

Physical models of bacterial chromosomes

Janni Harju¹ and Chase P. Brodersz^{1,2,✉}

¹Department of Physics and Astronomy, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands

²Arnold Sommerfeld Center for Theoretical Physics and Center for NanoScience, Department of Physics, Ludwig-Maximilian-University Munich, Theresienstr. 37, D-80333 Munich, Germany

The interplay between bacterial chromosome organization and functions such as transcription and replication can be studied in increasing detail using novel experimental techniques. Interpreting the resulting quantitative data, however, can be theoretically challenging. In this minireview, we discuss how connecting experimental observations to biophysical theory and modeling can give rise to new insights on bacterial chromosome organization. We consider three flavors of models of increasing complexity: simple polymer models that explore how physical constraints, such as confinement or plectoneme branching, can affect bacterial chromosome organization; bottom-up mechanistic models that connect these constraints to their underlying causes, for instance chromosome compaction to macromolecular crowding, or supercoiling to transcription; and finally, data-driven methods for inferring interpretable and quantitative models directly from complex experimental data. Using recent examples, we discuss how biophysical models can both deepen our understanding of how bacterial chromosomes are structured, and give rise to novel predictions about bacterial chromosome organization.

Correspondence: c.p.brodersz@vu.nl

1. Introduction

The genome of many bacterial species is contained in a single circular chromosome, which is compressed by orders of magnitude into the bacterial cell. Microscopy studies have revealed that various factors, such as transcription, Nucleoid Associated Proteins (NAPs), supercoiling, loop-extrusion by SMC complexes, and replication shape bacterial chromosome organization (Dame et al., 2019; Liroy et al., 2021; Yáñez-Cuna and Koszul, 2023; Gogou et al., 2021). However, since microscopy experiments cannot resolve the full 3D conformation of a bacterial chromosome, the effects of genetic and pharmacological perturbations on chromosome organization are often only explored indirectly, for instance by observing how they affect chromosome compaction or segregation. Alternatively, chromosome organization can be studied using sequencing-based methods, including Chromosome Conformation Capture experiments such as Hi-C (Le et al., 2013). Hi-C experiments measure how often pairs of loci are spatially proximate, or “in contact”, averaged over a population of cells. Although interpreting Hi-C data remains challenging, these and other high-resolution quantitative data open new avenues to address old, yet unanswered questions: how are bacterial chromosomes organized across scales? how do various biological mechanisms control this organization? and, how does chromosome organization facilitate biological functions?

The recent surge in experimental techniques to quantitatively probe bacterial chromosome organization poses new and exciting challenges for biophysical modeling. Theoretical and computational biophysical models use concepts from polymer physics to explore how different mechanisms, such as macromolecular crowding (Rivas and Minton, 2016; Polson and Kerry, 2018) or bridging by NAPs (Dame et al., 2020; Amemiya et al., 2021), can affect chromosome organization and dynamics. This minireview focuses on recent models for bacterial chromosome organization, grouped according to their underlying modeling approach, and ordered by increasing complexity. First, we discuss polymer models that study *how geometrical and topological constraints affect bacterial chromosomes*, such as how cellular confinement or polymer branching influence chromosome conformation and dynamics. Second, we explore bottom-up models, which study *how chromosome organization emerges from microscopic mechanisms*, like how loop-extrusion by SMC complexes (~ 50 nm) (Fudenberg et al., 2017; Banigan and Mirny, 2020) can organize chromosomes at the nucleoid scale (~ 1 μ m). Finally, we consider data-driven approaches, which seek to *infer a model for chromosome organization, given experimental data*, providing a physical interpretation for Hi-C maps. We discuss various benefits and limitations of these different modeling approaches, explore future modeling opportunities and challenges, and summarize key insights into bacterial chromosome organization gained via biophysical modeling.

2. Geometric and topological constraints determine chromosome organization

In its essence, a bacterial chromosome is a long polymer confined to a small volume. The simplest physical models for bacterial chromosome organization explore how different, often biologically motivated, forces and constraints affect the polymer’s organization and dynamics (Fig. 1A).

2.1. Geometric constraints

The volume of confinement and constraining loci within the cell are examples of geometric constraints on a bacterial chromosome. Even these minimal constraints can explain well-known features of bacterial chromosome organization: tethering the origin of replication to a cell pole can give rise to linear chromosome organization (Buenemann and Lenz, 2010, 2011), as seen in species such as *C. crescentus*, while tight confinement can drastically change the way that polymers interact, with implications for bacterial chromosome segregation.

arXiv:2312.09328v1 [physics.bio-ph] 14 Dec 2023




Fig. 1. Constraint-based and bottom-up models. **A** Examples of constraint-based models. Left to right: Polymer confinement can give rise to effects such as entropic segregation (Jun and Mulder, 2006). Constraining chromosomal regions corresponding to *E. coli* macrodomains to subvolumes of the nucleoid can give rise to order and chromosome segregation (Junier et al., 2014). Fixed loop topologies can orient bacterial chromosomes and enhance their segregation (Mitra et al., 2022b). Feather-boa models show that branching can affect chromosome compaction, segregation, and dynamics. Constraining origins of replication or other loci by tethering them to the cell membrane can give rise to linear ordering of the chromosome (Buenemann and Lenz, 2010, 2011). **B** Examples of bottom-up mechanisms. Left to right: Macromolecular crowding due to RNA, ribosomes, and other large molecules can compact bacterial chromosomes (Rivas and Minton, 2016). Loop-extrusion by MukBEF can contribute to macrodomain formation in *E. coli* (Lioy et al., 2018), whereas condensin can tie together the chromosomal arms in *C. crescentus* and *B. subtilis* (Le et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2017). NAPs can impact chromosome organization by condensing macrodomains, by bridging, by stabilizing supercoils, or by associating with the cell membrane (Dame et al., 2020; Amemiya et al., 2021). Transcription gives rise to twin-supercoiled-domains, with positive supercoiling ahead and negative supercoiling behind RNA polymerases (Junier et al., 2023). The insertion of newly translated proteins into the cell membrane (transertion) causes certain genes to associate with the cell wall (Roggiani and Goulian, 2015).

Jun and Mulder (2006) proposed that bacterial chromosome segregation could be explained by entropic forces acting on two confined polymers. Consider two polymers consisting of N monomers, confined to a long cylinder of diameter d . Since below length scales d , each polymer is unaffected by the confinement, we can split each polymer into subsections called “confinement blobs”, inside which the polymer is unconstrained. Each blob is constrained to lie along the long axis of the cylinder, which introduces an entropic cost. The entropic cost of confinement can hence be shown to scale with the number of confinement blobs, $N_{\text{blobs}} \sim Nd^{-1/\nu}$, where ν is the Flory exponent. Since overlap of any two blobs is entropically costly, the two polymers will entropically segregate. Such arguments can be extended for ring polymers and for shorter cylinders (Jun and Wright, 2010; Jung et al., 2012), suggesting that replicated bacterial chromosomes could entropically segregate in cellular confinement.

Despite theoretical arguments for entropic segregation, several simulation studies have shown that, without additional constraints, circular chromosomes do no segregate at intermediate replication stages. Constraints such as the concentric-shell model (Jun and Mulder, 2006), confining sections of the chromosome to sub-volumes of the nucleoid (modeling Macrodomains of the *E. coli* chromosome) (Junier et al., 2014), fixing the replisomes at mid-cell (El Najjar et al., 2020), or linking chromosomal arms with loop-extruders (Harju et al., 2023) have been necessary to achieve segregation concurrent with replication. Why are such additional constraints needed? We recently argued that at intermediate replication stages, purely entropic forces can ac-

tually *inhibit* bacterial chromosome segregation by pushing replication forks apart (Harju et al., 2023). Additionally, free energy calculations have shown that the time delay before entropic segregation begins can grow exponentially with the chain length (Minina and Arnold, 2014, 2015; Polson and Kerry, 2018), and that two polymers of different lengths do not necessarily demix in confinement (Polson and Zhu, 2021). Both due to partially conflicting simulation results and the lack of experimental evidence, the role of entropy in bacterial chromosome organization remains a subject of debate. Furthermore, we still lack theoretical understanding for chromosome segregation in spherically shaped cocci (Pinho et al., 2013), and in species with multiple chromosomes of different topologies (Ren et al., 2022).

