

Synthetic Biology

Biotechnology and Bioengineering
DOI 10.1002/bit.26521

Engineering Tunable Biosensors for Monitoring Putrescine in *Escherichia coli*[†]

Running title: Tunable putrescine biosensors

Xue-Feng Chen,¹ Xiao-Xia Xia,¹ Sang Yup Lee,² Zhi-Gang Qian¹

¹State Key Laboratory of Microbial Metabolism, Joint International Research Laboratory of Metabolic & Developmental Sciences, School of Life Sciences and Biotechnology, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 800 Dong Chuan Road, Shanghai, 200240, People's Republic of China; telephone: +86-21-34207254; e-mail: zgqian@sjtu.edu.cn

²Metabolic and Biomolecular Engineering National Research Laboratory, Department of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering (BK21 Program), BioProcess Engineering Research Center, Bioinformatics Research Center, and Institute for the BioCentury, KAIST, 291 Daehak-ro, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 34141, Republic of Korea

Correspondence to: Z.G. Qian

[†]This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: [10.1002/bit.26521]

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Received September 13, 2017; Revision Received November 29, 2017; Accepted December 13, 2017

ABSTRACT:

Biosensors can be a powerful tool for real-time monitoring of specific small molecules and for precise control of gene expression in biological systems. Thus, biosensors have attracted much attention for monitoring increasing number of molecules. However, strategies to tune the properties of biosensors remain less explored, which might restrict their wide applicability. Here we report the development of tunable biosensors for monitoring putrescine, an important member of biological polyamines, in *Escherichia coli*. The native putrescine-responsive PuuR repressor protein was employed as a sensing component, and its cognate operator was installed in engineered promoters to control the expression of downstream green fluorescent protein (GFP)mut3 as a reporter protein. The engineered biosensors were specific for putrescine, and the response time could be modulated by altering growth medium of the biosensor strains. In addition, the response dynamics and detection ranges of the biosensors can be tuned at the genetic level by modulation of PuuR expression, and by manipulation of the chromosomal genes involved in putrescine biosynthesis. To demonstrate utility of the biosensors, we were able to monitor the changes of endogenous putrescine levels caused by genetic manipulations. Furthermore, a link between the excretory putrescine titer and intracellular GFP fluorescence was established for an *E. coli* strain that was engineered for improved putrescine biosynthesis and excretion. This study provides a strategy for engineering synthetic biosensor circuit for monitoring and tuning the dynamics in sensing putrescine, which can be generally applicable for monitoring other chemicals through taking a similar approach in circuit design. This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

KEYWORDS: biosensor; putrescine; PuuR; response dynamics; *Escherichia coli*; synthetic biology

Introduction

In nature, living biological systems are evolved with sophisticated capabilities to sense a broad spectrum of small molecules and regulate genetic expression at hierarchical levels (Roth and Breaker, 2009; Stanton et al., 2014). The specific sensing is achieved, in part, through small molecule-responsive transcription factors and their cognate promoters (Stanton et al., 2014). In another scenario, RNA riboswitches known as noncoding *cis*-regulatory elements found in the 5'-untranslated regions of mRNAs, bind intracellular small-molecule metabolites through aptamer domains and convert the metabolic signal into a change in translation of downstream mRNA sequences (Roth and Breaker, 2009). Inspired by nature, scientists have recently begun to explore, recruit, and even repurpose the sensing components for the construction of genetically encoded biosensors for *in situ* monitoring of small molecules (Mahr and Frunzke, 2016; Skjoedt et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2015; Zhou and Zeng, 2015).

Indeed, biosensors are emerging as powerful devices with diverse applications in synthetic biology and metabolic engineering (Liu et al., 2015a; Zhang et al., 2015). For instance, the tetracycline-responsive TetR biosensors have for decades been used for precise control of gene expression in both prokaryotic and eukaryotic systems (Ramos et al., 2005; Smanski et al., 2016). Recently, metabolite biosensors have been developed and used to monitor product formation at the single cell level in real-time (Rogers and Church, 2016) and to identify high-performance enzymes in biosynthetic pathways and superior transporters for sugar uptake (Schendzielorz et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2016). In addition, metabolite biosensors have been demonstrated to enable high-throughput screening of microbial overproducers by programming adaptive control over production phenotypes (Chou and Keasling, 2013), by imbuing a fitness advantage to overproducing cells (Raman et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2013), by exploiting nongenetic cell-to-cell variation (Xiao et al., 2016),

and by dynamic, tunable overexpression of multiple enzymes of the biosynthetic pathways (Dahl et al., 2013; Dietrich et al., 2013; Fang et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2012). These developments highlight the exciting opportunities for the development of genetically encoded biosensors for broader applications.

Transcription factor-based biosensors are a family of sensing devices that have received most wide attention (Skjoedt et al., 2016; Stanton et al., 2014). This seems to be due to the fact that microbial genomes are a rich source of transcription factors that control biosynthesis of numerous products including amino acids, nucleotides, and vitamins (Skjoedt et al., 2016; Stanton et al., 2014). One approach to construct transcription factor-based biosensors is to directly recruit the natural transcriptional repressors or activators for the recognition of specific metabolites (Moser et al., 2013). Alternatively, the natural transcriptional factors can be engineered at the protein level to recognize non-native metabolites. For example, the L-arabinose-responsive transcriptional regulator AraC from *Escherichia coli* has been engineered to specifically respond to the levels of D-arabinose (Tang et al., 2008), triacetic acid lactone (Tang et al., 2013), and mevalonate (Tang and Cirino, 2011). Another strategy to expand the range of biologically detectable molecules is to transform nondetectable molecules *via* multistep biochemical reactions into molecules for which sensors already exist (Libis et al., 2016). Therefore, the range of molecules that can be monitored has been expanding rapidly and now includes certain members of sugars, amino acids (Mustafi et al., 2012; Mahr and Frunzke, 2016), lactams (Zhang et al., 2017), organic acids (Li and Yu, 2015), redox molecules (Zhang et al., 2016), heavy metals (Bereza-Malcolm et al., 2015; Cerminati et al., 2011), organophosphates (Chong and Ching, 2016), and flavonoids (Siedler et al., 2014). However, until now, there is no report on the development of biosensors for monitoring polyamines, which are ubiquitous organic cations of low molecular weight found in a wide range of organisms with important physiological roles (Tabor and Tabor, 1985).

Response dynamics is an important feature of biological sensing systems (Ang et al., 2013). Although a variety of transcription factor-promoter pairs are readily available by genomic mining (Stanton et al., 2014), these sensor devices are naturally adapted to the organisms' physiological purposes and usually limited in response characteristics such as specificity, sensitivity, detection range, and response time (Mahr and Frunzke, 2016). Therefore, the natural transcription factors and their cognate promoters need to be engineered either individually or in combination for tuning the responses of the resulting biosensor systems. Due to the highly modular architecture, the promoters can be rewired by altering the sequence, position, and number of operators, with which the transcription factors bind. For example, the dynamic range of an oleic acid biosensor was twelvefold higher by replacing the native FadR-regulated *fadBA* promoter with a synthetic promoter, which was designed by the introduction of two copies of FadR-binding operator sequence into the strong phage *T7* promoter (Zhang et al., 2012). More recently, impact of mutations to Lac operator site on isopropyl β -D-1-thiogalactopyranoside biosensors was examined, which revealed interdependencies between biosensor dynamic range and response threshold (Mannan et al., 2017). Another strategy to modulate the response of a biosensor is altering the expression levels of transcription factors (Liu et al., 2015a; Wang et al., 2016). This was elegantly demonstrated by adjusting the amount of FapR under the control of an inducible P_{BAD} promoter to modulate the response curves of a malonyl-CoA biosensor (Liu et al., 2015b). Although much work has been done, the strategies to tune the properties of biosensors remain less explored, particularly for monitoring metabolites that are involved in complex metabolic networks, including biosynthesis, degradation, uptake, and export.

Putrescine, also known as 1,4-diaminobutane, is a crucial intermediate in polyamine metabolism with important roles in cell proliferation and normal cell growth (Tabor and Tabor, 1985). Also, it is an important four carbon diamine monomer for the production of

engineering plastics (Jang et al., 2012; Nguyen et al., 2015; Qian et al., 2009). As a first step to monitor diverse polyamines in living organisms, here we report the development of biosensors based on the transcriptional factor PuuR for monitoring putrescine level in *E. coli*. First, synthetic promoters were designed and evaluated based on their ability to respond to PuuR and putrescine. Various strategies were then explored to modulate the responsive properties of the putrescine biosensors. Finally, the biosensors were utilized for monitoring intracellular putrescine levels upon modifications on putrescine biosynthetic capacity, and for monitoring putrescine production.

