

Drosophila melanogaster as an organism model for studying cystic fibrosis and its major associated microbial infections

Hamadoun Touré, Jean-Louis Herrmann, Sébastien Szuplewski, Fabienne Girard-Misguich

▶ To cite this version:

Hamadoun Touré, Jean-Louis Herrmann, Sébastien Szuplewski, Fabienne Girard-Misguich. Drosophila melanogaster as an organism model for studying cystic fibrosis and its major associated microbial infections. Infection and Immunity, 2023, 10.1128/iai.00240-23. hal-04257464v1

HAL Id: hal-04257464 https://uvsq.hal.science/hal-04257464v1

Submitted on 26 Oct 2023 (v1), last revised 24 Apr 2024 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Drosophila melanogaster as an organism model for studying cystic fibrosis

2 and its major associated microbial infections

- 3 Hamadoun Touré^{1,*}, Jean-Louis Herrmann^{1, 3}, Sébastien Szuplewski², Fabienne Girard-
- 4 Misguich¹

5 Affiliation

- 6 ¹Université Paris-Saclay, UVSQ, INSERM, U1173 Infection et Inflammation, Montigny-le-
- 7 Bretonneux, 78180, France.
- 8 ²Université Paris-Saclay, UVSQ, Laboratoire de Génétique et Biologie Cellulaire,
- 9 Montigny-le-Bretonneux, 78180, France.
- ¹⁰ ³Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpitaux Universitaires IIe-de-France Ouest, GHU
- 11 Paris-Saclay, Hôpital Raymond Poincaré, Garches, 92380, France
- 12 *correspondence: hamadountoure56@gmail.com

13 Abstract

14 Cystic fibrosis (CF) is a human genetic disease caused by mutations in the cystic fibrosis 15 transmembrane conductance regulator gene that encodes a chloride channel. The most 16 severe clinical manifestation is associated with chronic pulmonary infections by pathogenic 17 and opportunistic microbes. Drosophila melanogaster has become the invertebrate model of 18 choice for modelling microbial infections and studying the induced innate immune response. 19 Here, we review its contribution to the understanding of infections with six major pathogens 20 associated with CF (Staphylococcus aureus, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Burkholderia 21 cepacia, Mycobacterium abscessus, Streptococcus pneumoniae, and Aspergillus fumigatus) 22 together with the perspectives opened by the recent availability of two CF models in this 23 model organism.

Keywords: Drosophila, cystic fibrosis, CFTR, ENaC, Staphylococcus aureus, Pseudomonas
 aeruginosa, Mycobacterium abscessus

1. Bacterial infections in Cystic fibrosis

28 Cystic fibrosis (CF) is a human genetic disease with a recessive autosomal transmission. It is 29 the most common genetic disease among Caucasians and affects approximately 30 7,97/100.000 persons in the USA and 7,37/100.000 in the European Union (1). Although the 31 pulmonary form is the most severe clinical manifestation, other exocrine organs may also be 32 affected (e.g., the pancreas and intestine). The disease is caused by loss-of-function 33 mutations in the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (cftr) gene (2-4), 34 which encodes a member of the ATP-binding cassette (ABC) protein superfamily (3). CFTR 35 is an ATP-gated ion channel that conducts chloride ions across epithelial cell membranes (5, 36 6), as well as glutathione thiocyanates and bicarbonates.

37 In addition to modulating the chloride transport, it regulates the activity of other ion channels 38 such as the trimeric epithelial sodium channel (ENaC), which consists of the sub-units α , β 39 and y. How CFTR negatively regulates ENaC is still controversial. According to Konïg and 40 collaborators, this regulation occurs indirectly through the accumulation of intracellular 41 chlorine (7). However, conflicting results have shown that inhibition of ENaC by CFTR is 42 independent of the direction and extent of chloride transport (8). Studies have shown that 43 CFTR inhibits ENaC through a direct physical interaction (9) or by regulating ENaC subunit 44 quantities (10).

45 In any case, CFTR dysfunction leads to an excessive activity of the trimeric ENaC channel, 46 causing uncontrolled sodium and excessive water entry into the epithelial cells following the 47 osmotic gradient. This leads to dehydration of the intraluminal surface and an increase in the 48 thickness of the mucus bordering the epithelium (11). In the lungs, the accumulation of thick 49 viscous secretions causes abstruction and inflammation of the airways. These prevent the 50 proper functioning of the mucociliary barrier, which is the primary protective barrier against 51 many pathogens (12). In addition, this mucus has poor antibacterial activity owing to its 52 reduction in acidity. Indeed, CFTR dysfunction prevents the exit of bicarbonate ions. This 53 modified mucus constitutes the ideal environment for the accumulation, proliferation and 54 persistence of pathogenic and/or opportunistic microorganisms.

55 Chronic and recurrent infections and persistent inflammation cause airway damage that can 56 lead to bronchiectasis and thus, a decline in respiratory function (13). The ensuing 57 respiratory failure is the cause of more than 90% of the recorded deaths (14). According to 58 the 2021 report of the French Cystic Fibrosis Registry, these infections are mainly due to 59 Staphylococcus aureus (60.6%), Pseudomonas aeruginosa (34%), Aspergillus fumigatus 60 (21.6%), Haemophilus influenzae (10.1%), Stenotrophomonas maltophilia (9.3%), 61 Achromobacter xylosoxidans (6.4%), Streptococcus pneumoniae (1.7%), non-tuberculous 62 mycobacteria (3,7%) and Burkholderia cepacia (2%). The prevalence of these pathogens 63 vary according to the geography. For comparison, in the USA, S. aureus, P. aeruginosa and 64 non-tuberculous mycobacteria have approximately 63%, 24% and 9.6% respectively of the 65 overall prevalence according to the 2021 report of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation (CFF). The 66 dynamics of the prevalence of the isolated pathogens also changes with time. For example, 67 the respective trends in the prevalence of S. aureus and P. aeruginosa have taken opposite 68 trajectories over time in the USA. While the former is becoming increasingly prevalent (29% 69 in 1991 vs. 63% in 2021), the latter is less prevalent over time (61% in 1991 vs. 24% in 70 2021). The same trend is observed in Europe (15).

71 **2.** *Drosophila*, an established organism model for the study of pathogens

72 Drosophila melanogaster is a century-old organism model that is used in various aspects of 73 life sciences such as genetics, developmental biology, cellular biology, neurobiology, and 74 immunity. The constant development and availability of different genetic tools have facilitated 75 its genetic manipulation, making *Drosophila* central to the study of responses to infection and 76 host-pathogen interactions in the last three decades. In their own natural environment, fruit 77 flies face a panel of viruses, bacteria, fungi, and parasites (e.g., wasp (16)). In the laboratory, 78 Drosophila is used as an experimental host to study infection with its natural pathogens as 79 well as human ones. Indeed, Drosophila has become an attractive and emergent model for 80 studying host response, virulence factors and pathophysiology of pathogens associated with 81 human infectious diseases, such as those caused by Zika Virus, *Mycobacterium marinum*, 82 Listeria monocytogenes, and Candida albicans (17–21).

B3 Drosophila is a dipteran with three larval stages and a complete metamorphosis. In laboratory, third instar larvae and adults are usually infected either orally, locally by wounding or systemically by injecting the microorganism.

Drosophila lacks an adaptive immune response but has innate immunity involving conserved signaling pathways. In both mammals and flies, the JNK, JAK-STAT and NFκB signaling pathways are critical for immune response regulation (22). To note, the response mediated by Toll-like receptors was discovered in this organism (23). *Drosophila* pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) recognize the pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) of microbes, such as peptidoglycan (PGN), or lipoteichoic acid (LTA) (24). They induce an adequate immune response involving both cellular and humoral response (25).

93 The cellular response is based on blood cells (hemocytes) which are equivalent to 94 mammalian monocytes and macrophages. Until recently, three morphologically distinct types 95 of hemocytes have been identified: plasmatocytes, crystal cells (involved in wound healing, 96 reactive oxygen species production and hypoxic response) and lamellocytes (involved in 97 response to wasp parasitization) (26). The most abundant hemocytes are plasmatocytes that 98 respond to wound signals and control the coagulation response. They also phagocytose and 99 encapsulate invading pathogens and clear apoptotic bodies (27). However, this simplistic 100 classification of hemocytes into three subtypes has been reviewed thanks to recent studies 101 based on single-cell sequencing on either larval (28-31), adult (32) or pupal (33) hemocytes. 102 Collectively, these studies have identified at least eight distinct specialized hemocyte 103 subpopulations waiting to be functionally characterized.