2.2. Topological constraints

The shape of a bacterial chromosome is characterized by topological constants: a linear, a circular, and a partially replicated chromosome all have different numbers of loops (0, 1, or 2) and are hence topologically distinct. We will now discuss how topological changes can affect the organization and dynamics of bacterial chromosomes.

Mitra et al. (2022a,b) recently proposed that fixed loops at the boundaries of *E. coli* Macrodomains (Fig. 1A) could be sufficient to explain experimentally observed chromosome organization and segregation patterns. The authors showed that fixed loop architectures give rise to predictable and robust orientation of confined chromosomes, and that excluded volume interactions between loops can enhance chromosome segregation. Although it remains to be shown whether such stable loops at fixed genomic positions are common in bacte-

ria, these findings also suggest that more randomly placed loops could affect the direction of entropic forces at the single-cell level.

Another example of a topological constraint on a bacterial chromosome is its supercoiling level. To illustrate, consider holding the ends of a piece of ribbon, and twisting them in opposite directions. This causes the ribbon to writhe around its central axis. If you now release tension by bringing the ends of the ribbon closer together, the ribbon will coil up into a plectoneme, but the number of turns (the linking number) will be conserved. Similarly, supercoiling of bacterial chromosomes by active mechanisms causes the DNA to branch into plectonemes (Dorman, 2019; Junier et al., 2023). This observation motivated the development of “feather-boa” models, where the chromosome is considered to consist of loops or branches emanating from a backbone (Reviewed in Ha and Jung (2015)).

Branching can both compact chromosomes and enhance their segregation (Jun and Wright, 2010). Additionally, feather-boa models have been shown to reproduce experimentally observed features of bacterial chromosome organization and dynamics, such as subdiffusive motion of chromosomal loci (Yu et al., 2021), and helical ordering of chromosomal arms (Swain et al., 2019). Feather-boa models hence remain an active area of research, and new computational advances are improving simulation resolutions and speeds (Goodsell et al., 2018; Ghobadpour et al., 2021). Despite these computational advances, an open-standing theoretical question is how branches and loops should be (dynamically) distributed in bacterial chromosome models, given what we know about their underlying causes.

3. Bottom-up modeling

In this section, we focus on bottom-up models, which model how chromosome organization emerges from proposed biological mechanisms (Fig. 1B). Such models can describe how transcription gives rise to plectoneme branches, or how macromolecular crowding confines the nucleoid to only 40-90% of the cell (Gray et al., 2019).

A strength of bottom-up models is that they provide mechanistic insight and make novel predictions. A limitation is that more complex aspects of chromosome organization may be affected by several distinct mechanisms acting in unison. To illustrate, recent work by Joyeux (2021, 2023) has shown that crowding and supercoiling can compact the chromosome in non-additive ways at high supercoiling densities, and that macromolecular crowding can enhance chromosome compaction by crosslinkers. These works illustrate that different bacterial chromosome organization mechanisms do not act in isolation. Despite such challenges, bottom-up models can provide conceptual insight into how various molecular mechanism control bacterial chromosome organization.

3.1. Loop extrusion

Hi-C experiments have revealed that bacterial chromosomes are more ordered than homogeneous, randomly oriented polymers in confinement. For instance, bacterial condensin

mediates long-range contacts between the two chromosomal arms in species such as *C. crescentus* (Le et al., 2013), and *B. subtilis* (Wang et al., 2017), resulting in a prominent off-diagonal trace on Hi-C maps. Another SMC, MukBEF, on the other hand, enhances long-range contacts across large parts of the *E. coli* chromosome (Liroy et al., 2018). These findings have triggered the development of loop extrusion models for bacterial chromosomes.

One of the early questions addressed by biophysical modeling of SMCs in bacteria was whether these protein complexes move diffusively or via active loop extrusion. Whereas it was suggested that targeted loading of diffusive slip-links could be sufficient to model eukaryotic SMC behavior (Brackley et al., 2017) and that MukBEF clustering could arise due to Turing patterning (Murray and Sourjik, 2017), a simulation model for *B. subtilis* (Miermans and Broedersz, 2018) indicated that thousands of diffusive slip-links were needed to explain off-diagonal traces on bacterial Hi-C maps, while only tens of active loop-extruders were sufficient, more consistent with experimental reports of ~ 30 condensin complexes per chromosome (Wilhelm et al., 2015). These and other simulations, as well as mounting experimental evidence, have led to loop extrusion becoming more broadly accepted (Fudenberg et al., 2017; Banigan and Mirny, 2020).

MukBEF loop extrusion in *E. coli* has been modeled in 1D (Mäkelä and Sherratt, 2020). The authors proposed that non-targeted loading of MukBEF gives rise to an array of loops that spans most of the chromosome. Non-targeted loading of MukBEF could hence result in a feather-boa structure on parts of the *E. coli* chromosome, reminiscent of microscopy observations of MukBEF distributions in widened *E. coli* cells (Japaridze et al., 2023). However, future work still needs to address how loop extrusion by MukBEF could affect the 3D organization of *E. coli* chromosomes.

The effects of loop extrusion on *B. subtilis* chromosome organization, by contrast, have been modeled by combining 1D loop-extruder dynamics with 3D polymer simulations (Brandão et al., 2019, 2021). These models better recapitulate Hi-C data if loop-extruders slow down as they collide with RNA polymerases at highly transcribed regions. Patterns on Hi-C maps for strains with two loop-extruder loading sites, on the other hand, can be explained if loop-extruders can traverse each other upon collision, as seen *in vitro* (Kim et al., 2020).

More recently, we modeled how loop-extruders loaded at the origins of replication affect the segregation and organization of replicating bacterial chromosomes (Harju et al., 2023). This so-called topo-entropic segregation model explains how the geometry and effective topology of a replicating chromosome affect the direction of entropic forces. We found that at intermediate replication stages, purely entropic forces inhibit bacterial chromosome segregation. However, loop-extruders loaded at the origins of replication effectively linearize partially replicated chromosomes, and this change in effective topology redirects entropic forces to enable concurrent replication and segregation.

3.2. NAPs and phase separation

In vitro studies have shown that NAPs can locally twist, bend or bridge DNA (Song and Loparo, 2015; Dame et al., 2020; Amemiya et al., 2021). This shows that NAPs can *locally* affect DNA structure, but what is their impact on bacterial chromosome organization at larger scales? We will first discuss long-range bridging, which introduces transient cross-links on bacterial chromosomes. We then turn to liquid-liquid phase separation, which may allow compartmentalization within bacterial cells (Cohan and Pappu, 2020; Azaldegui et al., 2021).

Physically, NAPs can be modelled as particles that can diffuse, interact with each other, and bind to DNA. For bridging to occur, the number of DNA strands that the NAP can simultaneously bind to (its valency) should be at least two. Brackley et al. (2013) showed that, even in the absence of NAP-NAP interactions or cooperative binding, multivalent binding could be sufficient to give rise to NAP clustering. A bivalently binding NAP introduces a loop on the chromosome, which is entropically costly. Two bivalent NAPs can bind far apart, giving rise to two loops, or next to each other, effectively giving rise to just one loop. Hence, even in the absence of NAP-NAP interactions, bridging proteins can cluster for entropic reasons.

Non-cooperative NAP binding can also affect chromosome dynamics; Subramanian and Murray (2023) showed that transient bridging can give rise to sub-diffusive motion of loci at timescales below the bridge lifetime. Consistent with this model, an H-NS mutant of *E. coli* showed weaker sub-diffusive behavior of loci than the wild type.