Materials and Methods

Chemicals and Materials

1,3-Diaminopropane, putrescine, 1,5-diaminopentane dihydrochloride, and 1,6-diaminohexane were purchased from Tokyo Kasei Kogyo Co., Ltd. (Tokyo, Japan). All other chemical reagents were of the highest purity commercially available. PrimeSTAR Max DNA polymerase was obtained from Takara Biotechnology Co., Ltd (Dalian, China). Restriction enzymes and T4 DNA ligase were purchased from New England Biolabs (Ipswich, MA). Mini Plasmid purification Kit, Bacteria DNA Kit, PCR Purification Kit, and gel Purification Kit were purchased from TIANGEN Biotech (Beijing, China).

Plasmids and Strains

Plasmids constructed in this study are listed in Table I. PCR primers used for plasmid construction are listed in Table II. A description of plasmids construction, deletion of chromosomal genes, promoter replacement, and gene integration into the *E. coli* chromosome is provided in Supplementary Methods.

Characterization of PuuR-Responsive Promoters

To characterize the native *puuA* and synthetic promoters, each of the *gfpmut3*-expressing plasmids was transformed into the *puuR* knockout strain and the *speC speB speF* triple mutant. The former strain allowed full “ON” transcription of GFPmut3 due to PuuR absence, while the latter permitted only basal expression due to the presence of PuuR and absence of putrescine. These recombinant strains were inoculated into a 15 mL tube containing 4 mL of LB medium with 50 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ of kanamycin (Km), and grown overnight at 37 °C and 220 rpm in a rotary shaker. The overnight cultures were then diluted 100-fold into 200 μL of fresh LB medium on a 96-well cell culture plate (Flat bottom; Nest Biotech Co., Ltd, Wuxi, China). The plate was incubated and humidified at 37 °C and 400 rpm for 20 h. Cell growth (OD_{600}) and fluorescence (excitation 488 nm, emission 520 nm) were measured with a Spectramax M5 plate reader (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA). All fluorescence measurements were background corrected and normalized by OD_{600} . The dynamic range for each promoter was determined by dividing the fluorescence obtained in the *puuR* knockout strain by the level of fluorescence observed in the triple mutant.

Characterization of Biosensor Strains

Biosensor specificity was studied for *E. coli* MG1655 harboring pTacR2gfp with LB medium at 37 °C on the 96-well cell culture plates as described above. Each of the C3 to C6 diamines tested was first dissolved in fresh LB medium, adjusted to pH 7.0 with concentrated hydrochloric acid or 6 M NaOH, and 0.22- μm membrane sterilized to prepare stock solutions. Briefly, the recombinant strain was first inoculated into a test tube and grown overnight. The overnight culture (0.5 mL) was subsequently transferred into a 250-mL Erlenmeyer flask containing 50 mL of LB medium at 37 °C and 220 rpm. When the cell OD_{600} reached 0.3-0.4, this preculture (100 μL) was mixed in each well of the plates with an equal volume of pre-

warmed LB medium supplemented with one of the diamines from the stock solutions. The cells exposed to each of the diamines at a final concentration of 0.01-50 mM were incubated at 37 °C and 400 rpm for 20 h. OD₆₀₀ and GFP fluorescence were then measured using the Spectramax M5 plate reader as described above.

Response kinetics was studied for *E. coli* MG1655 harboring pTacR2gfp upon exposure to putrescine in three different culture media: LB medium, M9 medium, and a modified M9 medium. The M9 medium contained (in g L⁻¹): Na₂HPO₄·7H₂O, 12.8; KH₂PO₄, 3; NaCl, 0.5; NH₄Cl, 1; MgSO₄, 0.241; CaCl₂, 0.011; and glucose, 4. The modified M9 medium contained the same components as the M9 medium except that NH₄Cl was omitted. Putrescine was first dissolved in each of the above three media, adjusted to pH 7.0, and filter sterilized to make working solutions before being mixed with the bacterial cells. For response kinetic study with LB medium, the cell preculture was prepared in the same manner as in the specificity test described above. For studies with the M9 and modified M9 medium, the recombinant strain was first grown overnight in LB medium, transferred into a 250-mL Erlenmeyer flask containing 50 mL of M9 medium at 37 °C and 220 rpm, and grown to an OD₆₀₀ of 0.3-0.4 as the preculture for test with M9 medium. In another experimental setup, the cells were harvested by centrifugation at 3,214g and 25 °C for 10 min, washed twice with the modified M9 medium, re-suspended with the same volume of fresh medium, and then used as the preculture. The cells exposed to putrescine at a final concentration of 6 mM were grown on the plates for 24 h, with OD₆₀₀ and GFP fluorescence monitored every 2 h using the plate reader.

Dose-response studies were performed for the biosensor strains with genetically modified backgrounds in both LB and the modified M9 medium. Cell precultures and putrescine stock solutions were similarly prepared as described above. The cells exposed to putrescine at final concentrations from 0.001 mM up to 100 mM were incubated on the plates

at 37 °C. Following putrescine exposure, OD₆₀₀ and GFP fluorescence were determined for the cells grown with the modified M9 medium and LB medium at 10 h and 20 h, respectively.

Putrescine Biosynthesis and Overproduction in Flask Cultivation

E. coli MG1655 and its derivatives with genetic manipulations on the putrescine biosynthetic genes were transformed with pTacR2gfp. Each recombinant strain was grown with LB medium in a tube overnight at 37 °C, diluted 1:100 into a flask containing 50 mL of M9 medium, and incubated at 37 °C and 220 rpm to an OD₆₀₀ of 0.8-1.0, with GFP fluorescence monitored by the plate reader. An aliquot of fermentation broth corresponding to $\sim 3 \times 10^9$ cells was centrifuged at 15,557g and 4 °C for 10 min, and the resulting cell pellets were used for quantification of intracellular putrescine levels.

To establish a link between intracellular GFP intensities and extracellular putrescine titers, an *E. coli* MG1655-derived putrescine overproducer, strain ZQ19 was constructed (see Supplementary Method for details). *E. coli* ZQ19 harboring pTacR2gfp was first grown in LB overnight, and then diluted 1:100 into a flask containing 50 mL of R/2 medium supplemented with 10 g L⁻¹ of glucose and 3 g L⁻¹ of (NH₄)₂SO₄ (Qian et al., 2009; Qian et al., 2011). The cells were subsequently incubated at 220 rpm for 12 h, when glucose was completely consumed. Culture broth (200 μL) was taken every 2 h for measurements of GFP fluorescence on the 96-well plates. Upon centrifugation at 13,523g and 4 °C for 10 min, the culture supernatants were collected and stored at -20 °C for analyses of extracellular putrescine concentrations by HPLC. For accurate measurement, the samples were diluted, when necessary, to give putrescine concentration of less than 50 mg L⁻¹. All the experiments were carried out in triplicates.

Quantification of Putrescine Levels by HPLC

The cell pellets for intracellular putrescine quantification were washed once in 50 mM phosphate buffer (pH 7.0) and centrifuged at 13,523g and 4 °C for 10 min. The pellets were resuspended in the above phosphate buffer and lysed with an Ultrasonic Homogenizer (Model JY92-IIDN; Scientz, Ningbo, China). Upon centrifugation, the cell-free lysates were filtered through a 0.22-μm membrane for quantification of putrescine levels. Putrescine concentration was determined by precolumn *o*-phthaldialdehyde derivatization coupled with reverse-phase HPLC and UV detection at 230 nm, which was essentially same as described in our previous study (Qian et al., 2009). Intracellular putrescine level was normalized by biomass dry weight (DW) concentration, which was estimated based on the assumption that one OD₆₀₀ unit equals 0.33 g DW L⁻¹ of *E. coli* cell cultures. The data represent the average of three biological replicates and error bars correspond to the standard deviations.

