







A genome scale model of *Cupriavidus necator* for platform chemical production

Nicole Pearcy

Synthetic Biology Research Centre

6th May, 2022











Genome scale model of *Cupriavidus necator*





C. necator H16 an ideal chassis for biotechnology

- Grows on organic substrates or H₂ and CO₂ under aerobic conditions
- Grows to high-cell densities under lithoautotrophic or heterotrophic conditions
- Produces large amounts of a biodegradable polymer polyhydroxybutyrate (PHB)



STEM picture of *Cupriavidus necator* harbouring PHB granules



Flagellation of strain N-1. Bar, 1.0 μm





C. necator lithoautotrophic metabolism

- Carbon dioxide is fixed via the Calvin cycle
- Membrane bound hydrogenase directly connected to the electron transport chain (ETC) for generating ATP
- Soluble hydrogenase that is coupled to NADH synthesis that is required for the Calvin cycle or ETC
- Oxygen final electron acceptor (under anaerobic conditions nitrate is used)



Lithoautotrophic metabolism





C. necator lithoautotrophic metabolism

- Carbon dioxide is fixed via the Calvin cycle
- Membrane bound hydrogenase directly connected to the electron transport chain (ETC) for generating ATP
- Soluble hydrogenase that is coupled to NADH synthesis that is required for the Calvin cycle or ETC
- Oxygen final electron acceptor (under anaerobic conditions nitrate is used)



Lithoautotrophic metabolism





Genome scale model of *C. necator*

Constructed genome scale model of *C. necator* using Cell Systems Modelling Group pipeline







- Constructed genome scale model of *C. necator* using Cell Systems Modelling Group pipeline
 - 912 BioCyc reactions (AutoReutro.spy)







- Constructed genome scale model of *C. necator* using Cell Systems Modelling Group pipeline
 - 912 BioCyc reactions (AutoReutro.spy)
 - 97 Transport reactions (Transporters.spy)







- Constructed genome scale model of *C. necator* using Cell Systems Modelling Group pipeline
 - 912 BioCyc reactions (AutroReutro.spy)
 - 97 Transport reactions (Transporters.spy)
 - 16 Electron transport chain (ETC.spy)







- Constructed genome scale model of *C. necator* using Cell Systems Modelling Group pipeline
 - 912 BioCyc reactions (AutroReutro.spy)
 - 97 Transport reactions (Transporters.spy)
 - 16 Electron transport chain (ETC.spy)
 - 260 Additional reactions (ExtraReacs.spy, PHL.spy, FA.spy, LPS.spy)







Gene-reaction associations



Galactarate dehydratase rxn : (H16_A1258 AND H16_A1259) OR H16_B0965

- Further network curation
- Carry out gene knockout analysis
- Integrate gene expression data





Genome scale model validation



Substrate (mmol gDCW h)	Growth rate (1/h)	$\text{minimize}: \mathbf{v} $	
Fructose (2.1 ± 0.3)	0.17 ± 0.03		$\int Nv = 0$
		\Box subject to : \cdot	$v_{\rm bio} = 0.17$
			$v_{\text{ATPase}} = J_{\text{ATPase}}$





Genome scale model validation



Substrate (mmol gDCW h)	Growth rate (1/h)	$\text{minimize}: \mathbf{v} $	
Fructose (2.1 \pm 0.3)	0.17 ± 0.03		$\int Nv = 0$
		subject to : \langle	$v_{\mathrm{bio}} = 0.17$
			$v_{\rm ATPase} = J_{\rm ATPase}$





$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize}: |\mathbf{v}| & \longleftarrow & \text{Objective: min. sum of} \\ \text{fluxes} \\ \text{subject to} \begin{cases} Nv = 0 & \longleftarrow & \text{Steady state constraint} \\ v_{\mathrm{NH}_4} = 1.0 & \longleftarrow & \text{Fixed ammonium uptake} \\ v_{\mathrm{biomass}} = 0.1 & \longleftarrow & \text{Fixed biomass} \\ v_{\mathrm{fru}} = x & \longleftarrow & \text{Fructose uptake, varied} \\ \text{between 1 and 3} \end{cases} \end{array}$$





Genome scale model validation - ammonia limitation







Integrated gene expression data using iMAT approach to reduce the solution space













Flux sampling analysis scans the solution space to provide distribution of flux values per reaction. Compare flux distributions across two different conditions to find those that are differentially altered



The samples must be a 'good' representation of the solution space.





