Rhizobium meliloti nodD Genes Mediate Host-Specific Activation of nodABC

MARY A. HONMA,[†] MARGARET ASOMANING, AND FREDERICK M. AUSUBEL*

Department of Genetics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, and Department of Molecular Biology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts 02114

Received 26 May 1989/Accepted 4 October 1989

To differentiate among the roles of the three nodD genes of Rhizobium meliloti 1021, we studied the activation of a nodC-lacZ fusion by each of the three nodD genes in response to root exudates from several R. meliloti host plants and in response to the flavone luteolin. We found (i) that the $nodD_1$ and $nodD_2$ products (NodD₁ and NodD₂) responded differently to root exudates from a variety of hosts, (ii) that NodD₁ but not NodD₂ responded to luteolin, (iii) that NodD₂ functioned synergistically with NodD₁ or NodD₃, (iv) that NodD₂ interfered with NodD₁-mediated activation of nodC-lacZ in response to luteolin, and (v) that a region adjacent to and upstream of nodD₂ was required for NodD₂-mediated activation of nodC-lacZ. We also studied the ability of each of the three R. meliloti nodD genes to complement nodD mutations in R. trifolii and Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234. We found (i) that nodD₁ complemented an R. trifolii nodD mutation but not a Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234 nodD₁ mutation and (ii) that R. meliloti nodD₂ or nodD₃ plus R. meliloti syrM complemented the nodD mutations in both R. trifolii and Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234. Finally, we determined the nucleotide sequence of the R. meliloti nod D_2 gene and found that R. meliloti Nod D_1 and Nod D_2 are highly homologous except in the C-terminal region. Our results support the hypothesis that R. meliloti utilizes the three copies of nodD to optimize the interaction with each of its legume hosts.

In Rhizobium meliloti, nodulation genes involved in the early stages of symbiotic nodule formation are located on a large symbiotic plasmid (pRmeSU47a) and are closely linked to a cluster of nitrogen fixation (nif) genes (for a review, see reference 28). The R. meliloti nodulation genes can be classified into the following three groups: the so-called common nodulation genes (nodA, nodB, and nodC) are structurally and functionally conserved among several Rhizobium and Bradyrhizobium species (8, 12, 29). In contrast, the host-specific nodulation genes (nodE, nodF, nodG, and $nodH$) allow R . meliloti to form nodules on plants of the genera Medicago, Melilotus, and Trigonella, but not on Trifolium, which is the host of R . trifolii $(4, 25)$. The third category of nod genes is represented by nodD, whose product (NodD) is a positive regulator that activates both the common and host-specific nodulation genes in the presence of inducing compounds exuded by host roots (34, 41, 46). The inducing compounds are flavones, flavonones, or other closely related compounds that vary from one plant species to another. For example, the most active inducing compound of the R. meliloti nodABC genes in alfalfa seed exudate is the flavone luteolin (36), whereas dihydroxyflavone was identified as the most active inducer of the R. trifolii nod genes in white clover root exudate (40). A conserved sequence, the nod box, to which NodD binds in vitro (15, 22, 27), is present upstream of all inducible nod operons and appears to function as a cis-acting regulatory element of nod gene expression (14, 16, 42, 47).

R. trifolii and R. leguminosarum each have one copy of the *nodD* gene, and null mutations in these *nodD* genes result in a Nod⁻ phenotype (8, 10). In contrast, R. meliloti has three functional copies of nodD (20, 23, 35). We reported previously that R. meliloti strains containing different com-

binations of mutations in the three *nodD* genes exhibited different nodulation phenotypes on different host plants, suggesting that the *nodD* genes have a host-specific role in the nodulation process (23). This latter conclusion is consistent with data obtained by Spaink et al. (48) and by Horvath et al. (24), who found that the nodD genes of different Rhizobium species differed in their responses to flavonoid inducers in a species-specific way. The experiments reported in this paper provide additional support for the hypothesis that the three R. meliloti nodD genes are involved in mediating host-specific activation of the nodABC genes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacterial strains, plasmids, and media. The strains and plasmids used in this study are listed in Table 1. Rhizobia were grown on either TY medium (0.5% tryptone, 0.3% yeast extract, 3.4 mM CaCl₂) or MES minimal medium at pH 6.8 for R. meliloti and pH 6.5 for R. trifolii. MES minimal medium contained ¹⁰ mg of MES (morpholineethanesulfonic acid) per ml, 14.4 mM K_2HPO_4 , 18 mM KH_2PO_4 , 1 mM $MgSO_4$, 0.136 mM CaCl₂, 24 $\mu\dot{M}$ FeCl₃, 40 $\mu\dot{M}$ disodium EDTA, 3.4 mM NaCl, 2.0 mM NH4Cl, 0.05% sodium glutamate, 0.2% sucrose, 0.1% Gamborg trace elements (19), 1μ g of thiamine hydrochloride per ml, 1μ g of nicotinic acid per ml, 1 μ g of pyridoxine hydrochloride per ml, 0.02 μ g of biotin per ml, and $2 \mu g$ of pantothenate per ml. Tetracycline was added at 3 to 5 μ g/ml as required.

Plasmid transfer. Plasmids were transferred from Escherichia coli to Rhizobium spp. by triparental matings as described previously (43), followed by plating on either TY medium containing streptomycin $(200 \mu g/ml)$ and tetracycline (5 μ g/ml) or MES minimal medium containing tetracycline (3 to 5 μ g/ml).

Construction of R. meliloti nodD multiple mutants. In a previous report (23), we described the construction of a set of R. meliloti nodD mutants which contained all possible combinations of null mutations in each of the three nodD

^{*} Corresponding author.

^t Present address: Plant Gene Expression Center, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Albany, CA 94710.

Bacterial strains and plasmids	Relevant characteristics	Source or reference	
R. meliloti			
1021	Sm ^r derivative of SU47	30	
JM57	1021 pRmeSU47a nodC-lacZ	34	
$RmD1D2-1$	1021 $nodD_1$::Tn5(9B8) $nodD_2$::tm	23	
$RmD1D3-1$	1021 nodD ₁ ::Tn5(9B8) nodD ₃ ::sp/g-1	23	
RmD1D2D3-1	1021 nodD ₁ ::Tn5(9B8) nodD ₂ ::tm nodD ₃ ::sp/g-1	23	
$RmD1D2-3$	1021 $nodD_1$::Tn5(9B7) $nodD_2$::tm	This study	
$RmD1D3-3$	1021 nodD ₁ ::Tn5(9B7) nodD ₃ ::sp/g-1	This study	
$RmD1D2D3-3$	1021 nodD ₁ ::Tn5(9B7) nodD ₂ ::tm nodD ₃ ::sp/g-1	This study	
$RmD1-4$	1021 $nodD_1$::Tn5(9B7) $nodC$ -lacZ	This study	
$RmD2-4$	1021 $nodD_2$::tm $nodC$ -lacZ	This study	
$RmD3-4$	1021 $nodD_3::sp/g-1$ $nodC-lacZ$	This study	
$RmD1D2-4$	1021 nodD ₁ ::Tn5(9B7) nodD ₂ ::tm nodC-lacZ	This study	
RmD1D3-4	1021 $nodD_1$::Tn5(9B7) $nodD_3$::sp/g-1 $nodC$ -lacZ	This study	
$RmD2D3-4$	1021 nodD ₂ ::tm, nodD ₃ ::sp/g-1 nodC-lacZ	This study	
$RmD1D2D3-4$	1021 nodD ₁ ::Tn5(9B7) nodD ₂ ::tm nodD ₃ ::sp/g-1 nodC-lacZ	This study	
Rmnod291-3	1021 nod-291:: $Tn5$	This study	
Rmnod291-4	1021 $nod-291$::Tn5 $nodC$ -lacZ	This study	
Plasmids			
pUC13	Cloning vector	51	
pACYC184	Cloning vector	3	
pUC18(lacZ)	lacZ probe	52	
$pHP45\Omega$	Source of Ω fragment	38	
pHM5	$ColE1::Tn5$; Tn5 probe	30	
M13mp18	Sequencing vector	52	
M13mp19	Sequencing vector	52	
Bluescript	Cloning vector	Stratagene	
pRK290	Broad-host-range IncP plasmid, Tet ^r	7	
pWB5A	IncP, Tet ^r ; $pRK290 + polylinker$ in <i>EcoRI</i> site	W. Buikema	
pNodD ₁	785 bp of $nodD_1$ in M13mp10	23	
pNodD,	6.8-kb <i>EcoRI</i> fragment (<i>nodD</i> ₂) in plasmid πR	23	
pMHD ₂	6.8-kb <i>EcoRI</i> fragment (<i>nodD</i> ₂) from $pNodD_2$ in $pUC13$	This study	
pMH901	2.7-kb <i>PvuII-HindIII</i> fragment $(nodD_1)$ in pWB5A	This study	
pNoddD ₂ (1.5)	1.5-kb <i>EcoRI-HindIII</i> fragment ($nodD2$) from $pNodD2$ in $pUC13$	This study	
pMH93	6.8-kb <i>EcoRI</i> fragment (<i>nodD</i> ₂) from $pNodD$ ₂ in $pRK290$	This study	
pMH93-207	pMH93 with 0.6-kb deletion	This study	
pMH93-209	pMH93 with 1.3-kb deletion	This study	
pMH93-224	pMH93 with 1.6-kb deletion	This study	
pMH93-236	$pMH93$ with 0.6-kb deletion (deletes <i>nodD</i> ₂)	This study	
pMH93-291	pMH93 with Tn5 insertion (5) 2.5 kb upstream of $nodD_2$	This study	
pMH93-292	pMH93-291 with most of Tn5 deleted	This study	
pMH93-352	pMH93 with 2.4-kb deletion + Ω fragment	This study	
pMH93-373	$pMH93$ with Ω fragment at the XhoI site	This study	
pNodD ₃	15.5-kb fragment (syrM nodD ₃) in pACYC184	23	
pMH624	10.2-kb Xhol-EcoRI fragment (syrM nodD ₃) from pNodD ₃ in pUC13	This study	
pMH682	9.0-kb <i>HindIII</i> fragment (syrM nodD ₃) from pMH624 in pWB5A	This study	
pMH903	3.5-kb <i>PstI</i> fragment ($nodD_3$) from $pNodD_3$ in $pWB5A$	This study	
pMH904	4.2-kb <i>HindIII-ClaI</i> fragment (syrM) from pMH624 in pWB5A	This study	

