Screening and engineering of high-activity promoter elements through transcriptomics and red fluorescent protein visualization in *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*
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**ABSTRACT**

The versatile photosynthetic α-proteobacterium *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*, has recently been extensively engineered as a novel microbial cell factory (MCF) to produce pharmaceuticals, nutraceuticals, commodity chemicals and even hydrogen. However, there are no well-characterized high-activity promoters to modulate gene transcription during the engineering of *R. sphaeroides*. In this study, several native promoters from *R. sphaeroides* JDW-710 (JDW-710), an industrial strain producing high levels of co-enzyme Q\(_10\) (Q\(_10\)) were selected on the basis of transcriptomic analysis. These candidate promoters were then characterized by using *gusA* as a reporter gene. Two native promoters, *P\(_{\text{RSP}}\) 7571* and *P\(_{\text{RSP}}\) 6124*, showed 620% and 800% higher activity, respectively, than the tac promoter, which has previously been used for gene overexpression in *R. sphaeroides*. In addition, a *P\(_{\text{RSP}}\) 7571* derived synthetic promoter library with strengths ranging from 54% to 3200% of that of the tac promoter, was created on the basis of visualization of red fluorescent protein (RFP) expression in *R. sphaeroides*. Finally, as a demonstration, the synthetic pathway of Q\(_10\) was modulated by the selected promoter T334\(^*\) in JDW-710; the Q\(_10\) yield in shake-flasks increased 28% and the production reached 226 mg/L. These well-characterized promoters should be highly useful in current synthetic biology platforms for refactoring the biosynthetic pathway in *R. sphaeroides*-derived MCFs.
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1. Introduction

With the emergence and development of synthetic biology, the great potential of microorganisms as cell factories that can produce chemicals, pharmaceuticals and nutraceuticals has been extensively studied [1–3]. In addition to traditional microbial cell factories (MCFs) such as *Escherichia coli*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Streptomyces* [4,5], several biosynthetically talented strains with special metabolic capabilities, e.g., the thermophilic bacterium *Geobacillus thermoglucosidasius* [6] and the halophilic bacterium *Halanaerobium saccharolyticum* [7], have been engineered to serve as a chassis for biotechnological applications. Recently, the α-proteobacterium *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*, a facultative photosynthetic bacterium [8] with promising potential, has been significantly advanced as a novel MCF for industrial applications [9]. Because of its high metabolic versatility (e.g., phototrophic, photoheterotrophic and chemoheterotrophic), a variety of value-added products, such as cozyme Q\(_10\) (Q\(_10\)) [10–13], isoprenoids (i.e., lycopeene and β-carotene) [14–17], 5-amino-ketone pentyl acid [18] and even bio-hydrogen [19,20] can be efficiently produced in this cell factory. Therefore, developing a synthetic biology toolbox for *R. sphaeroides*...
would facilitate refactoring of synthetic pathways for bioproduct production and further expand the biotechnology application potential of \textit{R. sphaeroides}.

To date, several toolboxes for \textit{R. sphaeroides}, e.g., a CRISPR/Cas9-based genome editing system [21] and CRISPR/dCas9-based programmable base editing systems [22], have been developed. However, although promoters are among the most important and universal synthetic modular regulatory elements [23–25], only a very limited number of promoters are available in \textit{R. sphaeroides}. Lu et al. first applied the tac promoter, a glucose inducible promoter in \textit{E. coli}, for gene overexpression in \textit{R. sphaeroides} [26]. Since then, the tac promoter has been widely used in the upregulation of target genes or synthetic modules in \textit{R. sphaeroides} [11,15,17,27–29]. Some other promoters, such as \textit{P}_{\text{lac}}/\textit{P}_{\text{Iac}}, \textit{P}_{\text{lac}} \text{and } \textit{P}_{\text{Iac}}, \text{etc.}, have also been developed or applied in \textit{R. sphaeroides} for the control of transcription units [15,22,30–32]. Nevertheless, with the increasing number of applications of \textit{R. sphaeroides} in current biotechnology, well-characterized or quantitatively measured high-activity promoters are urgently needed for the precise design or control of synthetic modules in this novel cell factory. \textit{R. sphaeroides JDW-710} (JDW-710) is a high-yielding industrial strain used for \textit{Q}_{\text{10}} production [12], and it is also a nonpathogenic and generally regarded as safe (GRAS) microbial strain [9]. In this study, on the basis of transcriptomic analysis of JDW-710 and the use of a red fluorescent protein (RFP) reporter system, a native promoter-derived synthetic promoter library incorporating a range of different strengths was characterized. To demonstrate the application of these constitutive promoters, we modulated the synthetic pathway of the value-added nutraceutical \textit{Q}_{\text{10}} for overproduction in JDW-710.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Strains and culture conditions

