (*lex*) in *Escherichia coli* K-12 which affect radiation sensitivity and frequency of ultraviolet light-induced mutations. *J Bacteriol* **112**:886–893.
151. Cole ST. 1983. Characterization of the promoter for the *LexA* regulated *sulA* gene of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **189**:400–404.
152. Bi E, Lutkenhaus J. 1993. Cell division inhibitors *SulA* and *MinCD* prevent formation of the *FtsZ* ring. *J Bacteriol* **175**:1118–1125.
153. Kato T, Shinoura Y. 1977. Isolation and characterization of mutants of *Escherichia coli* deficient in induction of mutations by ultraviolet light. *Mol Gen Genet* **156**:121–131.
154. Foti JJ, Schienda J, Sutura VA Jr, Lovett ST. 2005. A bacterial G protein-mediated response to replication arrest. *Mol Cell* **17**:549–560.
155. Salles B, Defais M. 1984. Signal of induction of *recA* protein in *E. coli* *Mutat Res* **131**:53–59.
156. Sancar A, Sancar GB, Rupp WD, Little JW, Mount DW. 1982. *LexA* protein inhibits transcription of the *E. coli* *uvrA* gene *in vitro*. *Nature (London)* **298**:96–98.
157. Schnarr M, Granger-Schnarr M, Hurstel S, Pouyet J. 1988. The carboxy-terminal domain of the *LexA* repressor oligomerises essentially as the entire protein. *FEBS Lett* **234**:56–60.
158. Clark AJ. 1982. *RecA* operator mutations and their usefulness. *Biochimie* **64**:669–675.
159. McKenzie GJ, Harris RS, Lee PL, Rosenberg SM. 2000. The SOS response regulates adaptive mutation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **97**:6646–6651.
160. Weiss DS. 2004. Bacterial cell division and the septal ring. *Mol Microbiol* **54**:588–597.
161. Wertman KF, Little JW, Mount DW. 1984. Rapid mutational analysis of regulatory loci in *Escherichia coli* K-12 using bacteriophage M13. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **81**:3801–3805.
162. Lombardo MJ, Aponyi I, Rosenberg SM. 2004. General stress response regulator *RpoS* in adaptive mutation and amplification in *Escherichia coli*. *Genetics* **166**:669–680.
163. Kidane D, Graumann PL. 2005. Dynamic formation of *RecA* filaments at DNA double strand break repair centers in live cells. *J Cell Biol* **170**:357–366.
164. Miyabe I, Zhang QM, Kano Y, Yonei S. 2000. Histone-like protein HU is required for *recA* gene-dependent DNA repair and SOS induction pathways in UV-irradiated *Escherichia coli*. *Int J Radiat Biol* **76**:43–49.
165. Schlacher K, Leslie K, Wyman C, Woodgate R, Cox MM, Goodman MF. 2005. DNA polymerase V and *RecA* protein, a minimal mutasome. *Mol Cell* **17**:561–572.
166. Ndjonka D, Bell CE. 2006. Structure of a hyper-cleavable monomeric fragment of phage lambda repressor containing the cleavage site region. *J Mol Biol* **362**:479–489.
167. Barbe J, Villaverde A, Guerrero R. 1987. Induction of the SOS response by hydroxyurea in *Escherichia coli* K12. *Mutat Res* **192**:105–108.
168. Gardner TS, di Bernardo D, Lorenz D, Collins JJ. 2003. Inferring genetic networks and identifying compound mode of action via expression profiling. *Science* **301**:102–105.
169. Goerke C, Koller J, Wolz C. 2006. Ciprofloxacin and trimethoprim cause phage induction and virulence modulation in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **50**:171–177.
170. Goerlich O, Quillardet P, Hofnung M. 1989. Induction of the SOS response by hydrogen peroxide in various *Escherichia coli* mutants with altered protection against oxidative DNA damage. *J Bacteriol* **171**:6141–6147.
171. Ihara M, Yamamoto K, Ohnishi T. 1987. Induction of *phr* gene expression by irradiation of ultraviolet light in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **209**:200–202.
172. Nohmi T, Battista JR, Dodson LA, Walker GC. 1988. *RecA*-mediated cleavage activates *UmuD* for mutagenesis: mechanistic relationship between transcriptional derepression and posttranslational activation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **85**:1816–1820.
173. Shan Q, Bork JM, Webb BL, Inman RB, Cox MM. 1997. *RecA* protein filaments: end-dependent dissociation from ssDNA and stabilization by *RecO* and *RecR* proteins. *J Mol Biol* **265**:519–540.
174. Story RM, Weber IT, Steitz TA. 1992. The structure of the *E. coli* *recA* protein monomer and polymer. *Nature (London)* **355**:318–325.
175. Kenyon CJ, Walker GC. 1981. Expression of the *E. coli* *uvrA* gene is inducible. *Nature (London)* **289**:808–810.
176. Aertsen A, Van Houdt R, Vanoirbeek K, Michiels CW. 2004. An SOS response induced by high pressure in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **186**:6133–6141.
177. Aertsen A, Michiels CW. 2005. *Mrr* instigates the SOS response after high pressure stress in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* **58**:1381–1391.
178. Alpa H, Kalchayanand N, Bozoglu F, Ray B. 2000. Interactions of high hydrostatic pressure, pressurization temperature and pH on death and injury of pressure-resistant and pressure-sensitive strains of foodborne pathogens. *Int J Food Microbiol* **60**:33–42.
179. Cheftel JC. 1995. High-pressure, microbial inactivation and food preservation. *Food Sci Technol Int* **1**:75–90. (In French.)
180. Ganesan AK, Seawell PC. 1975. The effect of *lexA* and *recF* mutations on post-replication repair and DNA synthesis in *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Mol Gen Genet* **141**:189–205.
181. Mukherjee A, Cao C, Lutkenhaus J. 1998. Inhibition of *FtsZ* polymerization by *SulA*, an inhibitor of septation in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **95**:2885–2890.
182. Patil RV, Dekker EE. 1992. Cloning, nucleotide sequence, overexpression, and inactivation of the *Escherichia coli* 2-keto-4-hydroxyglutarate aldolase gene. *J Bacteriol* **174**:102–107.
183. Woodgate R, Ennis DG. 1991. Levels of chromosomally encoded *Umu* proteins and requirements for *in vivo* *UmuD* cleavage. *Mol Gen Genet* **229**:10–16.
184. Meyer RR, Glassberg J, Kornberg A. 1979. An *Escherichia coli* mutant defective in single-stranded binding protein is defective in DNA replication. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **76**:1702–1705.
185. Miller C, Ingmer H, Thomsen LE, Skarstad K, Cohen SN. 2003. *DpiA* binding to the replication origin of *Escherichia coli* plasmids and chromosomes destabilizes plasmid inheritance and induces the bacterial SOS response. *J Bacteriol* **185**:6025–6031.
186. Mount DW, Walker AC, Kosel C. 1973. Suppression of *lex* mutations affecting deoxyribonucleic acid repair in *Escherichia coli* K-12 by closely linked thermosensitive mutations. *J Bacteriol* **116**:950–956.