TABLE 1. Bacterial strains and plasmids used in this study

genes. In the current study, we transduced a nodC-lacZ fusion into each of these *nodD* mutants and surprisingly found that all strains that carried the $nodD_1$ mutation expressed the nodC-lacZ fusion constitutively. The nodD₁ mutation (allele no. 9B8) used previously to construct the various nodD mutants was ^a Tn5 insertion close to the N terminus of the $nodD_1$ gene (26). Because the $nodD_1$ and nodA genes are divergently transcribed and because their promoters probably overlap, the most likely explanation for the constitutive expression of nodC was that Tn5 was providing promoter sequences from which transcription could be initiated; this has been reported previously for R. meliloti (44).

To overcome the constitutive expression of nodABC associated with the $nodD_1$ (9B8) allele, we reconstructed the double mutants $nodD_1$ -nod D_2 and $nodD_1$ -nod D_3 and the triple mutant $nodD_1\text{-}nodD_2\text{-}nodD_3$, with a different $nodD_1$

allele (9B7) from strain RmTJ9B7, which contained Tn5 inserted in the C-terminal region of $nodD_1$ (26). This was accomplished by using bacteriophage M12-mediated transduction as described previously (13). The reconstructed nodD mutants were designated RmDlD2-3, RmDlD3-3, and RmDlD2D3-3, to distinguish them from the ones constructed previously, which had been designated RmDlD2-1, RmDlD3-1, and RmDlD2D3-1. The structures of the newly constructed mutants were verified by the Southern transfer and hybridization procedure (data not shown). We also tested the nodulation phenotypes of the reconstructed nodD mutants RmDlD3-3 and RmDlD2D3-3 on alfalfa and sweet clover as described previously (23) and found that they had the same phenotypes as the previously tested nodD mutants (23) , even though the original set of *nodD* mutants containing the $nodD_1$ (9B8) allele transcribed the $nodABC$ promoter constitutively (data not shown). This latter result was not

FIG. 1. Physical-genetic map of the nod-nif region of pRmeSU47a, the symbiotic plasmid of R. meliloti 1021. Short vertical hatch marks indicate EcoRI restriction sites. Other sites marked are \dot{C} (ClaI), H (HindIII), P (PsiI), Pv (PvuII), RI (EcoRI), Xb (XbaI), and Xh (XhoI). Horizontal arrows indicate the direction of transcription. The numbers below the genome map denote the lengths of selected EcoRI fragments in kilobase pairs. The large capital letters, A, B, C, G, E, F, H, D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 , indicate nodulation genes. The 10-kb scale marker refers to the central, nonexpanded map.

unexpected, since the host-specific nodulation genes (nodF, $node$, $nodG$, and $nodH$), which are also regulated by the nodD genes, would still be subject to normal regulation in the strains that contained the $nodD_1$ (9B8) allele.

Construction of *nodD* plasmids. Plasmids carrying the R . meliloti nodD genes that were constructed for this study are listed in Table 1, along with relevant features. The restriction fragments used to construct these plasmids are diagrammed in Fig. 1. A series of deletion and deletion-insertion derivatives of pMH93 were constructed by using Bal31 nuclease (see Fig. 3). The 2.0-kilobase-pair (kb) Ω fragment (SmaI) fragment from pPH45 Ω), which carries genes encoding resistance to streptomycin and spectinomycin and has transcription and translation terminators from bacteriophage T4 at its ends (18, 38), was used to construct the deletioninsertion derivatives. To construct pMH93-292, pMH93-291 was digested with XhoI and then subjected to self-ligation. This removed most of the TnS present in pMH93-291 and generated a small (0.5-kb) deletion between the Tn5 insertion site and the XhoI site of pMH93-291. Additional details concerning the construction of the plasmids can be obtained from the authors.

Construction of nodC-lacZ fusion strains. R. meliloti phage M12 (13) was used to construct R. meliloti strains carrying a nodC-lacZ fusion with all possible combinations of nodD mutations (i.e., nod D_1 , nod D_2 , nod D_3 , nod D_1 -nod D_2 , $\text{mod}D_1\text{-} \text{nod}D_3$, $\text{nod}D_2\text{-} \text{nod}D_3$, and $\text{nod}D_1\text{-} \text{nod}D_2\text{-} \text{nod}D_3$). The nodC-lacZ fusion was derived from strain JM57 (which carries a spectinomycin resistance gene downstream of a nodC-lacZ fusion). Transductants were plated on LB-M9 (1:1) medium (6). Concentrations of antibiotics used to select the transductants were 50 μ g of spectinomycin per ml, 100 μ g of neomycin per ml, 100 μ g of trimethoprim per ml, and 25 μ g of gentamicin per ml. The *nodD* mutations used in these constructions were derived from strains RmTJ9B7, RmD2, RmD3-1, RmD1-4, RmD3-4, and RmD2D3-1. All strain constructions were verified by Southern blotting and hybridization with pHM5 (ColE1::Tn5), pUC18(lacZ), $pNodD_1$ (carrying 785 base pairs [bp] of $nodD_1$ coding sequence), and pHP45 Ω as probes (data not shown).

Root exudates and inducing compounds. Alfalfa seed exudate was prepared as described by Mulligan and Long (34). Alfalfa exudate was collected, centrifuged to remove debris, and filter sterilized. Melilotus alba and Medicago truncatula root exudates were prepared from 10 and 60 g of seeds,

respectively, as described by Redmond et al. (40). Melilotus alba exudate was vacuum concentrated to dryness, and the residue was suspended in 6 ml of methanol. Medicago truncatula exudate was vacuum concentrated to 60 ml. Sterile exudates were stored at -20° C.

Induction of the *nodC-lacZ* fusion and *B-galactosidase* assays. Early-log-phase cells grown overnight in MES minimal medium (pH 6.8) were diluted to $A_{600} = 0.1$, and root exudate or luteolin was added. The alfalfa, Melilotus alba, and Medicago trancatula root exudates (extracts) were diluted 1:20, 1:500, and 1:10, respectively. These were the concentrations that maximally activated the nodC-lacZ fusion in strain JM57 carrying either pMH901 or pMH93 (data not shown). When required, luteolin was added to 10 μ M. Bacteria were grown in the presence of the inducers for 4 h.