Data Fitting

Putrescine response curves were fitted to the Hill equation as follows:

$$y = \text{GFP}_{\min} + \frac{(\text{GFP}_{\max} - \text{GFP}_{\min}) \cdot x^n}{k^n + x^n}$$

Here, y denotes the normalized fluorescence value corresponding to the putrescine concentration level at x . k represents the putrescine concentration resulting in half-maximal induction, and n is the Hill coefficient. $\text{GFP}_{\min}$ and $\text{GFP}_{\max}$ represent the smallest baseline and largest fluorescent signals, respectively. These parameters can be estimated by fitting the experimental data by using OriginPro 8 software (OriginLab Corporation, Northhampton, MA) according to the manufacture's instructions. Non-linear least-squares regression was used to minimize error between the fitted and actual data. The lower limit of detection was then estimated, which corresponded to the putrescine concentration resulting in a GFP signal higher than mean $\text{GFP}_{\min}$ by three times of the standard deviation. The upper limit of

detection was also estimated, which represented the putrescine concentration resulting in a GFP signal lower than mean GFP_{max} by three times of the corresponding standard deviation.

To link extracellular putrescine titer and intracellular GFP intensity for the putrescine overproducer in shake flask fermentation, a mathematical model was developed. As the GFP intensity was approaching a final stable level in a nonlinear manner, an asymptotic function was proposed for data fitting as follows:

$$y = a - b \cdot c^x$$

Here, y represents the intracellular GFP intensity at the time point when extracellular putrescine titer was at x . The parameters of the asymptotic function have clear biological relevance. The *asy* (a) is the maximal fluorescence value on continuous secreting putrescine, the *int* ($a-b$) is the fluorescence value at initiation of excretory putrescine production (beginning of flask fermentation). The constant c characterizes the rate of increase in fluorescence intensity, with $-\log_c(2)$ being the excretory titer for half the ultimate increase in fluorescent from *int* to *asy* to occur.

Results

Biosensor Design

As a potential transcription factor for sensing putrescine, PuvR is a negative regulator of the Puv pathway comprising the enzymes encoded by the *puu* genes that metabolize putrescine via γ -glutamylated intermediates to γ -amino butyric acid in *E. coli* K12 (Kurihara et al., 2005; Nemoto et al., 2012). It has been revealed that PuvR has a helix-turn-helix motif that binds to the promoter region of the first gene (*puuA*) of the Puv pathway (Nemoto et al., 2012). As putrescine responsive PuvR and its cognate promoter are naturally existing in *E. coli*, we decided to design and construct tunable PuvR-based biosensors in *E. coli* (Fig. 1). The cognate promoter positioned upstream of the green fluorescent protein reporter gene (*gfpmut3*)

could serve as a PuuR-repressive genetic element to express green fluorescence in a manner that depended on the intracellular concentration of putrescine. By manipulation of the expression level of PuuR, its cognate promoter and the chromosomal genes involved in putrescine biosynthesis, the resulting putrescine biosensors are anticipated to exhibit tunable properties for monitoring external putrescine.

Design and Evaluation of Synthetic Responsive Promoters

For use as an initial biosensor, plasmid ppuuAgfp expressing the *gfpmut3* gene under control of the native *puuA* promoter of *E. coli* (Fig. 2A) was constructed. The promoter activity was evaluated under two genetic backgrounds, both of which were derived from wild-type *E. coli* K12 MG1655. One was defective in the chromosomal *puuR* gene to mimic fully derepressed state for the *puuA* promoter, whereas the other harbored intact *puuR* but deficient in all the known genes responsible for putrescine biosynthesis, which would reveal basal activity of the *puuA* promoter under repressed state (Fig. 2B); the *puuR* single knockout strain XF07C and the *speC speB speF* triple knockout strain XF56 were thus constructed. Strains XF07C and XF56 harboring plasmid ppuuAgfp were then grown in standard LB medium at 37 °C and cell culture fluorescence (normalized by cell density) was measured. GFP fluorescence outputs of the *puuA* promoter from both XF07C and XF56 were ~50% higher than the respective autofluorescence levels without GFP expression (Fig. 2C), indicating only marginal activity of the *puuA* promoter in both the putrescine deficient and the PuuR defective backgrounds. On the other hand, the dynamic range of this promoter, represented as the ratio of fluorescence at the derepressed state to the repressed state, was rather low (1.24). For proper evaluation of the dynamic range, a moderate, constitutive *lacIQ* promoter was also included in the assay. Even though the *lacIQ* promoter was not supposed to respond to PuuR, this promoter showed a 1.22-fold change in fluorescence output. Therefore, the native *puuA*

promoter was undesirable and the creation of PuuR-regulated synthetic promoters with better sensitivity was necessary.

Next, we designed a series of synthetic promoters by inserting PuuR operator sequence into strong promoters, such as the *tac*, phage lambda, and phage *T7* promoters (Lutz and Bujard, 1997). Earlier, the PuuR operator (PuuO) with a length of 20 bp has been identified from the *puuA* promoter region of *E. coli* (Nemoto et al., 2012). In order to examine the effects of varying the copy number and position of PuuO, synthetic promoters were made with either a single PuuO downstream of transcriptional start site or with an additional one between the -35 and the -10 region of the phage *T7*, phage lambda and *tac* promoters; the *AR2*, *LR2* and *TacR2* promoters, each with dual PuuO sequences, and the single PuuO-harboring *AR3*, *LR3* and *TacR3* promoters were thus constructed (Fig. 2A). The engineered promoters were then placed upstream of the *gfpmut3* reporter gene and evaluated in *E. coli* XF07C and XF56. GFP fluorescence levels from the synthetic promoters with a single PuuO were approximately 30–100-fold higher than the promoters with double PuuO in both strains XF07C and XF56 (Fig. 2C). This result indicates that the additional PuuO placed between the -35 and the -10 region of synthetic promoters can serve as an efficient transcription roadblock. Notably, the *TacR2* promoter was found to exhibit the highest dynamic range of 3.69 (see Materials and Methods for dynamic range), whereas the remaining five synthetic promoters showed a dynamic range of 1.21-1.71. Based on these results, plasmid pTacR2gfp harboring the *TacR2* promoter upstream of the *gfpmut3* reporter was selected for its use in biosensor construction described below.

Putrescine Biosensors Are Highly Specific

We next studied specificities of the PuuR-based putrescine biosensors. This was performed with a typical sensing strain *E. coli* MG1655 harboring the chromosome-encoded PuuR and

the biosensor plasmid pTacR2gfp. Three biologically relevant diamines, 1,3-diaminopropane, putrescine (1,4-diaminobutane) and cadaverine (1,5-diaminopentane) and a non-natural diamine 1,6-diaminohexane were included in the specificity test. To this end, exponentially growing cells of *E. coli* MG1655 (pTacR2gfp) were treated with each of the above linear chain C3 to C6 diamines at a final concentration from 0 to 50 mM. As shown in Figure 3, GFP fluorescence of the biosensor strain responded to putrescine in a dose-dependent manner. The fluorescence displayed at background level without putrescine treatment (data not shown), started to increase with 0.1 mM putrescine, and reached a 6.8-fold higher level upon exposure to 50 mM putrescine. However, none of the other three diamines triggered any significant increase in the fluorescence signal over the entire concentration range tested (0.01-50 mM). These results demonstrated that the whole-cell biosensor was specific for putrescine over 1,3-diaminopropane, cadaverine and 1,6-diaminohexane.

Modulation of Response Time by Altering Culture Medium

We then explored whether the response time of putrescine whole-cell biosensor could be modulated. It was hypothesized that cell culture conditions, particularly nutrients in medium, might affect uptake of exogenous input molecule and thus response time by the whole-cell biosensor. To test this hypothesis, the putrescine biosensor, *E. coli* MG1655 (pTacR2gfp) was exposed to 6 mM putrescine in the rich LB medium, glucose minimal M9 medium, and a modified M9 medium without NH₄Cl (Fig. 4). During the first 6 h upon putrescine exposure in the LB medium, GFP fluorescence of the biosensor cells was indistinguishable from that of the control cells without putrescine treatment. After 6 h, the fluorescence levels of the putrescine-treated cells were significantly higher than the untreated cells, which indicated the biosensor response in the LB medium. On the other hand, the putrescine-treated cells in M9 medium exhibited fluorescence at levels comparable with those of the untreated cells during

the long time examined (24 h), implying that the biosensor was not responsive to putrescine in the minimal medium. Interestingly, the responsiveness was restored when the biosensor was exposed to putrescine in the modified M9 medium, and the response time in this scenario was shortened to approximately 2 h. Clearly, the existence or absence of ammonium in the glucose minimal medium dictated the responsive behavior of the putrescine biosensor cells. This might be due to that ammonium was a more favorable nitrogen source in minimal medium and its presence compromised uptake of the exogenously applied putrescine (see discussion below). Taken together, the results proved that it was possible to modulate biosensor response time by altering the culture medium.

