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INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF REVIEW

Oxidative stress can be functionally defined as an excess of prooxidants in the cell. Active oxygen molecules have been shown to cause damage to DNA, RNA, protein, and lipids. Active oxygen species are produced as an incapable by-product of normal aerobic metabolism, and their production is further enhanced by exposure to certain environments or by dietary or disease conditions. Oxidative toxicity results when the degree of oxidative stress exceeds the capacity of the cell defense systems. Oxidative stress is distinct from other stress responses, such as those induced by heat shock, carbon starvation, or peroxide stress.

Oxidative stress responses are divided into two main categories: peroxide stress responses and superoxide stress responses. The peroxide stress response is characterized by the activation of the SoxRS regulon, which encodes two proteins, SoxR and SoxS. The superoxide stress response is mediated by the OxyR regulon, which is activated by direct exposure to oxidative stress.

The two oxidative stress responses are distinct in their reactivities and sources. Peroxide stress response is activated by hydrogen peroxide (H2O2) and hydroxyl radical (OH•), while superoxide stress response is activated by superoxide anion (O2•−). The sources of these reactive oxygen species include the respiratory chain, xanthine oxidase, and other metabolic pathways.
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strongly implicated in a number of diseases such as rheumatoid arthritis, inflammatory bowel disorders, and atherosclerosis (102, 104). It is also emerging as one of the most important causative agents of mutagenesis, tumorigenesis, and aging (1, 3–5, 40, 75). Virtually all aerobic organisms have evolved complex defense and repair mechanisms to mitigate the damaging effects of active oxygen (160, 161).

Because of the powerful genetic techniques available for manipulations in bacteria, tremendous progress has been made toward understanding the genetic and physiological responses to oxidative stress in bacteria. Many aerobic bacteria tested to date appear to encode multigene responses to oxidative stress (for example, see reference 23). In this article, we will summarize what has been learned to date about cellular responses to oxidative stress, primarily in *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella typhimurium*. We will briefly describe the reactivities of active species of oxygen, detail the genetics and molecular biology of oxidative stress responses, and discuss the physiological role of the responses in oxidative stress. Mere recently, responses analogous to those first characterized in bacteria have been found in mammalian cells (e.g., 55a, 131, 185a). We will conclude by briefly reviewing the similarities and differences between oxidative stress responses in bacteria and eukaryotic organisms.

This review is intended to be comprehensive and self-contained so that most readers will obtain a current picture of the field without frequent consultation with references. Readers familiar with the background information might skip the beginning section.

Portions of the material covered in this article have been reviewed elsewhere in greater detail. The reader is referred to the following reviews for further coverage of specific topics: the chemistry and biochemistry of oxygen radicals (34, 36, 95, 112, 205); the sources of active oxygen species (3, 74, 188); oxygen radicals and tissue damage, disease, aging, and cancer (75, 98, 104, 198, 207); oxygen radicals and DNA damage and repair (7, 56, 66, 119, 147, 197, 219, 233); lipid peroxidation (61, 79, 80, 103, 129); bacterial responses to other forms of stress (67, 87, 96, 159, 176, 177); and superoxide dismutases (77, 210, 222).

**OXIDATIVE STRESS RESPONSES**

**Active Oxygen Species**

Molecular oxygen (O₂) has an even number of electrons. However, it has two unpaired electrons in its molecular orbitals, one in the π^*Y antibonding orbital and one in the πZ antibonding orbital; the σZ orbital is empty. These electrons have the same spin quantum number (parallel spins). Molecular oxygen cannot easily oxidize another molecule by accepting a pair of electrons since typically a pair of electrons in an atomic or molecular orbital would have antiparallel spins. As a consequence of its being spin restricted, molecular oxygen is unreactive with most compounds except radicals. Thus oxidation by molecular oxygen is limited to acceptance of electrons. For thermodynamic reasons, molecular oxygen is a poor acceptor of one electron [E₀(O₂/O⁻)] = -0.33 V] (see reference 36 and references therein). The spin restriction of molecular oxygen can be overcome by interaction with another paramagnetic center. Transition metals such as Fe or Cu are good catalysts for the one-electron reduction of O₂ (sources of active oxygen species are discussed below).

Its reactivity increases upon acceptance of one, two, or three electrons to form, respectively, a superoxide radical (O²⁻), hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂), and hydroxyl radicals (OH⁻), or when it undergoes a spin flip to become singlet oxygen (S²O₂) (76, 112). The overall four-electron reduction of molecular oxygen to water is shown below.

\[
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Under more acidic conditions, O₂⁻ can be protonated to form HOO (hydroperoxyl radical) (19).

**Reactivities.** O₂⁻ will oxidize thiols, ascorbate, toco- pherol, and catecholamines (78, 112, 156). Proteins containing (Fe-S₄) clusters are highly sensitive to attack by O₂⁻ (80). Probably the most important reactions of O₂⁻ are its spontaneous dismutation to H₂O₂ + O₂ and its ability to reduce transition metals and metal complexes. Spontaneous dismutation of O₂⁻ in aqueous neutral pH environments produces H₂O₂ (78). As mentioned above, when O₂⁻ is protonated, the hydroperoxyl radical (HOO⁻) is produced (O₂⁻ + H⁺ → HOO⁻). The HOO⁻ radical is much more reactive than O₂⁻ because the negative charge has been neutralized. The pKₐ of this species is 4.8. Thus, at physiological pH, the ratio of O₂⁻ to its protonated form would be about 100:1. When the pH of the cell (or mitochondria) decreases, such as when oxidative membrane damage has occurred (as will be discussed in a later section), the ratio of HOO⁻ to O₂⁻ increases.

O₂⁻ also can act as a reducing agent for transition metals. In vivo the relevant transition metals are Fe³⁺ and Cu²⁺, although other transition metals such as titanium can be reduced (34). The general reaction is as follows:

\[
O₂⁻ + M^{n+} + H⁺ \rightarrow O₂ + M^{n+}
\]

The reduction of cupric and ferric ions by O₂⁻ can occur even when the metals exist in complexed form. For example, cytochrome c (Fe³⁺) can be reduced by cytochrome c (Fe²⁺) by O₂⁻ (8, 160).

The reactions of H₂O₂ with organic molecules remain unclear, partly because it reacts quickly with contaminating metals to form more reactive species which obscure its own role in oxidation reactions. It can act as a weak oxidizing agent and will attack thiol groups of proteins or reduced glutathione. It can also react directly with some keto acids (104, 237). Most significantly, H₂O₂ will react with reduced iron or copper ions to generate hydroxyl radicals (OH⁻) in the Fenton reaction (see reference 36 and references therein). Since O₂⁻ will reduce both Fe³⁺ and Cu²⁺ and since its dismutation produces H₂O₂, it is likely that when the intracellular concentration of O₂⁻ increases, the concentrations of H₂O₂ and OH⁻ will also rise.

Reactions of hydroxyl radicals are numerous because OH⁻ is so reactive that within the cell it will react with most biomolecules at diffusion-limited rates (206). The reactivity of OH⁻ is due to its very high standard electrode potential, +2.3 V (the standard potential of O₂ is ca. +0.8 V). It will oxidize almost anything but ozone. Because of the reactivity, the average diffusion distance of an OH⁻ radical is only a few nanometers (206), and thus its effects on any given biomolecule will depend largely upon the location of its formation.

Another form of highly reactive oxygen is ozone (O₃). O₃ is a ubiquitous air pollutant that is formed during photochemical reactions involving NO₂ and hydrocarbons. Ozone decom-
poses in pure water to form OH' and HOO' radicals with a bimolecular rate constant of 50 to 70 M⁻¹ s⁻¹ (209). Besides its decomposition to OH' and HOO', ozone reacts rapidly with dienes, amines, and thiols. Mechanisms of ozone reactions with biomolecules include formation of ozonides (cyclic peroxides), or H₂O₂ and aldehydes, or both, through reactions with dienes such as polyunsaturated fatty acids. Ozone may also directly oxidize sulfhydryl (or thiol) groups of amino acids in low-molecular-weight compounds or proteins (166).

Almost all reactions involving singlet oxygen with biomolecules are additions of the ¹O₂ (Σg 0₂) to conjugated bonds. Typically, peroxides are the initial products. ¹O₂ can add to olefins to produce allylic hydroperoxides and a shift in the double bond, or it can add to diene systems to produce endoperoxides (76). Reactions of ¹O₂ with unsaturated fatty acids or histidine are good examples of these types of reactions. ¹O₂ can also undergo (2 + 2) cycloadditions to dienes to produce dioxygenates, which decompose to yield carbonyl compounds (137). The second-order rate constants for the reactions of singlet oxygen with histidine and tryptophan are 1 x 10⁶ and 3 x 10⁶ M⁻¹ s⁻¹, respectively (205).

In addition to the above active oxygen species, there is growing evidence that iron-oxygen complexes may play a key role in several types of oxidative mechanisms. A superoxide anion will form a complex with Fe²⁺ to yield a "perferryl" radical, [2Fe²⁺O₂⁻]. This species is not thermodynamically capable of undergoing oxidative reactions with most biomolecules, but will undergo a series of reactions to produce the ferryl radical, [2Fe²⁺O²] (10, 11, 27, 28). This species is electron rich, has radical characteristics, and is not spin restricted in its reactions. Consequently, it is proposed as one of the major initiating species of lipid peroxidation and possibly DNA damage as well (10, 119). It is worth noting that formation of the ferroferryl radical will be enhanced under conditions of increased O₂⁻⁻.

Sources. Active oxygen species are produced by a variety of compounds and enzymes. The four-electron reduction of O₂ to H₂O is done sequentially and is catalyzed enzymatically by several membrane-associated respiratory-chain enzymes. Recently, Imlay and Fridovich (116) have shown that autoxidation of NADH dehydrogenase, succinate dehydrogenase, and α-lactate dehydrogenase are major sources of O₂⁻ in E. coli. One cytosolic enzyme thought to be capable of generating significant amounts of O₂⁻ is glutathione reductase, which uses NADH as an electron source (116, 150). Cytochrome P-450s have been shown to be important sources of active oxygen species in mammalian tissues. In certain mammalian tissues, specifically the liver, P-450s can represent up to 4% of the total cell protein (68a). Whereas bacteria contain several P-450s, the role of these cytochromes in production of oxy-radicals is not known.

Nonenzymatic production of O₂⁻ occurs by autoxidation of several cellular components including ubiquinins, catechols, thiols, and flavins. Electrophoric quinone compounds, both natural cellular constituents (such as ubiquinone) and exogenous sources (such as plumbagin and menadione) (Fig. 1), are easily reduced to semiuniones, which in turn readily reduce O₂ to O₂⁻, regenerating the oxidized quinone. The oxidized quinone can undergo this cycle numerous times and is thus referred to as a redox-cycling agent. Paraquat (methyl viologen), a dipyridyl, is also a very effective redox-cycling agent (Fig. 1). As indicated above, reduced transition metals, both free and in complexed form, can donate a single electron to molecular O₂ to generate O₂⁻⁻. This reaction is readily reversible and depends upon the concentrations of reduced and oxidized metal and of O₂ and O₂⁻⁻.

Sources of H₂O₂ include spontaneous and superoxide dismutase (SOD)-catalyzed dismutation of O₂⁻⁻, as well as several oxidases such as α-amino acid oxidase. There is also abundant evidence that H₂O₂ is a photoproduot of near-UV irradiation (67).

Sources of OH' are numerous. Tryptophan resides generate OH' upon absorption of a photon of 365 nm. Radiolysis of water produces OH' as well as a myriad of other active oxygen species (112). Another significant source of OH' is the reaction of H₂O₂ with reduced iron in the Fenton reaction:

\[
\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{Fe}^{2+} + \text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{OH}' + \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{Fe}^{3+}
\]

Since O₂⁻ will reduce transition metals such as iron and since O₂⁻ is dismutated to form H₂O₂, it is highly likely that when the steady-state concentration of O₂⁻⁻ rises, the steady-state concentrations of H₂O₂ and OH' will also rise. Singlet oxygen may be generated in vivo by the action of certain enzymes, decomposition of superoxide, decomposition of peroxiglated glutathione (GSOO), and photosensitization reactions with endogenous sensitizers such as riboflavin and bile pigments (76, 205). A combination of the photosensitizer methylene blue and visible-light radiation is also known to generate singlet oxygen in vitro (68).