104 The existence of an inducible humoral response in fruit flies was first reported in 1972 (34). 105 This response is mainly based on the production of antimicrobial peptides (AMPs), primarily 106 by the fat body, which is functionally homologous to mammalian adipocytes and liver. AMPs 107 can also be produced locally by epithelial cells or hemocytes. Two conserved NF κ B 108 signalling pathways, Toll and Immune deficiency (Imd), mediate AMP production. The former 109 is implicated in response to both bacteria with Lys-type PGN (mainly Gram-positive) and 110 fungal infections, while the second is involved in responses to infection by bacteria with DAP-

type PGN (mainly Gram-negative) (22, 23, 35, 36). In addition to AMPs production, humoral
response also includes the generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) by DUOX proteins
locally at the epithelial level (37, 38).

114 **3.** Lessons from *Drosophila* infections with some CF major pathogens

Drosophila is commonly used to study infections with a single pathogen associated with CF or co-infection. Here, we review the contributions of this model organism to the identification of host receptors, *in vivo* validation of virulence factors, and to the screening of effective drugs. We will follow the prevalence of these pathogens as reported by the French Cystic Fibrosis Registry in 2021, and the number of relevant publications. An overview is provided by the Table 1.

Stenotrophomonas maltophilia and Achromobacter xylosoxidans were excluded for the following reasons. Stenotrophomonas maltophilia has been isolated at the surface and in the gut of wild female *Drosophila* captured in Puerto Rico (39). Its intestinal presence was confirmed in laboratory strains (40). Achromobacter xylosoxidans, has been reported to be pathogenic for *Drosophila*, as its injection in adult males leads to rapid dose-dependent death (41).

127 Staphylococcus aureus

128 Infections with the Gram-positive bacterium Staphylococcus aureus (S. aureus) are among 129 the most prevalent in CF patients. Injection of live S. aureus into Drosophila leads to an 130 important transcriptional response and a systemic infection resulting in a reduction in fly life 131 expectancy (42, 43). Phagocytosis plays a major role in the response to S. aureus infection 132 as flies devoid of plasmatocytes succumb more rapidly (44, 45). Drosophila Schneider 2 (S2) 133 cells were used as a surrogate for hemocytes. Indeed, this widely used cell line, derived from 134 late embryos, is phagocytic. Genetic screening of S2 cells identified Eater and Croquemort, 135 as S. aureus scavenger receptors (44). This was confirmed in adult hemocytes (44) and 136 mammalian macrophages (46). Croquemort is the first CD36 family member to be described 137 as being involved in bacterial recognition. Eater does not recognize lipoteichoic acid (LTA), a cell wall polymer found in Gram-positive bacteria. Indeed, the *ltaS* mutant strain (deficient in LTA synthesis) was phagocytosed less by wild-type hemocytes than the wild-type *S. aureus* strain. Moreover, the *ltaS* mutant strain was equally phagocytosed by wild-type and Eaterlacking larval hemocytes (47). However, this was not the case for hemocytes lacking the receptor Draper, whose extracellular region binds LTA, strongly suggesting that this cell wall component is its ligand, contrary to Eater (47).

144 The integrin βv is also involved in *S. aureus* recognition by the hemocytes but through 145 peptidoglycan. Indeed, a mutant bacterial strain that produces reduced levels of PGN, due to 146 defective UDP-N-acetylenolpyruvylglucosaminereductase, was less efficiently phagocytosed 147 by integrin βv -deficient hemocytes (48).

148 PGN Recognition Proteins (PGRP), such as PGRP-SA and PGRP-SC1a, are also important 149 for the recognition and phagocytosis of S. aureus (49). However, wall teichoic acids (WTA), 150 which are covalently linked to PGN, mitigate S. aureus recognition by these Drosophila 151 immune receptors. Indeed, infection with strains with defective WTA production led to a 152 reduction of S. aureus virulence. This loss of pathogenicity is due to increased PGN binding 153 and detection by PGRP-A (50). Complementary to inducing a cellular response, S. aureus 154 PGRP-SA-mediated recognition systemically activates the Toll pathway leading to AMPs 155 production (e.g., Drosomycin, Defensin and Metchnikowin) (51). Although Imd-related AMPs 156 are not induced, this pathway is required for effective clearance of the infection (52).

157 Moreover, fly infections have been used to validate known virulence factors, such as 158 hemolysin α (53), as well as to identify new ones. An example is the production of D-159 alanylated teichoic acid, which reduces PGN recognition by host receptors and thus 160 interferes with the host humoral response to *S. aureus* infection (51).

Drosophila infections have confirmed that Methycillin-Resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) isolates, notably the USA300 and PFGE strains, were less virulent than non-MRSA isolates (54). Correlations with clinical observations were found for the community-associated MRSA strains USA300, USA400 and CMRSA2. Indeed, the latter are more virulent than the

hospital-associated strain CMRSA6 (53). Recently, a model of oral USA300 infection in
 Drosophila larvae showed that bacterial catalase neutralizes a DUOX-mediated oxidative
 response that promotes AMPs production through Toll pathway activation (55).

To identify drugs effective against these MRSAs, a panel of antibacterial peptides was screened *in vivo*. Two antibiotics, nisin and NAI-107, have been shown to have the ability to rescue adult flies from fatal infections with the USA300 strain. NAI-107 presented an efficacy equivalent to that of vancomycin, a widely applied antibiotic for the treatment of serious MRSA infections (56).

The antimicrobial activity of plumbagin, a phytochemical, was also validated with the Drosophila systemic infection model, whether with *S. aureus* alone or in co-infection with *C. albicans*, as is often observed in the urinary tract in humans. Plumbagin (5-hydroxy-2-methyl-1,4-naphthoquinone) has been identified *in vitro* as a potent antimicrobial agent against *S. aureus* and *C. albicans* (57).

178 **Pseudomonas aeruginosa**

Drosophila is susceptible to both oral and systemic infections by the Gram-negative bacterium *P. aeruginosa*. This leads to the invasion of host tissues, then their degradation and ultimately death through the bacterial spread in the hemolymph (34, 58–60).

182 P. aeruginosa infections induce systemic AMP production mediated by both the Toll and Imd 183 pathways (60, 61), a local epithelial Imd-dependent one and a cellular response (59). More 184 recently, a novel and evolutionarily conserved defence mechanism has been reported (62). 185 P. aeruginosa infection induces the overexpression of the iron transferrin 1-encoding gene in 186 the fat body. The consequence is sequestration of iron from the hemolymph and its 187 relocation to the fat body. The importance of the competition for iron between *P. aeruginosa* 188 and its host is further supported by the reduced pathogenicity of a siderophore-defective 189 strain of *P. aeruginosa* in *Drosophila* (62).

Fruit flies have been used to screen *P. aeruginosa* mutants and thus to validate (63) and identify new virulence factors (*e.g.*, relA) (64). Similarly, the contribution of certain virulence

192 factors has been characterized in vivo in fruit flies. Examples include the oxylipins involved in 193 biofilm formation and virulence (65), glutathione biosynthesis genes gshA and gshB (66), 194 transcriptional regulators PA1226 and PA1413, which modulate the virulence (67), reactive 195 chlorine species resistance factor RcsA (68), glucose transport regulator GltB (69) and the 196 nitrite reductase NirA (70). The essential role of the P. aeruginosa respiratory chain in 197 virulence and pathogenicity has also been demonstrated in Drosophila. Indeed, a PA4427-198 PA4431 operon mutant strain, defective for respiratory chain complex III (cytobc1), induces 199 less mortality in Drosophila than the PAO1 reference strain (71).

200 Many pathogenic Gram-negative bacteria, including P. aeruginosa, possess a type III 201 secretion system (T3SS), which injects virulence factors into their host (72). The presence 202 and activation of T3SS are required in *P. aeruginosa* to induce fly death (73). The exotoxin 203 ExoS, whose injection into the host cell cytoplasm is mediated by T3SS, interferes with 204 bacterial phagocytosis by hemocytes (74). ExoS is known to target host Rho GTPases and 205 the contribution of different fly Rho GTPases to P. aeruginosa infection resistance has been 206 assessed in vivo, revealing that Rac2 is the main target of ExoS to prevent engulfment (75). 207 ExoS can also induce apoptosis at least in Drosophila S2 cells (76), similar to Exotoxin A 208 (77).