Although some NAPs might bind non-cooperatively, many are known to interact, which can be modelled by introducing NAP-NAP interactions in simulations. Joyeux (2021) studied how protein self-association impacts chromosome organization. Inspired by the *E. coli* NAP H-NS, two modes of NAP binding were modeled: filament- or cluster-forming. In simulations, filament-forming proteins stiffened chromosomal regions where they bound, but did not to compact DNA. Conversely, clustering proteins condensed the chromosome, but did not stiffen DNA. This work illustrates that even simple coarse-grained models can capture a variety of NAP behaviours.

Certain NAP-NAP interactions can give rise to collective phenomena, such as biomolecular condensation. For instance, HU and Dps, two important NAPs in *E. coli*, have been observed to lead to phase separation of DNA segments *in vitro* (Gupta et al., 2023). Put simply, phase separation can occur when attractive interactions start to dominate over entropic effects; whereas entropy favors spreading NAPs across the accessible volume, attractive NAP-NAP interactions of suitable geometry and sufficient range can favor NAP condensation. Since phase separation can create long-range order, it can impact chromosome organization at large scales.

Some of the earliest evidence for biomolecular condensation in bacterial cells came from observations of ParB clusters forming at *parS* sites on bacterial chromosomes and plasmids (Broedersz et al., 2014; Jalal and Le, 2020). Bottom-up

models have been used to explore transport (Lim et al., 2014; Surovtsev et al., 2016; Hu et al., 2017; Walter et al., 2017; Köhler and Murray, 2023) and force generation (Hanauer et al., 2021) by the ParABS system, as well as ParB cluster formation (Broedersz et al., 2014; Sanchez et al., 2015; Walter et al., 2021). These works offer two key physical insights. First, as opposed to earlier works that assumed that ParB only spreads along the one-dimensional DNA strand (Murray et al., 2006; Breier and Grossman, 2007), the formation of ParB clusters is an inherently three-dimensional phenomenon; a well-known result from statistical physics states that phase separation cannot occur in one-dimensional systems with short range interactions. Hence a combination of 1D spreading, 3D bridging, and fluctuations of the chromosome are important for the formation of ParB clusters. Accordingly, *in vitro* experiments have confirmed that bridging is essential for ParB spreading (Graham et al., 2014), and that ParB-dimers can recruit each other in-trans and form dynamic clusters via bridging (Tišma et al., 2022, 2023). Second, the maintenance of separate ParB clusters consumes energy; to minimize their surface area, phase-separated droplets are expected to merge either via Ostwald ripening (when constituents diffuse from smaller droplets to larger ones) or by collision. This implies that the maintenance of ParB condensates on separate plasmids and/or *parS* sites may require an active mechanism, such as ParA ATPase (Guilhas et al., 2020) and/or ParB CTPase activity (Osorio-Valeriano et al., 2021).

3.3. Effects of transcription

Transcription and translation can affect bacterial chromosome organization in multiple ways. Steric interactions with ribosomes and RNA can affect nucleoid compaction and localization (Xiang et al., 2021; Miangolarra et al., 2021). Transertion – the insertion of membrane proteins into the cell wall as they are translated and transcribed (Roggiani and Goulian, 2015; Spahn et al., 2023) – can cause loci to remain near the cell membrane. Highly transcribed genes have been proposed to colocalize, since RNA polymerases can cluster in fast growth conditions (Ladouceur et al., 2020). Finally, transcription introduces both positive and negative supercoils, and highly transcribed genes can act as topological barriers that inhibit plectoneme diffusion (Le et al., 2013; Le and Laub, 2016). Since single-molecule experiments are providing evidence that some NAPs (Guo et al., 2021) and potentially SMCs (Kim et al., 2022) are recruited to areas of high supercoiling, future models could explore the interplay of these different mechanisms of bacterial chromosome organization.

By comparing Monte Carlo simulations of a confined polymer to experimental data, Xiang et al. (2021) showed that the mesh size of the *E. coli* nucleoid is compatible with the chromosome being embedded in an effective poor solvent. Since ribosome and DNA densities were found to be anti-correlated, the authors suggested that this effective poor solvent could be a result of excluded volume interactions between the chromosome and ribosomes and/or RNA. Miango-

larra et al. (2021) further explored steric interactions between bacterial chromosomes and the transcriptional-translational machinery. By modeling the coupled 1D dynamics of DNA, ribosomes, and mRNA, they showed how active transcription and translation can affect the shape, size, and position of the nucleoid.

As reviewed by Junier et al. (2023), supercoiling due to transcription has not yet been modeled at scales of the bacterial chromosome. This is mainly due to computational limitations: bottom-up simulations for transcription-induced supercoiling in 3D have only been conducted for scales of tens of kilobases (Lepage and Junier, 2019). In light of these limitations, recent chromosome-scale models have considered branched polymers with plectoneme distributions that correlate with transcriptional activity (Hacker et al., 2017; Wasim et al., 2023a,b). To illustrate, Hacker et al. (2017) divided the *E. coli* chromosome into “plectoneme-rich” and “plectoneme-free” regions based on RNAP Chip-seq data, and then simulated branched polymers with sampled plectoneme configurations. Such use of complex, quantitative experimental data to constrain a model is a defining characteristic of modern data-driven modeling, which can offer new conceptual and mechanistic insights into bacterial chromosome organization.

4. Data-driven models

Over the last decade, Hi-C experiments have led to a breakthrough in studying chromosome organization quantitatively. A typical Hi-C map for a bacterial chromosome at a 5-10 kb resolution consists of ~ 160000 data points, accurately probing features of chromosome organization over 3 orders of magnitude in genomic scales. Unlike microscopy methods, however, Hi-C experiments do not yield easily interpretable images, but rather a statistical metric for population-averaged pairwise contact counts. Using Hi-C data to faithfully extract information about the underlying distribution of three-dimensional chromosome configurations is thus a daunting theoretical challenge.

Data-driven theoretical approaches seek to exploit the quantitative potential of Hi-C maps by directly inferring a model for 3D chromosome organization from experimental data (Contessoto et al., 2022). Since Hi-C data represent an ensemble average of contact frequencies over the full distribution $P(\{\mathbf{r}\})$ of 3D chromosome conformations $\{\mathbf{r}\}$, data-driven models for bacterial chromosome organization usually seek to find either a single “average” chromosome consensus structure, $\{\mathbf{r}\}_{\text{consensus}}$, or an ensemble of chromosome configurations, $P_{\text{model}}(\{\mathbf{r}\})$ (McCord et al., 2020). Inference of both types of models is a technically challenging inverse problem, as we discuss below.

4.1. Consensus structure models

Most data-driven models don’t use Hi-C data directly as input, and consensus structure algorithms are no exception (Fig. 2). To construct a consensus structure, Hi-C scores are first converted into average spatial distances between locus pairs. This can be done by assuming that the mean distance

between loci has a power-law scaling with the contact frequency (Marbouty et al., 2015), or by using an experimentally determined calibration curve (Umbarger et al., 2011). Theoretically, however, the pairwise contact frequency between two foci is expected to depend not only on their mean distance, but also on the distance distribution’s shape. Accordingly, experimental (Lioy et al., 2018) and simulation (Messelink et al., 2021) results show that mean distances between chromosomal loci can show large deviations from average scalings. Nevertheless, once an average distance map has been found, computational algorithms (reviewed by Liu et al. (2023)) can be used to find a single 3D structure where the pairwise distances between loci are as compatible with the estimated mean distances as possible.

How should we interpret a consensus structure? Unlike proteins that often fold into specific, robust shapes that are critical for their function, bacterial chromosomes are highly flexible and dynamic polymers; imaging experiments show that the positions of chromosomal loci can vary by as much as half a cell length (Viollier et al., 2004). This inherent conformational variability is neglected by consensus structure algorithms: they cannot predict population-level variations in chromosome organization. Nonetheless, consensus structures may offer intuition for global chromosome organization by providing a “convenient visualization tool” (Lioy et al., 2018) for estimated mean distances between chromosomal regions. Furthermore, comparison of consensus structures for mutant strains or for drug-treated cells might yield clues about how different perturbations affect global chromosome organization.