All strains and plasmids used in this study are shown in Tables S1 and S2. \textit{R. sphaeroides} and its derivatives were cultivated on agar plates (0.3% glucose, 0.8% yeast extract, 0.2% sodium chloride, 0.13% monobasic potassium phosphate, 0.0125% magnesium sulfate and 1.5% agar, supplemented with 15 mg/L biotin, 1 mg/L thiamine hydrochloride and 1 mg/L nicotinic acid) or 20% TSB (trypticase soy broth) medium at 32°C for 72 h. Growth of \textit{R. sphaeroides} was measured by HPLC, as previously reported [12]. For seed culture, broth was inoculated in a 250-mL flask containing 45 mL of fermentation medium at 1% glucose, 0.1% yeast extract, 0.1% sodium chloride, 0.1% ammonium chloride, 0.01% magnesium sulfate, 0.09% potassium phosphate and 0.06% monopotassium phosphate, pH 7.0) and cultured at 32°C and 220 rpm for 24 h. For the \textit{Q}_{\text{10}} fermentation, 9 mL of seed culture broth was inoculated in a 250-mL flask containing 45 mL of fermentation medium (4% glucose, 0.4% corn steep liquor, 0.3% sodium glutamate, 0.3% ammonium sulfate, 0.28% sodium chloride, 0.3% monobasic potassium phosphate, 0.63% magnesium sulfate and 0.2% calcium carbonate, supplemented with 1 mg/L thiamine hydrochloride, 1 mg/L nicotinic acid and 15 μg/L biotin) and fermented at 220 rpm and 32°C for 72 h. Growth of \textit{R. sphaeroides} cells was detected by measurement of the optical density at 700 nm (OD\textsubscript{700}), as previously reported [13].

### 2.2. Plasmid construction, error-prone PCR and transformation

Plasmid pBRR1MCS2 (pBRR) was digested by \textit{BamHI} and \textit{Sacl} to obtain a linear vector, and a high fidelity GXL polymerase (TaKaRa) was used to amplify the promoter sequence by using \textit{R. sphaeroides} genomic DNA as a template. The gus\textit{A} gene was chemically synthesized after codon optimization on the basis of a previously reported DNA sequence [23] and also amplified by GXL polymerase. For promoter library construction, error-prone PCR was performed with a Diversify PCR Random Mutagenesis Kit (Clontech). The linear vector DNA and PCR products were assembled with a NovoReC® Plus one step PCR Cloning Kit (Novoprotein, China). All primer sequences used for plasmid construction are shown in Table S3. The electro-transformations of \textit{R. sphaeroides} was performed in 2-mm cuvettes with a Bio-Rad GenePulsar Xcell™ system (electroporation conditions: 2000 V, 20 μF and 25 μF).

### 2.3. GusA enzymatic assays

\textit{R. sphaeroides} transformants were cultured in TSB medium or fermentation medium. After sampling at different time points, the amounts of cells were adjusted to OD\textsubscript{700} = 1.0, and cell pellets were collected by centrifugation (12,000 rpm for 1 min). Subsequently, the cell pellets were resuspended and lysed at 37°C for 20 min in 900 μL buffer II (50 mM phosphate buffer, pH 7.0, 0.1% Triton X-100, 5 mM dithiothreitol and 1 mg/mL lysozyme). Then, the cell lysate was diluted in 900 μL buffer I (50 mM phosphate buffer, pH 7.0, 0.1% Triton X-100 and 5 mM dithiothreitol), and the supernatant was collected by centrifugation (14,000 rpm, 10 min) at 4°C. Finally, 100 μL of the resulting supernatant and 100 μL of buffer III (50 mM phosphate buffer, pH 7.0, 0.1% Triton X-100, 5 mM dithiothreitol and 2 mM 4-nitrophenyl-β-D-glucuronic acid) were mixed in 96-well microplates and the absorbance was immediately measured at 415 nm per min for 30 min with a microplate reader (CLARIOstar, BMG LABTECH). The GusA enzymatic activity was determined by calculation according to a previous study [23].