Modulation of Response Dynamics by Altering PuuR Level

As the expression level of PuuR would influence expression of the *gfpmut3* reporter, we next explored the effects of altering PuuR level on biosensing performance. Here, an alternative biosensor plasmid pS6 was constructed by inserting a *lacIQ* promoter-*puuR* expression cassette into the backbone of plasmid pTacR2gfp. Two additional biosensor strains were constructed by transforming plasmid pS6 into *E. coli* MG1655 and its *puuR* mutant (XF07C), and then exposed to putrescine in the LB medium or the modified M9 medium (Fig. 5).

In both media, the two pS6-harboring strains exhibited lower basal expression of GFP, as compared with the former strain MG1655 (pTacR2gfp) with chromosomal *puuR* only. This result was expected because *puuR* expression from plasmid pS6 would give higher level of PuuR compared with its chromosomal expression only, and thus resulted in tighter repression on the *TacR2* promoter. In addition, the GFP expression levels upon induction with 100 mM putrescine in the LB medium were decreased by approximately 60% for the two pS6-harboring strains (Fig. 5A). It was an extreme case that in the modified M9 medium, the expression of GFP was completely repressed in the pS6-harboring strains under the wide

range of putrescine concentrations tested (Fig. 5B). This unexpected phenomenon might be due to the retarded uptake of putrescine by the pS6-harboring strains because expression of the chromosomal *puuP* gene, which encodes the major putrescine transporter PuuP (Kurihara et al., 2005), was also repressed by PuuR. To explore the possibility, we monitored relative cell growth of the biosensor strains before and after putrescine exposure to the modified M9 medium, since uptake of extracellular putrescine was the only possible means to acquire nitrogen source for supporting cell growth. Indeed, almost no growth was observed for the strains harboring pS6, whereas the other strains showed appreciable cell growth under the experimental conditions (Supplementary Fig. 2). Collectively, the results demonstrated that an alteration in PuuR expression modulated the response dynamics of the biosensor strains.

Modulation of Response Dynamics by Altering Putrescine Biosynthetic Capability

Since *E. coli* was able to biosynthesize putrescine, the endogenous levels of putrescine were postulated to affect response dynamics of the biosensor strains to external putrescine. In fact, wildtype *E. coli* MG1655 possessed two pathways for putrescine biosynthesis: one pathway generates putrescine through direct decarboxylation of ornithine catalyzed by either *speC* or *speF* gene product, whereas the other pathway involves arginine decarboxylation and agmatine hydrolysis by agmatinase (*speB*) to yield putrescine (Fig. 1). As one can envision, chromosomal disruption of one or more putrescine biosynthetic genes would decrease the endogenous levels of putrescine in the engineered strains. Indeed, the endogenous level of putrescine was decreased by ~50% in the *speC* gene knockout strain (XF20C) and almost completely abolished in the *speC speB speF* triple knockout strain (XF56) when these strains were grown in glucose M9 medium (Supplementary Fig. 1).

To explore response dynamics of the biosensors with attenuated putrescine biosynthetic capacity, we constructed another two biosensor strains by transforming plasmid pTacR2gfp

into *E. coli* XF20C and XF56, respectively. These two strains, together with the prototype biosensor MG1655 (pTacR2gfp) as a control, were then exposed to 0-50 mM of putrescine in the modified M9 medium (Fig. 6). It was observed that the response properties, including minimal and maximal expression levels, induction ratio and dose response curve changed dramatically. Notably, *E. coli* XF20C (pTacR2gfp) and XF56 (pTacR2gfp) responded more sensitively to exogenous putrescine, compared with the prototype biosensor. For example, the former two strains allowed a detection range of 0.04-0.65 mM and 0.03-0.72 mM, respectively, whereas the prototype biosensor gave a detection range of 0.11-7.18 mM (Supplementary Table I). On the other hand, the dynamic range of *E. coli* XF20C (pTacR2gfp) and XF56 (pTacR2gfp) was decreased by approximately 22-25%. The above results clearly demonstrated that response dynamics of the putrescine biosensors could be modulated by altering putrescine biosynthetic capability of the chassis cells for biosensing. Nonetheless, the detailed mechanisms for the changes in biosensing properties remain unclear, which might be due to the fact that putrescine metabolism in *E. coli* was complicated by biosynthesis, degradation, utilization and uptake of extracellular putrescine.

***In vivo* Application of Putrescine Biosensors**

Having demonstrated that response dynamics of the putrescine biosensors could be modulated by tuning biosensing components, we next explored utility of the engineered biosensors *in vivo*. First, we tested if the biosensors can report changes in intracellular putrescine levels caused by genetic modifications. To this end, the sensing plasmid pTacR2gfp was transformed into a series of *E. coli* strains with either attenuated or elevated putrescine biosynthetic capacity. Here, two putrescine overproduction strains ZQ19 and ZQ26 were included in the tests. Strain ZQ26 was also derived from *E. coli* MG1655 and constructed (see Supplementary Method for details) with chromosomally integrated

expression cassette for an ornithine decarboxylase variant under the strong P_{N25} promoter (Kammerer et al., 1986). These recombinant strains were cultivated with glucose M9 medium to exponential growth phase with cell OD₆₀₀ at ~0.8-1.0. The bacterial cells were harvested and the endogenous levels of putrescine were quantified by HPLC. As expected, overexpression of the putrescine biosynthetic genes in strains ZQ26 and ZQ19 resulted in two- to threefold higher levels of intracellular putrescine, whereas the genetic backgrounds with deletion in one or more of the putrescine biosynthetic genes possessed decreased levels of endogenous putrescine (Fig. 7). More interestingly, we observed a strong linear correlation ($R^2=0.9471$) between GFP output and endogenous putrescine levels that spanned a wide range of 0.048 to 18.049 mg g DW⁻¹. Hence, the above result demonstrated applicability of the putrescine biosensor for reporting putrescine biosynthetic capacity in *E. coli*.

Furthermore, we explored whether the putrescine biosensor could be utilized for reporting production titers in fermentation of putrescine overproduction strain. As a typical example, the putrescine overproducer *E. coli* ZQ19 (pTacR2gfp) was grown in baffled shake flask with minimal R/2 medium supplemented with 3 g L⁻¹ of (NH₄)₂SO₄ and 10 g L⁻¹ of glucose, which was developed as a production medium for C3 to C5 diamines in our previous studies (Chae et al., 2015; Park et al., 2012; Qian et al., 2009; Qian et al., 2011). As shown in Figure 8A, the extracellular titers of the strain increased slightly in the first 6 h of cultivation and then sharply from 50 to 608.6 mg L⁻¹ in the following 6 h of fermentation. It was very interesting that the cell fluorescence exhibited the same trend in changes as the excretory putrescine titer during the whole fermentation process. The results strongly suggested that there might be a link between cell fluorescence and excretory putrescine titer. Indeed, a correlation study identified an asymptotic model that well recapitulated the quantitative relationship between cell fluorescence intensity and excretory putrescine titer (Fig. 8B). In addition, the asymptotic model was biotechnologically relevant with regard to the

fermentation process. At the very beginning of fermentation, the extracellular putrescine level was negligible, whereas a basal level of endogenous putrescine was observed for the *E. coli* cells that had been grown overnight in LB medium. As the cells grew in the production medium, *de novo* putrescine biosynthesis resulted in elevated levels of endogenous putrescine leading to a gradual increase in cell fluorescence, and the cell secreted putrescine into the extracellular medium to maintain putrescine homeostasis. At the later stage of fermentation, the endogenous putrescine was approaching an upper asymptote (saturation level) resulting in toxicity to the bacterial cells, whereas the putrescine titer increased gradually as long as there was sufficient glucose and ammonium in the culture medium that fueled putrescine biosynthesis and export. Overall, the results indicated that the putrescine biosensor was able to report putrescine production titers in shake flask fermentation.