Umbarger et al. (2011) applied an algorithm originally developed for macromolecular assemblies such as nuclear pore complexes (Russel et al., 2012) to predict consensus structures for a *C. crescentus* chromosome based on 5C data. A set of candidate structures were found by initializing the algorithm with different initial conditions, and the inferred structures were then grouped by similarity. The model suggested that the arms of the *C. crescentus* chromosome are wound in a loose helical structure. The authors also inferred structures for a mutant where the *parS* site was relocated, leading to a shift in the cross-diagonal line on the 5C map. The corresponding consensus structure showed that the end of the nucleoid shifted to the new location of the *parS* site, consistent with this site being tethered to a cell pole.

More recently, an error vector resultant algorithm was developed for faster and more accurate inference of consensus structures for prokaryotic chromosomes (Hua and Ma, 2019). The algorithm was applied to Hi-C data from *C. crescentus*, *E. coli* and *B. subtilis*. By comparing consensus structures for wild-type and a Δfis mutant of *E. coli*, the authors concluded that the terminal region bends towards the rest of the chromosome in the mutant strain, reflecting increased Hi-C counts between the terminal region and the rest of the chromosome. Contrasting earlier consensus structures (Umbarger et al., 2011; Marbouty et al., 2015), helicity of the arms was only predicted for *B. subtilis*. Such contradictory results raise further questions about how consensus structures relate to the




Fig. 2. Data-driven modeling of bacterial chromosomes. Data-driven models aim to infer a model for bacterial chromosomes from Hi-C data, which reflects the population-averaged contact counts between chromosomal regions. Subfigure shows Hi-C data for *C. crescentus* swarmer cells (Le et al., 2013). Most models start by converting the Hi-C map to a distance matrix, for instance by assuming a scaling between mean distances between loci $d(i, j)$ and their contact counts $M_{i,j}$. Mean distances can be used to create a consensus structure, which depicts the estimated mean distances using a 3D curve. Subfigure shows consensus structure for *E. coli*, adapted from (Hua and Ma, 2019). Alternatively, mean distances can be used to constrain spring-based ensemble models, with effective harmonic potentials between loci. An ensemble model can also be inferred directly from Hi-C data: by maximizing the distribution entropy with constraints on contact probabilities (\bar{S}), one can choose the least-assuming chromosome configuration distribution $P_{\text{model}}(\{\mathbf{r}\})$ consistent with Hi-C data (Messelink et al., 2021). The MaxEnt procedure selects a model that features effective close-range interactions between monomers. For both spring-based and MaxEnt ensemble models, the effective interaction parameters need to be inferred using computational approaches. Once these parameters have been determined, the distribution can be sampled for single-cell chromosome configurations. Subfigure shows sampled configurations from the MaxEnt model for *C. crescentus* swarmer cells (Messelink et al., 2021).

underlying distribution of chromosome configurations in individual cells.

4.2. Ensemble models

Ensemble methods aim to capture population-level variability in bacterial chromosome organization by finding a distribution $P_{\text{model}}(\{\mathbf{r}\})$ of single-cell chromosome configurations, given Hi-C data (Fig. 2). Most approaches assume an underlying statistical model for this distribution, defined by a set of effective interaction parameters. Once the effective parameters have been inferred from data, the model ensemble can be sampled using statistical methods such as Monte Carlo simulations. Samples from the distribution can be interpreted as single-cell chromosome configurations. In this way, an ensemble model constructed using population-averaged data can be used to make predictions about chromosome organization both on the single-cell and population level.

Like consensus structure models, most data-driven ensemble models for bacterial chromosome organization start by assuming a relation between Hi-C scores and average monomer distances. However, these distances are now typically used to define spring-like interactions between loci, which constrain the mean distances in the model to match input data. For example, Yildirim and Feig (2018) constructed an ensemble model for the *C. crescentus* chromosome by first converting Hi-C scores to expected distances between loci based on previous calibration data (Umbarger et al., 2011), and then constraining distances between a subset of monomer pairs in a plectonemic model using spring-like interactions. Equilibrium molecular dynamics simulations were used to produce an ensemble of chromosome configurations, and configura-

tions were assigned statistical weights based on how closely their distance matrices matched input Hi-C data. The correlation between the model's contact map and the experimental Hi-C map (0.88) was comparable to that between Hi-C maps of *C. crescentus* and *B. subtilis* (0.878 for Hi-C maps from (Le et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015)). This illustrates that models constrained with inferred distances do not necessarily reproduce the Hi-C map faithfully.

Using a similar approach, Wasim et al. (2021) constructed a spring-based model for the *E. coli* chromosome. They have since studied the sub-diffusional behavior of loci in their model, compared models for wild-type cells and HU- and MatP-mutants, and constructed a model with plectonemes (Bera et al., 2022; Wasim et al., 2023c,a). These works have suggested that locus (sub-)diffusion depends on genomic position, and that inclusion of plectonemes in the model slightly affected chromosome compaction, but not organization.

These and other ensemble techniques have advanced data-driven modeling beyond consensus structure inference for both pro- and eukaryotic chromosomes (Marti-Renom et al., 2018; Oluwadare et al., 2019; McCord et al., 2020). However, several issues remain. Many ensemble approaches rely on strong assumptions, like thermal equilibrium or converting Hi-C counts to expected mean distances. Furthermore, the diversity of methods hints at a more fundamental concern: while all these approaches lead to a model based on a given Hi-C map, many distinct ensembles could be consistent with the same data. So, how do you select the right one?

To address this challenge, our group developed a data-driven model for bacterial chromosome organization based

on the Maximum Entropy (MaxEnt) principle. This principle selects the unique chromosome conformation distribution $P_{\text{MaxEnt}}(\{\mathbf{r}\})$ that reproduces a given Hi-C map but is otherwise as unstructured as possible. Notably, the model does not rely on converting Hi-C scores to mean pairwise distances between loci. We applied this approach to model chromosome organization in new-born *C. crescentus* swarmer cells (Messelink et al., 2021). As validation, we showed that the model accurately predicts the long-axis distributions of loci over the entire chromosome, as measured by independent experiments (Viollier et al., 2004). The MaxEnt model can also reveal novel features of chromosome organization. For example, our model predicted the presence of “super-domains”, or clusters of high chromosomal density at the single-cell level. The presence of these super-domains was validated using super-resolution microscopy.

Our MaxEnt model was limited to new-born cells with a single chromosome, constrained using Hi-C data from synchronized cells (Le et al., 2013). However, Hi-C experiments on *E. coli*, *B. subtilis*, and many other bacteria are conducted on asynchronous populations. The resulting Hi-C maps reflect an average over cells at different replication stages, which poses challenges for data-driven modeling. For instance, bacterial chromosome organization can vary over the cell cycle (Wang et al., 2014), and Hi-C experiments in replicating bacteria count both cis- and trans-contacts. Wasim et al. (2021) inferred models for *E. coli* at discrete replication stages by constraining each model with the same asynchronous Hi-C data, and by assuming that trans-contacts are negligible. Since the validity of these approximations has yet to be established, an open-standing question in the field is how to best infer a model using Hi-C data from an asynchronous population. This is clearly a challenging but worthwhile problem: Such a model could provide new insight into the dynamics of chromosome organization across the cell cycle.

5. Discussion and future challenges

We have discussed three biophysical approaches to modeling bacterial chromosomes: models based on imposed geometric or topological constraints, bottom-up models, and data-driven approaches. Simple models of (branched) polymers in confinement have revealed how different constraints affect bacterial chromosome organization. Bottom-up approaches link these constraints to their underlying biophysical causes, and can hence be used to gain mechanistic insights. Data-driven methods aim to capture detailed chromosome organization by inferring models from experimental Hi-C data. Importantly, we note that these modeling approaches can complement each other. For instance, data-driven approaches can help hypothesize simple physical principles of chromosome organization, which can then guide the construction of bottom-up or constraint-based models.