**Oxidative Stress and Cellular Responses**

As discussed above, active species of oxygen naturally occur in aerobic cells, arising from a variety of intracellular and extracellular sources. It is not surprising, therefore, that cells maintain a strong defense against the threat. For example, aerobically growing E. coli cells are equipped with two superoxide dismutases (SODs), Mn-containing SOD (MnSOD, encoded by sodA) and Fe-containing SOD (Fe-SOD, encoded by sodB). SODs dismutate O₂⁻ to H₂O₂. Catalases (HPI catalase encoded by katG and HPH encoded...
by katE) disproportionate H₂O₂ into H₂O and O₂. Alkylhydroperoxide reductase (Ahp; encoded by ahpC and ahpF) is thought to provide additional defense by reducing various organic hydroperoxides.

Under certain circumstances, the concentration of active oxygen rises to a level that overwhelms the basal level of the scavenging capacity of the cell, giving rise to an oxidative stress condition. Artificially, oxidative stress can be brought about by addition of H₂O₂ or superoxide radical generators such as paraquat and plumbagin (Fig. 1) or by raising the partial pressure of oxygen by bubbling pure oxygen through a culture. Mutational inactivation of genes encoding catalases and superoxide dismutases is also an effective means of imposing oxidative stress onto aerobically growing cells. For example, in E. coli sodA sodB double-mutant cells completely lacking SOD activity (37), the concentration of endogenous O₂⁻ may be elevated 2.5 × 10³-fold over that in aerobically growing wild-type cells (116).

Bacteria respond to a variety of stresses and undergo derepression of a set of globally regulated genes (87). At least 13 different multigene systems (stimulons) are known to be induced in the response to a variety of stress stimuli (176). When oxidatively stressed, bacteria respond by invoking one or both of two known stimulons.

**Peroxide stress response.** In response to an increased flux of H₂O₂ and other organic peroxides such as tert-butyl hydroperoxide and cumene hydroperoxide (Fig. 1), the cellular concentrations of at least 30 proteins become elevated over the basal levels. We define this response as the peroxide-mediated stress response, although the actual stimulus for the induction is not known. The peroxide stimulon includes eight proteins in E. coli and at least nine proteins in S. typhimurium that are positively regulated by the locus oxyR. The genes encoding these proteins constitute the OxyR regulon (see below for details). Thus, both E. coli and S. typhimurium deleted for the oxyR gene (oxyRΔ) fail to induce these proteins. In OxyR(Con) mutants, the levels of these proteins are constitutively elevated.

Concomitantly with the derepression of the peroxide stimulon, bacteria acquire resistance to peroxide stress. For example, cells pretreated with a low dose of H₂O₂ display enhanced resistance to subsequent challenge doses of H₂O₂ (57). The increased survival derives, at least in part, from an induced DNA repair capacity. Thus, λ phage damaged by exposure to H₂O₂ have a higher plating efficiency on pretreated cells than on naive cells (57). Since λ phage injects naked DNA into the host cells, increased plating efficiency indicates an increased repair capacity for oxidatively damaged DNA. As the OxyR response does not appear to include a DNA repair pathway (70d), this response must be part of the broader peroxide stimulon.

**Superoxide stress response.** When stressed under elevated levels of the superoxide radical anion, O₂⁻, bacteria respond by invoking an entirely different stimulon. Treatment of cells with paraquat, for example, results in induction of more than 30 proteins (91, 234). These superoxide stimulon proteins are for the most part different from those belonging to the peroxide stress stimulon (see below for details). At least six of the superoxide stimulon proteins are known to be regulated by the products of two regulatory genes, soxR and soxS (92, 226, 241). Mutations inactivating either of the two genes render cells noninducible for the proteins. Thus, SoxR and SoxS proteins positively control the expression of the SoxRS regulon genes.

As in the peroxide stress response, the superoxide stress response enhances survival of the stressed cells. Cells pretreated with a nonlethal dose of plumbagin, for example, display enhanced survival upon an exposure to a challenge dose (71). An increased capacity of pretreated cells for reactivating λ phage damaged by treatment with O₂⁻-generating agents indicates that the superoxide stress response includes an increased DNA repair capacity (71). This is supported by the finding that the level of endonuclease IV, a DNA repair enzyme belonging to the SoxRS regulon, is dramatically elevated in cells treated with O₂⁻-generating agents (41).

**The two oxidative stress responses are distinct.** A large volume of evidence has accumulated which indicates that the peroxide and superoxide stress responses are distinct. For example, cells pretreated with H₂O₂ and cells preinduced with O₂⁻ generators do not develop cross-resistance; i.e., H₂O₂-treated cells show no enhanced survival when exposed to plumbagin, and vice versa (71). Similarly, H₂O₂-pretreated cells reactivating H₂O₂-damaged phage but not O₂⁻-damaged phage, whereas O₂⁻-pretreated cells reactivating O₂⁻-damaged phage but not H₂O₂-damaged phage. Proteins induced with H₂O₂ are, for the most part, different from those induced under O₂⁻-generating conditions (234). Furthermore, the OxyR and SoxRS regulons are controlled by two distinct control elements. Most of the OxyR regulon genes are not inducible with O₂⁻ generators and vice versa. Detailed analyses of the two responses and their regulation are described below.

**OXIDATIVE STRESS-INDUCIBLE PROTEINS**

Several approaches have been taken to examine proteins and genes induced under oxidative stress conditions. Two-dimensional gel electrophoresis analysis of cell extract from 35S-labeled cells is an effective means of probing induction of proteins (179). Since stress proteins are induced at different times after the onset of stress (44, 228), the timing of protein labeling is a crucial factor in determining the kinds of proteins induced. Also important is the means by which stress is brought about. For example, chronic O₂⁻ stress brought about by the lack of SOD in aerobically growing SOD- cells (i.e., sodA sodB double mutants) induces proteins that are not seen in wild-type cells stressed by addition of paraquat (234). Treatment with different redox-cycling agents (e.g., paraquat, plumbagin, and menadione), as well as with different concentrations of these agents, results in different patterns of induced proteins (91, 234). These variables would account at least in part for the considerable discrepancy found among reports in the literature.

The second approach is to monitor enzyme activities during the stress (44, 91, 107). Several enzymes have been identified as being induced under various oxidative stress conditions. These are included in Table 1. The third approach is to screen random operon fusions to a reporter gene (e.g., lacZ) for inducibility by oxidative stress (132). Since the fusion event often leads to inactivation of the gene, inspection of a two-dimensional electrophoresis gel for disappearance of a protein spot allows one to identify a putative protein which the gene encodes (234). The sot::lacZ fusions have been cloned (70d) and partially characterized (70d).

A number of proteins that are induced in S. typhimurium and E. coli under various oxidative stress conditions have been detected. Table 1 lists some of the oxidatively inducible proteins for which cellular activities or encoding genes, or both, are known. The examination of the patterns of induced proteins permits the following generalization. (i) The proteins that are induced by O₂⁻ stress are, for the most part,
different from those induced by peroxide stress. (ii) Each stress condition induces a set of proteins including those that are apparently unique to that stress. (iii) Some proteins that are induced by oxidative stress can also be induced by other types of stress, such as heat shock, starvation, and SOS. These points are elaborated in the sections that follow. (iv) The regulation of certain oxidative stress-inducible genes appears to be different in S. typhimurium and in E. coli. For example, a moderate degree of induction of MnSOD in E. coli was reported (44), whereas no significant induction was detected in S. typhimurium (221). The absence of MnSOD in E. coli cannot be induced by heat shock (221). Consistent with this observation, induction of MnSOD was shown to be not dependent on OxyR+ (29).

A similar two-dimensional protein analysis of E. coli cells treated with H2O2 revealed that more than 30 proteins are synthesized at an elevated rate after induction, 9 of which are constitutively expressed at an elevated level in oxyR1 mutants but are not at all induced with H2O2 in oxyRΔ2 strains in which the oxyR gene is deleted (44). The oxyRΔ2 mutation does not affect the inducibility of the remaining 21 proteins. Thus, only 9 of 30 peroxide stress proteins are regulated by the oxyR locus. Two of the OxyR-regulated proteins are heat-shock proteins. Four of the remaining seven proteins have been identified; two are electromorphs of the HPI catalase (228), and two are subunits of Ahp (Table 1). As expected, it was found that the activities of these enzymes are constitutively elevated significantly in oxyR1 mutants (44). In addition, MnSOD and glutathione reductase activities are moderately elevated in the constitutive mutants. It is not known whether any of the remaining unidentified proteins are responsible for these two enzyme activities. Thus, in S. typhimurium, 8 to 11 observed proteins are under oxyR control. Of course, additional OxyR-regulated polypeptides may be hidden or unobservable on two-dimensional gels.

**Peroxide Stress Proteins**

The two-dimensional gel analysis of S. typhimurium proteins labeled during the 60-min period following treatment with a low dose of H2O2 indicated that the rate of synthesis of 30 proteins is elevated over that seen in untreated cells (44, 171). Of those 30 proteins, 12 (early proteins) are maximally synthesized during the first 30 min whereas 18 (late proteins) continue to be synthesized at an elevated rate in the second 30 min. Nine of the 12 early proteins are constitutively expressed at an elevated level in S. typhimu-
O$_2^-$ Stress Proteins

The first enzyme that was identified as being induced by O$_2^-$-generating conditions is MnSOD (93, 107). The activity of endonuclease IV (Endo IV), normally a minor apurinic/apyrimidinic (AP)-endonuclease, was found to be induced dramatically in E. coli after treatment with a sublethal dose of paraquat and moderately after treatment with plumbagin and menadione (41). Glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase (glucose-6-P dehydrogenase) (91) and NAD(P)H dehydrogenase (diaphorase) were also found to be induced with paraquat or menadione (Table 1).

A more systematic survey for proteins inducible by O$_2^-$-mediated oxidative stress was undertaken by use of two-dimensional protein gel analysis (234). An increase in O$_2^-$ flux induces MnSOD, which in turn stimulates production of H$_2$O$_2$. The elevated level of H$_2$O$_2$ is expected to induce peroxide stress-inducible proteins. In this particular study, sodA sodB double mutants completely lacking SOD activity were used to minimize the expected secondary induction. Because of their lack of dismutase activity, use of the SOD cells also permitted the use of paraquat or plumbagin at approximately 100- to 1,000-fold lower concentrations than those normally used with SOD$^+$ cells. This was expected to minimize any effect that might arise from the action of the agents other than generation of O$_2^-$ (234). Proteins elevated under these conditions were compared with the proteins induced in SOD$^+$ cells stressed with O$_2^-$ generators. On the whole, about 30 proteins were found to be induced under O$_2^-$ stress conditions. Of these ca. 30 Sod proteins (for superoxide inducible), 6 have been identified: 2 proteins associated with HPI catalase, 2 proteins of Ahp, heat shock protein GroEL, and endonuclease IV (Table 1). MnSOD, a basic protein, was not resolved on these gels. Except for the two proteins associated with HPI catalase and the two proteins of Ahp, no other H$_2$O$_2$-inducible proteins are elevated under O$_2^-$ stress conditions (234). In a similar study, Greenberg and Demple (91) found that O$_2^-$-generating agents, paraquat and menadione, induce wild-type strains at least 33 proteins that are not seen with H$_2$O$_2$. These include GroES and two other heat shock proteins, MnSOD, endonuclease IV, and glucose-6-P dehydrogenase (Table 1).

Screening random operon fusions for inducibility to paraquat treatment, Kogoma et al. (132) found three soi::lacZ fusions that are inducible specifically with O$_2^-$-generating agents. One fusion, soi-28::lacZ, lacked the Soi protein F120, and the other two, soi-17::lacZ and soi-19::lacZ, did not synthesize the Soi protein H47 with or without O$_2^-$ stress (234). The soi-28 and soi-17/soi-19 genes have been tentatively assigned to the genes encoding F120 and H47, respectively (Table 1). The functions of these Soi proteins in oxidative stress have not been determined. Since the soi::lacZ fusion strains are somewhat more sensitive to paraquat than is soi$^+$ (132), and since the absence of these Soi proteins in the fusion strains results in an increased expression of other Soi proteins (234), they are possibly protective proteins involved in scavenging active oxygen species.

A recessive mutation in the locus, mvrA, that renders cells sensitive specifically to paraquat (methyl viologen) has been isolated (172). The wild-type gene has been cloned, and the nucleotide sequence has been determined. The molecular weight and pI estimated for the amino acid sequence are similar to those of the Soi protein H30 (234). However, inducibility of MvrA protein with paraquat has not been demonstrated.

