Plasmid transfer from Escherichia coli to Bacteroides fragilis: Differential expression of antibiotic resistance phenotypes

(bacterial conjugation/broad host range plasmid/RK2/anaerobic bacteria/shuttle vector)

DONALD G. GUINEY, PATRICIA HASEGAWA, AND CHARLES E. DAVIS

Departments of Medicine and Pathology, University of California, San Diego Medical Center, ²²⁵ Dickinson Street, San Diego, CA ⁹²¹⁰³

Communicated by Helen M. Ranney, July 25, 1984

ABSTRACT A unique shuttle plasmid, pDP1, has been constructed to mediate gene transfer between Escherichia coli and the Gram-negative anaerobe Bacteroides fragilis. pDP1 contains the pBR322 replicon and the Bacteroides clindamycin resistance plasmid pCP1 linked to the transfer origin of the broad host range plasmid RK2. pDP1 can be transferred from E. coli to B. fragilis by the RK2 conjugation system even though RK2 itself is not maintained in the Bacteroides recipients. The antibiotic resistance and replication functions of pDPl have been mapped by deletion analysis, and a 5-kilobase portion of the plasmid has been identified as the essential region for maintenance in Bacteroides. Comparison of the resistance conferred by $pDP1$ on E . coli and B . fragilis shows that antibiotic resistance genes are expressed differently in aerobic and anaerobic bacteria. These results document the feasibility of gene transfer from E . coli to B . fragilis and demonstrate the usefulness of this conjugation system to study genetic structure and expression in Bacteroides.

Studies of genetic exchange between aerobic and anaerobic bacteria have produced inconclusive results. Systematic efforts to transfer well-characterized antibiotic resistance plasmids from Escherichia coli to Bacteroides fragilis have been unsuccessful, despite the fact that the B . fragilis group of Gram-negative anaerobes contains the most numerous organisms in the human colon, where they are in close contact with *E. coli* (1-3). Transfer of drug resistance from *Bacte*roides to E . coli has been reported, but the plasmids involved have not been characterized and no further work with these strains has been published (4-6). In an earlier study, we identified a large conjugative plasmid in Bacteroides ochraceus (subsequently renamed Capnocytophaga ochraceus) capable of transferring multiple antibiotic resistance to E. coli (7). However, this R plasmid could not be transferred into intestinal Bacteroides, a finding consistent with the subsequent classification of C. ochraceus as an oral microaerophilic organism, distinct from the strict anaerobes (2). Only one report has described transfer of antibiotic resistance from \overline{E} . coli to Bacteroides, and the plasmid involved was not identified or characterized (8). We have tested plasmids from 14 different incompatibility groups in E. coli (IncA-C, B, FII, FIV, H, I, K, L, N, P, U, W, Y, and 9) for transfer to B. fragilis, but none could be detected in the Bacteroides recipients (3). We have concluded that there is ^a substantial barrier to plasmid transfer between E. coli and B. fragilis. This barrier could operate at the level of plasmid DNA transfer during conjugation, plasmid DNA replication in the new host, or the expression of antibiotic resistance genes in the Bacteroides recipient.

To study this problem, we have constructed a unique shuttle vector to mediate gene transfer between E . coli and B . fragilis. This transfer system utilizes the conjugation func-

tions of the broad host range plasmid RK2, a member of the P incompatibility group. We chose the conjugation system of RK2 because it is particularly well adapted to overcome species barriers and can mediate gene transfer between a wide variety of Gram-negative bacteria (3). In earlier studies, we mapped, cloned, and sequenced the origin of conjugal DNA transfer (oriT) of RK2 (9), which is contained within ^a 760 base-pair Hae II restriction fragment. Small vector plasmids containing this *oriT* sequence are transferred at high frequency by the RK2 conjugation system provided by an RK2 "helper" plasmid present in the same cell (9). Accordingly, we constructed a hybrid plasmid containing replicons from E. coli and B. fragilis linked to the oriT fragment from RK2. This shuttle vector can be transferred from E. coli to B. fragilis by the RK2 conjugation system. Furthermore, experiments with this hybrid plasmid show that differences in plasmid replication and the expression of drug resistance genes are both substantial barriers to genetic exchange between aerobic and anaerobic bacteria.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacterial Strains and Plasmids. The E. coli strain used as a donor for the matings was JA221, leuB, A trpE5, lacY, recA, hsdR⁻, hsdM⁺. Recipients were E. coli HB101 nal^R (9), B. fragilis 638 rif^R (10), and B. fragilis TM4000 rif^R (11). E. coli K802, used for antibiotic sensitivity testing, is gal, met, supE, hsdR⁻, hsdM⁺. pRK231 is a derivative of RK2 with a Pst I-generated deletion in the ampicillin resistance gene; its phenotype is Km^R , Tc^R, Tra⁺ (9). pDG5 is a derivative of pBR322 lacking tetracycline resistance and containing the 760-base-pair Hae II oriT fragment from RK2 (9). pCP1 is a 15-kilobase (kb) clindamycin resistance plasmid originally isolated from Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron (13).