Flux sampling analysis scans the solution space to provide distribution of flux values per reaction. Compare flux distributions across two different conditions to find those that are differentially altered



The samples must be a 'good' representation of the solution space.





Genome scale model validation - ammonia limitation

- The results show the mean flux value for the growth phase predicted fluxes and the nitrogen-limited phase predicted fluxes
- PHB production and degradation is active
- Calvin-Benson cycle is active in ammonia limited conditions
- TCA cycle flux decreases in ammonia limited conditions







Redirecting flux towards platform chemicals











Ethylene production

Widely used in the chemical industry, worldwide production exceeds **150 million tons**

Currently produced from **steam cracking**, which releases vast quantities of **CO**₂

Already produced in microorganisms that contain the **ethylene forming enzyme (EFE)** but with low yields

EFE stoichiometry:

 $3 \text{ AKG} + \text{Arg} + 3 \text{ O}_2 \longrightarrow 2 \text{ Ethylene} + \text{Succinate} + \text{P5C} + \text{Guanidine} + 7 \text{ CO}_2$





Maximum theoretical yields of ethylene







Maximum theoretical yields of ethylene

max. v_{ethylene} subject to : $\begin{cases} Nv = 0 & \longleftarrow & \text{Steady state} \\ 0 \leq v_{\text{fru}} \leq 2 \\ 0.05 \leq v_{\text{bio}} \leq \infty \end{cases}$





Maximum theoretical yields of ethylene

$\begin{array}{l} {\rm max.} \ v_{\rm ethylene} \\ {\rm subject \ to} : \left\{ {\begin{array}{*{20}c} {Nv = 0} \\ {0 \le v_{\rm fru} \le 2} & \longleftarrow \\ {0.05 \le v_{\rm bio} \le \infty} \end{array} \right.} \begin{array}{*{20}c} {\rm Constrain \ the} \\ {\rm fructose \ uptake} \\ {\rm rate \ to \ be \ less \ or} \\ {\rm equal \ to \ 2 \ mmol} \\ {\rm gDCW^{-1}h^{-1}} \end{array} \right.} \end{array} \right.$





Maximum theoretical yields of ethylene

max. v_{ethylene} subject to : $\begin{cases} Nv = 0\\ 0 \le v_{\text{fru}} \le 2\\ 0.05 \le v_{\text{bio}} \le \infty \end{cases}$





Maximum theoretical yields of ethylene



All rates in: mmol gDCW⁻¹ h⁻¹





Redirecting flux towards ethylene via growth coupling







Redirecting flux towards ethylene via growth coupling

Simulated double reaction knockouts in the model with maximisation of biomass as objective function

max. v_{Biomass} subject to : $\begin{cases} Nv = 0\\ 0 \le v_{\text{fru}} \le 2\\ v_i = 0\\ v_j = 0 \end{cases}$





Redirecting flux towards ethylene via growth coupling

- Identified solution that blocks proline biosynthesis by KO of 2 reactions
- EFE becomes essential for restoring proline biosynthesis







Conclusions

- GSM predicts growth rates with high accuracy during growth phase
- Predicting ammonia limited conditions however has more variability in the model. Integrating OMICs data can reduce the variability and correctly produced PHB as sole product
- GSM is useful for predicting capabilities for producing non-native products and to assess and predict new engineering strategies
- Optimisation approaches can be used such as optGene, optKnock, optStrain to predict growth coupling strategies





Acknowledgements

- David Fell Mark Poolman Hassan Hartman
- Muhammad Hamzah Alex Conradie Nigel Minton Jacque Minton Alan Burbidge Louise Dynes

SBRC-dry team

Mohit Dalwadi James Gilbert John King Thomas Milat Rupert Norman Vanisha Patel Jamie Twycross

SBRC-wet team