There are conflicting reports with regard to the inducibility of OxyR-regulated proteins with O$_2^-$ generators. Hassan and Fridovich (108) detected significant induction of catalase activity with menadione and plumbagin but not with paraquat, whereas Kao and Hassan (128) reported induction of catalase with paraquat. Greenberg and Demple (91) observed the induction with paraquat or menadione of all of the proteins that are under OxyR control. The induction of OxyR proteins including HPI and Ahp proteins with paraquat, plumbagin, or menadione is clearly OxyR-dependent (91, 234). This suggests that the induction is mediated by H$_2$O$_2$, a product of the dismutation of O$_2^-$ which is stimulated by induced MnSOD as discussed above. In keeping with this suggestion, Walkup and Kogoma (234) found that deletion of SOD activity as in sodA sodB double mutants abolishes the induction of these proteins with paraquat or plumbagin, with the exception of ApHF, which is present at a markedly elevated level in SOD$^-$ cells with or without paraquat treatment. Greenberg and Demple (91) also reported significant levels of induction of HPI catalase proteins in SOD$^-$ cells treated with menadione. It appears, therefore, that a significant amount of H$_2$O$_2$ is generated from O$_2^-$ in the complete absence of SOD activity in these mutants. However, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the redox-cycling agents commonly used may generate H$_2$O$_2$ directly. Alternatively, some of the OxyR regulon genes may possess a cis-acting control element that is sensitive to an O$_2^-$-mediated inducing signal (see below).

In summary, more than 30 proteins are induced under O$_2^-$ stress conditions in E. coli. These proteins are, for the most part, different from those induced by H$_2$O$_2$ stress. For at least six superoxide stress proteins, enzyme activities and/or encoding genes are known (Table 1). It should be noted that there are no comparative studies for S. typhimurium. Therefore, we know little about proteins inducible by O$_2^-$ stress in this organism, with the exception of MnSOD (44).

Overlaps with Other Stress Responses

Heat shock response. One of the remarkable observations, repeated in a number of studies, is that oxidative stress induces some of the proteins that are also induced under other stress conditions such as heat shock and DNA damage (44, 91, 171, 228, 234). In particular, heat shock proteins GroES and GroEL have been shown to be induced by both peroxide- and superoxide-mediated oxidative stresses as well as heat shock, starvation, and SOS, at least in E. coli (Table 1). Another heat shock protein, DnaK, has been shown to be induced by treatment with H$_2$O$_2$, nalidixic acid, UV irradiation, and starvation. Elevated levels of the protein, however, could not be seen under O$_2^-$ conditions (234). An SOS protein, RecA, can be induced by both types of oxidative stress but not by heat shock (Table 1). These observations clearly indicate that several stress responses overlap and that the extent of the overlap varies in different overlapping responses.

Mutants of E. coli deleted for the rpoH gene, which encodes the major heat shock sigma factor, are extremely sensitive to thermal stress; they cannot grow at temperatures above 20°C (246). Heat shock genes are expressed at much reduced rates in these mutants. However, overproduction of GroEL and GroES proteins alleviates the effects of the rpoH deletion and allows growth at up to 40°C (136). Growth at temperatures above 40°C requires concomitant overexpression of the dnaK gene (136). These results strongly suggest that GroE and DnaK are key proteins that
are important in protection against thermal stress. Together with these observations, the fact that these proteins are induced in at least four overlapping responses (Table 1) points to an attractive notion that some of the heat shock proteins may serve as general antistress proteins. In support of this idea, it has been demonstrated that the rpoH deletion renders E. coli SOD and SOD cells extremely sensitive to both peroxide and superoxide stress, although a mutation in the groES, grpE, or dnaK gene does not by itself increase the sensitivity appreciably (132a).

Privalle and Fridovich (186) observed that heat shock (for 1 h at 48°C) followed by a period of recovery at 37°C resulted in a moderate induction of MnSOD. Since the induction was seen only under aerobic conditions, they speculated that heat shock might generate O$_2^-$ as a result of disruption of the electron transport system of the membrane by heat. In support of this proposal, a recent study has shown that certain membrane-binding drugs (anesthetics) which inhibit the membrane-bound respiratory activity also induce MnSOD only under aerobic conditions (245). Whether these cells acquired resistance to heat shock or oxidative stress was not examined.

Cells adapted to peroxide stress exhibit increased resistance to heat shock. Thus, pretreatment of S. typhimurium with H$_2$O$_2$, which induces 30 proteins including 5 heat shock proteins (e.g., DnaK) (171), leads to markedly increased resistance to thermal stress (44). An OxyR(Con) mutant (oxyR1) of S. typhimurium was shown to be markedly more resistant to killing by heat than the wild type was (44). Similarly, transcription of several heat shock genes has been found to be constitutively elevated in E. coli SOD- cells chronically stressed by high levels of O$_2^-$ (88). However, these cells are no more resistant to thermal stress than are SOD+ cells, partly because they are defective in the induction of heat shock proteins upon temperature shift-up (123a).

Carbon starvation response. Glucose-starved stationary-phase cells of E. coli develop enhanced resistance to several forms of stress such as heat shock, oxidation, osmotic shock, and starvation, and more than 30 proteins are induced in starved cells, including several oxidative stress and heat shock proteins (126, 159). Apparently, three of the heat shock proteins (DnaK, GroEL, and HspG) are regulated by 82, which has been shown to increase upon starvation (125a). However, the oxidative stress proteins seen in starved cells are not induced by oxidative stress. Instead, the induction of these proteins is regulated as part of a multigene system (the KatF regulon) which is turned on upon entry to the stationary phase or to carbon starvation (see below).

SOS response. Genetic stress invokes the SOS response, which includes an inducible DNA damage repair response (233, 239). Brawn and Fridovich (30) reported that paraquat treatment causes induction of a din (damage-inducible) gene and imparts resistance to UV irradiation only in the presence of oxygen. They proposed that O$_2^-$ induced the SOS response. However, induction of MnSOD with paraquat has since been shown to be independent of RecA$^+$ (105). Plum-bagin at the concentrations that induc a DNA repair response in E. coli has failed to activate the din gene or to confer resistance to UV irradiation (71). The concentrations of paraquat necessary to confer protection against UV irradiation (0.5 to 10 mM) (30) are much higher than those needed to fully induce SoxRS regulon genes (e.g., 0.1 mM for sodA and 0.05 mM for soi genes) (105, 132, 221). It is possible, therefore, that paraquat at high concentrations causes SOS-inducing damage (e.g., single-strand breaks) by elevating both O$_2^-$ and H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations, leading to formation of OH·. The RecA$^+$ dependence of the induction of UV resistance with paraquat is yet to be demonstrated.

Treatment with low (91) but not high (101) concentrations of H$_2$O$_2$ induces recA, an SOS gene. Similarly, H$_2$O$_2$ is known to cause the induction of two SOS functions, λ phage induction from lysogens and cell filamentation (118). Cell filamentation during the SOS response is due to the induction of the sfiA (sulA) gene encoding a cell division inhibitor (82). It is puzzling, therefore, that the H$_2$O$_2$-induced filamentation is not dependent on sfiA$^+$ (118) and yet the sfiA gene is inducible with H$_2$O$_2$ (65, 84). It is likely that H$_2$O$_2$ causes both SOS-dependent and SOS-independent inhibition of cell division.

REGULATION OF CELLULAR RESPONSES TO OXIDATIVE STRESS

OxyR Regulon

Positive regulatory protein, OxyR. The expression of a limited number of the proteins inducible with H$_2$O$_2$ is regulated by the oxyR locus. Thus, oxyR controls only a subset of the 30 H$_2$O$_2$-inducible proteins. This was demonstrated by the isolation of an S. typhimurium mutant, oxyR1, in which the expression of 9 of the early 12 proteins is constitutively elevated (44). The oxyR1 mutation was mapped by linkage to Tn10 insertions in the nearby argH (ω 89.5 min on the standard E. coli linkage map [12]). By 10-mediated deletion, S. typhimurium and E. coli mutants deleted for the oxyR locus were generated (44). The deletion of the gene abolished the inducibility of the nine proteins with H$_2$O$_2$. Thus, it was inferred that the oxyR gene product is a positive factor essential for activation of the OxyR regulon genes (44). The E. coli oxyR gene has been cloned, and the nucleotide sequence has been determined (45, 216a). The gene encodes a protein of 34 kDa which shares significant homology with a family of bacterial regulatory proteins known as the LysR family (111). The oxyR gene expression is negatively autoregulated, as is the expression of many Lys family regulatory genes (59). The regulation by OxyR operates primarily at the transcriptional level. Thus, the katG transcript is elevated more than 50-fold in S. typhimurium oxyR1 mutants (171), which is in good agreement with the 50-fold increase in catalase activity observed in the mutants (44). Induction of β-galactosidase with H$_2$O$_2$ in strains carrying a katG::lacZ operon fusion is completely blocked by introduction of an oxyR deletion mutation (218). Similar transcriptional activation of the ahp operon by OxyR has been demonstrated by the presence of elevated levels of ahpC transcript and AhpC protein in oxyR constitutive mutants (218). Footprinting analysis with purified OxyR protein has identified the regions upstream of the katG gene, ahpCF operon, and oxyR gene to which OxyR protein binds. The OxyR-binding sites extend into the −35−70 binding sites, suggesting that the OxyR protein interacts with RNA polymerase to activate transcription. Intriguingly, inspection of the sequences of these OxyR-binding sites has revealed only a few conserved nucleotides (218).

OxyR is known to regulate the expression of one other gene: the phage Mu mom gene which encodes a DNA modification function (26). OxyR (MomR) protein prevents transcription of the mom gene by binding to a 5' region of the mom structural gene which contains three GATC sites (the
target sequence for Dam methylase (157), only when these sites are unmethylated. Thus, the OxyR protein can discriminate between unmethylated and methylated states of the mom promoter region (26). Whether the Dam methylation-dependent repression of the mom gene in any way relates to oxidative stress is not known. E. coli dam mutants are hypersensitive to killing by H₂O₂ (242). Thus there may be other OxyR-regulated genes whose repression or induction depend upon correct methylation. It is interesting that there is significant homology between the OxyR-binding site sequences of the mom and oxyR genes (26), in contrast to the absence of a consensus among those of the katG, ahpCF, and oxyR genes as mentioned above. This suggests that the modes of interaction with DNA might be different depending on whether the protein functions as a repressor or an activator.

**Direct activation of OxyR protein by oxidative stress.** In response to the elevated flux of H₂O₂, OxyR protein activates transcription of the OxyR regulon genes. How is an oxidative stress signal transduced to OxyR protein? Upon treatment of cells with H₂O₂, the transcription of oxyR'-lacZ does not change (216), nor does the rate of OxyR protein synthesis increase (213). Thus, induction of the OxyR regulon does not involve an increase in the amount of OxyR expression. The possibility of direct activation of OxyR protein by oxidation was suggested by the initially surprising observation that OxyR protein purified from unstressed cells is capable of activating transcription of ahpCF and katG genes in vitro. It was subsequently demonstrated that OxyR prepared in the absence of oxygen is inactive as a transcriptional activator, but it can be readily converted to an active form by exposure to air (213). In fact, addition and removal of dithiothreitol, a reducing agent, permits conversion between the active and inactive forms of the protein. The conversion to the active form by removal of the reductant can be prevented by the addition of catalase. Therefore, it appears that as soon as it is removed from the reducing environment within the cell, OxyR protein is oxidized, perhaps by H₂O₂ that is present under the aerobic conditions. These results led to the conclusion that upon oxidative stress the increased flux of H₂O₂ converts OxyR protein to an oxidized form, which in turn activates transcription of the OxyR regulon genes (213). Thus, in this scenario, OxyR is both the sensor and the transducer of an oxidative stress signal which is H₂O₂ itself.

The mechanism by which the oxidized form of OxyR activates transcription has not been clearly elucidated. OxyR protein contains six cysteine residues (45). Although good candidates for the redox-active center, these cysteine residues are not likely to be involved in formation of intramolecular disulfide bonds by oxidation because the conversion of five of the six residues to serine does not affect the activation of the protein (213). A change in the cysteine residue at position 199 to serine inactivates the protein, however. Both the reduced and oxidized forms of OxyR bind to the regulatory regions of ahpCF, katG, and oxyR, but the footprints obtained with the two forms are clearly different, suggesting a distinct conformational change upon oxidation and reduction of the protein (213). OxyR mutant protein, which is inactivated by conversion of the essential cysteine residue to serine, even when prepared in the presence of oxygen, yields a footprinting pattern identical to that seen with the reduced form of wild-type protein. It has been suggested that the postulated conformational change alters the interaction of the protein with RNA polymerase, leading to activation of transcription (213). It should be pointed out, however, that the same difference in the footprinting patterns between the reduced and oxidized forms can be seen with the regulatory region of the OxyR regulon gene which is bound and repressed by both the reduced and oxidized forms of OxyR (213). Therefore, the suggested conformational alteration may be a necessary change, but not a sufficient event leading to transcriptional activation. The understanding of the precise mechanism of the transcriptional activation would require detailed structural and genetic studies of the two forms of the OxyR protein.