Discussion

In this study, we report design, construction, and tuning of transcription factor-based biosensors for monitoring both exogenous and endogenous putrescine in *E. coli*. For initial biosensor design and construction, we sought to recruit the putrescine-responsive transcription factor PuuR and its naturally occurring cognate promoter. The *puuA* promoter appeared to be an attractive candidate for biosensor construction as the transcriptional level of *puuA* was induced approximately 13-fold in M9-tryptone medium supplemented with 0.2% putrescine (Kurihara et al., 2008). Unfortunately, the native *puuA* promoter was relatively weak in strength and insensitive to the absence of PuuR in our assay (Fig. 2), which prevented its use as a reporting element and required the design of synthetic PuuR-responsive promoters. With the knowledge of PuuR-binding operator sequence in hand, which was a priori for any synthetic promoter design, we made a series of synthetic promoters by inserting one or more of the operator sequences into strong promoters in order to achieve desirable

PuuR responsiveness and promoter activity. Notably, the spacer length between the -35 and -10 sequences of a prokaryotic promoter is one of important factors that affect the promoter strength. According to Aoyama et al. (1983), 17 bp-spacing appeared to be optimal for promoter activity in *E. coli* and was more frequently found in naturally occurring promoters than the spacing from 15 to 21 bp. Indeed, a rather low activity was observed for the native *puuA* promoter with a spacer length of 15 bp and a 20-bp PuuR binding sequence. Positioning of the 20 bp operator between the -35 and -10 regions of the two phage promoters did not result in active synthetic promoters, whereas such insertion in the *tac* promoter yielded the *TacR2* promoter with desirable activity and responsiveness (Fig. 2). This result implied that in addition to spacer length, other promoter features might also play a role in determining promoter strength.

Response time is an important property of whole-cell biosensors for monitoring signals of interest (Liu et al., 2015a). Our results demonstrated that it was possible to modulate response time of the putrescine whole-cell biosensors by altering culture medium. It was surprising that the response time upon putrescine exposure was shortened from 6 h in rich medium to 2 h in modified glucose M9 medium, whereas the presence of ammonium in the original M9 medium abolished the responsiveness (Fig. 4). According to Reitzer (2003), *E. coli* can assimilate both inorganic (ammonia) and organic nitrogen sources (e.g., amino acids or putrescine), and ammonia supports the fastest growth rate and is therefore considered the preferred nitrogen source. From a metabolic point of view, ammonia is directly assimilated in reactions catalyzed by glutamate dehydrogenase or glutamine synthetase. However, when putrescine is utilized as a sole nitrogen source in glucose minimal medium, putrescine is first transported inside cells of *E. coli* via importer PuuP and then catabolized to release the direct nitrogen source, ammonia (Kurihara et al., 2008). Therefore, it was reasonable that ammonia was preferentially assimilated in the medium containing both ammonia and putrescine, and

the existence of abundant ammonia might compromise import of putrescine into the bacterial cells for triggering responses. One can envision that the uptake of extracellular target chemical by a whole-cell biosensor is the first step for triggering output events and could be a critical factor in determining response time of the biosensor. Therefore, whether nutrients in the culture medium affect import of the chemical to be monitored should be taken into consideration in biosensing studies, even though this issue has often been ignored in previous studies.

We also explored tuning of the putrescine biosensors and found that many properties of the repressor-based biosensors can be modulated by different strategies. In addition to the strategy of designing synthetic P_uuR-responsive promoter, we also tested the effects of varying P_uuR expression and altering endogenous putrescine biosynthetic capacity by chromosomal modifications. The strategy of expression level control on P_uuR was able to modulate background output and biosensor dynamic range, which coincided with previous studies in tuning other transcriptional repressor-based biosensors (Liu et al., 2015b; Merulla et al., 2016). More importantly, we demonstrated a previously unknown strategy of modulating endogenous biosynthetic capacity for modulating biosensor dynamics (Fig. 6). It was notable that a reduction in endogenous putrescine biosynthetic capacity could improve sensitivity of the biosensor to external putrescine. This effect was possibly due to autonomous overexpression of the chromosomal *puuP* gene encoding the main putrescine importer in minimal medium, which facilitated uptake of extracellular putrescine even at very low concentrations and resulted in higher biosensor sensitivity. Therefore, the endogenous biosynthetic capacity of chassis cells should be taken into consideration for constructing and tuning other whole-cell biosensors. To further optimize biosensor performance, other strategies may also be considered including mutagenesis of the synthetic P_uuR-responsive promoter to tune promoter strength and P_uuR affinity or the modification of P_uuR effector

binding domain to modulate its affinity with putrescine. Since the identification of design constraints in transcription-factor-based biosensors (Mannan et al., 2017), the above strategies may be examined in combination to achieve orthogonal control and optimization of diverse biosensor parameters.

Finally, we have demonstrated the capacity of the biosensor to report different levels of endogenous putrescine in *E. coli* variants as well as excretory production titers of putrescine from an overproducing strain. The PuuR-based biosensor system can potentially enable fast bioprocess optimization by online reporting putrescine titers and high-throughput screening of *E. coli* mutants with improved biosynthetic capacity through random genome engineering. At last, the overall strategies described here for tuning biosensors should be useful for future design and engineering of repressor-based biosensors for monitoring other highly regulated cell metabolites in prokaryotes.

Acknowledgments

We thank D.E. Cameron for providing us with plasmids pZA2pBAD-gfp and pECA102. The program for professor of special appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of Higher Learning is appreciated. SYL acknowledges the support from KAIST-Hanwha Chemical Future Technology Institute. The authors have filed a patent related to this work.

Contract grant sponsor: National Natural Science Foundation of China

Contract grant number: 21406138

Contract grant sponsor: The National Key Research and Development Program of China

Contract grant number: 2016YFE0204400

References

- Ang J, Harris E, Hussey BJ, Kil R, McMillen DR. 2013. Tuning response curves for synthetic biology. *ACS Synth Biol* 2(10):547–567.
- Aoyama T, Takanami M, Ohtsuka E, Taniyama Y, Marumoto R, Sato H, Ikehara M. 1983. Essential structure of *E. coli* promoter: effect of spacer length between the two consensus sequences on promoter function. *Nucleic Acids Res* 11(17):5855–5864.
- Bereza-Malcolm LT, Mann G, Franks AE. 2015. Environmental sensing of heavy metals through whole cell microbial biosensors: a synthetic biology approach. *ACS Synth Biol* 4(5):535–546.
- Cerminati S, Soncini FC, Checa SK. 2011. Selective detection of gold using genetically engineered bacterial reporters. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 108(11):2553–2560.
- Chae TU, Kim WJ, Choi S, Park SJ, Lee SY. 2015. Metabolic engineering of *Escherichia coli* for the production of 1,3-diaminopropane, a three carbon diamine. *Sci Rep* 5:13040.
- Chong H, Ching CB. 2016. Development of colorimetric-based whole-cell biosensor for organophosphorus compounds by engineering transcription regulator DmpR. *ACS Synth Biol* 5(11):1290–1298.
- Chou HH, Keasling JD. 2013. Programming adaptive control to evolve increased metabolite production. *Nat Commun* 4:2595.
- Dahl RH, Zhang F, Alonso-Gutierrez J, Baidoo E, Batth TS, Redding-Johanson AM, Petzold CJ, Mukhopadhyay A, Lee TS, Adams PD, Keasling JD. 2013. Engineering dynamic pathway regulation using stress-response promoters. *Nat Biotechnol* 31(11):1039–1046.
- Dietrich JA, Shis DL, Alikhani A, Keasling JD. 2013. Transcription factor-based screens and synthetic selections for microbial small-molecule biosynthesis. *ACS Synth Biol* 2(1):47–58.

- Fang M, Wang T, Zhang C, Bai J, Zheng X, Zhao X, Lou C, Xing XH. 2016. Intermediate-sensor assisted push-pull strategy and its application in heterologous deoxyviolacein production in *Escherichia coli*. *Metab Eng* 33:41–51.
- Jang YS, Kim B, Shin JH, Choi YJ, Choi S, Song CW, Lee J, Park HG, Lee SY. 2012. Bio-based production of C2-C6 platform chemicals. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 109(10):2437–2459.
- Kammerer W, Deuschle U, Gentz R, Bujard H. 1986. Functional dissection of *Escherichia coli* promoters: information in the transcribed region is involved in late steps of the overall process. *EMBO J* 5(11):2995–3000.
- Kurihara S, Oda S, Kato K, Kim HG, Koyanagi T, Kumagai H, Suzuki H. 2005. A novel putrescine utilization pathway involves gamma-glutamylated intermediates of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Biol Chem* 280(6):4602–4608.
- Kurihara S, Oda S, Tsuboi Y, Kim HG, Oshida M, Kumagai H, Suzuki H. 2008. γ -Glutamylputrescine synthetase in the putrescine utilization pathway of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Biol Chem* 283(29):19981–19990.
- Li YF, Yu Z. 2015. Construction and evaluation of a genetic construct for specific detection and measurement of propionate by whole-cell bacteria. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 112(2):280–287.
- Libis V, Delépine B, Faulon JL. 2016. Expanding biosensing abilities through computer-aided design of metabolic pathways. *ACS Synth Biol* 5(10):1076–1085.
- Liu D, Evans T, Zhang F. 2015a. Applications and advances of metabolite biosensors for metabolic engineering. *Metab Eng* 31:35–43.
- Liu D, Xiao Y, Evans BS, Zhang F. 2015b. Negative feedback regulation of fatty acid production based on a malonyl-CoA sensor-actuator. *ACS Synth Biol* 4(2):132–140.