187. Sweasy JB, Chen M, Loeb LA. 1995. DNA polymerase beta can substitute for DNA polymerase I in the initiation of plasmid DNA replication. *J Bacteriol* **177**:2923–2925.

- 188. Weigle JJ.** 1953. Induction of mutation in a bacterial virus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **39**:628–636.
- 189. Blazquez J, Gomez-Gomez JM, Oliver A, Juan C, Kapur V, Martin S.** 2006. PBP3 inhibition elicits adaptive responses in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Mol Microbiol* **62**:84–99.
- 190. Cirz RT, Jones MB, Gingles NA, Minogue TD, Jarrahi B, Peterson SN, Romesberg FE.** 2007. Complete and SOS-mediated response of *Staphylococcus aureus* to the antibiotic ciprofloxacin. *J Bacteriol* **189**:531–539.
- 191. Cirz RT, O'Neill BM, Hammond JA, Head SR, Romesberg FE.** 2006. Defining the *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* SOS response and its role in the global response to the antibiotic ciprofloxacin. *J Bacteriol* **188**:7101–7110.
- 192. Madiraju MV, Templin A, Clark AJ.** 1988. Properties of a mutant *recA*-encoded protein reveal a possible role for *Escherichia coli recF*-encoded protein in genetic recombination. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **85**:6592–6596.
- 193. Ubeda C, Barry P, Penades JR, Novick RP.** 2007. A pathogenicity island replicon in *Staphylococcus aureus* replicates as an unstable plasmid. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**:14182–14188.
- 194. Foster PL.** 2004. Adaptive mutation in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **186**:4846–4852.
- 195. Foster PL.** 2004. Rebuttal: adaptive point mutation (Rosenberg and Hastings). *J Bacteriol* **186**:4845.
- 196. Rolfes RJ, Zalkin H.** 1988. Regulation of *Escherichia coli purF*. Mutations that define the promoter, operator, and purine repressor gene. *J Biol Chem* **263**:19649–19652.
- 197. Rosenberg SM.** 2001. Evolving responsively: adaptive mutation. *Nat Rev Genet* **2**:504–515.
- 198. Rosner JL, Kass LR, Yarmolinsky MB.** 1968. Parallel behavior of F and Pl in causing indirect induction of lysogenic bacteria. *Cold Spring Harbor Symp Quant Biol* **33**:785–789.
- 199. Cairns J, Foster PL.** 1991. Adaptive reversion of a frameshift mutation in *Escherichia coli*. *Genetics* **128**:695–701.
- 200. McGrew DA, Knight KL.** 2003. Molecular design and functional organization of the RecA protein. *Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol* **38**:385–432.
- 201. Lavery PE, Kowalczykowski SC.** 1990. Properties of *recA441* protein-catalyzed DNA strand exchange can be attributed to an enhanced ability to compete with SSB protein. *J Biol Chem* **265**:4004–4010.
- 202. Lomba MR, Vasconcelos AT, Pacheco AB, de Almeida DF.** 1997. Identification of *yebG* as a DNA damage-inducible *Escherichia coli* gene. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **156**:119–122.
- 203. Iusupova DV, Sokolova RV, Porfir'eva OV, Ponomareva AZ.** 1991. Induction of intracellular endonuclease synthesis in *Serratia marcescens* by agents suppressing DNA replication. *Mikrobiologiya* **60**:279–284.
- 204. Ossanna N, Mount DW.** 1989. Mutations in *uvrD* induce the SOS response in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **171**:303–307.
- 205. Padan E, Schuldiner S.** 1986. Intracellular pH regulation in bacterial cells. *Methods Enzymol* **125**:337–352.
- 206. Schnarr M, Oertel-Buchheit P, Kazmaier M, Granger-Schnarr M.** 1991. DNA binding properties of the LexA repressor. *Biochimie* **73**:423–431.
- 207. Dri A-M, Moreau PL.** 1994. Control of the LexA regulon by pH: evidence for a reversible inactivation of the LexA repressor during the growth cycle of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* **12**:621–629.
- 208. Sommer S, Knezevic J, Bailone A, Devoret R.** 1993. Induction of only one SOS operon, *umuDC*, is required for SOS mutagenesis in *E. coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **239**:137–144.
- 209. Ryder L, Sharples GJ, Lloyd RG.** 1996. Recombination-dependent growth in exonuclease-depleted *recBC sbcBC* strains of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Genetics* **143**:1101–1114.
- 210. Peat TS, Frank EG, McDonald JP, Levine AS, Woodgate R, Hendrickson WA.** 1996. Structure of the UmuD' protein and its regulation in response to DNA damage. *Nature* **380**:727–730.
- 211. Drlica K, Engle EC, Manes SH.** 1980. DNA gyrase on the bacterial chromosome: possibility of two levels of action. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **77**:6879–6883.
- 212. Smith M, Cavanaugh MM, Little JW.** 1991. Mutant LexA proteins with an increased rate of *in vivo* cleavage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **88**:7356–7360.
- 213. Gudas LJ, Mount DW.** 1977. Identification of the *recA(tif)* gene product of *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **74**:5280–5284.
- 214. Kanuri M, Nechev LV, Kiehna SE, Tamura PJ, Harris CM, Harris TM, Lloyd RS.** 2005. Evidence for *Escherichia coli* polymerase II mutagenic bypass of intrastrand DNA crosslinks. *DNA Repair (Amst.)* **4**:1374–1380.
- 215. Sims J, Benz EW Jr.** 1980. Initiation of DNA replication by the *Escherichia coli dnaG* protein: evidence that tertiary structure is involved. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **77**:900–904.
- 216. Anderson DG, Kowalczykowski SC.** 1998. Reconstitution of an SOS response pathway derepression of transcription in response to DNA breaks. *Cell* **95**:975–979.
- 217. Courcelle J, Donaldson JR, Chow KH, Courcelle CT.** 2003. DNA damage-induced replication fork regression and processing in *Escherichia coli*. *Science* **299**:1064–1067.
- 218. Tsaneva IR, Muller B, West SC.** 1992. ATP-dependent branch migration of Holliday junctions promoted by the RuvA and RuvB proteins of *E. coli*. *Cell* **69**:1171–1180.
- 219. Bork JM, Cox MM, Inman RB.** 2001. The RecOR proteins modulate RecA protein function at 5' ends of single-stranded DNA. *EMBO J* **20**:7313–7322.
- 220. Moore T, McGlynn P, Ngo HP, Sharples GJ, Lloyd RG.** 2003. The RdcC protein of *Escherichia coli* binds DNA and counters a toxic effect of RecFOR in strains lacking the replication restart protein PriA. *EMBO J* **22**:735–745.
- 221. Courcelle J, Hanawalt PC.** 1999. RecQ and RecJ process blocked replication forks prior to the resumption of replication in UV-irradiated *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **262**:543–551.
- 222. Hersh MN, Ponder RG, Hastings PJ, Rosenberg SM.** 2004. Adaptive mutation and amplification in *Escherichia coli*: two pathways of genome adaptation under stress. *Res Microbiol* **155**:352–359.