### 2.4. Red fluorescence analysis

During the promoter library construction, a portable fluorescent protein detector, LUYOR-3260GR and red filter LUV-50-A (Shanghai LUYOR Instrument Co., Ltd), were used to screen \textit{R. sphaeroides} transformants on agar plates. For 48-well microplate culture, the red fluorescence was measured with a BMG CLARIOstar microplate reader (BMG Labtech, UK) with excitation at 570 nm and emission at 620 nm.

### 2.5. \textit{Q}_{\text{10}} fermentation and cell growth detection

For seed culture, \textit{R. sphaeroides} and its derivatives were cultivated on agar plates for 5 days, and single clones were inoculated in seed medium (1% glucose, 0.1% yeast extract, 0.1% sodium chloride, 0.1% ammonium chloride, 0.01% magnesium sulfate, 0.09% potassium phosphate and 0.06% monopotassium phosphate, pH 7.0) and cultured at 32°C and 220 rpm for 24 h. For the \textit{Q}_{\text{10}} fermentation, 9 mL of seed culture broth was inoculated in a 250-mL flask containing 45 mL of fermentation medium (4% glucose, 0.4% corn steep liquor, 0.3% sodium glutamate, 0.3% ammonium sulfate, 0.28% sodium chloride, 0.3% monobasic potassium phosphate, 0.63% magnesium sulfate and 0.2% calcium carbonate, supplemented with 1 mg/L thiamine hydrochloride, 1 mg/L nicotinic acid and 15 μg/L biotin) and fermented at 220 rpm and 32°C for 72 h. Growth of \textit{R. sphaeroides} cells was detected by measurement of the optical density at 700 nm (OD\textsubscript{700}), as previously reported [13].

### 2.6. \textit{Q}_{\text{10}} detection and high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC)

\textit{Q}_{\text{10}} production was measured by HPLC, as previously reported [13]. Briefly, 500 μL of fermentation broth was mixed with 5 μL of 6 N hydrochloric acid and 100 μL 30% hydrogen peroxide, 1 mL acetone was added, and the mixture was vortexed for 1 min. Then, the volume was adjusted to 5 mL with ethanol, and incubated in an ultrasonic bath for 45 min at room temperature. The supernatant was collected by centrifugation at 12,000 rpm for 10 min at 4°C and then passed through a 0.45-μm filter (Merck Millipore). Finally, the resulting samples were used for \textit{Q}_{\text{10}} detection by an Agilent 1260 system (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA).

### 2.7. RNA-seq and qRT-PCR assays

RNA-seq was used for transcriptomics analysis, as described previously [33]. Briefly, the quality of the isolated RNA samples was analyzed with an Agilent Bioanalyzer 2100 system (Agilent Technologies), and RNA depletion was applied for mRNA enrichment. The RNA-seq and transcriptomics analyses were performed by Novogene Co., Ltd. (Beijing, China). The qRT-PCR assays were performed as previously reported [34]. Total RNA was isolated with a Redzol reagent kit from SBS Genetech Co. Ltd (Beijing, China). RNA was purified and reverse transcribed with a commercially available PrimeScript™ RT Reagent Kit with gDNA Eraser (Takara). The qPCR was performed with cDNA as the template.
and primers were designed as shown in Table S4. The relative expression levels of dxs and ubiE were normalized internally to 16 S rDNA level and quantified with the $2^{-ΔΔCT}$ method [35].

2.8. Data analysis

Statistical analyses were performed in Microsoft Excel 2016. Data are expressed as the mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM). Student’s t-tests were used for statistical analysis, and $P < 0.05$ indicated statistical significance.

3. Results

3.1. Screening and verification of native high-activity promoters

*R. sphaeroides* carried two different circular chromosomes, namely chromosome I (~3 Mb) and chromosome II (~0.9 Mb) [36]. To screen highly active native promoters from *R. sphaeroides*, we performed transcriptomic analyses of both JDW-710 and the wild type (WT, *R. sphaeroides* 2.4.1) at different time points (24-h and 48-h) by RNA-seq. The transcriptional activity of chromosome I was higher than that of chromosome II (Fig. 1A), and the median transcription levels of chromosome I were 41% and 369% higher than those of chromosome II in JDW-710 and WT, respectively. Therefore, we subsequently analyzed the transcriptional profile of ~3100 genes in chromosome I (Fig. 1B, Fig. S1). On the basis of their FPKM (Fragments Per Kilobase of transcript per Million fragments mapped) values, seven promoters ($P_{rsp.2718}$, $P_{puhA}$, $P_{pusBAC}$, $P_{rnpb}$, $P_{rnp}\_7571$, $P_{bchE}$ and $P_{rsp}\_6124$) exhibiting high transcriptional activity in both JDW-710 and WT from late logarithmic phase (24 h) to the stationary phase (48 h) were selected as candidates for characterization.