**SoxRS Regulon**

**Isolation of Sox(Con) mutants.** The demonstration that the induction of soi::lacZ fusions is completely independent of previously described regulatory loci, oxyR, rpoH, and recA, led to the prediction of the existence of a new control locus termed soxR (for superoxide radical response) (132). The soxR regulatory locus was defined by subsequent isolation of mutations [SoxR(Con)] that render the expression of several O₂- inducible genes constitutive in E. coli. Two mutations, soxRI and soxR2, were isolated by searching for extragenic mutations that elevate expression of the extragenic soxR(Con) fusion (226). Additionally, two mutations, soxR101 and soxR105, were found among the mutations that conferred elevated levels of resistance to redox-cycling agents (92). The mutations have been mapped at 92.2 min on the E. coli chromosome (92, 226). The genes which are expressed constitutively in these mutants are nfo, zwf, sodA, soi-17, soi-19, and sol-28 (Table 1). Four other proteins including a ribosomal protein were also found elevated in soxR(Con) mutants by two-dimensional gel analysis (92). The SoxR(Con) mutants are not particularly more resistant to O₂- generating agents than is the wild type, except for soxR101 and soxR105 mutants, which are isolated by virtue of increased resistance to menadione. Thus, the mutants are resistant to this agent and plumbagin, but not to paraquat (92).

The regulation by the soxR locus appears to occur primarily, if not exclusively, at the level of transcription because SoxR(Con) mutations affect the expression of nfo'-lacZ, which utilizes the ribosome-binding site of lacZ (226). Large deletions in the soxR locus lead to nondetectability by paraquat. The inducibility can be restored by introduction of a plasmid carrying this region of the chromosome (92, 226). Thus, the soxR locus encodes a trans-acting positive factor(s) essential for transcriptional activation of soxR regulon genes.

The soxR region encodes two proteins. The actual SoxR regulation appears to be much more complex than one positive factor activating transcription of the regulon in the response to stress. By analyzing proteins coded for by the DNA sequences in this region, Tsaneva and Weiss (226) have detected two polypeptides, of 17 and 13 kDa, which have assigned to SoxR and SoxS proteins, respectively. Both SoxR and SoxS are essential for the inducibility of the SoxR regulon genes (241). Deletions and insertions near the 3'end of the soxR gene lead to the constitutive phenotype, thus raising the possibility that the activation of the SoxR protein involves cleavage by a protease activity in analogy to the RecA-mediated cleavage of LexA protein in SOS induction (233). The two genes, soxR and soxS, are transcribed divergently (226). Furthermore, the soxR promoter lies within the soxS gene (241). The significance of this divergent and overlapping transcription has not been elucidated. The mechanism by which the two proteins activate transcription of the SoxRS regulon genes is not known. One possibility
that the activation involves an increase in the amount of these proteins has been suggested by the observation that the soxS gene is inducible by paraquat (241). Since SoxR is normally expressed at barely detectable levels (226), the expression of soxR may also be inducible by O$_2$ stress.

The individual roles of the SoxR and SoxS proteins in the regulation of SoxRS-regulated genes has not been elucidated. SoxS is related to the AraC family of proteins (2a, 241) that function as positive transcriptional regulators. The SoxR protein was found to share regions of homology to the MerR protein (2a), which, when bound by mercury, positively regulates several genes involved in mercury detoxification (180). SoxR contains four cysteines clustered in a region near the carboxy terminus (241). This suggests the possibility of a bound metal whose redox state might determine the activity of the SoxR protein as an inducer (signal sensor) or transcriptional activator. It has recently been shown that SoxS alone can switch on the SoxRS regulon genes in the absence of SoxR or paraquat (2a).

Pleiotropic effects of soxR(Con) mutations. Greenberg et al. (92) have made an interesting observation that SoxR(Con) mutants are multiply resistant to several antibiotics including chloramphenicol, nalidixic acid, ampicillin, tetracycline, and bleomycin. This multiple drug resistance phenotype can be accounted for at least in part by additional effects of soxR(Con) mutations on gene expression. First, SoxR(Con) mutants have diminished amounts of protein S6A, accompanied by concomitant increases in protein S6C (92). The gene encoding this activity (rimK) has recently been cloned and sequenced (127). Addition of glutamyl residues to the carboxy terminus of the S6 protein, yielding S6C, affects the level of resistance to several antibiotics (189). Second, the levels of the OmpF porin are significantly decreased in SoxR(Con) mutants (92). This change appears to be mediated by the increased expression of the micF gene (55a) encoding the antisense RNA, which inhibits translation of ompF mRNA (169). A similar multiple drug resistance conferred by the marA mutations has been shown to be caused at least in part by the decreased levels of OmpF porin in these mutants (46). It appears, therefore, that soxR(Con) mutations enhance the expression of the micF gene which decreases the OmpF porin level and in turn lowers the membrane permeability to antibiotics.

Garvey et al. (81) observed a significant decrease in the level of OmpF porin upon SOS induction by treatment with nalidixic acid. Since nalidixic acid treatment is known to induce some oxidative stress proteins (228), Greenberg et al. (92) speculated that nalidixic acid might generate oxygen radicals in the treated cells. This attractive hypothesis is unlikely because the decrease in OmpF porin is observed not only after SOS induction in recA$^+$ cells treated with nalidixic acid, but also in recA730 mutants which constitutively express SOS genes in the absence of nalidixic acid (81).

**Other Factors Involved in Regulation of SoxRS Regulon Genes**

There is evidence indicating that SoxRS regulon genes are regulated by additional factors. For example, SoxRS regulon genes are not maximally expressed in SoxR(Con) mutants; thus, the expression of several SoxRS regulon genes can be further elevated by treatment of SoxR(Con) mutants with paraquat (92, 226). This partial expression might account for the puzzling observation that soxR(Con) mutants are not particularly more resistant to many redox-cycling compounds than is the wild type, as mentioned above. A group of mutations [soxQ(Con)] have been isolated which elevate the expression of some SoxRS regulon genes at the transcriptional level like soxR(Con) but map at a locus distinct from the latter (88). soxQ$^+$ is not required for the induction by paraquat. Thus, SoxQ could be a factor responsible for additional control of some SoxRS genes.

**Multilayered Regulation of SodA Expression**

In addition to the SoxRS control, the expression of the sodA gene is under at least two and possibly three other global controls. Moody and Hassan (170) made a seminal observation that MnSOD can be anaerobically induced by the addition of iron chelators. The observation led them to propose the involvement of an iron-containing protein in the negative control of the SodA expression at the transcriptional level. Niederhoff et al. (178) noted that the promoter region of the sodA sequence (216) contains a stretch of sequence that is homologous to the iron box, a 19-bp consensus sequence that is found in the regulatory region of genes involved in iron uptake (14). The Fur protein which requires Fe$^{2+}$ as cofactor binds to the iron box and represses the expression. The involvement of Fur protein was subsequently demonstrated by modest levels of derepression of the sodA-lacZ operon fusion in aerobically and anaerobically growing fur mutants and by gel shift of DNA fragments containing the sodA promoter by Fur protein (178).

The genetic study by Tardat and Touati (217) confirmed the involvement of Fur and further uncovered another layer of control over SodA expression. They isolated and analyzed mutants that are capable of anaerobic expression of SodA. The analysis revealed that high levels of the anaerobic derepression require two mutations, one each in the fur and arc regulatory systems, and that single mutations affecting only one of the systems allow only partial derepression. The arc regulatory system negatively controls expression of a number of genes involved in aerobiosis (121–123). Thus, SodA expression is coupled to respiration by the Arc regulatory system and to iron availability by the Fur system. It has been speculated that the derepression of MnSOD by the unavailability of ferric iron is designed to compensate decreased activities of FeSOD in case of insufficient cellular iron concentrations for full FeSOD activity (217). Importantly, the derepressed level of MnSOD in fur arc double mutants can be further elevated by paraquat in the presence of oxygen, indicating that the positive regulation by SoxRS is independent of the Fur and Arc systems (217). Recent evidence suggests a role for Fnr in SodA expression as well (109a). Thus, the SodA expression is under at least three independent global regulatory systems. In addition, evidence indicates that overproduction of MnSOD represses transcription of the sodA gene; thus, the SodA expression is also autoregulated (221).

**KatF (RpoS) Regulon**

_E. coli_ possesses two catalases, HPI and HPII, encoded by katG and katE, respectively (152, 154). Whereas KatG catalase expression is under OxyR control, KatE expression is not inducible with H$_2$O$_2$, but is regulated in a growth phase-dependent manner (201). The synthesis of KatE catalase requires the katF gene product as a positive regulatory factor (153). The nucleotide sequence of a cloned katF gene has suggested that KatF protein is a factor (173). KatF synthesis is turned on before or coincidently with KatE expression as cells enter the stationary phase (174). Thus, it
appears that a starvation signal triggers the synthesis of KatF, which activates RNA polymerase to turn on transcription of the katE gene. Moreover, the observation that katF mutants die off more rapidly than the wild type upon prolonged exposure to starvation conditions led to the suggestion that KatF positively controls other genes involved in their response to starvation stress (174). Exonuclease III (Exo III) encoded by xthA, is an important repair enzyme in H2O2-mediated oxidative stress (58, 59). Thus, xthA mutants are very sensitive to exposure to near-UV and H2O2 (58, 194). Although KatF regulates KatE expression, inactivation of the katF gene but not katE results in sensitivity to near-UV (195). This observation led Sak et al. (193) to examine a possible role of KatF in XthA expression. They found that katF mutant cells contain as little Exo III activity as xthA mutant cells. The expression of xthA is controlled in a growth phase-dependent manner, as is katE expression. Thus, KatF appears also to regulate XthA expression. The speculation that the xthA and katE genes belong to the same operon (193) has not been critically examined.

Furthermore, katF (appR) is also known to regulate the expression of the appA gene (138, 225), which encodes an acid phosphatase (224), and the bola gene (22, 139), a "morphogene" which controls the cell morphology change from the rod shape of growing cells to the spherical shape upon entry to the stationary phase (2). It is not likely that these gene products play a significant role in the defense against oxidative stress. Instead, the katE and xthA genes are regulated as part of a multigene system (the KatF or RpoS regulon) which is invoked when cells enter the stationary phase (138, 159). The induction of katE and xthA would account for the remarkable degree of tolerance against H2O2 which develops in glucose-starved stationary-phase cells (126, 159a) since katF is one of the carbon starvation-inducible genes (138). Glucose starvation also elicits resistance to heat shock (126). However, katF is not inducible by heat (138). Thus, it appears that stationary-phase cells can develop tolerance to several types of stress by a unique mechanism which is not mediated by regular stress response systems such as the OxyR and heat shock regulons.

**AppppN, Heat Shock, and Oxidative Stress**

Ames and coworkers found that unusual nucleotides, AppppN and AppppN (N = A, C, G, or U), accumulate in cells stressed by heat shock or by exposure to a wide variety of oxidizing agents including menadione and H2O2 (141). An enzyme (dimucleotide tetraphosphate hydrolase) which hydrolyzes the nucleotides has been identified, and the gene (apaH) encoding the enzyme has been cloned (164). It has been proposed that these nucleotides may be alarmones signaling the onset of the stress (21). At least three lines of evidence resulting from subsequent investigations appear to rule out this possibility. First, the time course of the accumulation of AppppN lags behind induction of heat shock proteins (228). Second, cells carrying an apaH' gene on a high-copy-number plasmid do not accumulate the nucleotides during heat shock or oxidative stress as a result of an elevated level of the hydrolase activity. However, the pattern of these to starvation stress or heat shock conditions is not altered (184). Nor are ApaH overproducers particularly sensitive to H2O2 (184). Third, apaH(Null) mutants, whose basal level of AppppN is the same as that reached in heat shock-induced wild-type cells, do not show elevated levels of constitutive expression of heat shock proteins (69).