- 223. Borek E, Ryan A.** 1973. Lysogenic induction. *Prog Nucleic Acid Res Mol Biol* **13**:249–300.
- 224. Borek E, Ryan A.** 1958. The transfer of irradiation-elicited induction in a lysogenic organism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **44**:374–377.
- 225. D'Ari R, Huisman O.** 1982. DNA replication and indirect induction of the SOS response in *Escherichia coli*. *Biochimie* **64**:623–627.
- 226. Devoret R, George J.** 1967. Induction indirecte du prophage lambda par le rayonnement ultraviolet. *Mutat Res* **4**:713–714.
- 227. George J, Castellazzi M, Buttin G.** 1975. Prophage induction and cell division in *E. coli*. III. Mutations *sfiA* and *sfiB* restore division

- in *tif* and *lon* strains and permit the expression of mutator properties of *tif*. *Mol Gen Genet* **140**:309–332.
228. Rosenberg SM, Hastings PJ. 2004. Rebuttal: adaptive mutation in *Escherichia coli* (Foster). *J Bacteriol* **186**:4853.
229. Lloyd RG, Picksley SM, Prescott C. 1983. Inducible expression of a gene specific to the *recF* pathway for recombination in *Escherichia coli* K12. *Mol Gen Genet* **190**:162–167.
230. Perry KL, Elledge SJ, Mitchell B, Marsh L, Walker GC. 1985. *umuDC* and *mucAB* operons whose products are required for UV light- and chemical-induced mutagenesis: UmuD, MucA, and LexA proteins share homology. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **82**:4331–4335.
231. Lewis LK, Jenkins ME, Mount DW. 1992. Isolation of DNA-damage inducible promoters in *E. coli*: regulation of *polB* (*dinA*), *dinG*, and *dinH* by LexA repressor. *J Bacteriol* **174**:3377–3385.
232. Singleton MR, Dillingham MS, Gaudier M, Kowalczykowski SC, Wigley DB. 2004. Crystal structure of RecBCD enzyme reveals a machine for processing DNA breaks. *Nature* **432**:187–193.
233. Bates H, Randall SK, Rayssiguier C, Bridges BA, Goodman MF, Radman M. 1989. Spontaneous and UV-induced mutations in *Escherichia coli* K-12 strains with altered or absent DNA polymerase I. *J Bacteriol* **171**:2480–2484.
234. Nunoshiba T, Nishioka H. 1991. 'Rec-lac test' for detecting SOS-inducing activity of environmental genotoxic substance. *Mutat Res* **254**:71–77.
235. Sandler SJ, Clark AJ. 1994. RecOR suppression of *recF* mutant phenotypes in *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Bacteriol* **176**:3661–3672.
236. Opperman T, Murli S, Walker GC. 1996. The genetic requirements for UmuDC-mediated cold sensitivity are distinct from those for SOS mutagenesis. *J Bacteriol* **178**:4400–4411.
237. Sukchawalit R, Vattanaviboon P, Utamapongchai S, Vaughn G, Mongkolsuk S. 2001. Characterization of *Xanthomonas oryzae* pv. *oryzae* *recX*, a gene that is required for high-level expression of *recA*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **205**:83–89.
238. Hegde SP, Qin MH, Li XH, Atkinson MA, Clark AJ, Rajagopalan M, Madiraju MV. 1996. Interactions of RecF protein with RecO, RecR, and single-stranded DNA binding proteins reveal roles for the RecF-RecO-RecR complex in DNA repair and recombination. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **93**:14468–14473.
239. Little JW, Mount DW, Yanisch-Perron CR. 1981. Purified *lexA* protein is a repressor of the *recA* and *lexA* genes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **78**:4199–4203.
240. Marsh L, Walker GC. 1985. Cold sensitivity induced by overproduction of UmuDC in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **162**:155–161.
241. Villani G, Pierre A, Salles B. 1984. Quantification of SSB protein in *E. coli* and its variation during RecA protein induction. *Biochimie* **66**:471–476.
242. Godoy VG, Jarosz DF, Simon SM, Abyzov A, Ilyin V, Walker GC. 2007. UmuD and RecA directly modulate the mutagenic potential of the Y family DNA polymerase DinB. *Mol Cell* **28**:1058–1070.
243. Irino N, Nakayama K, Nakayama H. 1986. The *recQ* gene of *Escherichia coli* K-12: primary structure and evidence for SOS regulation. *Mol Gen Genet* **205**:298–304.
244. Datta S, Ganesh N, Chandra NR, Muniyappa K, Vijayan M. 2003. Structural studies on MtRecA-nucleotide complexes: insights into DNA and nucleotide binding and the structural signature of NTP recognition. *Proteins* **50**:474–485.
245. Datta S, Krishna R, Ganesh N, Chandra NR, Muniyappa K, Vijayan M. 2003. Crystal structures of *Mycobacterium smegmatis* RecA and its nucleotide complexes. *J Bacteriol* **185**:4280–4284.
246. Datta S, Prabu MM, Vaze MB, Ganesh N, Chandra NR, Muniyappa K, Vijayan M. 2000. Crystal structures of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* RecA and its complex with ADP-AlF₄: implications for decreased ATPase activity and molecular aggregation. *Nucleic Acids Res* **28**:4964–4973.
247. Stohl EA, Brockman JP, Burkle KL, Morimatsu K, Kowalczykowski SC, Seifert HS. 2003. *Escherichia coli* RecX inhibits RecA recombinase and coprotease activities *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *J Biol Chem* **278**:2278–2285.
248. Story RM, Bishop DK, Kleckner N, Steitz TA. 1993. Structural relationship of bacterial RecA proteins to recombination proteins from bacteriophage T4 and yeast. *Science* **259**:1892–1896.
249. Story RM, Steitz TA. 1992. Structure of the RecA protein-ADP complex. *Nature (London)* **355**:374–376.
250. Fuchs RP, Koffel-Schwartz N, Pelet S, Janel-Bintz R, Napolitano R, Becherel OJ, Broschard TH, Burnouf DY, Wagner J. 2001. DNA polymerases II and V mediate respectively mutagenic (–2 frameshift) and error-free bypass of a single N-2-acetylaminofluorene adduct. *Biochem Soc Trans* **29**:191–195.
251. Jarosz DF, Godoy VG, Delaney JC, Essigmann JM, Walker GC. 2006. A single amino acid governs enhanced activity of DinB DNA polymerases on damaged templates. *Nature* **439**:225–228.
252. Picksley SM, Morton SJ, Lloyd RG. 1985. The *recN* locus of *Escherichia coli* K12: molecular analysis and identification of the gene product. *Mol Gen Genet* **201**:301–307.
253. Yoo SJ, Seol JH, Shin DH, Rohrwild M, Kang MS, Tanaka K, Goldberg AL, Chung CH. 1996. Purification and characterization of the heat shock proteins HslV and HslU that form a new ATP-dependent protease in *Escherichia coli*. *J Biol Chem* **271**:14035–14040.
254. VanLoock MS, Yu X, Yang S, Galkin VE, Huang H, Rajan SS, Anderson WF, Stohl EA, Seifert HS, Egelman EH. 2003. Complexes of RecA with LexA and RecX differentiate between active and inactive RecA nucleoprotein filaments. *J Mol Biol* **333**:345–354.