209 P. aeruginosa uses quorum sensing (QS) to regulate and adapt its gene expression. During 210 infection, the QS signaling molecule N-3-oxododecanoyl homoserine lactone (3OC12-HSL) 211 is essential for the bacterial virulence in flies. Drosophila lacks Paraoxonases (PONs) which 212 are able to degrade 3OC12-HSL in vitro. Transgenic expression of human PON1 protects 213 flies against P. aeruginosa infection lethality by interfering with 3OC12-HSL-dependent QS 214 (78). The QS transcription factor RhIR interferes with the host's cellular immune response 215 during the early stages of infection (59). P. aeruginosa can also inhibit the host response by 216 suppressing AMP production (61).

217 Chronic *P. aeruginosa* infection in patients with CF is associated with the formation of 218 mucoid micro-colonies called biofilms. These are observed in the *Drosophila* crop, the 219 functional equivalent of the mammalian stomach, after oral infection. Bacteria recovered from

this *in vivo* biofilm present an increased antibiotic resistance and less virulence than the planktonic bacteria (79). Transcriptional regulator PA3898 controls biofilm formation and virulence in *Drosophila* (80). Furthermore, oral infection with *P. aeruginosa* leads to midgut hyperplasia. This is due to activation of the stress response JNK pathway in enterocytes, leading to their apoptosis and indirectly to the overproliferation of intestinal stem cells (81).

Fruit flies can help to find alternative effective therapeutic strategies against *P. aeruginosa* infections, in addition to antibiotics. Indeed, the *in vivo* antibacterial efficacy of *P. aeruginosa*targeting lytic phages, such as MPK1 and MPK6, has been assessed and proven in *Drosophila* (Heo *et al.*, 2009; Lindberg *et al.*, 2014; Jang *et al.*, 2019). Moreover, Baicalin, has been validated *in vivo* in *Drosophila* (84). This extract from the Chinese herb *Scutellariae radix* has been proposed as an alternative anti-*P. aeruginosa* compound targeting bacterial T3SS.

232 Aspergillus fumigatus

233 Immuno-compromised patients as well as those living with CF are prone to invasive 234 aspergillosis. In order to examine the conserved Toll pathway associated with the response 235 to fungal infection in Drosophila, including A. fumigatus (85) and the virulence of different 236 strains of the cosmopolitan filamentous fungus A. fumigatus was assessed using Toll-237 deficient flies (86). Infections were induced by injecting, feeding or rolling flies with conidia 238 (87). Concordance with results obtained in mammalian models was observed with either the 239 hypovirulent strain $\Delta a/b1$ (88) or other A. fumigatus mutant strains defective in siderophore 240 biosynthesis, starvation stress response (89), or Glicotoxin production (90).

Toll-deficient *Drosophila* have also been used to assess the *in vivo* efficacy of orally absorbed antifungal agents such as voriconazole and posaconazole, which are commonly used as prophylaxis and treatment for the fungus (88, 91). An *in vitro* pre-exposure of *A*. *fumigatus* to these molecules was performed before *Drosophila* infection did not affect the fungal virulence or the efficacy of these molecules to clear the infection *in vivo* (88, 91).

Synergistic effects have been observed when voriconazole was combined with terbinafine(87, 91, 92).

In vivo toxicity of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) produced by filamentous fungi (*e.g.*, alcohols, aldehydes, thiols, esters...) has been explored in flies. Exposition of *Drosophila* larvae to VOCs emitted by living fungi delayed metamorphosis towards the pupae stage and subsequently to the adult stage. In addition, this exposure was detrimental to both larval and adult survival (Inamdar *et al.*, 2014; Zhao *et al.*, 2017; Al-Maliki *et al.*, 2017). This toxigenic effect suggests that VOCs may contribute to the fungal pathogenesis, at least in flies.

254 Burkholderia cepacia complex

Drosophila is an established model for studying systemic infections caused by species of opportunistic Gram-negative bacteria belonging to the *Burkholderia cepacia* complex (Bcc). It has been used to characterize the virulence of different strains (96), the phenotype of some mutants (97–99) and also to identify virulence factors of strains isolated from CF patients (100).

In response to *B. cepacia* infection, fruit flies produce AMPs, such as Drosomycin and Diptericin, via both the Toll and Imd pathways (101). We recently demonstrated that the induced AMPs are crucial for *Drosophila* survival against *B. cepacia* infection (102).

Drosophila mutants for the *period* gene, whose circadian rhythm is altered, are more tolerant to Bcc infection (101). This study also revealed that both glucose and amino-acid intake improved host tolerance to infection and that the TOR pathway mediates both resistance and tolerance to Bcc infections (101).

267 Mycobacterium abscessus and the non-tuberculous mycobacteria

268 Drosophila is also a validated model for studying mycobacterial infections. As recently 269 reviewed, most studies have focused on the pathogenic slow-growing Mycobacterium marinum to model tuberculosis (103). The most frequently isolated non-270 271 tuberculous mycobacteria (NTM) in patients with CF are species of *M. abscessus* and *M.*

avium complexes, *M. fortuitum* being rarely found (104, 105). In a study including French
patients, *M. abscessus* accounted for more than half of the NTMs isolated (104). This
bacterium causes the most deleterious pulmonary infections in patients with CF (106). *M. abscessus* belongs the group of fast-growing mycobacterium which are predominantly
saprophytic. It is considered the most pathogenic species within this group (107).

277 After systemic injection, M. abscessus can proliferate within Drosophila, leading to severe 278 tissue damage and, ultimately, death (Oh et al., 2013). It is recognized by PGRP-SA and 279 activates the production of Drosomycin, a Toll-mediated AMP (108). Recently, we confirmed 280 and extended this observation. Indeed, M. abscessus injection induced the expression of 281 AMPs encoding genes, either Toll or Imd-regulated and showed that these AMPs did not 282 seem to play a major role for Drosophila survival during M. abscessus infection, as indicated 283 by the similar survivals of wild-type and AMP-deficient flies (102). We therefore hypothesized 284 and demonstrated that the intracellular localization of *M. abscessus* protects it from AMPs, 285 particularly Defensin, which we have shown to have a direct bactericidal action against 286 extracellular M. abscessus (109). Indeed, after its injection, M. abscessus is rapidly 287 internalized by Drosophila plasmatocytes in which it grows (102), as observed during fly 288 infection with *M. marinum* (18).

Fly infections have been used to validate mutants for genes encoding known virulence factors, such as the $\triangle 0855$ and $\triangle 4532c$ strains, both defective for intracellular growth (110, 111), as well as to identify some new genes such as *MAB_0471*, *MAB_0472* and *MAB_3317c* (112).

Drosophila have also highlighted *M. abscessus* resistance to host innate cytotoxic responses. Indeed, thanacytes, a newly described hemocyte subpopulation identified by single-cell sequencing (29), induce caspase-dependent apoptosis in *M. abscessus*-infected plasmatocytes through the action of two serine proteases, encoded by *CG30088* and *CG30090*. However, *M. abscessus* resists this lysis and spreads systemically, leading to bacteremia and subsequent death of infected flies. The resistance of *M. abscessus* to cytotoxic lysis of phagocytes was validated in a mammalian model after contact of infected

300 murine primary macrophages with autologous natural killer cells. This propensity of 301 *M. abscessus* to resist the host cytotoxic innate response, typical of strict pathogenic 302 mycobacteria such as *M. tuberculosis*, could partially explain its superior pathogenicity 303 among fast-growing mycobacteria.

M. abscessus is also multi-resistant to antibiotics, including most of the anti-tuberculosis drugs (113), making it difficult to treat its infections in patients with CF (114). *Drosophila* have been used to test the effectiveness of antibiotics against *M. abscessus in vivo*. Tigecycline treatment was the most efficient and its potency was increased when combined with linezolid (115).

309 Streptococcus pneumoniae

310 Injection of the Gram-positive bacterium S. pneumoniae in Drosophila causes lethal 311 infections. Fly exposure to sublethal doses primes resistance to subsequent infections by S. 312 pneumoniae (116). Phagocytosis by plasmatocytes is crucial for resistance to streptococcal 313 infections (116–118). It is activated by Eiger, a *Drosophila* homolog of humans TNF α , (119). 314 Hemocyte activation requires increased consumption of energy, which is obtained by a 315 systemic metabolic switch involving the release of glucose from glycogen. This is mediated 316 by adenosine signalling and is modulated by adenosine deaminase ADGF-A to prevent the 317 loss of energy reserves during chronic infection (118). Interestingly, this effect of adenosine 318 has also been observed in a mice lung streptococcal infection model in which it regulates 319 pulmonary neutrophil recruitment (120).

The *Drosophila* response to a systemic infection with *S. pneumoniae* is not limited to the immune cellular response because it also includes the production of AMPs, mediated by both Toll and Imd pathways (118).