The widely used reporter gene, β-glucuronidase (gusA) has been applied in promoter characterization [23]. In this study, the GusA activity of all JDW-710 transformants containing the pBBR plasmid with a different promoter driving gusA was analyzed (Fig. 1C). The GusA activity of $P_{bchE}$, $P_{rsp}\_6124$ and $P_{rnp}\_7571$ was significantly higher than that of tac. Subsequent analysis showed that the activity of $P_{rsp}\_6124$ and $P_{rnp}\_7571$ was 800% and 620% higher, respectively, than that of tac (Fig. 1D). These transcriptional analysis and promoter characterization results indicated that $P_{rsp}\_6124$ and $P_{rnp}\_7571$ were highly active native promoters in *R. sphaeroides*.

3.2. In vivo characterization of selected promoters

The transcriptional activity of many native promoters is often under strict regulation, and might be affected by changes in external or environmental conditions. Therefore, we characterized the activity of the selected promoters in different culture media at different time periods.
Both commercially available tryptic soy broth (TSB) medium and Q$_{10}$ fermentation medium [13] were used. As shown in Fig. 2A and C, except for the decreased cell growth shown by P$_{\text{rsp}_6124}$, all other JDW-710 transformants containing different promoters exhibited no significant differences with respect to the control in both media. The activity of these promoters from the logarithmic phase to the stationary phase was also monitored, as shown in Fig. 2B, and the activity of P$_{\text{rsp}_6124}$ and P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ ranged from 600% to 836%, and 409%–640%, respectively, in TSB medium. In the Q$_{10}$ fermentation medium, the activity of P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ ranged from 429% to 1234%, and 496%–888%, respectively (Fig. 2D). These results indicated that both P$_{\text{rp}_6124}$ and P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ maintained high activity in different media and time periods. Although P$_{\text{rp}_6124}$ and P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ were used. As shown in Fig. 2A and C, except for the decreased cell growth shown by P$_{\text{rp}_6124}$ and P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$, all other JDW-710 transformants containing different promoters exhibited no significant differences with respect to the control in both media. The activity of these promoters from the logarithmic phase to the stationary phase was also monitored, as shown in Fig. 2B, and the activity of P$_{\text{rp}_6124}$ and P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ ranged from 600% to 836%, and 409%–640%, respectively, in TSB medium. In the Q$_{10}$ fermentation medium, the activity of P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ ranged from 429% to 1234%, and 496%–888%, respectively (Fig. 2D). These results indicated that both P$_{\text{rp}_6124}$ and P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ maintained high activity in different media and time periods. Although P$_{\text{rp}_6124}$ was stronger than that of P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$, because of the former’s inhibitory effects on cell growth, P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ was selected for subsequent study.

### 3.3. Construction of the constitutive promoter library

The 500 bp upstream region of the open reading frame rsp$_{7571}$ was arbitrarily selected as the original length P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$, which probably contained some redundant sequences and was additionally too long for future applications. Therefore, before the creation of a library of synthetic promoters with different strengths, we attempted to shorten and simplify the sequence of P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ by sequence truncation. As shown in Fig. 3A, three P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$-derived promoters, T344, T167 and T84, were generated by truncation, and the spacing between the consensus sequences in these P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$-derived promoters was 18 bp. The activity of T84 was 90% lower than that of P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ during the entire culture period (6–32 h), whereas the activity of T344 and T167 was approximately 50% lower (Fig. 3B). Although the sequence truncation decreased the promoter activity, T344 and T167 still had 3–4-fold higher activity than the tac promoter. Both T344 and T167 were used as error-prone PCR templates for subsequent promoter library construction (see Fig. 4).