255. Yasuda T, Morimatsu K, Horii T, Nagata T, Ohmori H. 1998. Inhibition of *Escherichia coli* RecA coprotease activities by DinI. *EMBO J* **17**:3207–3216.
256. Drees JC, Lusetti SL, Chitteni-Pattu S, Inman RB, Cox MM. 2004. A RecA filament capping mechanism for RecX protein. *Mol Cell* **15**:789–798.
257. Drees JC, Lusetti SL, Cox MM. 2004. Inhibition of RecA protein by the *Escherichia coli* RecX protein: modulation by the RecA C-terminus and filament functional state. *J Biol Chem* **279**:52991–52997.
258. Umezū K, Nakayama K, Nakayama H. 1990. *Escherichia coli* RecQ protein is a DNA helicase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **87**:5363–5367.
259. Sugino A, Peebles CL, Kreuzer KN, Cozzarelli NR. 1977. Mechanism of action of nalidixic acid: purification of *Escherichia coli* *nalA* gene product and its relationship to DNA gyrase and a novel nicking-closing enzyme. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **74**:4767–4771.
260. VanLoock MS, Yu X, Yang S, Lai AL, Low C, Campbell MJ, Egelman EH. 2003. ATP-mediated conformational changes in the RecA filament. *Structure (Camb.)* **11**:187–196.
261. Pages V, Koffel-Schwartz N, Fuchs RP. 2003. *recX*, a new SOS gene that is co-transcribed with the *recA* gene in *Escherichia coli*. *DNA Repair (Amst.)* **2**:273–284.
262. Papavinasasundaram KG, Anderson C, Brooks PC, Thomas NA, Movahedzadeh F, Jenner PJ, Colston MJ, Davis EO. 2001. Slow induction of RecA by DNA damage in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *Microbiology* **147**:3271–3279.

263. Padan E, Zilberstein D, Rottenberg H. 1976. The proton electrochemical gradient in *Escherichia coli* cells. *Eur J Biochem* **63**: 533–541.
264. Luo Y, Pfuetzner RA, Mosimann S, Paetzel M, Frey EA, Cherney M, Kim B, Little JW, Strynadka NCJ. 2001. Crystal structure of LexA: a conformational switch for regulation of self-cleavage. *Mol Cell* **106**:585–594.
265. Lee JH, Wendt JC, Shanmugam KT. 1990. Identification of a new gene, *molR*, essential for utilization of molybdate by *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **172**:2079–2087.
266. Neher SB, Flynn JM, Sauer RT, Baker TA. 2003. Latent ClpX-recognition signals ensure LexA destruction after DNA damage. *Genes Dev* **17**:1084–1089.
267. Sutton MD, Guzzo A, Narumi I, Costanzo M, Altenbach C, Ferentz AE, Hubbell WL, Walker GC. 2002. A model for the structure of the *Escherichia coli* SOS-regulated UmuD₂ protein. *DNA Repair (Amst.)* **1**:77–93.
268. Sutton MD, Opperman T, Walker GC. 1999. The *Escherichia coli* SOS mutagenesis proteins UmuD and UmuD' interact physically with the replicative DNA polymerase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **96**: 12373–12378.
269. Khil PP, Camerini-Otero RD. 2002. Over 1000 genes are involved in the DNA damage response of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* **44**:89–105.
270. Relan NK, Jenuwine ES, Gumbs OH, Shaner SL. 1997. Preferential interactions of the *Escherichia coli* LexA repressor with anions and protons are coupled to binding the *recA* operator. *Biochemistry* **36**:1077–1184.
271. Silver MS, Fersht AR. 1982. Direct observation of complexes formed between *recA* protein and a fluorescent single-stranded deoxyribonucleic acid derivative. *Biochemistry* **21**:6066–6072.
272. Renzette N, Gumlaw N, Nordman JT, Krieger M, Yeh SP, Long E, Centore R, Boonsombat R, Sandler SJ. 2005. Localization of RecA in *Escherichia coli* K-12 using RecA-GFP. *Mol Microbiol* **57**:1074–1085.
273. Bagdasarian M, Bailone A, Angulo JF, Scholz P, Devoret R. 1992. PsiB, and anti-SOS protein, is transiently expressed by the F sex factor during its transmission to an *Escherichia coli* K-12 recipient. *Mol Microbiol* **6**:885–893.
274. Bagdasarian M, Bailone A, Bagdasarian MM, Manning PA, Lurz R, Timmis KN, Devoret R. 1986. An inhibitor of SOS induction, specified by a plasmid locus in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **83**:5723–5726.
275. Bailone A, Backman A, Sommer S, Celerier J, Bagdasarian MM, Bagdasarian M, Devoret R. 1988. PsiB polypeptide prevents activation of RecA protein in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **214**: 389–395.
276. Dutreix M, Backman A, Celerier J, Bagdasarian MM, Sommer S, Bailone A, Devoret R, Bagdasarian M. 1988. Identification of *psiB* genes of plasmids F and R6–5. Molecular basis for *psiB* enhanced expression in plasmid R6–5. *Nucleic Acids Res* **16**:10669–10679.
277. Goldfless SJ, Morag AS, Belisle KA, Sutura VA Jr, Lovett ST. 2006. DNA repeat rearrangements mediated by DnaK-dependent replication fork repair. *Mol Cell* **21**:595–604.
278. Cox MM. 2007. Regulation of bacterial RecA protein function. *Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol* **42**:41–63.
279. Drees JC, Chitteni-Pattu S, McCaslin DR, Inman RB, Cox MM. 2006. Inhibition of RecA protein function by the RdgC protein from *Escherichia coli*. *J Biol Chem* **281**:4708–4717.
280. Ryan KR, Shapiro L. 2003. Temporal and spatial regulation in prokaryotic cell cycle progression and development. *Annu Rev Biochem* **72**:367–394.
281. Briggs GS, McEwan PA, Yu J, Moore T, Emsley J, Lloyd RG. 2007. Ring structure of the *Escherichia coli* DNA-binding protein RdgC associated with recombination and replication fork repair. *J Biol Chem* **282**:12353–12357.
282. Moolenaar GF, van Rossum-Fikkert S, van Kesteren M, Goosen N. 2002. Cho, a second endonuclease involved in *Escherichia coli* nucleotide excision repair. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **99**:1467–1472.
283. Gudas LJ, Pardee AB. 1975. Model for regulation of *Escherichia coli* DNA repair functions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **72**:2330–2334.
284. Hegde S, Sandler SJ, Clark AJ, Madiraju MV. 1995. *recO* and *recR* mutations delay induction of the SOS response in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **246**:254–258.
285. Horii T, Ogawa T, Nakatani T, Hase T, Matsubara H, Ogawa H. 1981. Regulation of SOS functions: purification of *E. coli* LexA protein and determination of its specific site cleaved by the RecA protein. *Cell* **27**:515–522.
286. Rothfield L, Taghbalout A, Shih YL. 2005. Spatial control of bacterial division-site placement. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **3**:959–968.