Plasmid DNA Procedures. Plasmid DNA was purified from E. coli and B. fragilis by CsCl/ethidium bromide density gradient centrifugation as described (9, 11). Standard methods for restriction enzyme digestion, DNA ligation, agarose gel electrophoresis, and bacterial transformation were followed (12). The hybrid plasmid pDP1 was constructed by ligating a partial EcoRI digestion of pCP1 with a complete EcoRI digestion of pDG5. The ligation mix was transformed into E . *coli* JA221 selecting for tetracycline resistance at 10 μ g/ml. To delete the EcoRI C and A fragments from pDP1, the plasmid was partially digested with $EcoRI$, religated, then digested to completion with Hpa I, and transformed into $E.$ coli JA221. To generate the Bgl II and HindIII deletions, pDP1 was digested separately to completion with Bgl II or HindIII, then religated, and transformed into E. coli JA221.

Bacterial Matings. Matings between E. coli strains were done by a standard filter mating procedure for 3 hours with the transfer frequency calculated as described (9). Matings between E. coli and B. fragilis were performed according to a modification of the plate mating procedure of Privitera et

The publication costs of this article were defrayed in part by page charge payment. This article must therefore be hereby marked "advertisement" in accordance with 18 U.S.C. §1734 solely to indicate this fact.

Abbreviation: kb, kilobase(s).

al. (10). The E. coli donor strain was grown overnight in brain heart infusion broth, supplemented with hemin and cysteine (BHC, described in ref. 11), and containing selective antibiotics (penicillin, 200 μ g/ml for pDP1; kanamycin, 50 μ g/ml for pRK231). The *B*. fragilis recipient was grown overnight in BHC without antibiotics. The overnight donor culture was washed, diluted, and grown to early logarithmic phase on an aerobic shaker. The recipient was diluted and grown to stationary phase in an anaerobic jar (7). The donor and recipient cultures were mixed in a 1:2 ratio; 0.15 ml of this mating mix was spread on the surface of ^a BHC plate and incubated anaerobically overnight. The entire confluent growth was scraped from the plate, suspended in saline, diluted, and plated on BHC containing $5 \mu g$ of clindamycin per ml and 20 μ g of nalidixic acid per ml (selection for pDP1 transfer) or 1μ g of tetracycline per ml and 20 μ g of nalidixic acid per ml (selection for pRK231 transfer). Transfer frequency is the number of transconjugants containing the indicated plasmid divided by the total number of B. fragilis recipients recovered at the end of mating. The B. fragilis transconjugants were checked for lack of aerobic growth and purified by several subcultures prior to the isolation of plasmid DNA. Later mating experiments with pDP1 and its deletion derivatives were performed by a triparental mating procedure: the pRK231 helper plasmid in E. coli HB101 and pDP1 (or a derivative) in E. coli JA221 were mixed with the B. fragilis recipient for mating on plates as described above.

RESULTS

Construction and Properties of pDPl. To construct a hybrid plasmid capable of replication in both E. coli and B. fragilis, we ligated the Bacteroides R plasmid pCP1 to the E. coli pBR322 derivative, pDG5. pCP1 encodes high-level resistance to erythromycin and clindamycin by means of determinants located in the EcoRI B fragment between direct repeats (13). This EcoRI B fragment also contains a cryptic tetracycline resistance determinant that is expressed when cloned in E. coli but is not expressed by pCP1 in Bacteroides (14). We have used this tetracycline resistance phenotype to clone the entire pCP1 plasmid in E. coli linked to the vector pDG5, a pBR322 derivative that has been deleted for the pBR322 tetracycline resistance region and contains the transfer origin (ori) of the broad host range plasmid RK2 (9). Fig. ¹ shows the hybrid plasmid pDP1 with pDG5 insert-