Fig. 4A shows the entire workflow of the constitutive promoter library construction. Briefly, T344 and T167 were randomly mutated by error-prone PCR, and RFP was used for promoter screening. By using a portable fluorescence vision system, we were able to directly pick transformants with promoters with different activity from the agar plates according to fluorescence intensity. After the next step of inoculation and culture in 48-well microplates, the transformants were verified with a fluorescence reader. In this study, after further characterization, 20 of 67 synthetic promoters were selected (Fig. S2). The corresponding DNA sequence of each selected promoter is listed in Table S5. Most of the transformants (18/20) showed no significant differences in cell growth with respect to that of the control (transformant containing tac or P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$ promoters) (Fig. S3), and these synthetic promoters had strengths ranging from 54% to 2987% that of the tac promoter (Fig. 4B).

### 3.4. Upregulation of key biosynthetic genes for Q$_{10}$ production

To demonstrate the application of these promoters, T334*, which showed similar activity to P$_{\text{rp}_7571}$, was selected from the promoter library to upregulate the biosynthetic pathway for Q$_{10}$ production in JDW-710. As shown in Fig. 5D, dks and ubiE are two key genes involved in the methlyerythritol phosphate (MEP) pathway and quinone modification, respectively [11,27]. In the subsequent fermentation, both dks and ubiE were overexpressed under the control of T334* in JDW-710 (DOE2). Compared with that in the control (JDW:pBBR), the cell growth was slightly lower (10% in 48 h, and 7% in 72 h; Fig. 5A); however, the Q$_{10}$ production increased by 18%, reaching 226 mg/L in 72 h (P < 0.05; Fig. 5B), and the Q$_{10}$ yield increased 28% (P < 0.05; Fig. 5C). Furthermore, dks and ubiE transcription in DOE2 was verified...
at 24 h, as shown in Fig. 3E-F, and the transcription of \( dxs \) and \( ubiE \) increased 38-fold and 27-fold, respectively (\( P < 0.05 \)). Simultaneously, the \( tac \) promoter was used to overexpress \( dxs \) and \( ubiE \) in JDW-710. Although the transcription was greater than that in the control (JDW-pBBR), no significant effects on cell growth and \( Q_{10} \) production were observed (Fig. S4).
R. sphaeroides different MCFs [23, 25]. Despite being the widely used promoter in opposite (enzymatic activity were not always consistent and sometimes were transcription profile analysis. However, the transcriptional activity and activity in this photosynthetic bacterium. On the basis of our previous -moters and ribosomal binding sites) are strongly motivated by the need to precisely control the expression of target genes or pathways in met the requirements for gene overexpression. To resolve the lack of construction and characterization of regulatory elements (e.g., promoters and ribosomal binding sites) are strongly motivated by the need to precisely control the expression of target genes or pathways in different MCFs [23, 25]. Despite being the widely used promoter in R. sphaeroides, the tac promoter has never been well characterized for its activity in this photosynthetic bacterium. On the basis of our previous experience [13], the strength of the tac promoter probably does not fully meet the requirements for gene overexpression. To resolve the lack of known regulatory elements in R. sphaeroides, this study focused on characterizing and engineering synthetic promoters. Transcriptionomic analysis-based screening of high activity native promoter candidates has been demonstrated previously [37]. To obtain a highly active native promoter with good universality in R. sphaeroides, we selected seven promoters showing good transcriptional consistency in different strains (JDW-710, WT) as candidates, on the basis of transcription profile analysis. However, the transcriptional activity and enzymatic activity were not always consistent and sometimes were opposite (e.g., P_{P_gsp716} > P_{gusA} > P_{gusBAC}) (Fig. 1). A weak correlation between RNA and protein abundance has also been observed in a previous study [37], probably for a variety of reasons, such as post-transcriptional gene regulation (i.e., by small RNAs and RNA-binding proteins) and the activity of ribosomal binding sites [25, 38]. Interestingly, the promoters of gsp_6124 (97 amino acid residues) and gsp_7571 (55 amino acid residues), both of which are annotated as hypothetical proteins, displayed a good correlation between RNA abundance (FPKM) and GusA enzymatic activity. Moreover, these two putative genes are highly sequence conserved in other photosynthetic bacteria beyond WT and JDW-710, such as R. sphaeroides K131 (KCTC12005) [39], R. sphaeroides ATCC 17025 (AHT2.4.3) [40] and R. sphaeroides ATCC 17029 (AHT2.4.9) [40]. Although the biological function of these two hypothetical genes remains unknown, their broad distribution probably indicated the universality of these regulatory elements in different R. sphaeroides.