S. pneumoniae infections have been used to assess whether interactions between circadian rhythm and immunity exist in flies, as observed in mammals (121). Infected wild-type flies lose circadian regulation of locomotor activity, whereas mutant flies for *timeless* or *period*,

326 which encode components of the central circadian clock, were more sensitive than wild-type

327 flies to S. pneumoniae infection (122).

328 4. Coinfection models

329 Most patients with CF are prone to polymicrobial infections. Drosophila has been used to 330 study such interactions between pathogens as well as those with the host microbiome. 331 Indeed, flies were orally infected with a combination of *P. aeruginosa* and strains isolated 332 from the oral flora of patients with CF to compare bacterial virulence genes and host AMP 333 gene expression with mono-infections. Thus, it was observed that coinfection with 334 Streptococcus sp. and P. aeruginosa increased the production of the flagellar filament 335 protein fliC in P. aeruginosa, most likely to increase its motility (123). Upon co-infection with 336 Gram-positive bacteria, P. aeruginosa also presents an increased virulence, due to the 337 production of antimicrobials and toxins that kill the other bacteria as well as the host cells. 338 The latter is induced by the detection by P. aeruginosa of Gram-positive bacteria PGN (124).

Conversely, *Streptococcus parasanguinis*, a Gram-positive colonizer of the airway of patient with CF, hijacks *P. aeruginosa* exopolysaccharide alginate production to form a biofilm that limits *P. aeruginosa* growth. This biofilm contains streptococcal adhesins, which are also key factors for fly colonization and mortality (125). Nitrite reductase production is crucial for *P. aeruginosa* virulence (126).

A more recent model of co-infection with two common pathogens found in patients with CF was based on the co-injection with *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa* in adult *Drosophila* (127).

346

5. Modelling CF in Drosophila

347 Two CF-like models have been proposed in *Drosophila*. The first consists of mutant flies for 348 the *bereft* gene which encodes *miR-263a*, a microRNA which negatively regulates the 349 quantity of transcripts encoding the α and β subunits of ENaC (*ppk4* and *ppk28* respectively). 350 Thus these flies are a model of ENaC hyperactivity model. Indeed, phenotypes in their 351 midgut are similar to those observed in epithelia of patients with CF. It was observed that

there was excessive sodium entry within enterocytes, the most abundant intestinal cells, leading to an incoming flow of water following the osmotic gradient and to a dehydration of the intraluminal area bordering the epithelium (128).

These phenotypes are also observed in the second gastro-intestinal *Drosophila* CF, which has been more recently reported model (129). It is a CFTR mutant model obtained by depleting in enterocytes of the transcripts of *CG5789/Cftr*. This gene encodes the *Drosophila* structural and functional equivalent of human CTFR. Indeed, the expression of human *CFTR* in this CF model rescued gastro-intestinal phenotypes. Partial suppression of these phenotypes as also observed upon overexpression of *miR-263a*, suggesting that ENaC may act downstream of CFTR, as in humans (129).

Both models exhibit increased levels of antimicrobial peptides due to the activation of the Imd pathway in response to increased bacterial accumulation in the midgut. Moreover, they are more susceptible to oral infections with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (128, 129). Here again, *human CFTR* expression rescued this phenotype in flies depleted of *Cftr* transcripts, establishing a new model to study CF pathophysiology, particularly in respect to the susceptibility to pathogen infections (129).

However, such phenotypic rescue experiments have not been reported in *miR-263a* mutant flies. Thus, whether hyper-susceptibility to bacterial infections is due to increased levels of ENaC of remains to be determined. Similarly, even if it is likely, it would be interesting to determine the susceptibility to other major pathogens found in CF. To note, ENaC has been proposed to be involved in airway liquid clearance (130). One may wonder whether the CF phenotypes observed in *miR-263a* mutant flies are only restricted to the midgut and whether this model is more susceptible to systemic infections.

375 6. Concluding remarks

The recent use of certain CFTR modulators has brought relief to many CF patients; but unfortunately, not to all. The development of relevant models is crucial for understanding CF pathophysiology and consequently for searching for effective molecules that can be

379 beneficial in all kinds of *cftr* mutations leading to CF. *Drosophila* can meet this need, all the 380 more so as CFTR and ENaC channels are present and their deregulation leads to a CF 381 phenotype. As we have shown in this review, fruit flies have already allowed the identification 382 of many virulence factors of the most common pathogens in patients with CF, as well as 383 numerous host factors required to counter these infections. Drosophila use should make it 384 possible to study and understand host resistance factors that are modulated in the context of 385 CF. In the long term, treatments based on the modulation of the evolutionarily conserved 386 susceptibility and predisposition factors could reduce CF-associated infections.

388 References

- Farrell PM. 2008. The prevalence of cystic fibrosis in the European Union. J Cyst
 Fibros 7:450–453.
- 391 2. Kerem B, Rommens JM, Buchanan JA, Markiewicz D, Cox TK, Chakravarti A,
- Buchwald M, Tsui LC. 1989. Identification of the cystic fibrosis gene: genetic analysis.
 Science 245:1073–1080.
- 394 3. Riordan JR, Rommens JM, Kerem B, Alon N, Rozmahel R, Grzelczak Z, Zielenski J,
- 395 Lok S, Plavsic N, Chou JL, Al E. 1989. Identification of the cystic fibrosis gene:

396 cloning and characterization of complementary DNA. Science 245:1066–1073.

- 397 4. Rommens JM, Iannuzzi MC, Kerem B, Drumm ML, Melmer G, Dean M, Rozmahel R,
- Cole JL, Kennedy D, Hidaka N, Al E. 1989. Identification of the cystic fibrosis gene:
 chromosome walking and jumping. Science 245:1059–1065.
- Anderson MP, Gregory RJ, Thompson S, Souza DW, Paul S, Mulligan RC, Smith AE,
 Welsh MJ. 1991. Demonstration that CFTR is a chloride channel by alteration of its
 anion selectivity. Science 253:202–205.
- 403 6. Nagel G, Hwang T-C, Nastiuk KL, Nairn AC, Gadsbyt DC. 1992. The protein kinase

404 A-regulated cardiac CI – channel resembles the cystic fibrosis transmembrane

- 405 conductance regulator. 6399. Nature 360:81–84.
- König J, Schreiber R, Voelcker T, Mall M, Kunzelmann K. 2001. The cystic fibrosis
 transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) inhibits ENaC through an increase in
 the intracellular Cl– concentration. EMBO Rep 2:1047–1051.

409	8.	Chabot H, Vives MF, Dagenais A, Grygorczyk C, Berthiaume Y, Grygorczyk R. 1999.
410		Downregulation of epithelial sodium channel (ENaC) by CFTR co-expressed in
411		Xenopus oocytes is independent of Cl- conductance. J Membr Biol 169:175–188.
412	9.	Yan W, Samaha FF, Ramkumar M, Kleyman TR, Rubenstein RC. 2004. Cystic
413		Fibrosis Transmembrane Conductance Regulator Differentially Regulates Human and
414		Mouse Epithelial Sodium Channels in Xenopus Oocytes. J Biol Chem 279:23183-
415		23192.
416	10.	Rubenstein RC, Lockwood SR, Lide E, Bauer R, Suaud L, Grumbach Y. 2011.
417		Regulation of endogenous ENaC functional expression by CFTR and Δ F508-CFTR in
418		airway epithelial cells. Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol 300:L88–L101.
419	11.	Boucher RC. 2007. Cystic fibrosis: a disease of vulnerability to airway surface
420		dehydration. Trends in Molecular Medicine 13:231–240.
421	12.	Hoegger MJ, Fischer AJ, McMenimen JD, Ostedgaard LS, Tucker AJ, Awadalla MA,
422		Moninger TO, Michalski AS, Hoffman EA, Zabner J, Stoltz DA, Welsh MJ. 2014.
423		Impaired Mucus Detachment Disrupts Mucociliary Transport in a Piglet Model of
424		Cystic Fibrosis. Science 345:818-822.
425	13.	Ratjen F, Döring G. 2003. Cystic fibrosis. Lancet 361:681-689.
426	14.	O'Sullivan BP, Freedman SD. 2009. Cystic fibrosis. The Lancet 373:1891–1904.
427	15.	Hatziagorou E, Orenti A, Drevinek P, Kashirskaya N, Mei-Zahav M, De Boeck K,
428		ECFSPR. Electronic address: ECFS-Patient.Registry@uz.kuleuven.ac.be, ECFSPR.
429		2020. Changing epidemiology of the respiratory bacteriology of patients with cystic
430		fibrosis-data from the European cystic fibrosis society patient registry. J Cyst Fibros
431		19:376–383.