- Lutz R, Bujard H. 1997. Independent and tight regulation of transcriptional units in *Escherichia coli* via the LacR/O, the TetR/O and AraC/I1-I2 regulatory elements. *Nucleic Acids Res* 25(6):1203–1210.
- Mahr R, Frunzke J. 2016. Transcription factor-based biosensors in biotechnology: current state and future prospects. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 100(1):79–90.
- Mannan AA, Liu D, Zhang F, Oyarzún DA. 2017. Fundamental design principles for transcription-factor-based metabolite biosensors. *ACS Synth Biol* 6(10):1851–1859.
- Merulla D, van der Meer JR. 2016. Regulatable and modulable background expression control in prokaryotic synthetic circuits by auxiliary repressor binding sites. *ACS Synth Biol* 5(1):36–45.
- Moser F, Horwitz A, Chen J, Lim W, Voigt CA. 2013. Genetic sensor for strong methylating compounds. *ACS Synth Biol* 2(10):614–624.
- Mustafi N, Grünberger A, Kohlheyer D, Bott M, Frunzke J. 2012. The development and application of a single-cell biosensor for the detection of L-methionine and branched-chain amino acids. *Metab Eng* 14(4):449–457.
- Nemoto N, Kurihara S, Kitahara Y, Asada K, Kato K, Suzuki H. 2012. Mechanism for regulation of the putrescine utilization pathway by the transcription factor PuuR in *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Bacteriol*, 194(13):3437–3447.
- Nguyen AQ, Schneider J, Reddy GK, Wendisch VF. 2015. Fermentative production of the diamine putrescine: system metabolic engineering of *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. *Metabolites* 5(2):211–231.
- Park JM, Park HM, Kim WJ, Kim HU, Kim TY, Lee SY. 2012. Flux variability scanning based on enforced objective flux for identifying gene amplification targets. *BMC Syst Biol* 6:106.

- Qian ZG, Xia XX, Lee SY. 2009. Metabolic engineering of *Escherichia coli* for the production of putrescine: a four carbon diamine. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 104(4):651–662.
- Qian ZG, Xia XX, Lee SY. 2011. Metabolic engineering of *Escherichia coli* for the production of cadaverine: a five carbon diamine. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 108(1):93–103.
- Raman S, Rogers JK, Taylor ND, Church GM. 2014. Evolution-guided optimization of biosynthetic pathways. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 111(50):17803–17808.
- Ramos JL, Martínez-Bueno M, Molina-Henares AJ, Terán W, Watanabe K, Zhang X, Gallegos MT, Brennan R, Tobes R. 2005. The TetR family of transcriptional repressors. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 69(2):326–356.
- Reitzer L. 2003. Nitrogen assimilation and global regulation in *Escherichia coli*. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 57:155–176.
- Rogers JK, Church GM. 2016. Genetically encoded sensors enable real-time observation of metabolite production. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 113(9):2388–2393.
- Roth A, Breaker RR. 2009. The structural and functional diversity of metabolite-binding riboswitches. *Annu Rev Biochem* 78:305–334.
- Schendzielorz G, Dippong M, Grünberger A, Kohlheyer D, Yoshida A, Binder S, Nishiyama C, Nishiyama M, Bott M, Eggeling L. 2014. Taking control over control: use of product sensing in single cells to remove flux control at key enzymes in biosynthesis pathways. *ACS Synth Biol* 3(1):21–29.
- Siedler S, Stahlhut SG, Malla S, Maury J, Neves AR. 2014. Novel biosensors based on flavonoid-responsive transcriptional regulators introduced into *Escherichia coli*. *Metab Eng* 21:2–8.
- Skjoedt ML, Snoek T, Kildegaard KR, Arsovska D, Eichenberger M, Goedecke TJ, Rajkumar AS, Zhang J, Kristensen M, Lehka BJ, Siedler S, Borodina I, Jensen MK,

- Keasling JD. 2016. Engineering prokaryotic transcriptional activators as metabolite biosensors in yeast. *Nat Chem Biol* 12(11):951–958.
- Smanski MJ, Zhou H, Claesen J, Shen B, Fischbach MA, Voigt CA. 2016. Synthetic biology to access and expand nature's chemical diversity. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 14(3):135–149.
- Stanton BC, Nielsen AA, Tamsir A, Clancy K, Peterson T, Voigt CA. 2014. Genomic mining of prokaryotic repressors for orthogonal logic gates. *Nat Chem Biol* 10(2):99–105.
- Tabor CW, Tabor H. 1985. Polyamines in microorganisms. *Microbiol Rev* 49(1):81–99.
- Tang SY, Cirino PC. 2011. Design and application of a mevalonate-responsive regulatory protein. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl* 50(5):1084–1086.
- Tang SY, Fazelinia H, Cirino PC. 2008. AraC regulatory protein mutants with altered effector specificity. *J Am Chem Soc* 130(15):5267–5271.
- Tang SY, Qian S, Akinterinwa O, Frei CS, Gredell JA, Cirino PC. 2013. Screening for enhanced triacetic acid lactone production by recombinant *Escherichia coli* expressing a designed triacetic acid lactone reporter. *J Am Chem Soc* 135(27):10099–10103.
- Wang M, Li S, Zhao H. 2016. Design and engineering of intracellular-metabolite-sensing/regulation gene circuits in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 113(1):206–215.
- Xiao Y, Bowen CH, Liu D, Zhang F. 2016. Exploiting nongenetic cell-to-cell variation for enhanced biosynthesis. *Nat Chem Biol* 12(5):339–344.
- Xu P, Li L, Zhang F, Stephanopoulos G, Koffas M. 2014. Improving fatty acids production by engineering dynamic pathway regulation and metabolic control. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 111(31):11299–11304.
- Yang J, Seo SW, Jang S, Shin SI, Lim CH, Roh TY, Jung GY. 2013. Synthetic RNA devices to expedite the evolution of metabolite-producing microbes. *Nat Commun* 4:1413.

- Accepted Preprint
- Zhang F, Carothers JM, Keasling JD. 2012. Design of a dynamic sensor-regulator system for production of chemicals and fuels derived from fatty acids. *Nat Biotechnol* 30(4):354–359.
- Zhang J, Barajas JF, Burdu M, Ruegg TL, Dias B, Keasling JD. 2017. Development of a transcription factor-based lactam biosensor. *ACS Synth Biol* 6(3):439–445.
- Zhang J, Jensen MK, Keasling JD. 2015. Development of biosensors and their application in metabolic engineering. *Curr Opin Chem Biol* 28:1–8.
- Zhang J, Sonnenschein N, Pihl TP, Pedersen KR, Jensen MK, Keasling JD. 2016. Engineering an NADPH/NADP⁺ redox biosensor in yeast. *ACS Synth Biol* 5(12):1546–1556.
- Zhou LB, Zeng AP. 2015. Exploring lysine riboswitch for metabolic flux control and improvement of L-lysine synthesis in *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. *ACS Synth Biol* 4(6):729–734.

List of Table captions

Table I. *Escherichia coli* strains and plasmids used in this study.

Table II. PCR primers used in this study.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the development of tunable putrescine biosensors in *E. coli*. *puuR* is expressed at diverse levels, from either chromosome or plasmid-based overexpression. PuuR represses *gfpmut3* transcription from a synthetic PuuR-responsive promoter of suitable strength, and the repression is relieved upon binding of PuuR with putrescine, thus generating GFP signal in a putrescine dose-dependent manner. The metabolic pathways involved in putrescine biosynthesis, uptake and catabolism were also shown. Enzymes encoded by the genes are: *adiA/speA*, degradative/biosynthetic arginine decarboxylase; *puuA*, glutamate-putrescine ligase; *puuB*, γ -glutamylputrescine oxidase; *puuC*, γ -glutamyl- γ -aminobutyraldehyde dehydrogenase; *puuD*, γ -glutamyl- γ -aminobutyrate hydrolase; *puuP*, putrescine importer; *puuR*, transcription factor of Puu pathway; *speB*, agmatinase; *speC/speF*, biosynthetic/degradative ornithine decarboxylase; *ycdW*, γ -aminobutyraldehyde dehydrogenase; *ygjG*, putrescine aminotransferase. Abbreviations: GABA, γ -aminobutyrate; TCA cycle, tricarboxylic acid cycle.