Given that simplified constraint-based and bottom-up models are tailored to explain only certain aspects of chromosome organization, it can be difficult to test their predictions *in vivo* with controlled and targeted perturbations. To test

whether effects seen in polymer simulations are relevant at biological length- and time-scales, these simplified models could be compared to artificial systems of chromosomes in confinement (Birnie and Dekker, 2021). Conversely, bottom-up models could be constructed for “simpler” organisms: Stevens et al. (2023) recently presented a model for an entire, minimal bacterial cell, with a 543 kb long circular chromosome. For more complex systems, the increased availability of high-quality quantitative data creates opportunities for data-driven modeling. For instance, multiple types of data, such as Hi-C, imaging, and/or RNA-sequencing, can be combined to infer data-driven models that capture bacterial chromosome organization in its full complexity (Messelink et al., 2021; Wasim et al., 2023a).

In conclusion, biophysical modeling has helped shape our understanding of how bacterial chromosomes are functionally organized. Since biophysical models can be easily adapted for different organisms, modeling can help search for divergent and unifying principles of prokaryotic genome organization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the members of our group for helpful discussions, and the organizers and attendants of the 2023 “Biology and physics of the prokaryotic chromosome” workshop at the Lorentz Center in Leiden, the Netherlands.

Bibliography

- Haley M. Amemiya, Jeremy Schroeder, and Peter L. Freddolino. Nucleoid-associated proteins shape chromatin structure and transcriptional regulation across the bacterial kingdom. *Transcription*, 12(4):182, 2021. doi: 10.1080/21541264.2021.1973865.
- Christopher A. Azaldegui, Anthony G. Vecchiarelli, and Julie S. Biteen. The emergence of phase separation as an organizing principle in bacteria. *Biophys. J.*, 120(7):1123–1138, April 2021. ISSN 0006-3495. doi: 10.1016/j.bpj.2020.09.023.
- Edward J. Banigan and Leonid A. Mirny. Loop extrusion: theory meets single-molecule experiments. *Current Opinion in Cell Biology*, 64:124–138, 6 2020. ISSN 0955-0674. doi: 10.1016/j.CEB.2020.04.011.
- Palash Bera, Abdul Wasim, and Jagannath Mondal. Hi-C embedded polymer model of *Escherichia coli* reveals the origin of heterogeneous subdiffusion in chromosomal loci. *Physical Review E*, 105:064402, 6 2022. ISSN 2470-0045. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.105.064402.
- Anthony Birnie and Cees Dekker. Genome-in-a-Box. *ACS Nano*, 15(1):111, January 2021. doi: 10.1021/acsnano.0c07397.
- C. A. Brackley, J. Johnson, D. Michieletto, A. N. Morozov, M. Nicodemi, P. R. Cook, and D. Marenduzzo. Nonequilibrium Chromosome Looping via Molecular Slip Links. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 119(13):138101, September 2017. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.138101.
- Chris A. Brackley, Stephen Taylor, Argyris Papantonis, Peter R. Cook, and Davide Marenduzzo. Nonspecific bridging-induced attraction drives clustering of DNA-binding proteins and genome organization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 110(38):E3605–E3611, September 2013. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1302950110.
- Hugo B. Brandão, Payel Paul, Aafke A. van den Berg, David Z. Rudner, Xindan Wang, and Leonid A. Mirny. RNA polymerases as moving barriers to condensin loop extrusion. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 116(41):20489–20499, October 2019. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1907009116.
- Hugo B. Brandão, Zhongqing Ren, Xheni Karaboja, Leonid A. Mirny, and Xindan Wang. DNA-loop-extruding SMC complexes can traverse one another *in vivo*. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 28:642–651, August 2021. ISSN 1545-9985. doi: 10.1038/s41594-021-00626-1.
- Adam M. Breier and Alan D. Grossman. Whole-genome analysis of the chromosome partitioning and sporulation protein Spo0J (ParB) reveals spreading and origin-distal sites on the *Bacillus subtilis* chromosome. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 64(3):703–718, May 2007. ISSN 0950-382X. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2007.05690.x.
- Chase P. Broedersz, Xindan Wang, Yigal Meir, Joseph J. Loparo, David Z. Rudner, and Ned S. Wingreen. Condensation and localization of the partitioning protein ParB on the bacterial chromosome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 111(24):8809–8814, June 2014. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1402529111.
- Mathias Buenemann and Peter Lenz. A Geometrical Model for DNA Organization in Bacteria. *PLoS One*, 5(11):e13806, November 2010. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0013806.
- Mathias Buenemann and Peter Lenz. Geometrical ordering of DNA in bacteria. *Commun. Integr. Biol.*, pages 291–293, May 2011. ISSN 1091-4891.
- Megan C. Cohan and Rohit V. Pappu. Making the Case for Disordered Proteins and Biomolecular Condensates in Bacteria. *Trends Biochem. Sci.*, 45(8):668–680, August 2020. ISSN 0968-0004. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2020.04.011.
- Vinicius G. Contessoto, Ryan R. Cheng, and José N. Onuchic. Uncovering the statistical physics of 3D chromosomal organization using data-driven modeling. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 75:102418, 8 2022. ISSN 0959-440X. doi: 10.1016/j.SBI.2022.102418.