Although AppppN cannot be a signal for the heat shock or oxidative stress response, the following evidence (69, 126a) suggests that AppppN levels may modulate the heat shock response, perhaps by altering DnaK functions. (i) apaH (Null) mutants are more sensitive to killing at 55°C than is the parental strain with or without preexposure to 43°C. (ii) apaH(Null) mutants show prolonged synthesis of some heat shock proteins, including GroEL, DnaK, and E89 when heat-shocked cells are returned to low temperatures. (iii) apaH(Null) mutants exhibit an induction lag when lambda c1857(Ts) lysogens are shifted from 30 to 43°C. (iv) Although the level of phosphorylated DnaK increases upon heat shock in wild-type cells, the level in apaH(Null) mutants is already high at 30°C and does not increase after a heat shock. (v) Overproduction of DnaK decreases the heat sensitivity of an apaH ksgA double mutant and, as previously shown (142), DnaK overproduction suppresses the filamentation phenotype of the double mutant. Together with the observations that DnaK is involved in controlling the stability of c32 (220) and that DnaK protein autophosphorylates (247), these results point to the possibility that AppppN levels affect DnaK functions, thereby modulating the heat shock response. How AppppN affects DnaK functions is not clear at present, although photocrosslinking experiments with N8-azido-[32P]AppppA show that several stress proteins, including DnaK, GroEL, E89, C45, and C40 are AppppA-binding proteins (126a).

**Summary**

Bacteria respond to oxidative stress by invoking two distinct stress responses, the peroxide stimulon and the superoxide stimulon (Fig. 2). The two stimulons each contain a set of more than 30 proteins which overlap slightly. The expression of a subset of genes in each stimulon is controlled by a unique regulatory element. These genes constitute the OxyR and SoxRS regulons (Fig. 2). No overlap has been detected between the two regulons, with the possible exception of the sodA gene in *S. typhimurium*. The proteins induced by the peroxide stimulon may be H2O2 itself, whereas the signal for the SoxRS regulon is not known. The nature of the proteins outside the regulons and the regulation of the genes encoding these proteins have not been elucidated.

H2O2 and O2- generators also induce some heat shock
FIG. 3. Map positions of \( E. coli \) oxidative stress-related genes. The map positions of the genes listed in Table 2 are those of Bachmann (12). The genes in boldface letters are regulatory loci. See the text for details.

Table 2: Map Positions of \( E. coli \) Oxidative Stress-Related Genes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Map Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sodA</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodB</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xthA</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katE</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nth</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevention of Oxidative Damage**

Cellular defenses against the damaging effects of oxidative stress involve both enzymatic and nonenzymatic components. The enzymatic components may directly scavenge active oxygen species or may act by producing the nontoxic antioxidants. The protective enzymes are, with rare exception, ubiquitous among aerobic organisms. There are four enzymes that provide the bulk of protection against deleterious reactions involving active oxygen in bacteria: SODs (encoded by sodA and sodB), catalases (katE and katG), glutathione synthetase (gshAB), and glutathione reductase (gor). Although some bacteria have NADH-dependent peroxidases specific for \( H_2O_2 \), \( E. coli \) and \( S. typhimurium \) do not; nor do they have glutathione peroxidase activities.

The reaction catalyzed by SOD is thought to occur in a two-step reaction as follows:

\[
\text{Enz}_{\text{oxidized}} + O_2^- \rightarrow \text{Enz}_{\text{reduced}} + O_2 \\
\text{Enz}_{\text{reduced}} + O_2^- + 2H^+ \rightarrow \text{Enz}_{\text{oxidized}} + H_2O_2
\]

There are three types of SOD based on the metal ligand(s) bound, CuZnSOD, FeSOD, and MnSOD. Each of the metals in the SOD isozymes is a transition metal that facilitates electron transfer. FeSOD is found primarily in prokaryotes. MnSOD is found in both prokaryotes and eukaryotes. CuZnSOD is generally not found in bacteria. One exception is the marine bacterium *Photobacter leiognathi* (210). The second-order rate constants are quite similar, at about \( 6 \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \). The steady-state concentration of SOD in \( E. coli \) is approximately \( 10^{-5} \text{ M} \) (77). The reaction between SODs and \( O_2^- \) is first order with respect to \( O_2^- \). The steady-state concentration of \( O_2^- \) in a wild-type aerobically growing \( E. coli \) cell is about \( 10^{-9} \) to \( 10^{-10} \text{ M} \). In sodA sodB mutant cells lacking SOD activity, the calculated steady-state concentration of \( O_2^- \) is about \( 5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ M} \) (116). Thus the presence of SOD in the cell reduces the steady-state concentration of \( O_2^- \) by up to three orders of magnitude.

One of the products of \( O_2^- \) dismutation is \( H_2O_2 \), which is itself a reactive species. The function of SOD would not appear, therefore, to benefit the cell, unless (i) \( O_2^- \) is more toxic than \( H_2O_2 \), or (ii) \( H_2O_2 \) is disproportionated very rapidly, or (iii) SOD directs \( O_2^- \) to \( H_2O_2 \) versus other potentially toxic routes of clearance such as through the glutathione radical (GS'). Although it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the relative toxicities of \( H_2O_2 \) and \( O_2^- \) in vivo, it is certainly true that cellular catalases destroy \( H_2O_2 \) with remarkable rapidity. The turnover number for typical catalase is about \( 10^7 \text{ molecules of } H_2O_2 \) disproportionated per active site per second (at 1 M \( H_2O_2 \)) (236). The electron source is from \( H_2O_2 \) itself, and so the reaction is a disproportionation and does not require an exogenous reducing source. Likewise, the reaction is exothermic and does not require ATP. Catalases therefore provide protection against \( H_2O_2 \) even in an energy-depleted cell. The two catalases in \( E. coli \) are found in different cellular locations. HPI and HP II are found in the periplasm and cytoplasm, respectively (110).
This differential localization suggests that sources of H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} may vary during starvation-dependent and starvation-independent oxidative stress.

Peroxidases are also capable of destroying H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}. Peroxidases, unlike catalase, require NADH or NADPH as an electron source. Under conditions where reducing power is limited, the protective role of peroxidase is likely to be small.

Glutathione (GSH) is an important antioxidant and is synthesized by glutathione synthetase. The high steady-state levels of glutathione in E. coli (and presumably in S. typhimurium) maintain a strong reducing environment in the cell (150). GSH will react with H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}, O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{−}, or HOO\textsuperscript{−} to form a stable glutathione radical (GS'). These radicals will then dimerize. Finally, glutathione reductase will transfer an electron from NADPH to the oxidized glutathione (GSSG), to re-form the reduced GSH (165, 205). The overall reaction is shown below.

\[
\text{GSH} + \text{HOO'} \rightarrow \text{GS'} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \\
\text{GS'} + \text{GS'} \rightarrow \text{GSSG} \\
\text{GSSG} + 2\text{NADPH} \rightarrow 2\text{GSH} + 2\text{NADP}^+ 
\]

One of the most important functions of GSH is to reduce disulfide bonds caused by oxidative stress in proteins. Although formation of disulfide bonds is easily reversible, their presence can drastically alter protein function. \(V_{\text{max}}\) and \(K_m\) are modified in many proteins as a function of the thiol/disulfide status (94, 144). Intracellular proteins exist primarily in the thiol state and have a low cysteine content (approximately 2%). Surprisingly, GSH is not essential for maintaining a relatively reduced state of most intracellular proteins, and mutants unable to synthesize GSH (gshA) show no increased sensitivity to H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} and only slight sensitivity to redox active compounds (55a, 89). Other low-molecular-weight thiols including thioredoxin and glutaredoxin may compensate for the lack of GSH (discussed below).

Another enzyme that may play an important protective function is Ahp. This enzyme will reduce many organic hydroperoxides in vitro, including cumene hydroperoxide and \(t\)-butyl hydroperoxide (124). Mutants lacking Ahp activity are sensitive to killing by these agents (212), and therefore these compounds may be substrates for this enzyme in vivo as well. In addition, a mutant overproducing ahp was found to suppress the H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} sensitivity of E. coli \(\Delta\text{oxyR}\) cells (90), suggesting that Ahp may act on H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} directly.

These are the main enzymatic defenses against active oxygen species. It is important to note that peroxidases and the GSH system require a source of reducing power in order to function. In addition, at least in E. coli, the most important catalase, KatG, is inducible, as is MnSOD. As we shall see in a later section, reducing power and the ability to synthesize new gene products are limited under conditions of severe oxidative stress. The threshold level of oxidative toxicity may be at the concentration of active oxygen at which the cell can no longer induce or maintain an effective enzymatic defense.

In addition to the enzymatic defenses against active oxygen, most cells employ a wide variety of nonenzymatic organic antioxidants. The main nonenzymatic antioxidants in E. coli are GSH and thioredoxin (encoded by \textit{trxA}) (155, 165). Ubiquinone and menaquinone may also serve as membrane-associated antioxidants.

**Oxidative Damage and Repair**

Oxygen radicals cause a great deal of damage to macromolecules in vitro and in vivo. The oxidative damage that leads to cell death, however, is not always clear. Treatment of cells with redox-active drugs causes both DNA and membrane damage, either of which can be lethal. Oxygen radicals also damage RNA and proteins in vivo. Although damage to RNA and proteins is not likely to be the cause of oxygen radical-induced death, such damage must, at the very least, waste cell energy and resources since the damaged molecule must be either repaired or degraded and replaced. In this section, we will present the major types of damage caused by active oxygen species in vivo. We will also discuss the repair mechanisms that ameliorate that damage.

**DNA damage.** Cell exposure to H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}, O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{−}-generating compounds, ionizing radiation, organic hydroperoxides, singlet oxygen, and ozone results in numerous types of DNA lesions. Both the base and the sugar moieties of DNA are attacked by active oxygen species. Attack on the base produces 8-hydroxyguanine, hydroxymethyl urea, urea, thymine glycol, thymine, and adenine ring-opened and ring-saturated products (for reviews, see references 7, 119, 147, and 197).

Hydroxyl radical attacks on the sugar moiety of DNA lead to sugar fragmentation and production of strand breaks with 3'-phosphate or 3'-phosphoglycolate termini (231). Thymine residues in DNA can be hydroxylated to produce 5-hydroxymethyluracil or oxidatively degraded to produce thymine glycol or a urea residue (31, 60, 133). Guanosine can also be oxidatively degraded in a photooxidative process (215). Addition reactions of OH\textsuperscript{•} with guanosine residues form 8-hydroxydeoxyguanosine.

In addition to the DNA damage caused directly by oxygen radicals, intermediate organic radicals that are formed during the propagation step of lipid peroxidation can react with DNA. For example, in the presence of autoxidizing methyl linoleate, either the oxidizing fatty acid transfers free radicals to purines (abstracts an \(H^+\)), resulting in decomposition of the purines, or the fatty acid radical adds to the purine to form a bulky adduct (200, 227). Incubation of DNA with linoleic acid hydroperoxide also causes site-specific cleavage of double-stranded DNA adjacent to guanidylate residues (200, 227).

Lipid peroxides formed during the initiation and propagation steps decompose into a number of nonradical, stable end products containing a wide range of functional oxygen groups. These include an array of aldehyde, epoxide, hydroxy, carboxy, and peroxy groups, as well as alkanes and alkenes (for reviews, see references 16 and 129). Many stable termination products, such as 4-hydroxyalkenals, epoxides, and other aldehydes have been shown to be directly reactive with DNA, either by alkylating bases (203) or by forming intrastrand and interstrand cross-links (214).

To what extent do these specific reactions occur, and what is their relative significance in vivo? Biochemical analyses of damaged DNA derived from treated cells, coupled with genetic experiments with known DNA repair-deficient mutants (Table 2), allow for an approximate answer to these questions.