432	16.	Kim-Jo C, Gatti J-L, Poirié M. 2019. Drosophila Cellular Immunity Against Parasitoid
433		Wasps: A Complex and Time-Dependent Process. Front Physiol 10.
434	17.	Liu Y, Gordesky-Gold B, Leney-Greene M, Weinbren NL, Tudor M, Cherry S. 2018.
435		Inflammation-induced STING-dependent autophagy restricts Zika virus infection in the
436		Drosophila brain. Cell Host Microbe 24:57-68.e3.
437	18.	Dionne MS, Ghori N, Schneider DS. 2003. Drosophila melanogaster is a genetically
438		tractable model host for Mycobacterium marinum. Infect Immun 71:3540–3550.
439	19.	Mansfield BE, Dionne MS, Schneider DS, Freitag NE. 2003. Exploration of host-
440		pathogen interactions using Listeria monocytogenes and Drosophila melanogaster. Cell
441		Microbiol 5:901–911.
442	20.	Davis MM, Alvarez FJ, Ryman K, Holm ÅA, Ljungdahl PO, Engström Y. 2011. Wild-
443		Type Drosophila melanogaster as a Model Host to Analyze Nitrogen Source Dependent
444		Virulence of Candida albicans. PLOS ONE 6:e27434.
445	21.	Yang H, Hultmark D. 2017. Drosophila muscles regulate the immune response against
446		wasp infection via carbohydrate metabolism. Sci Rep 7.
447	22.	Lemaitre B, Hoffmann J. 2007. The Host Defense of Drosophila melanogaster. Annu
448		Rev Immunol 25:697–743.
449	23.	Lemaitre B, Nicolas E, Michaut L, Reichhart JM, Hoffmann JA. 1996. The
450		dorsoventral regulatory gene cassette spätzle/Toll/cactus controls the potent antifungal
451		response in Drosophila adults. Cell 86:973–983.
452	24.	Bergman P, Seyedoleslami Esfahani S, Engström Y. 2017. Drosophila as a Model for
453		Human Diseases-Focus on Innate Immunity in Barrier Epithelia. Curr Top Dev Biol
454		121:29–81.

455	25.	Lu Y, Su F, Li Q, Zhang J, Li Y, Tang T, Hu Q, Yu X-Q. 2020. Pattern recognition
456		receptors in Drosophila immune responses. Developmental & Comparative
457		Immunology 102:103468.
458	26.	Banerjee U, Girard JR, Goins LM, Spratford CM. 2019. Drosophila as a Genetic Model
459		for Hematopoiesis. Genetics 211:367–417.
460	27.	Vlisidou I, Wood W. 2015. Drosophila blood cells and their role in immune responses.
461		The FEBS Journal 282:1368–1382.
462	28.	Cho B, Yoon S-H, Lee D, Koranteng F, Tattikota SG, Cha N, Shin M, Do H, Hu Y, Oh
463		SY, Lee D, Vipin Menon A, Moon SJ, Perrimon N, Nam J-W, Shim J. 2020. Single-
464		cell transcriptome maps of myeloid blood cell lineages in Drosophila. Nature
465		Communications 11:4483.
466	29.	Fu Y, Huang X, Zhang P, van de Leemput J, Han Z. 2020. Single-cell RNA sequencing
467		identifies novel cell types in Drosophila blood. J Genet Genomics 47:175–186.
468	30.	Tattikota SG, Cho B, Liu Y, Hu Y, Barrera V, Steinbaugh MJ, Yoon S-H, Comjean A,
469		Li F, Dervis F, Hung R-J, Nam J-W, Ho Sui S, Shim J, Perrimon N. 2020. A single-cell
470		survey of Drosophila blood. eLife 9.
471	31.	Cattenoz PB, Sakr R, Pavlidaki A, Delaporte C, Riba A, Molina N, Hariharan N,
472		Mukherjee T, Giangrande A. 2020. Temporal specificity and heterogeneity of
473		Drosophila immune cells. EMBO J 39:e104486.
474	32.	Boulet M, Renaud Y, Lapraz F, Benmimoun B, Vandel L, Waltzer L. 2021.
475		Characterization of the Drosophila Adult Hematopoietic System Reveals a Rare Cell
476		Population With Differentiation and Proliferation Potential. Frontiers in Cell and
477		Developmental Biology 9:2863.

478	33.	Hirschhäuser A, Molitor D, Salinas G, Großhans J, Rust K, Bogdan S. 2022. PSC niche
479		develops into immune-responsive blood cells capable of transdifferentiating into
480		lamellocytes in Drosophila. preprint. Cell Biology.
481	34.	Boman HG, Nilsson I, Rasmuson B. 1972. Inducible antibacterial defence system in
482		Drosophila. Nature 237:232–235.
483	35.	Lemaitre B, Kromer-Metzger E, Michaut L, Nicolas E, Meister M, Georgel P,
484		Reichhart JM, Hoffmann JA. 1995. A recessive mutation, immune deficiency (imd),
485		defines two distinct control pathways in the Drosophila host defense. Proc Natl Acad
486		Sci USA 92:9465–9469.
487	36.	Ferrandon D, Imler J-L, Hetru C, Hoffmann JA. 2007. The Drosophila systemic
488		immune response: sensing and signalling during bacterial and fungal infections. Nat
489		Rev Immunol 7:862–874.
490	37.	Ritsick DR, Edens WA, McCoy JW, Lambeth JD. 2004. The use of model systems to
491		study biological functions of Nox/Duox enzymes. Biochem Soc Symp 85-96.
492	38.	Ha E-M, Oh C-T, Bae YS, Lee W-J. 2005. A Direct Role for Dual Oxidase in
493		Drosophila Gut Immunity. Science 310:847–850.
494	39.	Ramírez-Camejo LA, Maldonado-Morales G, Bayman P. 2017. Differential Microbial
495		Diversity in Drosophila melanogaster: Are Fruit Flies Potential Vectors of
496		Opportunistic Pathogens? Int J Microbiol 2017:8526385.
497	40.	Tan FHP, Liu G, Lau S-YA, Jaafar MH, Park Y-H, Azzam G, Li Y, Liong M-T. 2020.
498		Lactobacillus probiotics improved the gut microbiota profile of a Drosophila
499		melanogaster Alzheimer's disease model and alleviated neurodegeneration in the eye.
500		Benef Microbes 11:79–89.

501	41.	Aryal SK, Carter-House D, Stajich JE, Dillman AR. 2017. Microbial associates of the
502		southern mole cricket (Scapteriscus borellii) are highly pathogenic. J Invertebr Pathol
503		150:54–62.
504	42.	Needham AJ, Kibart M, Crossley H, Ingham PW, Foster SJ. 2004. Drosophila
505		melanogaster as a model host for Staphylococcus aureus infection. Microbiology,
506		150:2347–2355.
507	43.	Troha K, Im JH, Revah J, Lazzaro BP, Buchon N. 2018. Comparative transcriptomics
508		reveals CrebA as a novel regulator of infection tolerance in D. melanogaster. PLoS
509		Pathog 14:e1006847.
510	44.	Nehme NT, Quintin J, Cho JH, Lee J, Lafarge M-C, Kocks C, Ferrandon D. 2011.
511		Relative Roles of the Cellular and Humoral Responses in the Drosophila Host Defense
512		against Three Gram-Positive Bacterial Infections. PLOS ONE 6:e14743.
513	45.	Defaye A, Evans I, Crozatier M, Wood W, Lemaitre B, Leulier F. 2009. Genetic
514		ablation of Drosophila phagocytes reveals their contribution to both development and
515		resistance to bacterial infection. J Innate Immun 1:322-334.
516	46.	Stuart LM, Deng J, Silver JM, Takahashi K, Tseng AA, Hennessy EJ, Ezekowitz RAB,
517		Moore KJ. 2005. Response to Staphylococcus aureus requires CD36-mediated
518		phagocytosis triggered by the COOH-terminal cytoplasmic domain. J Cell Biol
519		170:477–485.
520	47.	Hashimoto Y, Tabuchi Y, Sakurai K, Kutsuna M, Kurokawa K, Awasaki T, Sekimizu
521		K, Nakanishi Y, Shiratsuchi A. 2009. Identification of lipoteichoic acid as a ligand for
522		draper in the phagocytosis of Staphylococcus aureus by Drosophila hemocytes. J
523		Immunol 183:7451–7460.