Assays for β -galactosidase activity were performed essentially as described by Miller (32). Four separate cultures of each strain were assayed for each treatment with exudate or luteolin. The wild-type strain RmlO21, which does not carry the nodC-lacZ fusion, was also grown as a control in the presence of each inducer, and the β -galactosidase activity of these cells (5 to 10 U) was subtracted from the activity obtained for each strain.

Nodulation assays. Alfalfa and sweet clover nodulation tests were carried out as described previously (23, 30) with the following exceptions. One to two days after planting, alfalfa or sweet clover seedlings were inoculated with R. meliloti cultures that had been grown overnight at 32°C until late log phase in TY medium, centrifuged, and suspended in $10 \text{ mM } MgSO₄$. To determine the optimal inoculum dose, we varied the amounts of wild-type (Rm1021) and $nodD_1$ -nod D_2 mutant (strain RmD1D2-1) inoculum over a range of 50 to $\overline{8}$ \times 10⁷ cells per plant. Cell numbers were determined by viable counts. An inoculum dose of $10³$ to $10⁴$ cells per plant was not only optimal for nodulation of the wild-type strain but also optimal for distinguishing between the wild-type and delayed-nodulation phenotypes. Two experiments with ²⁵ plants per strain were carried out for each condition tested, except that the experiments in which the nodD triple-mutant strain was complemented with each nodD gene on a plasmid were performed only once. For each set of experiments, tubes inoculated with different R. meliloti strains were randomized in racks. Plants were incubated in growth chambers at 20 to 24°C in a 16-h light, 8-h dark cycle. The time of appearance and number of nodules were scored every day

from day 5 until day 16 and every 2 days thereafter. Medicago sativa var. Iroquois seeds were obtained from Agway, Inc., Waltham, Mass. Melilotus alba seeds were a generous gift of B. Kneen and T. LaRue, Boyce Thompson Institute, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Nodulation assays for siratro (Macroptilium atropurpureum) and white clover (Trifolium repens) were performed as described above with the following exceptions. The pH of the plant medium for white clover was 6.5. White clover seedlings were inoculated with 107 bacteria per plant, and siratro seedlings were inoculated with 10^7 , 5×10^7 , or 10^8 bacteria per plant, as indicated. Siratro and white clover plants were grown at 25 to 28°C and 19 to 21°C, respectively. The appearance of nodules was scored every ¹ to 2 days from days 6 to 14 postinoculation and every 3 to 8 days thereafter. Twenty to twenty-five plants were inoculated with each strain, and each experiment was performed three times, except for experiments involving pMH93, which were carried out twice. Siratro and white clover seed was obtained from Wright Stephenson, Ltd., New South Wales, Australia, and John D. Lyon, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., respectively.

Isolation of bacteria from nodules. Nodules were surfaced sterilized by immersion in 50% commercial chlorine bleach for ¹ to 2 min and then given several-washes in sterile water. Nodules were squashed in 10 mM $MgSO₄$ by using a wooden applicator stick, and the liquid was plated on TY containing the appropriate antibiotics.

DNA sequencing. The $nodD₂$ sequence was generated as follows. The 1.5-kb EcoRI-HindIII fragment containing the $nodD_2$ structural gene was subcloned from plasmid pNodD₂ into pUC13, yielding $pNodD₂(1.5)$. Deletion derivatives of $pNoddD₂(1.5)$ were generated with *Bal* 31 nuclease as described by Poncz et al. (37), and a series of deleted 1.5-kb EcoRI-HindIII fragments were subcloned into M13mpl8 and M13mp19. Because the 1.5-kb EcoRI-HindIII fragment does not contain the entire $nodD₂$ promoter region, additional M13 clones were made by subcloning BamHI-PvuI (420-bp), ClaI-BamHI (2,350-bp), and BamHI-ClaI (300-bp) fragments from $pNodD₂$ into M13mp18 and M13mp19 (see Fig. 3). Two ClaI sites were present in plasmid $pNodD_2$; however, since the ClaI site which overlaps with one PvuI site (see Fig. 3) is methylated by dam methylase, only the other ClaI site is susceptible to digestion with ClaI. Dideoxy sequencing reactions with Klenow polymerase and $[35S]dATP$ were carried out as described previously (1). Sequence data were analyzed on a VAX11/780 computer (Digital Equipment Corp.) as described by Earl et al. (11).

RESULTS

Experimental strategy. We and others have recently shown that \overline{R} . meliloti contains three copies of the nodD gene, all of which are functional, and have hypothesized that these three nodB genes are involved in optimizing the recognition of particular legume hosts (21, 23). To provide additional support for this hypothesis, we determined the DNA sequence of the R. meliloti nod D_2 gene to determine its degree of divergence from the $nodD_1$ gene, tested the ability of each of the three R. meliloti nodD genes to respond to root exudates from three different R. meliloti hosts and to the flavone luteolin, and determined the ability of each of the three R. meliloti nodD genes to complement nodD mutations in R. trifolii and in the broad-host-range Rhizobium strain NGR234.

Nucleotide sequence of $nodD_2$. The DNA sequence of the

c AlaSerArgIllAspProGlnSerAspThrCysEnd d SerGluPhe GlyGlu SerLeuGluEnd

FIG. 2. Nucleotide and amino acid sequences of R. meliloti 1021 $nodD_1$ (12) and $nodD_2$ (this work). The nucleotide sequence of $nodD₁$ is shown on line a, and the deduced amino acid sequence is shown on line c. Only differences in bases and amino acids are shown for the $nodD_2$ sequences (lines b and d). Dashes indicate missing bases in the $nodD₂$ sequence. These data have been submitted to GenBank and have been assigned accession number M29367.

R. meliloti 1021 nodD₂ gene is compared with the previously published sequence of R. meliloti 1021 nodD₁ (12) in Fig. 2. The $nodD_2$ gene codes for a predicted protein of 310 amino acids, compared with the 308 amino acids encoded by nodD₁. The homology between nodD₁ and nodD₂ is 85 and

			Activation (β-galactosidase units with following inducer):						
Strain		Plasmid (gene present)	None	Luteolin	Medicago sativa exudate	Melilotus alba exudate	Medicago truncatula exudate		
	JM57	None	3	14	13	ND ^a	ND		
2.	$RmD1-4$	None	5	6	3	ND	ND		
3.	$RmD2-4$	None	$\overline{2}$	89	34	ND	ND		
4.	$RmD3-4$	None	$\overline{2}$	12	11	ND	ND		
5.	$RmD1D2-4$	None		4	$\overline{2}$	ND	ND		
6.	$RmD1D3-4$	None	5	5	4	ND	ND		
7.	RmD _{2D} 3-4	None	$\overline{2}$	76	27	ND	ND		
8.	RmD1D2D3-4	None	4	4	3	ND	ND		
9.	JM57	None	3	17	14	$\overline{2}$	8		
	10. RmD2-4	None		85	23	ND	ND		
	11. Rmnod291-4	None		22	10	ND	ND		
	12. JM57	pMH901 (nodD ₁)		430	270	43	64		
	13. JM57	$pMH93$ ($nodD2$)	8	9	217	28	112		
	14. JM57	pMH903 (nodD ₃)	5	34	27	5	17		
	15. JM57	$pMH904$ (syrM)	10	48	31	13	33		
	16. JM57	$pMH682 \pmod{D_3 \text{ }\text{sym}}$	1,036	1,398	1,131	1,154	1,268		
17.	RmD1D2D3-4	None	5	5	4	2	5		
18.	RmD1D2D3-4	pMH901 (nodD ₁)		405	328	51	69		
	19. RmD1D2D3-4	pMH93 (nodD ₂)		6	18		22		
20.	RmD1D2D3-4	pMH93-291 (nodD ₂)					6		
21.	RmD1D2D3-4	pMH93-236 (nodD ₂)							
	RmD1D2D3-4	$pMH93-352 \ (nodD2)$				2			
23.	RmD1D2D3-4	$pMH903 \ (nodD3)$		10			11		
	24. RmD1D2D3-4	$pMH904$ (syrM)		5					
	25. RmD1D2D3-4	$pMH682 \pmod{D_3}$, syrM)	1,112	1,298	1,122	1,139	1,368		

TABLE 2. Activation of nodC-lacZ fusion in response to different nodD genes and host root exudates

^a ND, Not done.