Figure 2. Design and evaluation of synthetic PuuR-responsive promoters. (A) DNA sequence of synthetic promoters compared with the native *puuA* promoter (*puuAp*). The sequences in italics represent the -10 and -35 regions. The PuuR recognition site is in grey and transcriptional start site underlined. The dynamic range of each promoter was also shown. (B) In the absence of intracellular and environmental putrescine, PuuR binds to the operator sequence (*puuO*) and represses *gfpmut3* transcription. When PuuR is absent, *gfp* transcription is fully “ON”, regardless the presence of putrescine. (C) The strength of each promoter at the repressed and fully “ON” states. Plasmid harboring each *gfpmut3*-reporting promoter was transformed into *E. coli* MG1655 with deficiency either in putrescine biosynthesis (open column) or in PuuR (filled column). Cells were grown in LB medium at 37 °C and fluorescence measured at 20 h. The dynamic range of each promoter was determined by

dividing the fluorescence observed in the *puuR* knockout strain (XF07C) by that in strain XF56 with disruption in the *speC*, *speF* and *speB* genes responsible for putrescine biosynthesis. The cells without *gfpmut3* were included as negative controls, whereas the cells expressing *gfpmut3* from constitutive *lacIQ* promoter (*piq*) were shown as positive controls.

Figure 3. Test of biosensor specificity. A typical biosensor strain *E. coli* MG1655 harboring plasmid pTacR2gfp was grown at 37 °C in LB medium with exogenous addition of 1,3-diaminopropane (filled circle), putrescine (filled square), 1,5-diaminopentane (filled triangle) or 1,6-diaminohexane (open diamond). Cell fluorescence was measured at 20 h upon diamine treatment. The cells without harboring pTacR2gfp were exposed to putrescine and included as negative control (open square). The best-fit curve of data to a Hill function was also shown.

Figure 4. Modulation of response kinetics for the putrescine biosensor. *E. coli* MG1655 harboring pTacR2gfp was exposed to 6 mM putrescine in LB medium (filled square), M9 medium (filled circle) or modified M9 medium with removal of ammonium chloride (filled triangle). Putrescine was added at time zero and fluorescence was monitored for the cells grown at 37 °C for 24 h. The cells grown with the same media without putrescine treatment were included as controls (open symbols).

Figure 5. Tuning detection range by varying PuuR levels in biosensors. The biosensor strains, with chromosome- or plasmid-based expression of PuuR, were exposed to various concentrations of putrescine in LB medium (**A**) and the modified M9 medium (**B**). Cell fluorescence was measured upon incubation at 37 °C for 20 h in the LB medium and for 10 h in the modified M9 medium. The biosensor strains tested were *E. coli* MG1655 harboring

pTacR2gfp (filled square), MG1655 harboring pS6 with plasmid-based PuuR coexpression (filled triangle), and XF07C harboring pS6 (open square). The PuuR deficient strain, *E. coli* XF07C harboring pTacR2gfp (open diamond) was included as positive control, whereas MG1655 without any plasmid was included as negative control (filled circle). The best-fit curves of data to a Hill function were also shown.

Figure 6. Tuning detection range by modulating putrescine biosynthetic capability. The biosensor strains, with and without disruption in the chromosomal putrescine biosynthetic genes, harbored same reporting plasmid, pTacR2gfp. The recombinant strains were exposed to various concentrations of putrescine in the modified M9 medium and cell fluorescence was measured upon incubation at 37 °C for 10 h. Genetic backgrounds and symbols for the biosensors: MG1655 (wild-type, filled square), XF20C (*speC* mutant, filled triangle), and XF56 (*speC speB speF* triple mutant, open square).

Figure 7. Use of the biosensor for monitoring intracellular putrescine. The sensing plasmid pTacR2gfp was transformed into wild-type *E. coli* MG1655 and its derivatives with genetic knockouts or overexpressions of the putrescine biosynthetic genes. The recombinant strains were grown in M9 medium at 37 °C. Fluorescence was measured when cell OD₆₀₀ reached 0.8~1.0, and intracellular putrescine levels were determined by HPLC as described in Methods section. Endogenous putrescine and normalized fluorescence intensities were plotted for each strain. A fitted straight line based on linear regression was shown.

Figure 8. Use of the biosensor for reporting extracellular production of putrescine. The engineered putrescine overproducer, *E. coli* ZQ19 was transformed with pTacR2gfp and grown in flasks with glucose R/2 medium at 37 °C. (A) Cell fluorescence (filled square),

OD₆₀₀ (filled triangle), and excretory putrescine titer (filled circle) were monitored for 12 h.

(B) Excretory putrescine titers and cell fluorescence were plotted. An asymptotic 1-D model was proposed to correlate cellular fluorescence and excretory putrescine titer, which quantitatively described the dynamic changes of intracellular and extracellular putrescine levels for the engineered cell factory.

Table I. *Escherichia coli* strains and plasmids used in this study.

Strain/plasmid	Description ^a	Source or reference
Strains		
TOP10	F ⁻ <i>mcrA</i> Δ (<i>mrr-hsdRMS-mcrBC</i>) ϕ 80 <i>lacZ</i> Δ M15 Δ <i>lacX74 recA1 araD139</i> Δ (<i>ara-leu</i>)7697 <i>galU galK rpsL</i> (Str ^R) <i>endA1 nupG</i>	Invitrogen ^b
DH5 α	F ⁻ ϕ 80 <i>lacZ</i> Δ M15 Δ (<i>lacZYA-argF</i>) U169 <i>recA1 endA1 hsdR17</i> (r _k ⁻ m _k ⁺) <i>phoA supE44</i> λ <i>thi-1 gyrA96 relA1</i>	Invitrogen ^b
MG1655	<i>Coli</i> Genetic Stock Center strain (CGSC) No. 6300	CGSC ^c
XF07C	MG1655 <i>puuR::Cm</i> ^R	This study
XF18C	MG1655 <i>speB::Cm</i> ^R	This study
XF19C	MG1655 <i>speF::Cm</i> ^R	This study
XF20C	MG1655 <i>speC::Cm</i> ^R	This study
XF52	MG1655 Δ <i>speC</i> Δ <i>speB</i>	This study
XF56	MG1655 Δ <i>speC</i> Δ <i>speB</i> Δ <i>speF</i>	This study
ZQ09	MG1655 Δ <i>puuAP</i> Δ <i>speG</i> Δ <i>speE</i> Δ <i>ygjG</i>	This study
ZQ19	ZQ09 <i>PspeF-potE::P</i> _{N25}	This study
ZQ26	ZQ09 <i>lacI::P</i> _{N25} - <i>speC'</i>	This study
Plasmids		
pKD46	Ap ^R , λ Red recombinase under arabinose-inducible <i>araBAD</i> promoter, <i>ts</i> origin, 6.3-kb	Datsenko and Wanner, 2000
pKD3	Ap ^R , Cm ^R , FRT-Cm ^R -FRT cassette, 2.8-kb	Datsenko and Wanner, 2000
pZS*26mCherryFRT	Km ^R , Cm ^R , FRT-Cm ^R -FRT, <i>mCherry</i> under P _{N25} promoter, pSC101* origin, 5.2-kb	Lab stock
pZS*26speCFRT	Km ^R , Cm ^R , FRT-Cm ^R -FRT, <i>E. coli speC</i> under P _{N25} promoter, pSC101* origin, 6.7-kb	This study
pZS*26speC'FRT	Km ^R , Cm ^R , FRT-Cm ^R -FRT cassette, variant <i>speC</i> under P _{N25} promoter, pSC101* origin, 6.7-kb	This study
pECA102	Ap ^R , Flp recombinase under arabinose-inducible <i>araBAD</i> promoter, <i>sacB</i> cassette, 3.5-kb	Dr. D. E. Cameron
pZA2pBAD-gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under arabinose-inducible <i>araBAD</i> promoter, 2.8-kb	Dr. D. E. Cameron
pZA27gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under constitutive <i>lacIQ</i> promoter, 2.9-kb	This study
ppuuAgfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under <i>puuA</i> promoter, 2.9-kb	This study
pAR2gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under AR2 promoter, 2.9-kb	This study

pAR3gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under <i>AR3</i> promoter, 2.9-kb	This study
pLR2gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under <i>LR2</i> promoter, 2.9-kb	This study
pLR3gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under <i>LR3</i> promoter, 2.9-kb	This study
pTacR2gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under <i>TacR2</i> promoter, 2.9-kb	This study
pTacR3gfp	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under <i>TacR3</i> promoter, 2.9-kb	This study
pZA27puuR	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>E. coli puuR</i> under <i>lacIQ</i> promoter, 2.7-kb	This study
pS6	Km ^R , p15A ori, <i>gfpmut3</i> under <i>TacR2</i> promoter, <i>puuR</i> under <i>lacIQ</i> promoter, 3.6-kb	This study

^aAbbreviations: Ap, ampicillin; Cm, chloramphenicol; Km, kanamycin; Str, streptomycin; R, resistance; ts, temperature sensitive.