287. Rothman RH, Clark AJ. 1977. Defective excision and post-replication repair of UV-damaged DNA in a *recL* mutant strain of *E. coli* K-12. *Mol Gen Genet* **155**:267–277.
288. Sancar GB, Smith FW, Sancar A. 1983. Identification and amplification of the *E. coli phr* gene product. *Nucleic Acids Res* **11**: 6667–6678.
289. Madiraju MV, Lavery PE, Kowalczykowski SC, Clark AJ. 1992. Enzymatic properties of the RecA803 protein, a partial suppressor of *recF* mutations. *Biochemistry* **31**:10529–10535.
290. Wertman KF, Mount DW. 1985. Nucleotide sequence binding specificity of the LexA repressor of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Bacteriol* **163**:376–384.
291. Seong IS, Oh JY, Yoo SJ, Seol JH, Chung CH. 1999. ATP-dependent degradation of Sula, a cell division inhibitor, by the HslVU protease in *Escherichia coli*. *FEBS Lett* **456**:211–214.
292. Ubeda C, Maiques E, Tormo MA, Campoy S, Lasa I, Barbe J, Novick RP, Penades JR. 2007. SaPI operon I is required for SaPI packaging and is controlled by LexA. *Mol Microbiol* **65**:41–50.
293. Umezū K, Chi N-W, Kolodner RD. 1993. Biochemical interactions of the *Escherichia coli* RecF, RecO, and RecR proteins with RecA protein and single-stranded binding protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **90**:3875–3879.
294. Kow YW, Imhoff B, Weiss B, Hung DC, Hindoyan AA, Story RM, Goodman SD. 2007. *Escherichia coli* HU protein has a role in the repair of abasic sites in DNA. *Nucleic Acids Res* **35**:6672–6680.
295. Lavery PE, Kowalczykowski SC. 1992. Biochemical basis of the constitutive repressor cleavage activity of *recA730* protein. *J Biol Chem* **267**:20648–20658.
296. Vierling S, Weber T, Wohlleben W, Muth G. 2000. Transcriptional and mutational analyses of the *Streptomyces lividans recX* gene and its interference with RecA activity. *J Bacteriol* **182**:4005–4011.
297. Hishida T, Han YW, Shibata T, Kubota Y, Ishino Y, Iwasaki H, Shinagawa H. 2004. Role of the *Escherichia coli* RecQ DNA helicase in SOS signaling and genome stabilization at stalled replication forks. *Genes Dev* **18**:1886–1897.
298. Anderson DG, Kowalczykowski SC. 1997. The recombination hot spot chi is a regulatory element that switches the polarity of DNA degradation by the RecBCD enzyme. *Genes Dev* **11**:571–581.

299. Anderson DG, Kowalczykowski SC. 1997. The translocating RecBCD enzyme stimulates recombination by directing RecA protein onto ssDNA in a chi-regulated manner. *Cell* **90**:77–86.
300. Chedin F, Ehrlich SD, Kowalczykowski SC. 2000. The *Bacillus subtilis* AddAB helicase/nuclease is regulated by its cognate Chi sequence in vitro. *J Mol Biol* **298**:7–20.
301. Chedin F, Handa N, Dillingham MS, Kowalczykowski SC. 2006. The AddAB helicase/nuclease forms a stable complex with its cognate chi sequence during translocation. *J Biol Chem* **281**:18610–18617.
302. Dillingham MS, Spies M, Kowalczykowski SC. 2003. RecBCD enzyme is a bipolar DNA helicase. *Nature* **423**:893–897.
303. Kaasch M, Kaasch J, Quinones A. 1989. Expression of the *dnaN* and *dnaQ* genes of *Escherichia coli* is inducible by mitomycin. *Mol Gen Genet* **219**:187–192.
304. Kano Y, Osato K, Wada M, Imamoto F. 1987. Cloning and sequencing of the HU-2 gene of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **209**:408–410.
305. Kano Y, Wada M, Imamoto F. 1988. Genetic characterization of the gene *hupA* encoding the HU-2 protein of *Escherichia coli*. *Gene* **69**:331–335.
306. Kano Y, Wada M, Nagase T, Imamoto F. 1986. Genetic characterization of the gene *hupB* encoding the HU-1 protein of *Escherichia coli*. *Gene* **45**:37–44.
307. Bonnefoy E, Rouviere-Yaniv J. 1991. HU and IHF, two homologous histone-like proteins of *Escherichia coli*, form different protein-DNA complexes with short DNA fragments. *EMBO J* **10**:687–696.
308. Bonnefoy E, Rouviere-Yaniv J. 1992. HU, the major histone-like protein of *E. coli*, modulates the binding of IHF to *oriC*. *EMBO J* **11**:4489–4496.
309. Miller HI, Nash HA. 1981. Direct role of the *himA* gene product in phage integration. *Nature (London)* **290**:523–526.
310. Koonin EV. 1993. *Escherichia coli* *dinG* gene encodes a putative DNA helicase related to a group of eukaryotic helicases including Rad3 protein. *Nucleic Acids Res* **21**:1497.
311. Renzette N, Gumlaw N, Sandler SJ. 2007. DinI and RecX modulate RecA-DNA structures in *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Mol Microbiol* **63**:103–115.
312. Craig NL, Roberts JW. 1980. *E. coli* *recA* protein-directed cleavage of phage lambda repressor requires polynucleotide. *Nature (London)* **283**:26–30.
313. Craig NL, Roberts JW. 1981. Function of nucleoside triphosphate and polynucleotide in *Escherichia coli* *recA* protein-directed cleavage of phage lambda repressor. *J Biol Chem* **256**:8039–8044.
314. Sassanfar M, Roberts JW. 1990. Nature of the SOS-inducing signal in *Escherichia coli*: the involvement of DNA replication. *J Mol Biol* **212**:79–96.
315. Kim B, Little JW. 1992. Dimerization of a specific DNA-binding protein on the DNA. *Science* **255**:203–206.
316. Napolitano RL, Lambert IB, Fuchs RPP. 1997. SOS factors involved in translesion synthesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **94**:5733–5738.
317. Walker GC. 1987. The SOS response of *Escherichia coli*, p 1346–1357. In Neidhardt F, Ingraham JL, Low KB, Magasanik B, Schaechter M, and Umberger HE (ed), *Escherichia coli and Salmonella typhimurium, Cellular and Molecular Biology*. American Society for Microbiology, Washington, DC.
318. Lifsics MR, Lancy ED Jr, Maurer R. 1992. DNA replication defect in *Salmonella typhimurium* mutants lacking the editing (ϵ) subunit of DNA polymerase III. *J Bacteriol* **174**:6965–6973.
319. Rangarajan S, Woodgate R, Goodman MF. 2002. Replication restart in UV-irradiated *Escherichia coli* involving pols II, III, V, PriA, RecA and RecFOR proteins. *Mol Microbiol* **43**:617–628.
320. Rohrwild M, Coux O, Huang HC, Moerschell RP, Yoo SJ, Seol JH, Chung CH, Goldberg AL. 1996. HslV-HslU: a novel ATP-dependent protease complex in *Escherichia coli* related to the eukaryotic proteasome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **93**:5808–5813.