87% at the DNA and amino acid levels, respectively. As has been observed previously in comparisons of nodD genes from different Rhizobium species (24, 45), we found that R. $meliloti \text{NodD}_1$ and NodD_2 are most highly conserved in the N-terminal halves and diverge in the C-terminal halves. In particular, the last six of eight amino acids of $NodD₁$ are different from those in $NodD_2$; $NodD_2$ also has two additional amino acids at the C-terminal end. As discussed below, these results are consistent with the hypothesis that the C-terminal regions of NodD proteins are involved in determining flavonoid specificity.

The 5'-noncoding regions of R. meliloti nod D_1 and nod D_2 show strong homology to each other, with the exception of a 10- to 12-bp deletion in the region upstream of $nodD_2$, adjacent to the nod box consensus sequence (42).

The nod D_1 and nod D_2 genes of R. meliloti Rm41 (an independent wild-type isolate) have been sequenced (20). Comparison between the DNA sequences of the $nodD_1$ and $nodD₂$ genes or strains Rm1021 and Rm41 revealed very few differences. There are only two base changes between $nodD_1$ of RmlO21 and Rm4l: one each in the coding and upstream regions. There are ¹² base differences between the DNA sequences of Rm41 and Rm1021 $nodD_2$; 5 of these base changes result in different amino acids.

Induction of nodC-lacZ in nodD mutants. To determine the relative contributions of each of the three R. meliloti nodD genes in activation of nodABC, we studied the expression of a nodC-lacZ fusion (integrated at the nodC locus) in R. meliloti strains which contained all possible combinations of mutations in each of the three *nodD* genes. (See Materials and Methods for details of strain construction and Table ¹ for a listing of each strain with its genotype.)

The effect of alfalfa seed exudate or luteolin on nodC-lacZ

expression is shown in Table 2, lines 1 to 8. The $NodD⁺$ control, JM57, showed a four- to fivefold induction upon addition of luteolin or alfalfa seed exudate (line 1). The nodC-lacZ fusion was not induced by either luteolin or alfalfa seed exudate in a $nodD_1$ mutant (line 2). In contrast, in a nodD₂ mutant, the nodC-lacZ fusion was induced to significantly higher levels than in JM57, suggesting that the $nodD₂$ product may have a negative effect on nodC-lacZ induction (line 3). In a $nodD_3$ mutant, $nodC·lacZ$ was induced to about the same levels as in the wild type. The double mutants $nodD_1$ -nod D_2 and $nodD_1$ -nod D_3 and the triple nodD mutant had a phenotype similar to the single $nodD_1$ mutant (lines 5, 6, and 8), and the $nodD_2$ - $nodD_3$ double mutant had a phenotype similar to the single $nodD_2$ mutant (line 7).

In general, levels of *nodC-lacZ* induction were low in these strains, and it was difficult to draw conclusions based on small differences in expression between the different mutants.

Expression of nodC-lacZ in strains carrying multiple copies of each of the nodD genes. Initially, we sought to test the effect of several different seed exudates, in addition to alfalfa seed exudate and luteolin, on the expression of the *nodC*lacZ fusion in the nodD mutants. However, because expression of the nodC-lacZ fusion was very low (less than ⁸ U of β-galactosidase [Table 2, line 9]) in the presence of *Melilotus* alba (sweet clover) or Medicago truncatula (barrel clover) exudates, we tested the ability of multiple copies of each nodD gene to activate nodC-lacZ expression. This was done by introducing multicopy plasmids (derivatives of pRK290 that most probably have a copy number of approximately ⁵ to ⁸ [7]) carrying one of the nodD genes into either a triple nodD mutant strain (RmD1D2D3-4) carrying the nodC-lacZ

J. BACTERIOL.

fusion or a NodD⁺ strain (JM57) carrying the *nodC-lacZ* fusion.

First, to verify that each of the cloned plasmid-borne nodD genes was functional, plasmids carrying each of the cloned nodD genes were tested for their ability to complement a nodD triple mutant (RmD1D2D3-3). The nodD triple mutant carrying either pMH901 ($nodD_1$) or pMH903 ($nodD_3$) elicited alfalfa or sweet clover nodules at the same rate as wild-type strains did (data not shown). However, only 80% of the alfalfa plants and 30% of the sweet clover developed one or more nodules when inoculated with the *nodD* triple mutant carrying pMH93-292 ($nodD₂$), and these nodules appeared with a significant delay. In addition to nodules, numerous rounding swellings which did not appear to be true nodules were present on all plants. We concluded from these experiments that both $p\dot{M}H901$ (nodD₁) and $p\dot{M}H903$ $(nodD₃)$ carry fully functional nodD genes but that the nodD₂ gene carried on pMH93-292 is inherently less active in the nodulation assay than $nodD_1$ or $nodD_3$.

The results we obtained with the $nodD₂$ -containing plasmid were similar to those previously obtained when alfalfa and sweet clover plants were inoculated with a $nodD_1$ -nod D_3 double mutant. In the case of the double $nodD_1\text{-}nodD_3$ mutant, 50% of the alfalfa plants formed nodules, no nodules were observed on sweet clover plants, and swellings were observed on some, but not all, alfalfa and sweet clover plants (23). These previous results, combined with those obtained here, suggest that the function of $nodD₂$ can be enhanced when it is present in multiple copies.

Having determined that each of the cloned $nodD_1$, $nodD_2$, and $nodD_3$ genes were functional, we tested the ability of each of these cloned genes to activate nodC-lacZ expression in response to luteolin or to three different root exudates. The results are summarized in Table 2. Both strain JM57 and strain RmD1D2D3-4 carrying pMH901 $(nodD₁)$ expressed P-galactosidase at high levels when induced with either luteolin or alfalfa seed exudates (lines 12 and 18). The same two strains expressed lower levels of β -galactosidase when induced with exudates from either Melilotus alba or Medicago truncatula (lines 12 and 18).

The nodC-lacZ fusion in strain JM57 carrying pMH93 $(nodD₂)$ showed a two- to threefold increase in basal expression compared with strain JM57 and was activated to high levels when exposed to exudates of Medicago sativa or Medicago truncatula (Table 2, line 13). In fact, multiple copies of $nodD₂$ activated $nodC$ -lacZ to higher levels than multiple copies of $nodD_1$ in response to Medicago truncatula seed exudate (compare lines 12 and 13). The opposite was true when the inducer was Melilotus alba exudate (lines 12 and 13). These results indicated that levels of the presumptive $NodD₂$ -specific inducer are highest in *Medicago sativa* exudate, lower in Medicago truncatula, and lowest in Melilotus alba. The nodD triple-mutant strain with pMH93 $(nodD₂)$ also responded to Medicago sativa and Medicago truncatula exudates, but to a significantly lesser extent (line 19). The difference in nodC expression observed between the wild-type host and a triple nodD mutant suggested that NodD₂ acts synergistically with either NodD₁ or NodD₃ in activation of the nodC-lacZ fusion.

Interestingly, $NodD₂$ did not respond to luteolin, although it apparently did respond to another compound(s) present in the seed exudates tested (Table 2, lines 13 and 19). Indeed, the presence of $nodD₂$ on a plasmid appeared to inhibit luteolin activation in the wild-type strain JM57 (compare lines 9 and 13), suggesting that $NodD₂$ interferes with $NodD₁$ -luteolin-mediated activation. This result is in agreement with the results presented in lines 3 and 7, where a $nodD₂$ mutant was able to activate the nodC-lacZ fusion to levels higher than wild-type levels in the presence of either luteolin or alfalfa seed exudate.

 $NodD₃$ -mediated activation of nodC-lacZ appears to require another gene, syrM, that is tightly linked to $nodD_3$ (35). A plasmid carrying both syrM and $nodD_3$ (pMH682) caused high constitutive expression of nodC-lacZ in either a nodD triple mutant (Table 2, line 25) or a wild-type background (line 16). However, the presence of a plasmid carrying only $nodD_3$ (pMH903) in either the *nodD* triple mutant or the wild-type strain increased both the basal and induced levels of expression of the nodC-lacZ fusion only twofold (lines 14 and 23). Since both JM57 and the *nodD* triple-mutant strain are syr M^{+} , it appears that NodD₃ and SyrM can activate when present in *trans*, although the level of activation was marginal, presumably because SyrM is limiting. Addition of a plasmid carrying $syrM$ (pMH904) to strain JM57 resulted in a three- to fivefold increase in *nodC-lacZ* expression (line 15), whereas addition of the same plasmid to the nodD triple-mutant strain (RmDlD2D3-4; line 24) had no effect on expression. Although our results with the $syrM$ -containing plasmid suggest that $NodD₃$ requires syrM to function as an activator, we cannot exclude the possibility that SyrM has a general stimulatory effect on nodD genes or their protein products.