Strand breaks and other lesions that block replication are likely to contribute more toward lethality than does base damage that does not hinder replication, although the latter may contribute significantly to mutagenesis. Thymine glycols and 8-hydroxydeoxyguanosine residues are two of the
most important predominant stable products of oxygen radical attack on DNA (60, 64). Thymine glycol has been shown to block replication in vitro (115). It will also spontaneously decompose to form formylpyruvylurea, urea, and N-substituted urea residues (31). Thymine glycol and its decomposition products are readily removed by an N-glycosylase activity associated with endonuclease III (Endo III) (49, 235). Mutants lacking Endo III activity have no detectable decomposition products are readily removed by an N-glycosylase activity associated with endonuclease III (Endo III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Map position (min)</th>
<th>Regulon</th>
<th>Gene product or activity</th>
<th>Sensitivity to $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ahpCF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>OxyR</td>
<td>Ahp</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>? 90, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>KatF</td>
<td>DNA adenine methylase</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>138, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arcA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Resistance to methylene blue</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dam</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Heat shock protein</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132a, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dnaK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Heat shock proteins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gor</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>OxyR</td>
<td>Glutathione reductase</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groELS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Glutathione synthetase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88a, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gtx</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glutaredoxin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gshA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glutathione synthetase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88a, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyrB</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>DNA gyrase β subunit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>233a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>KatF</td>
<td>Catalase HPII</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>151, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katF</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endo III</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>55a, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katG</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>OxyR</td>
<td>Catalase HPI</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16S rRNA methylase</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>126b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>micF</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Inhibitor of OmpF transla</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>55a, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutM (fpg)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Formamidopyrimidine DNA glycosylase</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>23, 24, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mvrA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>gpr</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndh</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Respiratory NADH dehydrogenase</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>118, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nfo</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Endo IV</td>
<td>-b</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nrdB</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Ribonucleoside diphosphate reductase</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>66a, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nth</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Endo III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ompF</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Porin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>55a, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxyR</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>OxyR regulon activator</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>44, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxyS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>General antioxidant/regulator</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polA</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>DNA polymerase I</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>DNA polymerase III</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Recombination/SOS regulator</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>39, 71, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recBC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exonuclease V</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rimK</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>S6 glutamic acid transferase</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>92, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rpoH</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>$\sigma^{2}$ protein</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>132a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>MnSOD</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodB</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>FeSOD</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soi-1719</td>
<td>45-61</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soi-28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soxRS</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Regulon activators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92, 226, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>DNA topoisomerase I</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trxA</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thioredoxin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trxB</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thioredoxin reductase</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uvrA</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Excinuclease</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50, 146, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uvrB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Excinuclease subunit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50, 146, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uvrC</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Excinuclease subunit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50, 146, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xthA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>KatF</td>
<td>Exo III</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>58, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwf</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>SoxRS</td>
<td>Glucose-6-P dehydrogenase</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>91, 192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Symbols: +, a mutation in the gene renders cells sensitive; -, not sensitive; ?, not known.

$^b$ Generally not sensitive, but sensitive to tert-butyl hydroperoxide and bleomycin.

Deletion mutants were found to be A · T → G · C transitions (211). A · T base pairs have been shown to be very sensitive to transitions by many chemical oxidants (143). H$_2$O$_2$ causes strand breaks in vivo in the presence of Fe$^{3+}$ (117). Strand breaks also accumulate in H$_2$O$_2$-treated cells (6, 71, 100). Single-strand breaks induce the SOS response (148, 233), whereas thymine glycol apparently do not, since nth mutants, which lack thymine glycol glycosylase activity, do not show enhanced induction of the SOS response by H$_2$O$_2$ (84). In E. coli, killing by H$_2$O$_2$ is bimodal. The first mode (mode I) is maximal at 1 to 2 mM H$_2$O$_2$, is approximately zero order with respect to H$_2$O$_2$ concentration, and requires active metabolism. The second mode (mode II) appears to be first order with respect to H$_2$O$_2$ between 10 and 100 mM and does not require active metabolism (117). The SOS response is induced by H$_2$O$_2$ in proportion to the degree of killing at mode I concentrations (118). Further-
more, recA mutants are very sensitive to killing by \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) (39), and it is the RecA protein itself that is important in cell survival upon exposure to \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) (118). This suggests that it is the role of RecA in the recombinational repair pathway that is crucial for cell survival against peroxide stress. This conclusion is supported by the observation that recB mutants are hypersensitive to \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \), and sbcB mutations which activate the RecF pathway of recombination suppress the hypersensitivity of recBC mutants to \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) (117).

The results cited above strongly suggest that the genotoxic damage induced by \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) is single-strand breaks. That xthA (Exo III) mutants are also hypersensitive to killing by \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) suggests that sugar fragments (blocking groups) must occur with high frequency at the 3' end of the strand breaks. This has been confirmed in experiments showing that \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \)-nicked DNA cannot serve as primers for in vitro DNA synthesis unless incubated in the presence of Exo III (58, 59, 119).

Endo IV, the nfo gene product, like Exo III, also removes 3'-blocking groups (48, 59), and overexpression of Endo IV alleviates some of the \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) sensitivity in an xthA mutant (188a). There are differences between Exo III and Endo IV that are discussed below.

Excinuclease (A)BC (encoded by uvrA, uvrB, and uvrC), which plays a crucial role in repair of UV-damaged DNA, was considered to play only a minor role in repair of oxidative DNA damage, because uvrA, uvrB, and uvrC mutants are not sensitive to ionizing radiation (121) or \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) (118). Saporito et al. (196) reported that a uvrA nfo xthA triple mutant cannot be constructed, although mutants with any combination of two mutations are viable. Similar results were reported by Goerlich et al. (84). These results suggest a functional redundancy of excinuclease (A)BC, Endo IV, and Exo III. In support of this suggestion, it has been demonstrated that excinuclease (A)BC is capable of removing thymine glycols and AP sites from oxidatively damaged DNA (146). Therefore, it is likely that excinuclease (A)BC also participates in repair of oxidatively damaged DNA. However, the results do not necessarily indicate overlapping specificities of the enzymes. An alternative explanation has been proposed by Foster (76a), who showed that relieving the burden of AP sites by using an ung mutation allows construction of a uvrA nfo xthA triple mutant.

The involvement of excinuclease (A)BC in the repair of oxidative damage is further demonstrated by more recent experiments, which also indicate the participation of the Fpg protein, a DNA glycosylase which has the ability to excise the imidazole ring-opened form of purines. The photosensitizer methylene blue plus visible light generates singlet oxygen as the ultimate reactive species (68) and produces the damaged base 8-hydroxyguanine (202). It has been shown that pBR322 DNA treated with methylene blue plus light transforms uvrA Fpg double mutants at a significantly lower frequency than it transforms the wild type, whereas the uvrA or fpg single mutation does not affect the transformation frequency (50). Fpg mutants are defective in the formamidopyrimidine-DNA glycosylase activity (Fpg protein) (23, 24). The results indicate that both excinuclease (A)BC and Fpg protein are capable of excising damaged bases (perhaps 8-hydroxyguanine and other modified bases) and that these excision activities are a functional duplication for the damage repair.

Finally, \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) has been shown to stimulate ATP- and Mg\(^{2+}\)-independent DNA repair synthesis in vitro (100). As shown with recA and xthA mutants, polA mutants have also been found to be hypersensitive to killing by \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) (6). Taken together, these findings show that DNA repair synthesis after \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) damage requires DNA polymerase I activity. Furthermore, polC(Ts) mutations encoding thermolabile DNA polymerase III sensitize cells to \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) at 43°C and polC(Ts) mutants fail to repair single-strand breaks caused by \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) when incubated at the high temperature (99). Therefore, DNA polymerase III is also required for repair of DNA damage by \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \). It has been proposed that at least two pathways are involved for repair of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \)-induced DNA damage: one requires Exo III and DNA polymerases I and III, whereas the other utilizes DNA polymerase I (101).

**Mutagenicity.** Since oxygen radicals cause DNA damage in vitro and in vivo, and since DNA repair-deficient mutants are hypersensitive to oxidative stress, it is not surprising that oxidative stress leads to mutagenesis. It has been known since the mid-1950s that hyperbaric oxygen is mutagenic in *E. coli* (73). Even concentrations of oxygen physiological to humans have been reported to be mutagenic in *S. typhimurium* (35), although not so in *E. coli* (70).

The mutagenic potential and pathway for \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) has been fairly well established (38, 118). As with killing, \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) mutagenicity is biphasic. At low (mode I) concentrations, mutagenicity is strongly correlated with SOS induction as measured by induction of a lambda lysogen (118). At high (mode II) concentrations, the correlation is weaker. The SOS-dependent mutagenesis observed after UV irradiation depends largely upon expression of the umuDC operon (13, 15). Surprisingly, \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) mutagenesis was reported to be UmuDC independent in *E. coli* (118). And yet, lexA(Ind-) mutants are even more sensitive to killing by \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) than are recA mutants, suggesting that other SOS functions are important for cell survival (118). Furthermore, as mentioned above, \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) induces cell filamentation in an sfaA -independent manner (118). The role of the SOS response in \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) killing and mutagenicity is therefore somewhat unusual.

Another approach to understanding the mutagenic potential and specificity of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) was taken by Storz et al. (211), who used oxyRA mutants in an *S. typhimurium* His\(^{-}\)→ His\(^{+}\) reversion assay. When oxyRA mutants are grown under normal oxygen tension, they show a His\(^{-}\)→ His\(^{+}\) reversion frequency of 11-fold higher than do isogenic wild-type cells. Interestingly, the mutagenesis in an oxyRA strain carrying *mucA* and *mucB* + on a plasmid (pKM101) is 50-fold higher than in the wild-type with the same plasmid. These results suggest that the products of *mucA* and *mucB* + enhance mutagenesis by converting premutagenic lesions to mutagenic lesions. Since *mucA* and *mucB* are plasmid-encoded analogs of the *E. coli* umuDC genes, this finding indicates either that the paths of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) mutagenicity differ in *S. typhimurium* and *E. coli* or that there is an unresolved discrepancy in the results. The difference in results may simply reflect a difference in mutagenicity markers. The oxyR and pKM101 mutational analysis involved a His reversion assay (211), whereas Inman and Lim (117, 118) used forward mutation markers.

As noted above, the most frequent type of mutation in the oxyRΔ strain is A → G · C · transversions, as might be expected if oxidative damage to thymine residues is prevalent. Similar results were obtained with *E. coli* or *S. typhimurium* cells lacking catalase activity or Ahp activity (211). The nature and pathway of \( \text{O}_2^- \) mutagenicity are less clear. Since \( \text{O}_2^- \) is not very reactive toward many biological substrates in vitro (18–20), there remains the important question of how dangerous an increase in the flux of \( \text{O}_2^- \) is in vivo and whether endogenously produced \( \text{O}_2^- \) poses a threat to genetic integrity. Some redox-active compounds
have been shown to be slightly mutagenic (43, 71, 170). Given the pleiotropic effect of many redox compounds, however, the results did not exclude the possibility of O$_2^-$-independent mutagenicity of these compounds. In fact, O$_2^-$ that is generated by the hypoxanthine-xanthine oxidase system has been shown to cause a significant increase in mutations only in a particular strain (TA104) of S. typhimurium which carries a uvrB mutation (54). The possible involvement of excinuclease (A)BC in oxidative DNA damage repair has been discussed above.

By using a different approach, both the mutation frequency and rate in SOD$^-$ cells (i.e., sodA sodB double mutants) have been determined in the absence of reductively-active compounds (70), when the steady-state concentration of O$_2^-$ is ca. 10$^3$ times higher than in wild-type cells (116). The mutation rate was determined by a fluctuation test measuring the rate of rifampin-sensitive to rifampin-resistant mutagenesis during aerobic growth of SOD$^-$ cells. The target of the antibiotic rifampin is the β subunit of RNA polymerase, and resistant mutants possess an altered subunit as a result of mutations in the rpoB gene. Such mutations must be mostly, if not exclusively, base substitutions (83). The mutation rate toward rifampin resistance is thus a sensitive assay for this class of mutational events. The sodA sodB double mutant shows a 40-fold increase in the rate of aerobic spontaneous mutations toward rifampin resistance, and the sodA single mutant shows a 9-fold increase compared with the wild type; the sodB single mutant do not show an increase in the mutation rate (70, 223).

The increased mutagenesis observed in SOD-less cells is oxygen dependent. In anaerobic cultures, the frequency of Thy$^+$→Thy$^-$ mutations is essentially identical for the sodA sodB double mutant and the wild-type strain. When SOD-less cells are subjected to bubbling of pure oxygen through the culture or are exposed to plumbagin, they display a very high mutation frequency. These results indicate that the increase in spontaneous mutagenesis in cells lacking SOD activity depends on the presence of oxygen and that exposure to increased levels of O$_2^-$ greatly enhances mutagenesis.

In keeping with the finding that O$_2^-$-generating agents do not induce the SOS response (71), the presence of a recA(Def) mutation does not alter the oxygen-dependent mutagenesis in sodA sodB mutants (70). Furthermore, by using dinD::lacZ and sfa::lacZ fusions (dinD and sfa genes are repressed by LexA), it has been shown that SOD-less cells do not display induction of the SOS response. Thus, unlike H$_2$O$_2$, mutagenesis, O$_2^-$ mutagenesis appears to be completely independent of the SOS response.