FIG. 1. Map of pDP1. The Bacteroides plasmid pCP1 is shown by the thin line; A, B, and C refer to the three EcoRI fragments of pCP1. The arrows show the locations of the direct repeats of pCP1 (13). The E. coli plasmid pDG5 is shown by the thick line: the solid portion represents the region of pBR322 containing the origin of replication (oriV) and the TEM β -lactamase gene (Am^R) , and the hatched line shows the RK2 DNA with its origin of transfer (oriT, ref. 9). Fragment B encodes clindamycin resistance (Cl^R) in Bacte*roides* and tetracycline resistance (Tc^R) in E. coli (refs. 13 and 14 and Table 3). In pDP1.1, the pDG5 DNA is inserted in the EcoRI site between fragments A and C of pCP1.

ed into the EcoRI site between fragments B and C of pCP1. We also obtained another plasmid, designated pDP1.1, with pDG5 inserted between EcoRI fragments A and C. pDP1 is dependent on the pBR322 replicon in E. coli, since pDP1 could not be transformed into the polA mutant of E. coli, C2110. In addition, we were unable to transform the native pCP1 plasmid into E. coli, selecting for tetracycline resistance. These results show that the Bacteroides plasmid pCP1 cannot replicate in E. coli.

Transfer of pDPl to Bacteroides. The data in Table ¹ show that pDP1 can be transferred at a high frequency in E . coli by the RK2 helper plasmid pRK231, which is also co-transferred at about the same frequency. Both pDP1 and pDP1.1 could be transferred into B. fragilis with a frequency of approximately 10-6. pDP1 was transferable into two different B. fragilis recipients, 638 and TM4000, at the same frequency. pDP1 transfer into both the E . coli and B . fragilis recipients was completely dependent on the helper plasmid, pRK231. However, no transfer of pRK231 into B. fragilis could be detected by selecting for the tetracycline resistance on pRK231. Plasmid DNA extracted from the clindamycinresistant Bacteroides transconjugants revealed that pDP1 was transferred and maintained intact in B. fragilis. Fig. 2 shows that the pDP1 DNA extracted from B. fragilis ⁶³⁸ after transfer from E. coli JA221 is identical to the pDP1 DNA present in the E. coli donor. This pDP1 DNA from-Bacteroides was transformed back into E. coli and expressed both ampicillin and tetracycline resistance. However, none of 10 B. fragilis transconjugants (selected for pDP1 transfer) contained pRK231 DNA. Since pRK231 is nearly 100% cotransferred with $pDG5$ in $E.$ coli matings (9), these results suggest that $p\n RK231$ cannot be maintained in B. fragilis.

Properties of pDP1 Deletions. To reduce the size of pDP1 and locate the region essential for replication in Bacteroides, we isolated the deletions shown in Fig. 3. In pDP1 Δ 1, the EcoRI C fragment is deleted, whereas in pDP1 Δ 2, both the A and C fragments have been removed. $pDP1 \Delta3$ contains a 3.3-kb HindIII-generated deletion from fragment C extending into the adjacent A fragment and also ^a small internal deletion of 0.7 kb in the B fragment. pDP1 Δ 4 has a large 4.6kb Bgl II deletion extending further into the A fragment. All four deletion plasmids contain pDG5 with $oriT$ as well as an intact EcoRI B fragment expressing tetracycline resistance in E. coli. Table 2 shows the transfer data for these plasmids into B. fragilis. pDP1 Δ 1 and pDP1 Δ 4 can still be transferred to Bacteroides, whereas transfer of pDP1 Δ 2 and pDP1 Δ 3 could not be detected. Both pDP1 $\Delta 1$ and pDP1 $\Delta 4$ could be recovered intact from the Bacteroides transconjugants and transformed back into E. coli. These results show that the C fragment and an adjacent 3-kb portion of the A fragment are not required for replication in Bacteroides. Since pDP1 $\Delta 2$ cannot be transferred to B. fragilis, the essential region for

Table 1. Conjugal transfer of pDP1 and pDP1.1

Plasmids in E. coli		Transfer frequency	
JA221 donor	Recipient	pDP1	pRK231
pDP1	E. coli HB101 nal ^R	${<}10^{-8}$	
$+$ pRK231	E. coli HB101 nal ^R	0.7	1
pDP1	B. fragilis 638	${<}10^{-8}$	
$+$ pRK231	B. fragilis 638	3×10^{-6}	$< 10^{-8}$
$+ pRK231$	B. fragilis TM4000	3×10^{-6}	
$pDP1.1 + pRK231$	B. fragilis TM4000	0.6×10^{-6}	

Transfer frequency is the number of transconjugants containing the indicated plasmid divided by the total number of E. coli or B. fragilis recipients recovered at the end of the mating. pDP1 transfer was selected by penicillin resistance in E. coli and clindamycin resistance in B. fragilis. pRK231 transfer was selected by kanamycin resistance in E. coli and tetracycline resistance in B. fragilis.