321. Roland KL, Little JW. 1990. Reaction of LexA repressor with diisopropylfluorophosphate: a test of the serine protease model. *J Biol Chem* **265**:12828–12835.
322. Slater SC, Lifsics MR, O'Donnell M, Maurer R. 1994. *holE*, the gene coding for the theta subunit of DNA polymerase III of *Escherichia coli*: characterization of a *holE* mutant and comparison with a *dnaQ* (epsilon-subunit) mutant. *J Bacteriol* **176**:815–821.
323. Janion C, Sikora A, Nowosielska A, Grzesiuk E. 2002. Induction of the SOS response in starved *Escherichia coli*. *Environ Mol Mutagen* **40**:129–133.
324. Payne N, Sancar A. 1989. The LexA protein does not bind specifically to the two SOS box-like sequences immediately 5' to the *phr* gene. *Mutat Res* **218**:207–210.
325. Sutton MD, Farrow MF, Burton BM, Walker GC. 2001. Genetic interactions between the *Escherichia coli* *umuDC* gene products and the beta processivity clamp of the replicative DNA polymerase. *J Bacteriol* **183**:2897–2909.
326. Ferentz AE, Opperman T, Walker GC, Wagner G. 1997. Dimerization of the UmuD' protein in solution and its implications for regulation of SOS mutagenesis. *Nat Struct Biol* **4**:979–983.
327. Burckhardt SE, Woodgate R, Scheuermann RH, Echols H. 1988. UmuD mutagenesis protein of *Escherichia coli*: overproduction, purification, and cleavage by RecA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **85**:1811–1815.
328. Sherratt DJ. 2003. Bacterial chromosome dynamics. *Science* **301**:780–785.
329. Casadaban MJ, Cohen SN. 1980. Lactose genes fused to exogenous promoters in one step using a Mu-*lac* bacteriophage: *in vivo* probe for transcriptional control sequences. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **76**:4530–4533.
330. Kelley WL. 2006. Lex marks the spot: the virulent side of SOS and a closer look at the LexA regulon. *Mol Microbiol* **62**:1228–1238.
331. Arthur HM, Eastlake PB. 1983. Transcriptional control of the *uvrD* gene of *Escherichia coli*. *Gene* **25**:309–316.
332. Shurvinton CE, Lloyd RG. 1982. Damage to DNA induces expression of the *ruv* gene of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **185**:352–355.
333. Voloshin ON, Vanevski F, Khil PP, Camerini-Otero RD. 2003. Characterization of the DNA damage-inducible helicase DinG from *Escherichia coli*. *J Biol Chem* **278**:28284–28293.
334. Quillardet P, Huisman O, D'Ari R, Hofnung M. 1982. SOS chromotest, a direct assay of induction of an SOS function in *Escherichia coli* K-12 to measure genotoxicity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **79**:5971–5975.
335. Garcia-Graells C, Valckx C, Michiels CW. 2000. Inactivation of *Escherichia coli* and *Listeria innocua* in milk by combined treatment with high hydrostatic pressure and the lactoperoxidase system. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **66**:4173–4179.
336. Knight KL, Aoki KH, Ujita EL, McEntee K. 1984. Identification of the amino acid substitutions in two mutant forms of the RecA protein from *Escherichia coli* RecA441 and Rec629. *J Biol Chem* **259**:11279–11283.

337. Erill I, Campoy S, Barbe J. 2007. Aeons of distress: an evolutionary perspective on the bacterial SOS response. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **31**:637–656.
338. Au N, Kuester-Schoeck E, Mandava V, Bothwell LE, Canny SP, Chachu K, Colavito SA, Fuller SN, Groban ES, Hensley LA, O'Brien TC, Shah A, Tierney JT, Tomm LL, O'Gara TM, Goranov AI, Grossman AD, Lovett CM. 2005. Genetic composition of the *Bacillus subtilis* SOS system. *J Bacteriol* **187**:7655–7666.
339. Campoy S, Fontes M, Padmanabhan S, Cortes P, Llagostera M, Barbe J. 2003. LexA-independent DNA damage-mediated induction of gene expression in *Myxococcus xanthus*. *Mol Microbiol* **49**:769–781.
340. Rai R, Peng G, Li K, Lin SY. 2007. DNA damage response: the players, the network and the role in tumor suppression. *Cancer Genomics Proteomics* **4**:99–106.
341. Britton RA, Kuster-Schock E, Auchtung TA, Grossman AD. 2007. SOS induction in a subpopulation of structural maintenance of chromosome (Smc) mutant cells in *Bacillus subtilis*. *J Bacteriol* **189**:4359–4366.
342. Echols H, Goodman MF. 1991. Fidelity mechanisms in DNA replication. *Annu Rev Biochem* **60**:477–511.
343. Liu S-K, Tessman I. 1990. Error-prone SOS repair can be error-free. *J Mol Biol* **216**:803–807.
344. Munoz M, de Ancos B, Sanchez-Moreno C, Cano MP. 2007. Effects of high pressure and mild heat on endogenous microflora and on the inactivation and sublethal injury of *Escherichia coli* inoculated into fruit juices and vegetable soup. *J Food Prot* **70**:1587–1593.
345. Wagner J, Nohmi T. 2000. *Escherichia coli* DNA polymerase IV mutator activity: genetic requirements and mutational specificity. *J Bacteriol* **182**:4587–4595.
346. Walker GC. 1985. Inducible DNA repair systems. *Annu Rev Biochem* **54**:425–457.
347. Walker GC. 1984. Mutagenesis and inducible responses to deoxyribonucleic acid damage in *Escherichia coli*. *Microbiol Rev* **48**:60–93.
348. Bridges BA, Dennis RE, Munson RJ. 1967. Differential induction and repair of ultraviolet damage leading to true reversions and external suppressor mutations of an ochre codon in *Escherichia coli* B/r WP2. *Genetics* **57**:897–908.
349. Wang L, Lutkenhaus J. 1998. FtsK is an essential cell division protein that is localized to the septum and induced as part of the SOS response. *Mol Microbiol* **29**:731–740.
350. Whitby MC, Lloyd RG. 1995. Altered SOS induction associated with mutations in *recF*, *recO* and *recR*. *Mol Gen Genet* **246**:174–179.
351. Witkin EM. 1969. The mutability towards ultraviolet light of recombination-deficient strains of *Escherichia coli*. *Mutat Res* **8**:9–14.
352. Elledge SJ, Walker GC. 1983. Proteins required for ultraviolet light and chemical mutagenesis: identification of the products of the *umuC* locus of *Escherichia coli*. *J Mol Biol* **164**:175–192.
353. Shinagawa H, Iwasaki H, Kato T, Nakata A. 1988. RecA protein-dependent cleavage of UmuD protein and SOS mutagenesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **85**:1806–1810.
354. Wood LF, Tszine NY, Christie GE. 1997. Activation of P2 late transcription by P2 Ogr protein requires a discrete contact site on the C terminus of the alpha subunit of *Escherichia coli* RNA polymerase. *J Mol Biol* **274**:1–7.