Exo III, encoded by the xthA gene, has several catalytic activities that are involved in the repair of certain types of DNA damage. The enzyme possesses 3' exonuclease and phosphatase activities, RNase H, and apurinic endonucleolytic activities, as well as an endonucleolytic activity that recognizes bases containing urea residues (133, 168, 238). xthA mutants lack 90% of the normal Exo III activities (238). When mutation frequencies in wild-type, sodA sodB, and sodA sodB xthA strains were measured, it was found that the enhanced mutation frequency observed in the sodA sodB culture is largely dependent on the presence of a functional xthA gene (70, 113). The observation suggests that cells lacking SOD suffer from increased levels of premutagenic DNA damage and that the action of Exo III on these DNA lesions greatly enhances their mutagenicity.

Little is known about the mutagenic specificity of O$_2^-$-inflicted DNA damage. Evidence shows that it cannot be identical to that induced by H$_2$O$_2$. First, it is SOS independent. Second, whereas SOD-less cells show higher plating efficiency of O$_2^-$-damaged λ damage than wild-type cells do, they show no difference in plating efficiency of H$_2$O$_2$-damaged phage (71a). Finally, O$_2^-$ induces synthesis of Endo IV, whereas H$_2$O$_2$ does not. It is probable that Endo IV and Exo III do not have identical substrate specificities since overproduction of Endo IV in an xthA mutant does not complement the H$_2$O$_2$ sensitivity defect of the mutant (48). Also, nfo mutants are sensitive to bleomycin and cumene hydroperoxide, whereas xthA mutants are not sensitive to bleomycin (48).

A · T base pairs are the major targets for substitutions in E. coli mutants lacking SOD activity (131a). Furthermore, both Endo III and MutY adenine glycosylase (specific for A·G mismatches) may be (Fe-S)$_4$-containing proteins (167). Several (Fe-S)$_4$-containing proteins have been shown to be remarkably sensitive to inactivation by O$_2^-$ (80). It is therefore possible that the elevated mutagenesis in SOD-less cells comes from inactivation of one or both of these repair enzymes. mutY mutants show a high frequency of transversions (9), whereas H$_2$O$_2$ mutagenesis largely generates transitions. If determination of the mutagenic specificity in SOD-less cells turns up an elevated frequency of transversions, this might suggest a role of MutY in O$_2^-$-dependent mutagenesis.

Since elevated concentrations of oxygen are mutagenic in E. coli, it was of interest to determine the role, if any, of the SOS response in that mutagenesis. The SOS response includes error-prone repair functions that create mutations at the site of DNA lesions (targeted mutagenesis), as well as functions that mutate undamaged DNA ("untargeted" mutagenesis) (239). It is possible, however, that all DNA contains cryptic lesions, revealed only when fixed as mutations in an SOS-induced cell. Active oxygen species are a potential source of such lesions. To determine whether untreated SOS mutagenesis is oxygen dependent, the frequency of His$^+$→His$^-$ reversions in a recA44(Tif) strain was compared when cells were grown aerobically or anaerobically. The recA44(Tif) mutation allows activation of RecA protein at 42°C without DNA damage, leading to an increase in the spontaneous mutation rate. The results revealed no reduction in Tif-mediated untreated mutagenesis in the absence of oxygen. It was concluded that untreated SOS mutagenesis is not responding to oxygen-dependent lesions (70).

Although ozone and singlet oxygen have both been shown to cause DNA damage in vivo and in vitro, their roles in oxidative mutagenesis remain controversial (51, 63, 68, 145, 199, 230).

**DNA damage and transcription.** As discussed above, thymine glycol and possibly other damaged bases, as well as AP sites, block replication by DNA polymerase. It has recently been shown that thymine glycols also interfere with transcription by causing RNA polymerase to pause or stop completely at or near the lesion (35a). Although other forms of oxidative DNA damage may be even more lethal, it is probable that single-strand breaks, AP sites, 8-hydroxydeoxyguanosine, and many other forms of oxidatively damaged DNA either block RNA polymerase or cause misreading. Both of these effects would result in production of truncated or abnormal proteins, a result that, if severe enough, would itself induce the heat shock response (85). The chaperone proteins, DnaK and GroEL, show increased synthesis after oxidative stress, suggesting the possibility that they serve to handle the increased level of misfolded proteins (discussed
in detail below). Toxicity induced by severe oxidative DNA damage may result directly from disruption of transcription as well as from mutagenesis.

**Membrane damage.** Oxidative damage to membranes can arise through either lipid or membrane protein damage. Oxidative stress has been shown to cause peroxidation of lipids both in vitro and in vivo. Of the active oxygen species formed during oxidative stress, HOO·, OH·, singlet oxygen, ozone, and perferryl radicals can all initiate lipid peroxidation in vitro and in vivo. Lipid peroxidation entails three steps: initiation, propagation, and termination. It is likely that a lipid peroxidation chain reaction begins after hydrogen abstraction from an unsaturated fatty acid to form a lipid radical. The lipid radical (L·) thus formed reacts with molecular oxygen to form a lipid peroxy radical (ROO·). The reaction is perpetuated when the lipid peroxy radical attacks another unsaturated fatty acid and abstracts a hydrogen atom to form a fatty acid hydroperoxide (ROOH) and perpetuate the initial reaction. The hydroperoxides thus formed will break down thermally or in the presence of O2− or reduced transition metals to form lipid peroxy radicals (LOO·) or lipid alkoxy radicals (LO·), both of which can initiate new rounds of peroxidation. It is also possible that NADH will donate an electron to the hydroperoxide to generate another lipid radical and water (129).

Lipid alkoxy radicals can undergo cleavage of C−C bonds to form unsaturated fatty acid aldehydes and alkyl radicals. The peroxidation of lipids thus generates products which are shorter than the initial fatty acid. In addition to producing fatty acyl chains that are shorter than the parent chain, the end products of lipid peroxidization include alkanes, ketones, epoxides, and aldehydes (16, 129, 163). When fatty acid chains become shortened or gain charges, their ability to rotate within the membrane is altered and the membrane becomes more fluid (162, 163). An increase in membrane fluidity results directly in a loss of structural integrity. Structural integrity is required for transport of most nutrients, F1/F0 ATPase activity, motility, and prevention of osmotic imbalance (62, 130, 140). Because membrane permeabilization will destroy the proton gradient across the cell membrane, the internal pH will drop, causing the O2− → HO2− equilibrium to shift to the right, which in turn is likely to result in further oxidative damage (72).

A second hazard posed by lipid peroxidation is that peroxidation intermediates and end products are mutagenic. As stated above, lipid peroxidation products include an array of aldehyde, epoxide, hydroxy, carboxy, and peroxide groups, as well as alkanes and alkenes. Many stable termination products, such as 4-hydroxyalkenals, epoxides, and other aldehydes have been shown to be directly reactive with DNA, either by alkylating bases (203) or by forming intrastrand and interstrand cross-links as discussed above (214). Lipid oxidation products listed above also react with and inactivate proteins (42).

*E. coli* and *S. typhimurium* are defended against lipid peroxidation in both simple and complex ways. The rate of fatty acid peroxidation is directly proportional to the number of unsaturated C−C bonds (129), and bacteria have generally saturated or monounsaturated fatty acids in their membranes. It has been shown that *E. coli* fatty acid auxotrophs grown on oleic acid (monounsaturated fatty acid) were more sensitive to killing by oxidative stress than were those grown on saturated fatty acids (106); therefore, that there is a cost associated with maintaining even monounsaturated fatty acids in the membrane. Additionally, certain stress conditions such as exposure to ethanol have been shown to cause an increase in the level of unsaturated fatty acids into the membranes (17). Taken together, these data suggest that bacteria are not altogether immune to oxidative lipid damage.

In *E. coli*, there may be an inducible membrane repair response. It has been shown that H2O2 disrupts membrane functions at nonlethal doses and that cells which are pre-treated with a low concentration of H2O2 acquire the ability to rapidly recover from the loss of membrane functions (72). The peroxide stress response is required for this inducible recovery of membrane function. Furthermore, katG (under control of oxyR) plays a necessary, although not sufficient, role in this response (72). It is possible that the OxyR-regulated Ahp (ahpC ahpF) plays an important role in inducible membrane repair by reducing fatty acid hydroperoxides. In these experiments, membrane functions were monitored by measuring ΔpH-dependent and ΔpH-independent transport. The concentrations of H2O2 sufficient to induce rapid recovery of transport inhibition has no effect upon transport activities. This would imply that the signal to induce transport recovery does not initiate with damage to the membrane itself.

Other evidence for the existence of an inducible membrane response comes from experiments showing that ionizing radiation induces a membrane repair response as measured by sensitivity of naive and preexposed cells to hypotonic medium (244). Cells treated with chloramphenicol prior to the inducing treatment failed to develop resistance to osmotic stress, suggesting that novel gene products are required for induced resistance.

**Protein damage.** Interactions between oxygen radicals and proteins leads to conversion of proline and arginine residues into carbonyl derivatives. Oxidative attack of histidinyl and prolyl residues converts them into asperginyl and glutamyl derivatives, respectively (208). Methionine and cysteinyl residues are oxidized to form methionine sulfoxide derivatives and disulfide derivatives, respectively. These alterations generally inactivate enzymes and can lead to their targeted degradation. Several *E. coli* enzymes have been shown to be quite sensitive to oxidative damage, including dihydroxy acid dehydratase, glutamine synthetase, ribosomal protein L12, quinolate synthetase, aconitase, and 6-phosphogluconate dehydratase (32, 80, 155). Dihy­droxy acid dehydratase, quinolate synthetase, aconitase, and 6-phosphogluconate dehydratase have (Fe-S)4 clusters, and it is likely that these are the sites of O2− attack (80). It would appear to be generally true that metal-binding sites in proteins are especially sensitive to attack by active oxygen species. It will be of value to determine whether Endo III and MutY are inactivated by O2− since they may contain (Fe-S)4 clusters.

Repair of protein damage appears to be limited to reduction of disulfides and methionine sulfoxides. Reduction of both of these is facilitated by thioredoxin and thioredoxin reductase in an NADPH-dependent pathway (86, 155). Little is known about the regulation of inducibility of protein repair enzymes.

In *E. coli*, there appear to be specific proteinases that selectively degrade oxidized proteins (52). This degradation pathway is ATP independent and is distinct from the Lon protease associated with the heat shock response (53). A protease has been purified from *E. coli* that selectively degrades oxidized glutamine synthetase (191). Whether this specific degradation serves simply to expedite recycling of amino acids, or whether it has some other physiological function (for example, to prevent accumulation of damaged
proteins that can cause induction of the heat shock response or accumulation of glutamate owing to inactivation of a high proportion of the total glutamine synthetase) is not currently known. Regulation of these proteases is also poorly understood, although OxyR(Con) mutants show a two-fold increase in protease activity, suggesting a possible role for OxyR in their induction (53).

**Role of the Peroxide Stress Response**

We know the biochemical functions of only a minority of OxyR- and non-OxyR-regulated genes that are induced in the peroxide stress response. The OxyR-regulated genes whose functions are known are katG (HPI catalase), gor (glutathione reductase) and ahpC-ahpF (alkylhydroperoxide reductase). The role of HPI catalase is to reduce the concentration of H$_2$O$_2$. The reduction of GSSG by glutathione reductase would be useful for maintaining the reducing environment of the cell and for directly reacting with and destroying H$_2$O$_2$. Surprisingly, however, mutant cells completely devoid of GSH (gshAB mutants) show no increased sensitivity to H$_2$O$_2$ (89), raising the question of the role of glutathione reductase during exposure to peroxide stress.

Ahp activity is likely to play two important roles during exposure to peroxides. By reducing the level of the offending peroxide, it diminishes the threat of damage. Also, by reducing the level of peroxidized cellular components, it repairs the damage that is not prevented from occurring in the first place.