FIG. 2. Restriction digestion of pDP1 extracted from B. fragilis ⁶³⁸ and E. coli JA221. Lanes A and B are EcoRI digests, and lanes D and E show Ava I digests of pDP1 extracted from $B.$ fragilis (lanes A and D) or E. coli (lanes B and E). The middle band in the EcoRI digests is a doublet containing fragment B and pDG5 (see Fig. 1). Lane C is a HindIII digest of λ DNA.

maintenance of pDP1 in Bacteroides is most likely located in ^a 5-kb region of fragment A between coordinates ⁴ and ⁹ kb on the map.

Expression of pDP1 Resistance Genes in E. coli and B. fragilis. Since pDP1 can replicate in both E . coli and B . fragilis, expression of the drug resistance genes on the plasmid was tested in these hosts. Table 3 shows that the TEM β -lactamase gene from pBR322 confers high-level ampicillin resistance on E. coli but gives no resistance to Bacteroides. The erythromycin resistance determinant from the Bacteroides plasmid pCP1 is not expressed in E . coli although it gives high-level resistance to B. fragilis. The cryptic tetracycline resistance determinant, encoded by EcoRI fragment B of pCP1 (see Fig. 1), is expressed in E. coli but not in Bacteroides. A particularly interesting feature of this tetracycline

FIG. 3. Deletions of pDP1. The EcoRI fragments A, B, C, and pDG5 are shown as in Fig. 1. Restriction sites are indicated by the following letters: E, EcoRI; B, Bgl II; and H, HindIII. The DNA deleted in $\Delta 1$, $\Delta 2$, $\Delta 3$, and $\Delta 4$ is represented by the bars. Two additional Bgl II sites in the A fragment deleted in $\Delta 4$ are not shown. rep refers to the region of fragment A required for replication in Bacteroides (see text).

Table 2. Transfer of pDP1 deletions to B . fragilis

Plasmid in E. coli JA221	Transfer frequency to $B.$ fragilis 638	
$EcoRI$ deletion*		
pDP1	8×10^{-6}	
$pDP1 \Delta1$	4×10^{-6}	
$pDP1 \Delta2$	$< 10^{-8}$	
<i>HindIII</i> and Bgl II deletions [†]		
pDP1	0.6×10^{-6}	
$pDP1 \Delta3$	${<}10^{-8}$	
$pDP1 \Delta 4$	1.2×10^{-6}	

*Matings were done with the helper plasmid pRK231 present in the same cell, as described in Materials and Methods and in Table 1. tMatings were done by using the triparental cross procedure: pDP1 or the deletion derivative in E. coli JA221 was mated with E. coli HB101 containing pRK231 and *B. fragilis* 638. The transfer frequencies using this triparental technique are somewhat lower, but pDP1 and the deletions are more stable in E. coli in the absence of the helper plasmid pRK231.

resistance region of pCP1 is that it is not expressed in E. coli when the cells are grown anaerobically (14). Table 3 also shows the level of tetracycline resistance encoded by pDP1 under various growth conditions in $E.$ coli. Even the addition of nitrate as an alternative electron acceptor did not restore tetracycline resistance expression under anaerobic conditions. These results suggest that this differential expression of tetracycline resistance is not due to differences in the availability of energy or electron transport during anaerobic growth. Furthermore, the failure of Bacteroides to express tetracycline resistance was not due to instability or deletion of this region, since pDP1 isolated from B. fragilis could be transformed back into E. coli with full expression of tetracycline resistance.