Identification of a region upstream of $nodD₂$ required for $nodD₂$ -mediated activation. The $nodD₂$ gene is located on one end of the 6.8-kb *Eco*RI fragment cloned in plasmid pMH93 (Fig. 3). As described above, two lines of evidence indicated that pMH93 carries a functional $nodD_2$ gene. First, a plasmid derived from pMH93 (pMH93-292) that carries a fragment of Tn5 and a small deletion 2.5 kb upstream of $nodD₂$ partially complemented a *nodD* triple mutant. Second, plasmid pMH93 activated a nodC-lacZ fusion in the presence of various root exudates (Table 2, line 19). On the other hand, the plasmid from which pMH93-292 was derived, pMH93- 291, which carries an intact TnS at the same position as the deleted Tn5 in pMH93-292, did not activate the nodC-lacZ fusion (line 20). One explanation for these results is that the Tn5 insertion in pMH93-291 and pMH93-292 is located in or has a polar effect upon a gene required for $nodD₂$ to function. It is likely that pMH93-292 was able to complement the nodD triple mutant because the triple mutant carries an intact copy of the gene mutated by Tn5 on pMH93-292. If this reasoning is correct, it is unlikely that the TnS insertion is polar upon $nodD₂$ itself, because pMH93-292 complemented the nodD triple mutant.

Further evidence that the TnS insertion in pMH93-291 is not polar upon $nodD_2$ was obtained as follows. An R. meliloti strain was constructed (Rmnod291-4) carrying the TnS-291 mutation and the nodC-lacZ fusion recombined into pRmeSU47a. Rmnod291-4 was then tested for its ability to respond to luteolin and alfalfa seed exudate (Table 2, lines 9 to 11). As shown in line 3, a $nodD₂$ strain expressed higher levels of $nodC$ -lac Z than the wild type did, presumably because $NodD_2$ interferes with $NodD_1$ -mediated activation (line 10). However, strain Rmnod291-4 expressed nodC-lacZ in a manner similar to the wild type (lines 9 and 11), suggesting that $nodD₂$ is still active in Rmnod 291-4 and that the putative, newly identified gene upstream of $nodD₂$ is not required for the negative effect of $NoddD_2$ on $NoddD_1$ activation.

To further investigate the putative gene upstream of $nodD₂$, we constructed a set of deletion and deletion-insertion mutations which originated at the $XhoI$ site in plasmid

FIG. 3. Activation of nodC-lacZ by R. meliloti nodD₂-containing plasmids. (Left) Physical map of 6.8-kb EcoRI fragment of R. meliloti 1021 carrying nodD₂. pMH93 contains the entire 6.8-kb EcoRI fragment. The horizontal lines corresponding to each plasmid represent regions present in various deletion and/or insertion derivatives of pMH93. The triangle represents the 2.0-kb Ω fragment. Abbreviations: B, BamHI; C, ClaI; RI, EcoRI; H, HindIII; Pv, PvuI; Xb, XbaI; and Xh, XhoI. (Right) The table represents β -galactosidase units obtained with each plasmid in JM57 (nodC-lacZ) with the specified inducer.

pMH93, 3.0 kb upstream of $nodD_2$ (Fig. 3). The deletioninsertion mutations contained the so-called Ω fragment, which carries genes encoding resistance to streptomycin and spectinomycin and has transcriptional and translational stop signals from bacteriophage T4.

Each of the mutant derivatives of pMH93 was tested in the wild-type strain JM57 for its ability to activate the nodC-lacZ fusion in response to luteolin and to alfalfa seed exudate. Plasmids pMH93-207 and pMH93-209, which contain 0.6 and 1.3-kb deletions from the XhoI site, respectively, both activated the nodC-lacZ fusion (Fig. 3). In contrast, pMH373, which contains the Ω fragment inserted at the XhoI site, failed to activate the *nodC-lacZ* fusion (Fig. 3), suggesting that the gene required for $nodD₂$ -mediated activation is located on either side of the XhoI site and is part of an operon. Plasmid pMH93-224, which contains a 1.6-kb deletion, and plasmid pMH93-352, which contains a 3.0-kb deletion and the Ω fragment, also failed to activate the nodC-lacZ fusion (Fig. 3).

To test whether the region upstream of $nodD₂$ is also required for activation of the nodC-lacZ fusion in response to exudates from plants other than alfalfa, we also tested selected mutant plasmids in the nodD triple-mutant strain with Medicago truncatula and Melilotus alba exudates. In the triple-mutant background, pMH93 activated nodC-lacZ in the presence of Medicago truncatula as well as alfalfa exudates (Table 2, line 19), whereas pMH93-352, which contains the Ω fragment inserted at the XhoI site, did not (line 22). As a control, a derivative of pMH93, pMH93-236, carrying an internal 0.6-kb deletion in $nodD_2$, was also tested and failed to activate the nodC-lacZ fusion in the triple nodD mutant background (line 21). It appears that activation of nodC-lacZ with either alfalfa or Medicago truncatula root exudate requires both $nodD_2$ and the region upstream of $nodD₂$.

All deletion derivatives of plasmid pMH93 (originating from the XhoI site) inhibited luteolin induction of nodC expression, as was seen with the wild-type plasmid pMH93 (Fig. 3).

Complementation of R. trifolii and Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234 nodD mutants with R. meliloti nodD genes. To provide additional evidence that the three R. meliloti nodD genes are functional but not equivalent, we tested the ability of the three nodD genes to complement mutations in the nodD genes of two other Rhizobium species: R. trifolii, which nodulates clovers, and Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234, which nodulates a wide variety of legumes (9, 33, 49, 50). R. trifolii ANU843 has a single nodD gene (8). Strain NGR234 has two regions in its genome which hybridize to a *nodD* probe; however, only one of these $(nodD₁)$ appears to be functional, since NGR234 nodD₁ mutants have a Nod⁻ phenotype on all hosts tested (M. Nayudu, personal communication).

The nodD mutant strains ANU851 (R. trifolii) and ANU1255 (Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234), carrying each of the R . *meliloti nodD* genes, were inoculated on white clover seedlings (ANU851 derivatives) or siratro seedlings (ANU1255 derivatives) to assay for nodulation. R. meliloti $nodD_1$ complemented the R. trifolii nodD mutation, with nodulation delayed about 4 days compared with that of wild-type R. trifolii, but failed to complement the NGR234 nodD mutation (Table 3). The R. meliloti nodD₂ gene weakly complemented the nodD mutations in both R. trifolii and Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234; that is, 5 to 6 weeks postinoculation, 17% of white clover plants and 5 to 32% of the siratro plants (depending on inoculation dose) developed nodules. Finally, both R. meliloti syrM and $nodD_3$ were required for complementation of the R . trifolii nodD mutation; however, either syrM or $nodD_3$ alone was sufficient to partially complement the NGR234 nodD mutation. Bacteria were reisolated from nodules elicited by the R. trifolii and Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234 nodD mutants carrying the R. meliloti nodD genes to verify that the presence of nodules was not due to contamination of wild type bacteria.