524	48.	Shiratsuchi A, Mori T, Sakurai K, Nagaosa K, Sekimizu K, Lee BL, Nakanishi Y.
525		2012. Independent recognition of Staphylococcus aureus by two receptors for
526		phagocytosis in Drosophila. J Biol Chem 287:21663–21672.
527	49.	Garver LS, Wu J, Wu LP. 2006. The peptidoglycan recognition protein PGRP-SC1a is
528		essential for Toll signaling and phagocytosis of Staphylococcus aureus in Drosophila.
529		Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 103:660–665.
530	50.	Atilano ML, Yates J, Glittenberg M, Filipe SR, Ligoxygakis P. 2011. Wall teichoic
531		acids of Staphylococcus aureus limit recognition by the drosophila peptidoglycan
532		recognition protein-SA to promote pathogenicity. PLoS Pathog 7:e1002421.
533	51.	Tabuchi Y, Shiratsuchi A, Kurokawa K, Gong JH, Sekimizu K, Lee BL, Nakanishi Y.
534		2010. Inhibitory role for D-alanylation of wall teichoic acid in activation of insect Toll
535		pathway by peptidoglycan of Staphylococcus aureus. J Immunol 185:2424–2431.
536	52.	Hori A, Kurata S, Kuraishi T. 2018. Unexpected role of the IMD pathway in
537		Drosophila gut defense against Staphylococcus aureus. Biochemical and Biophysical
538		Research Communications 495:395–400.
539	53.	Wu K, Conly J, Surette M, Sibley C, Elsayed S, Zhang K. 2012. Assessment of
540		virulence diversity of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus strains with a
541		Drosophila melanogaster infection model. BMC Microbiol 12:274.
542	54.	Ben-Ami R, Watson CC, Lewis RE, Albert ND, Arias CA, Raad II, Kontoyiannis DP.
543		2013. Drosophila melanogaster as a model to explore the effects of methicillin-resistant
544		Staphylococcus aureus strain type on virulence and response to linezolid treatment.
545		Microb Pathog 55:16–20.

546	55.	Ramond E, Jamet A, Ding X, Euphrasie D, Bouvier C, Lallemant L, He X, Arbibe L,
547		Coureuil M, Charbit A. 2021. Reactive Oxygen Species-Dependent Innate Immune
548		Mechanisms Control Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Virulence in the
549		Drosophila Larval Model. mBio 12:e0027621.
550	56.	Thomsen TT, Mojsoska B, Cruz JCS, Donadio S, Jenssen H, Løbner-Olesen A, Rewitz
551		K. 2016. The Lantibiotic NAI-107 Efficiently Rescues Drosophila melanogaster from
552		Infection with Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus USA300. Antimicrob
553		Agents Chemother 60:5427–5436.
554	57.	Nair SV, Baranwal G, Chatterjee M, Sachu A, Vasudevan AK, Bose C, Banerji A,
555		Biswas R. 2016. Antimicrobial activity of plumbagin, a naturally occurring
556		naphthoquinone from Plumbago rosea, against Staphylococcus aureus and Candida
557		albicans. International Journal of Medical Microbiology 306:237-248.
558	58.	Apidianakis Y, Rahme LG. 2009. Drosophila melanogaster as a model host for
559		studying Pseudomonas aeruginosa infection. 9. Nature Protocols 4:1285–1294.
560	59.	Limmer S, Haller S, Drenkard E, Lee J, Yu S, Kocks C, Ausubel FM, Ferrandon D.
561		2011. Pseudomonas aeruginosa RhIR is required to neutralize the cellular immune
562		response in a Drosophila melanogaster oral infection model. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA
563		108:17378–17383.
564	60.	Lau GW, Goumnerov BC, Walendziewicz CL, Hewitson J, Xiao W, Mahajan-Miklos
565		S, Tompkins RG, Perkins LA, Rahme LG. 2003. The Drosophila melanogaster toll
566		pathway participates in resistance to infection by the gram-negative human pathogen
567		Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Infect Immun 71:4059–4066.
568	61.	Apidianakis Y, Mindrinos MN, Xiao W, Lau GW, Baldini RL, Davis RW, Rahme LG.
569		2005. Profiling early infection responses: Pseudomonas aeruginosa eludes host

defenses by suppressing antimicrobial peptide gene expression. Proc Natl Acad Sci
USA 102:2573–2578.

572	62.	Iatsenko I, Marra A, Boquete J-P, Peña J, Lemaitre B. 2020. Iron sequestration by
573		transferrin 1 mediates nutritional immunity in Drosophila melanogaster. Proc Natl
574		Acad Sci U S A 117:7317–7325.

- Kim S-H, Park S-Y, Heo Y-J, Cho Y-H. 2008. Drosophila melanogaster-based
 screening for multihost virulence factors of Pseudomonas aeruginosa PA14 and
 identification of a virulence-attenuating factor, HudA. Infect Immun 76:4152–4162.
- 578 64. Erickson DL, Lines JL, Pesci EC, Venturi V, Storey DG. 2004. Pseudomonas
- aeruginosa relA contributes to virulence in Drosophila melanogaster. Infect Immun
 72:5638–5645.
- 581 65. Martínez E, Campos-Gómez J. 2016. Oxylipins produced by Pseudomonas aeruginosa
 582 promote biofilm formation and virulence. Nat Commun 7:13823.
- 583 66. Wongsaroj L, Saninjuk K, Romsang A, Duang-Nkern J, Trinachartvanit W,
- 584 Vattanaviboon P, Mongkolsuk S. 2018. Pseudomonas aeruginosa glutathione
- 585 biosynthesis genes play multiple roles in stress protection, bacterial virulence and
- biofilm formation. PLoS ONE 13:e0205815.
- 587 67. Heacock-Kang Y, Zarzycki-Siek J, Sun Z, Poonsuk K, Bluhm AP, Cabanas D, Fogen
- 588 D, McMillan IA, Chuanchuen R, Hoang TT. 2018. Novel dual regulators of
- 589 Pseudomonas aeruginosa essential for productive biofilms and virulence. Mol
- 590 Microbiol 109:401–414.
- 591 68. Nontaleerak B, Duang-Nkern J, Wongsaroj L, Trinachartvanit W, Romsang A,
- 592 Mongkolsuk S. 2020. Roles of RcsA, an AhpD Family Protein, in Reactive Chlorine

593		Stress Resistance and Virulence in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Appl Environ Microbiol
594		86:e01480-20.
595	69.	Xu C, Cao Q, Lan L. 2021. Glucose-Binding of Periplasmic Protein GltB Activates
596		GtrS-GltR Two-Component System in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Microorganisms
597		9:447.
598	70.	Fenn S, Dubern J-F, Cigana C, De Simone M, Lazenby J, Juhas M, Schwager S,
599		Bianconi I, Döring G, Elmsley J, Eberl L, Williams P, Bragonzi A, Cámara M. 2021.
600		NirA Is an Alternative Nitrite Reductase from Pseudomonas aeruginosa with Potential
601		as an Antivirulence Target. mBio 12:e00207-21.
602	71.	Shen L, Gao L, Yang M, Zhang J, Wang Y, Feng Y, Wang L, Wang S. 2021. Deletion
603		of the PA4427-PA4431 Operon of Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1 Increased
604		Antibiotics Resistance and Reduced Virulence and Pathogenicity by Affecting Quorum
605		Sensing and Iron Uptake. Microorganisms 9:1065.
606	72.	Dey S, Chakravarty A, Guha Biswas P, De Guzman RN. 2019. The type III secretion
607		system needle, tip, and translocon. Protein Sci 28:1582-1593.
608	73.	Fauvarque M-O, Bergeret E, Chabert J, Dacheux D, Satre M, Attree I. 2002. Role and
609		activation of type III secretion system genes in Pseudomonas aeruginosa-induced
610		Drosophila killing. Microbial Pathogenesis 32:287–295.
611	74.	Avet-Rochex A, Bergeret E, Attree I, Meister M, Fauvarque M-O. 2005. Suppression
612		of Drosophila cellular immunity by directed expression of the ExoS toxin GAP domain
613		of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Cell Microbiol 7:799–810.