DISCUSSION

These results document the feasibility of plasmid transfer from E. coli to Bacteroides. Both E. coli and the B. fragilis groups of anaerobes are present in large numbers in the human colon and also frequently co-exist in infected tissues. Since plasmid-mediated transfer of antibiotic resistance is widespread in aerobic and facultative bacteria, we and others anticipated that R plasmids would transfer between these Gram-negative bacteria that share the same ecological niche. However, systematic studies with both narrow and broad

Table 3. Expression of antibiotic resistance by pDP1 in E. coli and B. fragilis

Bacterial strain	Growth condition*	Minimal inhibitory concentration, μ g/ml		
		Am	Em	Тc
E. coli	$+O2$	10	70	2
$+$ pDP1	$+O2$	>2000	70	40
$+$ pDP1	-0			
$+$ pDP1	$-0, +NO3$			
B. fragilis	-0,	20	ا>	<1
$+$ pDP1	-0,	20	>320	ا>

The E. coli strain was K802; the B. fragilis was strain 638. The minimal inhibitory concentration was determined by a standard tube dilution technique (11). Am, ampicillin; Em, erythromycin; Tc, tetracycline. Although exact minimal inhibitory concentration values of Am and Em were not determined for E. coli grown anaerobically, no substantial differences from the aerobic values were noted.

 $*+O₂$ refers to growth in atmospheric oxygen, $-O₂$ is growth in anaerobic jars (7), and $+ NO_3$ refers to supplementation with 0.2% sodium nitrate. The medium used throughout was brain heart. infusion broth supplemented with hemin and cysteine (11).

host range conjugative plasmids of E. coli have failed to detect transfer to Bacteroides (1-3). The results described here with pDP1 clarify the genetic basis for this barrier to gene exchange. Although the broad host range conjugation system of RK2 can mediate transfer of plasmid DNA from E. coli to B. fragilis, differences in plasmid replication and gene expression prevent its maintenance in Bacteroides. Despite the broad host range property of RK2 replication in aerobic bacteria (15), pRK231 DNA was never found in the B. fragilis transconjugants selected for pDP1 transfer. Although it is possible that pRK231 DNA is more sensitive to restriction systems in the Bacteroides recipient, it seems unlikely that it would be selectively degraded, while the pDP1 DNA remained intact. Furthermore, our inability to detect pDP1 $\Delta 2$ in Bacteroides (Table 2) indicates that pBR322 cannot maintain this hybrid plasmid in B. fragilis. pDP1 Δ 2 is missing the A and C fragments but still contains the B fragment required for clindamycin resistance expression in Bacteroides. Similarly, the Bacteroides plasmid pCP1 cannot replicate in E. coli and requires the pBR322 replicon on pDP1 for maintenance. Therefore, the inability of plasmids to replicate in the foreign host constitutes one substantial barrier to plasmid transfer between E. coli and Bacteroides.

Differential gene expression (Table 3) represents a second major barrier to plasmid exchange between these bacteria. The TEM β -lactamase gene on pBR322 is widespread in aerobic bacteria and is expressed in diverse genera including many enterobacteriaceae, Pseudomonas, Neisseria, and Hemophilus. However, this gene confers no increment of resistance on B. fragilis. This result is similar to the lack of expression of the TEM β -lactamase gene in the Gram-positive organism Bacillus subtilus (16). The erythromycin/clindamycin resistance determinant encoded by fragment B of pDP1 has disseminated widely in Bacteroides but is not expressed in E. coli. Expression of phenotypically similar erythromycin resistance genes (encoding the macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B, or MLS, resistance pattern) from Gram-positive bacteria has been detected in E. coli (17, 18). However, the Bacteroides erythromycin resistance region does not share detectable DNA homology with the common MLS gene from streptococci, indicating that the Bacteroides gene is probably distinct from the Gram-positive MLS genes (11). Our earlier study had identified a cryptic tetracycline resistance determinant, encoded by the B fragment of pCP1 and expressed in E . coli but not B . fragilis (14). We are now able to show that the host-dependent expression of this tetracycline resistance region is not due to alteration or mutation of the fragment during cloning in E. coli. As shown in Table 3, pDP1 confers tetracycline resistance on E. coli but not Bacteroides. Furthermore, pDP1 isolated from B. fragilis transconjugants could be transformed back into E. coli with full expression of tetracycline resistance. The lack of expression in B. fragilis is due to the dependence of the resistance phenotype on aerobic growth of the host cell, since pDP1 does not express tetracycline resistance in E. coli under anaerobic growth conditions (ref. 14 and Table 3). Although nitrate can replace oxygen as the terminal electron acceptor in respiration, addition of nitrate to E . *coli* containing $pDP1$ did not restore expression of tetracycline resistance under anaerobic conditions. These results suggest that the defect in expression in anaerobic cells is related to the absence of oxygen rather than a block in the respiratory process.

