High-throughput and reliable acquisition of in vivo turnover number fuels precise metabolic engineering
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ABSTRACT

As synthetic biology enters the era of quantitative biology, mathematical information such as kinetic parameters of enzymes can offer us an accurate knowledge of metabolism and growth of cells, and further guidance on precision metabolic engineering. \( k_{\text{cat}} \), termed the turnover number, is a basic parameter of enzymes that describes the maximum number of substrates converted to products each active site per unit time. It reflects enzyme activity and is essential for quantitative understanding of biosystems. Usually, the \( k_{\text{cat}} \) values are measured in vitro, thus may not be able to reflect the enzyme activity in vivo. In this case, Davidi et al. defined a surrogate \( k_{\text{app}} \) for \( k_{\text{cat}} \) and developed a high throughput method to acquire \( k_{\text{app}} \) from omics data. Heckmann et al. and Chen et al. proved that the surrogate parameter can be a good embodiment of the physiological state of enzymes and exhibit superior performance for enzyme-constrained genome scale models to the default one. These breakthroughs will fuel the development of system and synthetic biology.

Traditional synthetic biology and metabolic engineering focus more on the trial-and-error-based pathway engineering, which consumes lots of time and effort. With the development of big data and machine learning, synthetic biology has evolved to the era of quantitative biology, and it is possible to conduct precise metabolic engineering guided by rational design like multi-scale data processing and learning from microbial intelligence. For this purpose, mathematical parameters are crucial for a better knowledge of cell growth and metabolism [1,2]. Among them, \( k_{\text{cat}} \) is considered as one of the most important parameters that illustrate the basic metabolic activities.

\( k_{\text{cat}} \) values, also called the turnover numbers, are parameters describe the maximum number of substrates converted to products per unit time per active site. It is a quantitative measurement of enzyme activity. The \( k_{\text{cat}} \) values are defined by equation (1),

\[
k_{\text{cat}} = \frac{v_{\max}}{E_0}
\]

where \( v_{\max} \) is the maximum reaction rate and \( E_0 \) is the concentration of the enzyme. In system and computational biology, the \( k_{\text{cat}} \) values are adopted for enzyme-constrained genome scale models, which offers a better understanding of metabolic activities of living cells [2]. Also, \( k_{\text{cat}} \) values can provide quantitative guidance for pathway engineering and metabolic reconstitution (Fig. 1). To this end, it is important to develop strategies for \( k_{\text{cat}} \) acquisition.

\( k_{\text{cat}} \) values are normally obtained from protein expression assays by a low throughput way (Fig. 1), which is labor-intensive and time-consuming [3]. Indeed, the in vitro \( k_{\text{cat}} \) measurements differ among literatures and only 9% of \( k_{\text{cat}} \) values of the well-studied \textit{Escherichia coli} are available [4]. Furthermore, the in vitro \( k_{\text{cat}} \) may not be a true reflection for in vivo scenarios since the conditions are significantly changed [5]. Actually, the \( k_{\text{cat}} \) value varies according to pH, buffer, temperature, and immobilization. For example, the in vitro \( k_{\text{cat}} \) of catalase varies from 11 s\(^{-1}\) to 151 s\(^{-1}\) due to changes in pH and buffer in \textit{E. coli} [6]. Therefore, it is an urgent necessity for a universal method to estimate \( k_{\text{cat}} \) data that well matching the in vivo scenarios.

To address the aforementioned issues, Davidi et al. defined \( k_{\text{app}} \), as a
surrogate for in vitro $k_{\text{cat}}$ [7]:

$$k_{\text{app},ij} = \frac{v_{ij}}{E_{ij}} = \eta k_{\text{cat},ij}$$

(2)

$$k_{\text{app,max},i} = k_{\text{cat},i}$$

(3)