614	75.	Avet-Rochex A, Perrin J, Bergeret E, Fauvarque M-O. 2007. Rac2 is a major actor of
615		Drosophila resistance to Pseudomonas aeruginosa acting in phagocytic cells. Genes
616		Cells 12:1193–1204.
617	76.	Sharma AK, FitzGerald D. 2010. Pseudomonas exotoxin kills Drosophila S2 cells via
618		apoptosis. Toxicon 56:1025–1034.
619	77.	Jia J, Wang Y, Zhou L, Jin S. 2006. Expression of Pseudomonas aeruginosa toxin ExoS
620		effectively induces apoptosis in host cells. Infect Immun 74:6557–6570.
621	78.	Stoltz DA, Ozer EA, Taft PJ, Barry M, Liu L, Kiss PJ, Moninger TO, Parsek MR,
622		Zabner J. 2008. Drosophila are protected from Pseudomonas aeruginosa lethality by
623		transgenic expression of paraoxonase-1. J Clin Invest 118:3123-3131.
624	79.	Mulcahy H, Sibley CD, Surette MG, Lewenza S. 2011. Drosophila melanogaster as an
625		Animal Model for the Study of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Biofilm Infections In Vivo.
626		PLoS Pathog 7.
627	80.	Heacock-Kang Y, Sun Z, Zarzycki-Siek J, Poonsuk K, McMillan IA, Chuanchuen R,
628		Hoang TT. 2018. Two Regulators, PA3898 and PA2100, Modulate the Pseudomonas
629		aeruginosa Multidrug Resistance MexAB-OprM and EmrAB Efflux Pumps and
630		Biofilm Formation. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 62.
631	81.	Apidianakis Y, Pitsouli C, Perrimon N, Rahme L. 2009. Synergy between bacterial
632		infection and genetic predisposition in intestinal dysplasia. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA
633		106:20883–20888.
634	82.	Heo Y-J, Lee Y-R, Jung H-H, Lee J, Ko G, Cho Y-H. 2009. Antibacterial efficacy of
635		phages against Pseudomonas aeruginosa infections in mice and Drosophila
636		melanogaster. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 53:2469-2474.

637	83.	Lindberg HM, McKean KA, Wang I-N. 2014. Phage fitness may help predict phage
638		therapy efficacy. Bacteriophage 4:e964081.
639	84.	Zhang P, Guo Q, Wei Z, Yang Q, Guo Z, Shen L, Duan K, Chen L. 2021. Baicalin
640		Represses Type Three Secretion System of Pseudomonas aeruginosa through PQS
641		System. Molecules 26:1497.
642	85.	Huang C, Xu R, Liégeois S, Chen D, Li Z, Ferrandon D. 2020. Differential
643		Requirements for Mediator Complex Subunits in Drosophila melanogaster Host
644		Defense Against Fungal and Bacterial Pathogens. Front Immunol 11:478958.
645	86.	Ben-Ami R, Lamaris GA, Lewis RE, Kontoyiannis DP. 2010. Interstrain variability in
646		the virulence of Aspergillus fumigatus and Aspergillus terreus in a Toll-deficient
647		Drosophila fly model of invasive aspergillosis. Med Mycol 48:310–317.
648	87.	Lionakis MS, Kontoyiannis DP. 2012. Drosophila melanogaster as a model organism
649		for invasive aspergillosis. Methods Mol Biol 845:455–468.
650	88.	Lionakis MS, Lewis RE, May GS, Wiederhold NP, Albert ND, Halder G, Kontoyiannis
651		DP. 2005. Toll-deficient Drosophila flies as a fast, high-throughput model for the study
652		of antifungal drug efficacy against invasive aspergillosis and Aspergillus virulence. J
653		Infect Dis 191:1188–1195.
654	89.	Chamilos G, Bignell EM, Schrettl M, Lewis RE, Leventakos K, May GS, Haas H,
655		Kontoyiannis DP. 2010. Exploring the concordance of Aspergillus fumigatus
656		pathogenicity in mice and Toll-deficient flies. Med Mycol 48:506–510.
657	90.	Spikes S, Xu R, Nguyen CK, Chamilos G, Kontoyiannis DP, Jacobson RH, Ejzykowicz
658		DE, Chiang LY, Filler SG, May GS. 2008. Gliotoxin production in Aspergillus

659 fumigatus contributes to host-specific differences in virulence. J Infect Dis 197:479–
660 486.

661	91.	Lionakis MS, Kontoyiannis DP. 2010. The growing promise of Toll-deficient
662		Drosophila melanogaster as a model for studying Aspergillus pathogenesis and
663		treatment. Virulence 1:488–499.
664	92.	Lamaris GA, Ben-Ami R, Lewis RE, Kontoyiannis DP. 2008. Does pre-exposure of
665		Aspergillus fumigatus to voriconazole or posaconazole in vitro affect its virulence and
666		the in vivo activity of subsequent posaconazole or voriconazole, respectively? A study
667		in a fly model of aspergillosis. J Antimicrob Chemother 62:539–542.
668	93.	Inamdar AA, Zaman T, Morath SU, Pu DC, Bennett JW. 2014. Drosophila
669		melanogaster as a model to characterize fungal volatile organic compounds. Environ
670		Toxicol 29:829–836.
671	94.	AL-Maliki HS, Martinez S, Piszczatowski P, Bennett JW. 2017. Drosophila
672		melanogaster as a Model for Studying Aspergillus fumigatus. Mycobiology 45:233-
673		239.
674	95.	Zhao G, Yin G, Inamdar AA, Luo J, Zhang N, Yang I, Buckley B, Bennett JW. 2017.
675		Volatile organic compounds emitted by filamentous fungi isolated from flooded homes
676		after Hurricane Sandy show toxicity in a Drosophila bioassay. Indoor Air 27:518–528.
677	96.	Castonguay-Vanier J, Vial L, Tremblay J, Déziel E. 2010. Drosophila melanogaster as
678		a model host for the Burkholderia cepacia complex. PLoS ONE 5:e11467.
679	97.	Vial L, Groleau M-C, Lamarche MG, Filion G, Castonguay-Vanier J, Dekimpe V,
680		Daigle F, Charette SJ, Déziel E. 2010. Phase variation has a role in Burkholderia
681		ambifaria niche adaptation. ISME J 4:49–60.

682	98.	Agnoli K, Schwager S, Uehlinger S, Vergunst A, Viteri DF, Nguyen DT, Sokol PA,
683		Carlier A, Eberl L. 2012. Exposing the third chromosome of Burkholderia cepacia
684		complex strains as a virulence plasmid. Mol Microbiol 83:362–378.
685	99.	Chapalain A, Vial L, Laprade N, Dekimpe V, Perreault J, Déziel E. 2013. Identification
686		of quorum sensing-controlled genes in Burkholderia ambifaria. Microbiologyopen
687		2:226–242.
688	100.	Schwager S, Agnoli K, Köthe M, Feldmann F, Givskov M, Carlier A, Eberl L. 2013.
689		Identification of Burkholderia cenocepacia strain H111 virulence factors using
690		nonmammalian infection hosts. Infect Immun 81:143–153.
691	101.	Allen VW, O'Connor RM, Ulgherait M, Zhou CG, Stone EF, Hill VM, Murphy KR,
692		Canman JC, Ja WW, Shirasu-Hiza MM. 2016. period-Regulated Feeding Behavior and
693		TOR Signaling Modulate Survival of Infection. Curr Biol 26:184–194.
694	102.	Touré H, Galindo LA, Lagune M, Glatigny S, Waterhouse RM, Guénal I, Herrmann J-
695		L, Szuplewski S, Girard-Misguich F. 2023. Mycobacterium abscessus resists the innate
696		cellular response by surviving cell lysis of infected phagocytes. PLOS Pathogens
697		19:e1011257.
698	103.	Marshall EKP, Dionne MS. 2021. Drosophila versus Mycobacteria: A Model for
699		Mycobacterial Host-Pathogen Interactions. Mol Microbiol
700		https://doi.org/10.1111/mmi.14819.
701	104.	Roux A-L, Catherinot E, Ripoll F, Soismier N, Macheras E, Ravilly S, Bellis G, Vibet
702		M-A, Le Roux E, Lemonnier L, Gutierrez C, Vincent V, Fauroux B, Rottman M,
703		Guillemot D, Gaillard J-L, Jean-Louis Herrmann for the OMA Group. 2009.
704		Multicenter study of prevalence of nontuberculous mycobacteria in patients with cystic
705		fibrosis in france. J Clin Microbiol 47:4124–4128.