355. Defais M, Fauquet P, Radman M, Errera M. 1971. Ultraviolet reactivation and ultraviolet mutagenesis of lambda in different genetic systems. *Virology* **43**:495–503.
356. Karu AE, Belk ED. 1982. Induction of *E. coli recA* protein via *recBC* and alternate pathways: quantitation by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA). *Mol Gen Genet* **185**:275–282.
357. Sousa FJ, Lima LM, Pacheco AB, Oliveira CL, Torriani I, Almeida DF, Foguel D, Silva JL, Mohana-Borges R. 2006. Tetramerization of the LexA repressor in solution: implications for gene regulation of the *E. coli* SOS system at acidic pH. *J Mol Biol* **359**:1059–1074.
358. Witkin EM. 1967. Mutation-proof and mutation-prone modes of survival in derivatives of *Escherichia coli* B differing in sensitivity to ultraviolet light. *Brookhaven Symp Biol* **20**:495–503.
359. Battista JR, Ohta T, Nohmi T, Sun W, Walker GC. 1990. Dominant negative *umuD* mutations decreasing RecA-mediated cleavage suggest roles for intact UmuD in modulation of SOS mutagenesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **87**:7190–7194.
360. Sutton MD, Smith BT, Godoy VG, Walker GC. 2000. The SOS response: recent insights into *umuDC*-dependent DNA damage tolerance. *Annu Rev Genet* **34**:479–497.
361. Petit C, Cayrol C, Lesca C, Kaiser P, Thompson C, Defais M. 1993. Characterization of *dinY*, a new *Escherichia coli* DNA repair gene whose products are damage inducible even in a *lexA*(Def) background. *J Bacteriol* **175**:642–646.
362. Sauer RT, Ross MJ, Ptashne M. 1982. Cleavage of the λ and P22 repressors by RecA protein. *J Biol Chem* **257**:4458–4462.
363. Donnelly CE, Walker GC. 1992. Coexpression of UmuD' with UmuC suppresses the UV mutagenesis deficiency of *groE* mutants. *J Bacteriol* **174**:3133–3139.
364. Donnelly CE, Walker GC. 1989. *groE* mutants of *Escherichia coli* are defective in *umuDC*-dependent UV mutagenesis. *J Bacteriol* **171**:6117–6125.
365. Liu G, Draper GC, Donachie WD. 1998. FtsK is a bifunctional protein involved in cell division and chromosomal localization. *Mol Microbiol* **29**:893–903.
366. Kim S-R, Maenhaut-Michel G, Yamada M, Yamamoto Y, Matsui K, Sofuni T, Nohmi T, Ohmori H. 1997. Multiple pathways for SOS-mutagenesis in *Escherichia coli*: an overexpression of *dinB/dinP* results in strongly enhancing mutagenesis in the absence of any exogenous treatment to damage DNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **94**:13792–13797.
367. Hendricks EC, Szerlong H, Hill T, Kuempel P. 2000. Cell division, guillotining of dimer chromosomes and SOS induction in resolution mutants (*dif*, *xerC* and *xerD*) of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* **36**:973–981.
368. Gitai Z, Thanbichler M, Shapiro L. 2005. The choreographed dynamics of bacterial chromosomes. *Trends Microbiol* **13**:221–228.
369. Bonner CA, Hays S, McEntee K, Goodman MF. 1990. DNA polymerase II is encoded by the DNA damage-inducible *dinA* gene of *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **87**:7663–7667.
370. Prieto-Alamo MJ, Jurado J, Gallardo-Madueno R, Monje-Casas F, Holmgren A, Pueyo C. 2000. Transcriptional regulation of glutaredoxin and thioredoxin pathways and related enzymes in response to oxidative stress. *J Biol Chem* **275**:13398–13405.
371. Al Mamun AA, Humayun MZ. 2006. *Escherichia coli* DNA polymerase II can efficiently bypass 3,N(4)-ethenocytosine lesions in vitro and in vivo. *Mutat Res* **593**:164–176.
372. Berardini M, Foster PL, Loechler EL. 1999. DNA polymerase II (*polB*) is involved in a new DNA repair pathway for DNA interstrand cross-links in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* **181**:2878–2882.
373. Kano Y, Yoshino S, Wada M, Yokoyama K, Nobuhara M, Imamoto F. 1985. Molecular cloning and nucleotide sequence of the HU-1 gene of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Gen Genet* **201**:360–362.
374. Wang X, Cheung HW, Chun AC, Jin DY, Wong YC. 2008. Mitotic checkpoint defects in human cancers and their implications to chemotherapy. *Front Biosci* **13**:2103–2114.

375. Nakanishi A, Oshida T, Matsushita T, Imajoh-Ohmi S, Ohnuki T. 1998. Identification of DNA gyrase inhibitor (GyrI) in *Escherichia coli*. *J Biol Chem* **273**:1933–1938.
376. Rand L, Hinds J, Springer B, Sander P, Buxton RS, Davis EO. 2003. The majority of inducible DNA repair genes in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* are induced independently of RecA. *Mol Microbiol* **50**:1031–1042.
377. Aylon Y, Oren M. 2007. Living with p53, dying of p53. *Cell* **130**:597–600.
378. Lobner-Olesen A, Marinus MG, Hansen FG. 2003. Role of SeqA and Dam in *Escherichia coli* gene expression: a global/microarray analysis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **100**:4672–4677.
379. Radman M. 1974. Phenomenology of an inducible mutagenic DNA repair pathway in *Escherichia coli*: SOS repair hypothesis, p 128–142. In Prakash L, Sherman F, Miller M, Lawrence C, and Tabor HW (ed), *Molecular and Environmental Aspects of Mutagenesis*. Charles C Thomas, Springfield, IL.
380. Wang TC, Smith KC. 1988. Different effects of recJ and recN mutations on the postreplication repair of UV-damaged DNA in *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Bacteriol* **170**:2555–2559.
381. Gibert I, Calero S, Barbe J. 1990. Measurement of *in vivo* expression of *nrdA* and *nrdB* genes of *Escherichia coli* by using *lacZ* gene fusions. *Mol Gen Genet* **220**:400–408.
382. Kuczynska-Wisnik D, Kedzierska S, Matuszewska E, Lund P, Taylor A, Lipinska B, Laskowska E. 2002. The *Escherichia coli* small heat-shock proteins IbpA and IbpB prevent the aggregation of endogenous proteins denatured *in vivo* during extreme heat shock. *Microbiology* **148**:1757–1765.
383. Maples VF, Kushner SR. 1982. DNA repair in *Escherichia coli*: identification of the *uvrD* gene product. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **79**:5616–5620.
384. Roth JR, Andersson DI. 2004. Rebuttal: adaptive point mutation (Rosenberg and Hastings). *J Bacteriol* **186**:4844.
385. Rothman RH, Clark AJ. 1977. The dependence of post-replication repair on *uvrB* in a *recF* mutant of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Mol Gen Genet* **155**:279–286.