The R. trifolii nodD mutant carrying R. meliloti nodD₁ elicited Fix' nodules on white clover. In contrast, although the R. meliloti syrM and nodD₃ genes together could com-

Strain	Plasmid		Phenotype			
(genotype)	(R. meliloti gene present)	Plant host	Nod	Delay (days)	Fix	
R. trifolii						
ANU843 (wild type)	None	White clover	$+$ ^a		\div	
ANU851 (nodD)	None	White clover		NR^b	NR.	
ANU851 (nodD)	pMH901 (nodD ₁)	White clover	$\ddot{}$	4	$^+$	
ANU851 (nodD)	pMH93 (nodD ₂)	White clover	\pm^c	$15 - 20$		
ANU851 (nodD)	$pMH682$ (syrM nodD ₃)	White clover	$\ddot{}$			
ANU851 (nodD)	pMH903 $(nodD_3)$	White clover		NR	NR.	
ANU851 (nodD)	$pMH904$ (syrM)	White clover		NR	NR.	
Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234						
ANU240 (wild type)	None	Siratro	$\ddot{}$	0	NT^d	
ANU1255 $(nodD_1)$	None	Siratro		NR	NT	
ANU1255 ($nodD_1$)	pMH901 (nodD ₁)	Siratro		NR	NT	
ANU1255 $(nodD_1)$	pMH93 (nodD ₂)	Siratro	\pm^e	$15 - 20$	NT	
ANU1255 $(nodD1)$	$pMH682$ (syrM nodD ₃)	Siratro	$+$		NT	
ANU1255 ($nodD_1$)	pMH903 (nodD ₃)	Siratro	$^{+}$		NT	
ANU1255 $(nodD_1)$	$pMH904$ (syrM)	Siratro	$\,^+$	$1 - 2$	NT	

TABLE 3. Interspecies complementation of nodD mutations

 $a +$, All plants contain one or more nodules.

b NR, Not relevant.

 c 17% of plants contain nodules 4 weeks postinoculation (see text for details).

^d NT, Not tested.

 e 5 to 32% of plants contain nodules 6 weeks postinoculation (see text for details).

plement the Nod⁻ phenotype of the R . trifolii nodD mutant, the nodules were Fix^- .

DISCUSSION

All three R. meliloti nodD genes are functional. In a previous report, we demonstrated that R. meliloti has three functional *nodD* genes by showing that each of the *nodD* genes alone was sufficient to elicit nodules on alfalfa or sweet clover but that a triple $nodD$ mutant had a Nod⁻ phenotype (23). In the current set of experiments, we confirmed that each of the R . *meliloti nodD* genes is functional by showing that each was capable of activating a nodC-lacZ fusion in the presence of the appropriate root exudate or the presence of the flavone luteolin. Moreover, we showed that each of the cloned R. meliloti nodD genes was capable of genetically complementing nodD mutations in either R. trifolii or Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234. Gyorgypal et al. (21) and Mulligan and Long (35) have also demonstrated that the R. meliloti nodD genes are functional but not equivalent.

The R. meliloti nod D_1 and nod D_2 genes respond to different inducers. A major conclusion from the previous study (23) was that although each of the three R . meliloti nodD genes is functional, they are not equivalent in nodulation. That is, R . meliloti mutant strains carrying different combinations of mutations in the three nodD genes exhibited different nodulation phenotypes on two alternative hosts, alfalfa and sweet clover. This result suggested that the three nodD genes play a host-specific role in nodulation (23). In the current set of experiments, we sought to obtain additional evidence that the nodD genes were involved in determining host specificity by testing the hypothesis that the nodD genes mediate differential induction of nod gene expression in response to different inducing compounds in root exudates.

In support of the hypothesis that each *nodD* gene responds most efficiently to a different spectrum of flavonoids, we demonstrated that R . meliloti N od D_1 responded very efficiently to luteolin in activating a $nodC$ -lacZ fusion, whereas $NoddD₂$ failed to respond to luteolin at all but did respond to an inducer(s) present in alfalfa and Medicago truncatula seed exudates. Examination of the data in Table 2 suggests

that the $NodD₂$ -specific inducer(s) is present at lower levels in sweet clover exudate than in alfalfa or Medicago truncatula exudate.

The activation data in Table 2 are generally consistent with the conclusions drawn from the nodulation phenotypes of R. meliloti nodD mutants observed previously. For example, the fact that $nodD_1$ appeared to be more important than $nodD_2$ in nodulation of both alfalfa and sweet clover (23) is consistent with the fact that $nodD_1$ activated $nodC$ $lacZ$ more effectively than $nodD₂$ did in the presence of either alfalfa or sweet clover exudates. The fact that a $nodD_1$ -nod D_3 mutant weakly nodulated alfalfa but not sweet clover is consistent with the low level of $nodD₂$ -mediated activation in the presence of sweet clover exudates. Interestingly, however, a multicopy plasmid carrying nodD_2 was able to complement a R. meliloti nodD triple mutant, eliciting nodules on 30% of the sweet clover plants inoculated. It seems likely that the additional copies of the $nodD₂$ gene compensated for the low levels of $NodD₂$ -specific inducer present in Melilotus alba exudates. The data in Table 2 show that a plasmid carrying $nodD_3$ along with syrM caused high constitutive $nodC$ expression, which did not increase further upon addition of seed exudates. Based on these results, it seems likely that $NodD₃$ does not respond to an inducer. However, it is also possible that increasing the copy number of both syrM and nodD₃ alleviates the requirement for an effector. Examples of effector-independent activation by positive regulators upon increasing gene dosage have been reported for the xylS gene of *Pseudomonas putida* (31) and the *malT* gene of *Escherichia coli* (39).

On the other hand, we also found that the levels of nodC expression in the *nodD* mutants did not always correlate perfectly with the nodulation phenotypes previously observed on alfalfa. For example, although the R . meliloti $nodD_1$ mutant nodulated alfalfa after a relatively short delay of 5 to 6 days, it activated *nodC* at the same level as did the $nodD_1$ -nod D_2 -nod D_3 mutant in response to alfalfa seed exudate. An explanation of this apparent discrepancy is that the composition of flavonoids in the alfalfa seed exudate is not the same as the root exudate of germinating seedlings. Also,

we did not measure activation of the host-specific nod genes, and this may be a critical factor in determining the nodulation phenotype.

Complementation of R. trifolii and Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234 nodD mutations. Additional support for the conclusion that $nodD_1$ and $nodD_2$ products are not equivalent in their ability to activate nod gene expression comes from the data in Table 3, which demonstrate that R . meliloti nod D_1 complemented an R. trifolii nodD mutation for nodulation of white clover but not a Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234 nodD mutation for nodulation of siratro, whereas R. meliloti $nodD₂$ weakly complemented the $nodD$ mutations in both species. One explanation for these results is that $NodD₁$ responds to an inducer(s) produced by white clover exudate but not to an inducer(s) produced by siratro. This explanation is consistent with the results of Spaink et al. (48), who showed that the $nodD_1$ gene of R. meliloti responded to white clover root exudate and activated the R . leguminosarum nodA promoter, and Horvath et al. (24), who showed that the R . meliloti nod D gene could not activate the NGR234 (MPlK3030) nodA promoter in the presence of siratro root exudate. Complementation of a R. trifolii nodD mutation by the R. meliloti nodD₁ gene has been previously reported by two different laboratories (17, 48).

R. meliloti syrM plus nodD₃ were also able to complement the R. trifolii nodD mutation; however, the nodules formed were Fix⁻. It is likely that syrM plus nodD₃ complement the R. trifolii nodD mutant because they are able to activate the R. trifolii nod genes without inducers, and it is possible that this unregulated expression of nod genes has a detrimental effect on nitrogen fixation in a heterologous host. Support for this conclusion is provided by the work of Burn et al. (2), who isolated R. leguminosarum nodD mutants that were able to activate nod gene expression to high levels in the absence of inducers. Interestingly, these R. leguminosarum $nodD$ mutants elicited Fix⁻ nodules on pea plants, suggesting that high, unregulated nod gene expression is deleterious during late stages of nodule development.

The R . meliloti nod $D₂$ gene was able to weakly complement the R . trifolii nod \overline{D} mutation. Nodules elicited by this strain [ANU851(pMH93)] appeared much later than nodules elicited by either ANU851 carrying R. meliloti nod D_1 or ANU851 carrying syrM and nodD₃. Although nodules elicited by $ANU851(pMH93)$ were Fix^- , by the time the ANU851(pMH93)-elicited nodules appeared, the plants were so starved for nitrogen that they may have been unable to sustain nitrogen fixation.

A plasmid carrying both syrM and $nodD_3$ was able to complement the NGR234 nodD mutation; however, in contrast to what was observed with R . trifolii, either syrM or $nodD₃$ alone was sufficient to partially complement NGR234 nodD. We were somewhat surprised by this result, because in R. meliloti both syrM and nodD₃ are required to activate the expression of the nod genes. Presumably, the R. meliloti $nodD₃$ gene can activate the nod genes of strain ANU1255; this activation may or may not acquire inducers from siratro root exudate. By far the most curious result was that syrM alone complemented the NGR234 nodD mutation. Although SyrM alone may be able to activate the nod genes of NGR234, it is also possible that SyrM, along with the remaining $nodD$ gene of NGR234, $nodD₂$, is able to activate nod gene expression. Although mutations in $nodD_1$ of $NGR234$ render the strain Nod^- on nine hosts tested (Nayudu, personal communication), it is not known whether this second *nodD* gene $(nodD₂)$ is functional.