706	105.	Griffith DE, Aksamit T, Brown-Elliott BA, Catanzaro A, Daley C, Gordin F, Holland
707		SM, Horsburgh R, Huitt G, Iademarco MF, Iseman M, Olivier K, Ruoss S, von Reyn
708		CF, Wallace RJ, Winthrop K, ATS Mycobacterial Diseases Subcommittee, American
709		Thoracic Society, Infectious Disease Society of America. 2007. An official ATS/IDSA
710		statement: diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of nontuberculous mycobacterial
711		diseases. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 175:367–416.
712	106.	Qvist T, Taylor-Robinson D, Waldmann E, Olesen HV, Hansen CR, Mathiesen IH,
713		Høiby N, Katzenstein TL, Smyth RL, Diggle PJ, Pressler T. 2016. Comparing the
714		harmful effects of nontuberculous mycobacteria and Gram negative bacteria on lung
715		function in patients with cystic fibrosis. J Cyst Fibros 15:380-385.
716	107.	Johansen MD, Herrmann J-L, Kremer L. 2020. Non-tuberculous mycobacteria and the
717		rise of Mycobacterium abscessus. Nat Rev Microbiol 18:392–407.
718	108.	Oh C-T, Moon C, Jeong MS, Kwon S-H, Jang J. 2013. Drosophila melanogaster model
719		for Mycobacterium abscessus infection. Microbes Infect 15:788–795.
720	109.	Touré H, Durand N, Guénal I, Herrmann J-L, Girard-Misguich F, Szuplewski S. 2023.
721		Mycobacterium abscessus Opsonization Allows an Escape from the Defensin
722		Bactericidal Action in Drosophila. Microbiology Spectrum 0:e00777-23.
723	110.	Dubois V, Viljoen A, Laencina L, Le Moigne V, Bernut A, Dubar F, Blaise M, Gaillard
724		J-L, Guérardel Y, Kremer L, Herrmann J-L, Girard-Misguich F. 2018. MmpL8MAB
725		controls Mycobacterium abscessus virulence and production of a previously unknown
726		glycolipid family. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 115:E10147–E10156.
727	111.	Dubois V, Pawlik A, Bories A, Le Moigne V, Sismeiro O, Legendre R, Varet H,
728		Rodríguez-Ordóñez MDP, Gaillard J-L, Coppée J-Y, Brosch R, Herrmann J-L, Girard-

729		Misguich F. 2019. Mycobacterium abscessus virulence traits unraveled by
730		transcriptomic profiling in amoeba and macrophages. PLoS Pathog 15:e1008069.
731	112.	Boeck L, Burbaud S, Skwark M, Pearson WH, Sangen J, Wuest AW, Marshall EKP,
732		Weimann A, Everall I, Bryant JM, Malhotra S, Bannerman BP, Kierdorf K, Blundell
733		TL, Dionne MS, Parkhill J, Andres Floto R. 2022. Mycobacterium abscessus
734		pathogenesis identified by phenogenomic analyses. Nat Microbiol 7:1431-1441.
735	113.	Medjahed H, Gaillard J-L, Reyrat J-M. 2010. Mycobacterium abscessus: a new player
736		in the mycobacterial field. Trends in Microbiology 18:117–123.
737	114.	Floto RA, Olivier KN, Saiman L, Daley CL, Herrmann J-L, Nick JA, Noone PG, Bilton
738		D, Corris P, Gibson RL, Hempstead SE, Koetz K, Sabadosa KA, Sermet-Gaudelus I,
739		Smyth AR, van Ingen J, Wallace RJ, Winthrop KL, Marshall BC, Haworth CS. 2016.
740		US Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and European Cystic Fibrosis Society consensus
741		recommendations for the management of non-tuberculous mycobacteria in individuals
742		with cystic fibrosis. Thorax 71:i1–i22.
743	115.	Oh C-T, Moon C, Park OK, Kwon S-H, Jang J. 2014. Novel drug combination for
744		Mycobacterium abscessus disease therapy identified in a Drosophila infection model. J
745		Antimicrob Chemother 69:1599–1607.
746	116.	Pham LN, Dionne MS, Shirasu-Hiza M, Schneider DS. 2007. A specific primed
747		immune response in Drosophila is dependent on phagocytes. PLoS Pathog 3:e26.
748	117.	Chambers MC, Lightfield KL, Schneider DS. 2012. How the fly balances its ability to
749		combat different pathogens. PLoS Pathog 8:e1002970.

- 750 118. Bajgar A, Dolezal T. 2018. Extracellular adenosine modulates host-pathogen
- 751 interactions through regulation of systemic metabolism during immune response in 752 Drosophila. PLoS Pathog 14:e1007022.
- 753 119. Schneider DS, Ayres JS, Brandt SM, Costa A, Dionne MS, Gordon MD, Mabery EM, 754 Moule MG, Pham LN, Shirasu-Hiza MM. 2007. Drosophila eiger mutants are sensitive 755
- to extracellular pathogens. PLoS Pathog 3:e41.
- 756 120. Bou Ghanem EN, Clark S, Roggensack SE, McIver SR, Alcaide P, Haydon PG, Leong 757 JM. 2015. Extracellular Adenosine Protects against Streptococcus pneumoniae Lung 758 Infection by Regulating Pulmonary Neutrophil Recruitment. PLoS Pathog
- 759 11:e1005126.
- 760 Majde JA, Krueger JM. 2005. Links between the innate immune system and sleep. 121. 761 Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 116:1188–1198.
- 762 Shirasu-Hiza MM, Dionne MS, Pham LN, Ayres JS, Schneider DS. 2007. Interactions 122. 763 between circadian rhythm and immunity in Drosophila melanogaster. Current Biology 764 17:R353–R355.
- 765 Sibley CD, Duan K, Fischer C, Parkins MD, Storey DG, Rabin HR, Surette MG. 2008. 123. 766 Discerning the Complexity of Community Interactions Using a Drosophila Model of 767 Polymicrobial Infections. PLOS Pathogens 4:e1000184.
- 768 124. Korgaonkar A, Trivedi U, Rumbaugh KP, Whiteley M. 2013. Community surveillance 769 enhances Pseudomonas aeruginosa virulence during polymicrobial infection. PNAS 770 110:1059–1064.

771	125.	Scoffield JA, Duan D, Zhu F, Wu H. 2017. A commensal streptococcus hijacks a
772		Pseudomonas aeruginosa exopolysaccharide to promote biofilm formation. PLoS
773		Pathog 13.
774	126.	Scoffield JA, Wu H. 2016. Nitrite reductase is critical for Pseudomonas aeruginosa
775		survival during co-infection with the oral commensal Streptococcus parasanguinis.
776		Microbiology (Reading, Engl) 162:376–383.
777	127.	Lee Y-J, Jang H-J, Chung I-Y, Cho Y-H. 2018. Drosophila melanogaster as a
778		polymicrobial infection model for Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Staphylococcus
779		aureus. J Microbiol 56:534–541.
780	128.	Kim K, Hung R-J, Perrimon N. 2017. miR-263a Regulates ENaC to Maintain Osmotic
781		and Intestinal Stem Cell Homeostasis in Drosophila. Dev Cell 40:23-36.
782	129.	Kim K, Lane EA, Saftien A, Wang H, Xu Y, Wirtz-Peitz F, Perrimon N. 2020.
783		Drosophila as a model for studying cystic fibrosis pathophysiology of the
784		gastrointestinal system. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA
785		https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1913127117.
786	130.	Liu L, Johnson WA, Welsh MJ. 2003. Drosophila DEG/ENaC pickpocket genes are
787		expressed in the tracheal system, where they may be involved in liquid clearance. Proc
788		Natl Acad Sci USA 100:2128–2133.
789		

	Host immune response						
Pathogen	Cellular response		Humoral response		Other	Host manipulation by the pathogen	In vivo validated
	Phagocytosis	ROS production	Toll	IMD	response(s)	~, the participan	
S. aureus	Receptors: Croquemort, Draper, Eater	~	~	×	?	- Neutralization of host oxidative and antimicrobial responses by catalase - Reduction of PGN detection and humoral response by producing D-alanylated teichoic acid	- Nisin - NAI-107 - Plumbagin
P. aeruginosa	Receptors:	?	~	~	 Activation of JNK pathway in enterocytes during oral infection Nutritional immunity: iron sequestration from the hemolymph and relocation to the fat body 	 Prevention of phagocytosis by hemocytes by RhIR and the exotoxin ExoS Induction of apoptosis of S2 cells by ExoS and Exotoxin A Suppression of AMP production 	- Lytic phage MPK1 - Lytic phage MPK6 - Baicalin
B. cepacia	? <u>Receptors:</u> ?	?	~	~	Activation of TOR pathway for tolerance and resistance	?	?
M. abscessus	Receptors:	?	~	~	Granzyme- mediated cytotoxic response by thanacytes	?	- Tigecycline - Linezolid
S. pneumoniae	Receptors:	?	~	~	Activation of adenosine signaling for metabolic switch	- Loss of circadian regulation of locomotor activity	?
A. fumigatus	Receptors:	?	~	×	?	?	- Voriconazole - Posaconazole - Terbinafine