- Remus T. Dame, Fatema Zahra M. Rashid, and David C. Grainger. Chromosome organization in bacteria: mechanistic insights into genome structure and function. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 2019 21:4, 21:227–242, 11 2019. ISSN 1471-0064. doi: 10.1038/s41576-019-0185-4.
- Remus T. Dame, Fatema-Zahra M. Rashid, and David C. Grainger. Chromosome organization in bacteria: mechanistic insights into genome structure and function. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 21: 227–242, April 2020. ISSN 1471-0064. doi: 10.1038/s41576-019-0185-4.
- Charles J. Dorman. DNA supercoiling and transcription in bacteria: a two-way street. *BMC Mol. Cell Biol.*, 20(1):1–9, December 2019. ISSN 2661-8850. doi: 10.1186/s12860-019-0211-6.
- N. El Najjar, D. Geisel, F. Schmidt, S. Dersch, B. Mayer, R. Hartmann, B. Eckhardt, P. Lenz, and Graumann P. L. Chromosome Segregation in *Bacillus subtilis* Follows an Overall Pattern of Linear Movement and Is Highly Robust against Cell Cycle Perturbations. *msphere*, 5(3): e00255–20, June 2020. ISSN 2379-5042. doi: 10.1128/msphere.00255-20.
- G. Fudenberg, N. Abdennur, M. Imakaev, A. Goloborodko, and Mirny L. A. Emerging Evidence of Chromosome Folding by Loop Extrusion. *Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quant. Biol.*, 82:45–55, January 2017. ISSN 0091-7451. doi: 10.1101/sqb.2017.82.034710.
- Elham Ghobadpour, Max Kolb, Mohammad Reza Eftehadi, and Ralf Everaers. Monte Carlo simulation of a lattice model for the dynamics of randomly branching double-folded ring polymers. *Phys. Rev. E*, 104(1):014501, July 2021. ISSN 2470-0053. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.104.014501.
- Christos Gogou, Aleksandre Japaridze, and Cees Dekker. Mechanisms for Chromosome Segregation in Bacteria. *Front. Microbiol.*, 12:685687, June 2021. ISSN 1664-302X. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2021.685687.
- David S. Goodsell, Ludovic Autin, and Arthur J. Olson. Lattice Models of Bacterial Nucleoids. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 122(21):5441–5447, May 2018. ISSN 1520-6106. doi: 10.1021/acs.jpbc.7b11770.
- Thomas G. W. Graham, Xindan Wang, Dan Song, Candice E. Eton, Antoine M. van Oijen, David Z. Rudner, and Joseph J. Loparo. ParB spreading requires DNA bridging. *Genes Dev.*, 28(11):1228–1238, May 2014. ISSN 0890-9369. doi: 10.1101/gad.242206.114.
- William T. Gray, Sander K. Govers, Yingjie Xiang, Bradley R. Parry, Manuel Campos, Sangjin Kim, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner. Nucleoid size scaling and intracellular organization of translation across bacteria. *Cell*, 177:1632, 5 2019. ISSN 10974172. doi: 10.1016/j.CELL.2019.05.017.
- Baptiste Guilhas, Jean-Charles Walter, Jerome Rech, Gabriel David, Nils Ole Walliser, John Palmeri, Celine Mathieu-Demaziere, Andrea Parmeggiani, Jean-Yves Bouet, Antoine Le Gall, and Marcelo Nollmann. ATP-Driven Separation of Liquid Phase Condensates in Bacteria. *Mol. Cell*, 79(2):293–303.e4, July 2020. ISSN 1097-2765. doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2020.06.034.
- Monica S. Guo, Ryo Kawamura, Megan Littlehale, John F. Marko, and Michael T. Laub. High-resolution, genome-wide mapping of positive supercoiling in chromosomes. *eLife*, 10, 7 2021. ISSN 2050084X. doi: 10.7554/eLife.67236.
- Archit Gupta, Ashish Joshi, Kanika Arora, Samrat Mukhopadhyay, and Purnananda Guptasarma. The bacterial nucleoid-associated proteins, HU and Dps, condense DNA into context-dependent biphasic or multiphasic complex coassociates. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 299(5), May 2023. ISSN 0021-9258. doi: 10.1016/j.jbc.2023.104637.
- Bae Yeun Ha and Youngkyun Jung. Polymers under confinement: single polymers, how they interact, and as model chromosomes. *Soft Matter*, 11:2333–2352, 3 2015. ISSN 17446848. doi: 10.1039/C4SM02734E.
- William C. Hacker, Shuxiang Li, and Adrian H. Elcock. Features of genomic organization in a nucleotide-resolution molecular model of the *Escherichia coli* chromosome. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 45(13):7541–7554, July 2017. ISSN 0305-1048. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkx541.
- Christian Hanauer, Silke Bergeler, Erwin Frey, and Chase P. Brodersz. Theory of Active Intracellular Transport by DNA Relaying. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 127(13):138101, September 2021. ISSN 1079-7114. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.138101.
- Janni Harju, Muriel C. F. van Teeseling, and Chase P. Brodersz. Loop-extruders alter bacterial chromosome topology to direct entropic forces for segregation. *bioRxiv*, page 2023.06.30.547230, 7 2023. doi: 10.1101/2023.06.30.547230.
- Longhua Hu, Anthony G. Vecchiarelli, Kiyoshi Mizuuchi, Keir C. Neuman, and Jian Liu. Brownian Ratchet Mechanism for Faithful Segregation of Low-Copy-Number Plasmids. *Biophys. J.*, 112(7):1489–1502, April 2017. ISSN 0006-3495. doi: 10.1016/j.bpj.2017.02.039.
- Kang-Jian Hua and Bin-Guang Ma. EVR: reconstruction of bacterial chromosome 3D structure models using error-vector resultant algorithm. *BMC Genomics*, 20(1):738., October 2019. ISSN 1471-2164. doi: 10.1186/s12864-019-6096-0.
- Adam S. B. Jalal and Tung B. K. Le. Bacterial chromosome segregation by the ParABS system. *Open Biol.*, 10(6):200097, June 2020. ISSN 2046-2441. doi: 10.1098/rsob.200097.
- Aleksandre Japaridze, Raman van Wee, Christos Gogou, Jacob W. J. Kerssemakers, Daan F. van den Berg, and Cees Dekker. MukBEF-dependent chromosomal organization in widened *Escherichia coli*. *Front. Microbiol.*, 14:1107093, March 2023. ISSN 1664-302X. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2023.1107093.
- Marc Joyeux. Impact of Self-Association on the Architectural Properties of Bacterial Nucleoid Proteins. *Biophys. J.*, 120(2):370–378, January 2021. ISSN 0006-3495. doi: 10.1016/j.bpj.2020.12.006.
- Marc Joyeux. Organization of the bacterial nucleoid by DNA-bridging proteins and globular crowders. *Front. Microbiol.*, 14:1116776, February 2023. ISSN 1664-302X. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2023.1116776.
- Suckjoon Jun and Bela Mulder. Entropy-driven spatial organization of highly confined polymers: Lessons for the bacterial chromosome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 103(33):12388–12393, August 2006. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0605305103.
- Suckjoon Jun and Andrew Wright. Entropy as the driver of chromosome segregation. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.*, 8:600–607, August 2010. ISSN 1740-1534. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro2391.
- Youngkyun Jung, Chanil Jeon, Juin Kim, Hawoong Jeong, Suckjoon Jun, and Bae-Yeun Ha. Ring polymers as model bacterial chromosomes: confinement, chain topology, single chain statistics, and how they interact. *Soft Matter*, 8(7):2095–2102, January 2012. ISSN 1744-683X. doi: 10.1039/C1SM05706E.
- Ivan Junier, Frédéric Boccard, and Olivier Espéli. Polymer modeling of the *E. coli* genome reveals the involvement of locus positioning and macrodomain structuring for the control of chromosome conformation and segregation. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 42(3):1461–1473, February 2014. ISSN 0305-1048. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkt1005.