386. Shen X, Sayer JM, Kroth H, Ponten I, O'Donnell M, Woodgate R, Jerina DM, Goodman MF. 2002. Efficiency and accuracy of SOS-induced DNA polymerases replicating benzo[a]pyrene-7,8-diol 9,10-epoxide A and G adducts. *J Biol Chem* **277**:5265–5274.
387. Cooper S, Helmstetter CE. 1968. Chromosome replication and the division cycle of *Escherichia coli* B/r. *J Mol Biol* **31**:519–540.
388. Donachie WD. 1993. The cell cycle of *Escherichia coli*. *Annu Rev Microbiol* **47**:199–230.
389. Foster PL. 2007. Stress-induced mutagenesis in bacteria. *Crit Rev Biochem* **42**:373–397.
390. Bridges BA. 1995. Are there DNA damage checkpoints in *E. coli*? *BioEssays* **17**:63–70.
391. Foti JJ, Persky NS, Ferullo DJ, Lovett ST. 2007. Chromosome segregation control by *Escherichia coli* OgbE GTPase. *Mol Microbiol* **65**:569–581.
392. Oeda K, Horiuchi T, Sekiguchi M. 1982. The *uvrD* gene of *E. coli* encodes a DNA-dependent ATPase. *Nature (London)* **298**:98–100.
393. Cordell SC, Robinson EJ, Lowe J. 2003. Crystal structure of the SOS cell division inhibitor SulA and in complex with FtsZ. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **100**:7889–7894.
394. Begg KJ, Dewar SJ, Donachie WD. 1995. A new *Escherichia coli* cell division gene, *ftsK*. *J Bacteriol* **177**:6211–6222.
395. Walker GC. 2001. To cleave or not to cleave? Insights from the LexA crystal structure. *Mol Cell* **8**:486–487.
396. Margolin W. 2001. Spatial regulation of cytokinesis in bacteria. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **4**:647–652.
397. Marsh L, Nohmi T, Hinton S, Walker GC. 1991. New mutations in cloned *Escherichia coli* *umuDC* genes: novel phenotypes of strains carrying a *umuC125* plasmid. *Mutat Res* **250**:183–197.
398. Opperman T, Murli S, Smith BT, Walker GC. 1999. A model for a *umuDC*-dependent prokaryotic DNA damage checkpoint. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **96**:9218–9223.
399. Sutton MD. 2004. The *Escherichia coli* *dnaN159* mutant displays altered DNA polymerase usage and chronic SOS induction. *J Bacteriol* **186**:6738–6748.
400. Goranov AI, Katz L, Breier AM, Burge CB, Grossman AD. 2005. A transcriptional response to replication status mediated by the conserved bacterial replication protein DnaA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **102**:12932–12937.
401. Dronkert ML, Kanaar R. 2001. Repair of DNA interstrand cross-links. *Mutat Res* **486**:217–247.
402. Golub E, Bailone A, Devoret R. 1988. A gene encoding an SOS inhibitor is present in different conjugative plasmids. *J Bacteriol* **170**:4392–4394.
403. Campoy S, Salvador N, Cortes P, Erill I, Barbe J. 2005. Expression of canonical SOS genes is not under LexA repression in *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus*. *J Bacteriol* **187**:5367–5375.
404. Davis EO, Springer B, Gopaul KK, Papavinasasundaram KG, Sander P, Bottger EC. 2002. DNA damage induction of *recA* in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* independently of RecA and LexA. *Mol Microbiol* **46**:791–800.
405. Kawai Y, Moriya S, Ogasawara N. 2003. Identification of a protein, YneA, responsible for cell division suppression during the SOS response in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Mol Microbiol* **47**:1113–1122.
406. Godoy VG, Jarosz DF, Walker FL, Simmons LA, Walker GC. 2006. Y-family DNA polymerases respond to DNA damage-independent inhibition of replication fork progression. *EMBO J* **25**:868–879.
407. Maiques E, Ubeda C, Campoy S, Salvador N, Lasa I, Novick RP, Barbe J, Penades JR. 2006. Beta-lactam antibiotics induce the SOS response and horizontal transfer of virulence factors in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J Bacteriol* **188**:2726–2729.
408. Tseng YC, Hung JL, Wang TC. 1994. Involvement of RecF pathway recombination genes in postreplication repair in UV-irradiated *Escherichia coli* cells. *Mutat Res* **315**:1–9.
409. Ubeda C, Maiques E, Knecht E, Lasa I, Novick RP, Penades JR. 2005. Antibiotic-induced SOS response promotes horizontal dissemination of pathogenicity island-encoded virulence factors in staphylococci. *Mol Microbiol* **56**:836–844.
410. Beaver JW, Burrus V, Hochhut B, Waldor MK. 2002. Comparison of SXT and R391, two conjugative integrating elements: definition of a genetic backbone for the mobilization of resistance determinants. *Cell Mol Life Sci* **59**:2065–2070.
411. Beaver JW, Hochhut B, Waldor MK. 2002. Genomic and functional analyses of SXT, an integrating antibiotic resistance gene transfer element derived from *Vibrio cholerae*. *J Bacteriol* **184**:4259–4269.
412. Beaver JW, Hochhut B, Waldor MK. 2004. SOS response promotes horizontal dissemination of antibiotic resistance genes. *Nature* **427**:72–74.
413. Beaver JW, Waldor MK. 2004. Identification of operators and promoters that control SXT conjugative transfer. *J Bacteriol* **186**:5945–5949.

- 414. Hobbs MD, Sakai A, Cox MM.** 2007. SSB protein limits RecOR binding onto single-stranded DNA. *J Biol Chem* **282**:11058–11067.
- 415. Quinones A, Juterbock W, Messer W.** 1991. Expression of the *dnaA* gene of *Escherichia coli* is inducible by DNA damage. *Mol Gen Genet* **227**:9–16.
- 416. Quinones M, Kimsey HH, Ross W, Gourse RL, Waldor MK.** 2006. LexA represses CTXphi transcription by blocking access of the alpha C-terminal domain of RNA polymerase to promoter DNA. *J Biol Chem* **281**:39407–39412.
- 417. Wade JT, Reppas NB, Church GM, Struhl K.** 2005. Genomic analysis of LexA binding reveals the permissive nature of the *Escherichia coli* genome and identifies unconventional target sites. *Genes Dev* **19**:2619–2630.
- 418. Zlotnick A, Mitchell RS, Steed RK, Brenner SL.** 1993. Analysis of two distinct single-stranded DNA binding sites on the recA nucleoprotein filament. *J Biol Chem* **268**:22525–22530.
- 419. Meddows TR, Savory AP, Grove JI, Moore T, Lloyd RG.** 2005. RecN protein and transcription factor DksA combine to promote faithful recombinational repair of DNA double-strand breaks. *Mol Microbiol* **57**:97–110.
- 420. Elliott SJ, Sperandio V, Giron JA, Shin S, Mellies JL, Wainwright L, Hutcheson SW, McDaniel TK, Kaper JB.** 2000. The locus of enterocyte effacement (LEE)-encoded regulator controls expression of both LEE- and non-LEE-encoded virulence factors in enteropathogenic and enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli*. *Infect Immun* **68**: 6115–6126.