DNA sequence of the R . meliloti nod D_2 gene. There are a

number of possible reasons why R . meliloti nod D_2 , but not $nodD_1$, complemented the Rhizobium sp. strain NGR234 nodD mutation: higher expression of nodD₂ than nodD₁ in ANU1255, the ability of $NodD₂$ to respond more efficiently to siratro root exudate than NodD, does, or the ability of $NodD₂$ to activate the ANU1255 nod genes better than NodD₁ does. R. meliloti NodD₁ and NodD₂ are highly homologous except in the C-terminal halves. Six of the last eight amino acids of R. meliloti $NodD₁$ and $NodD₂$ are different, and $NodD₂$ has two additional amino acids. Since we have shown that $NodD₁$ and $NodD₂$ respond to different inducers, it is possible that the last few amino acids are important for flavonoid specificity.

Interaction between $NodD_2$ and $NodD_1$ or $NodD_3$. Comparison of the levels of nodC-lacZ expression in a nodD triple mutant versus a wild-type strain, each carrying a $nodD₂$ plasmid, suggests that NodD₂ functions more effectively as an activator in the presence of either the $nodD_1$ or $nodD_3$ gene. From our experiments, we cannot determine whether $nodD_1$ or $nodD_3$ or both are responsible for this synergism. One possible explanation for this phenomenon would be that NodD is functional as a multimer in activation of transcription and that $NodD₂$ -mediated activation is enhanced by the heterodimer $NodD_1-NodD_2$ or $NodD_3-NodD_2$.

Interestingly, although NodD₂ apparently requires NodD₁ or NodD₃ to efficiently activate the *nodC-lacZ* fusion, $NodD₂$ interfered with $NodD₁$ -mediated luteolin activation. Strains which were nod D_1^+ nod D_2 nod D_3^+ expressed nodC at levels higher than wild-type levels, and introduction of a plasmid carrying $nodD₂$ into a wild-type strain also inhibited $nodC$ expression. It is possible that $NodD₂$ interferes with luteolin activation by competing with $NodD₁$ for binding sites at the *nodA* promoter or by acting as a poison subunit in a NodD₁ multimer. Such interactions between the $nodD$ gene products have also been observed by Mulligan and Long (35), who found that $NodD_2$ function required $NodD_1$ and that $NodD₂$ and $NodD₃$ reduce $nodABC$ induction by NodD, and luteolin. Unlike Mulligan and Long, we did not observe an effect of $nodD_3$ on NodD₁-luteolin activation; however, our experiments and those of Mulligan and Long used different $nodD_3$ alleles.

Identification of ^a new nodulation gene. We have tentatively identified a region upstream of $nodD_2$ which is required for $nodD_2$ -mediated activation. This region may encode gene products which are required for $N \text{od}D_2$ function, or the region may affect $nodD_2$ gene expression. At present, we cannot distinguish between the two possibilities that deletions and/or insertion(s) in this region either (i) affect a gene which is required for $nodD_2$ -mediated activation or (ii) are polar on $nodD_2$ expression. Our results do not indicate a precise position of the putative gene important for $nodD_2$ function. It could reside on either side of the XhoI site in the 6-kb region upstream of $nodD₂$. Sequence analysis and transcript mapping of this region will help in identifying a gene(s) which is important for $NoddD₂$ function. It is intriguing that both $nodD_3$ and $nodD_2$ appear to require additional linked regions to activate NodC expression. Comparisons between nodD₃-syrM and nodD₂ and its upstream region may provide important clues about the functions of these regulatory genes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank B. Tracy Nixon and Clive Ronson for help in sequencing; John Mulligan, Sharon Long, Barry Rolfe, and Murali Nayudu for strains and communication of results prior to publication; and Rachel Hyde for assistance in preparation of the manuscript.

This work was funded by ^a grant from Hoechst AG to Massachusetts General Hospital.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. Ausubel, F. M., R. Brent, R. E. Kingston, D. D. Moore, J. G. Seidman, J. A. Smith, and K. Struhl. 1987. Current protocols in molecular biology. Greene Publishing Associates and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- 2. Burn, J., L. Rossen, and A. W. B. Johnston. 1987. Four classes of mutations in the nodD gene of Rhizobium leguminosarum biovar. viciae that affect its ability to autoregulate and/or activate other nod genes in the presence of flavonoid inducers. Genes Dev. 1:456-464.
- 3. Chang, A. C. Y., and S. N. Cohen. 1978. Construction and characterization of amplifiable multicopy DNA cloning vehicles derived from the P1SA cryptic miniplasmid. J. Bacteriol. 134: 1141-1156.
- 4. Debelle, F., C. Rosenberg, J. Vasse, F. Maillet, E. Martinez, J. Denarie, and G. Truchet. 1986. Assignment of symbiotic developmental phenotypes to common and specific nodulation (nod) genetic loci of Rhizobium meliloti. J. Bacteriol. 168:1075-1086.
- 5. de Bruijn, F. J., and J. R. Lupski. 1983. The use of transposon TnS mutagenesis in the rapid generation of correlated physical and genetic maps of DNA segments cloned into multicopy plasmids-a review. Gene 27:131-149.
- 6. de Vos, G., G. C. Walker, and E. R. Signer. 1986. Genetic manipulations in Rhizobium meliloti utilizing two new transposon derivatives. Mol. Gen. Genet. 204:485-491.
- 7. Ditta, G., S. Stanfield, D. Corbin, and D. R. Helinski. 1980. Broad host range DNA cloning system for Gram-negative bacteria: construction of a gene bank of Rhizobium meliloti. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 77:7347-7351.
- 8. Djordjevic, M. A., P. R. Schofield, and B. D. Rolfe. 1985. TnS mutagenesis of Rhizobium trifolii host-specific nodulation genes result in mutants with altered host range ability. Mol. Gen. Genet. 200:463-471.
- 9. Djordjevic, M. A., W. Zurkowski, J. Shine, and B. G. Rolfe. 1983. Sym plasmid transfer to various symbiotic mutants of Rhizobium trifolii, R. leguminosarum, and R. meliloti. J. Bacteriol. 156:1035-1045.
- 10. Downie, J. A., D. D. Knight, A. W. B. Johnston, and L. Rossen. 1985. Identification of genes and gene products involved in the nodulation of peas by Rhizobium leguminosarum. Mol. Gen. Genet. 198:255-262.
- 11. Earl, C. D., C. W. Ronson, and F. M. Ausubel. 1987. Genetic and structural analysis of the Rhizobium meliloti fixA, fixB, fixC, and $fixX$ genes. J. Bacteriol. 169:1127-1136.
- 12. Egelhoff, T. T., R. F. Fisher, T. W. Jacobs, J. T. Mulligan, and S. R. Long. 1985. Nucleotide sequence of Rhizobium meliloti 1021 nodulation genes: nodD is read divergently from nodABC. DNA 4:241-248.
- 13. Finan, T. M., E. Hartwieg, K. Lemieux, K. Bergman, G. C. Walker, and E. R. Signer. 1984. General transduction in Rhizobium meliloti. J. Bacteriol. 159:120-124.
- 14. Fisher, R. F., H. L. Bierley, J. T. Mulligan, and S. R. Long. 1987. Transcription of Rhizobium meliloti nodulation genes. J. Biol. Chem. 262:6849-6855.
- 15. Fisher, R. F., T. T. Egelhoff, J. T. Mulligan, and S. R. Long. 1988. Specific binding of proteins from Rhizobium meliloti cell-free extracts containing NodD to DNA sequences upstream of inducible nodulation genes. Genes Dev. 2:282-293.
- 16. Fisher, R. F., J. A. Swanson, J. T. Mulligan, and S. R. Long. 1987. Extended region of nodulation genes in Rhizobium meliloti 1021. II. Nucleotide sequence, transcription start sites, and protein products. Genetics 117:191-201.
- 17. Fisher, R. F., J. K. Tu, and S. R. Long. 1985. Conserved nodulation genes in Rhizobium meliloti and R. trifolii. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 49:1432-1435.
- 18. Frey, J., and H. Krisch. 1985. Omega mutagenesis in Gramnegative bacteria: a selectable interposon which is strongly polar in a wide range of bacterial species. Gene 36:143-150.
- 19. Gamborg, O. L., and D. Eveleigh. 1968. Culture methods and detection of glucanases in suspension cultures of wheat and

barley. Can. J. Biochem. 46:417-421.