- Ivan Junier, Elham Ghobadpour, Olivier Espeli, and Ralf Everaers. DNA supercoiling in bacteria: state of play and challenges from a viewpoint of physics based modeling. *Front. Microbiol.*, 14:1192831, October 2023. ISSN 1664-302X. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2023.1192831.
- Eugene Kim, Jacob Kerssemakers, Indra A. Shaltiel, Christian H. Haering, and Cees Dekker. DNA-loop extruding condensin complexes can traverse one another. *Nature*, 579:438–442, March 2020. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2067-5.
- Eugene Kim, Alejandro Martin Gonzalez, Biswajit Pradhan, Jaco van der Torre, and Cees Dekker. Condensin-driven loop extrusion on supercoiled DNA. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 29:719–727, July 2022. ISSN 1545-9985. doi: 10.1038/s41594-022-00802-x.
- Robin Köhler and Seán M. Murray. Putting the Par back into ParABS: Plasmid Partitioning Driven by ParA Oscillations. *bioRxiv*, page 2023.10.16.562490, October 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.16.562490>.
- Anne-Marie Ladouceur, Ballyot Singh Parmar, Stefan Biedzinski, James Wall, S. Graydon Tople, David Cohn, Albricht Kim, Nicolas Soubry, Rodrigo Reyes-Lamothe, and Stephanie C. Weber. Clusters of bacterial RNA polymerase are biomolecular condensates that assemble through liquid-liquid phase separation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 117(31):18540–18549, August 2020. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2005019117.
- Tung B. K. Le, Maxim V. Imakaev, Leonid A. Mirny, and Michael T. Laub. High-Resolution Mapping of the Spatial Organization of a Bacterial Chromosome. *Science*, 342(6159):731–734, November 2013. ISSN 0036-8075. doi: 10.1126/science.1242059.
- Tung BK Le and Michael T Laub. Transcription rate and transcript length drive formation of chromosomal interaction domain boundaries. *The EMBO Journal*, 35:1582–1595, 7 2016. ISSN 1460-2075. doi: 10.15252/EMBJ.201593561.
- Thibaut Lepage and Ivan Junier. A polymer model of bacterial supercoiled DNA including structural transitions of the double helix. *Physica A*, 527:121196, August 2019. ISSN 0378-4371. doi: 10.1016/j.physa.2019.121196.
- Hoong Chuin Lim, Ivan Vladimirovich Surovtsev, Bruno Gabriel Beltran, Fang Huang, Jörg Bewersdorff, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner. Evidence for a DNA-relay mechanism in ParABS-mediated chromosome segregation. *eLife*, May 2014. doi: 10.7554/eLife.02758.
- Virginia S. Lioy, Axel Cournac, Martial Marbouty, Stéphane Duigou, Julien Mozziconacci, Olivier Espéli, Frédéric Boccard, and Romain Koszul. Multiscale Structuring of the *E. coli* Chromosome by Nucleoid-Associated and Condensin Proteins. *Cell*, 172(4):771–783.e18, February 2018. ISSN 0092-8674. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2017.12.027.
- Virginia S. Lioy, Ivan Junier, and Frédéric Boccard. Multiscale Dynamic Structuring of Bacterial Chromosomes. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.*, 75(1):541–561, October 2021. ISSN 0066-4227. doi: 10.1146/annurev-micro-033021-113232.
- Tong Liu, Qin-Tian Qiu, Kang-Jian Hua, and Bin-Guang Ma. Evaluation of chromosome structure modelling tools in bacteria. *bioRxiv*, page 2023.10.26.564237, October 2023.
- Martial Marbouty, Antoine Le Gall, Diego I. Cattoni, Axel Cournac, Alan Koh, Jean Bernard Fiche, Julien Mozziconacci, Heath Murray, Romain Koszul, and Marcelo Nollmann. Condensin- and Replication-Mediated Bacterial Chromosome Folding and Origin Condensation Revealed by Hi-C and Super-resolution Imaging. *Molecular Cell*, 59:588–602, 8 2015. ISSN 1097-2765. doi: 10.1016/j.MOLCEL.2015.07.020.
- Marc A. Marti-Renom, Genevieve Almuzni, Wendy A. Bickmore, Kerstin Bystrycky, Giacomo Cavalli, Peter Fraser, Susan M. Gasser, Luca Giorgetti, Edith Heard, Mario Nicodemi, Marcelo Nollmann, Modesto Orozco, Ana Pombo, and Maria-Elena Torres-Padilla. Challenges and guidelines toward 4D nucleome data and model standards. *Nat. Genet.*, 50:1352–1358, October 2018. ISSN 1546-1718. doi: 10.1038/s41588-018-0236-3.
- Rachel Patton McCord, Noam Kaplan, and Luca Giorgetti. Chromosome Conformation Capture and Beyond: Toward an Integrative View of Chromosome Structure and Function. *Molecular cell*, 77:688–708, 2 2020. ISSN 1097-4164. doi: 10.1016/j.MOLCEL.2019.12.021.
- Joris J.B. Messelink, Muriel C.F. van Teeseling, Jacqueline Janssen, Martin Thanbichler, and Chase P. Brodersz. Learning the distribution of single-cell chromosome conformations in bacteria reveals emergent order across genomic scales. *Nature Communications*, 12:1–9, 3 2021. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-22189-x.
- A. Movilla Miangolarra, Sophia Hsin-Jung Li, Jean-François Joanny, Ned S. Wingreen, and Michele Castellana. Steric interactions and out-of-equilibrium processes control the internal organization of bacteria. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 118(43):e2106014118, October 2021. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2106014118.
- Christiaan A. Miermans and Chase P. Brodersz. Bacterial chromosome organization by collective dynamics of SMC condensins. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 15, 10 2018. ISSN 17425662. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2018.0495.
- Elena Minina and Axel Arnold. Induction of entropic segregation: the first step is the hardest. *Soft Matter*, 10(31):5836–5841, 2014. doi: 10.1039/C4SM00286E.
- Elena Minina and Axel Arnold. Entropic Segregation of Ring Polymers in Cylindrical Confinement. *Macromolecules*, 48(14):4998–5005, July 2015. ISSN 0024-9297. doi: 10.1021/acs.macromol.5b00636.
- Debarshi Mitra, Shreerang Pande, and Apratim Chatterji. Polymer architecture orchestrates the segregation and spatial organization of replicating *E. coli* chromosomes in slow growth. *Soft Matter*, 18(30):5615–5631, 2022a. doi: 10.1039/D2SM000734G.
- Debarshi Mitra, Shreerang Pande, and Apratim Chatterji. Topology-driven spatial organization of ring polymers under confinement. *Phys. Rev. E*, 106(5):054502, November 2022b. ISSN 2470-0053. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.106.054502.
- Heath Murray, Henrique Ferreira, and Jeff Errington. The bacterial chromosome segregation protein Spo0J spreads along DNA from parS nucleation sites. *Mol. Microbiol.*, 61(5):1352–1361, September 2006. ISSN 0950-382X. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2958.2006.05316.x.
- Seán M. Murray and Victor Sourjik. Self-organization and positioning of bacterial protein clusters. *Nat. Phys.*, 13:1006–1013, October 2017. ISSN 1745-2481. doi: 10.1038/nphys4155.
- Jarno Mäkelä and David J. Sherratt. Organization of the *Escherichia coli* Chromosome by a MukBEF Axial Core. *Molecular Cell*, 78:250–260.e5, 4 2020. ISSN 1097-2765. doi: 10.1016/j.MOLCEL.2020.02.003.
- Oluwatosin Oluwadare, Max Highsmith, and Jianlin Cheng. An Overview of Methods for Reconstructing 3-D Chromosome and Genome Structures from Hi-C Data. *Biol. Proced. Online*, 21(1):1–20, December 2019. ISSN 1480-9222. doi: 10.1186/s12575-019-0094-0.
- Manuel Osorio-Valeriano, Florian Altegoer, Chandan K. Das, Wieland Steinchen, Gaël Panis, Lara Connolly, Giacomo Giacomelli, Helge Feddersen, Laura Corrales-Guerrero, Pietro I.