In subsequent in vivo characterization of the native promoters, during the entire fermentation period, both P_{gsp_6124} and P_{gsp_7571} showed high GusA enzymatic activity in both a glucose-rich fermentation medium [13] and a commercially available TSB medium. However, the application of P_{gsp_6124} significantly inhibited cell growth (Fig. 2). High copy numbers of the plasmids and high production of enzymes are known to hinder cell growth [41]. In this study, the activity of P_{gsp_6124} was relatively similar, but the application of P_{gsp_7571} had no effects on cell growth. Moreover, after the truncation of P_{gsp_6124}, although the GusA enzymatic activity was ~40% lower than that of native P_{gsp_6124}, the cell growth remained significantly inhibited (Fig. S5). Therefore, the inhibitory effects of P_{gsp_6124} on cell growth were probably due to some unknown mechanism, a possibility requiring further investigation. Although detection of the enzymatic activity of GusA in protein extracts is a sensitive and versatile method, that has been used in promoter library screening [23, 42], it remains a cumbersome, labor-intensive process. In addition, on the basis of our preliminary results (data not shown), we found that in the R. sphaeroides culture system, the red fluorescence had a relatively high sensitivity, low background and no interference from the medium or intracellular metabolites, e.g., bacteriochlorophyll and carotenoids [43]. Consequently, we used a portable red fluorescence visualization system to directly screen the promoters with different strengths on the basis of fluorescence intensity (Fig. 4). With this RFP visualization system, the promoter library was rapidly and efficiently constructed. After several rounds of mutation and screening, each well-characterized promoter sequence in the library had three to seven site mutations, as compared with the native promoter sequence. This panel of P_{gsp_6124}-derived synthetic promoters with higher sequence diversity may have merit in applications [44]. T344 and T167, two P_{gsp_7571}-derived promoters created by sequence truncation (Fig. 3), contain both the promoter region and the native ribosomal binding site (RBS) region. During the error-prone PCR amplification in library construction, mutagenesis of only the promoter region was performed. The resulting well-characterized synthetic

Fig. 5. Enhanced Q_{DP} production achieved by engineering the synthetic pathway in JDW-710. A-C. Time course of cell growth, Q_{DP} production and yield in shake-flask fermentation. D. Biosynthetic pathway of Q_{DP} in R. sphaeroides. E-F. Transcriptional verification of dxs and ubiE expression in different strains in 24 h by q-PCR.
constitutive promoters had strengths ranging from 54% (T334-13) to 2987% (T334-6) that of the Q10 synthetic pathway refactoring. Therefore, we constructed the T334*, which showed similar activity to \( P_{\text{R}p,7571} \), to strengthen the Q10 synthetic pathway in JDW-710. In Q10 production, \( dxS \) and \( ubiE \) are two known bottleneck genes [11,27]. However, use of the tac promoter does not significantly affect Q10 production in JDW-710. Owing to the higher activity of T334* (920% higher than that of tac) and moderate copy number of pBBR plasmid (~10 copies per cell) [47], the transcription of \( dxS \) and \( ubiE \) increased 38-fold and 27-fold, respectively, under the same strategy. The Q10 yield increased 28%, and Q10 production reached 226 mg/L in DOE2 (Fig. 5). Although the Q10 production in DOE2 must be further improved before that in a previous study [13], these results indicate that a highly active promoter element was a requirement for successful engineering of a high-producing industrial strain. Beyond the slight inhibition of cell growth by using T334*, we found that the concentration of bacteriochlorophyll significantly increased in DOE2 (Fig. S6), indicating that the terpenoid precursor (e.g., geranylgeranyl pyrophosphate) supply for the downstream pathway was also upregulated [48]. Future fine tuning of promoter activity and the metabolic flux toward Q10 biosynthesis is needed to improve the yield of the Q10 high-producing industrial strain.

5. Conclusion

In summary, on the basis of transcriptional analysis of two types of \( R. \) sphaeroides and enzymatic activity verification, we identified \( P_{\text{R}p,7571} \) as a native highly active promoter. Through random sequence mutation and the use of an RFP visualization screening system, we constructed a \( P_{\text{R}p,7571} \)-derived synthetic promoter library. Finally, a selected strong synthetic promoter was used to significantly improved the Q10 biosynthetic efficiency in a high-producing industrial strain. These well-characterized promoters should be highly useful in current synthetic biology platforms for refactoring the biosynthetic pathway in \( R. \) sphaeroides-derived MCFs.
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