where $v_{ij}$ is the reaction rate of $i$-th enzymatic reaction under $j$-th cultivation conditions. $E_{ij}$ is the enzyme concentration. $\eta$ is a condition-dependent function, ranging between 0 and 1, which describes the decrease in the catalytic rate. The $k_{\text{app,max}}$ values represent the maximum turnover number under optimal state among varied cultivation conditions. It can be determined when the growth condition pools are large enough. Davidi et al. tested 31 different growth conditions and proteomic data $E_{ij}$ were extracted (Fig. 1). For the reaction rate, flux balance analysis (FBA) was adopted for the calculation of $v_{ij}$. The $k_{\text{app,max}}$ values were then determined. Comparison of $k_{\text{app,max}}$ values with in vitro $k_{\text{cat}}$ values for $E. coli$ yielded a correlation factor of $R^2 = 0.62$, indicating a good agreement for in vivo and in vitro situations [7].

Chen et al. used the same method to obtain the $k_{\text{app}}$ data of yeast and the correlation analysis results in a $R^2 = 0.26$, which suggested a high in vivo and in vitro discrepancy. The in vitro $k_{\text{cat}}$ values of yeast were further analyzed by Chen et al. and the authors found that the weak correlation is caused by the heterologous expression of enzymes. Exclusion of these heterologous expressed enzymes led to a better $R^2 = 0.41$ but still not as good as for $E. coli$ [8].

However, since the metabolic flux $v_{ij}$ is calculated by FBA in the method, such estimation can be limited by poor FBA accuracy or incomplete genome-scale model, and the robustness of the $k_{\text{app}}$ in response to various perturbations remains unclear [9]. Therefore, Heckmann et al. proposed a $^{13}$C metabolic flux analysis (MFA) based method for $k_{\text{app}}$ predicition [9] (Fig. 1). To obtain the $v_{ij}$ data, $E. coli$ cells with various knockouts of central metabolism were cultivated in minimum medium with glucose. The resulting cultures were then subjected to MFA to generate $v_{ij}$ of 21 strains from adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) [10,11]. The MFA based $k_{\text{app,max}}$ showed good consistency with $k_{\text{app,max}}$ by FBA with $R^2 = 0.9$, indicating this method a good complementation for the systems lacking FBA data. Heckmann et al. [9] and Chen et al. [8] then applied $k_{\text{app}}$ to the enzyme-constrained metabolic model and found that model with $k_{\text{app}}$ showed better performance in compared with the original one. It is clear that flux data and proteome data from the well characterized species under the certain cultivation conditions are available and reliable. Although getting omics data under different cultivation conditions is still a tedious process for non-model organisms, the work flow and protocols, as described in this comment, are available to some extent.

The above summarized methods can effectively and unfailingly measure the $k_{\text{app}}$ in a high-throughput way currently. However, the coverage is still limited. To address this issue, Chew et al. developed a 3D convolutional neural network to predict enzymatic catalysis rates based on experimental reaction data and corresponding molecular dynamics simulation data, which can be used to predict flux data [12]. It is worth mentioning that Heckman et al. [9] made use of machine learning to extrapolate the $k_{\text{app}}$ to genome scale, which combined with the 3D structure and biochemical characteristics of enzymes in the database to further estimate the $k_{\text{app}}$ for enzymes suffering from coverage issue of proteomic techniques [13]. This method offered another perspective for
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**Fig. 1.** Stages of the development of $k_{\text{cat}}$ extraction methods for higher throughput and better coverage.
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biochemical property is limited for some enzymes of interest. Thus, a more complete dataset regarding the machine learning is being developed for generic k_{app} prediction. This shows that k_{app} data extraction methods are transitioning from a low-throughput, low-coverage approach to a high-throughput, high-coverage, high-accuracy approach.

In the outlook, the accurate and complete dataset of k_{cat}/k_{app} provides us another mathematical measurement in addition to transcriptome, proteome and metabolome and reveals the quantitative picture of genome scale metabolic network. On the other hand, kinetic features can effectively provide theoretical guidance for metabolic engineering modification and further realize the transformation from random trial-and-error to rational design. The development of k_{cat} values will support a revolutionary progress for synthetic biology and metabolic engineering.
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