- Giammarinaro, Juri Hanßmann, Marc Bramkamp, Patrick H. Viollier, Seán Murray, Lars V. Schäfer, Bert Bange, and Martin Thanbichler. The CTPase activity of ParB determines the size and dynamics of prokaryotic DNA partition complexes. *Mol. Cell*, 81(19):3992–4007.e10, October 2021. ISSN 1097-2765. doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2021.09.004.
- Mariana G. Pinho, Morten Kjos, and Jan Willem Veening. How to get (a)round: mechanisms controlling growth and division of coccoid bacteria. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2013 11:9, 11:601–614, 8 2013. ISSN 1740-1534. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3088.
- James M. Polson and Deanna R.-M. Kerry. Segregation of polymers under cylindrical confinement: effects of polymer topology and crowding. *Soft Matter*, 14(30):6360–6373, August 2018. ISSN 1744-683X. doi: 10.1039/C8SM01062E.
- James M. Polson and Qinxin Zhu. Free energy and segregation dynamics of two channel-confined polymers of different lengths. *Phys. Rev. E*, 103(1):012501, January 2021. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.103.012501.
- Zhongqing Ren, Qin Liao, Xheni Karaboja, Ian S. Barton, Eli G. Schantz, Adrian Mejia-Santana, Clay Fuqua, and Xindan Wang. Conformation and dynamic interactions of the multipartite genome in *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 119(6):e2115854119, February 2022. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2115854119.
- Germán Rivas and Allen P. Minton. Macromolecular Crowding In Vitro, In Vivo, and In Between. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, 41:970–981, 11 2016. ISSN 13624326. doi: 10.1016/j.tibs.2016.08.013.
- Manuela Roggiani and Mark Goulian. Chromosome-Membrane Interactions in Bacteria. *Annu. Rev. Genet.*, 49(1):115–129, November 2015. ISSN 0066-4197. doi: 10.1146/annurev-genet-112414-054958.
- Daniel Russel, Keren Lasker, Ben Webb, Javier Velázquez-Muriel, Elina Tjioe, Dina Schneidman-Duhovny, Bret Peterson, and Andrej Sali. Putting the Pieces Together: Integrative Modeling Platform Software for Structure Determination of Macromolecular Assemblies. *PLoS Biol.*, 10(1):e1001244, January 2012. ISSN 1545-7885. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1001244.
- Aurora Sanchez, Diego I. Cattoni, Jean-Charles Walter, Jérôme Rech, Andrea Parmeggiani, Marcelo Nollmann, and Jean-Yves Bouet. Stochastic Self-Assembly of ParB Proteins Builds the Bacterial DNA Segregation Apparatus. *Cell Systems*, 1(2):163–173, August 2015. ISSN 2405-4712. doi: 10.1016/j.cels.2015.07.013.
- Dan Song and Joseph J. Loparo. Building bridges within the bacterial chromosome. *Trends in Genetics*, 31:164–173, 3 2015. ISSN 0168-9525. doi: 10.1016/j.TIG.2015.01.003.
- Christoph Spahn, Stuart Middlemiss, Estibaliz Gómez-de Mariscal, Ricardo Henriques, Helge B. Bode, Séamus Holden, and Mike Heilemann. Transertion and cell geometry organize the *Escherichia coli* nucleoid during rapid growth. *bioRxiv*, page 2023.10.16.562172, October 2023.
- Jan A. Stevens, Fabian Grünewald, P. A. Marco van Tilburg, Melanie König, Benjamin R. Gilbert, Troy A. Brier, Zane R. Thornburg, Zaida Luthey-Schulten, and Siewert J. Marrink. Molecular dynamics simulation of an entire cell. *Front. Chem.*, 11:1106495, January 2023. ISSN 2296-2646. doi: 10.3389/fchem.2023.1106495.
- Srikanth Subramanian and Seán M. Murray. Subdiffusive movement of chromosomal loci in bacteria explained by DNA bridging. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 5(2):023034, April 2023. ISSN 2643-1564. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevResearch.5.023034.
- Ivan V. Surovtsev, Manuel Campos, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner. DNA-relay mechanism is sufficient to explain ParA-dependent intracellular transport and patterning of single and multiple cargos. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 113(46):E7268–E7276, November 2016. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1616118113.
- Pinaki Swain, Bela M. Mulder, and Debasish Chaudhuri. Confinement and crowding control the morphology and dynamics of a model bacterial chromosome. *Soft Matter*, 15:2677–2687, 3 2019. ISSN 17446848. doi: 10.1039/C8SM02092B.
- Miloš Tišma, Maria Panoukidou, Hammam Antar, Young-Min Soh, Roman Barth, Biswajit Pradhan, Anders Barth, Jaco van der Torre, Davide Michieletto, Stephan Gruber, and Cees Dekker. ParB proteins can bypass DNA-bound roadblocks via dimer-dimer recruitment. *Sci. Adv.*, 8(26), June 2022. ISSN 2375-2548. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abn3299.
- Miloš Tišma, Richard Janissen, Hammam Antar, Alejandro Martin-Gonzalez, Roman Barth, Twan Beekman, Jaco van der Torre, Davide Michieletto, Stephan Gruber, and Cees Dekker. Dynamic ParB–DNA interactions initiate and maintain a partition condensate for bacterial chromosome segregation. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 51(21):11856–11875, November 2023. ISSN 0305-1048. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkad868.
- Mark A. Umbarger, Esteban Toro, Matthew A. Wright, Gregory J. Porreca, Davide Baù, Sun-Hae Hong, Michael J. Fero, Lihua J. Zhu, Marc A. Marti-Renom, Harley H. McAdams, Lucy Shapiro, Job Dekker, and George M. Church. The Three-Dimensional Architecture of a Bacterial Genome and Its Alteration by Genetic Perturbation. *Mol. Cell*, 44(2):252–264, October 2011. ISSN 1097-2765. doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2011.09.010.
- Patrick H. Viollier, Martin Thanbichler, Patrick T. McGrath, Lisandra West, Maliwan Meewan, Harley H. McAdams, and Lucy Shapiro. Rapid and sequential movement of individual chromosomal loci to specific subcellular locations during bacterial DNA replication. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 101(25):9257–9262, June 2004. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0402606101.
- J.-C. Walter, J. Dorignac, V. Lorman, J. Rech, J.-Y. Bouet, M. Nollmann, J. Palmeri, A. Parmeggiani, and F. Geniet. Surfing on Protein Waves: Proteophoresis as a Mechanism for Bacterial Genome Partitioning. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 119(2):028101, July 2017. ISSN 1079-7114. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.028101.
- Jean-Charles Walter, Thibaut Lepage, Jérôme Dorignac, Frédéric Geniet, Andrea Parmeggiani, John Palmeri, Jean-Yves Bouet, and Ivan Junier. Supercoiled DNA and non-equilibrium formation of protein complexes: A quantitative model of the nucleoprotein ParBs partition complex. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 17(4):e1008869, April 2021. ISSN 1553-7358. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008869.
- Xindan Wang, Paula Montero Llopis, and David Z. Rudner. *Bacillus subtilis* chromosome organization oscillates between two distinct patterns. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 111(35):12877–12882, September 2014. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1407461111.
- Xindan Wang, Tung B.K. Le, Bryan R. Lajoie, Job Dekker, Michael T. Laub, and David Z. Rudner. Condensin promotes the juxtaposition of DNA flanking its loading site in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Genes & Development*, 29:1661–1675, 8 2015. ISSN 0890-9369. doi: 10.1101/GAD.265876.115.
- Xindan Wang, Hugo B. Brandão, Tung B. K. Le, Michael T. Laub, and David Z. Rudner. *Bacillus subtilis* SMC complexes juxtapose chromosome arms as they travel from origin to terminus. *Science*, 355(6324):524–527, February 2017. ISSN 1095-9203. doi: 10.1126/science.1248982.
- Abdul Wasim, Ankit Gupta, and Jagannath Mondal. A Hi-C data-integrated model elucidates *E. coli* chromosome’s multiscale organization at various replication stages. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 49:3077–3091, 4 2021. ISSN 0305-1048. doi: 10.1093/NAR/GKAB094.
- Abdul Wasim, Palash Bera, and Jagannath Mondal. Development of a Data-Driven Integrative Model of a Bacterial Chromosome. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2023, April 2023a. ISSN 1549-9618. doi: 10.1021/acs.jctc.3c00118.
- Abdul Wasim, Palash Bera, and Jagannath Mondal. On the Spatial Positioning of Ribosomes around chromosome in *E. coli* Cytoplasm. *bioRxiv*, page 2023.07.04.547709, July 2023b.
- Abdul Wasim, Ankit Gupta, Palash Bera, and Jagannath Mondal. Interpretation of organizational role of proteins on *E. coli* nucleoid via Hi-C integrated model. *Biophysical Journal*, 122:63–81, 1 2023c. ISSN 1542-0086. doi: 10.1016/j.bpj.2022.11.2938.
- Larissa Wilhelm, Frank Bürmann, Anita Minnen, Ho-Chul Shin, Christopher P. Toseland, Byung-Ha Oh, and Stephan Gruber. SMC condensin entraps chromosomal DNA by an ATP hydrolysis dependent loading mechanism in *Bacillus subtilis*. *eLife*, May 2015. doi: 10.7554/eLife.06659.
- Yingjie Xiang, Ivan V. Surovtsev, Yunjie Chang, Sander K. Govers, Bradley R. Parry, Jun Liu, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner. Interconnecting solvent quality, transcription, and chromosome folding in *Escherichia coli*. *Cell*, 184(14):3626–3642.e14, July 2021. ISSN 0092-8674. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2021.05.037.
- Fares Osam Yáñez-Cuna and Romain Koszul. Insights in bacterial genome folding. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 82:102679., October 2023. ISSN 1879-033X. doi: 10.1016/j.sbi.2023.102679.
- Asli Yildirim and Michael Feig. High-resolution 3D models of *Caulobacter crescentus* chromosome reveal genome structural variability and organization. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 46(8):3937, May 2018. doi: 10.1093/nar/gky141.
- Shi Yu, Jiabin Wu, Xianliang Meng, Ruizhi Chu, Xiao Li, and Guoguang Wu. Mesoscale Simulation of Bacterial Chromosome and Cytoplasmic Nanoparticles in Confinement. *Entropy* 2021, Vol. 23, Page 542, 23:542, 4 2021. ISSN 1099-4300. doi: 10.3390/E23050542.