- 20. Gottfert, M., B. Horvath, E. Kondorosi, R. Putnocky, F. Rodriguez-Quinones, and A. Kondorosi. 1986. At least two nodD genes are necessary for efficient nodulation of alfalfa by Rhizobium meliloti. J. Mol. Biol. 191:411-426.
- 21. Gyorgypal, Z., N. Iyer, and A. Kondorosi. 1988. Three regulatory nodD alleles of diverged flavonoid-specificity are involved in host-dependent nodulation by Rhizobium meliloti. Mol. Gen. Genet. 212:85-92.
- 22. Hong, G.-F., J. E. Burn, and A. W. B. Johnston. 1987. Evidence that DNA involved in the expression of nodulation (nod) genes in Rhizobium binds to the product of the regulatory gene nodD. Nucleic Acids Res. 15:9677-9689.
- 23. Honma, M. A., and F. M. Ausubel. 1987. Rhizobium meliloti has three functional copies of the *nodD* symbiotic regulatory gene. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 84:8558-8562.
- 24. Horvath, B., C. W. B. Bachem, J. Schell, and A. Kondorosi. 1987. Host-specific regulation of nodulation genes in Rhizobium is mediated by a plant-signal, interacting with the $nodD$ gene product. EMBO J. 6:841-848.
- 25. Horvath, B., E. Kondorosi, M. John, J. Schmidt, I. Torok, Z. Gyorgypal, I. Barabas, U. Wieneke, J. Schell, and A. Kondorosi. 1986. Organization, structure, and symbiotic function of Rhizobium meliloti nodulation genes determining host specificity for alfalfa. Cell 46:335-343.
- 26. Jacobs, T. W., T. T. Egelhoff, and S. R. Long. 1985. Physical and genetic map of a Rhizobium meliloti nodulation region and nucleotide sequence of nodC. J. Bacteriol. 162:469-476.
- 27. Kondorosi, E., J. Gyuris, J. Schmidt, M. John, E. Duda, B. Hoffman, J. Schell, and A. Kondorosi. 1989. Positive and negative control of nod gene expression in Rhizobium meliloti is required for optimal nodulation. EMBO J. 5:1331-1340.
- 28. Kondorosi, E., and A. Kondorosi. 1986. Nodule induction on plant roots by Rhizobium. Trends Biochem. Sci. 11:296-299.
- 29. Marvel, D. J., G. Kuldau, A. Hirsch, E. Richards, J. G. Torrey, and F. M. Ausubel. 1985. Conservation of nodulation genes between Rhizobium meliloti and a slow-growing Rhizobium strain that nodulates a nonlegume host. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 82:5841-5845.
- 30. Meade, H. M., S. R. Long, G. B. Ruvkun, S. E. Brown, and F. M. Ausubel. 1982. Physical and genetic characterization of symbiotic and auxotrophic mutants of Rhizobium meliloti induced by transposon Tn5 mutagenesis. J. Bacteriol. 149:114-122.
- 31. Mermod, N., J. L. Ramos, A. Bairoch, and K. N. Timmis. 1987. The xylS gene positive regulator of TOL plasmid pWWO: identification, sequence analysis and overproduction leading to constitutive expression of meta cleavage operon. Mol. Gen. Genet. 207:349-354.
- 32. Miller, J. H. 1972. Experiments in molecular genetics. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.
- 33. Morrison, N., H. C. Chen, B. Bassam, J. Plazinski, R. Ridge, and B. Rolfe. 1984. Tn5 mutagenesis and symbiotic mutants of a fast-growing cowpea Rhizobium, p. 692. In C. Veeger and W. E. Newton (ed.), Advances in nitrogen fixation research. Martinus Nijhoff/Junk, The Hague, The Netherlands.
- 34. Mulligan, J. T., and S. R. Long. 1985. Induction of R. meliloti nodC expression by plant exudate requires nodD. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 82:6609-6613.
- 35. Mulligan, J. T., and S. R. Long. 1989. A family of activator genes regulates expression of Rhizobium meliloti nodulation genes. Genetics 122:7-18.
- 36. Peters, N., J. Frost, and S. R. Long. 1986. A plant flavone, luteolin, induces expression of Rhizobium meliloti nodulation genes. Science 233:977-980.
- 37. Poncz, M., D. Solowiejczyk, M. Ballantine, E. Schwartz, and S. Surrey. 1982. Nonrandom DNA sequence analysis in bacteriophage M-13 by the dideoxy chain termination method. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 79:4298-4302.
- 38. Prentki, P., and H. M. Krisch. 1984. In vitro insertional mutagenesis with ^a selectable DNA fragment. Gene 29:303-313.
- 39. Raibaud, O., and M. Schwartz. 1980. Restriction map of the Escherichia coli malA region and identification of the malT

product. J. Bacteriol. 143:761-771.

- 40. Redmond, J., J. Batley, M. Djordjevic, R. Innes, P. Kuempel, and B. Rolfe. 1986. Flavones induce expression of nodulation genes in Rhizobium. Nature (London) 323:632-635.
- 41. Rossen, L., C. A. Shearman, A. W. B., Johnston, and J. A. Downie. 1985. The nodD gene of Rhizobium leguminosarum is autoregulatory and in the presence of plant exudate induces the nodA,B,C genes. EMBO J. 4:3369-3373.
- 42. Rostas, K., E. Kondorosi, B. Horvath, A. Simoncsits, and A. Kondorosi. 1986. Conservation of extended promoter regions of nodulation genes of Rhizobium. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 83:1757-1761.
- 43. Ruvkun, G. B., and F. M. Ausubel. 1981. A general method for site-directed mutagenesis in prokaryotes. Nature (London) 289: 85-88.
- 44. Schmidt, J., M. John, U. Wieneke, H.-D. Krussmann, and J. Schell. 1986. Expression of the nodulation gene nodA in Rhizobium meliloti and localization of the gene product in the cytosol. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 83:9581-9585.
- 45. Schofield, P. R., and J. M. Watson. 1986. DNA sequence of Rhizobium trifolii nodulation genes reveals a reiterated and potentially regulatory sequence preceding nodABC and nodFE. Nucleic Acids Res. 14:2891-2903.
- 46. Shearman, C. A., L. Rossen, A. W. B. Johnston, and J. A. Downie. 1986. The Rhizobium leguminosarum nodulation gene

nodF encodes a polypeptide similar to acyl-carrier protein and is regulated by nodD plus ^a factor in pea root exudate. EMBO J. 5:647-652.

- 47. Spaink, H. P., R. J. H. Okker, C. A. WiJffelman, E. Pees, and B. J. J. Lugtenberg. 1987. Promoters in the nodulation region of the Rhizobium leguminosarum Sym plasmid pRLlJI. Plant Mol. Biol. 9:27-39.
- 48. Spaink, H. P., C. A. Wijffelman, E. Pees, R. J. H. Okker, and B. J. J. Lugtenberg. 1987. Rhizobium nodulation gene nodD as a determinant of host specificity. Nature (London) 328:337-340.
- 49. Trinick, M. J. 1980. Relationships amongst the fast-growing rhizobia of Lablab purpureus, Leucaena leucocephala, Mimosa spp., Acacia farnesiana and Sesbania grandiflora and their affinities with other rhizobial groups. J. Appl. Bacteriol. 49: 39-53.
- 50. Trinick, M. J., and J. Galbraith. 1980. The Rhizobium requirements of the non-legume Parasponia in relation to the crossinoculation group of legumes. New Phytol. 86:17-26.
- 51. Vieira, J., and J. Messing. 1982. The pUC plasmids, and M13mp7-derived system for insertion mutagenesis and sequencing with synthetic universal primers. Gene 19:259-268.
- 52. Yanisch-Perron, C., J. Vieira, and J. Messing. 1985. Improved M13 phage cloning vectors and host strains: nucleotide sequences of M13mpl8 and pUC19 vectors. Gene 33:103-119.