Another activity that may be at least partially regulated by OxyR is that of ribonucleoside diphosphate reductase (66a), which converts all ribonucleoside diphosphates to 2'-deoxyribonucleoside diphosphates, precursors for DNA synthesis. Ribonucleoside diphosphate reductase can use either glutaredoxin or thioredoxin as a hydrogen source. GSH is required for synthesis of glutaredoxin. As discussed above, one of the OxyR-regulated genes, gor, encodes glutathione reductase. One possible role of enhanced levels of glutathione reductase may be to maintain sufficient levels of GSH so that glutaredoxin levels do not fall dramatically during oxidative stress. H$_2$O$_2$ has been shown to inhibit incorporation of radiolabeled thymine into the DNA, and pretreated cells show a more rapid recovery from inhibition of incorporation after a challenge dose than naive cells do (56). Since H$_2$O$_2$ treatment also disrupts uptake of thymine (72), it is not clear whether H$_2$O$_2$ also directly inhibits DNA synthesis. If it does, however, and recovery of DNA synthesis after H$_2$O$_2$ treatment requires OxyR functions, the candidate functions would be ribonucleoside diphosphate reductase and glutathione reductase.

The heat shock proteins DnaK and GroEL are inducible with H$_2$O$_2$ (171). GroEL is induced by O$_2^-$ (234). DnaK makes up approximately 1% of the total cellular protein at 37°C and approximately 4% after a temperature shift (182). It possesses several activities in vitro: (i) it is essential for in vitro replication of λ phage, (ii) it has a 5' nucleotidase activity that is inhibited by AppppA, and (iii) it autophosphorylates (247) in a temperature-dependent manner (159b). dnak mutants also do not phosphorylate glutaminyl- and threonyl-tRNA synthetases (232). Finally, DnaK plays an important role as a chaperone protein (see references 96 and references therein). Since DnaK is induced by H$_2$O$_2$, the presumption is that it must play a role during peroxide stress. Which, if any, of the above functions is important in the response of the cell to peroxide stress is not known. It is interesting that AppppA is strongly induced by H$_2$O$_2$, starvation, and heat shock conditions that all induce DnaK.

AppppA has recently been shown to bind to DnaK and increase the level of DnaK autophosphorylation in vitro (126a).

**Role of the Peroxide Stress Response**

As discussed above, the SoxRS-regulated genes that encode known functions are sodA (SOD), nfo (Endo IV), micF (antisense regulator of ompF), zwf (glucose-6-P dehydrogenase), and rimK (an enzyme that adds noncoded glutamic acid residues to the carboxy terminus of the ribosomal protein S6) (92, 127). A SoxRS-regulated function whose gene has not been characterized is an NADH diaphorase (70c).

The role of SOD is to reduce the level of O$_2^-$. Endo IV repairs oxidatively damaged DNA by removing 3'-blocking groups such as phosphoglycolates. As discussed above, there must be some substrate specificities not shared by Endo IV and Exo III. The function of the micF antisense RNA in down-regulating ompF has been discussed above. SoxR(Con) mutants show increased resistance to several antibiotics whose uptake may be OmpF dependent, and it has been hypothesized that the natural function of OmpF down-regulation by SoxR is to exclude naturally occurring antibiotics (92). Another possible function of OmpF down-regulation might be to limit the uptake of naturally occurring redox-active compounds that promote O$_2^-$ production. However, ompF mutants are not more resistant to menadione than is the wild type (55a).

The role of glucose-6-P dehydrogenase is to produce NADPH. NADPH production would be useful under conditions of oxidative stress since it is required as the electron source for both thioredoxin reductase and glutathione reductase. Also, protein repair catalyzed by methionine sulfoxide reductase requires NADPH. Furthermore, NADPH does not reduce Fe$^{3+}$, whereas NADH does (146a). Thus NADPH production would provide the cell with reducing
equivalents without facilitating OH\textsuperscript{-} production via the Fenton reaction.

The role(s) for the NADH-dependent diaphorase activity induced by O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-} stress is likely to be the same as that of the H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}-induced diaphorase, namely, to reduce the level of NADH, to decrease the rate of respiration, or to detoxify re redoxygen-active quinones to the hydroquinone state by a two-electron reduction. In E. coli, one of the NADH dehydrogenases is the product of the ndh gene (185). It is not known whether either of the oxidative stress-inducible diaphorases is the product of the ndh gene, although upstream sequence homology between the ndh gene and several SoxRS-regulated genes suggests that this gene may be regulated, at least in part, by SoxRS (82a). The functions of soi-17/19 and soi-28 are not yet known, although these genes must play an important role since they sensitize cells to O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-} stress (132). The function of mvr\textsubscript{A} is presently unknown.

Possible Role of the Stringent Response

Another response that may play a role in oxidative stress is the stringent response. When uncharged tRNAs enter the A site of a ribosome, during translation, if the A site stalls and a ribosomal protein, the RelA protein, produces a stringent factor, 3',5'-tetraphosphoguanosine (ppGpp). The ppGpp then binds to RNA polymerase and alters the transcription from rrr operons (149). The net effect is that during amino acid starvation, the cell decreases or suspends production of RNA and ribosomal protein. This suspension serves at least one apparent purpose: it saves the cell the costly expenditure of precursors and energy required to synthesize ribosomes when those ribosomes would end up being unemployed owing to the lack of amino acids.

Interestingly, ppGp is also produced during heat shock and during exposure to H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} and paraquat (33, 228). Certain quinones and quinonelike drugs that are capable of redox cycling have been shown to inhibit leucyl-tRNA synthetases in vitro, suggesting that in vivo, leucyl-tRNA\textsubscript{S} would be unloaded in the presence of these compounds, triggering the stringent response (181). In addition, increased levels of ppGpp have been detected in E. coli after exposure to hyperbaric oxygen, and it has been proposed that this accounts for the inhibition of protein synthesis observed in these cells (204). In E. coli, an enzyme required for branched-chain amino acid biosynthesis (dihydroxy-acid dehydratase) is highly sensitive to inactivation by O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-} (80), and SOD-less mutants are auxotrophs for these amino acids (37). It is therefore likely that O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-}-mediated stress causes induction of the stringent response by inactivating dihydroxy-acid dehydratase. All of the above inducing stresses are likely to disrupt normal translation (229). Some oxidative stress disrupts translational machinery, the stringent response may serve to limit production of unnecessary stable RNA. It would make sense for the cell to slow general protein synthesis under conditions where the membrane and DNA are under oxidative attack. Indeed, there is preliminary evidence that in relA mutants exposed to plumbagin, DNA synthesis decreases while the optical density of the culture increases (70d).

Other Genes Involved in Protection against Oxidative Stress

In addition to the genes and proteins discussed above, several genes are constitutively expressed, and there are genes whose regulation is SoxRS and OxyR independent and whose functions have been demonstrated to be necessary during oxidative stress, based on the fact that mutations in these genes sensitize the cell to oxidative stress. These include, but are not limited to, apaH (ApppN hydrolase) (126a) and ksgA (16S rRNA methylase) (70b). Mutations in the xthA (Exo III), dam (DNA adenine methylase), gyr (DNA gyrase), and topA (topoisomerase I) genes also play a role in protection against the oxidative damage. There are also mutations in genes whose functions are unknown, but nevertheless render the cell more sensitive to oxidative stress. These include soi-17/19, soi-28, mvrA, and several oxyS genes (125, 132, 172). In addition, there are several other genes whose functions would strongly suggest that they play an important role in protection against oxidative damage, but whose sensitivity to oxidative stress has not been determined, e.g., trxA (thioredoxin). These genes are included in Table 2.

CONCLUSIONS

Most of the proteins induced by either peroxide or O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-} stress remain unidentified. Consequently we know relatively little about the physiological functions or pathways used during oxidative stress. The few functions that have been identified, however, suggest that many, if not most, of the metabolic pathways in the cell are altered in some way by oxidative stress and the responses of the cell to it. For example, oxidative membrane damage leads to a plethora of subsequent problems for the cell; loss of A\textsubscript{pH} will change the intracellular pH, causing further production of HOO\textsuperscript{-}, will decrease ATP synthesis, will increase permeability to toxic compounds, will prevent chemotaxis, etc. Each one of these events requires further metabolic adjustments by the cell. For example, the loss of energy charge is likely to affect macromolecular synthesis, which, in turn, might induce the stringent response, and oxidative DNA or protein damage is likely to generate its own sequelae of events.

One approach to unraveling the complex responses of the cell to oxidative stress may therefore be to determine which types of damage or disruption inevitably follow one another. For example, certain types of DNA damage may generally lead to production of truncated or abnormal proteins. Because of the general cooccurrence of these events, the cell may have evolved a regulon that coinduces a response to deal with abnormal proteins, whether or not abnormal proteins have actually been produced. An example of this might be in the SoxRS response, in which the cell coregulates induction of antioxidants such as MnSOD and a DNA repair enzyme, Endo IV. It is unlikely that at the time of initial activation of the SoxRS regulatory elements, severe DNA damage has already occurred. Rather, through evolutionary experience, the cell may "know" that whenever it needs extra MnSOD, it is likely to need extra Endo IV. In terms of assigning genes or functions to stimulons, coinduction of genes or functions rather than sequential inductions would be suggestive of, although not proof of, coregulated events. Final assignment of genes to stimulons can, however, be made only when a necessary interaction between the regulators (SoxR, SoxS, OxyR, etc.) and the genes they regulate (nfo, soi-28 promoters, etc.) has been demonstrated.

Comparison and Extrapolation to Eukaryotes

There is a great deal of similarity in the overall strategy of defense against oxidative stress between bacteria and eukaryotic cells. On the other hand, there appear to be some
pressed from mammalian DNA repair enzymes specific for oxidative damage share notes appear in the regulation and complexity of the responses to oxidative stress. The inducers of the oxidative stress responses in bacteria appear to be either the oxidant itself or interaction of the oxidant with a cell component, as in the case of OxyR. On the other hand, oxygen radicals do not, in general, induce limited production of antioxidant enzymes in mammalian cells. Rather, cytokines such as tumor necrosis factor, interleukin-1, or bacterial lipopolysaccharides induce SOD synthesis and multigene responses (157a, 240). Evolutionally this makes sense, given that most mammalian cells exist in an environment where the oxygen concentration is constant (ambient 4% in blood serum). An exception is upon sequestration and activation of neutrophils to produce active oxygen species. It is economical that the same signals that sequester and activate neutrophils should also induce antioxidants in bystander cells. Indeed, although paraquat has no inductive effects on MnSOD and phase II enzymes in mammalian cells, since cells of internal organs that are never exposed to near-UV show strong inducibility of these proteins by MnSOD and phase II enzymes in mammalian cells, tumor necrosis factor is a very potent inducer (240).

Sources of active oxygen species of evolutionary importance (that fluctuate sufficiently to warrant inducible responses) include near-UV radiation, ionizing radiation, and possible ingestion of redox-active or radical generating phytoalexins (i.e., psoralen in celery). Mammalian cells induce a few proteins in specific response to NUV stress, most notably heme-oxygenase and glutathione transferase. Since cells of internal organs that are never exposed to near-UV show strong inducibility of these proteins by near-UV (131), this suggests either that their regulation pathway is ancient, or that the actual natural inducer is not near-UV, but rather a subsequent reactant, possibly H2O2. The regulation pathway of H2O2-inducible genes in mammalian cells is unknown. It is possible, however, that simple activation of a DNA-binding protein results in gene expression, as appears to be the case in bacterial OxyR-regulated genes.

Although the regulatory pathway(s) appears to be enormously complex and involves several factors, recent work shows that O2- is a strong tumor promoter that works by activation and induction of growth competence-related gene products; c-fos, c-jun, c-myc, and β-actin (40a, 47). These gene products are transcription factors that regulate a battery of genes. Other factors involved in the regulation of eukaryotic antioxidant gene expression include an induction of calmodulin kinase by increase in Ca2+ concentrations, which in turn activates S6 phosphorylation. The elevation of Ca2+ concentration levels, which could occur when membranes are damaged by O2- radicals, also leads to phosphokinase C activation. Phosphokinase C activation in turn phosphorylates and activates topoisomerase I (184a). Phospholipid hydroperoxides, produced by membrane oxidation, will also activate phospholipid hydroperoxide reductase, glutathione peroxidase, and phospholipase II.

Finally, DNA strand breaks induced by oxidative stress will induce poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase. Several proteins, including Jun, Fos, TopI, and a DNA polymerase α subunit, are poly-ADP-ribosylated. Poly-ADP-ribosylation is crucial for activation of Fos. The relationship between an increase in the concentration of calcium and DNA damage is unclear. Other factors involved in increased expression of the c-fos gene upon oxidative stress include the serum-responsive factor, serum-responsive element, and cyclic AMP-responsive element (40a).

In summary, the complexity in bacterial responses appears to be in the sheer number of proteins induced by oxidative stress, well over 60. Conversely, the relative number of proteins induced in mammalian cells is small, but the regulatory pathways are highly complex.
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