^bInvitrogen, Corp., Carlsbad, CA.

^cColi Genetic Stock Center, New Haven, CT.

Table II. PCR primers used in this study.

Primer	Sequence (5' to 3') ^a
FPiq	TCGAGTGGTGCAAAACCTTTCGCGGTATGGCATGATAGCGCCCG GAAGAGAGTCAATTCAGGG
RPiq	AATTCCTGAAATGACTCTCTTCGGGGCGCTATCATGCCATACC GCGAAAGGTTTTGCACCAC
FpuuApXh1	CCCGCTCGAGTCATTTTTGCAAACCTCAATTTA
RpuuApKp	CACTGGTACCGATTCTTCGCCTTTGGTTT
FpAR2Xh	TCGAGAAAATTTATCAAAAAGAGTGTTGACTGTGGTCATTATAT TTTACGCGATACTTAGATTCAGTGGTCATTATATTTTACGCG
RpAR2Ec	AATTCGCGTAAAATATAATGACCACTGAATCTAAGTATCGCGTA AAATATAATGACCACAGTCAACACTCTTTTTGATAAAATTTTC
FpAR3Xh	TCGAGAAAATTTATCAAAAAGAGTGTTGACTTAAAGTCTAACCT ATAGGATACTTAGATTCAGTGGTCATTATATTTTACGCG
RpAR3Ec	AATTCGCGTAAAATATAATGACCACTGAATCTAAGTATCCTATA GGTTAGACTTTAAGTCAACACTCTTTTTGATAAAATTTTC
FpLR2Xh	TCGAGATAAATTATCTCTGGCGGTGTTGACAGTGGTCATTATAT TTTACGCGATACTGAGCACAGTGGTCATTATATTTTACGCG
RpLR2Ec	AATTCGCGTAAAATATAATGACCACTGTGCTCAGTATCGCGTAA AATATAATGACCACTGTCAACACCGCCAGAGATAATTTATC
FpLR3Xh	TCGAGATAAATTATCTCTGGCGGTGTTGACATAAATACCACTGG CGGTGATACTGAGCACAGTGGTCATTATATTTTACGCG
RpLR3Ec	AATTCGCGTAAAATATAATGACCACTGTGCTCAGTATCACCGCC AGTGGTATTTATGTCAACACCGCCAGAGATAATTTATC
FptacR2Xh	TCGAGCTGTTGACAGTGGTCATTATATTTTACGCTATAATGTGT GGAGTGGTCATTATATTTTACGCG
RptacR2Ec	AATTCGCGTAAAATATAATGACCACTCCACACATTATAGCGTAA AATATAATGACCACTGTCAACAGC
FptacR3Xh	TCGAGCTGTTGACAATTAATCATCGGCTCGTATAATGTGTGGAG TGGTCATTATATTTTACGCG
RptacR3Ec	AATTCGCGTAAAATATAATGACCACTCCACACATTATACGAGCC GATGATTAATTGTCAACAGC
FpuuRKp	CGGGGTACCATGAGTGATGAGGGACTGGC
RpuuRXm	TCCCCCGGGTTAAAACGTGGTGGGCGTAT
F7puuRTAa	TTAGGACGTCTCTAGGGCGGCGGATTTGTC
R7puuRTXh	GACAGCTCGAGTGGTGCAAAACCTTTCG
FKOpuuR	GCGACTCTGACCACTACAGTTTAAGGAAATGCAAATATGTGTGT AGGCTGGAGCTGCTT
RKOpuuR	GCGCATTGCGCTTACCCGGCTTACAGAACAAAAAGATTAGGGA ATTAGCCATGGTCCAT
FKOspeC	GGTATTCTTACTTCCCCGAAACGGGTTTGCGCTTATGTGTAGGC TGGAGCTGCTT
RKOspeC	AAACGGGTCGCCAGAAGGTGACCCGTTTTTTTTTATTCTTAGGGA ATTAGCCATGGTCCAT
FKOspeF	TGAGGACCTGCTATTACCTAAAATAAAGAGATGAAAAATGTGT GTAGGCTGGAGCTGCTT
RKOspeF	TTAACTGAACGACGCCCATTTTGTTCGATTTAGCCTGACTCAGG GAATTAGCCATGGTCCAT
FKOspeB	CGCGGAAGGGTTTTTTTATATCGACTTTGTAATAGGAGTCCATC CTGTGTAGGCTGGAGCTGCTT

RKOspeB	AATGGCACGTTTTACCCGTGCGCATCGCATCTGGTGCTTAGGGA ATTAGCCATGGTCCAT
FKOspeB2	CCGCCACAATTTATTGTGACAAATCCAACCCTTCCTCGTCGGGC CTAACGACGCGGAAGGGTTTTTTTATA
RKOspeB2	ACGGGTGCCGAACGTAGGTCGGATAAGGCGTTCACGCCGCATC CGACATTAATGGCACGTTTTACCCGTG
FKOspeF2	CGGGGTAACTTTGCTTTTTTCCGGCACGATCGATTTCTCATTCTGA GAAATTGAGGACCTGCTATTACCTA
RKOspeF2	CGGCAGCATGATGATACCGGAGCCCATCATGTTGACCATCGTCA GTATGGTTAACTGAACGACGCCATT
FKOpuuA	TGATAACGAGCGGAAAACAAACCAAAGGCGAAGAATCATGTGT GTAGGCTGGAGCTGCTT
RKOpuuP	TGCGCCGCGCATCCGACTATTACGTTTCACTCACCGGCGTGGA ATTAGCCATGGTCCAT
FKOspeG	AACCTGTTATTGATTTAAGGAATGTAAGGACACGTTATGTGTGT AGGCTGGAGCTGCTT
RKOspeG	TTACACCATCAAAAATACGATCGATTATTATTAATGCTAGGGAA TTAGCCATGGTCCAT
FKOspeE	TTTTTTTACGGGTGTTAACAAAGGAGGTATCAACCCATGTGTGT AGGCTGGAGCTGCTT
RKOspeE	ATGCAGTTTCAGTTTTTTCAATTTCTTATCTTCTCCTTAGGGAAT TAGCCATGGTCCAT
FKOygjG	CGGTATCATGTGATACGCGAGCCTCCGGAGCATATTTTGTGTGT AGGCTGGAGCTGCTT
RKOygjG	TCGGATGGCGACGTCGATCGCCATCCGATTTGATATTAGGGAA TTAGCCATGGTCCAT
FPspeF	TAAGGGCACTTCAGCGTACAGGTCTTCCTGACTCTCTGTAGGCT GGAGCTGCTT
RPspeF	GTCCGGGCAAGAATCACTAACCGCAATTTTAAATTTTGACATGG TACCTTTCTCCTCTTT
FlacIFRT	GTGAAACCAGTAACGTTATACGATGTCGCAGAGTATGCCGGTG TCTCTTATGTGTAGGCTGGAGCTGCTT
RlacIT1	TCACTGCCCCGCTTTCAGTCGGGAAACCTGTCGTGCCAGCTGCA TTAATGGCGGATTTGTCCTACTCAGG
FspeCKpn	CCTCGGTACCATGAAATCAATGAATATTGCC
FspeCBam	AATCGGATCCTTACTTCAACACATAACCGTA
FspeC'	ACCCATACCGGATCGGCGAAAGAT
RspeC'	AAGCAGATCGCCCAATTTTACGTCAGC

^aRestriction sites are underlined.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7




Figure 8