Analysis of the deletions shown in Fig. ³ allows us to locate functional regions on the Bacteroides plasmid pCP1 contained in pDP1. Since fragment C and an adjacent 3.4-kb portion of fragment A (defined by the Bgl II deletion in pDP1 Δ 4) are not required for replication in Bacteroides, the essential sequences for maintenance in B . fragilis lie in the remaining 5-kb region of fragment A. The small 0.7-kb HindIII deletion in fragment B of pDP1 Δ 3 tentatively locates the clindamycin resistance coding region, since the larger 3.3-kb HindIII deletion occurs within the non-essential region of the A and C fragments and should not affect the maintenance of pDP1 Δ 3 in *Bacteroides*. Since pDP1 Δ 3 still expressed tetracycline resistance in E. coli, the cryptic tetracycline resistance gene must be distinct from the clindamycin resistance determinant.

These results demonstrate the usefulness of this unique gene transfer system for studying plasmid function and gene expression in anaerobic bacteria. The genetic analysis of Bacteroides and other anaerobes has been frustrated by the lack of a system for genetic manipulation. This obstacle can be overcome by the use of shuttle vectors like pDP1, which allow Bacteroides genes and plasmids to be cloned in E. coli and returned to Bacteroides for functional analysis. The broad host range properties of the RK2 conjugation system can mediate plasmid transfer from E . coli to B . fragilis, although RK2 itself apparently cannot replicate in Bacteroides. The transfer system of RK2 is well adapted to promote mating between unrelated types of aerobic Gram-negative bacteria (3). In addition, RK2-mediated plasmid transfer from E. coli to cyanobacteria has been reported (19). Our results further extend the host range of RK2 conjugation to include anaerobic bacteria. The use of a bifunctional vector plasmid containing two replicons and the RK2 transfer origin can facilitate gene transfer between bacteria that rarely, if ever, exchange plasmids under natural conditions.

This work was supported by Grants Al ¹⁶⁴⁶³ and GM ²⁸⁹²⁴ from the National Institutes of Health. D.G.G. is a Teaching and Research Scholar of the American College of Physicians.

- 1. Del Bene, V., Rogers, M. & Farrar, W. (1976) J. Gen. Microbiol. 92, 384-390.
- 2. Guiney, D. G. & Davis, C. E. (1982) Plasmid 7, 196–198.
3. Guiney, D. G. (1984) J. Infect. Dis. 149. 320–329.
-
- 3. Guiney, D. G. (1984) J. Infect. Dis. 149, 320–329.
4. Mancini, C. & Behme. R. (1977) J. Infect. Dis. 1. Mancini, C. & Behme, R. (1977) J. Infect. Dis. 136, 597-600.
- 5. Young, F. & Mayer, L. (1979) Rev. Infect. Dis. 1, 55-63.
- 6. Rotimi, V., Dverder, B. & Hafiz, S. (1981) J. Med. Microbiol. 14, 359-370.
- 7. Guiney, D. G. & Davis, C. E. (1978) Nature (London) 274, 181-182.
- 8. Burt, S. & Woods, D. (1976) J. Gen. Microbiol. 93, 405–409.
9. Guiney, D. G. & Yakobson, F. (1983) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.
- Guiney, D. G. & Yakobson, E. (1983) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 80, 3595-3598.
- 10. Privitera,G., Sebald, M. & Fayolle, F. (1979) Nature (London) 278, 657-659.
- 11. Guiney, D. G., Hasegawa, P., Stalker, D. & Davis, C. E. (1983) J. Infect. Dis. 147, 551-558.
- 12. Kahn, M., Kolter, R., Thomas, C., Figurski, D., Meyer, R., Remaut, E. & Helinski, D. (1979) Methods Enzymol. 68, 368- 380.
- 13. Guiney, D. G., Hasegawa, P. & Davis, C. E. (1984) Plasmid 11, 268-271.
- 14. Guiney, D. G., Hasegawa, P. & Davis, C. E. (1984) Plasmid 11, 248-252.
- 15. Thomas, C. (1981) Plasmid 5, 277-291.
- 16. Kreft, J., Burger, K. & Goebel, W. (1983) Mol. Gen. Genet. 190, 384-389.
- 17. Barany, F., Boeke, J. & Tomasz, A. (1982) Proc. Nati. Acad. Sci. USA 79, 2991-2995.
- 18. Macrina, F., Evans, R., Tobian, J., Hartley, D., Clewell, D. & Jones, K. (1983) Gene 25, 145-150.
- 19. Wolk, C. P., Vonshak, A., Kehoe, P. & Elhai, J. (1984) Proc. Nati. Acad. Sci. USA 81, 1561-1565.